



Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (IHPC) **HEARING AGENDA**

Wednesday, June 4, 2025, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Public Assembly Room, City-County Building
200 East Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana

Commission

Present: Anson Keller (AK), William Browne (WB), David Baker (DB), Krystin Wiggs (KW), Micheal Bivens (MB); Annie Lear (AL)

Absent: Disa Watson (DW), Anjanette Sivilich (AS) and Susan Williams (SW)

Staff

Present: Meg Busch (MEG), Cristopher Steinmetz (CS), Shelbi Long (SL), Morgan Marmolejo (MM), Caroline Emenaker (CE) and Grace Goedeker (GG)

Absent: Emily Jarzen (EJ)

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER 5:37

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES 5:37

APRIL 2, 2025 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

MAY 7, 2025 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

Motion: AK

2nd: DB

Unanimous Approval

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:37

2024-COA-188A (WP) 958 WOODRUFF PLACE MIDDLE DRIVE

ALI KHAN (Ali)

Violation correction monthly check in.

Ali: We have finished everything that was supposed to be a part of Part A. Everything is done, before it was supposed to be.

Shelbi: Tomorrow I am going to do some comparison and if everything looks okay I will sign off on it. Part B is continued to the August hearing.

WB: So part A will be done and he won't have to report on that anymore?

SL: That is correct.

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:39

INTRODUCTION OF IHPC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEWER – Caroline Emenaker

RESOLUTION 2025-R-01 – Adoption of Resolution to designate Caroline Emenaker a Hearing Officer

Motion: MB
2nd: KW
Unanimous Approval

WB: Introduces Commission and Staff; Reads rules of procedure.

PUBLIC HEARING

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS 5: 41

2025-COA-149 (HMP) & 2025-VHP-004 **2064 NORTH ALABAMA STREET AKA 251 & 253 EAST 21ST STREET**
JEFFREY COWSERT

Construct two family house and for a VDS for construction in the clear sight triangle.
Continue to July 2nd hearing.

Motion: KW

2nd: AK

Motion passes unanimously to continue to July 2nd.

VI. EXPEDITED CASES 5:45

Meg: Request to Move 2025-COA-111 to the end of the agenda as Commissioner Keller will need to recuse himself and there will be a lack of a quorum; Reads all other expedited cases.

WB: Announces the Arrival of Annie Lear for Quorum

Meg: Reads 2025-COA-111 into record.

2025-COA-083 (CH) **1306 EAST SAINT CLAIR STREET**
RIVERA GROUP

Construct single-family house & detached carriage house.

Heather Sullivan (HS): I am formerly the chair of the conservation committee, so my replacement chair is also here. We received an email on April 7th and my last attempt to contact her was May 6th, the night of our committee meeting. Our meetings are always on a Tuesday in case there is something for the commission. We have a policy that we do not review unless a representative is present. We were emailed a set of plans but due to a lack of review we were asked to not support the project.

Meg: By the nature of expedited case there is no remonstrance. If the applicant is here we can pull it and hear it. If not, it should be continued to July 2nd.

Applicant Not Present

WB: Calls for Motion to Continue to July 2nd.

Motion: AK

2nd: KW

Motion passes unanimously.

2025-COA-111 (MCD) **WEST MARKET STREET**
AK Recused **BILL KINCIUS, DPW**

Street and sidewalk improvements on Market Street, between Illinois Street and Capitol Avenue.

2025-COA-132 (CAMA) **604 EAST NORTH STREET**

RIVERA GROUP

Construct front addition on existing patio.

2025-COA-134 (HMP)**1802 NORTH ALABAMA STREET****MELISSA IANNUCCI**

Construct single-family house and detached garage.

2025-COA-137 (FS)**RIGHT-OF-WAY SEGMENTS OF SHELBY STREET, VIRGINIA AVENUE, PROSPECT STREET, WOODLAWN AVENUE, SANDERS STREET AND MORRIS STREET****GAVIN MERRIMAN FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

Curb line, sidewalk and bike lane alterations, construct and improved ADA ramps, installation of rain gardens, and utility pole relocations.

Motion: DB**2nd: KW****Unanimous Approval to approve the above five expedited cases.****VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)****NONE****VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)****5:50****2025-COA-151 (HMP)****1827 NORTH PENNSYLVANIA STREET****2025-VHP-005****JASON WOLFE (JW)**

Construct carriage house and for Variances of Use to allow for the construction of a secondary dwelling unit without a primary structure and a secondary dwelling unit without the owner occupying the lot as their primary residence.

JW: This project we are proposing the construction of a carriage house on a currently vacant lot. The current property is very tight so there is no opportunity to develop on the primary site. It is a standard 3-car garage with a carriage house above it. It is a space for extra entertaining. The structure is located in a typical location for a garage. This will also provide one of the owner's brother a place to live as he is a dependent adult. We know it is a little unusual but that is the reason behind that. They initially wanted it to be the same design as their house but changed to a transitional design as it could impact the design of a future house on the site. At the moment the roof is a standing seam metal. We engaged with staff early on. Staff felt comfortable with the garage house without a house, but staff kept saying they were wanting more of a transitional design. It is leaning contemporary but is transitional in nature. We did get an email on May 5th with more comments. We felt like the design was already transitional and it would be easy to make more traditional later if someone wanted to. We felt it was flexible and also what the clients wanted. Staff mentioned the balcony being more open, which we understand but as it is designed, provides privacy for the user. They also mentioned no supports under the balcony and we did not understand the goal behind the comment. Staff mentioned adding more windows. We added some, but the others they suggested did not seem to fit with the design. They also mentioned switching to an asphalt roof. In addition they recommended fencing and landscaping which is the future intention for the client. We got the staff report and we are surprise because it was more specific with things that were not mentioned to us. The recommendations in the report suggest it pigeonholes the design of the house to be more traditional. We met with the neighborhood, and they provided a letter of support for the

design. I mentioned, we are flexible. We are fine changing the pattern of the siding, switching to asphalt shingles, and adding additional windows. We are hopeful that we could get an approval. I will turn it over to Samantha, one of the owners.

Samantha: We have lived in the neighborhood for over a decade. Our hope is to move our proposal forward. It serves a very important purpose. My brother is a 57-year-old adult dependent who will be moving in with us. This home is being purpose built to include his favorite things. There are several intentional design details to suit his needs, such as the closed in and post supported balcony. We have been in contact with staff and the neighborhood. We understand this is a historic area with a mix of housing types and styles. This is why we feel the transitional style is appropriate for our project.

MM: I adopted this case from Emily. The initial communication was through her. As a staff we feel it should be more transitional in an attempt to not pigeonhole design. We are recommending the following changes for consideration, the detailing should lean transitional including the four-inch exposure siding, thicker trims on the window and door. Choosing double hung over casements, trim headers and window sills, opening the balcony, using brackets for the balcony, exterior light fixtures being a more lantern style and more openings on the first floor as it seems a little boxy and using an asphalt roof over the metal, and I can answer any questions.

DB: I am anxious to hear what my other commissioners say, because I do not have a problem with it. It seems like a blank palate. Two questions: You have a footprint of future house. Is it their intent to build a house?

JW: It is not. It is there to show that the potential is there.

DB: So it is not their intent to build a house. The porch enclosure, I am not sure I exactly understand it. Are those aluminum panels?

JW: Yes, the intent would be to paint the aluminum on the balcony to match the panels and have a metal cap.

DB: I think you could still have privacy and a little bit of separation.

JW: The intent is it is built more as a wall than a railing. We could consider doing more of a railing but that was not the intent.

DB: There are pros and cons. It will be visible for a very long time. In a sense, if it was an open one you would see a lot of clutter up there.

MB: I echo David's sentiment, but it does seem to have a lack of openings. Looking at the floor plan it makes sense, but from the outside it does not. You have blocked out future overhead doors, so I am fine with that. My lack of fenestration is my sticking point right now.

AK: I think the design is pretty neutral and lends itself to future development. Generally, there is a provision in the code that the secondary structure should not be higher than the primary. Is that something we can approve in the submittal and not in the variance.

Meg: As there is no primary structure, that is a good question.

Shelbi: As it is a variance of use, that trumps the development standards.

MM: I think Emily thought about that as she prepped everything. I am pretty sure Emily covered that before giving it to me.

AK: I think the amount of fenestration is consistent with carriage houses and garage structures. I have no issue with the design as it stands. Staff has relieved my procedural concerns.

AL: I would tend to agree, because it has the ability to do what needs to be done in the future, so I am in support as it is.

DB: I know there is an ordinance about the need for buildings on alleys to have the entrances be well defined. The entrance is on the side does it need something.

Meg: As long as it can be seen from the alley or right of way they are fine.

WB: I am fine with the design. The heaviness of the balcony, it may be worth looking at using large panel with smaller gaps to make it feel more open while still give privacy. If there was a house in front of it, I would not care as much, but since it is visible it is something to consider. I do think this design is open to work to be done later.

JW: I would like clarity on what we need to change.

WB: I would look at the balcony piece, and you can work with staff. I think you are fine on fenestration.

Meg: Staff recommends to approve a COA to construct a carriage house per submitted documentation.

COA
Motion: DB
2nd: AL
Unanimous Approval

Meg: Staff recommends approval of the two variances of use.

VHP:
Motion: AL
2nd: KW
Unanimous Approval

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL

6:20

2024-COA-356 (IRV)

5814 BEECHWOOD AVENUE

DARRYL GUNYON (DG)

Install railings and for work completed without approval including: replace windows and doors, install fiber cement siding, replace wood trim, enclose openings and create new openings, remove awnings, demolish greenhouse and construct new addition.

DG: I constructed two new homes in the neighborhood. I am invested in Irvington and that is why I bought this house. When I bought the house, I was told the responsibility of the windows followed the previous owner. There were doors and windows stored in the house. I installed these. I removed the greenhouse and exposed the slab foundation. There were doors that led to nowhere that I converted to a family space.

People love the sunporch I added. I submitted before and after photos. I called the permits department and he said no permits were necessary which led me to believe that the IHPC made an error with the windows. This led me to install the remaining windows. The plan states that new architectural additions should be simple in design and the addition I built is. The staff provided me a document that outlined requirements for authorization. One of these is potential hardship, this would be a hardship to replace work done as staff recommends. The only other option I have would be to walk away. I have no means to make changes and denial would force me into financial ruin. This is not the only house on the block that has vinyl siding and windows. The historic integrity of the neighborhood has been compromised for decades and my changes are not a detriment to the neighborhood. I admit I made a poor decision but now I need to find a way to move forward. The only way I see this is to sell the house. If I had to change the octagonal window, I would have to redo the bathroom again, which would be a financial hardship and decrease the value of the home. For the painted brick inside the sunporch, I was quoted 12 thousand dollars to fix. I have tried to create a thing of practical beauty and believe I have. I will not take any further unauthorized steps. I invite you all to come see the house for yourself.

Reads letters scanned and incorporated into the case record.

DI: I have lived in the neighborhood for 63 years and I approve what he has done to the property and feel it has benefitted the neighborhood.

YM: I live at the house next door. Every time I see him I compliment him on his house. I would hate to see him worry about it going into disrepair again.

TS: I live east of this house and I think all of the improvements on this house look great.

JS: I lived with my father up until a few years ago. This is one of the most beautiful houses on this street, especially with the changes. I think his changes are an improvement. I think they look great.

DG: I realize I took liberties. I was dealing with long term illness and brain fog. I was trying to get things done in a hurry. I might have lived there but now it's on the market because I fear this board is going to rule against me. I am retired. I hope I meet the criteria of substantial hardship.

SL: First, I want to address the non-contributing classification, based on its condition the non-contributing nature was either based on that addition or made in error. Staff recommends approval for Certificate of Authorization for the installation of the railing on the westside stoop, and work completed without approval including installing new wood trim, removing awnings, replacing doors, and demolishing the greenhouse. We are also recommending approval of the second story vinyl windows, although staff feels they are inappropriate it was done by a previous owner. For Part B we are recommending denial for the first-floor replacement windows and front door, the replacement of rough sawn fiber cement siding, on the dormers, the installation of the octagonal window, and the construction of the addition. We do not believe these meet the criteria of a Certificate of Authorization as any hardship was self-imposed by the owner. The owner has had cases before the commission in the past. The effect on the district will be substantial. It is important to note we were made aware of these violations by the neighborhood. This property is up for sale, so we are recommending a shorter time frame than normal. I can answer any questions.

WB: Is it my understanding you have been in front of our body before?

DG: I built two new houses but that was years ago. I do not think I ever stood here.

WB: My understanding is you knew this was in a historic district before you did the work.

DG: Yes, I did.

WB: Why did you not go to the staff?

DG: I was ill and making bad decisions.

WB: So, you were looking for forgiveness after doing the work.

DG: I wasn't think things through. I would still be in a hardship.

WB: I am trying to understand why in the world you would take this course when you knew you were in violation and knew you were breaking the rules. It is hard for our commission to give you forgiveness since you have lived in the district for years. You need to know this is the position you have put yourself and the staff in. You made a choice and we are now here living with the decisions you made.

DG: I do understand that but it is still a hardship that would ruin me. I did request you come to the site. I was here in April, and I heard commissioners have visited the site in the past.

WB: I suspect staff has visited the site. Commissioner visits may be an outcome from this, but we will see after commission comments

DB: I won't reiterate what Bill just mentioned. Before I had this position, I was a staff member and the situation of people not getting their permits is frustrating. The aspect of this case I want to talk about isn't that. I apologize this is my night for not going along with everything staff is saying. One thing that bothered me about this case is the non-contributing classification. The staff report states it is classified as non-contributing but speculated that was a mistake. Personally, I think it is a historically significant house and contributes to the neighborhood. However, our legally adopted plan, clearly classifies this property as non-contributing. In the plan it states, "work that is proposed to a property that is non-contributing is looked at differently". The plan we adopted, says its non-contributing and we are supposed to look at changes with this perspective. That tells me that maybe I do not think some of these were the right kind of change. I did go out and see the house. I looked at it with not what was right for the house but for the neighborhood. It would make no sense to have the differing windows. The one thing I thought that makes the house problematic is the addition he put on the side, if it had some type of base it would help. Again, would I approve that addition on a historic house, I don't think so. I tried to divorce my thinking from what I think the right thing would be for the architecture of this house. However, this doesn't excuse not getting a permit or talking to staff. With that said I will end for now.

KW: Is this something that is uncommon?

Meg: It is certainly rare, and it is also up for interpretation. Inventories are done using the secretary of interior standards but as Shelbi mentioned the addition on there may have been one of the reasons it was identified like that.

DB: We cannot really say it was a mistake, there were a lot of people working on it. It does not surprise me there was something not agreed with, but it is what got adopted and we have to deal with that.

AK: I hear what you are saying. My question is, this is one of the few examples of this style in the neighborhood. While it's not contributing the loss of the integrity still has a negative effect on the neighborhood, does it not?

WB: yes probably

AK: The fact that it was in disrepair was obviously a problem. Things that are glaring for me is a lack of a base on the addition and the first-floor windows, I think those were chosen for a reason. I am not as worried about the original door.

SL: I do not have written down how many panels, I do not have a picture of it. The new is fiber glass over wood core and has the twelve lights.

AK: The visibility from the street does not seem have as big of an effect. I abhor the fact that the process was not followed. I think that contributes to chaos. I personally think the windows on the first floor are a non-starter. I think they need to replicate what was there. I am not sure the hardship is as inflated as you say. I do not think we could approve everything, but I think there is a pathway to authorization.

WB: I am very frustrated by the process. I am similarly minded to David. If the staff were to look at this as a non-contributing building. I do not know if it makes sense to continue the case and have the staff look at it through that lense. Whether it is right or wrong there is an in between here. My recommendation is to continue the case and let the staff take a new look at it. Come back with a discussion from the applicant and see if there is a middle ground.

AL: I have one question, when you talked about the base of the addition is that something that can be altered.

WB: I think that is part of what I am getting at with staff taking a new look at it. I do think Anson's point about this having an effect in the neighborhood is an issue.

Meg: A few things. Just to be clear the staff's recommendation is based on the non-contributing guidelines. We will take a look at the house with the guidelines David reference. We would ask the commission ask the applicant to not sell the property.

WB: Are you agreeable to not sell the property?

DG: Yes

WB: I will take a motion to continue the case.

DB: The key to make this fit better is make some design changes to the front porch addition. There are several ways of doing that. You can work with staff or someone you know to help you.

DG: I think you're right. I wanted to do, essentially a brick ledge. I wanted to in the future tear the garage down and use those bricks.

DB: Make sure you come here and get an approval.

Motion: AL

2nd: KW

Unanimous Approval to continue to July 2nd.

2025-COA-140 (HMP)

**1808 NORTH DELAWARE STREET
JUSTIN LEINENBACH (JL)**

Maintain steel front door installed without approval.

JL: My family and I moved here from Bloomington and purchased the property as is. The door was replaced because it did not properly seal and was rotted. We had the door custom made and matched. I was unaware of the rules until I received notification. This is my first historical home and they require a lot of maintenance. We maintain our home responsibly. All of the new builds have steel doors. Please consider our application.

SL: Given that the opening is an alteration staff is in support of the enlarged opening so we are recommending the door be replaced with an appropriate wood door.

AK: Have you priced a wood replacement? One of the conditions is

hardship and my initial reaction is that many people would not be able to tell it is not wood. Given the previous door was handed in the wrong direction this is an improvement. I am not a fan of the way you went about it but I do feel we would be imposing a hardship.

DB: I also drove by this house. The new doors look better in person than in the picture. The door you replaced, words escape me. I have evolved over time on my fixation on things having to be wood always as the quality of wood has gone down. For me it is more how it visually preforms. I could not tell from sitting in front of the house. I think a lot you can tell from a mile away. I know the good from a bad. I am not sure we would get anything better. I am willing to live with it.

AL: I am in line with what Anson said. Let this be an important lesson that could have been very expensive.

Meg: Staff recommends approval of a certificate of appropriateness to retain the steel front door installed without approval.

Motion: KW

2nd: AL

MB Opposed

5-1 for, motion passes

XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD

NONE

XII. CLOSING BUSINESS

NONE

Adjourned: 7:17PM