



Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (IHPC)

Minutes

Wednesday, September 3, 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), Krystin Wiggs (KW), Michael Bivens (MB), Annie Lear (AL), Anjanette Sivilich (AS), Disa Watson-Summers (DW).

Absent: Susan Williams (SW) and David Baker (DB).

Staff

Present: Meg Busch (MEG), Christopher Steinmetz (CS), Shelbi Long (SL), Morgan Marmolejo (MM), Caroline Emenaker (CE), Grace Goedeker (GG) and Emily Jarzen (EJ).

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER 5:30

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NONE

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:30

2020-COA-594 (FS) 1034 VIRGINIA AVENUE *Page 3*

MINDA BALCIUS

Approval of one year extension.

SL: The work has not officially started yet so they are looking for a one-year extension in order to get approved work completed.

Motion: AS

2nd: AK

Unanimous approval to extend COA for one-year.

2024-COA-232 (IRV) RIGHT-OF-WAY, IN FRONT OF 5460 EAST WASHINGTON STREET *Pages*

RACHEL WILSON FOR INDYGO

Approval of three-year extension.

SL: Project has not started yet but this is for one of the blue line stations and the projected completion is fall 2028.

Motion: MB

2nd: AL

Unanimous Approval to extend for three-years.

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

PUBLIC HEARING
WB: Introduces Commission and Staff; Reads rules of procedure

V.	REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS	5:35
-----------	---	-------------

2025-COA-301 (CAMA)	656 EAST ARCH STREET ABBEY ROBERTSON Renovation of an existing 2-story single family residence with a detached garage. Scope includes: 1 and 2 story additions, a new wrap-around front porch, a new 2-car garage and carriage house. New exterior finishes, windows, and doors.	<i>continue to October 1, 2025</i> Page 7
----------------------------	--	---

Motion: KW
2nd: AS
Unanimous approval to continue to Oct. 1st

VI.	EXPEDITED CASES	5:36
------------	------------------------	-------------

2025-COA-260 (HMP)	1921 NORTH NEW JERSEY STREET ERIC MATSON Construct addition on garage to create secondary dwelling unit.	Page 9 <i>Submittals</i> Page 96
2025-COA-278 (IRV)	316 SOUTH AUDUBON ROAD KATIE STRAHAN Demolish historic garage and construct new garage.	Page 15 <i>Submittals</i> Page 108
2025-COA-293 (CH)	1310 EAST 9TH STREET WALTER RESINOS Construct rear addition.	Page 23 <i>Submittals</i> Page 116
2025-COA-300 (IRV) & 2025-VHP-008	5936 EAST WASHINGTON STREET GERARDO GONZALEZ Remodel and alter existing structure and site for new restaurant and for a Variance of Use.	Page 31 <i>Submittals</i> Page 127
2025-COA-306 (IRV)	51 NORTH HAWTHORNE LANE LOUIS PETRONE III Demolish historic detached garage, construct shed.	Page 43

COAs
Motion: KW
2nd: AL
Unanimous Approval

VHP
Motion: AS
2nd: MB
Unanimous Approval

VII.	APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)	5:38
-------------	---	-------------

2017-COA-049 AMENDMENT 8 (CAMA)	901 CARROLLTON AVENUE RYAN STAUDE (RS) Amend previously approved plans for Building 2. JC: I would like to highlight the issues from the last meeting and how we addressed them. First of all, the height of the building we reduced the height of the podium by four feet and increased the height of the tower portion. On the images you can see the dashed line which	Page 49 <i>Submittals</i> Page 175
--	---	--

indicated the height from the original submittal. We enlarged and opened the rooftop terrace area. We have included a material detail and we are hoping this reassures everyone the glass will be clear glass. Here you can see the nod to the Bottleworks bottling plant in the detailing. There was concern about the garage portion, so we have included this section to help explain what is happening there. Finally, there is a little more of an update on the traffic.

Aaron Hurt (AH): Since the last meeting we met with DPW. Some things we clarified were the number of parking spaces with the office being able to rent 200 spaces during the week. We talked through the trip generation for the use and the tenth street location for the curb cut. Some of the benefits is being able to stack up to eight cars versus four on Bellefontaine. The possibility of a dedicated u-turn lane was brought up with DPW which we would be willing to do. We shared all of that information, and I am happy to talk about that more if necessary.

LJ: I am a big supporter of Bottleworks but in general they have been here long enough to participate in downtown development. My first request remains the same about the parking lot that is essentially a mud pit and I bare the brunt of maintaining the area coming off of that lot. When they start the new building, the variance could get extended, so I am looking at several more years of mud and mess. With regards to the traffic, you cannot make a left turn onto the lane in Carrollton. This will impeded traffic. This entire process will put the burden back on the city for their building. Access off of tenth street there is only one way in and out. Access off of Bellefontaine has more options. In the report they included the two rights people will need to make to go north on College Ave. As I drove over here, the traffic is solid from Carrollton to College. All of the talk about plenty of access and plenty of room is incorrect. I was told that if I ever tried to make some sort of threat about doing something else, I would not get anything approved.

EJ: To reiterate a few of the recommendations staff made between the hearing, we suggested trying to trick the eye to bring the base down and they did drop it four feet. We also recommended more detail for the material for the screen and a photo was provided. We suggested a different approach, potentially something more refined than just the mesh and the concrete. They did say they would be open to looking at something in the future. Staff is looking at an approval with some potential for design changes. Unfortunately, DPW did not have a chance to look at this memo and provide comment because of another traffic study they are conducting.

AL: The one thing I would suggest, about the parking lot on the north side of tenth and be more forward thinking about that, as it will probably become a staging area. Near the end of that period there needs to effort put forth for the end result. To Larry's point the commitment to clean it up has been made multiple times and nothing has happened.

AK: I continue to be concerned with the bumper wall as it is highly visible. You have made an effort to decorate around it but there is no effort to screen the garage. I would like to see more effort to screen the garage. It is clear that is a parking lot with no effort

AS: Traffic was a constant flow going past there tonight. I think the left u-turn lane will be problematic. I see you made an effort to relate to the bottling building next door. I would like to see more.

WB: I do not think we should approve this without DPW. I think it needs to be approved by them first. Without needing to flip the garage is

there a way to drive through to Bellefontaine without changing the circulation.

JC: Yes, there would be, we just felt this would be more invisible.

WB: If everyone is doing Li-Turns that is going to be a challenge.

Matt: We have had coordination with DPW. We are dumbfounded about the severe reservations as they did not tell us about any reservations. They saw pros and cons to each one. I do understand there is concerns. Where the reservation has come from DPW has not been told to us. If we have the lane that we mentioned, it would impact some of the mechanical space. There are alternatives but there are many reasons why we went with this plan.

EJ: I have had limited conversations. They told me they got the memo but did not like the tenth street in-out.

WB: Obviously the timing is not great as we were hoping for a response from DPW so we could act accordingly.

LE: We did look about going north. It is better to go east before then going north. The data suggests they are going to want to head east or south before heading out. We talked to DPW and they said they are looking at removing a lane and adding parking on tenth. They gave us the recommendation for the u-turn lane.

JC: From our conversation we are willing to have DPW blessing as a stipulation for the COA.

WB: I look to Meg on how that would need to be set up.

Meg: Ultimately, that is your call. As their official response could impact the design and we have heard other design concerns mentioned tonight.

WB: I hate to keep pushing this, but there is a conversation about the bumper wall and making it look less like a garage.

JC: The wire mesh or the punched metal options, we are happy to keep that conversation going with staff. The material shown may not be the final material it is just what is shown. We will be doing a physical mock-up for staff approval.

Meg: As Mr. Jones has brought up the parking lot on tenth at two meeting, I want to mention that is approved under a separate COA.

JC: The biggest concern for us is this project will need a staging area and using that site for staging. After that is complete the parking lot would be finished off.

WB: Obviously, it would be good if that would occur as a part of the end of this project.

AL: Can I inquire about what that will become.

LE: A plan is put together for that to be a parking lot with nice landscaping and lighting.

JC: Those plans were approved the timing of this project is the main factor.

WB: I think we will continue to October to work out the traffic and garage comments.

Motion to continue to October 1st: AL

2nd: KW

Unanimously Approved

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

6:12

2025-COA-252 (IRV)

373 BURGESS AVENUE

LARRY DORFMAN (LD)

Construct two story addition on east side of house and 1.5 story

Page 61

Submitta/s

Page 202

detached garage with driveway, alter opening and existing roofline on south elevation; demo existing shed roof addition on east side.

LD: My clients would like to renovate the home and erect a two-story addition. It is an unusual lot as it is bounded on three sides by streets so it does not have a true rear yard. Years ago, a shed was approved to be put into the "back yard" on the east. The set back lines on the streets also impact the project and being able to do this addition on a different side. The addition would include a kitchen and owners suite. The owners have renovated the exterior in compliance with the commission requirements. Some of the benefits is the removal of the shed roof structure and a lot of concrete is eliminated. That sums up the project. I would like DJ to step forward.

Don Smith (DS): I am the owner and is my first home. Prior to us owning it, it was vacant. The overall upkeep of the home was poor prior to us owning it. We have given the home a little bit of love that I think has made a positive impact on the neighborhood. Since the construction of the house there is a precedent of development. We knew addition should be on the back. All development so far has been to the east. Anyone who stands there at the corner knows it would be unsafe to develop there. People already drive through the easement. We have been the best stewards that we can be and the needs of our house have changed. We want to grow old with our house and to do that we need more space.

LD: It was a tricky house to add on to. The floor plan was restricting. We needed more space which drove the addition. We did not want to place it too close to Rawles for safety and I just wanted to throw those ideas out.

SL: Staff is not in support of this request as it is in conflict with the plan. Overall, the garage design is acceptable, but the location is inappropriate. For this evening, we have recommended discussion and possible continuance.

AK: Just to recognize this is a difficult site, back is relative on a building like this. I do not think we should constrain homeowners to not be able to build. The only thing I see is discrepancies between elevations and renderings. Overall, I think the garage and addition are appropriate scale and they are kind of landlocked with the site.

MB: This might be a question for staff, the location of the garage as proposed, do you feel it should be farther south.

SL: Yes

MB: Did you provide guidance on how far?

SL: In an ideal world it would be as close to behind the house as possible to be in compliance with the plan.

MB: Is the length of the driveway that length for a reason.

LD: There is not an issue with moving it a little further south, we would like to limit the walk to the mudroom in poor weather.

MB: If the accessory building were more subservient to the burgess frontage, let the house stand close to the street and the garage stand further back. That is where it would not be so problematic for me.

WB: I will offer similar comments as the addition is fairly handsome, and I am trying to understand the need to push the garage. You have the dilemma of three fronts and to me it feels like it is in the right spot. It is a challenging site. I think it has an appropriate design so overall it feels like a good solution. I do not know if the small discrepancies can be worked through with staff.

SL: If the commission is comfortable with staff working that out, we can do that in final construction drawings.

WB: I do not think there is enough discrepancies to continue.
LD: If the concern is about how the house is approached it never happens from Burgess, so the garage feels like it is in the right place.
MEG: Reads staff recommendation with nine stipulations, one note and asks applicant if it is agreeable.
LD: Yes, I have done this a few times.

Motion: AS
2nd: AL
Unanimous Approval

**2025-COA-297 (CAMA) &
 2025-VHP-007**

**401 EAST MICHIGAN STREET
 KURT GREEN (KG)**

Repair masonry wall, replace gate and a Variance of Development Standards.

KG: We have a drawing set put together for the building on Mass and Michigan. There is a gate that is not the original access to the building. This is just showing the existing wall and gate and how it is not properly supported. We are replacing like with like, with a brick a mortar match. The only thing changing is that there will be a track below the gate to help mitigate the load. This gate provides a lot of flexibility, and the design is changing to echo the existing vocabulary of the building. We have the inspiration for the gate on the screen based on the cast iron gate and muttons. There has been work done around the building. The materials will allow for durability and a little transparency. It is a similar system to what is there now, but with the extra track and the gate being broken into thirds to allow for more flexibility. It looks similar on the inside. The view from Michigan street shows you only get a glimpse of it.

SL: Staff doesn't typically support requests for walls and fences that exceed the recommended. We received a letter or approval from Indiana Landmarks today.

WB: I think it is quite handsome. It will be a great addition to the alley.

AK: The only concern I have is the finish material for the steel beam. You have to take some tough consideration for how to field coat that so that the ice and snow does not wreck the beam.

Meg: Reads staff recommendation for approval. (see COA for stipulations)

Meg: Read staff recommendation for approval of variance.

Motion: KW
2nd: MB
Unanimous Approval

Motion: AS
2nd: AK
Unanimous Approval

*Page 75
 Submitta/s
 Page 247*

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL

2025-COA-282 (HMP)

ALEC NEU (AN)

6:40
*Submittals
 Page 260*

Construct new duplex with parking pad in the rear.

MM: In March of this year, we received a call about work being done here and they had not received notice. I discovered permits were issued without a COA. Work stopped and the permits were put in abeyance. The foundation was dug and footers were poured.

Meg: We are aware the permitting process can be a little complicated and I have reached out to BNS and I will be providing some training so they are aware of our statute and our expectations.

Josh Smith (JS)/Rivera Group: We do the permits for a lot of his homes. We got permit approval and started construction. I do not know if this is allowed but we have modified plans to address staff comments. This client likes to do side by side duplex. The roof pitch is 9X12 to match the height of the neighboring houses. Standard siding, smooth hardy, fiber-cement. There will be a parking pad in the rear wide enough for three cars. In the front, working with the land use committee. We plan to plant a white oak tree in the front yard. Moved the air conditioning to the rear.

MM: The newest plans were sent after Day Of packets went out. My initial comments was that they worked with staff and the neighborhood since it was reported. The front porch floor was originally wood lattice with wood deck. The new drawings appear that they have been cleaned up. The one comment not addressed was the secondary doors for each unit. Original recommendation was to continue the case so the changes could be made.

AK: Is this a rental and it was presented like that to the neighborhood?

JS AN: Yes,

AK: I am not super supportive of build to rent but that is not in our purview.

MM: To clarify I have not received an official letter of support from the land use committee.

JS AN: It will be a board and baton fiber cement panels with the lower portion being fiber cement.

WB: It does not look like the windows are symmetrical to the gable is that right?

JS AN: I think the dual gable frontage throws it off.

WB: I think you are going to want the window sill to be a little higher than the roof flashing and the porch.

JSAN: There is a fine line in the building code.

WB: You might need to lower the porch a few inches.

JSAN: The original plan for the porch was a pattern with 2X2 and now it is a poured.

WB: My sense is you need to work with staff a little bit more. There are a lot of high-quality homes in Herron Morton and this is a little rough. It feels flat. If you could refine this with staff and get the detailing a little tighter. We usually see a little higher quality drawing. The window sizes on the side. There are not very many windows. Work with staff and see if we can clean this up,

AK: Neither of the elevations match the plans so those of us familiar with plans, it is throwing us off. I think we just need something we can read.

WB: Work with Morgan and get that so we can get your through the next time.

Meg: Staff has worked with the Rivera group on several projects and we have the same issues. It is my recommendation that you take a look at the program you use. Investing in a program that helps prevent these issues will help with presenting to the commission.

WB: Asks for motion to continue.

Motion: AL

2nd: DW

Unanimous approval to continue to Oct. 1st_

XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD

NONE

XII. CLOSING BUSINESS

NONE

Adjourned: 6:56PM