



Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (IHPC)
HEARING AGENDA

Wednesday, November 5, 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), Michael Bivens (MB); Annie Lear (AL), and Susan Williams (SW)

Absent: Anjanette Sivilich (AS), Disa Watson-Summers (DW) and Krystin Wiggs (KW)

Staff

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

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER 5:30

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES 5:30

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:31

2025-COA-351 125 NORTH ORIENTAL STREET
(HOLY CROSS) ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF INDIANAPOLIS
Approval of Negative Findings of Fact

Motion: AL

2nd: SW

Unanimous

Approval

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:31

2025-R-03 Approval to enter into a professional services agreement with Building Ethos, LLC to update the Old Northside Historic Area Plan in the amount of \$16,000. (from January 1, 2026 through October 1, 2026)

Motion: AL

2nd: AK

Unanimous

Approval

PUBLIC HEARING

WB: Introduces Commission and Staff; Reads Rules of Procedure

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS 5:37

2025-COA-301 (CAMA) 656 EAST ARCH STREET *continue to December 3, 2025*
 ABBEY ROBERTSON

Demolish the majority of the existing home, leaving the street facing façade & segments of the west & east walls. Reconstruct the house & enlarge building footprint & increase overall building height at rear of structure. Replace windows & doors. Repair/replace foundation where necessary. Repair/replace siding & trim where necessary. Retain original rafter tails where existing. Construct new wrap-around front porch.

Demolish existing garage in its entirety & construct new 2-car garage & carriage house.

Motion: MB

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

5:38

2025-COA-322 (FP) **767 FLETCHER AVENUE**
MARK CROUCH
Construct single-family house and carriage house.

2025-COA-402 (CH) **610 DORMAN STREET**
HANNAH ABLE
Construct single-family house and carriage house.

Motion: DB

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

5:40

2025-COA-345 (CAMA) **922 NORTH COLLEGE AVENUE**
& 2025-VHP-009 **MATTHEW PEYTON (MP)**

Construct single-family residence & detached carriage house with living unit & a Variance of Development Standards for construction in the required clear sight triangle & for a reduced corner side setback.

MP: Explained that the packets being passed around where a highlight of the changes that were made. Mentioned that the design was more modern but still fit in with the neighborhood. Mentioned the limitations that the clear sight triangle put on the set back of the house. Explained the cost of doing brick and pointed to the longevity of the chosen material giving another house as an example.

SL: Staff does find the pulling the front porch forward, cantilevering the roof and changing the flat roof portion does make it more appropriate. We would just like the commission's thoughts on these changes and if you feel any more are needed. We have recommendations for a continuance and an approval if that is what the commission decides.

DB: I think what you have done with the north side is better in my mind than it was before. Even though it is a contemporary house it is a traditional shape. Now the form of the house is visible behind it. I am a little less bothered by the material at the smaller scale. One other thing, when I look at the front façade, specifically the door and the window, the window looks slightly shorter. It does not look like it lines up.

MP: Clarifies the window they are talking about and clarifies that the angle of the wall is why it looks the way it does, but confirms it's in alignment with the rest of the windows.

SW: I appreciate the creativity in which you responded to the concerns. The only issues that I have are on the Tenth Street side in the cube section on the carriage house the windows seem a little bit random to me, especially the one that is almost at ground level on the main house. If they could be gone or in alignment, it would be interesting to see. The only window that really bugs me is the one that is real low and can be handled by staff. The ones on the carriage house could relate to something better.

MP: The windows on the garage were there to announce that there is a stair there to the street, but if you want to see something more uniform we can make adjustments.

SW: Mentions how the location relates to the clear sight triangle and mentions wanting more trees or landscaping in the front.

AL: Are these going to be for sale or what is the plan for these?

MP: The main property is a rental the idea right now is for these to also be a rental but designed to be sold later if necessary.

SW: What is the square feet on the house and the carriage house?

MP: The first floor of the main house is about 800 sq ft and the second floor is approximately 880 sq ft. The living space in the garage is well under the 720. It is 540.

AL: Inquires about the work on the historic house.

MP: I talked with the contractor, and they were getting more supplies as I was talking with him.

WB: I think the changes are favorable to the design, I am fine with the alternative material. Have you talked at all about color.

MP: No but we will work with staff when the time comes. I have the colors we approved in the original COA. We will be more respectful of the color scheme of the historic house next door.

WB: Having gone through a color conversation in Lockerbie I did not want to have the situation again.

MP: Mentions they intend on talking with the neighborhood before painting.

AL: Are you planning on a fence around the property?

MP: Explains that the owner is most likely looking to rent the properties and that a fence was not planned at this time.

AL: I would maybe have him consider that as there is so much traffic around there.

Meg: If I could just offer, we can have that conversation with you but it could trigger a new variance due to visibility and transparency. Staff recommends to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff recommends to approve a variance.

MP: The construction documents, do I need to come back for a hearing?

Meg: No you will just need to submit it to staff before permitting.

Meg: Reads Staff Recommendation for COA

Reads Staff Recommendation for Variance

COA

Motion: DB

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval

VHP

Motion: DB

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

2025-COA-399 (ONS) 1508 BROADWAY STREET

DAVID SMITH (DS)

Alter openings on historic carriage house and Variance of Development Standards to exceed the maximum square footage of an allowed secondary dwelling unit.

DS: Explains the changes they are making to the openings on the carriage house and the plans to reinforce the structure and replacing any deteriorated materials. Mentions they believe their design retains the historic character. They also mention the reasoning for widening the

windows is for more lighting in the building. Mentions, we are open to suggestions but we want to allow as much light into the space as possible with their investment into the structure and neighborhood.

SB: We have owned the home for four years, so it is important to us to make sure it is done well. One reason we requested it be used as a door is that is one of the main points where we can move furniture upstairs.

SL: Staff is recommending to split this case into the variance and the Juliet balcony for part A. For Part B staff is recommending denial for the primary elevation as what is proposed alters the historic character of the house. For clarification other notes that are on the plans are for previously approved work done to the carriage house.

DB: Mentions the previous approvals. That façade has been compromised a lot for their new use. The south façade has already had the conversion of an original window into a door. The project has already made some compromises. I am not that concerned about the hayloft door and I think they are not expanding that opening. I am not sold on the east façade. There aren't too many building like this left and to me it does change the character of that façade.

AK: I think the main façade, the proportionality is intentional. The verticality of the openings is deliberate, and it would be detrimental to the character to change those. Everything else I could get on board with.

SW: I agree and I think extra lighting can come from sky lighting. The change is dramatic and I have a hard time thinking that is okay. If you look at the difference a vertical design is being changed to a horizontal look.

WB: I too am of the mind that the east elevation is a pure proportion and well-designed façade. If we are trying to get more light in, adding more smaller windows under the eave could be handled appropriately. I think that could be a way and the skylight approach could work as well. The east façade is a non-starter, and you have heard that from several of us.

DB: When I look at the floor plan, the north elevation on the left side, the bump out with the entrance could have a window and then you would have two windows into the bedroom with little effect on the overall proportions.

WB: The gable is such an important part but if you wanted to dot the smaller windows around you could certainly do that or add some skylights. I think you are going to have to move away from the east façade.

MP: And those thing could be done at staff level.

Meg: Yes we can do that.

WB: As David said there are already changes and you have more flexibility there. Meg if you want to modify the recommendation.

SB: I understand the reluctance to approve alterations to that facade. Certainly. A couple of notes, I guess. Is there any opportunity to perhaps still expand the windows, but not to the extent, or is it just straight, no alterations. And then the one, other point, I guess, is that one thing that we liked about the idea of the double doors is that there's symmetry with that in the main house, we have some pretty grand double doors as the entrance to the main house. That would kind of be not of be not mirrored, but it would be reminiscent of that to have those on, the off of the back deck area.

WB: The problem is the way the void and the solid is right now is quite handsome and if you expand the door that relationship changes dramatically. You can get daylight differently without altering the nicest elevation you have on this building.

Meg: The current recommendations has eleven stipulations and one note and I am going to add a new one.

Part A staff recommends to approve a COA for the west side.

Part B recommends to deny a COA for the east side
Staff recommends to approve a variance of development standards.

COA Part A

Motion: DB

2nd: MB

Unanimous Approval

COA Part B

Motion: DB

2nd: MB

Unanimous

VHP

Motion: DB

2nd: SW

Unanimous Approval

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL

6:35

**2025-COA-384 (IRV) 373 BURGESS AVENUE
DON SMITH (DS)**

Work completed without approval including: altering openings, installing lap siding, gutters, downspouts and boxed soffits, remove chimney and construct new chimney, alter porch, historic trim and decorative elements and bay window, and replace windows.

DS: Can staff talk first as this is a violation?

WB: Explains that is not how the process works and staff will give their comment after the applicant presents their case.

DS: Explains all the violations they are at the commission for and mentions that they got a COA for the siding and did not realize removing the stucco was in violation of that COA. Goes through the other violations they did not get a COA for and explains they were young at the time and trusted their contractors.

BA: This house was a labor of love when we bought it. Admits to changing it drastically because it needed a lot of work when they bought it. Also mentions that several of the violations are twelve years old and was not caught until they asked for a COA to build an addition.

AN: I serve as the city county councilor and live in the neighborhood. I am a resident of the historic district myself, and want to also thank staff for their engagement to date with the with the petitioners and with the property owners and architect and all involved. I know this has been an ongoing process, and I'm here tonight to really just ask that within your all's authority to provide authorizations and to keep this project moving forward, that we match both the intent of the historic plan with the reality of where we are at. And again, recognize that we have some, you know, good property owners here who really want to make a substantial investment, and I think I've been working really, really closely with staff in this commission to be able to both meet the needs and some of the make the concerns that have been brought up. I just think that we're at a place where where the commission should really kind of see it as their Israel's authority help this move forward so that the property owners here can continue their work. I am concerned that denial of this, some of these authorizations or kind of inability to move forward, won't just have an adverse impact on this property. I know that this may be outside of the

view of the commission. I know that you are evaluating specific petitions on a case-by-case basis, but I think this is a really strong example of you all being able to use your authority to keep this moving forward. So I'm happy to answer any questions. I know I don't have the opportunity to speak before you all that often, but I do appreciate your consideration on this. I would ask that we keep this moving, but also allow for these property owners.

WB: Okay I think we are ready for staff comment.

SL: So since the violation has such a large scope, I figured first I just quickly list the items go through real quick, alter the altered location of the opening, installed gutters and downspouts, boxed in soffits, chimney replacement alteration, alterations to the front porch, replace windows, added corbels to the bay window, altered historic trim decorative elements, as well as installed lap siding where there was stucco. Staff has provided recommended corrections for each item, for what is appropriate in their district plan, and we're recommending this evening that the Commission discuss the work as well as those recommendations to provide feedback to the owner. Any feedback on the windows and siding specifically would be really helpful as far as those would impact that addition that was approved earlier this year.

AK: First of all, I think we all recognize you have done a lot of work and made the house better. I do not feel as though some of the things are as egregious. The one thing I will say the diamond shaped window does make my eye twitch. My other pet peeve is painting the brick but you mentioned why you did it. There are some problems but we have to take it as a whole. The one thing I would want changed is the diamond window.

BA: The window is that way because we came home and it was done and it looked in approximately in the right location so we thought it was a win.

MB: I agree with the diamond window. I do not know if it is urgent, but it should be done. I may be in the minority, but I do not mind the brick porch, losing the piers. It does not look too bad. The chimney does not bother me. I would probably change the cap but it is not a deal breaker for me. You are not the typical violator and the fact that you are in this for the long haul helps the case.

DB: I drove by before the meeting. It is probably in better condition than everything around it. Knowing what I know I can point out the things that are not quite right. The first thing that is obvious is the diamond window. It is in the wrong place and looks like it. I have a question for the staff, when the removal of the siding was approved was it worded to “remove and replace with new siding?” Whether or not it was the right decision I might have said something else back then, but if they got approval to re-side it, then it is okay.

SL: I just pulled it up so the way that section of the ceiling is written says, remove existing vinyl siding and repair and replace wood siding as needed repair trim and paint and steering.

DB: In hindsight it probably would have been better to inspect what was underneath and then decide. I think it is understandable where someone would think they have approval for the siding. The windows, I would think differently if they replaced original, but they replaced inappropriate windows. I am also not as bothered by the porch. The corbels, is there a reason we should doubt those corbels were there?

SL: We have no evidence they were ever there.

AK: They fit perfectly.

DB: I think if we were going back, and they said we found these I would not have a problem with it.

WB: I think the only thing that needs to change is the diamond window. I

am fine with the chimney and porch. In whatever sequence if you could move the diamond window.

DA: How does that work? I think we should be allowed to fix it during our construction process.

Meg: The vinyl windows have the between the glass grids. The applicant still needs to get sign-offs for the addition windows.

WB: I do not think we want to replicate a problem so they will need to do that in the proper way.

Meg: I just wanted to clarify that.

DB: Also someday when they need to be replaced then you would match the proper windows in the addition.

BA: Agrees that when windows need to be replaced in the future they will match what they put in the addition and they view that as a maintenance cost for the property.

Meg: For clarification, is the commission recommendation for a certificate of authorization.

WB: Yes

Meg: Staff recommends to approve a certificate of authorization to retain the following, and I'm going to read through these, retain boxed soffits, gutters and downspouts, retain the newly constructed chimney, retain alterations to the front porch, retain replacement windows, retain corbels on West Side bay window, retain siding and return diamond window on North elevation to its historic location per the two stipulations and One Note that I'll read the diamond window shall be relocated no later than March 1, 2027 and notify IHPC staff prior to making unexpected repairs to the siding and trim which is going to be around that diamond window if needed to relocate the window to its original location. Is that acceptable to the applicant?

BA: If we have a deadline by March 1st and we are already behind on construction, is there an opportunity to extend it if we need it?

WB: We have extended things in the past you can come back to us if an extension is needed.

BA: Agrees to the recommendation and acknowledges the answer to his question.

Meg: Staff recommends to approve a certificate of authorization.

Motion: AL

2nd: DB

Unanimous Approval

XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD

NONE

XII. CLOSING BUSINESS

Meg: You have an email with the work program that will be voted on at the December hearing.

Adjourned: 7:10

INDIANAPOLIS HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSIONERS

William A. Browne, Jr., President	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	January 1, 2024-December 31, 2027
David Baker, Vice President	Indianapolis City-County Council	February 6, 2023- December 31, 2025
Susan Williams, Secretary	Indianapolis City-County Council	February 6, 2023-December 31, 2026
Anjanette Sivilich	Indianapolis City-County Council	February 5, 2024-December 31, 2027
Annie Lear	Indianapolis City-County Council	February 5, 2024-December 31, 2027
Anson Keller	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	June 28, 2023-December 31, 2025
Disa Watson-Summers	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	January 1, 2022-December 31, 2025
Krystin Wiggs	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	July 15, 2024-December 31, 2025
Michael Bivens	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	January 1, 2024-December 31, 2027

**To ensure a fair hearing, contacting any member of the
Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission regarding a pending or future proposal is
strictly PROHIBITED by the Rules of Procedure and Indiana State statute.**

This meeting can be viewed live at <https://www.indy.gov/activity/channel-16-live-web-stream>. The recording of this meeting will also be archived (along with recordings of other City/County entities) at <https://www.indy.gov/activity/watch-Previously-recorded-programs> or https://indianapolis.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=3.