



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

Wednesday, December 3, 2025, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Public Assembly Room, City-County Building
200 East Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana

Commission

Present: David Baker (DB) Chair, Anson Keller (AK), Michael Bivens (MB), Annie Lear (AL), Susan Williams (SW), Anjanette Sivilich (AS), Disa Watson-Summers (DW) and Krystin Wiggs (KW)
Absent: William Browne (WB)

Staff

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

DB called the meeting to order and read the Rules of Procedure.

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NONE

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

**2025-COA-399B (ONS) 1508 BROADWAY STREET
DAVID SMITH**

Approval of Negative Findings of Fact.

**Motion: AK
2nd: MB
Unanimous
Approval**

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

2026 IHPC WORK PROGRAM

**Motion: SW
2nd: AL
Unanimous
Approval**

PUBLIC HEARING

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

**2025-COA-301 (CAMA) 656 EAST ARCH STREET
ABBEY ROBERTSON**

continue to January 7, 2026

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 &

**Motion: MB
2nd: AS**

Unanimous Approval carriage house.

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

2024-COA-459 (LS) 316 NORTH COLLEGE AVENUE
JEREMY PORTILLO
Alter existing single-story rear addition, add a second-story rear addition,
construct attached rear addition with garage.

Motion: AS
2nd: DW
Unanimous Approval

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

NONE

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

2024-COA-226 230 SOUTH PENNSYLVANIA STREET
AMENDMENT 1 (WD) JENNIFER MILLIKEN
& 2025-VHP-011
Amend previously approved hotel design for additional stories and
Variance of Development Standards for the encroachment into the
required sky exposure plane.
TO: Mentions the previous approval from September 2024. Mentions the
changes were driven by owner preference and constructability issues.
Mentions the scope, the scale, the orientation on that site, have not
changed. Asks the commission to consider the project as a whole and
not only the changes. Mentions that the plans still meet the historic area
guidelines and they believe these plans are better than the initial ones
that got approved. Mentions increasing the building by two stories.
States they are going up to 197 feet and that it is the same height as a
building across the street. Mentions the added height is to increase
guest experience and add larger rooms. Mentions that they feel the
building is consistent with the Wholesale District. Quite honestly, we
think the color most mostly matches color that was on the demolished
building. Finally, there are changes in detailing, the building has details
that are consistent with the Wholesale District. Mentions the original
approval back in September 2024 included a development standard
variance to go above the sky exposure plane, so they have to renew the
development standard variance to account for the increase. Gives the
remaining time to Ratio architects.

JM: Mentions the slides show a good comparison and includes
examples from throughout the district. Mentions that the site plan hasn't
changed. The entrance has shifted to the north. This is the new tower,
you can see the more slender profile with the added floors and floor
height. Mentions and explains the samples they passed around. You
can see here the entrance on Pennsylvania has been enhanced. We are
trying to move away from the industrial and become more of a luxury
product. Explains the changes to the entrance and the terra cotta.
Mentioned they maintained the cornice and some of the corbeling.
Mentions the anchoring system is the reason for the new brick depth.
Explains the arches at the top are fully brick. The detail on the middle
shows the top of the second floor arches. Explains they come out two
bricks. Mentions the introduction of some special shapes, state they'll be
doing a mock-up. In summary we believe it is a luxurious look and the

darker brick is distinctive and will stand out as a key property in the district.

SL: Staff did note in the report a few concerns about the loss of detailing and the darker brick. We defer to the commission if those changes are appropriate.

SW: Before we start can we know what we were looking at.

JM: The single brick was from the original CSX building

SW: A couple of things, I pulled up a photograph of the CSX building. It really shows itself to be more orangey than the dark color here. I was disappointed in the new look of the north façade. You lose the dramatic verticality, and it no longer relates to the front. The fenestration, losing that flattens the building more and has a negative impact on elegance and as the brick gets darker. I am disappointed in the impact of the changes. I have issues with the color and issues with the changes dumbing down the hotel.

AS: I am of the same mind, too. I do not know if it is an issue with your Revit model and how it's coming across, but it looks like the window reveals on the north side, on the north elevation are more shallow compared to the east and west elevations, or it just might be how the whole building is sitting in shadow.

JM: It is just the rendering. It is still the same.

AK: But it is reduced from the original proposal?

JM: It is, working with the company that make the support brackets it was not feasible.

AS: I noticed the loss of banding at the base of the second floor and now everything above looks like its floating. It provided a bookend on the glass conference level. I also noticed the pilasters have gotten narrower so I do not know how that happened but as you turn that corner it is not a consistent design. I am also with Susan I am not a fan of the dark brick and the dark mortar. If you want to relate to the original CSX it is a red brick with brown mortar. I would like to see a lighter shade on the brick. I think if you go with a lighter brick the building will read a lot better.

AL: On my initial review I did like the darker brick, but I am thinking maybe there is some middle ground. I think from AS point of view everything she said makes sense. I think it will be a great project but find a brick color in the middle.

AK: Could you clarify where the north/south line where you are asking for approval. Where does the line stop. So partially through the venue?

JM: The venue will retain the orange brick.

AK: The change in the design of the venue is problematic for me. I do not think they work together as they previously did. I do not see that as something I could get on board with. I think it is an odd and seemingly hastily put together façade. On the structure itself, I also focus on the fenestration and articulation of it. Those were some of the reasons I voted in support of it initially. I feel like the watering down of the detail is to the detriment of the overall design. When you look at the elevation the

of solid brick to fenestration, the brick portion is larger than previous fenestration.

JM: As Tim mention the luxury product we are trying develop meant bigger rooms so the grid was reworked to fit the upgraded grid.

MB: I was not as bothered about the color because if I was inferring correctly it was to mimic the darker terra cotta. The thing that bothered me are the cornice, the corner and the horizontal band around the third floor. The old version had a nice coved top and this version has hard angular chamfers.

JM: The original version was terra cotta and now it is a corbeled brick and each one steps out a $\frac{3}{4}$ inch.

MB: I really liked the cove. I am not saying it's inappropriate. The loss of the vertical strip of articulation. Why was that removed.

JM: That was just as we developed the brick detailing, if it is a big deal we can look back at it.

MB: It looks visually awkward without it, unless there is a compelling reason its missing. The horizontal band around the third floor was lost for a particular reason.

JM: Not cost, this version cost more than the old version.

MB: It does look like a masonry building is being supported by a pane of glass. At least you would have a horizontal band acting as a transition. That may be my biggest gripe. I did like the entrance. I did not think I care about the loss of the terra cotta at first but now. The loss of the detail, at least the horizontal detailing and the corners is a detriment to the design.

AK: I do not see the band you guys are referencing.

DB: I think a lot of the things Anjanette said verbalized a lot of my thoughts. The original brick color in some ways was a little too light. I like the dark brick but it seems very dark on this very large building. What Anjanette pointed out about the shadow lines especially as the building is being flattened out is a problem. The third-floor glass strip seems bothersome. Before it looked interesting and worked and now it looks like something is missing. I will also agree with Anson about the building at the back even though we don't approve it, it was rather interesting before and now it's not.

Melody Park: One of the things I wanted to mention about the music venue, we talked with Regional Center and created something not as modern. They asked for some things to match up better, for example the large four windows. That is something the ownership wanted to go towards. As for the brick, we really wanted to harken back to the CSX and try to stay within the high-end guest experience. That is what we were going for. We did not make any decision lightly or as a cost issue.

JM: It seems like there are lots of opinions about different details. There are things we can work on. I would ask if we could get the variance approval for the taller building and get the COA to working with staff and if we can't then we can come back.

SW: As much as I love and trust the staff, our concerns are substantial. I would disagree making it a staff review. It is interesting to me, when I

look at a building, architectural detail says high end so whoever thinks taking that away would have to explain that to me. What we were looking at last time was so well thought through, and we lost that high end look when we lost the architectural detail.

DB: I also do not understand that explanation. Perhaps could you explain that more.

JM: I do not think it is fair to say it was low end before and is high end now. For the owner it is a holistic approach were we have to take in the inside and outside. It was focus on taking a different approach on the inside with the room changes. That was the driving force of the changes. I think there is a concern that this building got valued engineered and I wish that was the case because we would have money to play around with. A lot of this was born out of need and constructability.

AK: Just to rebut one thing. I think traditionally if you were trying to achieve the original design you would have a spandrel panel. I think you do not want to interrupt your glass, which I understand but something has to give. That looks very flat and the projection does not read at all. It is not a Wholesale building. It lacks the articulation that the 19th century building had. I do not think any of us have an issue with the sky plane.

AS: Can you got to the comparison of the east Pennsylvania on page 45. I noticed on the section just south of the hotel, it looks like you added a third floor so I do not know where that is sitting and before it was an outside roof garden, so I have no idea what's there.

JM: Part of that is the mechanical penthouse and the ballroom. There is a connection between the venue and the hotel at the second level/

AS: The third floor is set back I take it.

JM: Correct

AS: I need more information on that floor now to understand where that wall sits.

Meg: From what I am hearing it sounds like we are heading towards a continuance. I know one of the large changes was the additional stories, so I wanted to make sure there were no comments on the two stories.

TO: It would be helpful to have the variance.

DB: I think we really want to approve this so just address some of the comments so we can get over the edge. That is also why I am in support of the approval of the variance.

Meg: Staff recommends splitting the application into Part A and Part B. Part A for the variance only. Staff recommends to approve a certificate of appropriateness for a variance of development standards.

COA
Motion: AL
2nd: SW
Unanimous Approval

VHP
Motion: KW
2nd: AS
Unanimous Approval

Continuance Part B
Motion: AL
2nd: AK
Unanimous Approval

Meg: Part B the design of the building. Staff recommends to continue to the January 7th Hearing

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW**NONE****X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL****NONE****XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD****NONE****XII. CLOSING BUSINESS****NONE****Adjourned: 6:38****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.