



Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission (IHPC)
MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, January 7, 2026, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Public Assembly Room, City-County Building
200 East Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana

Commissioners

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

Absent: Michael Bivens (MB)

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

NOVEMBER 5, 2025 IHPC HEARING MINUTES
DECEMBER 3, 2025 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

Motion: KW
Second: DB
Unanimous Approval

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING 5:31

Motion: AL
Second: AS
Unanimous Approval

ELECTION OF OFFICERS
Bill Browne – President
David Baker – Vice President
Susan Williams – Secretary

621 LOCKERBIE STREET

IHPC Administrator asking to pursue enforcement action.

Meg: The IHPC state law does give us the ability to force maintenance. I have asked the owner to come this evening. We are hoping to see movement on making repairs. I will give them and their attorney the chance to speak and then I will give the floor to Emily to talk about their current application.

Attorney: We are not here to dispute anything. The owner has taken steps to complete that work. She has been in contact with staff and with a contractor. I can say the owner is doing everything she can to bring the property into compliance. Unfortunately, she has to rely on a contractor. We would like to request time to complete these repairs.

WB: Can you speak to the timing?

Attorney: I cannot. I know there is a meeting scheduled with staff and that is all I can say.

RD: I am not happy with the situation with the property, and I will make the repairs as soon as I can.

EJ: The owner has applied for work at the property. I did have a discussion with the contractor we are still working out some details on the scope of work and that is set up for next week.

Meg: For clarification we do not typically use this part of the statute but because of the time and number of complaints, we are concerned that it would deteriorate to a state where they would be asking for demolition. Thankfully the owner is being responsive and will continue coming to the commission. We are working with the department of business and neighborhood services. We are asking to move forward with that and to have the owner come back next month to give an update.

DB: Have you signed a contract with your contractor?

RD: Not yet

SW: It is my understanding that the property is vacant, but you listed it as your address so have you been receiving the mailings?

Meg: Part of the reason this has taken so much time is that the property address is the address of record and we had to do some research.

RD: My current address is 225 E North St

DB: The action you are asking to approve, you can reverse that at any time right?

Meg: That is correct. In the report we mention that if the property comes into compliance then we will not send this to the prosecutor.

DB: So this is not an adversarial thing but more of an insurance property and I hope things keep moving forward. I am not opposed to the action.

Meg: Right, it was not my plan to forward this to the prosecutor just yet. So, if we do not see progress, then we can revisit that. But for now, I think Ms. DeVaul is doing exactly what we've been asking, and we would like her to continue to do that and

WB: I think we are agreed to that. She will come back under old business?

Meg: Yes.

**WB: Introduces Commission and Staff; Reads Rules of Procedure
PUBLIC HEARING**

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

NONE

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

5:46

**2025-COA-477 (NA) & 4630 WEST 71ST STREET
2025-ZON-121 CASSANDRA THOMAS
Rezone from C1 to D3.**

**Motion: AS
Second: AK
Unanimous Approval**

**Motion: KW
Second: AS
Unanimous Approval**

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

5:47

**2024-COA-226 230 SOUTH PENNSYLVANIA STREET
AMENDMENT 1B (WD) JENNIFER MILLIKEN (JM)**

**WB Recused
DB Chaired
Motion: AK
Second:AL
Unanimous Approval**

Amend previously approved hotel design for additional stories and Variance of Development Standards for the encroachment into the required sky exposure plane.

Tim Ochs (TO): This was heard last month, at that time, there were views on changes that were being made for enhanced customer experience. This hotel will be branded as the Ritz Carlton, which is a historic brand name. Having said that, we heard a number of issued the commission raised. We listened and tried to address those concerns and we believe we have. I am going to turn it over to Jeff to explain.

JM: We studied this quite a bit. We increased the width of the windows by 16 inches. We think this increases the verticality from a proportion standpoint it is a nicer building. It was pointed out the detail at the corners were gone so we brought that back. We also got a comment about the band at the third floor so we went back to similar detail to the original. This gives the tower a nice way to transition to the meeting rooms. The projection of the brick at the windows, we were able to pull that out after working with the masons. Finally, the canopies, not knowing the full extent of the tenant needs, we intend to have a canopy at the entrance door but we did not include of those. We are happy with how the recessed entry presents its self. I am going to leave it at the changes that were made and I am happy to answer any questions.

TO: I want to take a minute to expand on what jeff indicated. What jeff said about the windows being expanded sixteen inches, we want to address why this has made such a difference. What we heard at the last hearing is that the windows look to close to the piers, which was correct. So when we swap these around by sixteen inches, that is for each window which makes the width difference three feet ten inches which is more than the original design. I wanted to point that out because it illustrates things better. I think we have changed the proportions back which was what was asked of us. We added the rowlock bricks to the corners and doubled their depth which is as far as the brick masons said we could go. We think we addressed all the concerns except the one that was not mentioned and the one that was not changed was the brick color. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. It would be one thing if the color is something you would not have seen a hundred years ago but this was a wholesale district of warehouses so there would have been some buildings with dark brick. We considered other colors, but ownership did not like those colors as much. We are happy to answer any questions.

DB: Ask for support or remonstrance. Asks for comments from staff.

SL: No additional comments

DB: Asks for comments from the commission

AS: I am wondering what the big black box is.

JM: That is the elevator overrun. The elevator will allow the hotel and vendors to access the amenity deck.

AS: I am a little concerned with that, so you may want to look at something different. I understand you like the brick color, but to me it is still black. Black brick with black mortar. I think a dark colored brick would be more appropriate. My main concern is that you will lose any shadow lines. If we do decide to go with black that is more permanent than paint.

TO: May I address the comments. Try as the computer software might, shadow lines never show up as well on paper as they do in real life.

We believe the shadow lines will be noticeable. We appreciate the relief and shadow lines. Will they be visible? Yes, we believe they will. With respect to the elevator column, it will be set about ten feet back and that is metal paneling. I think that is a minor enough detail we can discuss it with staff, and we will be coming back with final construction drawings.

AK: We have used this brick in historic districts. The secularity of it is something I would urge you to consider. I do not find it problematic and I find it consistent with historic use. I appreciate the widening of the windows. While I wish the projection could be more pronounced, I acknowledge an effort has been made. I would acknowledge that the one thing that I commented on the last time that I just can't get past is the and I'm sure this is probably not your priority in this meeting, but the union of the venue to the south of this project, I think, is particularly weak, weakened from its original iteration. The original design was more cohesive. The original design of the venue had a flourish that was a capstone that contradicted the tower. This design is diminutive by comparison while the entirety of it is not in our purview the connection is and I do not find it to be appropriate for this district.

TO: We appreciate those comments, and frankly, what we're comfortable with this evening would be to ask for an approval of the amended COA for everything starting we call it the lump that middle part that has the retail space that extends all the way to where you have the entrance into the garage. And if I understand your comments, it's right at the entrance to the garage, and what happens south of that, where you have the problem, and I think there's a story to be told there. I don't I think it hasn't been submitted appropriately to the commission, and we'd like an opportunity to come back. So if you are so inclined to approve the project, what we'd ask? Would it be an amendment for the lump the retail space and the power to leave the portion of the event venue for another day when the changes can be explained tweaked. But I do appreciate your comments.

AK: I am comfortable with that if staff is amenable to that.

Meg: Yeah, I think that's why the commission felt comfortable having them come back under old business for the final construction drawings, because so many of these details still need to be fleshed out. So if you're all comfortable with those changes happening on those set of drawings, and we can work with them to get to that point, bring those back to you later.

AK: I think I'm okay with that. One thing that I would like to clarify is that that retail portion that you mentioned, that's just to the north of the venue, is that brick the same as the hotel brick because it renders differently.

TO: It is supposed to be the same brick.

AL: I would be in agreement as well, with Anson. I think what you are hopefully hearing us say is that it needs to be more than a story. I loved the first rendering of the venue. I am okay with the hotel. It is one things to have a story. The design is another thing. Just food for thought.

DW: My opinion, the color of the brick I do not have an issue with and since we know it is going to be a Ritz Carlton, I do not think we can get any higher than that. The darker brick when you see other high-end hotels you see a lot of the darker brick. To me it adds more class than a lighter color brick.

Meg: There is a stipulation to do material mockups so that would be a good time to see what it will look like in real life.

DB: I think the changes you've made have improved it. It is shocking how small and subtle changes can make a big difference. I am not entirely comfortable with the brick color. However, with the proportion of glass to brick changing, it helps make me more comfortable with the color. Also, there is something of a sheen to it. I also know the way you look at the samples, it never looks the same as when its up. I think it will look different and not as dark and foreboding. Lastly, I want to comment about the entertainment venue. It is not horrible, but it is not as interesting as it was. I understand you are working with another agency so I would ask staff to have some conversation about what the different staffs are looking for. Do you have any final comments.

TO: Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Meg: One correction I will point out, the variance recommendation was accidently left in there, but I will not say that as it was already approved.

Staff recommends approval of a COA per submitted documentation.

2025-COA-301 (CAMA)

AL Recused

Motion: SW

Second: DB

**Unanimous approval
to continue to Feb 4th**

**656 EAST ARCH STREET
ABBEY ROBERTSON (AR)**

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.

AR: So I know it has been a few months, I wanted to just say it has taken a little time to take the feedback and try to find the in-between solution. Those changes brought some concessions the owners had to make. On this, the neighborhood is giving support to this project. The owners have put down roots in the neighborhood. It is still a modest home. The existing structure plus the addition is just over 2000 sqft. High level, we worked to move the addition nine feet further back allowing us to keep two of the openings on that side. The intent is to restore the details along those openings and restore that to the front windows. The actual addition portion we decreased by five feet. We lost back yard space and some interior footprint. We increased the square footage of the second floor because the head height in there is so short. We decided to decrease how much we moved it into the backyard, decreasing the length and rearranging causing us to lose the home office. We feel like we have worked hard to show that and present that. We removed the wrap around porch. We had some openness to having that porch, there is still a desire to have that but that was removed because of staff comment. I think on that note, the openness is because these houses have seen porches added and removed over the years. In the staff report it is noted that we are requesting to demolish 90% or the majority of the structure. We feel we are saving close to 70% of the structure. It was noted we were removing structure and siding. My response to those, by our measurements, we did line up.... In terms of siding and materials, we are maintaining and restoring anything ahead of the addition, unless it is beyond repair. We will find a match as close as possible for the addition. Our proposal is not to take it to studs. We want to maintain as much character as possible. We think the interior space removal is

counting against us in our demolition. We feel as though we have massaged this as much as possible. We are seeking approval and consideration of adding on that wrap around porch.

JH: I just want to say, I realize that we've benefited a lot from the historic commission. That's one of the reasons that Chatham March is so beloved. It's a beautiful neighborhood, but as mentioned, this is really only a project we can move forward with. It just requires so much commitment, big financial impact, if there's enough room to make it feasible. It's noted that the scaling of the house is historic, but a lot of these smaller reservations that perfectly preserve that small scale of the house are really limited by the financials and livability of the house. As Abby mentioned, this is the only project we can afford. It is noted that the scaling of the house is historic, but it is limited by financials. Economics can be hard in CAMA and the number of Airbnb's is increasing. To reiterate we have worked a lot on the design and a lot of the neighbors are happy with this design.

PN: I just want to say if you want us to keep the vinyl we are not on the same page but hopefully there is something historic underneath.

LM: I am here because I care about the outcome of this. I am the house three feet west. As a reminder we are talking about a home that has been abandoned for twenty years and we have a couple that wants to bring it back to life with a reasonable proposal. What is the downside to each decision? If you say no, it remains a vacant property. If you say yes, what is the downside? The roofline changes. I cannot think of much else. By voting no you are choosing decay over common sense. If this ends and the house is still abandoned, I think we will see what this commission truly cares about. This is a single couple that cannot play that game for as long as some of the bigger developments can

MM: I am going to run through the items in the staff report. In my report I outline the five reasons why we do not believe this aligns with the plan or commission comment. I do want to note that a wrap around front porch was not part of this request and staff has not received any updated neighborhood support.

SW: As I look at the new streetscape, I finally see the cottage. I am having a hard time what portion of the structure is being demolish. I want to remind the commission the only house that had significant demolition was the house on Broadway where we allowed them to demolish a non-historic addition and that was a precedent we were comfortable with. We need to ask if this is an acceptable precedent. I have no problems with the garage. My stumbling point is what we are allowing to be demolished.

MM: If you look at the shed roof portion of the home, that is original. The portion of the original home in that front porch is seven feet that is still be demolished.

SW: Where is their starting point.

MM: Seven feet further forward than the back of the shed roof.

AK: I would point out that the western wall is further back, they are maintaining that window.

MM: No, that window will go.

PN: Those lots are quite a bit bigger. I mean, this room is bigger than the lot that our house is sitting on. And I know that house had room to add more space as it's probably double the width of our lot.

SW: The issue for us is the historic house. I understand that was a different lot, but the cottage was retained even though it is a much bigger house now.

KW: It is just what Susan said. I appreciate the change of removing the wrap around point. It is a little confusing when architect and staff is disagreeing.

AR: That is why we were asking for clarification from staff because we feel we are saving 70% where it was less than 60% last time.

Meg: Going back to Susan comment. The mission of the commission is the preservation of the structure. We understand there will be framing that will be removed. We want to make sure the original envelope can be retained. We heard at the last meeting there was a desire for that to be pushed to the back wall and we are not there yet. As the structure is small, this is what would most closely align with the plan. There is a lot of removal of the structure still. What we heard was maintain as much as possible and that is not what is happening.

AK: On the west wall, it shows the window being maintained.

MM: That is a drawing error and the limitations of a word document.

AR: What we heard at the last commission was let's try to find an in between solution and save those openings. The lot is only 3200 sqft so it limits us on how far we can go back into the back yard. The further we go back we are eliminating yard, or we are reducing the functionality of the house. It is a requirement to have at least three bedrooms. We only have thirteen feet between the house and the garage. The size of the garage is to get storage space. It is extremely hard to come back with an in between solution. We already gave up back yard space and a home office. I think we hit the limit as we do not think we will be able to push it back any further.

WB: Is there any chance you can push the garage.

AR: We are only ten feet off the alley so pushing that would be making turning in difficult.

PN: Part of that alley is a brick wall making it tighter.

DB: I understand the explanation that this is not a massive house. You are struggling to get everything your client wants into this lot. One thing that makes this painful is that you all seem like very nice people. Clearly the neighborhood would like to have you, but we cannot take that into account. We must look at the house, the architecture and the district. This house has been a frustration for the neighborhood. Given all that, I am willing to accept a larger amount of loss than normal, but I cannot get past sacrificing a good bit of the building and not staying true to the front façade. A lot of houses like this do not have as much left as this one does and I am willing to accept quite a lot of other stuff if that part of it can be kept. I think the entirety of the original front porch needs to be retained with its opening. The stairs are the big problem with the floor plan. I realize what I am going to suggest would mean relooking at the floor plan, but have you considered moving the stairs to the back of the house.

AR: This is in respect to retaining the entire side porch. The issue is that we would loose another seven feet. The existing structure only allows for a bedroom. At that point we would have to lose a bedroom and try to figure out where our hallway would go. Pushing that back, it interrupts the usability and functionality of the space. I know it's a small home but the question I would have, is the amount it takes to do a project like this, the space of the home is not viable with today's standards. We are looking at reducing necessary livable spaces at that point.

PN: I just want to say, it's just not very usable. You can't put a hallway in there, it's too narrow. The sides, you know, are too low. So basically, as we move the structure back, you just make that front

bedroom bigger, essentially. I mean, that's, that's all we do. It just doesn't really like accomplish anything for our floor plan and that just makes us push the addition further back, which, which, to your point, as far as lot coverage, like, we're trying to reduce lot coverage like I You guys are the experts, but from what I read, I think we're allowed up to 60% lot coverage based on our lot size and the zoning and everything. And we don't, we don't want to do that. I think that the massing would look just, honestly, just not as good as what we think we proposed.

WB: Is there any way you can find a few feet moving the garage and then moving the house. If you mirrored the plan, you could potentially keep more of the porch a put a powder room. Maybe you do not have to flip it but you might get more room inside. I know that is not an easy thing but I think it is a strategy to saving more of the historic structure. I am less concerned about the north wall, but if you could save the other walls.

AR: We looked at flipping but we continue to run into the usability of the second floor. Squeezing it down five feet turns into non-functional space. I don't mean to sound prideful, but we have put many hours into trying to compress this while maintaining adequate room space. We have to configure our hallway to meet at the peak.

WB: I guess the question is, if you could push this back and move the garage back a few feet then can you save five more feet of the building and porch.

AK: You could consider off setting the cross gable that was moved up on the second floor. That could solve some of your headspace problems. There is a house on 1318 Pleasant Street that has a gable on the backside and a cross gable that masks it.

AR: So, I am hearing the commission would be open to having a cross gable on the second floor if we keep the existing porch.

WB: Yes, we have a responsibility to historic resources, and we are trying to help you solve this. We want to get this project to a place where we can be comfortable as these types of projects become precedent setting so we are trying to be as consistent as possible.

AR: Can we look at the context of this site giving restraints to the project.

WB: We are trying to get to a place that can work for you and us.

AK: I wanted to note the roofline of the previous proposal was more appropriate than this one, so you need to move back towards that. For me, the existing was very jarring.

AR: Something that would help with that is moving the cross gable up and keeping the porch beneath.

SW: The thing we are trying to do is get to yes. This back and forth is starting to seem like a debate. I would encourage you to take our comments as intended. We want to help you make this happen, but we have some statutory obligations. We are not quite there yet. The staff has probably taken more notes. Something we have not talked a lot about is the garage so maybe you can get a few feet back there. I am confident we will get this resolved.

MM: With the comments for the commission the goal is to maintain the character of the cottage.

WB: As Susan said we want to be true to the resource as much as possible.

AR: For clarity, we thought we were working to an in between solution.

WB: If you could work with staff, I think this needs a few more tweaks so we can accomplish some of the comments.

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

7:08

**2025-COA-489 (CAMA) 409 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
& 2025-VHP-013 JUSTIN KINGEN**

Part A:
Motion: KW
Second: AK
Unanimous Approval

Install sidewalk cafe with pergola and vinyl screen walls and install trash can screening & a Variance of Development Standards to exceed the maximum permitted height of a sidewalk cafe barrier.

Part B: Continuance
Motion: SW
Second:AL
Unanimous Approval

JK: We are her on behalf of dusk lounge. Historically this property has been developed in 1902 with a three-story brick and limestone structure known as the Oxford. The Oxford is historic apartment building with two street frontages, 409 Mass Ave and 316 East Vermont Street. The focus of this proposal in this hearing this evening, is going to be on the east Vermont street facade. What we are proposing is the installation of a sidewalk cafe that includes an enclosed pergola, along with planners that surround the cafe. I think it's important to note that the ground floor of this East Vermont street facade no longer is historic in nature. While the structure itself is over 120 years old, there have been modern improvements to the storefront, entryway and entry door over the years. The installation of the proposed pergola will not be affixed to the building. Nothing alters the masonry windows or character defining features. This is not a building addition. This is a free-standing sidewalk structure that can be removed without any damage being done or left behind. We anticipate some comments this evening regarding the trash placement and environment of the sidewalk in this area. We are actively exploring solutions to rectify the trash collection of the area. We've reached out to needlers across the street. Have yet to hear back from them, but I did have a phone conversation earlier this week with a property manager from Buckingham Properties who owned the apartment complex on the northwest corner of New Jersey and Vermont Street. Unfortunately, they're at full capacity with their commercial dumpster, but she did let me know that they would let us know if there was any opening for us to be able to use their dumpster. So we understand, we that this is an issue for the area, for the neighborhood, and we're working to address that. This proposal has received seven letters of support from various stakeholders in the downtown area. We've met with Mass Ave Merchants Association on two separate occasions, and we'll continue discussions with them. Our focus is on a design that works for the streetscape, and we believe that this proposed addition to the east Vermont street facade is an improvement to the existing condition. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Joseph Lese with progress studios. He's going to walk you through the design details of the project.

VHP:
Motion: KW
Second: AL
Unanimous Approval

JL: As justin was saying the pergola structure is not physically attached to the historic building. We are only working within the confines of the non-historic storefront. There are some discrepancies I would like to point out As Justin mentioned, I think there's a couple differentiators in the description of the recommendation the staff report, versus the renderings that are above the findings of fact on the on the last page that I would like to just point out originally, the first approach on the west side of the pergola had more of like a screen wall effect on that left side of the pergola, and that was to help screen it from the trash that is kind of floating out on the sidewalk. Currently, after some conversation with staff, we had removed that solid screen

wall, if you will, and replace that with the clear vinyl inserts, which I'll get to in a second. We replaced What was that vertical surface with at the time of filing? Was a fence around the trash that is currently out there. That is where the variance application portion of this came into play, and we have since removed that so that we are only kind of creating this semi-permanent corral, if you will, for the trash that's currently there until a solution can be provided with surrounding folks that have larger dumpsters. So, in the rendering, you'll see some taller plants and planters around the trash that's currently out there. The intent of the clear vinyl on inserts for what would effectively be the windows of the pergola would be during inclement weather, such as wintertime and such. So that does can operate their sidewalk cafe 12 months out of the year, if those on nice days and things like that, those entrance can be removed, so that they're not permanent and they're clear on purpose of it provides the transparency. So, we felt that that was important to notate as well as being in line with the pergola structure just to its west at tavern at the point. So, you'll see that in the renderings that are off the last page. So, I'll be happy to answer any further questions that any of you may have.

NM: I just wanted to first say thank you all for having us here. We're really excited to be more of the community. Obviously, I'm speaking to because we want to provide an additional dining experience for all of our guests, where they can enjoy the exterior space. Additionally, the rear portion of the building is not really pleasant for just past revising. We just kind of want to elevate and just bring something positive to the area without impacting, obviously, the historic elements of it. It's not a very large space, but because of the shape of our interior and a lot of the existing brick walls, we have very, very little seating inside. So, for us, this accounts for about 30 seats, which is about 30% of our entire capacity. And so this is right around a 400,000-hour incremental revenue impact for us, which obviously to us, that's a very big deal. May not be as big of a deal for everyone else, but I think it should be noted what they impact, would be there for us as well. So that's really everything for me. Thank you all for having us and looking forward to hearing your comments.

Meg Storrow (MS): I am President of the Mass Ave Art District and Merchants Association. I think it would be great to improve Vermont from being a back door. I think the previous patio was also not a good solution. I am hoping with your help they can find a better solution that solves the trash issue and respects that door.

PH: I certainly understand these folks want to have as much income producing square footage as possible, but we do not want our trash in front of our building. They need to put their trash behind their own building.

SL: As it has been mentioned this façade functions as a rear; however, it is the front facade of what is the historic Oxford building. Per the district plan, awnings and canopies should be traditional style. Canvas materials are noted as being preferred that fixed metal, as well as vinyl materials, can detract from the visual quality of a building. They should not overpower a building, cover architectural details or be so obtrusive that they detract from the street. as a whole. Since the pergola would be enclosed and heated, it would essentially be a metal vinyl addition on the front of a historic building. Per the plan, additions to historic structures should be located at the rear, away from a front facade, as well as not obstruct any architectural detailing. We're not aware of any sidewalk cafes enclosures of this nature over historic or over a

storefront on a historic structure on the front. So we do believe that granting this request would be precedent setting for the district as well as all of the districts that are of the commercial setting. Lastly, we do not believe that the variance petition request needs to test the findings. And for clarification with some of the comments from this evening regarding the need for the variance. The variance is required for the vinyl inserts themselves as a sidewalk cafe barrier is limited to three to four feet in height. So because those would go all the way to the top of the pergola, that is required. And so for those reasons, we are recommending denial of this request this evening. In closing, I did want to note that the commission has reviewed at least one request similar to this, as far as having an awning with enclosure walls that was on the front of historic facade. And if the commission has any interest in more details on that, I can provide that.

DB: Okay, so I was going to ask the staff, and I think you've already answered whether or not we can ever approve anything even remotely like this on public right of ways, public sidewalk, because that is different than adding something on private property or something else.

SL: The only one that seems as close as we could find is in the wholesale district. It was more of the traditional awning with added walls, but the walls did not end up getting approved.

AK: Doesn't the Tavern on the point have something similar.

SL: For staff the differentiation was the façade behind the enclosure.

JL: If you scroll down one more page it is the image on the right.

AK: Bru burger has it, but it is not in the right of way.

WB: I would argue that is still a primary façade as all these buildings do not have backs.

DB: Did we approve that one?

SL: Yes, that one came in in two parts. The first part, there was a request for pergola with the enclosure. The applicant ultimately withdrew that, I think, mostly based on staff's concerns that came back basically the next season, and asked for that, and ultimately did get approval from the Commission. There wasn't a ton of discussion at that time regarding the screens. A lot of it was due to their lot of discussion was on the trash screen. And then the one comment that did come up about the vinyl screens was a concern about these types of installations becoming more like permanent additions. But it was ultimately approved by the Commission.

SW: I was one of the people who complained about the garbage. The more people activity we can get the less like a back door it will look like. The thing for me, is it would be nice it would coordinate better from a height standpoint. Having said that, it is not that big of a deal. The garbage is a bigger deal, but they are not here to talk about that.

WB: I too have a problem with the trash, and it is the kind of thing that there has to be a solution and you have said you are working on that. I think the planters should be a little lower. I have not focused on the rhythm of the columns. There has to be a solution for the trash. I think we need to find a different answer, the screen is not the answer. If we could split this into two parts and continue the trash.

DB: I drove by there, the storefront façade, there is nothing original about that. I would have a hard time with this in front of a historic façade. Everyone wants to get more space. I think I am willing to consider it because of what's next door. If we approved, it the way its written we would be approving the trash. I do not want to approve any trash screening tonight because I do not want to encourage it being there.

WB: They can't answer the trash issue tonight, so I think we need to figure out how we feel about the outdoor space.

WB: There are solutions to this as other people do in an urban environments. There are all sorts of buildings that don't have an alley and a back to them. I guess from our standpoint, I think we want to approve the enclosure to the pergola, with the use of the vinyl in the wintertime. And I think that if they can work with the staff to get it tweaked a little bit relative to maybe its height, and the planters and those kinds of things, I think we can let you guys solve that. And then I think we want to continue the trash, make it a part B, and then we need to, we need to figure out an answer so the applicant can solve the trash.

MS: The other thing to remember is Buckingham is residential and there is tension between the residents and business that have patios. I think there needs to be a stipulation that there is security, and they follow the noise ordinance.

JK: So, this is a communal issue that we're all looking to solve. I know that one of the reasons that Buckingham could be an option is because what we may be able to do is increase the frequency at which their dumpsters are picked up, therefore allowing for more space. There are options of needlers. There's the potential of collaborating, and I know that this is a concern for patty and them, and just Secondly, seconding and not imposing it. And in regard to comments on noise order and superior you do have security there. We don't have any anybody exiting the building during business hours, and that would be used just for restaurant seating. Just want to assure everybody that these are considerations that are also important.

Meg: For Part A, Staff recommends approval of a COA to install a sidewalk café with pergola and vinyl enclosure walls and a variance of development standards to allow a barrier taller than four feet. For Part B, staff recommends continuing to the Feb. 4 hearing.

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

NONE

X. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD – WORK STARTED WITHOUT APPROVAL

7:36

2025-COA-039
AMENDED (LS)

711 EAST VERMONT STREET
BRIAN BUEHLER

Motion: SW

Second: AL

Unanimous Approval

Amend previously approved COA & extend fence removal deadline.

BB: We are asking for an extension for a COA approved last year. There was a miscommunication on the period of time. We are still in the facility and still building the other facility.

EJ: The staff does believe they clarified it was 2026. They are just asking to retain the fencing and need to remove it by December 2026 or when they vacate the site whichever comes first.

BB: Our goal is to be out in the summer. And so that's why we're asking for the extension till the end of the year. Again, the only concern is removing that fence as the properties being sold is just the issue of people coming on the property. I mean, we have an abandoned van that arrived on our facility six days ago that we're trying to get removed right now. And so there's just those types of things

Meg: Staff recommends approval to extend the COA.

XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD

NONE

XII. CLOSING BUSINESS

Meg: You may have read that the Archdiocese has dismissed their appeal the denial of a certificate of appropriateness for the demolition of Holy Cross. They did file a federal lawsuit. The complaint is there was a violation of the First Amendment, and so we are talking internally with our litigators and office Corporation Council, and at this time, there's no need for to for the commission to call an executive session, but if there is, we'll certainly let you know. So I'm happy to answer any questions.

positive news, I would like to give you a summary of the staff's some of their accomplishments from last year. I'll make it brief, but I thought these numbers were pretty remarkable. As far as the total number of COA cases that came in and that staff processed, Emily was at 200 Shelbi was at 160 Morgan was at 162 and Caroline, who only has seven months in, had 92 cases already. So, there's, there's been no down time at the IHPC. So as always, thank you to my team. They work incredibly hard and do an amazing job. I'm very thankful for them.

AL: I just wanted to go on the record I know so much of all the time behind the people, behind Meg and Chris, that it's often a thankless job, but you guys do such a good job, and it really, really is appreciated.

Adjourned: 7:43PM

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.