



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

Wednesday, June 3, 2026, 5:30 P.M.
2nd Floor, Public Assembly Room, City-County Building
200 East Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana

Commissioners

Present: William Browne (WB), Anson Keller (AK), David Baker (DB), Anjanette Sivilich (AS), Susan Williams (SW), and Michael Bivens (MB).

Absent: Krystin Wiggs, Annie Lear, and Disa Watson-Summers.

Staff

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

BUSINESS

I. CALL TO ORDER

WB called the meeting to order at **5:33 p.m.**

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MAY 2026 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES: **MB** moved to approve the minutes from the May 2026 IHPC Hearing. **AK** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

PUBLIC HEARING

WB made introductory comments.

MM swore in those from the public who intended to speak.

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

2025-COA-489B
(CAMA)

409 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
JUSTIN KINGEN
Solution for trash cans in right of way

MEG read the request to withdraw.

CASE WITHDRAWN

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

2026-COA-147 (HMP)
& 2026-VHP-006

1708 NORTH PENNSYLVANIA STREET
JULIE ZENT

Expand parking lot; improve existing lot; Variance of Use to allow a commercial parking lot in a dwelling district (D8); Variance of Development Standards to allow less street frontage trees than required

WB recused himself from this vote.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE COA: SW moved to approve the COA. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **5-0**.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE VARIANCES: SW moved to approve the VHPs. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **5-0**.

2026-COA-156 (HMP)

2142 NORTH NEW JERSEY STREET

MELISSA IANNUCCI

Construct single-family residence, detached garage, in-ground pool & a pergola

MOTION TO APPROVE THE COA: SW moved to approve the COA. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

2026-COA-054 (HMP)

1933 NORTH TALBOTT STREET

NICOLE QUINT & BROCK JACKSON

Additions on existing non-historic garage to provide for living space

Nicole Quint, 1933 N. Talbott St., presented the case.

No one spoke in support or remonstrance.

MM made staff comments.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE COA: DB moved to approve the COA as read by **MEG** and subject to the 9 stipulations and one note. **MB** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

**2026-COA-009 (RP) &
2026-VHP-008**

1010 DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR STREET

JOSEPH CALDERON

Construct new commercial building & parking lot; site improvements; Variances of Development Standards to allow less front setback than required, and for construction within the required clear-sight triangle

Chris Greisl (CG) of Barnes & Thornburg, 11 S. Meridian St., presented the case. He noted the zoning commitments made in agreement with the neighborhood. He further added that DPW was not requiring a traffic impact study to be completed by the project. He additionally addressed the concerns regarding truck servicing of the site and that there are no concerns in this area.

No one spoke in support of the project.

Candyce Offett of Ransom Place Neighborhood Association, 847 N. California St., **Paula Brooks (PB)**, 948 Camp St./1042 Dr. MLK St., **Carlette Duffy of M.E.D.I.C.**, 1329 Fall Creek Pkwy E. Dr., **Meg Storrow (MS) of Mass Ave Cultural District**, 576 E. Vermont St., **Matt Brown of Westside Development**, 9563 Irishman's Run Ln., Zionsville, IN, **Lynn Johnson**, 923 N. California St., **Steve Nelson**, 839 Paca St, and **Councilor Vop Osili of Council District 12**, spoke in remonstrance of the project.

SL made staff comments. She noted that staff is deferring to DPW for their determination regarding the traffic study.

AK asked if the site had been remediated of any site contamination.

Paul Mohit Kumar (PK) of Superjams, 5816 Victory Ave., stated that the site had been cleared of any contamination.

AK noted that the issues with traffic are larger than just a single site, and not something the Commission can hold one site accountable for. He added the design has improved since the original proposal, but there are some additional changes that need to be made.

SW agreed with **AK** that the applicant cannot be held responsible for the traffic issues of the intersection.

AS asked if the applicant was aware of the road construction set to occur near their proposal.

MB asked about the lighting and overall upkeep of the property. He additionally asked about temporary signage and outdoor ice machine.

PK stated that the proposed design for this location will not match his existing locations. This design was created to follow the IHPC standards.

DB stated that it would be rare that any use on this site would not have to deal with the traffic issue. He added that there were not many comments on the architecture of the building. He asked staff what would occur if unapproved items showed up on the site.

SL stated that signage and outdoor operations are not permitted in C-3 and would be subject to review.

WB asked if there was any flexibility with operating hours. He added that outdoor signage and operations would not be appropriate for the site. He further stated that the INDOT RFP is a very real change that will be occurring at the intersection by this site, which will hopefully solve the traffic issues in this area. He made comments regarding sense of entry for the structure.

DB asked if commitments could be made regarding hours of operation, lighting, and signage.

CG stated the applicant would be open to adding additional commitments.

AK added that lighted signage and advertisements in windows in a concern. He stated he would like to add a stipulation to restrict thought items. He added that with the current roadwork occurring in the area, a traffic study completed today may not be accurate either.

CG gave final applicant comments, he focused on their commitment to following the historic area plan, truck traffic, and their low impact on traffic as a whole.

John Nierzwicki of Contour, 984 Logan St., Noblesville, IN, presented information regarding the truck traffic of the site. He further stated that he has been in communication with traffic engineers from DPW

regarding the case. He confirmed that the project does not reach the threshold of the City to require a new traffic study. He added their impact is so low with the rate of traffic through the intersection, their impact is around 1-2%.

PK addressed the hours of operation.

PB addressed the Commission out of form for a public hearing.

WB stated the Commission is not able to speak on the traffic issue, it is not something we have purview over. He closed the public comment portion of the case.

CG asked if the variance and the COA were being continued. He further asked if the next hearing will discuss design changes.

WB confirmed both components of the case will be continued and the Commission will address the design and operational issues.

MEG clarified that for next month, there will need to be a resolution to the commitment for hours of operations for the next hearing.

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE APPLICATION: DB moved to continue the COA to the **July 1, 2026, IHPC Hearing**. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

2026-COA-057 (WD)

231, 235 & 239 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET
JENNIFER MILLIKEN

Demolish three historic buildings, maintaining only the front facades, constructing new single building behind the facades, alterations and repairs to remaining historic front facades, install signage, site alterations

WB recused himself. **DB** chaired.

Mike Balog (MIKE) 11312 Hazel Dell Pkwy, Carmel, IN, presented the introduction of the case and the background of the structures.

Ashley King (KI) of Woolpert, 224 N. Alexander St., New Orleans, LA, presented the condition of the existing structures, challenges with adapting the structures for proposed use, and alterations that will be made to the front facades of the structures.

Tim Ochs (TO) of Ice Miller 1 American Sq, Ste. 2900, presented additional comments on the changes to the plans based on the Commission's comments from the April 2026 Preliminary Review.

No one spoke in support of the project.

Mark Dollase of Indiana Landmarks, 1201 Central Ave., spoke in remonstrance of the case. He added that history is not made within facades, history is made within buildings. He added Indiana Landmarks may be willing to fund additional analysis on the buildings to preserve more of the structures.

SL made staff comments.

SW noted this was an exciting project. She noted that the tour of the

structures was beneficial for her. She stated she had a few questions but will hold those for a bit.

AK stated he believes the treatment of the façade is appropriate overall. He asked for clarification on the differences between the double hung windows on the 3rd floor and the fixed windows on the first two floors.

KI clarified that all the openings are double-hung, but only the front, third floor will be operational.

AK stated he believes the windows wrapping onto the south façade is not appropriate for this building. He adds that they will need to wrap the entirety of the façade onto the south façade for it to be more appropriate. He further asked the sizes of the lots.

TO stated the widths of the lots range from 21 to 25 feet per building with 195 in length.

AK added that the original purpose of the buildings is not a function present in Indianapolis anymore and it would be hard to fit any use into the current size of the buildings. He further added the deferred maintenance of the buildings makes them difficult to utilize. He stated there is a lack of history, work of a master, and other criteria to justify denial of the demolition.

DB read the following text as a script during the hearing:

I attended meeting at Ratio; toured bldgs.; missed Prelim. Review, but watched it.

HISTORY

Let's go back before CC Mall was built. The project site included many historic buildings and portions of the site were in the WD, which had been placed on the National Register in 1982.

When the City and Melvin Simon & Associates were developing plans for CC Mall, their intent was to clear the entire site of all buildings. But, when federal funds were sought to assist in the project, the City was required by Section 106 of the HP Act of 1966 to take into account the project's effect on historic resources. That was done by entering into a MOA with the Federal Advisory Council on HP regarding how those historic resources would be handled.

The MOA was negotiated between representatives of the Simon organization, the City, the State Historic Preservation Office, and a consortium of 3 local preservation organizations.

But at that time, the WD was not yet locally designated, so the IHPC was not a party to any of the decision regarding which historic buildings were to remain, to be demolished, have their facades retained in-place or rebuilt at a different location.

The Advisory Council had concerns that CC Mall would result in in-direct development pressures that could affect the surviving historic commercial buildings in the surrounding NR District. therefore, the City

agreed to protect the WD by creating a local historic district under the IHPC.

When the IHPC completed the designation in 1990, it accepted all the decision already made in the MOA regarding buildings in the project area, but applied its traditional guidelines to the rest of the WD.

That brings us to today...36 years later...and we're charged with protecting the surviving historic commercial buildings in the WD from the direct and indirect influences of new development.

OUR CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERING DEMOLITION

If we approve demolition, it must be based on at least one of four criteria.

- 1. The buildings pose an immediate and substantial threat to the public safety. NO*
- 2. The buildings or parts to be demolished do not contribute to the historic character of the structure or the district or the context. NO*
 - a. These buildings are among the oldest in the WD...and in Indpls.*
 - b. These buildings have a history...not just their facades.*
- 3. These buildings cannot be put to any reasonable economically beneficial use for which they are or may reasonably be adapted without approval of demolition. That has been argued, but NO...I do not buy it.*

Story of the 4 buildings on the north half of this same block.

- Many years ago, all 4 buildings were vacant, for sale and in bad condition.*
 - I was the IHPC staff administrator at the time.*
 - Developer sat in my office and told me he wanted to but them, tear them down and make a parking lot, which in his mind was much more needed than those derelict buildings.*
 - He then listed for me all the reasons that these buildings were NOT suitable for redevelopment: Deterioration, unworkable floorplates, and worst of all... "the floors do not line up."*
 - I told him I did not buy his argument and there is no way the staff would support demolition. He did not apply.*
 - Today...and for many years now: the buildings are beautifully restored and occupied by Kilroy's Bar & Grill, Meridian Lofts (apartments/condos) and Homewood Suites.*
- 4. Lastly, the demolition is necessary to allow new development which, in the commission's opinion is of greater significance to the preservation of the district than is retention of the buildings.*

I am not convinced that 1) demolition of the oldest buildings serves "preservation", and 2) I am not convinced that this project is impossible to accomplish without such radical demolition...more on that in a minute.

THIS IS WHAT BOTHERS ME ABOUT THIS REQUEST

1. *The attempt to blame the buildings for their deterioration and for the crime associated with past tenants. This argument is wasted on me. Poor maintenance and crime are not the buildings' fault. They are solely the responsibility of the buildings' owners, who control maintenance and leasing.*
2. *The cavalier approach to these buildings.*
 - a. *There is no evidence that the owner cared anything about the buildings when acquired other than their location and the land they occupy.*
 - b. *There is no evidence that any effort was given to adaptively reuse the buildings or find uses suitable for the buildings. That's not why they were acquired...they were simply "in the way."*
3. *What precedent does this set for the future? We've been told that the owner controls the building to the north. I read in the IJB that they now own one or more of the buildings to the south. We've been told that this is only the beginning of the owners plans for the area. It is hard to believe that other properties are being acquired because of the buildings that are on them...and not simply because of their location. If this facadectomy is approved, will it become a model for other development? Will much of the historic district simply become new building with historic facades pasted on them?*

I don't know how the others will vote on this, but you clearly do not have my vote tonight, and since there are only 5 of us here, you need us all to vote for it.

Is there any hope of getting my vote? It's going to be difficult. It would take a radical change in the project, one that respects the buildings and their role in the context of the district. I would need to see evidence that a real attempt was made to save more of the buildings.

It's not my role to design your project, but two obvious options come to mind that I think could be explored.

1. *At the Preliminary Review, Commissioner Bivens threw out a perfectly reasonable suggestion. He asked if you had considered retaining the front portions and removing only the later rear additions. It was immediately dismissed. But if you study the historic Sanborn Maps:*
 - a. *Only the front half of each building was originally 3 stories.*
 - b. *By 1887, there was still no addition on the rear of Building A, and only a 1-story addition on the rear half of buildings B and C.*
 - c. *There is some rational for saving only the front halves...the oldest and original portions...for appropriate uses. And then using the cleared rear half, along with the vacant site to the south, for the new music venue.*
2. *And something else that struck me immediately, since your client has control over the vacant land to the south [HAND OUT DRAWING] I've done a quick and dirty drawing to show that the*

footprint you're proposing for the new building behind the three historic facades could be accommodated in a new building on the vacant site and only affect one historic building, leaving the other two for other appropriate uses. It also has the benefit of filling in a missing gap in the streetscape, rather than maintaining a gap and using it as a service drive-through, as suggested at the Preliminary Review.

You now have the final word. And I'd like to know if you agree with the Staff recommendation to continue the case or if you want us to vote tonight. I recommend "continue and re-consider."

AK added the metal supports on the front of the buildings will need to be removed or replaced to be more appropriate, especially the one that is not straight.

KI commented that the plates are existing brick ties to shore up the upper portions of the façade. She added they could investigate straightening them.

AK asked **DB** why he supported the demolition of the CSX building, but is not supporting the demolition of these buildings.

DB stated that he did vote in support of the demolition of the CSX building, but it was painful, however after hearing the testimony and evidence, this was a different situation. He added the fact that CSX was big is immaterial and not ordinary for the period of significance for the district. He further added that there were constraints with reusing this building, especially with its size, he continued that these buildings are smaller and simpler and despite their deteriorated state, we've seen buildings in worse condition be saved. He continued that the fact that they lack decoration is part of their history, and if this was not a historic district, he would lament the loss, but he would understand, however, that is not the case here. This is a historic district, and there are more of these buildings that can be saved and still accommodate the proposed use. He added that he would like the applicant to continue and reconsider. He also added that he was not convinced they looked at the buildings and thought about what they could put in the existing structures, but instead had the project and wanted it in this location and the buildings were in the way, and due to the IHPC, they decided to keep only the façade.

MB stated that perhaps the Commission voted to demolish CSX because the proposed development would better aid the preservation of the district. He added the size of the CSX building would have precluded it from most developers

AK stated that was his point with these structures, they are so small and there are not many uses for them as they stand.

DB added that it would take a very creative architect to make them useful.

MB suggested that if they remove only the rear half of the structures, but keep the front, this could be a viable option for some developers. He added that he wanted to make sure there were distinctions between CSX

and this project to avoid any precedence.

TO stated that the buildings were purchased without a use in mind. When the use was found, they chose to use the site because they believed it could be put to a reasonable use. He added that the applicant owns 225, 239, 245, and 247 S. Meridian Street, but they have done due diligence and purchased recently. He stated that it is not his client's fault that these buildings were not maintained, but these are the worst out of the properties they own on this street. He stated this was not intended to be precedent setting, and they agreed to the request for the continuance.

DB encouraged the team to give some thought on lightening the impact on the buildings and filling the gap to the south.

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE COA: SW moved to continue the COA to the **July 1, 2026, IHPC hearing**. **MB** seconded. The motion was approved **5-0**.

2026-COA-143 (CAMA)

ROW: INTERSECTION OF MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE; NORTH COLLEGE AVENUE & EAST ST CLAIR STREET

MATTHEW PRZYBYLA

7-day waiver of notice and install curb extensions

WB returned to chair the hearing. **SW** recused herself.

Matthew Przybyla (MP) of DPW, 200 E. Washington St., presented the case.

WB asked if the Commission needed to address the 7-day waiver first.

MEG stated that the Commission would need to grant the waiver for the rest of the case to be heard and asked **EJ** to comment on the need for the waiver.

EJ stated the applicant did send notice on time, however staff only included one of the intersections because of this, some of the surrounding property owners that should have been notified were not. She added that boundaries needed to be clarified and those owners needed to be notified.

DB asked when the second round of notices were sent.

EJ clarified that the second notices went out on May 18th.

AK asked if there was feedback from the neighborhood.

EJ stated some residents have reached out, so people did receive notices.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE 7-DAY WAIVER OF NOTICE: DB moved to approve the waiver. **AK** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

MP continued to present the case.

MS spoke in support of the project.

Richard Sullivan, 860 N. College Ave., and **Tom Shafer**, 624 E. Walnut St., spoke in remonstrance of the project.

EJ made staff comments. She outlined the aspects of the project that are under IHPC purview.

DB asked if the case was for either the concrete or the urethane panels or for both.

MP confirmed that the request is for both of the materials.

WB asked why DPW has not spoke with the neighborhood.

MP asked staff if they would have been on the list for the notices.

EJ confirmed the neighborhood is part of the mailing list.

WB stated the Commission prefers applicants speak with the neighborhood with requests like this. He added that we do not have many solutions for traffic of this type in the neighborhood. He suggested that continuing the case to allow for neighborhood conversations to occur would be advisable. He asked if a month delay would be difficult for the applicant.

Mark St. John (MJ) of DPW, 200 E. Washington St., presented reason why case cannot be delayed.

WB asked when DPW could return to implement a permanent solution to replace the temporary.

MJ stated he could not give a specific timeline, but they would be willing to return to the Commission in a given time frame to discuss making the project permanent after the temporary solution has been implemented.

WB stated that there does need to be conversations with the neighborhood, especially if they are planning to implement this solution along Massachusetts Avenue. He added that he does not believe this would work if it's meant to be a permanent solution.

MJ clarified that the year timeframe was to reevaluate how the temporary infrastructure functioned and looked, but not to commit to a capital project or permanent infrastructure in a year.

WB asked when he thought they could commit to a permanent solution.

MJ stated that typically when they resurface a roadway, they do not return to recut it and repave within 5 years.

WB asked if they do not plan to work on this portion of roadway within the next 5 years.

MJ stated that was not part of the DPW's 5-year capital program.

WB asked if it would be possible to proceed with the temporary solution and to work with all parties, and then return in a month with a proposed timeline for the permanent solution.

MJ stated he could speak with his team, and involved parties. He added another solution would be to repave College Avenue, paint, and mark it with parking signage.

WB stated the Commission could approve the temporary solution and then return in a month or two with a timeline of when the permanent solution could be feasible.

MJ stated they would be open to returning to the Commission in a month to discuss when they would be able to fit that project into their capital plan.

Hunter West (HW) of WSP, 115 W. Washington St., presented that the project is a permanent solution with the truck apron.

WB clarified that the Commission may be approving this as only a temporary solution, and then having them return for a plan that is more permanent.

HW asked if the neighborhood opposition is what needs to be discussed further.

WB stated they will need to discuss with the neighborhood, and then also evaluate if the solution is working in the safety aspect as well.

Tom Hanify, 664 E. Arch St., commented on the impact on the historic area.

MEG stated that staff had prepared an alternate recommendation that is similar to what the Commission was discussion.

MJ stated this would be an agreeable solution, and asked if the curbs could be removed in a year if they determine it is not feasible for a permanent solution.

MEG clarified that they would not need a COA to remove the work, only if the removal required further alteration to the infrastructure upon removal.

WB stated he wanted to make sure they would be discussing with the neighborhood and business associations.

MJ stated DPW does not typically have a lot of public engagement with repaving programs. They do have more discussions with the 2-way conversions.

WB asked what the timing of the conversions is.

MJ stated the earliest corridors are starting construction in early 2027. And stated public conversations would be taking place before that.

MEG added that the time to engage the public for this solution would be now.

MJ asked if they had direction on the permanent concrete solution on

Massachusetts Avenue.

WB stated they would need to clarify if that was permanent or temporary.

DB asked if there was a stipulation for staff to approve the color, and asked that staff approve that in coordination with CAMA and Massachusetts Avenue groups.

MEG clarified that this was included in two of the stipulations.

WB added they may want to look into addressing the speed table.

MJ added that the bollards in this proposal are crash rated, and noted that the speed table in question is not a good example of what a speed table should accomplish. He added that the alterations to College Avenue should aid in this speed table functioning the way it should.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE COA: MB moved to approve the COA as read by **MEG** and subject to the 5 stipulations. **AK** seconded. The motion was approved **5-0**.

**2026-COA-144 (CH) &
2026-VHP-007B**

**1204 POLK STREET
MICAHA HILL**

Demolish rear of house; construct new addition; make repairs to existing building; construct garage apron; alter openings; Variances of Development Standards to allow a fence in the right-of-way, and for fence location in the clear-sight triangle

SW returned to the hearing.

Jason Wolf (JW) of Wove Design, 1617 N. Cornell Ave., presented the cases.

Heather Sullivan of Cottage Home, 1114 E. 9th St., spoke in support of the project.

Joan Hostetler, 714 Dorman St., spoke in remonstrance of the project.

EJ made staff comments.

SW stated she opposes 2-story connectors, but that the rest of the design is good. She added that she would like to see a different approach to the connector on 1204 Polk Street.

DB stated the design of 1204 Polk looks nice, but asked if they had given any thought on how to reduce the mass of the connector.

JW stated they worked to bring the massing down while also providing the function they're trying to achieve on the second floor. He suggested they could shorten the dormer so it's not as prominent. He added this is just an addition to the rear of the existing house by just extending the rear and raising the roof.

DB asked if the scale of it could shrink just a bit.

JW stated they would look into if that's something they could do.

to be heard
together

DB added that he does not have an issue with the lack of parking.

AS stated she supports the variances and new construction, but needs work on 1204 Polk Street.

AK agreed with previous Commissioner comments. He added that he appreciated the re-establishment of the historic lot composition. He stated that he did not believe the style of the dormer was appropriate, and if they were going to continue to propose a dormer alteration, it will need to be more appropriate to the style of the building.

WB reiterated that the connector needs to be a different scale. He suggested they push it back from the façade of the garage.

MOTION TO CONTINUE 2026-COA-144: **SW** moved to continue the COA to the **July 1, 2026 IHPC Hearing**. **DB** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

MOTION TO CONTINUE 2026-VHP-007B: **SW** moved to continue the VHP to the **July 1, 2026 IHPC Hearing**. **AK** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

**2026-COA-145 (CH) &
2026-VHP-007** **1208 (AKA 1204) POLK STREET
MICAH HILL**

Demolish non-historic garage; construct single-family house; Variance of Development Standards to allow less parking than required

MOTION TO APPROVE 2026-COA-145: **DB** moved to approve the COAs as read by **MEG** and subject to the 8 stipulations and note. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

**2026-COA-146 (CH) &
2026-VHP-007A** **941 NORTH HIGHLAND AVENUE (AKA 1204 POLK STREET)
MICAH HILL**

Construct single-family house; Variance of Development Standards to permit lot to have less square footage than required

MOTION TO APPROVE 2026-COA-146: **AS** moved to approve the COAs as read by **MEG** and subject to the 8 stipulations and note. **DB** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE 2026-VHP-007A: **SW** moved to approve the VHPs. **MB** seconded. The motion was approved **6-0**.

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 9:22 p.m.

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	January 1, 2026-December 31, 2029
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	January 1, 2026-December 31, 2029
Disa Watson-Summers	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	January 1, 2026-December 31, 2029
Krystin Wiggs	Mayor, City of Indianapolis	January 1, 2026-December 31, 2029
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.