



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

Wednesday, August 5, 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), Krystin Wiggs (KW), Annie Lear (AL), Susan Williams (SW), Michael Bivens (MB), and Disa Watson-Summers (DW).

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 **5:30 p.m.**

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

JULY 2026 IHPC HEARING MINUTES

MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES: KW moved to approve the minutes from the July 2026 IHPC Hearing. **MB** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

III. OLD BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

621 LOCKERBIE STREET

Check-in

Ronda Duvall (RD), 621 Lockerbie St. and **Arie Lipinski (Attorney)**, 951 N. Delaware St., were sworn in and presented their case.

RD stated that the chimney and roof work had been completed. The majority of the work being completed is carpentry work that is currently in progress. She added that once that work is completed they will finish with painting and gutters.

WB asked if **MEG** had any comments.

MEG stated that 7 of the 12 violations at the property had been corrected. She added that she has spoken with the contractor and they are expecting to have painting done by September. She noted there has been significant progress since the last meeting and staff would be comfortable monitoring the progress without bringing it back to the Commission.

WB asked the Commission if they would be comfortable with not having the case come back.

Commissioners agreed they would be comfortable with staff monitoring the progress.

2025-COA-322 (FP)
AMENDED

763 FLETCHER AVENUE (AKA 767 FLETCHER AVENUE)
MARK CROUCH

Adoption of negative findings

MOTION TO ADOPT THE NEGATIVE FINDINGS: **AL** moved to adopt the negative findings. **KW** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

2026-COA-057 (WD)

231, 235 & 239 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET
JENNIFER MILLIKEN

Review of front façade restoration plans

WB recused himself. **DB** chaired.

Mike Balog (MIKE) 11312 Hazel Dell Pkwy, Carmel, IN, presented the overview of the updates to the restoration plans.

Ashley King (KI) of Woolpert, 224 N. Alexander St., New Orleans, LA, presented the detail work to the restoration plans.

AK stated that overall he thinks this a good restoration and reuse of the building. He added that what they've proposed is appropriate and what the Commission would want to see. He questioned the decision to not add the keystone elements to the 235 building.

KI stated they are exploring alternate materials and they want to ensure that the new material is compatible with the existing materials. She stated that they did not include it on the plans but they are not opposed to adding them.

SW asked **MEG** about the lack of documentation stated in the staff report.

MEG directed the question to **SL**.

SL stated that what was seen in this drawing set were discrepancies between the notes on the plans and the presentation on what was going to take place on the building. Staff was also looking for more detailed drawings on the kickplate design, the corbeling, and the keystone elements. She added that staff was looking for a more refined detailing of the plans that we would typically see in a final construction set.

SW asked staff if they were comfortable with the Commission continuing the conversation or should they wait until staff received the detail level requested.

SL stated this was more of a decision for the Commission to make if they were okay approving this level of detailing. Staff did ask the Commission provide guidance on what they would like to see revised on the set for the final stamp off.

MIKE stated they provided an updated package to staff after the documentation deadline, adding it is what they received in the day of packet, which included some of the details staff requested.

SL stated staff received the updated plans the day prior and had not had a chance to review it in detail, but that updated set was included in the day of packet.

SW stated she appreciated the updates to the windows. She asked about the justification for covering the detail to be covered with the marquee.

KI stated the detailing will be minimally obscured by the marquee at the street level.

SW asked if the bright lighting will have any impact on the detailing.

KI stated the up lighting is at the middle of the building and the lighting on the perimeter of the marquee is meant to be accent lighting and is not intended to be a distraction. The intention is not to obscure the detailing at night.

SW stated that the depiction in the packet does seem to obscure the detailing and not celebrate it.

KI clarified the goal is to not obscure.

SW stated it seems like staff may be comfortable moving forward.

DB asked about the material of the keystones.

KI stated that on 235 the material is cast iron.

MIKE added they went up on a lift and there is paint flaking off to reveal metal underneath on the 235 building. The other two buildings have EFIS material that is failing, so the mesh screening underneath is visible. He added that on the hood vents, they had been replaced with wood and you can see the layers and had been filled with wood siding and painted to match the brick.

DB stated he understood getting the keystone back on 235 is going to be difficult but needs to go back.

MIKE stated they can agree to that.

DB asked what the material for the hood vents on the 235 building.

KI stated the material for the hood vents on 235 is brick and it is currently flush to the frame.

DB asked about the frame material.

KI clarified that the frame is metal, cast iron.

DB confirmed the material is cast iron and they will stay. He asked about why the design of the hood vent frames on the other two buildings is replicating the non-original wood frames and not the photograph from 1906.

KI stated they can alter the drawings.

MIKE asked if **DB** was requesting the frames be removed from 235 or be different from those on 231 and 229.

DB clarified that all the frames should match what is currently seen on 235.

KI stated they could make that change.

DB stated it would be unlikely that the kickplate on 235 would not have matched the others, but we don't have a photo of it. He asked why they chose to keep the one the way it is and the others match.

MIKE stated the Commission asked to make it look like 3 different buildings. He continued that they have not been able to find a photo of what was on 235 originally, but they do have photos that show the kickplate in this design for at least 30 years. He stated that if the Commission preferred they all match, they can make that alteration.

DB stated that while they were 3 different buildings, but they were so similar and any differences would be fairly subtle. When looking at the drawing and the photo, he cannot tell if they are the same. He asked for them to clarify if they were trying to match the photo.

KI stated they could make the alteration to match the photo.

DB he asked staff if they are understanding what he's pointing out for staff to check in the final drawings.

MIKE clarified that the detailing **DB** is looking for is included in the drawings, it is just difficult to see in the smaller images.

KI stated there is a grill in the kickplate, so that may be throwing off the drawing.

DB asked about the storefront windows being divided. He stated they were not originally, but clarified they wanted the new windows to be operational.

MIKE stated that other structures on Meridian Street have operational windows and they would like the same function.

DB stated that he could get on board with the idea since in the future, windows could be replaced if necessary. He wanted it noted that this would be a change to the façade. He finished by stating he is comfortable and staff knows what he's looking for.

AL stated she wanted to thank the applicant for their work on this project. She also wanted to thank them for being diligent in completing what the Commission is asking for. She finished by stating she believes this project will be strong for Meridian Street.

MEG stated the motion should include all of the comments they had this meeting.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESTORATION PLANS: **AL** moved to approve the plans. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **8-0**.

IV. NEW BUSINESS – NO PUBLIC HEARING

NONE

PUBLIC HEARING

WB returned to the meeting and made introductory comments.

ML swore in those from the public that intended to speak.

V. REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OR CONTINUE APPLICATIONS

2026-COA-198B (CH) **950 DORMAN STREET** *(continue to October 7, 2026)*
RUSSELL BROWN
Expand parking lot including 13 spaces to the south & repave 9th St.

2026-COA-206 (CH) **929 STILLWELL STREET** *(continue to September 2, 2026)*
MATTHEW PEYTON
Construct single-family house and 3-car garage

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE COAs: **MB** moved to continue the COAs to the **September 2, 2026 and October 7, 2026 IHPC Hearing**. **DB** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

VI. EXPEDITED CASES

2026-COA-228 (CH) & 2026-ZON-056 **1307 EAST 09TH STREET**
ENRIQUE MARTINEZ
Rezone from I-3 to D-8 & alter previously approved carriage house plans to garage only

2026-COA-194 (HMP) & 2026-VHP-009 **2027 NORTH DELAWARE STREET**
JOSHUA DAVID
Constructing a basketball court without approval, & for Variances of Development Standards to allow a game court to have less side yard setback than required & less rear yard setback than required

2026-COA-252A (IRV) **RIGHT OF WAY AT THE INTERSECTIONS OF JULIAN AVENUE & EMERSON AVENUE AND EAST MARKET AVENUE & NORTH BUTLER AVENUE**
MEREDITH WEINGART
Reconstruct & add curb ramps, add bumpouts, & add or relocate sewer inlets & manholes

MOTION TO APPROVE THE COAs: **KW** moved to approve the COA. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE VHP: **MB** moved to approve the VHP. **AK** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE ZON: **AL** moved to approve the ZON. **MB** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

VII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (CONTINUED)

2026-COA-111 (FP) **501 & 555 (AKA 551) EAST LOUISIANA STREET and 304 & 306 SOUTH COLLEGE AVENUE**
BUCKINGHAM COMPANIES
Construct townhomes, rezone from C-7 and I-4 to D 8 with Variances of Development Standards to exceed maximum lot size & for a reduced front building line

Matt Impink of Fletcher Place Neighborhood Association, 714 Noble St, stated the neighborhood is requesting a continuance of the

case.

WB stated that it would be helpful for the applicant to hear the comments from the Commission and the public, so it would be beneficial to hear the case tonight and continue it to a later hearing.

Brian Touhy (BT), 9294 N. Meridian St., presented the case for comment to the commission.

Derek Nobbe, 1215 Pleasant St., spoke in support of the project.

Matt Impink, Jim Lingenfelter, 525 Lord St, **Counselor Kristin Jones, Steve Tate**, 561 Lord St., **Jennifer Bailey**, 530 Fletcher Ave, **Greg Genich**, 5821 Central Ave., owner of 603 Lord St., and **Aidan Rice**, 517 Lord St., spoke in remonstrance of the project, but supported the request for a continuance.

Jim Lingenfelter spoke in support of the continuance. He stated the comments made by the Commission in the **May 2026 IHPC Hearing** were not reflected in the staff report. He stated that the design was cookie cutter and did not reflect a historic district, claiming the design is not applicable to the historic district. He added that the historic district would be in favor of an oil refinery if it adhered to the preservation plan. He asked that the case be continued to the **October 2026 IHPC Hearing**. He further stated there are elements of the design that staff got wrong in their report.

EJ made staff comments.

AK started by stating the new elevations are a vast improvement from the previous elevations. He stated that there is a lack of brick being used on the facades and there is brick present in the district, they should consider adding brick. He added that the design is a bit repetitive, but it is an improvement. He addressed the comments regarding street access and stated that Lord Street access is problematic. He continued that the rendering from East Street included in the package is a bit misleading, adding he would like to see a rendering actually from East Street and including all the facades that will be visible on Lord Street, not just those starting at the curb cut. He stated the centralized green space and the density are appropriate. He finished by saying the Commission is not here to tell a private company that they must keep green space, but rather to judge if the project is historically appropriate or not. He stated that he did not see anything other than what he addressed that would rise to the level of inappropriate.

SW stated she is pleased with the movement of the footprint and the enlarged green space. She added she is wondering why the setback on Louisiana Street is deeper than the setback on Lord Street, she added they may want to look at this closer. She stated that the architecture is clever, except that there are still repetitive rooflines, they should consider adding visual differences in the rooflines.

MB addressed the letter that was received from Indiana Landmarks and encouraged the applicant to review their comments. He stated the rear elevation was a bit toned down for the alley traffic, suggested they resemble the front elevations a little more. He also commented on the

ganged windows on the rear, he suggested they either be reduced to one window or more thought out.

AS stated she appreciated the changes but believes they can go further with the design. She noted concern with 6 buildings that could all look the same, 4 of those being in line with each other. She encouraged they push for more diversity in materiality.

DB noted that it's difficult with projects this large to have diversity. He did note that the units that are on Lord Street, do not necessarily need to match those along Louisiana. He added the units along Lord Street will have more visual impact on the district.

WB noted he agreed with much of what the Commission has said. He noted the stepping of the façade is 2 per building, but if they stepped it more, this could create more visual variety. He added that the space where the porch is, is an important recess and needs to be more prominent. He also added there should be more variety in the porches. He further added that there should be multiple types of buildings, more colors between the buildings, and that they should address the Indiana Landmarks letter. He finished by urging them to continue to push things further. He asked the applicant for their timeline for the continuance.

AK added that the setbacks on both Lord and Louisiana Streets are the same, but the right-of-way on Louisiana is deeper than Lord Street.

BT stated that they would be addressing the setback more in the next hearing. He added the right-of-way on Louisiana is 50-feet and the right-of-way on Lord is 30-feet.

WB noted that the Commission has the ability to aid with setbacks.

BT stated they would be agreeable with the continuance to the **October 7, 2026 IHPC Hearing**.

MOTION TO CONTINUE THE COA: SW moved to continue the COA to the **October 7, 2026 IHPC Hearing**. **AS** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

VIII. APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD (NEW)

2026-COA-202 (WP) & 2026-VHP-010 720 WOODRUFF PLACE WEST DRIVE LEAH BELOW

Variance of Use to allow small apartment use in D-5 & for a secondary dwelling unit without a single-family dwelling on the property, & for a Variance of Development Standards to exceed the maximum lot size for a small apartment

The case was pulled from the expedited docket for a full hearing.

Austin Turner (AT) and Leah Below (LB), 2102 N. Delaware St., presented the case for the variances.

No one spoke in support of the project.

Randy Veach, 811 Woodruff Pl East Dr, spoke in remonstrance of the case.

EJ made staff comments.

SW stated she understands that they are just discussing the variances, but to her understanding, there was only 1 occupant who was the owner that was letting the structure fall apart. She stated these are heroic applicants for taking on this project.

AT stated they know Randy personally. They commend the people of Woodruff Place for their desire to preserve these houses in the way they were originally intended. If they thought that returning the structure to a single-family home was feasible, that's the route they would be going. They believe the reason only 1 or 2 units were occupied in the last couple of years is because of the condition of the interior of the structure, it's unlivable and it's getting to a dangerous extent. They are concerned that if they are not able to leave the structure as a multi-family structure, they aren't sure how much longer the structure will be there. The carriage house is a large concern because the south side roof structure has caved in and the footer is gone. This is a critical point to save the structure and the only way that they can achieve this is to leave it multi-family, the funds needed to justify returning back to a single family are immense or feasible. He commented on the parking for the structure adding that there are additional parking spaces in the carriage house. He continued that their intent is to eventually move into the carriage house and continue to steward the home personally. They are not a business, they are just trying to preserve the home for the future in the best way they know how.

DB started by stating he was the administrator of the IHPC at the time the Woodruff Place plan was created, they had a meeting in the basement of the house. He added that he's well aware of the history of the house and the fact that it has been deteriorating. He continued that the meetings with the neighborhood and the want for preservation went back to the large houses being split into smaller units, it was discussed often. He was concerned that the neighborhood would be against this project, but that's not what happened. He recognized that the house is in a critical state, and that it may be reasonable to make an exception for this case. A house this size with the amount of restoration needed to allow it to survive, he could make an exception. He asked the applicant what the square footage is. He added that he has no issue with a separate unit in the carriage house.

LB stated the livable square footage of the main house is between 5,700 and 6,200 square feet, depending on attic cavities. The carriage house is between 2,000 and 2,200 square feet.

KW stated that she believes the reality if this project does not move forward then the house will fall down and be gone forever, and that feels worse than allowing it to stay multi-family. She added that even though this use may not be what was intended for the plan, it's important to acknowledge.

AK stated the reality of the situation is that there are not many people in Indianapolis that could afford to rebuild this house as a single-family structure. He noted that this is a very expensive and extensive renovation and asked the applicant if they have received an estimate

and a scope that says their plan is going to work.

AT asked for clarification on the question, if **AK** meant from a construction standpoint or a financial standpoint.

AK clarified he meant both. He asked if they had received a construction quote that reflects the amount of work that is needed and using the quality of work and materials that is required by the Commission. He noted the round windows with rounded glass.

AT stated they are still working through the bids process, but they have a bit of the reference. He noted that **LB** is an interior designer that has worked with an architectural group in the past. He added that for their personal home in Herron-Morton Place, they did an extensive restoration of the 130-year old home. He noted this is a forever project with a lot of work done in sweat and labor, but they have a projected budget with a good idea. He also noted you always find things you never plan for and they have contingencies for those. He stated he feels confident this is feasible with the right materials and done the correct way.

WB asked how the structure is being divided, how people will enter the structure, and how the units will be accessed.

LB stated it would be like a four square on the interior. The first floor and second floor will be split side-by-side. There is a front entrance and a rear stairwell entrance. The unit on the top floor will be accessed by a rear stairwell compliant with fire and safety. She added there is a back porch entrance to one of the first-floor units and that there is a central hall to access the second-floor units.

AT added that was the push for having the structure as 5-units because the central staircase is a large part of the character of the structure.

WB stated he understood their desire to keep the structure divided. He asked about parking in the carriage house.

AT affirmed the parking and the carriage house unit will have 2-3 parking spaces for it. He stated there is more parking in their plan than what is shown.

WB addressed the history of the multi-family buildings in Woodruff Place, but that this would be an exception because of the scale and the level of deterioration being significant. He added that he is supportive of the idea as long as the approach is appropriate.

AT stated that this project is incredibly risky for them. He added this is beyond a business venture, but instead this is the rest of their lives. Structures like this are why they love Woodruff Place and they want to be a part of the mindset the neighborhood has.

WB added that the Commission will be looking for a good renovation and restoration of the building. He placed an importance on following the guidelines of the Commission.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE COA: SW moved to approve the COA as

read by **MEG** and subject to the stipulations and note. **AL** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

MOTION TO APPROVE THE VHP: SW moved to approve the VHP. **DB** seconded. The motion was approved **9-0**.

IX. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

2026-COA-247 (HMP)

1707 NORTH PENNSYLVANIA STREET

CARROLL BILBREY

Construct new performing arts building and classroom addition

WB recused himself for the remainder of the hearing. **DB** chaired for the remainder of the hearing.

Zach Grajewski (ZG), Nick Robertson (NR) of Ratio, 101 S. Pennsylvania St., presented the preliminary review for the Performing Arts Center and Classroom additions at Herron High School.

AK stated overall he believes the design is strong while creating a respectful aesthetic; taking a small building and making it massive without it feeling massive. He noted he has a few concerns and asked if this was part of a long-range master plan for the campus.

Carroll Bilbrey (CB) of Herron High School, 110 E. 16th St., stated that yes, this is a part of a long-range plan for the campus to add more classrooms, but also to expand the performing arts programs they already have. The goal is to provide dedicated space for what they already have, but also allow growth for more programs.

AK asked if there is a plan that shows the long term campus.

CB stated he cannot speak to that, they are focused on this project for now.

AK stated his concern surrounds the expansion of the campus chewing up the surrounding neighborhood as the pressure to expand continues. He asked how many seats are in the performing arts center and how many parking spaces they have.

ZG stated there are 540 seats.

CB cannot say off the top of his head, but not that many. He noted they are aware of the concern surrounding parking. He added that Herron High School is working with surrounding neighbors to form agreements to allow them to use existing parking lots, especially when there are events.

AK stated that he is more concerned about the potential loss of other historic properties in the future because of the expansion of the campus. He stated that overall, he is supportive of the project, but would like to see a commitment to the limits of the campus when they return. He noted that there is a finite amount of space in their location and he would like to see them not contribute to the deterioration of the historic neighborhood. He asked about the dead ending alley.

ZG stated that they will be having a meeting with DPW to discuss the termination of the alley.

AS stated that she is in support of the design. She noted that they have taken into consideration a lot of the designed and existing elements in the surrounding neighborhood. She also noted she liked how the building scales down to the neighborhood.

KW stated she is supportive overall. She noted that she liked that the students are getting their own front porch, it's good for them to have their own space. She added it would be nice to see how other spaces will be meant for the students as the campus grows. He stated it's important for the students to have a place to showcase their talents, but would not like to see it overtake the neighborhood.

MB stated he appreciates the academic elements they drew from. He added he is supportive overall and the design seems to go well with the neighborhood. He noted they should lower the rooflines if possible, the height could be sensitive with the neighborhood. He added if it was any other use he would be concerned about the elevated porch, but in this setting, it's appropriate.

SW started by saying most of her feelings were expressed by other Commissioners. She thanked the applicant for the amount of material they had to review. She noted she was concerned about the historic house, but the view from their front porch eliminated that concern. She further noted a concern about the screening and landscaping for the parking lot. She added the design of the building is wonderful and it will be a nice addition to the school.

AL asked the applicants to pay attention to how the parking lots is finished out. She noted she likes the glass, porch, and the stepping of the structure. She stated support for the design.

DW stated this is a great project that will enhance Herron High School above the status it already has. She asked the applicants to work with the neighborhood and take their comments into consideration.

AK added that he wants to see the structural backing to the glass and the canopy.

DB stated he did not have much to add and agrees with the other Commissioners. He noted that he has sat and listened to other architects explain their concept and what they want to achieve, but that does not match their drawings. He continued that they nailed their concept with the drawings. He added this is a difficult site and achieved the goal of a performing arts center on this site. He noted that he appreciated how the addition gently touches the Fessler building and is not jammed up to it, it lets Fessler continue to be its own building. Asked the applicant when they would like to return.

ZG stated they will let us know, they are not ready to return for the September hearing.

XI. OLD BUSINESS – TO BE HEARD

NONE

XII. CLOSING BUSINESS

NONE

Adjourned 8:00 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> <https://www.indy.gov/activity/watch-previously-recorded-programs> or https://indianapolis.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=3.