

**METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY, INDIANA**

January 21, 2026

The regular meeting of the Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC) of Indianapolis-Marion County, IN, was held on Wednesday, January 21, 2026, at 1:00 P.M. in the Public Assembly Room of the City-County Building, Indianapolis, IN, for various purposes, including the holding of a Public Hearing on various Petitions listed on the Notice of Public Hearing, and for taking official action upon public business and public Notice thereof as required by IC 5-14-1.5.

ATTENDANCE

The following Commission members were present:

John J. Dillon III, President
Megan Garver, Vice-President
Brandon Herget
Brent Lyle
Daniel Moriarty
Brian P. Murphy, Secretary
Bruce Schumacher, Acting Secretary
Gregg West

The following Commission member was absent:

Brigid Robinson

The following City of Indianapolis employees were present:

Megan Vukusich	Director – DMD
Jennifer Fults	Deputy Director, Strategy and Collaboration - DMD
Carmen Lethig	Deputy Director, Planning, Preservation and Design - DMD
Kathy Frazier Battle	Principal Program Manager, Economic Incentives - DMD
Latisha Ramsey	Compliance Manager - DMD
Kathleen Blackham	Senior Planner - DMD
Marleny Iraheta	Senior Planner - DMD
Shannon Norman	Principal Planner II - Ordinance Revision
Bryce Patz	Manager - DMD
Jeffrey York	Manager - DMD
Nancy Whitaker	Board Specialist - DMD
Chris Steinmetz	Senior Counseling Attorney - ACC / OCC

BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER

President Dillon called the meeting to order at 1:04 P.M. and led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

MINUTES

Commissioner Garver made a Motion to adopt the Minutes from the January 7, 2026 meeting; Commissioner West seconded the Motion; the Commission adopted the Minutes by voice vote (7:0:1) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, West

Noes: None

Recusals: Commissioner Schumacher recused himself from the vote.

The Minutes from the January 7, 2026 meeting were adopted.

SPECIAL REQUESTS

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) announced that the Petitioner had withdrawn **Petition No. 2025-ZON-074** which had been approved by the MDC on November 19, 2025. She relayed that the Petitioner had withdrawn the Petition [before a decision on the petition by the City-County Council] due to issues in supplying water to the site.

2025-ZON-074 | 8221 and 8351 South Mitthoefer Road, 10100, 10550, and 10600 Maze Road

Franklin Township, Council District #25

Christopher D. Reed, Kimberly K. Reed, Paul L. Walton, Cheryl H. Walton, Maze Family Farm, LLC, John Levinsohn, Alan Rutherford and Shirley Rutherford, by Tony Bagato

Rezoning of 273.127 acres from the D-A (FF) (FW) and I-3 (FF) (FW) districts to the D-4 (FF) (FW) district to provide for a single-family residential development.

President Dillon acknowledged the withdrawal of Petition No. 2025-ZON-074.

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) requested a continuance for **Petition No. 2025-ZON-131** to the February 4, 2026 meeting, to allow executed commitments to be filed.

2025-ZON-131 | 1255 Roosevelt Avenue

Center Township, Council District #13

1255 Roosevelt Partners, LLC, by Tyler Ochs

Rezoning of 3.66 acres from the I-4 (FF) district to the C-S (FF) district to provide for indoor recreational uses including a pickleball facility, a bar/tavern, and all I-4 uses.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, Commissioner Herget made a Motion to approve the continuance request; Commissioner Moriarty seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (8:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West

Noes: None

Recusals: None

The Commission continued Petition No. 2025-ZON-131 to the February 4, 2026 meeting.

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) announced that the Petitioner had withdrawn **Petition No. 2025-ZON-100**.

REZONING PETITION RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL BY HEARING EXAMINER, NO APPEAL FILED:

2025-ZON-100 | 1231 West Troy Avenue

Perry Township, Council District #22

Jaak Properties, LLC, by David Gilman

Rezoning of 1.125 acres from the D-4 (FF) and C-5 (FF) districts to the I-2 (FF) district to provide for light industrial uses.

President Dillon acknowledged the withdrawal of Petition No. 2025-ZON-100.

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) requested a continuance for **Petition No. 2025-ZON-130** to February 4, 2026, to allow Staff time to review documents received the previous day and obtain Staff input and comments.

REZONING PETITION SCHEDULED FOR INITIAL HEARING:

2025-ZON-130 | 1033, 1037, 1041, 1045, 1049, and 1053 Harlan Street

Center Township, Council District #18

Harbours at Harlan, LLC, by Michael Rabinowitch

Rezoning of 1.05 acres from the D-5 district to the D-P district to provide for a townhome development, consisting of 15 dwelling units.

The Petitioner's attorney, Misha Rabinowitch (One Indiana Square, Suite 1800, Indianapolis, IN), asked to move forward with the hearing on the Petition. Mr. Rabinowitch noted the case was filed on November 6, 2025, and the D-P meeting was not scheduled to December 12, 2025. Also, Staff comments were not received until Wednesday, January 14, 2026, and after speaking with the City's architect on Thursday, the project's architect and engineer worked over the weekend to submit revised plans on Tuesday morning, January 20, 2026. Mr. Rabinowitch believed that the City architect's requests had been met and was not anticipating a continuance, especially since neighborhood representatives, including Riley Spelman who made great effort to attend in a wheelchair, were present to support the Petition.

President Dillon noted it was unusual for Staff to request a continuance when they hadn't had a chance to review the plans, but emphasized staff needed time to review rather than "flying blind." Commissioner Murphy asked Ms. Blackham (Staff) about the nature of the most recent submittal. Ms. Blackham responded that the Petitioner had addressed the City architect's comments related to a unit facing Harlan Street, but the City architect subsequently raised additional concerns yesterday regarding the site layout, preferring detached garages, which would represent a substantial change. Commissioner Murphy confirmed that the Staff architect still had unresolved issues with the most recent submittal. Mr. Rabinowitch expressed frustration that the issues the City architect raised had been present in the site plan when originally filed in November.

President Dillon acknowledged the Petitioner's frustration but emphasized that Staff deserved an opportunity to properly review the plans, expressing sympathy that neighborhood supporters had made the effort to attend in the cold weather.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, President Dillon made a Motion to approve the continuance request; Commissioner Garver seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (8:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Commission continued Petition No. 2025-ZON-130 to the February 4, 2026 meeting.

POLICY RESOLUTIONS

REAL ESTATE:

2026-R-001 Authorizes the Department of Metropolitan Development to dispose of real property through its Vacant to Vibrant land bank program.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INCENTIVES:

2026-A-002 Preliminary Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for TMC Winterton I LLC, located at 1010 East 86th Street and 8685 & 8699 Guilford Avenue, Council District #2, Washington Township. (Recommend approval of ten (10) years real property tax abatement.)

2026-A-003 (For Public Hearing) Resolution authorizing a hearing regarding termination of the Real Property Tax Abatement associated with Economic Revitalization Area Resolution 2019-A-052, 2019, for TWG Development Inc. and Northwood Partner LP, located at 9025 Compton Street, Council District #2, Washington Township.

COMMUNITY INVESTMENTS:

2026-C-001 Authorizes the Department of Metropolitan Development to negotiate and execute an Agreement with Club 720 Development Corporation to establish a clear, data-driven understanding of housing needs, market conditions and development feasibility in a not to exceed amount of \$250,000 with a term through December of 2026.

President Dillon noted that **Resolution Nos. 2026-R-001 and 2026-C-001** did not stand for public hearing.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, Commissioner Murphy made a Motion to approve the two Resolutions; Commissioner West seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (8:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Commission approved Resolution Nos. 2026-R-001 and 2026-C-001.

President Dillon stated that **Resolution No. 2026-A-003** stood for public hearing.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INCENTATIVES:

2026-A-003 (For Public Hearing) Resolution authorizing a hearing regarding termination of the Real Property Tax Abatement associated with Economic Revitalization Area Resolution 2019-A-052, 2019, for TWG Development Inc. and Northwood Partner LP, located at 9025 Compton Street, Council District #2, Washington Township.

Latisha Ramsey (Compliance Manager, DMD) explained that the resolution was regarding the termination of a 10-year tax abatement for Northwood Partners LP, which had requested to end the abatement early without being required to repay the previous tax savings, which had already been realized. Ms. Ramsey noted that Northwood Partners remained in compliance with all terms of the original agreement, which supported the request for termination without repayment. The Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD) supported the early termination of the abatement. She added that a representative from Northwood Partners was available to answer any questions.

President Dillon added that this matter was previously discussed at the last MDC pre-meeting, noting that TWG was withdrawing from their involvement and TWG was relinquishing all rights.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, Commissioner Schumacher made a Motion to approve the Resolution; Commissioner West seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (8:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West

Noes: None

Recusals: None

The Commission approved Resolution No. 2026-A-003.

President Dillon corrected an earlier remark, noting that Glick was not taking over the tax abatement, but that Glick was requesting a pilot that Staff was working on. Ms. Ramsey confirmed this statement.

President Dillon announced that, although **Resolution No. 2025-A-002** did not stand for public hearing, he asked Staff and Councilor Delaney if they would like to comment.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INCENTATIVES:

2026-A-002 Preliminary Economic Revitalization Area Resolution for TMC Winterton I LLC, located at 1010 East 86th Street and 8685 & 8699 Guilford Avenue, Council District #2, Washington Township. (Recommend approval of ten (10) years real property tax abatement.)

Kathy Battle (Principal Program Manager, Economic Incentives, DMD) noted that the Commission had earlier heard a presentation about the Winterton Office Park project, which was intended to revitalize the area and bring new life to it by introducing a residential housing complex along with retail space. Staff had provided the Commission a one-page document that outlined the key details of the request, which included a 10-year tax abatement at 100 percent. The developers committed to provide \$61.9 million to redevelop the area. Based on this information, DMD staff recommended approval of the resolution. She added that company had

provided Staff with an analysis as to what would happen with a TIF and the savings from the tax abatement, and it had been felt that this was the best tool to make the project viable.

City-County Councilor Brienne Delaney (CD #2) commented that she supported the proposed mixed-use development in the Nora neighborhood. She said that Nora had been experiencing steady organic growth driven by market demand and resident pride. She noted that the project was built on recent public and private investments, including the Nora Shopping Plaza redesign, Monon Trail bridge funding, the 86th Street walkability project currently underway, and a potential new facility she declined to reveal. The development also advanced the 40-year-old Monon Trail vision by creating a true mixed-use community along the trail. The Councilor emphasized that the project was in alignment with the community's vision for Nora's future and had strong neighborhood support, which she considered important given the prevalence of contested developments at both the Council and Commission levels. She believed this was smart, community-supported development that strengthened the tax base, enhanced quality of life, and reinforced Nora as a vibrant, connected part of the City, and asked for the Commission's support.

Michael Lofton, Indianapolis Economic Development Inc. (IEDI), expressed full support for the project and said he appreciated the collaborative opportunities, particularly with DMD, and highlighted the importance of working together to create a viable, transformative project for the Nora area. Noting that the IEDI did not typically engage in residential projects, he commented that the tax abatement opportunity made this project worthwhile, and the project would serve both the community and Nora.

Hearing no comments or questions from the Commission or from the public, Commissioner Herget made a Motion to approve the Resolution; Commissioner Garver seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote (8:0:0) as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusals: None

The Commission approved Resolution No. 2026-A-002.

President Dillon requested that the DMD Director give serious consideration and follow up to the discussions on the matters that had occurred during the MDC pre-meeting

PETITIONS OF NO APPEAL

Petitions Recommended for Approval by the Hearing Examiner:

2025-APP-019 | 8936 Southpointe Drive

Perry Township, Council District #23

HD-2

ForMotion Clinic, by Ed Williams

Hospital District Two Approval to provide for a proposed wall sign along the south elevation for a medical clinic.

2025-CZN-844 (Amended) | 127 East 34th Street

Center Township, Council District #8

Hoosier Outreach, Inc., by Craig McCormick

Rezoning of 0.11-acre from the C-1 (TOD) district to the D-8 (TOD) district to provide for a small apartment consisting of four units.

2025-CZN-852 | 2522 North Butler Avenue and 5200 East 25th Street

Warren Township, Council District #9

Eastside Coverage I70, LLC, by Joseph D. Calderon

Rezoning of 0.22-acre from the C-1 (TOD) district to the C-5 (TOD) district to provide for an expansion of an existing used vehicle sales lot.

2025-CZN-853 | 5023, 5047, and 5101 Madison Avenue, 1257 and 1265 East Thompson Road

Perry Township, Council District #23

Indiana Members Credit Union, by Michael Rabinowitch

Rezoning of 0.22-acre from the C-1 (TOD) district to the C-5 (TOD) district to provide for an expansion of an existing used vehicle sales lot.

Hearing no other questions or comments, Commissioner Garver made a Motion to approve the above-listed **Petitions of No Appeal [Petition Nos. 2025-APP-019 (8:0:0), 2025-CZN-844 (8:0:0), 2025-CZN-852 (8:0:0), and 2025-CZN-853 (7:0:1)]** that the Hearing Examiner recommended for approval; Commissioner West seconded the Motion; the Motion was carried by a roll-call vote as follows:

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Robinson, West (West voted "Yes" for all but Petition No. 2025-CZN-853)

Noes: West for Petition No. 2025-CZN-853 only

Recusals: None

The Commission approved Petition Nos. 2025-APP-019, 2025-CZN-844, 2025-CZN-852 and 2025-CZN-853.

PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

REZONING PETITION RECOMMENDED FOR DENIAL BY HEARING EXAMINER, APPEAL FILED BY PETITIONER:

2025-ZON-126 | 3441 West Washington Street

Wayne Township, Council District #17

Jesus Ivan Ibarra Tamayo

Rezoning of 0.76-acre from the I-3 (FF) (TOD) district to the C-5 (FF) (TOD) district to provide for general commercial uses.

President Dillon explained the Rules governing the hearing and noted no Remonstrators (other than Councilor Evans) were present. He added that due to a tie vote on January 7, 2026, the Petition was being heard again today as a *de novo* hearing (all testimony that was given in the earlier hearing was voided).

Ed Gonzalez (6705 Brookhaven Drive, Indianapolis, IN) testified that he was committed to complying with all zoning laws and ordinances for the project. He explained that when they started the process, he was unaware of some rules and regulations but was now fully committed financially and emotionally to making the project work. Mr. Gonzalez stated that savings had been invested into improving the property and purchasing vehicles and parts to ensure that reliable and affordable vehicles were sold. He emphasized his flexibility in meeting requirements, such as installing fencing to comply with overlay regulations. Mr. Gonzalez commented that the business represented a path to a more stable economic situation for his family.

City-County Councilor Jared Evans, the new majority leader, testified in opposition to the Petition despite sympathizing with the family's situation. He explained that in his eleven years on the Council, he had only supported one used car lot, which was given a five-year opportunity but failed to complete the required work and was ultimately overturned. Despite this, over 40 used car lots currently existed along West Washington Street from the Zoo to the county line, and the corridor was proliferated with used car lots, tire shops, and mechanic shops. Councilor Evans believed there were better uses for the property and emphasized that property owners had a responsibility to ensure their intended use was allowed under City ordinances before purchasing. He noted that this newly represented area lacked organized neighborhood associations that could formally remonstrate, though residents may have received public notices. He added that nearby organizations like Indy Gateway and 40 West, whose boundaries did not extend to this location, had communicated their opposition to the project.

Marleny Iraheta (Staff) said Staff strongly opposed the request to rezone the property from the I-3 district to the C-5 district for a used car dealership. A right-of-way dedication commitment had been requested by DPW, which the Petitioner had agreed to based on previous conversations. The site was partially within the floodway fringe of Pogues Creek, though aerial images did not indicate development within these areas. The most important factor in considering the rezoning request was that the site fell within the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Secondary District, which is intended to coordinate compact, walkable, and urban development patterns with public investment in transit systems. According to regulations, the site did not meet the allowance for automobile sales because permitted automobile sales had to be on parcels of half an acre or less, while this site was 0.76 acres. A variance of use would be required for the operation of an automobile sales business at this location, and Staff believed the C-5 district at this location within the newly proposed Blue Line bus rapid transit corridor would contradict the goals of the TOD Secondary District, which promoted walkable development with a variety of community services. Ms. Iraheta directed the Commission's attention to electronic exhibits showing that while the Blue Line represented only three percent of Marion County's land area, it represented 11 percent of the total land value in the County. Staff argued that valuable land should be reserved for projects that grow Indianapolis's economy, not land uses that did not contribute to the growth, stimulation, and prosperity of adjacent owners and neighborhoods. The exhibits illustrated that as distance from downtown increased along the Red and Blue Lines, total value per acre decreased, and the TOD aimed to preserve valuable land and spur redevelopment moving away from downtown through mixed-use development and housing that contributed to the resiliency and prosperity of Indianapolis. Staff emphasized that one-off auto-oriented uses diminished area value and removed properties from redevelopment consideration. She noted that the Commission and Council passed TOD ordinance updates to uphold the viability of the TOD Secondary District and overall success of the Blue Line TOD Strategic Plan 2024 along Washington Street, and opportunities to promote safe, walkable neighborhoods, smart economic growth, and job-generating uses along heavily established corridors were limited. Ms. Iraheta said Staff strongly recommended denial of the request.

Commissioner Murphy asked and received confirmation from Ms. Iraheta that the Petitioner operated an auto repair business on this site. Ms. Iraheta added that the Petitioner could continue to operate the auto repair business into perpetuity as currently zoned. Commissioner Murphy asked how the rezoning created an opportunity for the redevelopment of housing at the site. Ms. Iraheta clarified that rezoning the site to C-5 district would allow automobile sales if the Petitioner applied for a variance of use; however, if the rezoning did not proceed, any other developer or property owner could rezone the site to a more suitable use for the location.

Commissioner Murphy and Ms. Iraheta discussed the rezoning implications for the property. Commissioner Murphy clarified that regardless of whether the rezoning passed, the property could continue operating in its present use and could be rezoned in the future by any petitioner for different uses, including housing, and questioned the significance of the property being 0.76 acres instead of 0.5 acres or less. Ms. Iraheta explained that within the TOD district, automobile sales was limited to half-acre parcels, so this 0.76-acre site would require a variance of use. Commissioner Murphy clarified that if the property were not within a TOD overlay, automobile sales could operate on a 0.76-acre site without requiring a variance. Ms. Iraheta confirmed this was correct, and Commissioner Murphy concluded that the important factor was the TOD overlay itself.

Commissioner Herget said he appreciated the visuals and explanation of the TOD overlay, noting it has been a topic in several recent hearings. He asked for Staff to walk through tangible examples of development results from BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) investment along the Purple Line, Red Line, and special designated areas along the Blue Line. He wanted to know what outcomes could be pointed to as a result of the work done by this body and other Marion County bodies to incentivize both transit accessibility and TOD development along transit lines. Commissioner Herget asked for Shannon Norman (Principal Planner II – Ordinance Revision) to reply. Ms. Iraheta replied with an example where Staff had supported zoning petitions within a hospital district that had been proposed on the far east side within the Purple Line corridor. Shannon Norman (Principal Planner II, Ordinance Revision) testified that she helped craft the TOD overlay language with the MDC and City-County Council, which was unanimously passed to leverage close to a billion dollars in investment across three transit lines through strategic land use planning and regulations. Along the Red, Blue, and Purple Lines, the City had seen numerous mixed-use developments, including apartments with ground-floor commercial space, grocery stores, and mixed-use commercial developments that brought offices and neighborhood establishments to pivotal corners. Most importantly, redevelopment had occurred, and despite the BRT lines representing a relatively small portion of Indianapolis's 420 square miles, the land was extremely valuable. Ms. Norman explained that mixed-use development had created a domino effect with businesses locating in these areas, community services developing, and better sidewalk connectivity – all measurable outcomes. She had presented examples to Staff showing old industrial properties along the Red and Blue Lines that were transformed despite never being expected to redevelop, which was the purpose of an overlay strategy of applying design restrictions in specific geographical areas. The TOD zoning ordinance was intended to limit uses that only served a particular lot rather than contributing to overall community, neighborhood, and economic development. The half-acre restriction applies to those properties nearest to Transit Stations. She emphasized that the Blue Line's 24 miles and \$150 million in federal investment would be undermined when properties were lost to parking lots and auto-oriented uses, and could be lost for a generation. She concluded that the investment had been transformative, and mixed-use development had been especially important along the Blue and Purple Lines.

Jeff York (Manager, DMD) commented on a question that had been raised earlier about what if the site did not have in a TOD overlay. He noted that Staff did not look at the site as a non-TOD site since Staff had to consider all ordinance conditions that currently applied to a site when making a recommendation.

During his rebuttal, Mr. Gonzalez asked if he had not stated that he was opening a car sales lot, would that had made a difference in requesting the C-5 rezoning. If not rezoning for car sales, Ms. Iraheta replied that Staff would have recommended to rezone the site to a C-3 district, which allowed more appropriate general commercial uses. President Dillon further commented that Staff would have still asked Mr. Gonzalez as to what business he intended to operate on the site. Mr. Gonzalez then asked for an explanation of "TOD." President Dillon explained that this zoning overlay involved IndyGo transit, and properties that fall within the overlay have additional zoning restrictions. Ms. Norman added that this overlay provided restrictions and limitations on certain uses and design standards, which are in place to leverage the public's investment in transit. After additional questions by Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Norman explained that the subject property had two overlays, a flood plain and a transit-oriented development overlay. Mr. Gonzalez again asked for approval of the Petition.

Hearing no other questions or comments, President Dillon directed the Commissioners to mark their ballots. The ballots were marked as follows (4:4:0):

Ayes: Garver, Lyle, Moriarty, West
Noes: Dillon, Herget, Murphy, Schumacher
Recusal: None

President Dillon noted that due to the tie vote, the hearing was voided. He continued Petition No. 2025-ZON-126 to February 18, 2026, for a *de novo* hearing.

COMPANION PETITIONS TRANSFERRED BY THE HEARING EXAMINER FOR INITIAL HEARING:

2025-ZON-108 (Amended) / 2025-VAR-008 | 1360 East 30th Street

Center Township, Council District #8

Monon Development Group, LLC, by Christopher White

Rezoning of 0.98-acre from the I-2 district to the C-S district to provide for a mixed-use development consisting of commercial retail hotel, entertainment, and recreational amenities. Variance of development standards of the Consolidated Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance to eliminate the development standards of the C-S district and to provide for development generally consistent with the plans filed.

President Dillon explained the Rules governing the hearing and noted no Remonstrators were present.

Christopher White, Monon 30 Development Group (855 North River Road, Suite 220, Indianapolis, IN), described the rezoning request for property at the northeast corner of 30th Street and the Monon Trail, a former Hoosier Coal and Oil site. The project, initially approved in November 2021, encompassed about 20 acres for Phase One, with approximately \$75 million already invested. The parcel had been traded multiple times over 30 to 40 years and resembled a junkyard, having been used as a personal residence until the City issued an order in April 2024 prohibiting residential use. In September 2025, the Petitioner secured a purchase agreement with the resident. Mr. White explained that this corner property was critical to the overall

redevelopment due to its unsightliness in its current condition. A commitment had been secured from a national hotel brand (Hyatt under the Unscripted brand) for a six-story hotel that would serve as the anchor for the project. Environmental investigations revealed significant contamination, with five or six underground storage tanks still containing contaminated fluid, requiring over one million dollars in remediation costs. In December, Staff had requested a 19-foot right-of-way dedication along 30th Street for a trail, which the Petitioner agreed to provide along with a five-foot building setback from that additional right-of-way. The Petitioner expressed excitement about bringing this major hotel to the community after four and a half years of work, noting it would anchor future entertainment and restaurant concepts on the property.

Commissioner Lyle questioned Mr. White about the occupancy and performance of the recently completed apartment building associated with the Monon Development Group's project to the north. Mr. White explained the apartments were being occupied currently. He added that when the project was conceived four to five years ago, they had planned for three developments: commercial, apartments, and residential components, all considered essential to the project's success. However, they experienced several delays, including a year and a half to resolve trail right-of-way conveyance issues. The apartments received approvals in June 2023 and were completed, while the residential component only received final permits to "go vertical" in September of the previous year, nearly four years after starting the process.

Upon further questioning by Commissioner Lyle, Mr. White reported that the apartment building's current occupancy rate was about 30 percent and performing poorly, which he attributed to their inability to make progress on the commercial components of the site due to the sequence of approvals. When asked about market research supporting the hotel development, Mr. White explained that Hyatt conducted their own market research and approved the brand, and the hotel operator made the determination to proceed. The development group would sell the remediated ground to the hotel operator who would build the hotel. He mentioned that during the approval waiting period, they operated pop-up events over two summers that drew 3,500 to 4,000 people on Saturday afternoons, providing evidence that the area could successfully draw larger crowds than most in the region. Regarding additional retail interest, Mr. White stated that numerous letters of interest (LOIs) had been received and a commitment of six million dollars in development tax credits had been secured from the State of Indiana, which would be combined with the City's tax increment financing that was planned to be sought after receiving zoning approval.

Kathleen Blackham (Staff) said Staff recommended approval of the Petitions, subject to the three commitments on Page 35 of the Staff Report. She explained that the project would integrate with a larger development to the north and maintain similar characteristics. While the Comprehensive Plan recommended village mixture-use that does not typically include hotels, Staff supported this hotel proposal because it represented a small area within the overall development. The three commitments included dedication of a 44-foot-half right-of-way, maintaining site cleanliness, and submitting final site plans and building elevations for Administrator's Approval. During the exchange, President Dillon confirmed that Staff recommended approval contingent on the Petitioner agreeing to the three commitments. Mr. White affirmed agreement but clarified that he wanted to ensure a 5-foot setback commitment was included, measured from the building to the right-of-way being conveyed. He noted that the 44-foot right-of-way consisted of 25 feet of existing roadway plus the 19 feet being dedicated. Staff confirmed Staff's agreement to the 5-foot setback for the building lot line, and President Dillon verified that all necessary commitments had been addressed and agreed upon by both parties.

President Dillon directed the Commissioners to their ballots, and the ballots for **Petition No. 2025-ZON-108 (Amended)** were marked as follows (7:1:0):

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: Lyle
Recusal: None

The Commission approved Petition No. 2025-ZON-108 (Amended), subject to the commitments referenced and discussed during the hearing.

The ballots for **Petition No. 2025-VAR-008** were marked as follows (8:0:0):

Ayes: Dillon, Garver, Herget, Lyle, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: None
Recusal: None

The Commission approved Petition No. 2025-VAR-008.

President Dillon reminded Mr. White that the area was very important and the Commission would be paying close attention to the development.

REZONING PETITION SCHEDULED FOR INITIAL HEARING:

2025-ZON-127 | 6051 North Rural Street and 6101 North Keystone Avenue

Washington Township, Council Districts #3 and #7

Kite Realty, by Joseph D. Calderon

Rezoning of 8.5 acres from the D-3 and C-4 districts to the D-P district, to provide for live-work units, townhomes, and multi-family dwellings, with a total of 247 units.

President Dillon explained the Rules governing the hearing and noted a Remonstrator was present.

While referring to a paper exhibit provided to the Commissioners, the Petitioner's attorney, Joseph Calderon (11 South Meridian Street, Indianapolis, IN), explained that the existing area was currently C-4 commercial zoning, which did not permit multi-family or townhomes, but the Comprehensive Plan designated this area as village mixed-use, contemplating residential and commercial coexistence. The Petitioner had chosen to rezone to a D-P (Planned Unit Development) district to replicate their successful 2019 approach and provide certainty on development standards. The project would improve stormwater management through underground retention systems that would route to public stormwater under Rural Street, improving conditions particularly for neighbors to the east. The project included accommodation for the existing IndyGo bus line on Rural Street with a pull-off lane, bus shelter, and crosswalks. Mr. Calderon relayed that the Petitioner agreed to eight commitments, including two staff-requested items: final plans would be submitted for Administrator's Approval after receiving IndyGo approval for the bus stop configuration, and the Petitioner requested relief to place the bus shelter within the 10-foot sidewalk area rather than requiring additional space. The project had received support letters from Greater Allisonville Community Council (GACC) and Councilor Boots, though Councilor Boots had noted concerns from one neighbor at the northeast corner of Kessler and Rural that would be addressed. An updated traffic study showed no improvements were needed, as necessary infrastructure upgrades were completed during the 2019 rezoning and Phase One development.

Commissioner Murphy asked whether the townhomes would be for sale or for rent. Mr. Calderon responded that they were planned to be rentals but there was flexibility, as they had not committed definitively either way. Commissioner Murphy then asked if the project would involve any city subsidies, TIF money, or city support. Mr. Calderon confirmed that incentives would most likely be applied for after the rezoning and noted there had been initial conversations, mentioning that TIF was issued for Phase One. Commissioner Murphy followed up by asking if there would be an affordable housing component. Mr. Calderon confirmed there would be an affordable housing component. Gene Beierman, Kite Realty Group (30 South Meridian Street, Suite 1100, Indianapolis, IN) stated that there were plans to include affordable housing in the project. The exact number of units had not been fully determined, but the City's recommendations would be followed.

Commissioner Garver asked about the total number of units including the development completed a few years ago. Mr. Calderon responded that they were adding 200 apartments and 48 townhomes to the existing Ayr Apartments, estimating a total of around 220 or so units were in Phase One.

Commissioner Lyle asked if there was any affordable housing component in Phase One. Mr. Calderon noted that he did not know if there was an affordable component and was not involved in the TIF granted for Phase One.

Commissioner Lyle noted that a TIF had been applied for and granted, stating it would be helpful to have information about the occupancy of all those units, both market-rate and affordable. Drew Rosenbarger (4129 Cranbrook Drive, Indianapolis, IN), Milhaus (Indianapolis, IN), responded that Phase One had transitioned to other ownership, so they did not have specific occupancy data for that Phase. However, he emphasized that demand and occupancy were strong enough to necessitate pursuing Phase Two, indicating the market was positively speaking to them.

Tim Pendleton (6622 Cougar Court, Indianapolis, IN) testified in opposition to the project. He introduced himself as a 2019 graduate of the People's Planning Academy and board president of an HOA. He praised the Commission for their knowledge and effort in understanding the City's vision and guidelines. Mr. Pendleton expressed concern about what would be lost due to this development, particularly the operating Landmark movie theater. He emphasized that while affordable housing was important and he appreciated hearing that there would be some component of it, the project would remove a viable business that provided jobs and tax revenue. He argued that a movie theater was a facility that could not simply relocate. Mr. Pendleton highlighted that the Broad Ripple area had vibrant nightlife but few family-friendly or senior-oriented options. He asked the developer to find a way to keep the theater, emphasizing the importance of places where people can gather, share stories, and remain connected.

Marleny Iraheta (Staff) testified that the request would rezone the site from D-3 and C-4 districts to D-P (Planned Unit Development) classification to allow eight townhome-style buildings east of Rural Street measuring no more than 36 feet (reduced to 36 feet maximum due to a commitment) and four apartment buildings west of Rural Street measuring 52 feet from grade, with a total of 247 units and maximum density of 48 units per acre. A maximum of four percent live/work units would be allowed on the first floor of the western buildings with direct access to the parking lot and street. Staff noted that IndyGo bus routes 4 and 19 travel along Rural Avenue and would continue with this development, and proposed that Commitment Number Three should include notation for the pull-off location as well as the bus shelter location to be approved by IndyGo. A traffic study showed no improvements were recommended for this

location, and Staff believed the proposal aligned with the Comprehensive Plan recommendation for mixed-use or village mixed-use development. DPW's Trails and Greenways requested 10-foot sidewalks with 10-foot-wide ramps, and Staff asked that this language be added to Commitment Number Four. Staff had two commitments that were slightly incorporated within the Petitioner's eight written commitments. When President Dylan asked for clarification on the total number of commitments, after a discussion it was determined that there were eight commitments. Mr. Calderon agreed to modify the Commitments Numbers Three and Four as requested in Ms. Iraheta's testimony.

Commissioner Murphy asked Staff to clarify whether there was typically a requirement for affordable housing in exchange for TIF funds. He asked for confirmation if it was generally accurate that five to ten percent of units would be set aside as affordable housing depending on the request. Marleny Iraheta (Staff) initially deferred to others for clarification. Megan Vukusich, Director, Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD), confirmed that Commissioner Murphy was correct, that with any incentive, there were conditions for affordable housing, and the Department would review and vet any project for compliance with their standards. Director Vukusich confirmed that it was historically accurate that there was generally a five to ten percent set aside for affordable housing, depending on the TIF funding request and the AMI (Area Median Income) level of affordability of those units.

During the rebuttal, Mr. Calderon provided information requested earlier by the Commissioners. He stated that Phase Two (the current project) would propose 10 percent of the units as affordable at 50 percent AMI (Area Median Income), which should meet DMD economic development standards. He clarified the total unit count: 267 units in Phase One and 267 units in Phase Two (204 apartments and 48 townhomes, totaling 515 units between both phases, though he initially said 505). He noted that the current phase would be owned by the joint venture, while Phase One had been sold. Regarding the Landmark theater concerns raised by the Remonstrator, Mr. Calderon appreciated the speaker's thoughtfulness and expertise and noted there was another Landmark theater at Keystone at the Crossing, which was two miles north.

Mr. Rosenbarger acknowledged Mr. Pendleton's feelings on a personal level but noted that the site was no longer a viable site for a theater. He emphasized that having unused or unutilized property did not benefit the developer, the City, or residents, and the developer was trying to be proactive in envisioning the next evolution of Glendale. Mr. Calderon summarized by noting that everyone had witnessed Glendale's evolution over the years and acknowledged that people's hearts bled a little when they lost stores like Ayres and Blocks. He credited Kite for continually investing and reinvesting in Glendale, pointing out the fantastic uses that replaced Ayres with plenty of dining and recreation choices. He stated that with the success of Phase One, Phase Two made absolute sense, would eliminate at least the parking lot for the townhomes, would be well-engineered, had Staff support, and had considerable neighborhood support.

Commissioner Lyle asked for clarification about Phase One metrics, specifically the affordable housing numbers. While Phase One had 267 total units, Mr. Calderon explained that the affordable housing data for that phase was not available.

During his rebuttal, Mr. Pendleton argued that while things change, people still need certain neighborhood amenities. He questioned what entertainment options existed for families with small children in the area besides Broad Ripple Park, finding it "cold" to dismiss the theater as no longer viable. Although he lived in Franklin Township, he emphasized that Indianapolis doesn't need to lose another movie theater, noting the City fortunately didn't lose any post-COVID

theaters while hundreds closed nationwide. He stressed that Indianapolis had already lost many small businesses, restaurants, and retail establishments post-COVID, and shouldn't eliminate more jobs by removing existing viable businesses.

President Dillon directed the Commission to their ballots. The ballots for **Petition No. 2025-ZON-127** were marked as follows (6:1:1):

Ayes: Garver, Moriarty, Murphy, Schumacher, West
Noes: Lyle
Recusal: Dillon

The Commission approved Petition No. 2025-ZON-127, subject to the commitments referenced and discussed during the hearing.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

Seeing no additional business, Commissioner Schumacher made a Motion to adjourn. Hearing no objections, President Dillon adjourned the meeting at 2:54 P.M.



Megan Garver
President

Metropolitan Development Commission

Attest: 
Brian Murphy
MDC Secretary

Date: February 4, 2026