

BRVA LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, April 27, 2021 6:00 P.M.

Via Zoom

Present: Karen Valiquett, Mark Demerly, Kathy Andry, Lynn Levy, Molly Lawless Vance, Garrett Lawton, John Jackson, Chad Fallis, Tim Oprisu, Adam Hill, Summer Keown and Janine Lawton

Guests: Chad Thompson, Schyler Sullivan, Mike Klein, Greg Rasmussen, Tad Lupton, Tom Healy, Alan Hague, Brett Davis, Chris Mulloy, Misha Rabinowitch, Todd Morris, Aaron Hurt, Daniel Jacobs, Josh Mazur, Kyle Hughes, Rod Collier, Jade Sharpe, Paul Murzyn, Andrew Baldwin and Mitch French

Committee Chairperson, Karen Valiquett, called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and committee introductions were made.

A motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting was made by Mark Demerly and seconded by Garrett Lawton. Motion passed.

Meeting Notes: 845 E. 65th St., Kayak Pools – Schyler Sullivan with Neighborhood/Downtown Zoning Assistance, Inc. with a follow-up presentation and request for a vote on the petition for a Variance of Development Standards regarding setbacks, parking, landscaping and bike stalls.

Schyler Sullivan walked through the slides from his previous presentation and presented a new site plan based on the committee's comments from the previous meeting. Greg Rasmussen confirmed they've adjusted their plan to match the plan of the property to the east of their site to be more pedestrian friendly. On 65th Street there is a continuous sidewalk with striping coming from the site to the east that ties into the sidewalk and steps up to the entryway. There will be a continuous sidewalk with two off-street parking spaces that are parallel to the street, a ramp system against the building that allows more greenspace on that side and to the west of the ramp, and a concrete walkway that continues to the site to the west with a one-way drive off of Ferguson that will allow additional parallel parking spaces on the westside. The bike racks and one required handicap spaces are still there. They are adding 3 additional trees to the front of the building. Karen confirmed they are required to have 15 on-site parking spaces and they are requesting a reduction to 11. They indicated they can add the 2 spaces on Ferguson to the calculation. They are required to have 2 covered bike stalls and they will have more than the required number of stalls but they will be uncovered.

Karen asked for comments from the committee:

Mark Demerly – He appreciates the changes. Just confirm the two additional spots on Ferguson. It's a narrow street and he doesn't know if there is parking on their side.

Karen asked for comments from the public:

Tom Healy: He thanked the team for making the modifications. He added that it's going to make a huge improvement to the pedestrian safety in the whole way that street operates.

Karen asked if there was a motion from the committee.

Mark asked if they have filed for the variances yet. Schyler confirmed they have not filed and wanted to get a letter of support to include with the filing. Mark commented that the committee normally doesn't vote until the petition has been filed with the city and questioned whether they should vote now or wait until they file to vote.

Adam said he would move to support it.

Karen added that the committee could probably agree on a general level of support based on this site plan and if any changes are made or if the city wants to see any changes to what the committee has approved, they can come back and the committee can vote again. She added she has some concerns since the petition hasn't been filed, that the notices haven't gone out to the adjacent neighbors. Schyler said they would work with the

BRVA and the neighbors as they go forward, and if there are any changes they will come back before the committee for approval.

Mark moved to support the project with the site plan presented along with the reduced number of parking spaces to 11 and the setbacks that were shown. Adam said would adjourn Mark's motion. Kathy Andry seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Notes: 6114 Carvel Ave., Monon Court - Brett Davis and Chris Mulloy with a follow-up presentation and request for a vote on this project

Chris Mulloy gave some background on this project. He said this was filed with the city yesterday and they would like a vote of support for this project from the committee. He commented they've made some minor modifications on the entry. Karen confirmed that with D-P zoning the development standards are created specifically for this parcel and this project. She asked Chris to explain what they asking the committee to vote for tonight. Chris said they are asking for the committee's overall support for the project. Brett Davis commented that as they submit to the city there will be some changes as they go. They would come back and update at that time. They are just looking for a general letter of support.

Brett gave details on the building currently located at this location and walked through the slides from earlier presentations, with the changes highlighted. Based on comments from the committee and Indy Parks, they've revised the plan to include more nature. They've played with the push/pull of the building façade so it doesn't appear so flat. Regarding the previous comments regarding screening along the Monon, they will work with the vegetation to increase the screening of the garage. They've moved the trash collection area. With regard to affordability, they hope to slate this project right in the middle of the market. The cost of building is considerably higher now but they are still trying work on the affordability of this. This will be about a 3-month process to set the standards for the new zoning with the city. Brett explained their plans for landscaping and art installations. They've shared this with Indy Parks and they are very supportive of the idea. They committed to Indy Parks to do a tree survey and hire an arborist to identify invasive species so they can remove them as part of the process. He talked about the art installation for the Monon Place project. The hold-up was a maintenance agreement they need to supply to Indy Parks. As part of this project, they've set aside dollars to get that art piece installed.

Karen: Is Monon Trail going to be widened in this area? A: That is going to be part of the Indy Parks improvements they plan on doing this spring. With this project and the Indy Parks project their goal is to be minimally invasive but there will be some trees that will be removed. They will come back and restore after the fact.

Karen: What is the height of the development across the street? You said this project is 52' as proposed. A: They have the building on the south. It is about 40 – 46' tall. The building directly across the street doesn't quite have the same height.

Chad: He loves that they are adding the trees back in. What is the intent of the trees that are coming in. How large will they be at maturity? A: They would work with Indy Parks to get their preference. They envision large, overstory type trees. They would also put the understory planting in to prevent the invasives from coming back.

Chad: Concerning the 51 units that would be coming down, how many bedrooms do they have and approximately what do they rent for? A: They don't have the exact numbers with them but they will be happy to provide it. Chad said they don't normally push the affordability on projects but it feels important because they are removing more affordable options. Could a certain number of units be below market rent? He is glad they are conscientious about the affordability issue. A: They are very conscientious about it and it was the very first thing Brad Chambers said to them. They are faced with some strange times with the increasing costs. As they go forward with the city, they will continue to look at it. They are going to bring this product into the market at the middle range of the market.

Kathy: There a lot of efficiency and one-bedroom units in this project. Who are your occupants currently? And are you mostly one bedroom and efficiencies? A: They don't have the numbers for the current property with

them but they will look it up and pass it along. They have looked at the market and the comps and have come up with approximately 19 studios, 144 one bedrooms and 23 two bedrooms for this project.

Chad: Two bedrooms could add to affordability since it would allow for two adults to share the units.

Garrett: Is Indy Parks serving in an advisory capacity or they going to have to approve the trees that will be replanted? He is concerned they are going to clear everything out in one of the most shady parts of the Monon and then plant trees that will be big again in 30 years which won't benefit the current residents of the neighborhood. A: Anything that is done has to have written approval from Indy Parks. They know they are going to disturb it and they are trying to minimize that. They will try to pick species that are quicker growing and Indy Parks will require a certain size of species to go back in. They would have approximately a 2–3-inch caliper and be 16-18 feet tall from day one.

Mark: He is also interested in making this affordable. If you could earmark a certain number of units that could match what is currently in place that would be most important. Sometimes the mid-market isn't affordable. He's not a big fan of Hardie panel, large slabs so he would recommend lap siding which is less expensive and more integrative to the neighborhood. He appreciates their commitment to the art. A: They will be open to changing the siding as much as they can but the city sometimes has a different opinion about that. They are trying to balance the use of Hardie, lap and brick. As far as affordability, they are targeting a certain number of units that perhaps could be below market, but they are still working with the city on what requires they need for that. They are trying to not overcommit on that.

Mark: What do you see as the projected start of this project? A: The earliest would be Spring of 2022. They still have 3 months of additional conversations with the city, the committee and the neighbors to define what the development standards will be. They are also helping to relocate their residents.

John: What type of street closings and trail closings will this require and where will the construction people park? This project might coincide with BR Avenue closure and 61st Street will become the next major road to be used. A: They wouldn't anticipate full road closures. They anticipate restricted on street parking to allow for access to the site for construction. There are a handful of properties under Buckingham's control that they could use for construction parking. They can also use the parking garage when it's completed. They will work with the city to figure it out. They have their own general contracting company within their company so they will have more control on how they do things.

Molly: Are you planning to add additional trash cans with poop bag dispensers on the Monon? One near Monon Place and also at the new project would be helpful because there is always a problem on the Monon and on the sidewalks near the apartments. A: They would have to work with Indy Parks on that but they understand and will make note of that.

Tim: Do you own any of the properties to the north of this project? A: Not directly north but to the northeast, they own the property across the street.

Karen asked for comments from the public:

Tom Healy: Talking with some of the developers who have built apartments recently in the village, it's the two bedrooms that fly off the shelf. They have a harder time renting the one bedrooms. Can they get another art installation on the NE corner? A: They're sure Brad will try to get more art installed on this project. They will continue to evaluate the mix of one-bedroom and two-bedroom units going forward.

Karen asked if there was a motion from the committee.

Adam asked Brett and Chris to confirm they are asking the committee for general support of the project as presented, and they are also making a further commitment to continue to work with the BRVA on their development of standards. A: They said as things come up, they are happy to come back and discuss them.

Adam moved to support, in general, what they presented; with the commitment they will continue to work with the committee as they work through their PUD.

Kathy seconded: The motion passed unanimously.

1040 Broad Ripple Ave., River Bank Townhouses - Misha Rabinowitch with a follow-up presentation and request for a vote on the petition to rezone the property from C5 to D-P, to permit an eight-unit townhome development. Case #2021-CMP-830 – Hearing Date: TBD

Misha Rabinowitch introduced Todd Morris, Josh Mazur and Aaron Hurt. The petition didn't require a variance as originally asked for so they are only asking for support for the rezoning. The plans haven't changed a lot since the last time they presented. They made one change to the site plan and they spent some time studying the engineering again because of the committee's comments regarding the impact of this project on the riverbank. They are requesting a rezoning from C5 to a D-P or also known as a PUD which is tailored to the documents they submit and the uses and development standards are established by the documents. Misha shared slides and described the project previously shared with the committee. Access to the building and parking will be off of Broad Ripple Ave. and Riviera Drive. A greenways path along the river will be installed by the owner at his expense. All utilities are available to the site. The drainage will be improved from what is there now. The primary change to the site plan is that they included sidewalks on either end of the building to allow access to the RiverWalk Trail and to the front doors.

The building is set back 13 feet from the top of the riverbank. None of the vegetation along the riverbank will be impacted. It is in nearly the same location as the existing building but the amount of impervious surface has decreased from what is there now because of the green space that will be installed. The drainage will be improved because of updated piping and storm water controls that will be installed.

Karen asked for comments from the committee:

Karen: Where is the stormwater retention system going? A: It will be upsized pipes under the paving so everything will drain to the west and tie into the existing storm system. They will be able to add a water quality unit to pick up sediment. They won't need to install a new outlet pipe.

Karen: Are you just catching the stormwater from the new development drainage or the parking lot as well? A: The parking lot will get reworked so a portion of that will drain to the new system.

Karen: There is nothing there right now, correct? A: There's no water quality unit. It pretty much collects the water and drains right to the river.

Karen: There were concerns about traffic the last time this was presented. Will there be signage for the area to make the connection to Riviera Drive more obvious? A: They would add additional signage for direction. Todd added they originally intended the only access to be from Riviera Drive but it's become difficult to do that because of the access points into the garages. They will continue to work on the flow of this as it's developed.

Kathy: There is a lot of invasive honeysuckle on the bank so you might need to look at that because it might be holding the bank. Will there be a HOA that will maintain the exterior of the building and sidewalks on either side? A: Yes, as soon as the project is sold, the developer will turn over the association to the homeowners and they will be responsible for the exterior and sidewalks.

Chad: At the site, there is a step and floating dock on the river. Could this project have this as part of the project? A: They would love to have professional docks. They will continue to work with the different groups to see if they could get docks there. It's high on their list to achieve.

Chad: Looking at the 4th level where the decks are off the front and the back, was there any consideration to make the roof a flat or more of a straight angle roof with a slight overhang? A: They considered that. They think the flat roof would look fine with the aesthetic. They are open to that.

Kathy: She thinks the DNR will allow docks as long as they are not permanent.

Lynn: She is concerned about circulation on this site. These residents are going to be trying to back out of their garages with cars whizzing back and forth. Is there a way to create some traffic calming or closing off Riviera

there? It's a very narrow drive behind the garages. A: The drive behind the buildings is a 25-foot drive. They could put in speed bumps to the north or a gate arm to the north to help slow down traffic. Lynn: Speed bumps are a maintenance issue. If they can gate the north end, why can't they just close it off to vehicles all together. The original design was for the residents to come down Riviera Dr. but they are having a difficult time only allowing access from Riviera Dr. They will continue to work on that and make sure it's not a thoroughfare. They have it as a one-way off of Riviera Drive. Lynn: She thinks it's a more pleasant way to access from Riviera. She thinks signage won't change the behavior of the vehicles that currently use this. A: The gate idea has merit and the tenants could have a clicker to access the area. They are trying to balance retail needs and the needs of the tenants.

Lynn: She is concerned about the increased load on the riverbank with a building of this size. At just 13' from the edge of the bank and with the additional weight of the RiverWalk, they may be creating a situation they hadn't expected. A: Regarding the load, there's already a building there. They have soils reports and they will go through the process of making sure they take everything into consideration. This is a much lighter structure than the River House.

Lynn: When you are looking at the load on the riverbank, also look at the tree canopy as well. We don't want to see trees failing.

Mark: How many parking spaces are you losing? A: There were 50 and they'll lose 20-25 and they are replacing 16. They'll also pick up 3 more spots with the IU Urgent Health Care expansion.

Karen: What jurisdictions do you need to get permits from to build this? A: It is outside of the floodway so they don't need a DNR permit. It should all be City of Indianapolis. All drainage will meet the requirements of the city. They will capture the stormwater and treat it before it goes.

Mark: Where is your property line actually located? We would want a commitment that you will provide a public right of way along the RiverWalk that would be at least 8 feet so that people wouldn't have patios out to the trail area. A: They will maintain the trail requirement. The trail shown on the plan is at least 8 feet but they will look into that.

Kathy: Asked that they consider having a service door incorporated in the garages to accommodate people parking on the parking pads so they don't have to go around the building to enter the units.

Karen asked for comments from the public. There were no public comments.

Karen: Misha are you asking for a general letter of support? We would add expectations of you coming back and updating us as you work with the city. A: They would be happy to do that if there are any significant changes.

Karen: The traffic and circulation is a hot button issue and is important. If they would bring back the plans for that, the committee would very much appreciate it.

Mark: They need to define where their legal boundaries are. A: They can circulate the plat so they can see it. And there will be a plat for each of the units as well. Misha will forward the plat to the committee.

Karen asked if there was a motion from the committee.

Mark moved to approve what is being proposed based on the aspect they would come back to the committee with the additional plans and commitments.

Chad seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

62nd and College Ave., Office/Residential Project - Misha Rabinowitch with site plan and building elevation changes on this project.

Misha talked about this project from early 2020 which is located at 62nd and College and involves a mixed-use development with a 4-story apartment building to the south and 4-story office building to the north. The project

was approved with the support of the BRVA. The other owner of the project is Eight Eleven Group which is a technology staffing firm and their headquarters will be in the office building to the north. They will be adding 180-200 good paying jobs that will bring daytime workers to Broad Ripple. Two items have come up that require a change in the plans. The city planning staff said they can approve them administratively but they want to get the BRVA's approval as well. The growth of their company requires a change to the plan to add a 5th floor amenity space instead of the roof deck. There is an IPL main feed line and easement to the back of the property and IPL has been unwilling to budge on the requirement that they have 10 feet of clearance from the building to that power line, so they are requesting approval to shift the building 5 feet to the west.

They are proposing taking both stair towers and elevator up to an office penthouse and providing their amenity space on the top floor. Changes to the project as well as original renderings were presented. They've been trying to coordinate with IPL about the above ground line on the east of the building and they aren't willing to put the line in the ground. Originally, they had over 5 feet from those lines and 10 feet from the property line on the west side to the building. They would like to shift the building back to the west by 5' which gives a little more than 10 feet to the existing poles and leaves 5' to the property line on the westside. They will have a modified ramp and steps that come down so the sidewalk remains continuous along College. They are able to get more landscaping on the back now.

Karen asked for comments from the committee:

Lynn: Can you remind them how close the penthouse was to the north edge of the building? A: They didn't have a penthouse on the office building previously. They specifically asked them to add this space up on the 5th floor. It's set back farther on this side.

Lynn: Her concern is with the impression of this building from the north. You'll be able see this penthouse from the long view. She wants to be sensitive to what the view is going to be and what that façade is going to be. A lot of times the residents on the other side of the canal and Warleigh don't get considered with regard to the long view. She wants this to relate in massing and in finish. A: They are trying to use the same materials and to set it back as much as possible.

Mark: His biggest concern is that he doesn't want to see the building going any further west than it is. He doesn't support moving this 5 feet closer to College. A: Is that a scale issue? Mark: He is looking at the buildings that are beyond. He doesn't see how the ramp goes up to the building and how the public accessway goes along. The building is much further forward than the Vogue and other buildings along College. A: They took the switchback and straightened it out. The 7' sidewalk is shown there. They will get the dimensions on the planting corridor on the north and the south. They are 17' back from the right of way. They confirmed the property line.

Kathy: She doesn't understand why IPL is holding their customers hostage on the improvement of their neighborhood.

Mark: He doesn't know why they can't reduce the size of the building by the 5' they need for the utilities. A: The underground parking garage is tight as it is. They have shoring issues with IPL and the shoring company is concerned about bringing in rigging. Maybe they could expand the rooftop area and reduce the building some. When they started these conversations with IPL, they were receptive. Then AES and IPL merged they stopped being willing to help. There is 17 feet to the face of the apartments. The office building is setback 27 feet.

Kathy: Can they have a compromise where there is a setback at the ground level and an overhang on the upper levels? Dan Jacobs: One of the issues that he sees is they are closing on the TIF financing from the city in three weeks and they've already done all of their property tax calculations and assessed values to prep this bond to be purchased. So, when they decrease the size of the building, that will create an issue with the bonds.

Lynn: They aren't talking about the building being smaller if you try to take that space and add it back in on top. They are asking for it to be set farther back from College and find someplace above to put that space.

Adam: To the committee members, what is the concern about getting closer to college?

Mark: This doesn't show the clear sight triangle either. A: They got a variance for that. Mark: This isn't the same clear sight triangle if you are moving it 5 feet to the west.

Adam: If your issue is what IPL is doing, they can't do anything about that. If the issue is the clear sight triangle, can they set it back more for that? He's more supportive of letting them move it if it's just about the IPL issue. Mark: If you took the southern building and take a foot out of each of those units and pushed it back where it was before he doesn't know if that's a big hardship. The setback of the other property owners to the south of 62nd are much further. He's looking at this regarding the transition. He doesn't want it pushed out too far to College.

Adam: If everything gets reduced a foot on the inside, how does your pro forma look at that point? That affects the TIF funding.

Mark: The site plan doesn't show the transition to the south. He brings this up because of the comments of the people to the south in the past. A: This is the first time this has come up. The properties south are all businesses and those properties are elevated as well. Misha met with them before and they were supportive when the building was higher. Mark asked if the south portion could step back 5 feet and let the other move forward 5 feet. A: That's still an IPL issue.

Chad: He doesn't have a problem with the changes they are proposing.

Molly: She agrees with Chad.

Kathy: She is fine with these changes.

Karen: To be clear there are two changes with the additional penthouse and setbacks. She understands this project was approved a certain way but she isn't opposed to the changes.

Karen asked for comments from the public:

Tom Healy: He knows exactly what Mark is talking about. If there was some way Broad Ripple could convey that this is as far south as this magnitude of a structure will go. He doesn't feel the amount of square footage that would be lost is significant enough to affect the assessed value. He understands the dilemma of the tight timeframe. He thinks they need to convey to the community that this is the southern boundary for this type of structure and they won't see these types of structures encroaching into the neighborhoods.

Andrew Baldwin: He's excited for the project and appreciates the neighborhood investment. He's looking forward to more daytime traffic that might result in more neighborhood owner occupants. Any idea when we can see construction begin? A: Demo will begin next month and construction will begin no later than July 1st.

Karen asked if there was a motion from the committee.

Adam moved to support the changes as presented. Garrett seconded the motion. Eight members of the committee voted in support with Mark and Lynn opposing. The motion carried.

831 Broad Ripple Ave., Kilroy's Bar and Grill - Rod Collier with a presentation for a proposed patio/smart pergola on this property.

Rod Collier presented on behalf of Kilroy's. He shared the existing site plan for Kilroy's. There are currently 38 parking spaces. Because of Kilroy's proximity to the Red Line and the bike racks on site, they are only required to have 33 parking spaces. They want to eliminate the 9 parking spots next to Jimmy Johns and eliminate the access off of Broad Ripple Ave. They would be reducing their parking spaces down to 29. They could potentially pick up 2-3 street parking spaces. They are proposing the patio space be expanded and long term they would like to have a smart pergola over the outdoor space with enclosures to use during colder weather. He shared renderings for the new patio space and pergola. They would continue the same railings that are along Broad Ripple to create a more pedestrian friendly environment and help control the patio space from

both sides. Kilroy's wants to keep the area in front of the entrance as a staging space rather than make more parking space there.

Karen: Have you filed with the city yet? A: No, they wanted the committee's support first.

Karen: Would the parking variance be the only variance they would be asking for? A: Yes, they are required to have 33 spaces and they are providing 29 spaces.

Kathy: She believes this is zoned family dining. Is there a stage and a bar around the stage on the plan? Is this still zoned family dining? She remembers parking being an issue. A: There is no bar or stage presented at this time. That area is a firepit. This isn't an entertainment space. This is all outdoor dining or lounge seating. Long term they'd like an outdoor beer garden but right now they are just looking at expanding the outdoor dining.

Karen: So, you aren't proposing any area for outdoor entertainment or live music? A: Correct.

Kathy: Is this still zoned family dining? A: It is zoned C4. The restaurant does have family dining.

Kathy: What is going to take place under the pergola? Will that be separate from family dining? A: This is all going to be outdoor patio space similar to what they currently have they are just proposing phase 2 which will add the covered pergola. It will operate as it is currently. They allow children until 9pm.

Lynn: She understands they are trying to duplicate what they've created as a result of Covid, using more of their exterior space, but they went round and round the first time with Kilroy's about what was really going to be happening in this outdoor space after family dining hours end. She doesn't understand how this fits in to some of the things they agreed on in the original agreement. How many people would be accommodated? Is this in addition to what goes on inside?

Chad: To the committee members, are the Broad Ripple Ave. sidewalks getting widened? Mark: That is still being defined. We have not seen that yet.

Chad: The fence feels so tight right up to the sidewalk. Can that be pushed back 2 or 3 feet off the sidewalk? Mark added the fence doesn't have to be that tall. A: The goal was just to extend the current fence. It is 42 or 48 inches high. Mark asked if it could be lower so it's more engaging. Chad added he would like to have it be pushed back as well.

John: To the committee, are they ok with blocking off access to that corner? With the fence being that tall, it feels like they are closing off the street.

Mark: He doesn't understand why they couldn't provide more spaces along the back. Along Broad Ripple Ave. he'd like to see less fence. He wants the barrier reduced.

Karen: Mark, do you want a lowering and push back of the fence? Mark: He would like to see the fence lowered and a wider sidewalk is more inviting. A: Paul confirmed the fence on the rendering is exactly where it currently is.

Karen reminded everyone that Kilroy's made commitments to the BRVA when it comes to outdoor seating.

Adam: If they didn't need their parking variance, they could technically put up a fence and block off any access to any portion of their lot. We have to try to work with them. If it's reducing the height of the fence, they could probably do that. If it's moving the fence back, it would help but it reduces their ability to make income on property they purchased. Kilroy's needs to remember that they signed the Good Neighborhood Agreement. It's beneficial that they all work together. Where does Kilroy's stand on the requests so far? A: He appreciates the comments. They would be completely committed to lowering the height of the fence as long as they can use it to control the outdoor patio space. He would hesitate to move the fence back. They think they've done a good job keeping to the Good Neighborhood Agreement they signed 10 years ago. This new patio is somewhere people can sit outside to enjoy a meal and get together.

Adam: If we agreed to give approval, is there a way you could move the fence on the southside of the property one foot further to the south and move the fence on the north side, one foot further to the south which would

increase the width of the sidewalk by one foot and give you the same square footage within the fence. A: The entrance is kind of a limiting factor. They can't move the fence too far to the south. There may be some leeway to move the current fence a couple feet back. They think they actually have more sidewalk in front of Kilroy's than the neighbors on either side.

Mark: The vision of Broad Ripple Ave. is that the sidewalk becomes more engaging and he is in support of that. He would like to see a sidewalk café look. He likes getting rid of the access from Broad Ripple Ave. Paul: He would like to add some planting boxes to beautify it more. Their lease is up and he is invested in Broad Ripple because he believes in it. This isn't going to be cheap and he wants to sign a new lease and wants to do something most people would like.

Chad: He supports Kilroy's and thinks the overall plan looks great. The sidewalk is the same width the whole way but this is an opportunity to make the area more engaging for your patio.

John: If they pull the fence back a couple feet off the sidewalk, it opens up the sidewalk more. He would be fully supportive of the project if they move the fence back a couple feet.

Kathy: She agrees with John. Let's pull the fence back and make it more intimate. At a certain time of the evening, offer free parking if they have a receipt from the restaurant. She endorses getting rid of the cut through.

Lynn: She loves the idea of the planters. That would mitigate the noise and it would reinforce the idea of it feeling like a café. She understands the clientele will change after the family hours go away, but if you soften the area, that will affect the overall ambiance.

Karen asked for comments from the public:

Tom Healy gave some background on the previous Kilroy's commitments and expressed concerns about Kilroy's making additional commitments without follow through. He reminded everyone about the landscaping strip in front of the building that is now just gravel. The BRVA got them to agree to limit their capacity to 250 people. He commented that it seems this addition would increase their capacity. He asked how many more patrons they would be able to serve with this expanded area.

Paul said they would have to run the numbers. They tried to keep plants in front of the restaurant but they just kept getting trampled, so they finally just put in gravel. They'd like to put something else there. They have maintained the rose bushes on Guilford. They've tried really hard to honor the things they talked about. They don't know if there's been any concerns of too many people in Kilroy's at one time. They feel like it is certainly better than it was ten years ago.

Tom added that over the 10 years they've lived up to their Good Neighbor Agreement. He talked about a few noise problems for music and tents, but that could be worked out with the new agreement.

Karen would be in favor of updating the GN agreement since it is 10 years ago.

Karen asked if the committee was ready to vote or if they wanted wait for the changes.

Mark would like them to come back to address the north edge of the covered pavilion and also to provide a few additional onsite parking spaces. He thinks this is a great overall plan.

John, Kathy and Lynn agreed.

Rod said they will probably approach the city with those changes before the next meeting.

Karen tabled the closed portion of the meeting to another time.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.