

BRVA LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

July 28, 2026, 6:00 P.M.

Northminster Presbyterian Church

1660 Kessler Blvd. E. Drive

Present: Andrew Baldwin, Anthony Bellamy, Rebecca Dodge, Joe Evans, Chad Fallis, Brian Gamache, Garrett Lawton, Josh Mazur, Tim Oprisu, Sam Rogers, Karen Valiquett, Daisy Winkler, Mary Dicken and Emily Parkins

Guests: Jay Bade, Marianne Beck, Brad Bell, Bo Boroski, Drew Buttrum, Patricia Buttrum, Craig Charnley, Mary Charnley, Grace Crowell, Clara Deal, Jill Duncan, Caitlin Everett, Jessica Fischer, Ben Frame, Kathleen French, Mark French, Mark Fontanna, Thomas Halpin, Patrick Hannon, Paul Hannon, Jennifer Hannon, Alex Hart, Kimberly Henry, Justine Horlander, Tom Horlander, Mary Hornbach, Tom Hornbach, Karl Hostetler, Dave Hughey, Diane Johnson, Jennifer Jones, Steve King, Annette King, Nicholas Lanzetta, Lori Losee, Ted Malone, Alice Mattingly, Sue O'Connor, Julia Probasco, Tom Probasco, Misha Rabinowitch, Vince Reese, Samuel Satterfield, Sarah Soza, James Todd, Colton Vincent, Paige Vincent, Adam Whitraft, Larissa Wolf, Joe Zinkan, Sam Zinkan, Steve Zinkan.

Sam Rogers, LUD Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. Sam R. thanked the public for their attendance at the July meeting. The committee members were also introduced. Joe Evans was recognized as a new LUD committee member. Joe is a longtime area resident and brings expertise with sales and construction.

Sam R. opened the meeting by specifically stating what the BRVA Land Use and Development Committee is. In a simple sense, the LUD is the first step in the overall city process when there is a request for a variance or rezone. The city will tell petitioners to engage with the LUD. Ultimately, after hearing presentations, the LUD will either support, support with conditions, or not support. Then, the petition will go through the remainder of the city process. The LUD wants to make sure the residents are heard but also the LUD wants involvement in the development processes.

A member of the community asked if the Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD) can approve a petition even if the LUD does not support the request. Sam R. confirmed that this could happen.

Sam R. requested a motion for approval of the June 2026 meeting minutes. Karen made a motion to approve the June 2026 minutes. Garrett seconded the motion. The June 2026 minutes were approved unanimously.

Sam R. noted that there is one presentation on the agenda for the evening and a vote is expected. Sam R. reminded the room that petitioners will have ten minutes to present, followed by questions and commentary from the LUD Committee. Lastly, each member of the public that wishes to speak will have three minutes to do so.

1305 Broad Ripple Avenue – Flanner Buchanan site redevelopment by Zinkan and Barker Development. Misha Rabinowitch is presenting on a petition to rezone 1.54 acres from the D-5 district to the D-P district to provide for a mixed-use development consisting of 94 multi-family dwellings and approximately 9,000 square feet of neighborhood and service commercial uses.
Case Number: 2026-ZON-060 – Hearing scheduled for August 19, 2026

Misha Rabinowitch introduced himself as a land use and zoning attorney and a representative for Zinkan and Barker Development. Misha stated that he enjoys the LUD and city process as he appreciates the opportunity to hear all opinions and engage the public in the processes. Misha shared that with the current project – 1305 Broad Ripple Avenue – they have been discussing this plan for 6-7 months now. They first started appearing before the LUD in January 2025 to present initial concepts. Misha shared that they returned in April with updated drawings and are now present for a third time. Misha explained to the public that the LUD will make a recommendation to the city and the DMD will consider that information as a part of their analysis of this case. Misha confirmed that ultimately, the DMD makes the decision on whether this project is approved. Misha shared that the Zinkans have spent a lot of time with neighbors, business owners, architects and city staff and this project has come a long way since January. The Zinkans are proud of the project and anticipate their hearing with the city on August 19. Misha confirmed that the public is welcome at that hearing as well.

Misha highlighted some of the important takeaways with this project, including that this is an important gateway site for Broad Ripple. Misha shared that the Zinkans developed The Ripple right across the street from the proposed site. Misha emphasized the importance of having an architectural design that is representative of what Broad Ripple is and wants to be. Misha also underlined the importance of being sensitive to the single-family residential homes nearby and minimizing the impacts on the surrounding streets. Misha reviewed the key changes to the project, which included a 23% reduction in units (from 122 to 94), a reduction in building height from 55ft to 48ft, more brick and recessed sections and articulation to the front façade. Additionally, they worked with the Department of Public Works (DPW) about the traffic concerns and were informed that the city is not requiring a traffic study but recognized the concerns from the neighbors and recommended that the Zinkans work with a civil or traffic engineer to prepare a traffic memo. The Zinkans completed that process, and it was concluded that this project – with 94 units and less than 9,000 square feet of retail – would have an insignificant impact on the operations of the adjacent roadway network and the adjacent intersections. As such, no traffic improvements were recommended as a part of that report. Misha introduced Sam Z. to present the changes to the elevations.

Sam Z. shared that the Zinkans did not attend the June LUD meeting as there were still a lot of revisions they wanted to pursue for the project. Sam Z. reiterated one of the big changes was the reduction of the main part of the roofline to 48ft, which was changed as a direct result of community feedback. Another significant change was creating a better mix of classic and modern architecture, which was done by deepening the brick and changing the corner element of the building. Further, the stairwells were lowered.

Sam Z. also highlighted the landscaping and noted that the current documentation doesn't capture all the details of the landscape plan. Sam Z. pointed out the 6ft tall wood fence along the property line to the south of the property, illustrating that there will be a lot of trees covering that fence. Sam Z. also pointed out, most importantly, there are no apartments or rear facing balconies toward the south. Sam Z. mentioned there used to be two entrances on the west side of the property, but this has been reduced to two in total for the entire project. It was noted that one of the prior entrances was changed to a loading zone. Sam Z. highlighted the crosswalk that was added after hearing feedback from the neighbors at The Ripple. Sam Z. emphasized that the Zinkans have incorporated as much as they could regarding the feedback they received. Sam Z. shared they believe this is their best foot forward.

It was confirmed that the request is to rezone from D-4 residential to D-P. The development statement was distributed to the committee. Any approval of this project would be subject to the development statement which includes the number of units, the amount of parking, setbacks, restrictions on uses, etc. What Zinkans are asking for is a very confined rezoning just for this project.

Sam R. opened it to the committee for questions and feedback. Daisy thanked the developers for their continued work and communication specific to this project, and for incorporating much of the feedback they received. Daisy asked about the change in the renderings from the last meeting, specific to the wall in the front of the building. Sam Z. mentioned the elevation change along Broad Ripple Avenue. To keep the site flat, their finished elevation is a little bit higher than Broad Ripple Avenue. Sam Z. pointed out the additional sidewalk, the greenspace, retaining wall, plus the patio space. Daisy also asked about the restricted uses for the property as a part of the rezone petition. The petitioners confirmed they have included some restricted uses already and are open to reviewing and adding the LUD's normal list, if there are differences.

Karen asked for a review of the parking plans that were listed in the development statement, which referenced 157 spaces, to accommodate one space per unit plus one space per 400 square feet of retail. Sam Z. answered that they are well beyond what would normally be required, which is 117. Karen also asked about the primary makeup of the units. Joe confirmed the apartment complex will be mostly made up of studio and one-bedroom apartments, as that is their biggest demand at The Ripple across the street.

Andrew mentioned the exclusions listed and indicated he would like to see a more robust list attached to the petition. Andrew asked about the plans for trash and loading. The developers confirmed the trash will be fully contained and they will have two dumpsters, as well as a trash chute for the residents. Andrew then asked about the landscaping plans and acknowledged the detail that has been added to the plan since the last meeting, particularly along the south side of the property. Andrew asked if these plans represent what will actually be implemented. The Zinkans confirmed the plans will be implemented as written. Andrew introduced the topic of a crosswalk across Broad Ripple Avenue. It was mentioned that there was a DPW suggestion to add a

crosswalk. Andrew shared that he would love to see a raised crosswalk, also known as a speed table. The developers confirmed they will work with the DPW on implementing this suggestion. Lastly, Andrew asked about the retail plans. Andrew recognized that there are no issues with vacancies at their property across the street, but also acknowledged the challenges Broad Ripple is facing with vacant commercial properties. Andrew asked what the developers will do to ensure their new building does not experience vacancies. Sam Z. mentioned that they have not yet marketed the retail space because the plans have not officially been approved yet. They have heard from some local operators that would be interested in renting the space if/when approved. They are bullish on their ability to fill the space considering their experience at their existing property and given it will be a brand new building and they will price rent reasonably.

Sam R. asked that Misha walk the public through the process. Misha confirmed they are seeking a D-P rezone, which is the only zoning classification where the petitioners do not go to the hearing examiner, but straight to the Metropolitan Development Commission (MDC). Instead of the hearing examiner, a D-P meeting, also known as the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, occurs. Misha indicated that this meeting occurred the prior week and several city agencies were in attendance, as was Mary from the BRVA. Misha noted that the developers had spent a lot of time with city agencies prior to that meeting, so there weren't many comments in person during the meeting. The agencies were very supportive of the project. Misha explained the hearing before the MDC is scheduled for August 19 at 1 p.m. and will be held in the city county building. The MDC makes approval or denial. Then, depending on what happens, the request will go to the City Council.

Garrett asked the petitioners to walk the committee through the wall pictured on the south side of the building. Sam Z. indicated that, from the shallowest part, there is a 5-foot setback from the property line. There would also be a 6-foot wooden fence they would construct. All the trees and vegetation in the landscaping plan would fill that area.

Julia Probasco introduced herself as a resident living near the proposed site. She expressed interest in addressing the potential effect this project may have on the infrastructure in the neighborhood. She shared that the LUD core mission is to uphold responsible development under neighborhood guidelines. Julia believes that this project threatens the basic structural integrity of the local infrastructure, specific to sewage. Julia noted that with a project of this magnitude there would be approximately 10,000 gallons of continuous baseline wastewater added to the grid every single day, and with retail this could be greatly increased and may choke the existing lines. Julia expressed concern that peak hours and severe weather events would further impact these pipelines. Julia asked that the LUD obtain answers from the developers for three key areas: has Citizens Energy Group completed a formal sewer capacity availability review for this project; will the developers be required to install subterranean attenuation tanks to buffer peak hour flow; and will the developers hold full financial liability for downstream pipe upgrades or will local taxpayers be responsible? Julia closed by asking that the LUD protect the local infrastructure by deferring a recommendation until

an independent downstream hydraulic impact study is completed and made fully available to the public.

Ted Malone shared that there are apartment complexes in the village that are not operating at capacity, with multiple properties offering major discounts for new residents. Ted also mentioned that there is an empty apartment complex along the Monon Trail that is available and could be demolished and rebuilt and would be a better location for a new complex as opposed to infringing on an existing neighborhood.

Bo Boroski introduced himself as a supporter of Broad Ripple and the BRVA, as well as the Founder of Friends of Broad Ripple Village. Bo shared that he overwhelmingly supports this initiative. Bo appreciates that the developers have an existing footprint in the village, and that the individuals grew up here and care about the village. Bo noted that for the past six years their existing property, The Ripple, has been at 100% capacity for both residential and retail. Bo stated that the LUD committee exists because of the Envision Broad Ripple plan. Key elements of that plan include the importance of mixed diversity housing, the development of key projects and the need to increase density. Bo explained that he lives, works and plays in Broad Ripple and he hopes that the developers continue to accept and act on the feedback provided by the community. Bo shared examples of changes the developers have made in response to community feedback. Bo shared his hope that the developers install a camera system for their own security and use by the IMPD. Additionally, Bo would like to see Vape Shop added to the list of excluded uses. Lastly, Bo agreed that the developers should urge the DPW to install a speed table on Broad Ripple Avenue. Bo underlined his support for the project.

Ty Halpin shared that he is a resident of Broad Ripple. He attended the meeting as he was interested in hearing how invested the developers were in making some changes to the project and he feels really good about the changes that have been made. Ty recalled when the school was vacant and there wasn't anything at The Ripple site and mentioned that the funeral home was fine and always looked nice but it would be a challenge for any new developers to make something fit the community in that space. Ty explained that this project provides more opportunities for young individuals to start in Broad Ripple and hopefully stay there. Ty mentioned that the developers seem open to feedback and changes, and, from what he's seen, this is the kind of project you would want in your neighborhood. Ty emphasized the importance of the retail availability. Ty reiterated his support for the project.

Tom and Mary Horbach asked for the developers to point out on the map where their house is. They asked where the trees and fence would go on the south side of the property. Sam Z. confirmed that everything that is added would be on their side of the property line. Tom asked if the fence would be 6 feet, which Sam Z. confirmed. Tom also asked what the height would be with the added landscaping. Sam Z. mentioned that the landscaping plans are confirmed but he isn't sure the specific height of that species of vegetation. Tom asked if there was 15 feet between the fence and the building. Sam Z. indicated the space would be 24 feet wide and would be a drive aisle and no parking would be available there. Tom and Mary also asked the timeline for this

project, should it be approved. Joe noted that they haven't yet selected a general contractor and the timing will also depend on the process with the city. Ideally, they'd like to start construction in the spring of 2027 and the project would last 15-18 months. It was confirmed they would use the space across the street for staging and they do not plan to use Haverford or Indianola. The developers underlined that they want to be good neighbors and help during this project in any way they can.

Marianne Beck shared that she lives on Haverford, and that the members of the public that are present all care about Broad Ripple. Marianne asked if the sewer topic has been studied. It was confirmed that Citizens Energy Group will make them upgrade lines if determined necessary. It was also noted that their utilities plans must be approved before construction can start. If the current infrastructure cannot handle their plans, the developers will be required to upgrade before starting construction. It was reiterated that Citizens will determine all this. The developers shared they do have a civil engineer and will go through this entire process after they receive approvals for the project. The LUD noted that they can also ask the developers to return before the committee to continue learning about the project as it develops. Marianne appreciated the changes made to the exterior of the building and requested that they also add artwork. The developers noted that Mary from the BRVA has also been an advocate for artwork as well and has put them in touch with the Indy Arts Council.

It was shared that, as a part of the infrastructure review and approval, the developers will be required to obtain an Improvement Location Permit (ILP). In order to receive this permit, they will be required to show their utilities plans and how they will impact the system. Karen requested that the communication with the LUD stay open throughout that process.

Annette King said she is a neighbor that lives on Haverford across the street from the site. Annette noted she has questions about construction. Annette explained that many of the homes in the neighborhood are old, historic homes and construction could do damage to the homes. She explained her concern for things such as noise and dust. Annette asked how staging across the street from the property would impact traffic. Annette also requested permitted parking for neighbors only along the street and stated that many of the neighbors do not have garages or driveways. Annette reemphasized her concerns about the construction and traffic and stated that the neighbors do not want this project.

Alex Hart indicated he is very much in support of this project. He shared that he moved to Broad Ripple when he was young and has now been there for four years, indicating his plans to buy a home and stay in the village. Alex acknowledged the vacancies in the neighborhood and asked the Zinkans' plans to fill their property given the vacancies in the community. Sam Z. shared that everything they plan to do new property is based on their experience across the street at The Ripple, which has been very successful. Misha underlined that this project accounts for 40-50 parking spaces for retail, which is extremely important and often contributes to the success of retail spaces, as illustrated

at The Ripple. It was noted that Mayor Brainard of Carmel has said that if you want to drive density and retail, you need to have dedicated parking.

Clara Deal introduced herself as a neighbor that lives about 8 houses away from the site. Clara echoed what Marianne said about the cars and parking on Broad Ripple Avenue. She expressed her concern over how that will be fixed as the streets cannot be made wider. Ultimately, the concern is neighbors losing parking spaces to residents and patrons of the retail spaces.

Karen stated the importance of the LUD hearing feedback like that so they can communicate that to the city as a priority.

Sarah Soza shared that she lives in a historic home that is over 100 years old. She mentioned that she has two children and three pets and expressed concern over the congestion and safety both during and after construction. She shared that they are lucky to have an operating school nearby but any time there is an event, the parking is a mess in the neighborhood. Sarah explained the challenges residents face when turning left onto both Broad Ripple Avenue and Kessler Blvd. Sarah also expressed concern over a big apartment complex blocking the views of many bungalow-style homes.

Mary Charnley, a resident that lives on Indianola, shared that her concerns from the last meeting remain the same. Specifically, she has concerns with mass density as it relates to the infrastructure. Mary shared that the structure is there and can't be changed. Mary appreciated what the developers have done but is concerned that the city does not seem to be concerned about traffic as the city indicated a traffic study is not necessary. She asked the LUD to please insist that traffic is taken seriously and hoped that the city would be proactive instead of reactive as it relates to traffic. Mary wants the LUD to be advocates of the community before there is a tragedy.

Vince Reese introduced himself as a resident that lives on Haverford. Vince acknowledged that many of the neighbors have mentioned the sewer lines and shared that other apartment complexes in the area are still having issues, particularly with the smell. Vince appreciated that the developers have made a huge step with these plans but noted that there is still room for improvement. Vince asked that the developers please take the sewage aspect seriously.

One member of the community asked if condos were ever considered for this site. Sam Z. indicated that their company has not considered condos as that is not a part of their scope.

Sam R. confirmed that the petitioners are asking for a vote.

Karen moved to recommend support for the request with the condition that the petitioners update the permitted uses portion of the development statement include the LUD's list of excluded uses. Josh seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 11-1 (Chad opposed).

Sam R. stated that the LUD would like to see updates periodically from the petitioners as they progress through the development process. Additionally, Josh encouraged the public to attend the hearing downtown to make their voices heard.

A member of the public asked if they could see the development plans. It was confirmed the plans will be made public when they officially file with the city.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 p.m.