

**URBANE DESIGN INDIANAPOLIS**  
**Policies and Procedures Sub-Committee**  
Thursday, May 4, 2006 at 8:30 a.m.  
Ball State College of Architecture and Planning  
Indianapolis Center

**Present:** Lee Alig; Co-chair, Jackie Nytes; Co-chair, Carolyn Schleif.

**Staff:** Harold Rominger, Bob Wilch and Scott Truex.

**Discussion**

The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss two questions raised at the Urban Design Oversight Committee on November 15. The questions and the sub-committee responses follow:

1. Should there be some sort of notice to surrounding property owners regarding "significant" Regional Center approval cases?

The following statement from the November 15, 2005 Preliminary Recommendations/Decisions of the Policies and Procedures Sub-Committee was read:

"In addition the concept of having significant Regional Center cases automatically go to the Metropolitan Development Commission or a special hearing officer should be considered. If a special hearing officer is used, they should have a design background."

After some discussion, the sub-committee suggested that in significant Regional Center approval cases, the following should be notified and given an opportunity to comment at a public hearing:

- A. Surrounding property owners,
- B. Registered organizations, and
- C. City-County Councilors.

Further, the sub-committee suggested that a hearing officer process be used, similar to the one employed by the Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission, to provide public hearings for significant Regional Center approval cases. The hearing officer should be a City employee with a design background.

2. How should "significant" cases be identified?

The sub-committee discussed the following possible criteria for identifying significant cases:

- A. Whether the development uses public funds,
- B. The size of the development,
- C. The cost of the development, and
- D. The location of the development.

The sub-committee stated that more information was needed to make a decision regarding how to identify significant cases. Staff agreed to prepare a synopsis of Regional Center approval cases over a one-year period and to send it to the sub-committee members. This will give a better idea of the volume and types of cases reviewed in a typical year. Included with this synopsis will be a suggestion about how to select the types of cases recommended for public hearing.

3. In further discussion, it was suggested that the concept of electronic notification be investigated. Also, it was suggested that it would be helpful if petitioners should be asked to explain the design rationale of their projects, and explain how their design addressed the Regional Center guidelines.