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INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE PLAN
The Broad Ripple Village Plan is intended to enhance the quality of the village experience and serve as the foundation on which form-based zoning can be developed. The goal is to create a quality and sustainable environment for all to live, work, play, and gather in Broad Ripple Village.

This plan is an update and replacement of the Broad Ripple Village Plan Update adopted by the Metropolitan Development Commission in 1997 as a segment of the Comprehensive Plan (97-CPS-R-003).

A comprehensive plan is required by the state statute (Indiana Code 36-7-4-501 through 512) as a basis for zoning and must include objectives and policies for future land use development and development of public ways, places, land, structures, and utilities. A comprehensive plan segment is one part of the overall comprehensive plan for the county. The Comprehensive Plan for Indianapolis/Marion County is made up of over 80 segments.

This plan is a guide for anyone making a decision about the use of a property. It is useful for property owners, developers, neighbors, neighborhood organizations, City staff, and City boards and commissions. This plan will be used to evaluate rezoning applications, to project future population and employment concentrations, and prioritize capital improvements.

VISION PLAN / FORM-BASED ZONING
This vision plan is the most recent in a series of plans prepared for Broad Ripple Village, all with similar themes, goals, and objectives. What sets this plan apart from the previous plans is the introduction of form-based zoning. It was clear from the beginning that the Broad Ripple Village community, along with confirmation of past efforts, wanted to establish guidelines as future changes were made.

White River winds around and forms a natural boundary to the north and west of the village. Consequently, a large portion of the village falls within the 100-year flood plain. As planned flood control projects remove land from the flood plain, development pressure increases. The community was concerned that the character of the village would be compromised without some development standards to guide these future changes.

As pieces of the vision came together, it became clear that maintaining a quality environment and protecting the community fabric in the village area would require guidelines that were enforceable rather than “encouraged.” Form-based zoning became a tool that could be used to accomplish this. Form-based zoning “fosters predictable built results and high-quality public realm by using physical form (rather than separation of uses) as the organizing principle for the code. Form-based zoning addresses the relationship between building faces and the public realm, the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another, and the scale and types of streets and blocks.”

LOCATION AND STUDY AREA
The study area features boundaries established in the 1986 Broad Ripple Village Neighborhood Plan: east – Evanston Avenue; south – Kessler Boulevard; west – Meridian Street; and north – White River and 64th Street.

Within these boundaries lies an area that encompasses the commercial core along Broad Ripple Avenue and the area north of the canal between College Avenue and Westfield Boulevard where form based zoning is recommended.
PAST WORK

Broad Ripple residents are passionate about the Village and have participated in numerous public planning projects over the years. Envision Broad Ripple (EBR) benefited from the data and public input generated in previous planning efforts and incorporated long-standing community aspirations into the current plan. Highlights of past plans include:

**Broad Ripple Village Neighborhood Plan (1986)**
The study area: north: Riverview Avenue, the White River, and 64th Street South Drive; south: Kessler Boulevard; east: Evanston Avenue; west: Meridian Street. The Department of Metropolitan Development planning staff identified neighborhood goals and objectives based upon a door-to-door residential survey, a needs survey, and merchants survey that resulted in this plan. Key elements: developed goals and recommendations for land use and rezonings, the transportation system, parking standards, recreational facilities, citizen involvement in neighborhood programs and services, development standards in the commercial areas, adequate housing, public safety, educational environment, and the physical environment.

**Broad Ripple Charrette (1994)**
The Department of Metropolitan Development and the Broad Ripple Village Association, in collaboration with Ball State University, sponsored a two-day brainstorming event to generate a variety of ideas and alternatives addressing future growth and development of residential and commercial areas in Broad Ripple. The gathering was preceded by a survey of the residents and a public meeting, which provided information for the participants to consider. This charrette brought residents, merchants, students, and planning and design professionals together to focus on the challenges and opportunities and identify recommendations for the future of Broad Ripple. Key elements: identified potential for the Central Canal as a linear park; increased bike and pedestrian access, sidewalks and landscaping; urged removal of the parking deck over the canal and replacement with a parking structure.

**Broad Ripple Village 1994 Parking Study**
The City of Indianapolis entered into a contract with Walker Parking Consultants/Engineers, Inc., to perform a parking supply and demand analysis of the village area. The study area was defined as Compton Street and White River to the east, 64th Street to the north, College Avenue to the west, and 62nd Street to the south. The area was divided up into three zones: 1) area north of the canal; 2) south of the canal and west of Winthrop Avenue/Westfield Boulevard; and 3) east of Winthrop Avenue and Westfield Boulevard. Key Elements: Zone 2 has a deficit of spaces during weekend evening hours, with available spaces in Zones 1 and 3 during the peak evening demand periods. The overall surplus of spaces on a Saturday evening would be expected to disappear if development continues.

**Indy Parks/Indy Greenways Master Plan (1996)**
Opening the first section of the Monon Trail in Broad Ripple in 1996 established what has since become recognized as one of the metropolitan area’s most successful public works projects. The result of a lengthy public process that led to the City’s acquisition of the abandoned Monon Railroad right-of-way and conversion to a linear park, the Monon Trail was a significant investment in the Village that continues to pay dividends. Key elements: transform an eyesore into an asset and stimulate economic development along the corridor, with the addition of green space and enhancement of the bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

**Broad Ripple Village Plan Update (1997)**
This plan was adopted by the Metropolitan Development Commission (97-CPS-R-003) as a Comprehensive Plan Segment and the official plan of record for the Broad Ripple area. It recommended land uses for the entire neighborhood and provided more detailed development recommendations for its commercial and mixed-use heart of the community. Key elements: enhance the natural resources and recreational opportunities, acknowledge the market dynamics within the commercial district, protect the residential areas, and preserve the mixed-used “village” character.
2nd Globe and ROAMworks were commissioned by the Broad Ripple Village Association to conduct a study and provide a “scope” of recommendations that could be used to guide future development and maintain an appropriate balance among all interests in the Village. Key elements: create bike and pedestrian friendly Village with outdoor dining, recreation opportunities, and improved landscaping.

2nd Globe/NINEbark (Broad Ripple Central Canal Action Plan) (2001)
This plan was a further refinement and elaboration of the 1998 Scoping Document that set goals and objectives and provided a specific timeline to guide the implementation of canal redevelopment vision. It sought to strengthen the Central Canal’s relationship to the Village’s commercial corridor on Broad Ripple Avenue. Proposed upgrades to the Central Canal Towpath along the north bank would establish landscaped pedestrian-friendly areas. Key elements: improved streetscape with more street trees; provide bike and pedestrian amenities to create park-like atmosphere along the Central Canal to create a new Village “center.”

Glendale Area Special Neighborhood Study (2001)
The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) contracted with urban design firm Storrow Kinsella to lead a public planning process to transform the Glendale Shopping Center into a transit hub and create a more bike and pedestrian-friendly infrastructure. Study area: north: 65th and White River; south: 56th Street; east: Olney Street; west: Primrose Avenue. While a large portion of the study area lies outside of the Broad Ripple Village boundaries, the study included substantial public outreach and input from area stakeholders (including Broad Ripple Village). Community involvement helped spur several recommendations for improved bike, pedestrian, transit accommodations and greenspace that would have beneficial consequences for the Village, hence its inclusion on this list. Key elements: identified comprehensive bike, pedestrian, and transit enhancement principles and practices; described a methodology for rating bike and pedestrian infrastructure; encouraged seeing Broad Ripple Village as part of a larger network of neighborhoods; improved greenspace and aesthetics through increasing number of street trees and pocket parks; and, created a connection between Broad Ripple Park and the Village proper with a eye toward embracing White River.

Broad Ripple Overlay District (2002)
A joint effort between Broad Ripple community stakeholders and the Department of Metropolitan Development. The mission was to work from DMD’s Infill Housing Guidelines (1993) to develop standards to promote and retain the vitality and desirable characteristics of the Village, to protect property values and guide development without restricting creativity and to generally preserve and enhance the livability of Broad Ripple Village. Key elements: articulated rationale for defining standards that maintain Village character via building height, set-backs, massing and public parking.

Broad Ripple Historical Significance (2003)
This report summarized the history of Broad Ripple Village that began in 1820 when the federal government began selling land in Marion County. Historical information on transportation, commercial activities and structures, residential structures, and recreation activities are included in this document. Key elements: documents areas and structures of historic importance for preservation.

Crafted by the community in association with the Indianapolis Cultural Development Commission, this plan was a component of a City program to identify six Cultural Districts. Broad Ripple Village was the only Cultural District outside of central city. The Plan was limited in focus to the area bounded on the north - White River; south – 62nd Street, east – Compton Street, west – College Avenue. It looked specifically to increase local cultural participation, enhance the visual appeal of Broad Ripple Avenue, support local arts venues and increase public art. Key elements: highlighted Village cultural attributes, the lively mix of commercial and residential environments reputation for innovation, creativity and independence; urged preservation of Village integrity, enhancement of green spaces, and strengthening of overall design standards and visual qualities.
**Broad Ripple Village Parking Study (2007)**
The City of Indianapolis contracted with Walker Parking Consultants to analyze parking in the Village and to make recommendations for future parking strategies. The 40-city-block study area included the following boundaries: west: Broadway Street; east: Compton Street and White River; north: 67th Street; south: 61st Street. Key elements: recommended a three-tier approach to addressing parking issues: 1) construction of a 300 space parking structure; 2) establishment of neighborhood parking permit program (to reduce negative consequences of late-night traffic in adjacent residential neighborhoods); and 3) creation of a park and ride shuttle service between Broad Ripple and Glendale mall out lot on Rural Street.

**Midtown Indianapolis 2010, Guiding Principles and Future Development Strategies (2010)**
Harmoni (now known as Midtown Indianapolis, Inc.) and Maple Road Development Corporation commissioned this working planning document that is a collection of strategies to rejuvenate the neighborhoods and revive businesses. The study area had the following boundaries: White River to the west, White River/62nd Street to the north, Keystone Avenue to the east, and 38th Street/34th Street to the south. Key elements: Midtown aspirations include destination connected, exceptional outdoor experience, place of investment, employment generator, public policy collaborator, identifiable place, and the place to live.

**Indy Connect-Central Indiana’s Transportation Initiative (2011)**
The Metropolitan Planning Organization, Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority, and IndyGo partnered to develop a regional transportation plan. This proposed long-range transportation plan is designed to connect people to places around Central Indiana using bus, rail, roadways, pedestrian walkways, and bike pathways. The first phase begins with a ten-year plan to be built in Marion and Hamilton counties. A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line is proposed to run along College Avenue. Key elements: Double the current bus service in the first ten years, develop four BRT lines, develop rail transit between downtown Indianapolis and Noblesville, transition BRT service to light rail, construct pedestrian walkways and bicycle pathways to other transportation services and routes, and maintain roadways and bridges.

**North Midtown Economic Development District (2011)**
Economic development districts are established to provide cities with tools to stimulate and support reinvestment in areas where reinvestment might not otherwise occur. The North Midtown Economic Development District includes the College Avenue and Monon corridors between Fall Creek and White River and the 38th Street corridor between Fall Creek and Illinois Street. A significant portion of Broad Ripple is included in the boundary of the economic development district. A map of the area can be found on page 8. Due to the changing transportation infrastructure and the evolving needs of retailers and other business owners, the corridors in the economic development district are showing some degree of obsolescence. Key elements: The establishment of the economic development district is intended to provide better neighborhood services, provide tools for stimulating private investment, protect and create jobs, recycle obsolescent public property, and upgrade infrastructure.

The companion document prepared by Eden Collaborative presented a broad overview of existing conditions along the Central Canal towpath between the Indianapolis Museum of Art (IMA) and the Indianapolis Art Center (IAC). It identified various destinations, a hypothetical route, the need for access points, and a detailed plan for creating a major landmark attraction in Broad Ripple Village.

The feasibility study and opportunity analysis (also prepared by Eden Collaborative) more closely examined the potential for a recreational arts experience along the former Monon railroad right-of-way and the Central Canal while formalizing the connection between the IMA and the IAC. Key elements: This proposal would become a local and regional connector, enhance the community quality of life, serve as an economic driver, create an element of community identity, and provide a level of public safety.
CREATION OF THE VISION

After a March 2008 Mayor’s Night Out in Broad Ripple Village, neighborhood representatives met with Maury Plambeck, director of the City of Indianapolis, Department of Metropolitan Development, to ask for assistance in updating the Village’s 1997 Master Plan. Community leaders anticipated increased development in the areas north of the Canal upon completion of an Army Corps of Engineers levee project that would remove significant portions of the Village from the floodplain. They were motivated, in part, by Mayor Greg Ballard’s challenge to “come up with a plan.”

Since several controversial variances were granted over the years, community members wanted to establish enforceable development guidelines that would preserve and enhance the Village’s “look and feel.”

EBR planning efforts began on Earth Day in 2008; a partnership between the City of Indianapolis, Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD), and neighborhood groups including the Broad Ripple Village Association, Green Broad Ripple and HARMONI - the Historic Midtown Initiative (now known as Midtown Indianapolis, Inc.). A Steering Committee was established that included DMD planners and neighborhood representatives. Together, they designed exercises and set meeting agendas before each of the 27 public meetings, led work sessions and compiled results, and then debriefed afterwards by reviewing worksheets and public comments. This enabled the Steering Committee to craft and refine policy recommendations that reflected the substantial community input. In addition, Steering Committee members led field trips to Bloomington, Indiana, and Columbus, Ohio, to study other communities that resembled Broad Ripple Village and its environs.
PUBLIC MEETINGS AND WORK SESSIONS

Public work sessions were held every four to six weeks (see appendix “A” for an summary of every meeting). A diverse group of attendees participated: neighborhood residents, business owners, commercial property owners, developers, environmental activists, transit advocates, architects, designers, landscape architects, elected officials, and representatives from local community development agencies and cultural institutions. An average of 32 people participated in each session. Over the course of four years, more than 200 participants registered for work sessions with an indeterminate number in attendance who declined to register.

The role of Division of Planning staff in these meetings was to provide guidance based on best practices in neighborhood development. The planning profession had undergone a transformation since the Village Plan was adopted in 1998. Concepts like “Smart Growth,” “New Urbanism,” “Transit-oriented Development,” “Compact Urban Form,” and “Complete Streets” became recognized as effective planning principles designed to integrate sustainability and stewardship with economic development.

With the mandate to preserve and enhance the Village “look and feel,” DMD staff led the neighborhood in a series of exercises (walking tours, visual preference surveys, building blocks on base maps, etc.) to assess current conditions, identify desired outcomes and to explore policy options that could guide new development in Broad Ripple Village.

As these novel planning concepts were introduced and a vision emerged, planning staff suggested that each session include an educational component. Thus, EBR sessions frequently featured guest speakers – specialists with expertise in sustainability, tree ordinances, parking, transit and green space. They provided important background information for the community to use in its deliberations.

From the onset of the EBR process, planners stressed the importance of an inventory to identify specific community assets and characteristics. Several sessions devoted to compiling a list of assets generated these results:

- Broad Ripple Park
- Monon Trail
- White River
- Central Canal
- locally-owned small business commercial sector
- lively residential neighborhoods
- cultural hubs like the Indianapolis Art Center

Village characteristics include:

- mature trees
- pedestrian-friendly and bike-friendly streets
- mix of old and new architecture
- creative adaptive reuse of old buildings
- all-ages-friendly Village atmosphere

In previous planning efforts, the Broad Ripple Village community had decided against the establishment of a historic district and sought instead to create a voluntary overlay district. The failure of this effort in 2002 had stymied further plans. After several EBR sessions, DMD staff determined that a different approach to design guidelines was required. Rather than advisory, guidelines should be regulatory. Staff recommended altering the sub area plans to promote appropriate development. The goal was to provide a roadmap to achieve this, while building consensus for the community’s vision for the Village’s future.

One year into the EBR process, DMD staff recommended using form-based zoning in the regulating document. They made the compelling case in favor of well-crafted form-based zoning since it uses physical characteristics, rather than separation of land uses, to organize lively, vibrant communities. Establishing and maintaining a high quality public realm involves addressing the relationship
between pedestrians, building façades, building form and mass, appropriate scale, and the street. The EBR process became focused on crafting a vision that would use the form-based zoning tool to enshrine the community’s stated desires for walkable, bikeable, tree-lined streets, and promote locally-owned small businesses.

The resulting EBR neighborhood village plan will serve to articulate the community’s vision and provide the principles on which the “Regulating Plan” is based.

EBR was an active series of work sessions. Participants were engaged by DMD staff and Steering Committee members in exercises designed to evoke community aspirations for the Village. The outcomes were documented and then formulated into policy recommendations. In addition to educational presentations, City staff solicited community feedback through the following exercises:

**VISUAL PREFERENCE SURVEYS**
DMD staff presented slide shows depicting existing conditions interspersed with photos of a variety of architectural styles, building heights and village character. Participants rated each slide on a scale ranging from the most desirable to the least desirable for the Village.

**WALKING SURVEY**
The area north of the canal required more information because it is an area of much activity and controversy related to variances and rezonings. Participants were divided into four groups with each group conducting a walking survey for a specific area north of the canal. Each group rated four characteristics:
1. uses and activities
2. comfort and image
3. access and linkages
4. sociability
They also provided input by responding to the following questions:
1. What do you like best about this area?
2. What type of land uses and activities would be appropriate for this area?
3. What could be done that would make this area more attractive?
4. What could be done to make this area more accessible to the community?
5. How could a “sense of community” be fostered?
Additional comments and discussion ensued upon their return from the walking survey.
**MODEL BUILDING EXERCISES**

Perhaps the most innovative strategy - and certainly the most popular - engaged participants with scale models and base maps of the area. The challenge was to identify those areas of the community that are most likely to change in the next ten to twenty years and consider what might constitute appropriate development. The goal was to explore the relationship between pedestrians and the built environment by using wooden forms and LEGO blocks to represent buildings.

[Images showing community participants modeling and a model of the area north of the canal]
ENVISION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Elements of the Vision
Results from all work since the beginning of the visioning process are organized into the following nine major elements:
1. Improve transportation and infrastructure
2. Foster and improve sustainability
3. Improve the image of the Village
4. Honor the historic aspects of Broad Ripple Village
5. Increase trees and open space
6. Respect and protect the White River, the Central Canal, and the Monon Trail
7. Maintain the mixed-income diversity and provide housing opportunities for all age groups
8. Seek ways to develop key projects
9. Increase density

1. IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

(A) Improve public transit and encourage transit oriented development. IndyGo operates 30 local service routes throughout Marion County, delivering an average of 8 to 9 million trips per year, many of which converge at downtown Indianapolis. Two of the thirty routes operate within Broad Ripple Village. Route 17 travels between Glendale Mall and downtown, using Broad Ripple Avenue and College Avenue. Route 18 travels between 91st Street and downtown, using College Avenue and Central Avenue within the Broad Ripple Village area. Routes 19 and 26 travel along Keystone Avenue with connections to Broad Ripple.

The MPO prepared a regional transit plan that recommends bus rapid transit along College Avenue as well as Broad Ripple Avenue between Binford Boulevard and College Avenue. The plan retains bus service along Kessler Boulevard East Drive between Glendale Mall and Meridian Street.

Vision Statement
College Avenue is a primary arterial and should be utilized as a major public transit corridor, with connections to points north, downtown Indianapolis, and Keystone Avenue (Glendale Mall) and Butler University along Broad Ripple Avenue and Westfield Boulevard.

Goals:
- Develop a program in conjunction with Hamilton County that would promote College Avenue as a major north and south transit corridor.
- Create a program to increase ridership by encouraging Village businesses to offer incentives for residents and visitors to use public transportation.
- Develop a Regulating Plan that provides for transit oriented development along College Avenue at key commercial nodes.
- Initiate discussions with IndyGo to determine the feasibility of expanding public transit through the use of shuttles that would connect Butler University and Glendale Mall with Broad Ripple Village.

(B) Utilize Complete Streets standards
Complete Streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for users of all ages and abilities, whether motorist, bicyclist, pedestrian, wheelchair user, bus rider, or shopkeeper. By taking an inclusive and comprehensive approach, Complete Streets build road networks that are safer, more livable, sustainable, and inviting. An example of this is the recent repaving of Broad Ripple Avenue (see Infrastructure Improvements below).

Vision Statement
As improvements are made and new developments initiated, streets within Broad Ripple Village should include as many policies and elements of Complete Streets as possible.

Goals:
- Develop a Regulating Plan that includes elements of Complete Streets throughout Broad Ripple Village.
- Develop East 65th Street between College Avenue and Westfield Boulevard to the standards of Complete Streets and a gateway
into Broad Ripple Village.

- Support efforts in the Indiana Legislature for a comprehensive state-wide Complete Streets policy.

Vision Statement

Broad Ripple Village should set an example and establish itself as being the most walkable community within the Indianapolis metropolitan area that would attract visitors and encourage new residents.

Goals:

- Convene a survey that would specifically identify where new sidewalks and curbs are needed in order to create a connectivity network, in accordance with standards of the specific street typologies identified in the Regulating Plan and the Multi-modal Guidelines.
- Identify those areas within the existing sidewalk grid that are in need of repair and/or replacement; then coordinate with the Department of Public Works and developers to establish priorities to complete and maintain the connectivity grid.
- Close off street(s) or create programmable pedestrian spaces for special events.
- Identify those portions of the sidewalk network where it would be appropriate to widen the sidewalks.
- Identify those areas where streets could be safely narrowed and sidewalks widened.
- Construct a river pedestrian and bicycle walkway connector between the Monon Trail, Broad Ripple Village, and Broad Ripple Park.
- Identify access points for pedestrian and bicycle connections along the Monon Trail.
- Establish a lighting scheme that will create an environment that is visually inviting.

A complete street may include:

- wide paved shoulders
- special bus lanes
- sidewalks
- bike lanes
- comfortable and accessible public transportation stops
- frequent and safe crossing opportunities
- median islands
- accessible pedestrian signal
- curb extensions
- narrower travel lanes
- roundabouts

See Appendix C for more information.
identity for Broad Ripple Village and promote pedestrian safety.

- Develop Broad Ripple Avenue as walkable street with more pedestrian appeal to encourage walking to all services for living, shopping, and entertaining.
- Encourage vehicle parking at Broad Ripple Park and walking to the village.

(D) Improve alleys
Well-maintained alleys serve many useful purposes, including vehicular access and parking, pedestrian access, trash/recycling collection, and drainage. (see map on page 16)

Vision Statement
Attractive and well-maintained alleys throughout the Broad Ripple Village will improve, expand, and contribute to the Village vitality.

Goals:
- Discourage the vacation of alleys as new projects are proposed.
- Work with developers to maintain and improve the existing alley network.
- Develop a “clean up our alleys” program through Green Broad Ripple.
- Continue with the “Green Alleys” program through Green Broad Ripple.
- Use alleys for circulation, parking, drainage, recycling, and more housing.
- Utilize the Regulating Plan to establish standards for sustainable alleys that can be used for vehicle and pedestrian travel.

(E) Improve infrastructure
Due to age, drainage structures, curbs, sidewalks, and streets are in disrepair throughout Broad Ripple Village. Lack of adequate funding, however, prevents establishment of an appropriate maintenance program. Broad Ripple Avenue was repaved from College Avenue to Keystone Avenue in 2011.

Through the efforts of the concerned residents, funds were generated to provide additional amenities that included sidewalk bump-outs, benches, bike lane striping, unique crosswalks, and bike racks.

Vision Statement
A sustainable, complete and well-maintained infrastructure will improve drainage, contribute to the aesthetics of the village character, increase property values, and stimulate new development.

DRAINAGE
There are more than 10,000 miles of drainage facilities in Marion County (approximately 6,000 miles are on private property). Storm water drainage and flooding has been a chronic problem for the Broad Ripple Village. The Department of Public Works has a Storm Water Master Plan (currently in the process of being updated) that addresses problems and prioritizes problem areas in order of severity.

Goals:
- Conduct a comprehensive infrastructure assessment for Broad Ripple to include, but not limited to sanitary and storm sewers.
- Identify the most problematic drainage and flooding areas, report the problems to the Department of Public works, and request investigations. A list of priorities would then be prepared.
- Identify alleys with drainage and flooding problems where a “Green Alleys” project would be appropriate.
- Coordinate with the Department of Public Works and the US Army Corps of Engineers on the Indianapolis North Flood Damage Reduction Project.
- Encourage the use of rain gardens and rain barrels to reduce flooding and runoff impact upon our sewer system.
- Coordinate with the Department of Public Works and utilities to create programs that would improve energy efficiency and reduce utility costs to those living within the area.

CURBS
The presence of curbs improves the appearance of an area by organizing parking and separating pedestrians from vehicles. They also contribute to proper drainage and ease flooding by directing water into drainage structures.
Vision Statement
Curbs throughout Broad Ripple Village should either be repaired and/or installed where appropriate, including all new development.

Goals:
• Coordinate with the Department of Public Works to prepare an inventory of existing curbs and establish a priority of repairing curbs and installing new curbs.
• Encourage new developments to install and/or repair curbs within the boundaries of their development.

STREETS
Streets accommodate a variety of activities that are frequently in conflict with one another and create unsafe conditions. The Complete Streets program offers alternatives that provide safer travel for all users. The recent resurfacing of Broad Ripple Avenue set a Complete Streets standard for all future street projects where pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles are more safely integrated with one another.

Vision Statement
As streets are repaired, rebuilt, or installed, the principles of Complete Streets should be used to enhance and maintain a safe transportation network for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians that will enhance Broad Ripple Village experience and attract visitors and new residents.

Goals:
• Conduct an inventory of the existing street network in Broad Ripple Village that would include a rating system for the condition.
• Coordinate with the Department of Public Works to establish priorities for repairing and/or rebuilding streets based upon greatest need, as funds become available.
• Encourage developers to incorporate the principles of Complete Streets in their plans.
• Create a hierarchy of transportation in the following order: 1) Pedestrians; 2) Public Transit; 3) Bicycles; and 4) Vehicles.

(F) Improve bicycling
The City of Indianapolis will create 200 miles of bicycle lanes within the next 12 years, including a 1.02 mile bike lane installed in late 2011 along Broad Ripple Avenue between the Monon Trail and Keystone Avenue. Currently, there are 30.63 miles of bike lanes with another 29.82 miles planned for the next two years. Additionally, the City of Indianapolis has received the designation of “Bicycle Friendly” by the League of American Bicyclists. (map page 18)

Vision Statement
Broad Ripple Village will become an active and integral partner with the City of Indianapolis as the Indy Bikeways plan is implemented through the village’s support of activities that promote bicycling as a viable means of transportation within the area.

Goals:
• Partner with the City of Indianapolis and advocate for Broad Ripple Village as plans are made to expand the bikeways throughout the Indianapolis metropolitan area.
• Encourage businesses and employers to promote the IndyGo Bike ’n Ride programs by offering incentives for those who ride their bicycles.
• Incorporate safety features for bicyclists throughout Broad Ripple Village, including reverse angle parking (up to 43% reduction in accidents involving injuries related to parking), appropriate signage, etc.
• Encourage businesses and employers to provide accommodations for bicyclists, including safe storage, parking, and shower and changing rooms.
• Designate 61st Street as a bicycle boulevard through the study area and connecting to the Central Canal and Glendale Mall.

(G) Improve parking
The perceived lack of parking within the Broad Ripple Village has existed for many years. Two parking studies (1994 and 2007) found that deficits of parking are restricted to the area south of the canal during Saturday evenings. The 2007 study offered ideas to increase parking that included regulation of employee
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parking, valet parking, a residential parking program, circulator shuttle, and a parking garage.

**Vision Statement**

Improvements in parking should increase the number of parking spaces and have minimal impact upon the unique character that draws people to Broad Ripple Village.

Options suggested by the community include the following:

1. Improve and increase on-street parking.
2. Place off-street parking in appropriate locations.
3. Develop remote parking with a shuttle.
4. Develop a parking garage.

**Goals:**

- Explore the reverse angle parking that could increase the number of parking spaces in those parallel parking areas by 25%-30%.
- Promote the use of transit in an effort to reduce the need for more parking.
- Encourage the use of shared parking.
- Utilize form-based zoning to require more appropriate parking standards for a sustainable community.
- Conduct a survey of on-street parking to identify those areas where defining and organizing parking by striping and/or installing curbs would result in additional parking spaces.
- Conduct a study that would identify where existing curb cuts could be eliminated and increase space for parking.
- Develop typologies in the Regulating Plan that would locate parking in the rear and side of properties, rather than in the front of buildings.
- Investigate the potential of providing parking areas outside of the neighborhood with a shuttle providing service to and from Broad Ripple Village. Butler University, Broad Ripple Park, and Glendale Mall would be potential sites.
- Identify potential locations for a mixed use development that would include a parking garage.
- Utilize revenue from parking meters in Broad Ripple Village as a funding source to construct a parking garage within the business core area of the village and improve infrastructure.

**(H) Improve traffic circulation**

Traffic circulation has been an ongoing issue within the Broad Ripple Village. There have been a number of different recommendations put forth to address the congestion in the business core, particularly along Broad Ripple Avenue. The 2010-2011 repaving project generally provides for a center lane (for turning and deliveries) with an east/west lane on either side of the center lane, within which is a portion of the lane to be shared with bicyclists. There is also space on either side of the avenue for parallel parking. The inherent challenge in improving circulation lies with the limited rights-of-way and utilities that are generally located within the rights-of-way.

**Vision Statement**

Improvements in traffic circulation should include provisions for pedestrians and bicyclists, while maintaining the standards promoted by Complete Streets.

**Goals:**

- Conduct a traffic study within the commercial core of Broad Ripple Village that would look at the volume and congestion to determine what steps could be taken to relieve the situation.
- Survey residents and business owners about the impact of the existing one-way streets and whether changes would be appropriate.
- Incorporate street typologies in the Regulating Plan that would provide for multi-modal movement.
- Reinforce College Avenue as a transportation corridor to and from downtown, with cross connections at Broad Ripple Avenue and Kessler Boulevard.

**CONCEPTUAL STREETSCAPE CROSS-SECTIONS**

As a way to implement many of the recommendations of element #1 (Improve transportation and infrastructure), conceptual streetscape cross-sections have been developed. The conceptual cross-sections help to describe the intended outcomes of streetscape improvements among the village’s streets. (see Appendix C)
Because the streets in the village vary in how they look and function, the conceptual streetscape cross-sections vary according to street width, direction of traffic (one-way vs. two-way) and frontage typology (see “frontage typologies” on page 42).

The conceptual cross-sections are to be used as site improvements are made. Provision of streetscape amenities should be proportional to the site improvements. Examples are intensification of the use of the site, increase in building coverage, and increase in parking area. The conceptual cross-sections are to be treated as prototypes that should be modified as necessary to provide for traffic safety and flow, pedestrian safety and to make smooth transitions as the streetscape changes.

As the right-of-way gets wider, more space becomes available to enhance the streetscape. In the development of the draft cross-sections the following assumptions were made and standards adhered to:

- Streets have curbs.
- Sidewalks are inside the right-of-way.
- A sidewalk on at least one side of the street is a higher priority than on-street parking.
- Sidewalks are a minimum of five feet in width. In a small number of circumstances a width of four feet may be acceptable (for example, where space is limited and there is a five feet wide sidewalk on the other side of the street and the alternative is no sidewalk at all). In places with heavy pedestrian traffic and a wide right-of-way, sidewalks should be six to twelve feet wide.
- Sidewalks should have at least four feet of clear passage free from obstacles such as utility poles, traffic signs, tree pits, parking meters and fire hydrants.
- Sidewalks may be widened into the activity zone (the outdoor living space generally located between the pedestrian way and the front façade of the adjoining buildings).
- To provide for better maintenance, two feet is the minimum width of a “tree lawn” (the green space between a curb and sidewalk).
- A tree lawn must be at least five feet in width to permit installation of street trees; six feet wide or wider is preferable.
- With few exceptions, on-street parking is a higher priority than a tree lawn.
- Bump-outs at crosswalks are recommended in the area south of the canal.
- Transit stops should be safe, convenient and comfortable. Where appropriate, accommodation should be made for seating, shade, rain protection and trash disposal. Coordination with IndyGo or other transit providers for the installation and ongoing maintenance of enhanced transit stop facilities is important.
- Small tree pits in sidewalks typically do not allow for enough root area to sustain a tree in the long term. Tree pits should be a minimum size of 180 square feet with no exterior dimension less than 8 feet. The minimum volume of soil per tree should be 540 cubic feet.
- The Activity Zone is the area between the right-of-way line and the front façade of the structure. Potential elements in the activity space include: Bicycle parking
  - Landscaping, water features and green infrastructure such as rain gardens
  - Lighting
  - Outdoor dining
  - Outdoor display of merchandise (as allowed by zoning)
  - Pedestrian-only automated teller machines (if integrated into building façade)
  - Pedestrian walk-ways and ramps
  - Play equipment
  - Porches and terraces
  - Seating
- Spaces for social interaction are particularly encouraged in the Activity Zone.

The Cross Sections can be found in Appendix C.

2. FOSTER AND IMPROVE SUSTAINABILITY
Since 1986, the Broad Ripple Village community has embraced the concept of sustainability and identified specific priorities to improve the quality of life and economic vitality of the area. Today sustainability brings the public and private sectors together as they support economic and social growth without compromising the natural resource base and environmental quality of future generations.
The American Planning Association adopted a Policy Guide on Planning for Sustainability in 2000. This guide identifies the following four objectives:

1. Reduce dependence upon fossil fuels, extracted underground metals and minerals.
2. Reduce dependence on chemicals and other manufactured substances that can accumulate in nature.
3. Reduce dependence on activities that harm life-sustaining ecosystems.
4. Meet the hierarchy of present and future human needs fairly and efficiently.

(A) Increase recycling

Vision Statement
Broad Ripple Village should set recycling standards and expand a program throughout the area that has been initiated by the Green Broad Ripple organization that currently recycles glass and cardboard generated by businesses within a one-block section of Broad Ripple Avenue. This pilot program could serve as a model for the remaining village commercial establishments and surrounding residential community.

Goals:
• Support the efforts of Green Broad Ripple.
• Create well-designed recycling opportunities throughout Broad Ripple, including Broad Ripple Park, along the canal, shared dumpsters / recycling bins in proximity of merchants.
• Provide a location for community gardens in Broad Ripple Park.
• Develop greenhouses in Broad Ripple Park, using compost generated from waste from Broad Ripple Village restaurants.

(B) Ensure that new development is sustainable

Vision Statement
Historically, the Broad Ripple Village community has supported the principles of sustainability. This community value should be formalized and become an integral partner with Green Broad Ripple.

Goals:
• Form a group to oversee sustainability efforts in Broad Ripple.
• Renovate buildings and discourage demolition of those buildings of historical significance.
• Encourage developers to build green by creating a neighborhood award for green design.
• Recruit businesses that are sustainable.
• Encourage the use of permeable pavement and rain gardens throughout Broad Ripple Village.
• Develop standards for and a means to measure sustainability.
• Develop an education program for sustainability.
• Develop an active “green alleys” program for Broad Ripple Village.
• Encourage developers to be sensitive about site clearing.
• Seamlessly integrate nature, infrastructure, and community.

3. IMPROVE THE IMAGE OF THE VILLAGE

Broad Ripple Village has an eclectic charm and has become a popular night time destination for the younger crowd. The activities associated with this level of popularity unfortunately generate trash and in some cases, destruction of private property. The need then arises to maintain an environment that attracts visitors of all age groups and generates returning visitors.

(A) Improve maintenance

Vision Statement
Maintaining and improving the image of Broad Ripple Village is a partnership between the residences, commercial businesses and public entities.

Goals:
• Engage the commercial businesses to assure maintenance of their properties.
• Coordinate with the Department of Public Works, Department of Parks and Recreation, and Citizens Energy Group to establish maintenance responsibilities for the Central Canal, streets, and parks.
• Reduce visual clutter such as signs, graffiti, trash containers, and utility lines.
(B) Improve cleanliness

Vision Statement
Cleanliness and trash removal is a joint effort among the Broad Ripple Village businesses, residents, public agencies, and semi-public organizations.

Green Broad Ripple recently purchased a used “green machine” to more effectively and efficiently address and maintain a high level of trash removal. Additionally, the Broad Ripple Village Association organizes a monthly clean-up program.

Goals:
- Ensure that the efforts by Green Broad Ripple (example: purchase of a used green machine) receives volunteer and/or financial support from other groups who are responsible for maintaining their property within the Broad Ripple Village.
- Engage the community in city-wide efforts, such as the Great Indy Clean Up, and specifically target Broad Ripple Village.
- Coordinate with Keep Indianapolis Beautiful and their Adopt a Block program.

(C) Create a recognizable Broad Ripple Village identity

The reputation of Broad Ripple Village is well known, yet it does not have a cohesive and attractive visual image that would say “Broad Ripple” to those who live there or to future visitors.

Vision Statement
An appropriate visual identity tag should be developed that would build upon the existing character, yet encourage individual variations.

Goals:
- Develop a comprehensive lighting plan that would be appropriate for Broad Ripple Village.
- Develop a comprehensive signage plan that would offer variety, flexibility, and maintain the Village character and image, while diminishing the “commercial-strip” appearance.
- Expand upon the recently installed benches and bicycle racks along Broad Ripple Avenue by installing similar amenities as new development occurs.
- Consider using paving patterns as an identity and design element that would visually connect sidewalks throughout Broad Ripple Village.

(D) Improve gateways

Primary gateways into Broad Ripple Village consist of Westfield Boulevard from the west, Broad Ripple Avenue from the east, and College Avenue from the north (at White River) and south (at Kessler Boulevard). The intersection of Westfield Boulevard, College Avenue, and the Central Canal is the most prominent.

Vision Statement
Gateways into Broad Ripple Village should make powerful statements that are consistent with and speak to the “village character.” These gateways could be accented by architecture, public art, and pedestrian-friendly spaces.

Goals:
- Celebrate arrival into Broad Ripple Village by creating quality public spaces at the gateways that clearly delineates and announces entry into the Village.
- Create a secondary gateway at College Avenue and 65th Street, with elements of Complete Streets.
- Coordinate with the Art Center to solicit submittals for public art that could be placed throughout Broad Ripple Village.
4. **HONOR THE HISTORIC ASPECTS OF BROAD RIPPLE**

Broad Ripple Village has a rich history that dates back to the early 1800’s. The Committee for Historic Broad Ripple (a committee of the Broad Ripple Village Association) is very active and has assumed a leadership role in preserving and protecting the historical treasures and character of the village.

**Goals:**
- The Regulating Plan should provide typologies that require new development to maintain the character of a particular street and surrounding properties.
- The Committee of Historic Broad Ripple should continue their efforts in maintaining a history of Broad Ripple Village and protecting structures by nominating them for the National Register of Historic Places.
- Provide incentives to encourage the preservation of historic resources.
- Preserve structures within the Village that contribute to and are a part of the character and ambiance of the Village.

5. **INCREASE TREES AND OPEN SPACE**

Trees and open space lend a quality to our environment and provide benefits beyond improving the appearance of a space. Indianapolis has experienced a 37% loss in wooded lands from 1980 to 2000 and a 5.5% loss of high quality woodland from 1999 to 2002.

With the exception of Broad Ripple Park in the eastern portion of the Village, Broadway and 61st Street Park, and Opti Park in the northern portion, open space is limited. Similar to the impact of the presence of trees, open space enhances a space and lends a quality dynamic to an area.

**Vision Statement**

Existing trees and open space should be preserved in Broad Ripple Village. New trees should be installed and open space created as the village evolves and changes.

**Goals:**
- Conduct a survey of existing trees in Broad Ripple Village to determine which of the trees should be preserved and identify them as resources to be preserved.
- Encourage tree preservation by working with land owners to retain and increase the percentage of tree canopy.
- Ensure that the Regulating Plan will provide for appropriate location of trees and open space as new development occurs.
• Conduct a survey to identify areas where open space would be appropriate and then work with the property owners to create a quality space.
• Include provisions in the Regulating Plan that would require developers to incorporate trees and open space into their development.
• Include provisions in the Regulating Plan that would require the use of native species to reduce maintenance and improve sustainability.

6. RESPECT WHITE RIVER, CENTRAL CANAL, AND MONON TRAIL
The White River, Central Canal, and Monon Trail are amenities that are an integral part of Broad Ripple Village. They provide outdoor experiences that add value to the character of the Village and provide respite from the commercial activities. Efforts should be made to create pedestrian level views of White River, improve access to the Monon Trail, and install appropriate lighting along the Central Canal and the Monon Trail. There is no other place in Indianapolis/Marion County where this combination exists. This unique opportunity should be preserved and showcased.

Vision Statement
The contributions provided by the White River, Central Canal, and Monon Trail to the “unique village character” that exists in Broad Ripple Village should be preserved and enhanced. These amenities attract visitors, developers, and potential residents.
Goals:
• Conduct a survey of the south bank of White River to determine whether pedestrian access via a riverwalk would be appropriate, without disturbing the natural qualities of the river environment.
• Determine appropriate locations for creating views of and visual access to White River.
• Coordinate with the State Department of Natural Resources to establish a program that would eliminate invasive species along the banks of White River and develop a plan to restore and/or maintain the natural environment.
• Capitalize upon the resource and opportunities provided by the Central Canal and the towpath, including access, beautification, and preservation of natural environments.
• Identify and develop access points along the Monon Trail for pedestrians and bicyclists.
• Provide lighting along the Monon Trail along that portion running through the commercial core of the village.
• Enhance the canal experience by maintaining the character of the bridge crossings.

7. MAINTAIN THE MIXED-INCOME DIVERSITY AND PROVIDE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AGE GROUPS.
By promoting itself as a place to work, live, play, and gather, Broad Ripple Village will have the challenge of attracting a diversity of age groups to a variety of activities and housing opportunities, while maintaining their unique character and reputation.

Vision Statement
The vitality of Broad Ripple Village is, in part, dependent upon a balanced and diverse community. The “health” of Broad Ripple Village will require that the community continues to define itself by attracting visitors and residents that represent all levels of incomes and a variety of needs.

Goals:
• Develop design guidelines and a Regulating Plan that provide opportunities for all income groups to live, work, play, and gather in Broad Ripple Village.
• Encourage a wide spectrum of businesses to locate in Broad Ripple Village that appeal to the needs of all income levels.
• Provide a variety of housing, restaurants, stores, festivals, and events that would appeal to a wide range of ages.

**Vision Statement**
Broad Ripple Village will promote itself as a “village” that appeals to all age groups, by offering housing that is affordable to all income levels and with such amenities as the White River, Central Canal, and the Monon Trail.

**Goals:**
• Develop design guidelines and a Regulating Plan that provide for housing that will respond to the needs of all age groups.
• Encourage visitors to become residents by promoting Broad Ripple Village as a place that offers housing, shopping, recreation, and entertainment.

**8. SEEK WAYS TO DEVELOP KEY PROJECTS**
During the public process of envisioning the future of Broad Ripple Village, a number of projects were identified that would create a place where people could live, work, play and meet. Those projects are as follows:
  - Parking garage (project underway for completion in 2013)
  - Improved transit
  - Small hotel
Central Canal improvements
Infrastructure improvements
Parking shuttle bus

**Vision Statement**
The key component of these transformational projects is the funding. Funding options for new projects will be explored and implemented. New projects will protect and maintain the existing character of Broad Ripple Village.

**Goals:**
• Identify funding sources for redevelopment that might include, but not be limited to, tax increment financing, economic improvement district, or parking meter proceeds. The North Midtown Economic Development District, established in early 2012 provides a vehicle to generate funds for infrastructure improvements.
• Adopt a Regulating Plan that would result in architecture that adds a new dimension to the area without destroying the character of the surrounding properties.
• Create incentives for redevelopment through the Regulating Plan that will attract investors to Broad Ripple Village.

9. **INCREASE DENSITY**
For the Broad Ripple Village to succeed as a village and neighborhood center, it needs to be between 30-50 acres for a “core” and at least one mile from another village or center core. It also requires a walkable transitional neighborhood that is between 80-120 acres of approximately 3,000-4,000 residents living in a wide range of housing types (15-20 dwelling units per acre). Lastly, there is an “outer ring” within a one-mile radius of approximately 7,000 residents, with a density of 5-10 dwelling units per acre.

**Vision Statement**
Based upon 2010 census figures an additional 1,700 residents would be required for Broad Ripple to succeed as a vital self-sustaining village and neighborhood center that should provide for and serve a diverse population. The nightlife energy should not be diluted, but complemented with goods and services that would support a residential and neighborhood component during daytime hours.

**Goals:**
• Encourage the development of a variety of housing units that would attract all age groups and income levels.
• Invite mixed-use development that provides a residential component above commercial activity at the street level.
• Identify specific areas where multi-storied building and density would be appropriate, such as along the east side of College Avenue north of Broad Ripple Avenue, along 65th Street between College Avenue and Westfield Boulevard, and along the Monon Trail.

**Vision Statement**
For Broad Ripple Village to succeed as a place to work, live, play, and gather, more diversity in business, services, and employment opportunities should be developed. People will want to live in Broad Ripple Village because the variety and convenience of daily living needs would be present.

**Goals:**
• Attract the type of businesses that would provide a more diverse mix of services in Broad Ripple Village.
• Provide more neighborhood retail by implementing a “business plan” for the Broad Ripple Village that would attract smaller businesses interested in locating in a vibrant and diverse community.
• Encourage businesses that would bring more commercial balance to the area.
• Encourage business opportunities that would respond to the daily needs of a diverse residential community.
• Promote the “live, work, play, gather” theme.
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LAND USE

In this plan the topic of land use is treated as a grouping of four components: environmentally sensitive areas, land use recommendations, critical areas, and zoning recommendations.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

Environmental factors should be taken into consideration and have a modifying effect on any development or redevelopment of a site with those conditions. This plan includes an Environmentally Sensitive Areas map that depicts four environmental factors: wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, and woodlands. In the Broad Ripple Village area most of the wetlands, steep slopes, and woodlands are associated with the White River, the IWC canal and Broad Ripple Park.

Wetlands. This factor is based on mapping provided by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources.

Floodplains. These are areas where floodwater is likely to stand during a flood of such intensity that it is likely to happen once in 100 years. Mapping is based on 2001 Federal Emergency Management Agency flood panels.

A wide swath of the study area is within the 100-year floodplain. The City of Indianapolis is working with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct a levee that will protect the Broad Ripple, Warfleigh, Meridian Kessler and Butler Tarkington neighborhoods. The levee is being constructed in three sections: South Warfleigh, Warfleigh and Monon-Broad Ripple sections. The project segments are hydraulically linked, necessitating construction of all phases in order to successfully protect and remove approximately 2,400 properties from the 100-year floodplain.

The Warfleigh and Monon-Broad Ripple sections have been completed. At the time of this plan, the South Warfleigh section is in its pre-construction stages.

Natural Woodlands. These are groupings of trees, naturally occurring or planted.

Steep slopes. Based on 2003 data, these are slopes with greater than one foot of rise in elevation over 10 feet of horizontal distance.

LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS

The map of recommended land uses is a guide for property owners, neighbors and neighborhood associations, City staff, the Metropolitan Development Commission and Boards of Zoning Appeals when considering proposed development projects.

The map recommends one of 18 land use categories for each parcel (see Appendix E for descriptions of the land use categories). The land use categories broadly define development by use and intensity, and should be considered the most appropriate use for the land. They are the starting point for determining the appropriateness of land use requests such as zoning and variance of use petitions.

The Broad Ripple area is largely developed and outside the village area the existing land uses are generally stable. To bolster the area’s stability the land use recommendation for most parcels outside the village area is the same as its existing land use. Exceptions to this are Broad Ripple Avenue east of Broad Ripple High School, College Avenue south of 62nd Street and the Monon Rail-Trail Corridor south of 62nd Street. Land use changes in these three areas are recommended as an acknowledgement of the changing character of these areas and to build the resident Broad Ripple population. For more information, see Critical Areas 3, 4, 5 and 6. (pages 34-37)

BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE

Once a small, rural burg, Broad Ripple developed as many 19th-century towns did, as a mixed-use, walkable village. Broad Ripple was favored with assets such as the river, canal and Broad Ripple Park, which enabled it to flourish as a desirable place to live, shop and recreate. It developed an enviable reputation as a great place to be. Its popularity was built on a foundation of mixed uses and walkability.

To promote Broad Ripple’s continuing evolution as a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented village, the area is designated as “Village Mixed-Use” and “Urban Mixed-Use.”
The portion of the village south of the canal is designated Urban Mixed-Use. This category consists of densely developed, pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development; typically multi-story buildings located at or near the right-of-way line with retail and service uses on the ground floor and office and residential uses above.

The land use category designated for the village north of the canal is Village Mixed-Use. This category recommends a mix of retail, office and residential uses built to a pedestrian scale. Village mixed use areas are intended to be neighborhood gathering places and should allow a wide range of small businesses, housing types, and public and semi-public facilities.

The Urban Mixed-use category is generally denser than the Village Mixed-use category. Within the urban mixed-use area, the uses are typically mixed within buildings whereas in the village mixed-use area one would expect a number of both single-use and multi-use buildings all contributing to an overall mixed-use district.

In both the Urban Mixed-Use and Village Mixed-Use areas, potential development should focus on design issues related to architecture, building size, parking, landscaping and lighting. Typical strip commercial development, large-scale freestanding retail uses and heavy industrial development are generally inappropriate within these land use categories.

**CRITICAL AREAS**

Critical Areas are locations that exhibit an unusual character, important location or significant need that warrants more explanation and detail than the land use recommendation on the map can provide. The Critical Area text explains why a location is critical and how development in those areas should accommodate those critical factors.

**Critical Area 1**

**Location:** (North River Bend Area) West side of College Avenue and the area east between College Avenue and the White River. See map on page 32

**Why Critical:** College Avenue is an arterial street that connects northern Marion County and points north to downtown Indianapolis. The most recent traffic count taken in 2001 along this portion of College Avenue was 20,946 per day. This corridor served as a major public transit route used by the interurban from 1904 to 1938 and remains a heavily traveled street. Currently IndyGo operates two of its 30 routes along College Avenue.

The west side of College Avenue in this area developed as residential. Through the years, however, there have been conversions to commercial uses to the south which increases the vulnerability for commercial development to these existing residences that form an edge of a stable single family residential neighborhood to the west. Except for three residential structures, the building setbacks are consistent and should be maintained if any new residential development would be proposed. At the same time if any home-based occupation would be established, elements that contribute to a commercial appearance, including, but not limited to, parking spaces in the front yard and signage should be prohibited.

There is a parallel street (Old College Avenue) along College Avenue that runs along the northern five lots and continues to White River, at which point it turns west and becomes Riverview Drive. This street provides access to the houses and eliminates the need for driveways to each of the residences along this portion of College Avenue.

Development along the east side of College Avenue is higher density with an apartment building south of and adjacent to White River and a fifteen-unit condominium complex south of 67th Street.

The Indianapolis Art Center (IAC) campus lies to the east of the apartment building and continues to the Monon Trail. Except for two residential lots, the property is owned by the IAC. The IAC is a valuable asset to the village with a lively and widely diverse offering of classes and events that attracts people from a broad regional area. The land between the Monon Trail and Westfield Boulevard is comprised of White River and undeveloped floodway.

Opti Park is adjacent to the College Avenue condominiums and butts up against IAC parking on the south side of 67th Street and residential properties. The area to the east is developed with a 74-unit condominium
complex. Across Cornell Avenue and the Monon trail is a third condominium development of 148 units.

This peripheral buffer around the northern boundary of the form based zoning district protects the strength and integrity of lot and street typology within the area north of the canal. Proposed land use changes should support and reinforce the character of the form-based zoning and adjacent neighborhoods.

A flood control project was recently completed in this critical area that consisted of a flood wall and gates located along the northeast corner of the intersection of College Avenue and 67th Street. It skips over and runs along the southern edge of the 67th Street to the Monon Trail. It then runs north along the eastern edge of the Monon Trail up to the edge of the undeveloped floodway that lies northeast of the largest condominium development in this area and turns southeast for approximately 100 feet.

Recommendations:

- Protect the residential neighborhood along the west side of College Avenue by prohibiting commercial conversions of the residential structures. Commercial uses should remain south of 6500 College Avenue and not encroach into this residential neighborhood.
- The residential structures on the west side of College Avenue should be preserved.
- Any new structures along this west side of College Avenue should maintain the setbacks, height, style, material, and mass of the existing residential structures along the west side of College Avenue.
- Restrict commercial uses along the west side of College Avenue to the properties south of this critical area (approximately 6500 College Avenue).
- Parking in the front yard of the properties along the west side of College Avenue should not be permitted.
- If redevelopment of the multi-family sites would occur, the building heights should not be taller than the existing buildings.
- As the campus of the IAC expands, careful consideration should be given to any development that would occur in the floodway. The floodway should remain protected and left undeveloped or developed in appropriate open space uses, such as parks.
- Opti Park and the south east corner of 67th Street and Ferguson Street should be preserved as open space.
- Any redevelopment or new development should be sustainable, using the appropriate LEEDS standards.
- New development should not increase off-site storm water run-off.

Critical Area 2
Location: Broad Ripple Village
Why critical: Broad Ripple originally developed as a distinct village. Over the years, the City of Indianapolis grew out to envelope it. To maintain Broad Ripple’s identity as a distinct place it has been designated as Urban Mixed-Use and Village Mixed-Use. To retain and enhance the village character of Broad Ripple and to promote its evolution into a self-sustaining pedestrian-oriented village it is critical to increase the population density, promote mixed-use development and enhance vitality of the streetscape.

Recommendations:

- For land use recommendations for the village area see pages 29-33.
- For development guidelines for the village area see pages 39-46.

Critical Area 3
Location: Broad Ripple Avenue from Broad Ripple High School to Evanston Avenue
Why Critical: Broad Ripple Avenue is an arterial street that connects Broad Ripple Village with the retail area centered on Glendale Mall and points east. It carries a significant amount of daily traffic (24,254 in 1995).

The south side of Broad Ripple Avenue has remained relatively stable in land use over the years. The high school, funeral home and office building that anchor the west end of this stretch have been in place for over fifty years. The rest of this segment was originally developed with single family homes. Commercial office and retail uses have slowly crept west from Glendale to the point where the block between Evanston Avenue and Crittenden Avenue is now completely commercial. The
next block to the east, between Crittenden Avenue and Norwaldo Avenue, has seen at least two of its homes converted to offices. The area south of the parcels that front on Broad Ripple Avenue is a solid and stable single-family residential neighborhood.

The centerpiece of the north side of Broad Ripple Avenue is Broad Ripple Park. The park is a well-used amenity with facilities for active and passive recreation, a boat ramp, community center and dog park. The park’s chief natural amenity is White River, which runs along the park’s west side before it loops north and west around the village. A street side pedestrian connection between the village and the park is interrupted with many wide driveways. A boardwalk that strengthens the connection between the Monon Rail-Trail with Broad Ripple Park along the river’s edge has been recommended in the Indianapolis Greenways Plan.

West of the park a narrow strip of commercial uses is sandwiched between Broad Ripple Avenue and White River. To the east of the park, most of the street frontage was originally developed as single-family homes. Here too commercial development has slowly crept west from Glendale. The blocks between Evanston Avenue and Kingsley Drive are now almost entirely used for office, retail and institutional uses. North of the parcels that line Broad Ripple Avenue is a small single-family neighborhood bounded on the west and north by Broad Ripple Park. A small multi-family building is tucked up against the park boundary.

To function as a fully-realized pedestrian area, Broad Ripple Village must increase the number of residents within an easy walk. Prime locations for increasing the residential density in the area are the blocks along Broad Ripple Avenue that front the park. Conversion to multi-family use would halt the creep of commercial uses along the avenue. Conversion of homes to commercial uses dilutes the vitality of the commercial centers in Board Ripple and Glendale.

Recommendations:
- Allow conversion of the blocks fronting both Broad Ripple Avenue and Broad Ripple Park to multi-family residential uses as shown on the map.
- On the south side of Broad Ripple Avenue the multi-family uses should not encroach south of the first alley south of the avenue. To be compatible with the homes to the south, the multi-family structures should be modest in height and use materials and building forms common to the neighborhood to the south. On-street parking is an issue in this neighborhood, so it is important that any new multi-family development provide adequate on-site parking.
- On the north side of Broad Ripple Avenue the multi-family uses should not encroach east of Kingsley Drive. To be compatible with the homes to the east the multi-family structures should be modest in height and use materials and building forms common to the neighborhood to the east.
- Conversion of the single-family residential parcels to multi-family development should not be done in a piecemeal manner, but in groupings of contiguous parcels. The purpose of this is so homes are not isolated among the apartments/condominiums.
- An interim method of increasing residential density in this Critical Area is the addition of carriage houses to the existing residential properties.
- Restrict commercial conversions along Broad Ripple Avenue to the areas shown on the map.
- Connect Broad Ripple Park, Broad Ripple Village and the Monon Trail with an off-street bike and pedestrian trail.

Critical Area 4
Location: College Avenue corridor between 62nd Street and Kessler Boulevard, bounded by Carrollton Avenue to the east and Broadway Street to the west.
Why Critical: College Avenue is an arterial street serving the Broad Ripple area that connects northern Marion County and points north to downtown Indianapolis. As discussions continue about improving public transportation within the metropolitan region, this corridor should be considered for a transit route with transit oriented development at certain commercial nodes.
Through the years, properties fronting along this portion of College Avenue have been the subject of numerous variances, particularly use variances. This is primarily due to the fact that commercial use on these residentially-zoned properties has incrementally replaced residential use.

Properties along College Avenue are currently zoned residential, with the exception of the properties on College Avenue at the intersection of Kessler Boulevard East Drive and two other properties north of this intersection. The properties along College Avenue on the southeast corner of 62nd Street and the southwest corner of 61st Street are zoned C-1, which is a classification for office uses and compatible office type uses. These office-type uses typically serve as buffers to residential development.

The properties along the northern side of the intersection of College Avenue and Kessler Boulevard East Drive are zoned C-3 (Neighborhood Commercial District). As the C-3 classification implies, commercial intensity increases and serves the fully developed surrounding neighborhood. It should be noted that the properties along the southern boundary and outside the planning area are zoned C-4 (Community-Regional Commercial District).

The northwest corner of this critical area is zoned residential, with frontage along Westfield Boulevard. The land uses in this area are a mix of commercial and residential. Similar to the properties along College Avenue, a number of residentially-zoned properties have been converted to commercial use. The most intense use in this small area is a veterinarian clinic that has maintained the residential building character of the area.

Broadway and 61st Street Park is located on the southeast corner of 61st Street and Broadway Street and is designated as a neighborhood park by the Department of Parks and Recreation. Neighborhood parks serve individual communities and neighborhoods throughout the city. The land for Broadway and 61st Street Park was acquired in 1928. It is significant that this 2.93-acre piece of land has served as open space for the neighborhood for 84 years.

There are two older apartment complexes in the 6000 block of College Avenue. These units have existed for a number of years and are compatible with the surrounding residential uses as well as the commercial uses along College Avenue.

Recommendations:
- Protect the residential neighborhoods along the College Avenue corridor and along Westfield Boulevard by maintaining commercial uses at the present level and prohibiting commercial uses that would increase intensity.
- The residential structures along this portion of the College Avenue corridor and the small area along and south of Westfield Boulevard should be preserved.
- Lighting and signage associated with commercial developments should be designed in such a way as to minimize negative impact upon adjacent residential properties.
- Transit oriented development should be encouraged at the intersections of 61st Street and/or 62nd Street. This type of development should include taller mixed use buildings.
- Any new structures within this critical area should maintain the setbacks, height, style, material, and mass of the existing residential structures within this corridor, with the exception of the intersections where mixed use might occur to support transit oriented development.
- Parking in the front yard of the properties along this portion of College Avenue should not be permitted.
- If redevelopment of the multi-family sites would occur, the building heights should not exceed those of the existing buildings.
- 61st Street and Broadway Park should be preserved as open space.
- Commercial development along this corridor with characteristics of a one-story strip center should not be permitted.
- Any redevelopment or new development should be sustainable, using the appropriate LEED standards.
**Critical Area 5**

**Location:** Winthrop Avenue between 61st and 62nd streets

**Why Critical:** This area is immediately south of the commercial part of Broad Ripple Village and adjacent to the Monon Trail. The west side of Winthrop Avenue is solidly single-family residential. The east side of Winthrop Avenue is a mixture of single-family and multi-family residential development. Two multi-family developments break the row of single-family homes into three sections. The lots on the east side of Winthrop Avenue are deeper than those on the west side. This plan recommends the conversion of the parcels on the east side of the street to multi-family residential, but reaffirms the west side of Winthrop Avenue as single-family residential.

Winthrop Avenue is approximately 23 feet wide; barely accommodating two lanes of traffic plus on-street parking on one side.

**Recommendations:**
- Conversion of the single-family residential parcels to multi-family uses should not be done in a piecemeal manner, but in groupings of contiguous parcels to create reasonably-sized parcels and not isolate homes between multi-family developments.
- To blend with the existing neighborhood, the multi-family development should be modest in height, use materials and building forms common to the immediate neighborhood and have setbacks similar to those in the neighborhood.
- With the narrow width of Winthrop Avenue, it is important that any new multi-family development provide adequate on-site parking.
- New development should be well-landscaped and include a significant number of over-story trees.
- Multi-family development should be connected to the Monon Trail. The connection should be coordinated with the Indianapolis Parks and Recreation Department. A landscape buffer should be created and maintained between the development and the trail.

**Critical Area 6**

**Location:** 61st Street between the Monon Trail and Compton Avenue

**Why Critical:** This site has been the location of an industrial/commercial building for at least 70 years. However, this site is no longer a prime industrial or commercial site as it no longer has railroad access, is surrounded by a solidly residential neighborhood and is on a street with low traffic volume.

**Recommendations:**
- Development as a multi-family development as shown on the land use plan. To blend with the existing neighborhood, the multi-family development should be modest in height, use materials and building forms common to the immediate neighborhood and have setbacks similar to those in the neighborhood.
- Sidewalks should be provided along 61st and Compton streets.
- Multi-family development should provide sufficient on-site parking so that the capacity of adjoining streets is not diminished by on-street parking.
- New development should be well-landscaped and include a significant number of over-story trees.
- Multi-family development should be connected to the Monon Trail. The connection should be coordinated with the Indianapolis Parks and Recreation Department. A landscape buffer should be created and maintained between the development and the trail.
ZONING

ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS
Indianapolis employs zoning as a method to provide for orderly development. A recommended zoning plan has been developed to depict the most appropriate zoning district for each parcel. The recommended zoning is based on the recommended land use and the characteristics of each parcel and its surroundings.

The land use recommendations for most of the study area outside of the Village reflect the existing land use. Likewise the recommendations of the zoning plan are largely the same as the existing zoning districts. A small number of changes are recommended to conform the zoning to the existing land use.

Exceptions to this can be found along Broad Ripple Avenue east of Broad Ripple High School, College Avenue south of 62nd Street and the Monon Trail Corridor south of 62nd Street. Proposed zoning in these areas is matched to proposed changes in land use.

ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE VILLAGE AREA
As a recognizable village with a mix of uses, Broad Ripple has great potential for the successful application of form-based zoning.

Indianapolis, like most jurisdictions that practice zoning, uses a form of Euclidean zoning. Named for Euclid, Ohio, the foundation of this form of zoning is the separation of incompatible land uses. It is common for Euclidean zoning codes to also include development standards for such items as setbacks, parking, building heights and dozens of other aspects of site and building development. Euclidean zoning came of age in the automobile era and so Euclidean codes are usually car-centric.

Another type of zoning, called form-based zoning, is based less on the separation of uses and more on how buildings relate to their sites and the street. Form-based zoning and hybrid Euclidean/form-based codes are being adopted in an increasing number of jurisdictions.

The regulations and standards in form-based codes, presented in both diagrams and words, are keyed to a regulating plan that designates the appropriate form and scale (and therefore, character) of development. Not to be confused with design guidelines or general statements of policy, form-based codes are regulatory, not advisory.

Form-based codes commonly include the following elements:
- Regulating Plan. A plan or map of the regulated area designating the locations where different building form standards apply. The regulating plan is based on clear community intentions regarding the physical character of the area. The regulating plan may also include additional on-site development standards
- Public Space Standards. Specifications for the elements within the public realm (e.g., sidewalks, travel lanes, on-street parking, street trees, street furniture, etc.).
- Building Form Standards. Regulations controlling the configuration, features, and functions of buildings that define and shape the public realm.

The City of Indianapolis is proposing the creation a new zoning district, called Neighborhood-Village (NV) as the best way to implement form-based zoning. Broad Ripple village is recommended for this new zoning district. A more detailed description of the NV district can be found in Appendix F.

Typically implementation of a zoning plan is incremental over time as property owners wish to develop or redevelop their properties. However, the Metropolitan Development Commission has the authority to rezone multiple parcels at one time. This is usually done through a partnership with a community in an effort to implement a neighborhood or corridor plan.

In the case of the NV zoning recommendation, it is not anticipated that this district would be implemented on a parcel-by-parcel basis over a long period of time. This rezoning would need to occur for multiple parcels at one time and include a regulating plan detailing the components of the new district.
PROPOSED ZONING MAP
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- Streams
- Proposed Zoning
- Parcels
- Rivers
- Lakes
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D2 Very Low Density Single and Two Family
D3 Low Density Single and Two Family
D4 Low Density Single and Two Family
D5 Medium Density Single and Two Family
D6 Medium Density Multi-Family
D7 Urban Single to Multi-Family
D8 Suburban Mid- to High-Rise Multi-Family
D9 Planned Unit Development
PK1 Planned Unit Development

C1 Office
C2 Office and Apartment
C3 Neighborhood Commercial
NV Neighborhood Village
SU1 Church
SU2 School
SU7 Charitable and Philanthropic
SU9 Government Offices and Facilities
SU38 Water Pumping and Treatment
Until such time as the NV district is adopted, rezonings in the Village district should promote the mixed-use recommendations of the land use plan and the street typologies, building types and design elements outlined in this plan.

Design elements
As a method to implement many of this plan's development principles for the village, use and design elements have been recommended. These elements can be used as guidelines for the review of future zoning and variance petitions and also form a vision plan for the eventual development of form-based zoning.

Recommended use and design elements are:
Street level uses
• Building height, minimum and maximum
• Setbacks and build-to lines
• Streetscapes (sidewalk width, parking, landscaping)
• On-site parking
• Building entrance orientation
• Fenestration/transparency
• Rooflines
• Driveways

The design elements pertinent to any particular parcel are based on the type of street the parcel fronts. The design elements may be modified based on a secondary frontage type that was developed for lots that abut the Central Canal and the Monon Trail.

As form-based zoning is developed for the area, other use and design elements will likely be added.

Frontage typologies
The streets in the village vary in how they look and function. Design elements should be applied in different manners based on the type of street frontage. The village streets were analyzed and then each one was classified into one of eight frontage typologies.

• Main Street (Broad Ripple Avenue)
• College Avenue (north of Broad Ripple Avenue to 66th Street) - potential transit corridor, major access road.
• Gateway (65th Street) the major east/west traffic corridor connecting Westfield Boulevard with College Avenue.
• Commercial Local areas immediately north and south of Broad Ripple Avenue.
• North Village Local tree-lined streets and a less hectic pace generally north of 64th Street.
• Riverview (Westfield Boulevard north of the Canal) - area offers unique glimpses of White River.
• Canal for sites with two frontages: one along the street, the other along the Central Canal.
• Greenway (Monon Trail) - for sites either one frontage, which happens to be along the greenway or for sites with two frontages: one along the street, the other along the greenway.
### Frontages – Use, height and setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontage Typology</th>
<th>Allowed Uses</th>
<th>Permitted Street Level Uses</th>
<th>Building Height</th>
<th>Required Build Line (RBL)</th>
<th>Required Setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Corridor</td>
<td>Retail, Personal Services, Entertainment, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Residential</td>
<td>All allowed uses, except Residential</td>
<td>Minimum: 25 feet and 2 stories. Maximum: 40 feet or 4 stories, whichever is the lesser.</td>
<td>RBL – Yes</td>
<td>Rear Max: 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback: Min 5 ft. Max: 15 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Min: 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Retail, Personal Services, Entertainment, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Lodging, Residential</td>
<td>All allowed uses</td>
<td>Minimum: 25 feet and 2 stories. Maximum: 50 feet or 5 stories, whichever is the lesser.</td>
<td>RBL – Yes</td>
<td>Rear Max: 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback: Min 10 ft. Max: 20 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Min: 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Corridor</td>
<td>Retail, Personal Services, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Residential</td>
<td>Retail Personal Services, Restaurant, Tavern</td>
<td>Minimum: 25 feet and 2 stories. Maximum: 40 feet or 4 stories, whichever is the lesser.</td>
<td>RBL – Yes</td>
<td>Rear Max: 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback: Min 10 ft. Max: 20 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Min: 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Local Corridor</td>
<td>Retail, Personal Services, Entertainment, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Residential</td>
<td>Retail Personal Services, Restaurant, Tavern</td>
<td>Minimum: 25 feet and 2 stories. Maximum: 40 feet or 4 stories, whichever is the lesser.</td>
<td>RBL – Yes</td>
<td>Rear Max: 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback: Min 0 ft. Max: 10 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Min: 0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Village Local Corridor</td>
<td>Retail, Personal Services, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Residential</td>
<td>All allowed uses</td>
<td>Minimum: 20 feet Minimum: 40 feet or 4 stories, whichever is the lesser.</td>
<td>RBL – No</td>
<td>Rear Max: 20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback: Min 10 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Min: 5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Corridor</td>
<td>Offices, Lodging, Residential</td>
<td>All allowed uses</td>
<td>Minimum: 40 feet Minimum: 100 feet or 8 stories, whichever is the lesser.</td>
<td>RBL – No</td>
<td>Rear Max: 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front Setback: Min 10 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Side Min: 10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Typology</td>
<td>Allowed Uses</td>
<td>Permitted Street Level Uses</td>
<td>Building Height Required Build Line (RBL)</td>
<td>Required Setback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Greenway Corridor | Retail, Personal Services, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Residential | All allowed uses | On Monon Trail frontage:  
Minimum: 20 feet  
Maximum: 40 feet or 4 stories, whichever is the lesser; 3 stories on the trailside frontage. | RBL – No  
Minimum setback of 50 feet from the centerline of the Monon Trail |
| Canal Corridor | Retail, Personal Services, Restaurant, Tavern, Offices, Residential | All allowed uses | On Central Canal Corridor frontage:  
Minimum: 20 feet  
Maximum: 40 feet or 4 stories, whichever is the lesser. | RBL – No  
Minimum setback of 10 feet from the Canal ROW |
## Frontages – Access, facades and parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontage Typology</th>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>Frontage Face of Building</th>
<th>On-Site Parking</th>
<th>Driveways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Corridor</td>
<td>Primary Entrance(s) required from the frontage</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
<td>Not permitted between College Avenue and Monon Trail. Only alley access permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Permitted only behind a building in rear yard with alley access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Level(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Primary Entrance(s) required from the frontage</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Level(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Corridor</td>
<td>Primary Entrance(s) required from the frontage</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not permitted. Only alley access permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Level(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Local Corridor</td>
<td>An entrance(s) required from the frontage</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Not permitted. Only alley access permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Level(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Village Local Corridor</td>
<td>An entrance(s) required from the frontage</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Level(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview Corridor</td>
<td>An entrance(s) required from the frontage</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Level(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Typology</td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>Frontage Face of Building</td>
<td>On-Site Parking</td>
<td>Driveways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Corridor</td>
<td>An entrance(s) from the frontage permitted, not required</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level Min: 25% Max: 85% Upper Level(s) Min: 25% Max: 85%</td>
<td>Not permitted on Monon Trail frontage. Only permitted behind a building.</td>
<td>Not permitted on Monon Trail frontage. Pedestrian Access onto Monon if min. 100 feet separation from another access point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal Corridor</td>
<td>An entrance(s) from the frontage permitted, not required</td>
<td>Transparency at Ground Level Min: 25% Max: 85% Upper Level(s) Min: 25% Max: 85%</td>
<td>Not permitted on Canal frontage. Only permitted behind a building</td>
<td>Not permitted on Canal frontage. Only permitted behind a building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parking in the side yard must be behind the front façade line, well-screened from the street and limited to one drive-aisle and one row of parking spaces.

Signage
Building signs are important to help people easily locate destinations. However, an excessive amount of signage can detract from this purpose.

In all street typologies, signs should be designed creatively and artistically. Signs should be compatible with the architectural pattern, style and fenestration of the building. Building facades should be designed to incorporate building and business signs. Signs on buildings are preferred to pole signs. Strobes, motion, flashing, animation, moving images and other attention-getting devices should not be used. Signs in shop windows should not obscure more than a small percent of the window area. All buildings should have the street address number clearly visible.

Off-premise advertising signs (billboards) are not appropriate in the village district.
## Envision Broad Ripple Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR #1</td>
<td>4/22/2008</td>
<td>Glendale Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>Envision the Future – Exploring Community Planning</td>
<td>Livability, Visioning Broad Ripple Village, Quality for Life Planning, Current Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #2</td>
<td>5/29/2008</td>
<td>College Avenue Library</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Park/Riverfront/Canal</td>
<td>Placemaking, Transit-oriented Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #3</td>
<td>6/26/2008</td>
<td>American Legion Post</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Development (TOD), Density, Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trip</td>
<td>7/29/2008</td>
<td>Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #4</td>
<td>7/31/2008</td>
<td>American Legion Post</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bloomington / Indy Greenprint / LEED</td>
<td>Bloomington Trip, Indy Greenprint / LEED – Bill Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #5</td>
<td>8/28/2008</td>
<td>American Legion Post</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>KIBI / Greenways</td>
<td>KIBI / Broad Ripple Partnership – Andrew Hart, DPR Parks / Broad Ripple Partnership – Andre Denman, Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #6</td>
<td>10/2/2008</td>
<td>American Legion Post</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Design Guidelines / BR District Typologies</td>
<td>Introduction of design guidelines, District Typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #7</td>
<td>11/13/2008</td>
<td>Indianapolis Art Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 / Update</td>
<td>Key issues discovered by groups visioning sessions, Results of the process, Results of the Broad Ripple district typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trip</td>
<td>12/12/2008</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #9</td>
<td>1/15/2009</td>
<td>Indianapolis Art Center</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>VIS (2nd step) / Traffic Study / BR Avenue Street Project</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Traffic Study (08/03/07) – Jon Martens (Walker Parking Consultants), Broad Ripple Avenue Street Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #10</td>
<td>3/11/2009</td>
<td>Indianapolis Art Center</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>VIS Results / Model Building (Broad Ripple Avenue)</td>
<td>VIS Results, Model Building Exercise, Four areas of Broad Ripple Avenue Model Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Guidelines Draft  
Timeline for Completion of the Envision Process  
Walking Survey (north of the canal) |
| EBR #13        | 7/15/2009 | Indianapolis Art Center    | 23         | VIS Results / Walking Survey Results – North of Canal                   | Visual Image Survey Results / Walking Survey Results  
Synopsis of Previous Plans and Working Groups  
Model Building Exercise (North of the Canal) |
| EBR #14        | 8/26/2009 | Indianapolis Art Center    | 20         | Form-Based Zoning / Model – Broad Ripple Avenue and North of the Canal | Form-based Zoning  
Development Impact (preliminary)  
Pro-Forma Development Costs  
Review of the model for Broad Ripple Avenue and North of the Canal |
| EBR #15        | 9/30/2009 | Indianapolis Art Center    | 35         | Form-Based Zoning / Model – Broad Ripple Avenue and North of the Canal | Plan Ingredients / Model Building Summary – Bob Wilch  
Form-Based Zoning – Tammara Tracy  
Indygo Shuttle – Mike Terry  
Canal Improvements – Tom Healy |
Broad Ripple Park / Broad Ripple Farmer’s Market – Stuart Lowry  
Tree Canopy Ordinance – Keith Holdsworth  
Current Broad Ripple Projects – Tom Healy |
| EBR #17        | 2/16/2010 | Indianapolis Art Center    | 34         | Art Center Gateway Project – IndyConnect – Form Based Zoning            | Art Center Gateway Project – Carter Wolfe  
IndyConnect – Kathryn Shorter  
Form Based Zoning – Tammara Tracy  
Form Based Zoning District Boundary / Frontage and Lot Typologies – John Neal  
Form Based Zoning Computer Model / Timeline |
| EBR #18        | 3/31/2010 | Indianapolis Art Center    | 29         | Frontage/lot Typologies – 65th Street Gateway                          | Indy Connect – Kathryn Shorter  
EBR Sustainability Draft – Kathleen Blackham  
Frontage/Lot Typologies and District Boundary – John Neal  
65th Street Gateway – Bob Wilch |
| EBR #19        | 7/14/2010 | Indianapolis Art Center    | 40         | Frontage/lot Typologies/ Parking Study                                 | Frontage/lot typologies – Bob Wilch  
Parking Study – Tom Healy  
Survey – Tammara Tracy |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR #20</td>
<td>9/1/2010</td>
<td>Flanner Buchanan Event Center Suite</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Frontage/lot Typologies/ Parking Study</td>
<td>Frontage/lot typologies – Bob Wilch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Study – Bob Wilch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenways Update – Al Ensley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canal/Monon Typologies – Tom Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Options – John Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #22</td>
<td>11/17/2010</td>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Form Based Zoning Typologies</td>
<td>RAILVOLUTION 2010, Portland, OR – Curtis Ailes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BR Regulating Plan (basic elements) – John Neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #23</td>
<td>9/22/2011</td>
<td>Indianapolis Art Center</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Plan Draft/Land Use/Form-Based Zoning Typologies</td>
<td>Vision Plan Draft – Keith Holdsworth and Kathleen Blackham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Areas 1 and 2 Typologies – Gary Weaver and Tom Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #24</td>
<td>10/27/2011</td>
<td>Indianapolis Art Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use / Parking Garage</td>
<td>30-year history of Broad Ripple Village interest in mixed use parking structure – Tom Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #25</td>
<td>1/11/2012</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Park Family Center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Critical Areas/Cornell Avenue street typology/ Infrastructure</td>
<td>Critical Areas 4 and 5 – Kathleen Blackham and Keith Holdsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornell Avenue Street Typology – Tom Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornell Avenue improvements and alley improvements – Tom Healy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #26</td>
<td>4/18/2012</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Park Family Center</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Plan Draft Review</td>
<td>Review of Plan – Kathleen Blackham and Keith Holdsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments/Questions from public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR #27</td>
<td>9/24/2012</td>
<td>Indianapolis Art Center</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Plan Draft Review of changes Adoption schedule</td>
<td>Review of Plan – Kathleen Blackham and Keith Holdsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments/Questions from public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX “B”

An ideal complete streets policy*:

- Includes a vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets
- Specifies that *all users* includes pedestrians, bicyclists and transit passengers of all ages and abilities, as well as trucks, buses and automobiles.
- Applies to both new and retrofit projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations, for the entire right of way.
- Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval of exceptions.
- Encourages street connectivity and aims to create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network for all modes.
- Is adoptable by all agencies to cover all roads.
- Directs the use of the latest and best design criteria and guidelines while recognizing the need for flexibility in balancing user needs.
- Directs that complete streets solutions will complement the context of the community.
- Establishes performance standards with measurable outcomes.
- Includes specific next steps for implementation of the policy

*From the National Complete Streets Coalition
APPENDIX “C”

Conceptual Street Cross-section

As a way to implement many of the recommendations of element #1 (Improve transportation and infrastructure), conceptual streetscape cross-sections have been developed. The conceptual cross-sections help to describe the intended outcomes of streetscape improvements among the village’s streets.

The conceptual cross-sections are to be used as site improvements are made. Provision of streetscape amenities should be proportional to the site improvements. Examples are intensification of the use of the site, increase in building coverage, and increase in parking area. The conceptual cross-sections are to be treated as prototypes that should be modified as necessary to provide for traffic safety and flow, pedestrian safety and to make smooth transitions as the streetscape changes.

To determine the appropriate conceptual cross-section for a specific site, use the chart for the subject site’s street typology. A map of the street typologies can be found on page 53. For many of the street typologies, there is more than one chart. Often there is a chart for a one-way street and another for a two-way street. Within the appropriate chart, find the cross section for the width of the right-of-way at the subject site.

The assumptions and standards by which the charts were developed can be found on pages 32 – 33.
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Main Street, east of Monon: Conceptual Street Sections

Conceptual Street Sections: Main Street
Main Street, east of Monon:

Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Main Street

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors

Minimum Setback from ROW line: 5'

ROW width of 64'

Activity Zone

Sidewalk

Tree Lawn

Bike Lane

Drive lane

Turning lane

Drive lane

Bike lane

Tree Lawn

Sidewalk

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors

Maximum Setback from ROW: 15'

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors

Minimum Setback from ROW line: 5'

ROW width of 64'
Conceptual Street Sections: Main Street

Main Street, west of Monon: Plan View and Cross Section

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW: 5'
Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 15'
ROW width of 64'

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 15'
Main Street, west of Monon: Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Main Street
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

Proposed ROW width of 100'

Maximum Building Height: 5 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 20'

Conceptual Street Sections: College Avenue

College Avenue:
Plan View and Cross Section

appendices
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

Maximum Building Height: 5 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 20'

ROW width of 78'

College Avenue:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: College Avenue
Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

Maximum Building Height: 5 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 20'

ROW width of 88'

College Avenue:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: College Avenue
College Avenue Corridor: Conceptual Street Section for proposed 100' ROW

College Avenue Corridor: Conceptual Street Sections for existing ROW

College Avenue: Conceptual Street Sections
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 20'

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

ROW width of 60'

Gateway: Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Gateway
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Activity Zone

Conceptual Street Sections: Gateway

Row width of 52'

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 20'

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

Gateway: Plan View and Cross Section
**ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN**

- **Maximum Building Height:** 4 floors
- **Minimum Building Height:** 2 floors
- **Minimum Setback from ROW line:** 0'
- **ROW width of 64'**
- **Two-way traffic**

---

**Conceptual Street Sections:**

- **Commercial Local, Two-way:** Plan View and Cross Section

---

**Max Building Height:** 4 floors
**Max Setback from ROW:** 10'
Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 0'

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 10'

ROW width of 50'
Two-way traffic

Commercial Local, Two-way:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Commercial Local
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 10'

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 0'

ROW width of 38'
Two-way traffic

Commercial Local, Two-way:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Commercial Local
Commercial Local Corridor, two-way:

Conceptual Street Sections: Commercial Local
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 10'

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 0'

ROW width of 38'
One-way traffic

Commercial Local, One-way:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Commercial Local
Commercial Local, One-way: Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Commercial Local

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 0'

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: 10'

Tree lawn
Sidewalk
Sidewalk

Angle parking
Drive lane

ROW width of 50'
One-way traffic

ROW
ROW
ROW
ROW
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ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 0'

ROW width of 64'
One-way traffic

Conceptual Street Sections: Commercial Local

Commercial Local, One-way:
Plan View and Cross Section
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

ROW width of 56'

North Village Local, Two-way Traffic:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

ROW width of 40'

North Village Local, Two-way Traffic:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

ROW width of 22'

North Village Local, Two-way Traffic:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
North Village Local, One-way Traffic: Conceptual Street Sections

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
North Village Local, Two-way Traffic:
Conceptual Street Sections

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

- Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
- Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum
- Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
- Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'
- ROW width of 22'

North Village Local, One-way Traffic:
Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local

North Village Local, One-way Traffic: Plan View and Cross Section

ROW width of 40'  
Minimum Building Height: 2 floors  
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'  
Maximum Building Height: 4 floors  
Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum

Minimum Building Height: 2 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

ROW width of 56'

North Village Local, One-way Traffic: Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: North Village Local
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Minimum Building Height: 4 floors
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'

Maximum Building Height: 8 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum

ROW width of 72'

Conceptual Street Sections: Riverview

Riverview:
Plan View and Cross Section
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Maximum Building Height: 8 floors
Minimum Building Height: 4 floors
Maximum Setback from ROW: no maximum
Minimum Setback from ROW line: 10'
ROW width of 36'

Riverview: Plan View and Cross Section

Conceptual Street Sections: Riverview
ENVISION BROAD RIPPLE VILLAGE PLAN

Conceptual Street Sections: Riverview

Riverview: Conceptual Street Sections

each square represents 1' of ROW width

Min bldg setback
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APPENDIX “D”

Broad Ripple History

“The first owners of land in what became Broad Ripple were Jesse McKay and John Calip. Together they purchased 147 acres from the United States in 1822. In 1836, Jacob Coil and his family moved there from Virginia and purchased land from the McKays and Calips. He called his section Broad Ripple because people traveling from the north forded the river at its shallowest point. The ford used by travelers was at a wide point in the river and was easily recognized by the ripples caused on the surface by the shallow bed. In time, the ford, as well as the settlement, became known as “Broad Ripple”. There was at this time great plans by the state government to build canals for transportation at various places in the state. A canal was proposed to be built from Peru to Evansville. In 1836, surveying work began with the start of the canal at the intersection of Westfield Boulevard and the White River.

The canal transportation effort failed when the first railroads began to cross the state in 1847. The canal cost the State of Indiana $1.6 million and left the state treasury bankrupt with only eight of the 800 proposed miles of the canal finished. In 1851, the state sold the canal for $2,500 to a private investor. Eventually, the canal was sold to the Hydraulic Company (now the Indianapolis Water Company) as a main source of water for Indianapolis.

Broad Ripple's first house and store were built in 1836 when Joseph Wray built a home, grocery and saloon near the location of the river dam. A sawmill and a grist mill were constructed in 1843. Union Church was built in 1851 at 6330 Guilford and the First Methodist Church, now located at 6145 Guilford, was built in 1884. The first physician to maintain a practice in Broad Ripple was Dr. Harry Kerr who served the community from 1851 to 1880. The first year of schooling in Broad Ripple took place in a district school near Fairview Park. In 1854, Washington Township No. 14 (a one-room building) was built at the corner of Broad Ripple Avenue and Evanston Avenue.

In 1884, Broad Ripple was incorporated as a town by the County Commissioners. The first act of the Town Board was to make streets available by surveying. Early pioneers had built homes and buildings in a haphazard way. Some houses had to be moved onto new lots. Streets took names of some early settlers such as Ferguson, Coil, Light, and Marion. Eventually when the City annexed Broad Ripple in 1922, its streets were renamed to coincide with Indianapolis streets. Some examples were Shelby Street which became Broad Ripple Avenue, Bellefountaine which became Guilford, Cornell which became Winthrop, and Marion which became Compton.

Broad Ripple had trouble with floods in its early years. In 1875, floods destroyed the grist mill and the oldest house and grocery on the north side of the river. Volunteers worked for two days and nights with sandbags to form a levee at the north bend of the river. The levee lasted until 1884 when a high flood broke the levee and flooded the town again.

Broad Ripple began to prosper after it was incorporated. Ripple Hotel was built and is still standing as a commercial and apartment complex at the corner of Winthrop and Westfield. A dinner place, the Brenneman House, was located where the Kroger store is today. The first lumber yard, Buddenbaum Lumber Yard, was located east of the Monon tracks (now the Monon Trail) on Broad Ripple Avenue.

In the first half of the 20th century, very few recreation and amusement centers could rival White City Park (now Broad Ripple Park). The park featured a large merry-go-round with imported handmade animals from Germany and calliope-type music. It was originally in the north part of the park, but was later moved toward the south. The merry-go-round was still operating when the city purchased the park in 1945. A few years later, however, it was dismantled; some of the animals are now on display in the Children's Museum in Indianapolis. The park also included a large roller skating rink, which was a gathering place for young and old skaters. A zoo with monkeys, lions, and birds was also located in the park. In the mornings and evenings, the lions' roars could be heard over the surrounding neighborhood. A large swimming pool was built to the north of the park in 1908. It was then the third largest pool in the United States.
As suburban development continued further north in the middle and late 20th century, Broad Ripple underwent many transformations. Houses were converted to businesses; older buildings were torn down to make way for the new; and Broad Ripple took on a new image that best fits the term ‘avant-garde’. The charm of the village separated it from the mainstream of downtown hustle; a place to renew oneself became the organizing commercial theme of Broad Ripple during the 20th century. Once a haven for mature city dwellers connected to the quiet countryside by the interurbans and canal, Broad Ripple now caters to a younger demographic, one that is connected by car and seeks trendy restaurants, art and late night entertainment.\footnote{Taken from Washington Township, Marion County, Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, 1999.}

Broad Ripple Historic Sites and Structures

Broad Ripple contains nine historically significant places identified as “notable” (rating N on the following chart) or “outstanding”, (rating O), in the 1999 Washington Township, Marion County, Indiana Historic Sites and Structures Inventory (Interim Report) prepared by the Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana.

The “O” rating means the property has enough historic or architectural significance that it is already listed, or should be considered for individual listing, in the National Register of Historic Places. “Outstanding” resources can be of local, state, or national importance.

The rating of “N” means that the property did not quite merit an “Outstanding” rating, but still is above average in its importance. Further research or investigation may reveal that the property could be eligible for National Register listing. The property may be eligible for the Indiana Register of Historic Sites and Structures.

The first three structures fall within the boundaries of the Broad Ripple Historical District. The subsequent structures are scattered throughout the Broad Ripple Village Neighborhood.
## Historic Sites and Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Form and Style</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Depot</td>
<td>901 E. 64th St.</td>
<td>Stick Style</td>
<td>c.1885</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>New York Central Lines Caboose</td>
<td>6535 Cornell Ave.</td>
<td>between 1902 and 1923</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>School 80</td>
<td>920 E. 62nd St.</td>
<td>Art Deco</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Masonic Lodge Bldg. (Mustard Hall)</td>
<td>6235 N. Guilford Ave.</td>
<td>Neoclassical</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Architecture / Social History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Christian Church</td>
<td>6202 N. Carrollton Ave.</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Gothic Revival</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Architecture / Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5923 Winthrop Ave.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>c.1929</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5940 Guilford Ave.</td>
<td>Craftsman / Spanish</td>
<td>c.1930</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5934 N. College Ave.</td>
<td>Dormer-front bungalow/ Craftsman</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6159 Broadway St.</td>
<td>Queen Anne</td>
<td>c.1915</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6379 N. Broadway St.</td>
<td>American Foursquare</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6128 Broadway St.</td>
<td>Colonial bungalow</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6060 Park Ave.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>c.1928</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Elmer Pursell House</td>
<td>6032 Park Ave.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Double House</td>
<td>5935-5937 Central Ave.</td>
<td>American Foursquare</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6225 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Dormer-front bungalow / Craftsman</td>
<td>c.1919</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6272 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>American Foursquare</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6471 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Dormer-front bungalow/ Craftsman</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6138 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5924 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Tudor Revival</td>
<td>c.1928</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5920 Central Ave.</td>
<td>Tudor Revival</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>400 E. Kessler Blvd.</td>
<td>Tudor/English Cottage</td>
<td>c.1929</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5995 New Jersey St.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Dorothy Daily, architect/builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6371 Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>Tudor Revival</td>
<td>1941—1942</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6401 Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>Tudor Revival</td>
<td>c.1932</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6232 Washington Blvd.</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Form and Style</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>5914 New Jersey Blvd.</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>c.1927</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>320 E. Kessler Blvd.</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>c.1928</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Settos/Shea House</td>
<td>245 E. Westfield Blvd.</td>
<td>French Eclectic</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Central Canal</td>
<td>Follows Westfield Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1839</td>
<td>Transportation / Entertainment/ Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mt. Vernon Electro House</td>
<td>42 E. Kessler Blvd.</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Meridian St. Bridge #1087</td>
<td></td>
<td>Filled Spandrel Concrete Arch</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Engineering and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>St. Paul's Episcopal Church</td>
<td>6050 N. Meridian</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Gothic</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6171 Kingsley Dr.</td>
<td>Mission Revival</td>
<td>c.1924</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Apartment Bldg.</td>
<td>6126 Compton St.</td>
<td>Moderne</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6036 Haverford Ave.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>c.1930</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6008 Haverford Ave.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>c.1930</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>1337 E. 60th St.</td>
<td>Colonial Revival</td>
<td>c.1939</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6045 Primrose Ave.</td>
<td>English Cottage</td>
<td>c.1927</td>
<td>Sears &amp; Roebuck plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6212 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>c.1949</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6452 N. Broadway St.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>c.1949</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6321 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>c.1949</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6468 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>1945-1950</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>6466 N. Central Ave.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>c.1949</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>2019 E. 62nd St.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>c.1948</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>1908 E. Kessler Blvd.</td>
<td>Lustron</td>
<td>c.1949</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Broad Ripple Fire Station #32</td>
<td>6330 Guilford Ave.</td>
<td>Tudor Revival</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Architecture/ politics/ government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kassebaum Bldg.</td>
<td>6317-31 Guilford Ave.</td>
<td>Art Deco</td>
<td>c.1925</td>
<td>Architecture/Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>International Order of Odd Fellows Building</td>
<td>902 E. Westfield</td>
<td>Gothic Vernacular</td>
<td>c.1895</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Commercial Bldg.</td>
<td>924 E. Westfield</td>
<td>Italian Renaissance/ Craftsman</td>
<td>c.1910</td>
<td>Architecture/Commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use Categories

Land use categories broadly define development by use and intensity, and should be considered the most appropriate use for the land. They are the starting point for determining the appropriateness of land use requests such as zoning and variance of use petitions.

Residential Development greater than 0.00 and equal to or less than 1.75 units per acre.
Color: Vanilla
Index Number: 1
This density is consistent with rural development patterns and could also limit the impact of development on property with extreme topography or other significant environmental considerations such as floodplains, wetlands and old-growth woodlands. Additionally, this density would be conducive to agricultural and estate development.

Residential Development greater than 1.75 and equal to or less than 3.50 units per acre.
Color: Light Yellow
Index Number: 2
This density is consistent with single-family residential development in transitional areas between rural and suburban development patterns and is the typical density for single-family residential development in suburban areas of the City. Development at this density should not take place in rural and suburban areas where surrounding development patterns exhibit characteristics suitable for higher densities (property on mass transit corridors, near concentrations of employment, or near major commercial centers, for example).

Residential Development greater than 3.50 and equal to or less than 5.00 units per acre.
Color: Bright Yellow
Index Number: 3
This density is consistent with single-family residential development in suburban areas of the City and in transitional areas between suburban and urban patterns of development. Development at this density should not take place on mass transit corridors. Multi-family residential development is acceptable, but is unlikely considering the density ranges recommended.

Residential Development greater than 5.00 and equal to or less than 8.00 units per acre.
Color: Orange
Index Number: 4
In suburban and rural areas this is a common multi-family density and typically the highest density single-family category in suburban areas. In urban areas, it is common for both single-family and multi-family development. Development at this density is appropriate along bus corridors but should not take place in proximity to planned light rail transit stops.

Residential Development greater than 8.00 and equal to or less than 15.00 units per acre.
Color: Light Brown
Index Number: 5
This density is typically the highest density serviceable in suburban areas. In suburban areas it would typically be a multi-family (apartment or condominium) category. In urban areas, this is the highest density single-family residential category and a common multi-family category. Development at this density is appropriate for all types of mass transit corridors.

Residential Development greater than 15.00 units per acre.
Color: Dark Brown
Index Number: 6
This density is appropriate only within relatively intense urban areas where there is a full range of urban services and where those services have the capacity to accommodate the development. It may be appropriate in rare circumstances in suburban areas as assisted-living housing and as a buffer between major retail commercial uses and lower density residential uses. Development at this density is appropriate for all types of mass transit corridors.

Village Mixed-Use
Color: Peach
Index Number: 8
This land use category consists of a development focused
on a mixed-use core of small, neighborhood office/retail nodes, public and semi-public uses, open space and light industrial development. Residential development densities vary from compact single-family residential development and small-scale multi-family residential development near the “Main Street” or “Village Center” and progress to lower densities outward from this core. Village mixed use areas are intended to strengthen existing, historically rural, small towns and cities within Indianapolis, which are intended to continue as neighborhood gathering places and should allow a wide range of small businesses, housing types, and public and semi-public facilities. This category should be compatible in size and scale to existing villages in Marion County. It will allow development of residential and limited commercial uses on smaller lots than in other sections of rural and suburban Indianapolis.

Potential development in these areas should focus on design issues related to architecture, building size, parking, landscaping and lighting to promote a pedestrian-oriented “village” or “small town” atmosphere, rather than focusing on residential density. Strip commercial development (integrated centers setback from rights-of-way by parking areas), large-scale freestanding retail uses and heavy industrial development are generally inappropriate within this land use category. The Plan anticipates that this category will typically be designated as a critical area.

Urban Mixed-Use
Color: Beige
Index Number: 7

This land use category consists of existing areas of densely developed, pedestrian oriented, mixed-use (primarily commercial), development within the historic central city and first generation suburban areas of Indianapolis. The development pattern varies from location to location but typically includes multi-story buildings located at or near rights-of-way, with entrances and large windows facing the street. Parking is typically within, to the side, or to the rear of buildings. Original building uses were retail and services on the ground floor with offices or apartments on subsequent floors. Future development in these areas should maintain the historic fabric of the existing development.

Office Commercial Uses
Color: Pink
Index Number: 13

This land use category is for low-intensity office uses, integrated office development and compatible office-type uses. Retail uses are not promoted in this category, unless those uses are significantly subordinate to the primary office use or the retail use exclusively serves an abundance of office uses in proximity to the retail use. Office Commercial Uses can exist either as buffers between higher intensity land uses and lower intensity land uses or as major employment centers. The following uses are representative of this land use category: medical and dental facilities, education services, insurance, real estate, financial institutions, design firms, legal services, daycare centers, mortuaries, and communications studios.

Community Commercial Uses
Color: Red
Index Number: 14

This land use category is for low-intensity retail commercial and office uses, which serve a predominantly residential market adjacent to, or very near, the location of the use. The uses in this land use category are designed to fulfill a broad range of retail, personal, professional and business services and are either freestanding or part of a small integrated center typically anchored by a grocery store. These centers contain no, or extremely limited, outdoor display of merchandise. Generally, these uses are consistent with the following characteristics:

- Maximum Gross Floor Area: 125,000 square feet
- Maximum Acreage: 25 acres
- Service Area Radius: 2 miles
- Location: On an arterial or at the intersection of an arterial with a collector
- Maximum Outlots: 3

Regional Commercial Uses
Color: Rust
Index Number: 16

This land use category is for general commercial and office type uses, which serve a market that encompasses
several residential neighborhoods or communities. The uses in this land use category tend to benefit greatly from major business grouping and regional-sized shopping centers; therefore, this land use category may consist of a collection of relatively large freestanding commercial uses and integrated centers. These uses are generally characterized by indoor operations, but may have accessory outdoor operations limited to approximately 5 to 10 percent of a use’s gross floor area. Generally, these uses are consistent with the following characteristics:

Maximum Gross Floor Area: 1,000,000 square feet
Service Area Radius: 15 miles
Location: On a primary arterial near the intersection with a secondary or primary arterial.
Maximum Outlots: As needed.

Heavy Commercial Uses
Color: Dark Red
Index Number: 15
This land use category is for general commercial and related office type uses. The uses in this land use category tend to exhibit characteristics that are not compatible with less intensive land uses and are predominantly devoted to exterior operations, sales and display of goods; such as automobile sales and heavy equipment sales.

Location: On a primary arterial

Parking
Color: Green
Index Number: 10
This land use category consists of public or private property designated for active and/or passive recreational amenities. It also includes publicly and privately held conservation and preservation areas.

Linear Park
Color: Green
Index Number: 11
This land use category consists of public or private property designated for active and/or passive recreational amenities and is primarily used for the passage of people or wildlife. Typical examples are greenways and parkways.

Special Use
Color: Grey
Index Number: 12
This land use category consists of a variety public, semi-public and private land uses that either serve a specific public purpose (such as schools, churches, libraries, neighborhood centers and public safety facilities) or are unique uses exhibiting significant impacts on adjacent property (such as the Indianapolis International Airport, Indiana State Fair, and Indianapolis Motor Speedway).

Floodway
Color: Blue
This land use classification consists of areas within the floodway. These areas exhibit a great potential for property loss and damage or for water quality degradation and should not be developed. Nonconforming uses currently within a floodway should not be expanded.
APPENDIX “F”

Proposed Neighborhood Village (NV) District

This zoning district is one method of implementing the Village Mixed-Use recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan. It is intended to:
Preserve and restore existing, traditional and pedestrian scale buildings in established neighborhood commercial districts;
Create new commercial nodes that are pedestrian-oriented and provide uses that primarily serve adjacent neighborhoods;
Promote a balance of retail, service, office, dining and residential uses that serve the adjacent neighborhoods;
Alleviate development pressure on existing neighborhoods by placing reasonable controls on development and expansion of strip commercial areas within neighborhoods, particularly larger scale auto-oriented retail, service, office and dining uses that are intended to serve larger areas of the city;
Facilitate safe, attractive and convenient pedestrian circulation and minimize conflicts among bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists;
Encourage pedestrian flow through the design of mixed-use buildings with ground floor level retail uses that open directly onto sidewalks adjacent to public streets;
Establish building facade lines and sidewalk requirements, and reserve the space between buildings and the street for pedestrian functions;
Promote a nodal form of neighborhood commercial development that is of such a size that all uses within the district are within a convenient walking distance of one another and economically sustainable.
Foster an increased population density to sustain a fully functional village.

Although the NV district is more about the “how” of development rather than the “what,” it is still helpful to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate land uses in the village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate uses</th>
<th>Inappropriate uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses that generate pedestrian traffic</td>
<td>Uses that generate mostly vehicular traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses that are pedestrian-scaled</td>
<td>Uses that require a lot of space compared to the amount of pedestrian traffic they create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses that primarily serve the adjacent neighborhoods</td>
<td>Uses that require a lot of parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses that minimize conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles</td>
<td>Uses that create conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mix of retail, service, office, dining and residential uses</td>
<td>Uses that require a lot of outdoor storage or display</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX “G”

Resources

American Planning Association
http://planning.org/

Complete Streets
http://wwwCOMPLETESTREETS.org/

Form-Based Codes Institute
http://www.formbasedcodes.org/

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
http://www.lincolninst.edu/news/

New Urbanism
http://www.newurbanism.org

Smart Growth
www.smartgrowth.org

STREETSBLOG
http://www.streetsblog.org/

The Project for Public Spaces
www.pps.org

Transportation for America
http://t4america.org/

Urban Land Institute
www.uti.org

U.S. Green Building Council
www.USGBC.org

Midtown Indianapolis, Inc.
www.indyharmoni.org
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RESOLUTION 12-CPS-R-003, amending a segment of the Comprehensive or Master Plan of Marion County, Indiana, Broad Ripple Plan (Envision Broad Ripple).

Be it resolved that, pursuant to I.C. 36-7-4, the Metropolitan Development Commission of Marion County, Indiana, hereby amends the Comprehensive or Master Plan for Marion County, Indiana, by the adoption of the Broad Ripple Plan (Envision Broad Ripple), which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as an amendment to the Comprehensive or Master Plan of Marion County, Indiana.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Metropolitan Development Commission is directed to certify copies of this Resolution 12-CPS-R-003, amending the Comprehensive or Master Plan of Marion County, Indiana, Broad Ripple Plan (Envision Broad Ripple).

Be it further resolved that the Director of the Department of Metropolitan Development is directed to mail or deliver certified copies of this Resolution 12-CPS-R-003, to the Mayor of the City of Indianapolis, the City-County Council of Indianapolis and Marion County, and the Board of Commissioners of Marion County, Indiana and to the legislative authorities of the incorporated cities and towns of Marion County, Indiana that are directly affected by this plan. The Director shall also file one (1) copy of the Resolution and one (1) summary of the plan in the office of the Recorder of Marion County.

Ed / Mahern
Edmund Mahern, President
Metropolitan Development Commission

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM
AND ADEQUACY THIS 1st
DAY OF NOVEMBER 2012.

Stephen Neff
Deputy Chief Counsel