PLYMOUTH PLAN COMMISSION
January 6, 2026

The Plymouth Plan Commission met in regular session in the Council Chambers of the City Building, 124 North Michigan Street, Plymouth, Indiana, on January 6, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Commission President Doug Feece called the meeting to order for Commissioners Alex Eads, Mark Gidley, Randy Longanecker, Shiloh Carothers Milner, Dan Sellers, Fred Webster, and Paul Wendel, who were physically present and answered roll call. Commissioner Angela Rupchock-Schafer attended virtually at 6:06 p.m. Commissioners Beth Pinkerton and Linda Secor were absent. Others present were Building Commissioner Dennis Manuwal Jr., City Attorney Jeff Houin, Plan Director Ty Adley, and Mayor Robert Listenberger. The public was able to see and hear the meeting through Zoom and streamed live at https://www.youtube.com/@CityofPlymouth.

Commissioners Webster and Longanecker moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the last regular meeting on November 4, 2025. The motion carried.

Commissioners Wendel and Gidley moved and seconded to retain the current slate of officers. The motion carried.

Current Officers:

Doug Feece, President
Timothy A. Eads, Vice President
Fred Webster, Secretary

Commissioners Gidley and Wendel moved and seconded to retain Fred Webster as County Liaison and to retain the same appointed members to the Technical Review Committee. The motion carried.

The following legal notice was advertised in the Pilot News newspaper on December 24, 2025:

116 Legals

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

The Plan Commission of the City of Plymouth, Indiana will hold a meeting on January 6th, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the City Building, 124 N. Michigan St. (Garro St. entrance), Plymouth, Indiana on the following matters:

PC 2026-01: NAYLOR BRYAN D & JAYNE E AKER, 12498 Maple Road Plymouth, IN 46563: A request for a 2 lot sketch plan of a 30.00 acre property located at 12498 Maple Road Plymouth, IN 46563. Identified as parcels 50-32-21-000-008.000-018 zoned R-1 Rural Residential.

PC 2026-02: Plymouth Plan Commission, 124 N. Michigan Street, Plymouth, IN 46563: An Amendment to the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance: part 1- an amendment to Article 6.190 Public Improvement Standards for sidewalks to amend procedure, part 2- an amendment to Article 11.020 Processes Permits and Fees for variance petitions to amend supportive information and representation, part 3- an amendment to Article 11.030 Processes Permits and Fees for special exceptions process to amend supportive information and representation, and part 4- an amendment to Article 11.050 Processes Permits and Fees for zoning map amendments petitions to amend supportive information and representation,

PC 2026-03: Plymouth Plan Commission, 124 N. Michigan Street, Plymouth, IN 46563: An Amendment to the following sections of the Subdivision Control Ordinance: part 1- an amendment to Section 1.11 Resubdivision of Land to amend the interior lot line considerations and part 2- an amendment to Section 2.1 Review Procedure for Minor Subdivisions to amend the procedure

116 Legals

for sketch plans and primary plats.

Information on these matters may be obtained at the office of the Clerk-Treasurer,124 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, IN and telephone #574-936-2124.

If you are disabled and need special accommodations, please call the ADA Coordinator at 574-936-2948.

Kyle Williams, Recording Secretary, Plan Commission, December 24th, 2025.

December 24, 2025 PN370206 hspaxlp

PC 2026-01: NAYLOR BRYAN D & JAYNE E AKER, 12498 Maple Road, Plymouth, IN 46563: A request for a 2-lot sketch plan of a 30.00-acre property located at 12498 Maple Road, Plymouth, IN

46563. Identified as parcel 50-32-21-000-008.000-018, zoned R-1, Rural Residential District.

There was nobody in attendance to speak on behalf of this request.

Commissioners Longanecker and Webster moved and seconded to table PC 2026-01 as presented. The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor: Gidley, Longanecker, Milner, Rupchock-Schafer, Webster, and Feece
Opposed: Eads, Sellers, and Wendel
Absent: Pinkerton and Secor

PC 2026-02: Plymouth Plan Commission, 124 N. Michigan Street, Plymouth, IN 46563: An Amendment to the following sections of the Zoning Ordinance: part 1- an amendment to Article 6.190 Public Improvement Standards for sidewalks to amend procedure, part 2- an amendment to Article 11.020 Processes Permits and Fees for variance petitions to amend supportive information and representation, part 3- an amendment to Article 11.030 Processes Permits and Fees for special exceptions process to amend supportive information and representation, and part 4- an amendment to Article 11.050 Processes Permits and Fees for zoning map amendments petitions to amend supportive information and representation.

Plan Director Adley reviewed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

PC 2026-02: Plymouth Plan Commission

- **Section 1.** Zoning Ordinance, *Article 6 Development Standards; Chapter 190 Public Improvement Standards; Section B Sidewalks*, shall be amended as follows:
- B. Sidewalks
  - All developments shall be required to install public sidewalks along any public streets within and adjacent to the development ~~unless an exception is granted by the Commission~~ and approved according to the exception procedure of the City of Plymouth Complete Streets Policy.
    - 1. All sidewalks shall be constructed in the right-of-way or in a sidewalk easement adjacent to the right-of-way.
    - 2. Sidewalks shall be separated from the back of curb of the adjacent street by a planting strip which is a minimum of ten (10) feet in width along arterial and collector roads and six (6) feet in width along local streets.
    - 3. Sidewalks shall be a minimum of five (5) feet in width in residential areas and eight (8) feet width in nonresidential and mixed use areas, and constructed of concrete consistent with all applicable City of Plymouth construction standards.
    - 4. Refer to 96.061 for corporate limit sidewalk regulations

•**Section 2.** Zoning Ordinance, *Article 11 Processes, Permits, and Fees; Chapter 020 Variance Petitions*, shall be amended as follows:

- 020 Variance Petitions
  - The following procedure shall apply to all variance petitions;
    - A. Application
      - 5. required supportive information
        - Supportive information ~~shall~~ **may** include, but not be limited to the following
  - C. Public Hearing
    - The BZA will then, in a public hearing scheduled consistent with the adopted calendar of filing and meeting dates, review the variance application and required supportive information.
    - 1. Representation
      - The petitioner ~~and~~ **or** any representative of the petitioner must be present at the public hearing to present the petition and address the required findings of fact.

•**Section 3.** Zoning Ordinance, *Article 11 Processes, Permits, and Fees; Chapter 030 Special Exception Process*, shall be amended as follows:

- 030 Special Exception Process
  - A. Application
    1. required supportive information.
       - Supportive information ~~shall~~ **may** include, but not be limited to the following:
  - C. Public Hearing
    - The BZA will then, in a public hearing scheduled consistent with the adopted calendar of filing and meeting dates, review the special exception application and required supportive information.
    - 1. Representation
      - The petitioner ~~and~~ **or** any representative of the petitioner must be present at the public hearing to present the petition and address the required findings of fact.

- **Section 4.** Zoning Ordinance, *Article 11 Processes, Permits, and Fees; Chapter 050 Zoning Map Amendment Petitions*, shall be amended as follows:
- B. Application
  - 5. required supportive information
    - Supportive information ~~shall~~ **may** include, but not be limited to the following:
    - ~~a. Site Plan~~
      - ~~A site plan drawn to scale showing, at a minimum, all existing and proposed structures, setbacks, easements, rights-of-way, floodplains, and any other feature relevant to the petition.~~
- C. Technical Review
  - The application materials shall be reviewed by the City of Plymouth Technical Review Committee consistent with the provisions of *Article 10-030, Technical Review Committee* of this Ordinance.
  - 1. Representation
    - The petitioner(s) ~~and~~ **or** any representative of the petitioner(s) shall be present during the review to answer questions regarding the petition.
- (Cont.) **Section 4.** Zoning Ordinance, *Article 11 Processes, Permits, and Fees; Chapter 050 Zoning Map Amendment Petitions*, shall be amended as follows:
  - E. Plan Commission Public Hearing
    - 1. Representation
      - The petitioner ~~and~~ **or** any representative of the petitioner must be present at the public hearing to present the petition and address any questions the Commission might have.

Eads asked if we define what a representative was. Adley disagreed. Eads asked if something defined what a representative was.

Adley replied that the representative was typically either a legal counsel, the surveyor, or an engineer.

Eads asked about other family members.

Adley replied that another family member could be in attendance, so if a husband filled, the wife was technically not the petitioner, but at the same residence, so it made sense.

Eads stated he wanted to ensure that we were not pushing someone away, as they were not officially a representative for a homeowner matter.

There was a lengthy discussion on what a representative was. If a representative of the applicant sends someone who cannot answer questions or concerns from the board and the case gets denied or tabled, then that was on the applicant.

Rupchock-Schafer asked if there would be training for the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) around Complete Streets and the process around sidewalks to ensure a smooth handoff of this task previously assigned to the Plan Commission.

Adley replied they would be presented with the staff report that goes over the importance of sidewalks, like what the Plan Commission had received as well. He added there would be no specific training.

Rupchock-Schafer asked if it would be possible to add that just to go over the Complete Streets Policy and the multiple modes of transportation for sidewalks. She stated she was a part of the Complete Streets Committee when it was established, and she was protective of the idea of ensuring there are sidewalks.

Adley replied that he was sure they could explore something with the BZA and have a conversation with them about it.

Feece asked if sidewalk requests would be heard before this body. Adley replied that it would not be heard in front of the Plan Commission anymore. Feece stated sidewalks had been used as a bargaining chip before to ensure that we had the property to ensure we had right-of-way for sidewalks before.

Adley replied that the BZA had the same ability to create conditions and commitments.

Houin stated the reason for this was because it was a weird situation. He stated every other variance from developmental standards of the zoning ordinance had to be approved by the BZA. He stated the installation of sidewalks was the only standard that was waived by the Plan Commission and not the BZA, which was confusing to applicants.

Adley stated there was also coordination required with the Complete Streets Policy for the Board of Works as well. He stated they were seeking to get that amended and clarified with a new resolution. He stated it would make it one simple process instead of a procedure that was not currently being followed.

There was more discussion held about sidewalks and procedures.

Commissioners Webster and Eads moved and seconded to open the public hearing. The motion carried.

There were no comments at that time.

Commissioners Webster and Eads moved and seconded to close the public hearing. The motion carried.

Gidley asked if we were trying to limit these requests to not put sidewalks in.

Adley replied that nothing was trying to be limited.

Sellers stated it sounded like we were trying to make it more streamlined for an applicant to develop a piece of property.

Gidley asked if he was suggesting that putting in a sidewalk was making it difficult to develop a piece of property.

Eads replied in disagreement. He stated if they needed a sidewalk variance and they needed a separate variance that they would have to go to BZA for the one and to us for the sidewalk variance. He stated this change would allow the applicant to go to one meeting instead of two meetings.

Adley stated this amendment was not seeking to limit the public's ability to pursue a variance for sidewalks as it was not limited before.

Gidley suggested that maybe we should.

Houin stated the intent with this change was to not have any effect on the outcome but more so a procedural change. He stated that when an applicant was requesting what was currently a waiver of that requirement, instead of submitting a waiver request for the requirement to put in a sidewalk, they're simply submitting it as an application for a variance from development standards. He stated it did not change the requirements, and he did not anticipate it having any drastic effect on the outcome. He stated the administration's policy of favoring sidewalks was not changing. He stated it was simply a procedural change to who receives the application and makes the final determination on that variance.

Longanecker stated that, for a lot of requests, staff had recommended that we waive a lot of development from having to put the sidewalks in lately. He stated if we are going to require sidewalks, then let's put sidewalks in. He stated he gets irritated that we have these ordinances and then we waive them all the time. He stated if we are not going to care about sidewalks, then take it out of the ordinance.

Webster stated this was essentially taking the decision away from the Plan Commission and putting it on the BZA now.

Adley agreed and stated it was putting the decision where it should have been in the first place for a variance from development standards. He stated there was technically no application for this sidewalk waiver in front of the Plan Commission.

Gidley stated he understood the streamlining of the process for the applicant. He believed Longanecker was echoing what he was trying to say because we have this procedure and policy that says we want sidewalks, but we everyone knows if you go ask for a variance that they won't make you put one in.

Wendel stated that it was only happening along Oak Drive.

Longanecker stated he did not want that to be the standard.

Houin stated that anyone who did not want to put in a sidewalk now only had to submit a request to the Plan Commission for the waiver. He stated that, on other variances from development standards, it was not the case that they submit the application and it gets granted. He stated the BZA makes determinations based on the zoning ordinance and circumstances of said case in the same way the Plan Commission makes determinations for a sidewalk waiver.

Gidley believed that every case stood alone and asked if he felt the same.

Houin agreed there was no precedential impact from previous cases. He stated that it was very well illustrated when you look at the BZA requests for chickens. He stated every case stood alone and they were not bound by their decisions in previous cases. He explained that it was legally true as well.

Feece stated that we have a difference of opinion. He explained that if you have somebody on Oak Drive build a sidewalk, they would be the only person with a sidewalk out there; it would not be good. He stated if we have one lot with a sidewalk but no other sidewalks for four miles, why would we force them to put that in? He stated that they could be forced to pay for that sidewalk when things start moving along later.

Houin stated the BZA could make those same determinations. Feece agreed.

Webster asked for an update on where they were at with the plans to install a sidewalk on Oak Drive.

Adley replied that we were in the process of going through the funding acquisition and grant process.

Houin stated Sellers would be making a presentation to INDOT on Thursday to hopefully secure that grant.

Webster asked what the estimated price was.

Sellers replied that it was roughly $4.8 million.

Commissioners Sellers and Wendel moved and seconded to provide a favorable recommendation of PC 2026-02 to the City Council. The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor: Eads, Gidley, Longanecker, Milner, Sellers, Webster, Wendel, and Feece
Opposed: Rupchock-Schafer
Absent: Pinkerton and Secor

PC 2026-03: Plymouth Plan Commission, 124 N. Michigan Street, Plymouth, IN 46563: An Amendment to the following sections of the Subdivision Control Ordinance: part 1- an amendment to

Section 1.11 Resubdivision of Land to amend the interior lot line considerations and part 2- an amendment to Section 2.1 Review Procedure for Minor Subdivisions to amend the procedure for sketch plans and primary plats.

Plan Director Adley reviewed the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

PC 2026-03: Plymouth Plan Commission

- **Section 1.** Subdivision Control Ordinance, *Section 1.11 – RESUBDIVISION OF LAND – (REPLAT OF A SUBDIVISION),* shall be amended as follows:
  - Replats Not Requiring a Hearing -- Replats must be certified by any properly registered land surveyor. The Zoning Administrator shall determine whether a replat requires a public hearing before the Plan commission in compliance of with Section 2.0, Determination for Plat Approval of this ordinance. The following circumstances shall be considered by the Zoning Administer:
    - Interior Lot Line ~~Removal~~ **Adjustment** – A replat which involves ~~only~~ the removal **or adjustment** of interior lot lines, with the outside perimeter of the property remaining unchanged, resulting **no increase or** in fewer parcels than were contained in the original parcel. The new parcel must abide with the conditions of the secondary plat
- **Section 2.** Subdivision Control Ordinance, *Section 2.1 – REVIEW PROCEDURE – MINOR SUBDIVISION*, shall be amended as follows:
  - Upon request, the Commission ~~shall~~ **may** review a sketch plan or primary plat for a Minor Subdivision by placing it on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled Plan Commission meeting. Public notice is not required for the primary review of a Minor Subdivision.

Adley explained to replat, it would infer that it was a part of a subdivision already. He explained if it was a part of standard acreage in the county where you're going from section corners to call out lines and survey markers, that it wouldn't be eligible under this understanding. He stated the change from a board process to an administrative process could save time and, from a simplicity standpoint, if you own both lots and want to adjust the property line, it did not make a whole lot of sense to have to come in front of the board to get something done that was very simple. He stated that if he had three lots and he wanted to get rid of all the internal ones or make two small ones on the sides and a big one for himself, he could not do that currently.

Eads asked if the lots had to be owned by the same person.

Adley replied that it did not. He explained it could be two property owners where they're wanting to correct a longstanding issue with a property line. He stated they would be able to go through the administrative process with this amendment.

Webster asked if this extended to the two-mile limit.

Adley agreed but added that it also required that it be part of a subdivision. He stated that if you were in the two-mile subdivisions, you could do this. He stated if you wanted to add a new lot that you would still have to follow the same procedure.

Commissioners Wendel and Eads moved and seconded to open the public hearing. The motion carried.

There were no comments at that time.

Commissioners Wendel and Milner moved and seconded to close the public hearing. The motion carried.

Commissioners Longanecker and Webster moved and seconded to provide a favorable recommendation of PC 2026-03 to the City Council. The motion passed by roll call vote.

In Favor: Eads, Gidley, Longanecker, Milner, Rupchock-Schafer, Sellers, Webster, Wendel, and Feece
Opposed: None
Absent: Pinkerton and Secor

Comprehensive Plan Update / Other Business:

Adley stated he was excited that they hit approximately 75% completion or ongoing rate within the Comprehensive Plan itself, which was very unheard of in two years.

With there being no other business to come before the Commission, Commissioners Milner and Webster moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried, and the meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

/s/ Kyle Williams
Recording Secretary