REGULAR SESSION, COMMON COUNCIL, October 12, 2026

Be it Remembered that the Common Council of the City of Plymouth, Indiana, met in regular session on October 12, 2026. The meeting was held in the Council Chambers, on the second floor of the City Building, 124 N. Michigan St., Plymouth, Indiana, and was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Councilwoman Starr offered a prayer, and Mayor Listenberger led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Robert Listenberger presided over Council members Duane Culp, Don Ecker Jr., Kayla Krathwohl, Randy Longanecker, Shiloh Carothers Milner, Dave Morrow, and Linda Starr, who were physically present. Clerk-Treasurer Lynn Gorski was also present. The public could see and hear the meeting through Zoom, and it was streamed live at https://www.youtube.com/@CityofPlymouth.

Council members Starr and Krathwohl moved and seconded to approve the minutes of both the regular session of the Common Council on September 28, 2026, and the executive session of the Common Council on October 6, 2026, as presented. The motion carried.

Council Members listed the following:

- Longanecker: Parking concerns on the east side of Columbus Drive addressed.
- Longanecker: 309 Gibson Street, the old Pointe Apartments property. Street Superintendent Marquardt stated it would be mowed tomorrow, along with the old Dave and Ray's building. Both were sent notices and have not responded.

Mayor Listenberger presented Ordinance No. 2026-2268, An Ordinance Regarding Parking Motor Vehicles in Residential Lawn Areas, on second reading.

He read aloud a letter before discussion. See letter below:

“Council Members,

I want to begin by saying that I appreciate the thought behind this ordinance and the desire to address concerns about excessive parking in front yards. I think we can all agree that maintaining attractive neighborhoods and protecting property values are worthwhile goals. However, good intentions alone are not enough. Any ordinance we adopt must be carefully written, legally sound, and practical to enforce.

I was not aware that the parking ordinance was going to be added to the council agenda for the last meeting. I also know that City Attorney Houin did not help write it and had advised that it needed further work before being presented to the council.

Now that we have had more time to review the proposal, several significant problems have become apparent. The ordinance contains overly broad definitions and does not account for the fact that our city currently lacks regulations governing driveways and improved parking areas. As written, it could prohibit residents from parking everything from bicycles and baby strollers to campers and boat trailers anywhere in their front, side, or back yards. At the same time, there is nothing in our current city code that would prevent someone from covering an entire yard with stone and calling it an “improved parking area.”

I believe our City Attorney also has additional concerns regarding the legality of the ordinance, and it is unfortunate that he is unable to be here tonight to discuss those concerns with the council.

This issue deserves a more thorough approach. If the council believes there is a need to address front-yard parking, then we should take the time to do it correctly. That means starting over, engaging in a full legal review, examining how other communities have addressed similar concerns, and developing an ordinance that is fair, enforceable, and in the best interest of both the city and its residents.

Rather than moving forward with an ordinance that contains these significant shortcomings, I respectfully ask the council to reject it in its current form. Let us take the necessary time to craft a better solution that accomplishes the intended goal without creating unintended consequences for our residents.

For those reasons, I am asking you to vote no on this ordinance as it is currently written. Thank you."

Mayor Listenberger stated that resolving these issues would take time and it would not be done in two weeks. He believed the legal department needed to review it, and he believed keeping it tabled every two weeks was unnecessary, as it needed work.

The rest of the council expressed concerns about not wanting to take it off the agenda, as it was brought up a couple of years ago and nothing has been done since. The council discussed forming a committee to address this.

Longanecker addressed concerns about stormwater issues from people driving over curbs, people driving and parking on curb stops for water service, etc. He did not believe the ordinance, as it was written, was even close to a fix for these issues. He didn't want this off our radar, as there were a lot of questions that needed answering.

John Carlton (606 Beerenbrook Street, Plymouth, IN 46563)

Carlton stated there was a problem here that was going to be tough to solve. He said that, with it left on the table, he asked how the public would know when they would vote on it.

Longanecker stated that when they want to vote on it, we would put it back out.

Carlton stated that, since it was tabled, they could open it up and vote on it anytime.

Mayor Listenberger agreed because if we were to suddenly vote on it, the public wouldn't be able to provide input because they were not aware that it would be taken off the table. He stated that if this gets voted down and we come back with a new ordinance, then we are going to tell the public.

Carlton stated that you must be fair to the people, as he did not want to have to come here every two weeks to hear that it was not being taken off the table. He stated that when you get ready to vote, he'll come in and say his piece.

Culp stated he was with Longanecker that we need this, but we must get it right. He believed it needed more clarification. He asked if the "rummage sale" happened on Harrison Street, where they park 25-40 cars in a yard for 4-5 hours, if that would be in violation. He asked if the 15-day timeframe would reset if someone was in violation. He stated that for the "rummage sale," you

would be writing about 50 tickets for someone who's there to sell things that aren't permanent. He also asked if the vehicle needed to be visible from the roadway or if it had a fence around it.

Carolton stated his issue was that he had an enclosed trailer that had sat on his lot for 10 years. He stated he uses it 8-10 times a year and it was always licensed. He stated it caused no problems and it was between his house and the alley in the side yard. He stated it was never an issue for anybody, and he had 3 vehicles hit in front of his house, with 2 of them being totaled. He stated if he had to move that trailer out in front of his house and park it, he was very concerned about that. He stated that if there couldn't be any more trailers in yards whatsoever, he was sure there would be over a thousand trailers put on the road taking up parking spots. He listed travel trailers, car trailers, lawnmower trailers, etc. He stated that when you start putting travel trailers on some of these roads where you can't pass two cars because there's a car parked there, you're going to have a serious issue. He stated that if you drive a large pickup truck, you aren't getting through there, and the road was now blocked. He stated he understood the problem and would love it fixed up, but if we don't take this in small pieces and we don't think about it, we're going to make the medicine worse than the disease.

Mayor Listenberger understood keeping this in the forefront of everybody's minds, but he was still in favor of voting this down, putting a committee together, and working on it. He stated that, with so much to consider, this was going to take a long time, and it would not be an easy fix. He added that enforcing it would also be another issue. He stated he does not get a vote on this, but he sees the complexity here. He stated that when he was on the council six years ago, he saw the complexities then that weren't answered, and he couldn't vote in favor then. He stated that when we do go to vote on it, the public should know that it was the night to vote on it.

The consensus was to have a firm date to bring this back for the first meeting of 2027 on January 11, 2027. It was agreed that department heads and the public should be involved.

Morrow stated this was damaging and devaluing neighbors' property. He stated he took several pictures today, and it was such a diverse thing. He stated you can have a well-kept home and then at the next house you have someone parked right in front of their door. He stated that's not fair to that property owner who was taking care of their property. He agreed it was a complex issue, but he wanted a commitment from the Mayor that it would come back.

Gorski recommended putting it under "Other Business" as a discussion explaining what had been discovered so far. She stated the public would be able to discuss during that portion of it.

Darren Demis (405 Ewing Street, Plymouth, IN 46563)

Demis stated he had several elderly neighbors who have older homes that don't have any access to create a driveway or create any sort of space that would be great for parking other than their front yard. He stated the problem was that the road they live on was a two-lane road, and there's nowhere to park, so they're forced to park in those spots. He added that some neighbors had laid down gravel and others' yards were dirt because they parked there for so long. He believed this ordinance was predatory because it was brought up out of the blue. He stated he parked in his front yard, and it was not egregiously horrible. He stated he wasn't parking at his front door, making the neighborhood look terrible. He explained that suddenly saying that you must improve your property to park on your property, otherwise you get fined $50 a day, was not right. He stated that when it comes to plowing snow, his car had been plowed in a few times for parking on the road. He stated that if he was forced to park on the road because he didn't develop his property, his car would now be stuck through no fault of his own. He stated that for people who don't have that option on narrower roads, it was not feasible. He stated that you wouldn't get a plow through and you're potentially going to be damaging other people's property during the winter. He stated he was strongly against it and would like more research done.

Mayor Listenberger liked Gorski's suggestion that the next time we bring it up, it not be in ordinance form. He believed it would be good to update and give an opportunity for the public to provide input. He stated that it would be more reasonable for our public.

Culp stated that this was brought up 3-4 years ago and the problem was that the motion dies and the problem never gets brought back up again.

Krathwohl asked if this continued to stay tabled, if this would cause issues with filing ordinance books.

Gorski replied it would only if we continued passing ordinances and not addressing this one.

Starr stated she wished to speak on behalf of people her age who had spoken to her. She stated their concerns come from how it affects their property value and the beauty of the city, and they just thought it should be a done deal. She stated she thought that way first because she was all about keeping things tidy and having pride in your property. She stated she was aware of households that have several people who work and they have multiple vehicles. She stated this was not the time when everybody had one or two vehicles and had a place to park them. She stated that this was a problem and we're on the right track by discussing it and trying to come up with a compromise that's going to be beneficial to everybody.

Ecker stated he was the one who brought this up to begin with and still stands by his concern that it needed to be addressed. He explained that we said we would address it after we voted it down

six years ago, but it was never brought back. He noted he received positive comments and a small number of not-so-positive ones, but sitting there and doing nothing concerned him. He added that we have other things on our plate, and if we don't keep it in our sights, it's going to fall to the wayside. He compared it to the Comprehensive Plan; if we put the book on the shelf and don't touch it, we don't get stuff done. He believed they had a way to communicate that this would be the night it would be voted on.

Council members Ecker and Longanecker moved and seconded to table Ordinance No. 2026-2268, An Ordinance Regarding Parking Motor Vehicles in Residential Lawn Areas on second reading. The motion passed by roll call vote

AYES: Culp, Ecker, Krathwohl, Longanecker, Morrow, Starr

NAYS: Milner

Clerk-Treasurer Gorski stated that the city had received 2 donations: 1 in the amount of $50.00 from Hoosier Old Wheels and 1 in the amount of $470.00 from Bowen Printing, both to be used for the Police Department K-9. She asked whether they wished to accept the donations subject to the restricted terms, conditions, and purpose attached to the donations. She stated the donations would be receipted into the respective funds.

Council members Ecker and Starr moved and seconded to approve the donations as presented. The motion carried.

There were no updates on ONE Marshall County.

There were no updates for the Comprehensive Plan.

Council members Ecker and Starr moved and seconded to accept the following communications:

- Minutes of the Board of Public Works and Safety meeting of September 28, 2026
- October 12, 2026 Check Register
- August 4, 2026 Plan Commission Minutes

The motion carried.

There being no further business to come before the Council, Council members Longanecker and Milner moved and seconded to adjourn. Mayor Listenberger declared the meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.

/s/ Lynn M. Gorski
Clerk-Treasurer

APPROVED

/s/ Robert Listenberger
Mayor