MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
MICHIGAN CITY PLAN COMMISSION
JUNE 23,2026

The Michigan City Plan Commission held their regular monthly meeting in the Common Council Chambers, City Hall, 100 E Michigan Boulevard, Michigan City Indiana, on Tuesday June 23, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. local time; the date, hour, and place duly established for the holding of said meeting. Access LaPorte County Media the meeting and it is available for viewing on their website.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m. by Vice President Rose Tejeda

ROLL CALL

Roll call was called by Planning Director, Dr. Dominique Edwards

PRESENT: Timothy Warning, Fred Klinder, Antonio Conley, Steve DePalma, Rose Tejeda, Bryant Dabney, Christina Espar, Attorney Hale, Planning Director Dr. Dominque Edwards

ABSENT: Bruce De' Medici

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Espar made a motion to approve the agenda for the June 23, 2026, meeting, seconded by Mr. Dabney and was approved with the following vote:
AYE(7): Antonio Conley, Christina Espar, Fred Klinder, Rose Tejeda, Timothy Werner, Steve DePalma, Bryant Dabney
NAY(0):

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Espar made a motion to approve the May 26, 2026 meeting minutes with the corrections stated by Mr. Werner, seconded by Mr. Dabney and was approved with the following vote:
AYE(6): Antonio Conley, Christina Espar, Fred Klinder, Timothy Werner, Steve DePalma, Bryant Dabney
NAY(0):
ABSTAINED(1): Rose Tejeda

PETITION(S)

903-26; Nathan Plooster Requesting Primary and Secondary Plat for Minor Subdivision

Mr. Plooster, 212 Twilight Drive, addressed the Commission introducing himself and explained that he is before the commission to ask for approval of the subdivision for Twilight Crossings. He explains that it exists at one lot, but they are requesting to split it into two lots. He states that he will be retaining ownership of the Commercial property but there are two homes that will sit on the other lot and will be left to the current owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:
Tommy Kulavik, 1316 Ohio St, made a comment.

The Staff report was read by Planning Associate Lucas Lopez, it stated:

2. **Planning Department Staff Report:**

a. The parcel in question is located at the corner of Franklin Street and Greenwood Avenue. The property consists of approximately 14,375 square feet. The applicant has requested to subdivide the property into two parcels. There are currently three principal structures on the existing parcel, two residential properties, and a commercial property. For purposes of this petition, Lot 1 shall consist of the parcel containing the existing commercial structure, while Lot 2 shall consist of the parcel containing the two existing residential structures. Lot 1 has an area of 8,404.5 square feet while Lot 2 has an area of 6652.7 square feet. The parcel has an alley that borders the rear property line. The parcel currently has three accesses, one is on Franklin Street, one is on Greenwood Avenue, and there is also access to the parcel from the rear alley. The residential structures have access from the alley, while the accesses from Greenwood Avenue and Franklin Street primarily serve the commercial structure. This property is part of the Midtown / Franklin commercial corridor. Adjacent properties on Franklin Street are also zoned B2, General Commercial District. Aside from the Franklin Street corridor, the surrounding area is made up of residential parcels zoned R1D. This area is intended to accommodate commercial uses which entail large volumes of vehicular traffic, making this proposal viable. This proposal is a re-subdivision of land which will separate the commercial structure from the residential structures on the current lot. The separated parcels will have different owners. The overall intent is commercial development of Lot 1; a new pizza restaurant is planned.

3. **Staff Analysis:**

a. The parcel is zoned B2, General Commercial District. This zoning category is established to serve a larger population than what is serviced by a B1 district. The district is characterized by an integrated cluster of establishments services by a common parking area, thus generating a large volume of vehicle and pedestrian

the parking spaces that will be dedicated to Lot 2 is required. City ordinances allow for a maximum of 85% impervious surface coverage for parcels that are zoned by B2. A minor subdivision is required to divide this property into two parcels. Although the parcels do not meet the joint zoning ordinance requirements for 15,000 sq. Ft. under Article 7.03, after thorough analysis completed by the Department of Planning and Inspection – it was determined that the proposed subdivision will continue to operate under a historical use.

4. **Staff Recommendations:**

Staff have reviewed the proposal for the submitted plat for a minor subdivision and find the request to be in accordance with all applicable zoning and subdivision ordinance standards under Article 03 of City Ordinances for Minor Subdivisions and recommends the approval of the request subject to the following conditions:

a. Execute and record cross-access easement agreement between property owners of lots 1 and 2. Prior to recording the secondary plat, the petitioner shall obtain approval from the Enforcement Officer for the egress/ingress and parking easements.
b. Prior to recording the secondary plat, the petitioner shall install curbing alongside Greenwood Avenue with a curb cut per engineer specifications as reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

Attorney's Report was read by Attorney Hale, it stated:

Petitioner is filing for both primary plat and secondary plat (final plat) approval of a Minor Subdivision. The request involves approval to allow a single lot to be subdivided into two lots, one containing a commercial structure and the other containing two residential dwellings
The provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance pertinent to a minor subdivision include: Section 1.08(a)(2) (general provision for minor subdivisions), Article 3 (general rules pertaining to minor subdivisions) and Article 6 (design standards).
NOTE: The Tax Parcel Number listed on the Application is incorrect (applies to property across Greenwood Ave.). The number used above is correct.
NOTE: The name of the owner listed on the Application is incorrect. The correct owner per Beacon is 2400-08 Franklin LLC, which is listed above.
NOTE: Petitioner is not Property Owner. A consent is required. Application does not have required Consent of Property Owner.
NOTE: The proposed plat is apparently intended to serve as both the

primary and secondary plat. Reference should be made to Section 03.08 of the Subdivision Ordinance for the required information to appear on the secondary plat. It should be noted that Section 03.08 requires that the location of existing buildings on the site appear on the plat. None of the three buildings appear on the proposed plat.

NOTE: The proposed plat does not address Zoning Ordinance issues under Table 07.02 and Section 07.03 and Section 15.01 of the Zoning Ordinance such as lot size, required dimensions, street frontage and the like. According to Beacon the three structures on the single lot were built in 1910, 1946 and 1950. Planning Department staff has determined that these structures are grandfathered under Article 29 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Our Zoning Ordinance provides that, following recommended discussion with the enforcement officer, the Petitioner is to file a Primary Plat and supporting material set out in Section 03.08 with the Plan Commission/enforcement officer. The enforcement officer then reviews this plat for conformity with the Subdivision Ordinance, sends the plat to city departments for review and comments and, if it's in order, sends the Primary Plat to the Plan Commission.

The Plan Commission, upon proper notice, holds a public hearing and review the Primary Plat.

At the public hearing, the Plan Commission may approve the minor subdivision application, approve it with certain modifications that would bring the application into compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance or deny the application on the grounds that it does not comply with the Subdivision Ordinance. See the following Sections of our Subdivision Ordinance: Generally, Section 3.03(d); matters that the Plan Commission may consider are found at Section 3.03(e) and (f); the secondary plat (sometimes referred to as the final plat) is to include the information found at Section 3.08.

A Secondary Plat is filed with the enforcement officer (following approval of the Primary Plat) with documentation demonstrating that any conditions of primary plat approval have been met. The enforcement officer, if he determines that the requirements of the subdivision ordinance and all requirements have been met, can then approve the Secondary Plat.

Our Subdivision Ordinance also provide that any requirements may be modified or waived by the Plan Commission as it has the power to waive ("grant modifications") the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance as set out in Section 08.01. The necessary criteria to make such modifications are listed in Section 8.02. The Plan Department Report should indicate if any requirements are not met. It should be noted that, as set out in the Planning Department staff report, the proposed minor subdivision meets all of the requirements of our Zoning Ordinance and does not need any variances from the Zoning Ordinance development standards.
The submitted materials include:
(a) Michigan City Plan Commission Petition # 903-26 for Public Hearing signed by Petitioner/Applicant Nate Plooster.
(b) List of Property Owners within 300 feet (4 total pages).
Page 3 of 3
(c) Acknowledgement of Public Notice Requirements signed by Nate Plooster (Petitioner).
(d) Notice of Public Hearing for June 23, 2026.
(e) Affidavit of Service signed by Nate Plooster (Petitioner) and dated June 5, 2026.
(f) Owner Authorization Letter signed by Avi Coven, as owner (but with no explanation of connection with the Property). See Note above as to ownership.
(g) Second Notice of Public Hearing with full legal description.
(h) "Secondary Plat 'Twilight Crossing' Michigan City Indiana" prepared by Schneider Geomatics dated 5/29/26.

Attorney Hale asked Mr. Plooster if he will give permission/approval to the Planning Department to Correct his application being that he has put the wrong tax parcel on the application as well as the incorrect owner so it is accurate.

Attorney Hale stated that the signature on the authorization form is correct, he continues to go through the list of materials stating that everything else is correct. He stated that for the record the petitioner did submit primary plat it just was not on his list.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. DePalma asked staff for confirmation on staff analysis section 3a that the use is acceptable to operate under this use.

Dr. Edwards answered that because it is still going to operate under its historical use it is acceptable to operate.

Mr. DePalma asked about the easement and what the small figure of grey is extending between the two homes indicates.

Timothy Werner, City Engineer, answered that it is already existing pavement.

Mr. DePalma asked if it will be part of the easement.

Mr. Plooster referred to his surveyor.

Mr. DePalma stated that the current property has access from Franklin Street, Greenwood, and the Alley and going forwards the homes will only have access from Franklin. He asked all concerning parties is it acceptable that there is not any easements for parking regarding the homes.

Mr. Plooster answered that there is an old driveway that comes off from the existing parking lot going South that use to service the existing homes, it is over grown and has not been used recently but there is a hard black top service in that area.

Mr. DePalma asked if it is okay that the driveway is not in the easement.

Mr. Plooster answered yes, they do not intend to use it and believes the current owner does not intend on using it either, it is more of a walking path to their front door.

Mr. DePalma asked with it being a walking path, should it be included in the easement.

Mr. Plooster stated to answer Mr. DePalma's second question, they do supply parking to the two homes which would be the four spaces on the east side of the parking lot, from there they would be able to walk on the path to their homes.

Mr. DePalma asked if the current owner who will still own the homes in agreement on the easement plan.

Mr. Plooster answered yes.

Dr. Edwards stated that this is the reason why it is put into condition the agreement of a cross-access easement agreement within the staff reports.

Attorney Hale stated that an appropriate motion should be addressed to just the Primary Plat.

Mr. DePalma made a motion to approve the Primary Plat for petition 903-26 contingent upon meeting the two conditions set out by the Planning Department stated in the staff report and the notes from the attorneys report, seconded by Ms. Espar and was approved with the following vote:

AYE(7): Antonio Conley, Christina Espar, Fred Klinder, Rose Tejeda, Timothy Werner, Steve DePalma, Bryant Dabney
NAY(0):

OLD BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Edwards states that all workflow will now be digitized with CloudPermit, and there will be a training on our internal workflow for board members.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Tommy Kulavik, 1316 Ohio Street, made a comment.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Espar made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Klinder. The meeting was adjourned at 6:34 p.m.

President Bruce De' Medici

Secretary Fred Klinder