

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, August 6, 2020**

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, August 6, 2020 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 129 South Kalamazoo, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. | Meeting Convened |
| 2. Present: Larson, Bogen (phone), Brown (phone), Jarvis, Palenick, and Pioch. Also present: Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale and Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey. | Members Present |
| 3. Motion by Pioch, supported by Palenick, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Approval of Agenda |
| 4. Motion by Palenick, supported by Jarvis, to approve the minutes of the special Planning Commission meeting of June 24, 2020, as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Approval of Minutes |
| 5. No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered. | Public Comment |
| 6. Larson stated that no Public Hearing Item was scheduled for consideration. | Public Hearing Items |
| 7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration are proposed amendments to Article VI – Signs so as to respond to questions raised related to painted wall signs and changeable copy signs. | Ongoing Business:
Text Amendment -
Signs |
| <p>Harvey explained the questions raised on the existing sign standards and detailed the amendments to Article VI proposed to provide clarity on those issues. Specifically, a modification to Sec 42-433 a. – General Sign Regulations is proposed to clarify that a sign ‘painted directly on a wall or structure’ is allowed; a modification to Sec 42-438 is proposed to refer to ‘changeable copy sign’ as ‘changeable copy or electronic display sign’, consistent with the definition in the Ordinance; and, a modification to Sec 42-438 is proposed to clarify the existing standard that allows a ‘changeable copy or electronic display sign’ only as an element of an allowed sign.</p> <p>Following discussion, motion by Pioch, supported by Jarvis to accept the proposed amendments as drafted and to schedule same for public hearing at the September Planning Commission meeting. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.</p> | |
| 8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the request received for an amendment of Sec 42-370, Zoning Ordinance, to reduce the setback applicable to accessory buildings from 10 ft to 6 ft. | Ongoing Business:
Text Amendment -
Accessory Buildings |

Planning Commission members noted the following discussion elements of June 24, 2020:

- In 2019, the height, setback and size standards applicable to accessory buildings were recommended to be increased in conjunction with the proposed amendment authorizing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in accessory buildings.
- The Village Council approved the recommended increase in accessory building setback and size standards . . . but did not approve an increased building height standard nor allow the ADU use option.
- It was questioned if the 10 ft side setback requirement is necessary if the increased building height and additional use option (ADU) are not authorized.
- The setback requirements for principal buildings; the purpose of side setback standards; and, the desired dimensional relationship between a principal building and accessory building were studied.

Following continued discussion of the matter, it was determined that a reduction of the 10 ft side setback requirement to 6 ft would be comparable to the original 3 ft setback requirement; is consistent with the side setback requirement applicable to a principal building (8 ft/20 ft); would provide the building separation required by fire codes; and, would support the intended relationship between the side setback and the use, size and height of the building. It was further noted that the standard can be revisited if the ADU use option is reconsidered.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis to accept the proposal to reduce the 10 ft side setback for accessory buildings to 6 ft and to schedule same for public hearing at the September Planning Commission meeting. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

It was noted again that the Master Plan supports the new housing options recommended in 2019 . . . and additional housing is still needed in the Village. It was also recognized that Paw Paw Township is currently considering an amendment of their Zoning Ordinance to allow ADUs.

Support for a joint meeting of the Village Council and the Planning Commission for the opportunity to discuss the Plan's residential/housing policies and the details of the housing options recommended in 2019 was reiterated. Jarvis agreed to pursue the suggestion with Village Council.

Bogen expressed concern with the enforcement of the accessory building height limitation and the need for building design standards for residential

accessory buildings, similar to those applicable to commercial buildings. Specifically, he requested consideration of building break requirements to avoid expansive blank walls in residential districts. It was agreed to add the matter to the PC Work Plan.

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration is discussion of the Gateway Planned Unit Development District. She referenced the Memo provided by Harvey framing the discussion on the subject.

**Ongoing Business:
G-PUD District**

Harvey referenced the study conducted on the use of a gateway district in the community and provided an overview of the elements of the proposed gateway district text. She noted that the G-PUD District for the North Gateway was recently adopted by Paw Paw Township.

Planning Commission discussion ensued wherein the following points of consensus were noted:

- The proposed gateway districts are supported by and designed to implement the Master Plan.
- There is support for use of the gateway approach; with specific reference to uniform design standards and a wayfinding system.
- The West Gateway should extend west to the Village Limits.
- The South Gateway should extend south to I-94.

There was agreement to study/discuss each gateway district separately. To that end, consideration of the North Gateway PUD District was scheduled for the September Planning Commission meeting.

10. The Planning Commission prioritized the 2020-2021 PC Work Plan developed in April and accepted in May.
11. No member comments were offered.
12. No staff comments were offered.
10. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**Ongoing Business:
PC Work Plan**

Member Comments

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

Adjournment