

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, January 7, 2021**

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | The Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, January 7, 2021 convened at 7:00 p.m. Chairperson Larson presiding. The Planning Commission meeting was conducted through electronic remote access.   | <b>Meeting Convened</b>                      |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Brown, Jarvis, Palenick, and Pioch. Also Present: Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale and Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.   | <b>Members Present</b>                       |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Palenick, <b>supported</b> by Jarvis, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>                    |
| 4. | <b>Motion</b> by Jarvis, <b>supported</b> by Palenick, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of December 3, 2020, with a correction to Page 4, Item 10 to note the accessory building is ‘east’, not ‘west’, of Madison. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>                   |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.  | <b>Public Comment</b>                        |
| 6. | Larson stated that no Public Hearing Item is scheduled for consideration.  | <b>Public Hearing Items</b>                  |
| 7. | Larson stated that no New Business is scheduled for consideration.   | <b>New Business</b>                          |
| 8. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the requested discussion of the fencing standard set forth in Sec 42-405(c)(3) and the use of barbed wire fences in the Village. She reminded that the matter had been discussed in November, 2020, wherein the Planning Commission declined to approve the use of barbed wire fencing at the VBCO storage building and requested Village Council feedback prior to considering the requested amendment of the fence standard. | <b>Ongoing Business:<br/>Fence Standards</b> |

Moyer-Cale stated that the Village Council discussed the matter and voiced support for the use of barbed wire fencing at the VBCO storage building. To that end, they requested the Planning Commission consider an amendment of Sec 42-405(c)(3) that would allow the use of barbed wire fencing at facilities similar to the County storage building, while still limiting general use of barbed wire in the Village.

Harvey referenced the PC Memo provided on the subject, noting that she has compiled/developed alternate fencing standards that speak to ‘protective measure fencing’ to facilitate further Commission discussion of the matter.

Larson offered the following observations in her study of the issue:

- The use of barbed wire is the least expensive way to secure property, while more effective ways to secure property are through the use of exterior/interior lighting, motion detection, and a surveillance system.
- The use of barbed wire fencing is antiquated and no longer typical of urban areas.
- The effective use of barbed wire is suggested to require 9 ft fence heights where the barbed wire feature is outward-leaning . . which does not seem appropriate for a largely residential area frequented by school buses.
- Alternatives such as new anti-climb/anti-cut fence styles may be more supportable.

Larson expressed disappointment that the Village Council modified their previous position of prohibiting barbed wire fencing in the Village with little cause and without careful study.

Pioch inquired about the proposed use of barbed wire fencing at the VBCO storage building. Specifically, how close to the road and visible will the fencing be? He questioned why there was pressure to allow barbed wire fencing now . . reiterating that such fencing is not typical or desirable for urban areas and that alternative security measures appear to be available.

In response to the site-specific questions posed, Moyer-Cale presented the revised site plan for the VBCO storage building on which the updated fence proposal was indicated. She stated that the Council has asked the Planning Commission to pursue allowing barbed wire at this site. It would be within the Commission's purview to offer a range of ideas on the subject and explanations as to why the use of barbed wire is a concern.

Bogen noted his confusion at the County's choice of the location for the building given their concern for security. He feels the use of the building has changed from what was originally presented and approved, which may be what is causing the problem. He restated his position that fencing is not the best security measure.

Following lengthy discussion, the following points of consensus were noted:

- Discretion for allowing barbed wire fencing should not be available in the review process; it should be clearly allowed/disallowed.
- A 'protective measures fencing' standard be considered instead of reference to 'barbed wire fencing'.
- 'Protective measures fencing' should be defined to clarify if it includes barbed wire fencing. (photos should be used)

Harvey was directed to prepare draft text per the discussion of the Planning Commission for review at the February meeting

9. Larson stated that the next matter for consideration is discussion of the Gateway Planned Unit Development District. She noted that the G-PUD District was last discussed in September, whereafter missing maps were copied to Commissioners and individual walking tours of the North Gateway were conducted in preparation for continued discussion.

**Ongoing Business:  
G-PUD District**

In continued review of the North Gateway PUD provisions, the following questions were raised:

- Why is the PUD approach (or any zoning change) needed to improve the area's function as a gateway?
- How is the proposed PUD approach different than the existing zoning Pattern? (ie – how does the G-PUD District implement the Master Plan objectives better than the existing zoning?)
- Is the proposed North Gateway Boundary acceptable?

It was then suggested that, given the changed make-up of the Planning Commission and the time that has passed since the G-PUD Study was first introduced to the Village, there was merit in having the G-PUD District re-introduced to the Planning Commission. Through a re-introduction, key factors such as 1) how the G-PUD District will implement the Master Plan, and 2) how the proposed G-PUD District differs from the existing zoning districts, can be explained. Harvey agreed to schedule such a presentation for the next available Planning Commission meeting.

10. Bogen referenced the recently constructed accessory building on East Michigan (east of Madison), and again inquired about the number of vehicles frequently parked around the building. He reiterated his concern that it is being used as something other than a residential accessory building.

**Member Comments**

Moyer-Cale stated that she requested the complaint be investigated but that she is not aware of the findings from the inspection. She noted she would follow up on the matter.

11. Moyer-Cole provided information on the M-40 bridge reconstruction project scheduled for 2025.

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

12. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:24 p.m.

**Adjournment**