

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Special Meeting, May 20, 2021**

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | The special Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, May 20, 2021 convened at 2:00 p.m. at 114 N. Gremps, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.  | <b>Meeting Convened</b>                  |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Brown, Hellwege, Nottingham, and Palenick. Also Present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey   | <b>Members Present</b>                   |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Palenick, <b>supported</b> by Hellwege, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .  | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>                |
| 4. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.   | <b>Public Comment</b>                    |
| 5. | Larson stated that no Public Hearing Item was scheduled for consideration.  | <b>Public Hearing</b>                    |
| 6. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the request by Eric Cook, Taphouse & Bistro, for a Modification to an Architectural Requirement applicable within the Downtown Overlay District for an awning proposal. | <b>New Business:<br/>Taphouse Awning</b> |

Harvey reminded that the proposed awning is allowed within the District, but that the proposed wood/metal are outside the scope of materials allowed by Section 42-255 (5). She noted that the Commission will be guided by Section 42-257 – Modifications to Architectural Requirements in considering the proposed wood/galvanized steel materials.

Larson stated that a discussion of the proposal had occurred at the May 6, 2021 Planning Commission meeting wherein general support for the concept was noted but a request for more accurate/detailed graphics had been requested.

Eric Cook presented the requested graphics of the awning proposal, noting the following:

- The proposed design (and materials) is popular in urban centers; he wants to bring the look of Michigan’s active economic centers to downtown.
- The proposed materials are durable; they will not age/degrade as quickly or as visibly as the allowed canvas material.
- There are many examples of metal roofs in the immediate area (photographs provided) suggesting the proposed awning material is in character with other buildings in the downtown.
- Most existing metal roofs in the area are part of the visible storefront; the proposed awning for Taphouse is single-story and will be located only in the side yard, set back from the storefront building line.

Palenick, Hellwege and Brown agreed that use of the proposed materials for the side yard awning as designed would be in character with the downtown environment. Nottingham added that the design (and materials) was sleek and well suited to other construction in the area.

Larson expressed concern with the galvanized steel appearance (color/corrugated) and the how much of the steel would be visible, noting that she did not want to promote pole barn structures in the downtown. She suggested painting or covering the steel with another material.

Bogen questioned if painting of the galvanized steel could be required if there were signs of degradation. Harvey noted that the criteria set forth in Section 42-257 provide for consideration of appearance, quality and durability, not degradation, but that zoning compliance does involve the maintenance element.

General discussion ensued regarding the distinctions of the awning proposal that support use of wood/galvanized steel that would not necessarily apply to future proposals in the downtown. It was noted that the location of the awning in the side yard, and not on the storefront; the size and orientation of the awning in relation to the outdoor seating area and adjacent buildings; the height of the awning; and, the visibility of the materials given the design of the awning, allow for a finding of compatibility that is unique to this specific proposal.

**Motion** by Palenick, **supported** by Brown, to approve the use of wood/galvanized steel on the proposed awning over the outdoor seating area on the west side of the existing Taphouse building, as reflected on the drawing/graphic presented by the applicant, based on 1) a finding of general consistency with the awning standards of Section 42-255 (5); 2) the evaluation of the proposed awning materials per the criteria of Section 42-257, including consideration of the information provided in the application material; and, 3) the discussion of the Planning Commission that led to a finding of compatibility that is unique to the proposal. The **motion carried 4 to 1**, Larson dissenting.

- |     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 7.  | Larson stated that no Ongoing Business was scheduled for consideration.                               | <b>Ongoing Business:</b>                        |
| 8.  | No member comments were offered.  | <b>Member Comments</b>                          |
| 9.  | No staff comments were offered.   | <b>Village Manager/<br/>Planning Consultant</b> |
| 12. | There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m. | <b>Adjournment</b>                              |