

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, September 3, 2020**

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. The Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, September 3, 2020 convened at 7:00 p.m. Chairperson Larson presiding. The Planning Commission meeting was conducted through electronic remote access due to Executive Order. | Meeting Convened |
| 2. Present: Larson, Bogen, Brown, Jarvis, Palenick, and Pioch. Also present: Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey. | Members Present |
| 3. Bogen requested the amendment of the agenda to include a discussion of building design standards for residential accessory buildings under New Business. Motion by Brown, supported by Bogen, to approve the agenda as amended. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Approval of Agenda |
| 4. Motion by Pioch, supported by Palenick, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of August 6, 2020, as presented. The motion carried 5-0, with Bogen abstaining. | Approval of Minutes |
| 5. No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered. | Public Comment |
| 6. Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the proposed amendment of Sec 42-370, Zoning Ordinance to reduce the side setback applicable to accessory buildings from 10 ft to 6 ft. Larson opened the public hearing.

Brown requested confirmation that an amendment of this setback standard is possible if the Village moves forward with allowing Accessory Dwelling Units in the future. Harvey advised that an amendment of the provision remains an option.

No public comment was offered and Larson closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Motion was made by Bogen, supported by Jarvis, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendment of Sec 42-370 (b) – Accessory Buildings, as set forth in the September 3, 2020 Notice of Public Hearing. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Public Hearing:
Text Amendment -
Accessory Buildings |
| 7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration are the proposed amendments of Sec 42-333 and Sec 42-438, Zoning Ordinance to respond to questions raised related to painted wall signs and changeable copy signs.

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 | Public Hearing:
Text Amendment -
Signs |

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.

No public comment was offered and Larson closed the public comment portion of the public hearing.

Motion was made by Bogen, **supported** by Jarvis, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendments of Sec 42-433 – General Sign Regulations and Sec 42-438 – Changeable Copy Signs, as set forth in the September 3, 2020 Notice of Public Hearing. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the suggestion for an amendment of Sec 42-370, Zoning Ordinance to include a design standard that would require a visual or physical break in the walls of of residential accessory buildings to prevent expansive blank walls.

**New Business:
Text Amendment -
Accessory Buildings**

Bogen stated that a blank wall of a large accessory building can be negatively impactful when located in close proximity to a residence. He noted that the Ordinance allows a 12 ft x 70 ft accessory building, and that a 70 ft long blank wall situated within the allowed 12 ft of a residence is not desirable.

Planning Commission discussion ensued wherein it was noted that lot coverage and building setback requirements serve to further limit building size in the residential districts. It was also observed that residences are not subject to the building design standards being suggested for accessory buildings. Likely accessory building dimensions and alternate approaches to addressing blank walls, such as window requirements, were also discussed.

It was then agreed to consider a visual break requirement for residential accessory buildings similar to that established for commercial buildings given the potential for a residential accessory building to not have windows and the similarity in impact they can have on adjacent properties.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to direct Harvey to prepare draft text establishing a 20 ft visual break requirement applicable to residential accessory buildings and to schedule same for public hearing at the next available meeting. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

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 in August framing the discussion on the subject.

**Ongoing Business:
G-PUD District**

Harvey provided an overview of the elements of the proposed G-PUD District for the North Gateway. In response to questions, she noted the uses allowed are generally similar to the existing zoning in the area, but reclassifies existing uses of higher intensity as special land uses; offers some expanded use options as special land uses; and proposes the addition of design standards. Harvey confirmed that Paw Paw Township recently adopted/applied the G-PUD District to Township properties located within the proposed North Gateway boundaries.

Planning Commission discussion ensued regarding the proposed boundaries of the G-PUD District and the existing parcel layout and land use pattern in the area. During the discussion, it was discovered that many Commissioners did not have several of the maps contained within the original report, which was leading to confusion in the discussion. Harvey advised that the missing maps will be copied and distributed to the Commission.

Pioch also suggested that all Planning Commission members conduct an individual walking tour of the North Gateway to better understand the scope and foundation of the proposed G-PUD District.

Continued discussion of the North Gateway PUD District was scheduled for the October Planning Commission meeting.

10. Pioch observed that adoption of the proposed Waterfront District is still pending and expressed concern regarding the impact that a lack of standards will have on vacant waterfront property.

Member Comments

Bogen questioned the recent construction of the silos at St Julian's. He opined that they qualify as 'storage units' or 'outdoor storage' and as such are not allowed within the B-2 District. Harvey responded that the silos are allowed as accessory structures and are excepted from the 45 ft height standard through the application of Section 42-362 d. She advised that they were reviewed/approved through the permit process.

11. No staff comments were offered.

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

10. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Adjournment