Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, September 5, 2019

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, September 5, 2019 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 114 North Gremps, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.

2. Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Palenick, and Pioch. Also present: Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.

3. Motion by Pioch, supported by Bogen, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.

4. Motion by Jarvis, supported by Palenick, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of August 1, 2019 as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.

5. No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.

6. Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to amend the sign standards applicable within the Village Revitalization Area PUD District and to add the definition of ‘Development Sign’ to Section 42-3 – Definitions. Larson opened the public hearing.

   Larson referenced the public hearing notice wherein the proposed amendments are detailed. It was noted that the Commission has had extensive discussion on the matter since June, 2019.

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

   Motion by Pioch, supported by Palenick, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendments to Sec 42-348 – Streetscape Design Requirements (signs) of the PUD District and Sec 42-3 – Definitions, as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was continued discussion of the regulation of medical marihuana facilities in the Village.

   Larson referenced draft text dated September 5, 2019 prepared pursuant to the Planning Commission’s detailed discussions in July and August. Harvey provided an overview of the draft text noting the role of the use standards set forth in Sec 42-367 (28) to address
facility impact concerns and the consistency of the draft text with the adopted ordinance of Paw Paw Township.

Larson expressed concern that the draft text does not include a standard for separation of facilities from schools, parks, etc. Planning Commission members noted that the matter had been discussed in August and consensus reached to not include the minimum parcel size standard or the facility separation requirements found in the Paw Paw Township ordinance. It was further noted that use standard #7 will allow the Planning Commission to adequately consider locational concerns.

**Motion** by Jarvis, **supported** by Bogen, to accept the draft text as presented and to schedule same for public hearing in October. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration is the proposed review and revision of the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the authorization of ‘public or municipal buildings’ within the Village.

Harvey provided an overview of the PC Memo dated September 5, 2019, noting the following:

- A ‘public or municipal building’ is currently only allowed within the CBD, R-O, and I-1/I-2 Districts within the Village . . making those 4 districts the only options available for any municipal building.

- Each of the 4 districts refers to such a use differently. (ie. ‘publicly owned building, including government facilities’ vs. ‘public building and use’ vs. ‘municipal building and use’)

- The Planning Commission should consider the establishment of common/consistent terminology for a ‘public or municipal building’ . . and then 1) amend the CBD, R-O, and I-1/I-2 Districts to allow for said use uniformly; and 2) consider other districts where the Village may want to allow a ‘public or municipal building’ and amend those districts accordingly.

Don Stull, Paw Paw Township Supervisor was present and spoke to the recent work by the Township to identify a site for a new fire station and the results of the site search study. He noted that the Zoning Ordinance question was initially raised in response to the Township’s efforts to locate appropriately-zoned property in the Village. Fire Department personnel were also present to provide background on the needs of the Department and the objectives of the new fire station location.

Planning Commission discussion ensued pursuant to the Memo and the
following points of consensus were noted:

- There is support for selecting a common/consistent Zoning Ordinance term for ‘public buildings’; ‘public and/or municipal buildings’ was selected.

- There is support for modifying the provisions in the CBD, RO, and I-1/I-2 Districts so as to replace current terminology with ‘public and/or municipal buildings’.

- It would be reasonable to allow a ‘public and/or municipal building’ in the PUD District . . but no other districts appear appropriate at this time.

Harvey was directed to to prepare draft text pursuant to the Commission’s points of consensus.

**Motion** by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to schedule the draft text for public hearing in October. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was a request for the Planning Commission to schedule a review of the design/architectural requirements of the PUD District. Commission members inquired as to the questions/concerns raised with the district standards.

Harvey advised that she will seek additional guidance from the Village Manager and provide feedback for discussion in October.

10. No member comments were offered.

11. No staff comments were offered.

12. There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.