

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, January 3, 2019**

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, January 3, 2019 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 114 North Gremps, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. **Meeting Convened**

2. Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Palenick, and Pioch. Also present: Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale and Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey. **Members Present**

3. **Motion** by Jarvis, **supported** by Pioch, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**. **Approval of Agenda**

4. **Motion** by Jarvis, **supported** by Palenick, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of December 6, 2018 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 the next item for consideration was the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance so as to prohibit the establishment and/or operation of ‘any and all types of a “marihuana establishment” in any zoning district’ within the Village of Paw Paw. **Public Hearing Item - Prohibition of Marihuana Establishments**

Moyer-Cale noted that, at the direction of Village Council, a proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that will add Section 42-372 – Marihuana Establishments Prohibited, was prepared by Village legal counsel and submitted to the Planning Commission for public hearing.

Harvey noted that the draft text had been accepted by the Planning Commission at the December meeting and a public hearing was scheduled for the January 3, 2019 meeting.

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

Motion was then made by Palenick, **supported** by Jarvis, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment to add Section 42-372 – Marihuana Establishments Prohibited. All members present voting yes. The motion **carried unanimously**.

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by Village staff for Planning Commission reaffirmation of its recommendation for Village Council approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment **New Business: Waterfront Overlay District – PC**

to add Division 14 – Waterfront Overlay District.

Reaffirmation of Recommendation

Harvey noted that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed Waterfront Overlay District in June – September, 2017 and recommended approval of the proposed District on September 7, 2017. She added that the recommendation did not include the rezoning of any property so as to apply the proposed overlay district but that the Planning Commission intended to proceed with the requisite rezonings following adoption of the amendment.

Moyer-Cale explained that Village Council action on the Planning Commission’s 2017 recommendation to approve the Waterfront Overlay District was delayed due to the dam situation in Fall of 2017 and water quality issues throughout 2018. Given the delay, she explained that Village Council is requesting reaffirmation of the recommendation to approve.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to reaffirm the recommendation for Village Council approval of the proposed Waterfront Overlay District, subject to relocation of the vegetative buffer provision to Section 42-355 and minor revisions to Subsection c. and E. of Section 42-356 (as was recommended on September 7, 2017.) All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the review/revision of the residential districts. Specifically, a final review of Draft #3 - revisions to the R-2 District to provide for accessory dwelling units and cottage housing.

**OnGoing Business:
Residential Districts
- ‘missing middle
housing’**

Harvey stated that the Planning Commission reached consensus on draft amendments to the R-2 District; a necessary modification to Section 42-362 – Structures; a new Section 42-372 – Accessory Dwelling Units; and a necessary modification to Section 42-370 – Accessory Buildings in December. She presented Draft #3, noting that the draft text reflects the Commission’s final revisions made in December.

Harvey noted that the Planning Commission had also completed review of Draft #2 of Section 42-373 – Cottage Housing in December, with a request for modifications. She presented Draft #3, noting the inclusion of earlier review comments.

Planning Commission review and discussion of Draft #3 ensued wherein the following was noted:

- : (b) – Table
 - minimum/maximum cluster size – what is the objective

of mandating 25% of cottage units within a cluster to be less than 1000 sq ft in size . . variety of size or limiting larger footprints? discussion to continue

- should attached garages/carports be allowed?
- common open space and parking space standards discussed at length and accepted
- building coverage should be noted as ‘maximum’ allowed

: (d) – 1. Common Open Space – combine and rephrase c. and f.; add i. prohibiting inclusion of wetlands and storm water retention areas as common open space

: (d) – 2. Community building – revise c. to reference pitched roof; add d. to prohibit inclusion as common open space

: (f) – 4. Cottage Units Setbacks – does the Fire Department require 150 ft?

: (g) – 2. Parking Area Design – separate f. into 2 standards

General consensus on the remaining elements of the draft text was noted.

In response to Planning Commission inquiry in December related to cottage housing heights, Harvey compiled sample house plans for cottage housing with building footprints and heights noted. General discussion ensued wherein the connection between the cottage housing profile and the cottage housing design standards in the text was observed.

Harvey was then directed to revise Draft #3 per Planning Commission discussion for continued review in February.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 9. | Jarvis and Palenick advised they would be absent for the February Planning Commission meeting. | Member Comments |
| 10. | No staff comments were offered at this time. | Village Manager/
Planning Consultant |
| 11. | There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m. | Adjournment |