

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, February 1, 2018**

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, February 1, 2018 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 114 North Gremps, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. | Meeting Convened |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Hildebrandt, Pioch, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey. | Members Present |
| 3. | Motion by Pioch, supported by Thomas, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Approval of Agenda |
| 4. | Motion by Pioch, supported by Bogen, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of January 4, 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 to clarify the existing definitions of ‘restaurant’ and to revise the standards applicable to ‘drive in restaurants’. She reminded that the matter had been placed on the 2017-2018 Planning Commission Work Plan after use/design issues were raised by several ‘drive-in’ restaurant proposals during the last year.

Harvey stated that the draft text had received lengthy consideration at the November meeting and was revised pursuant to the Commission’s discussion. She noted that the revised text received further Planning Commission review in January prior to scheduling the public hearing for February.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

Bogen questioned if there was a need to include screening standards in Section 42-367 (10) that would apply if a restaurant was to be located opposite residential land use. Harvey referenced existing screening standards set forth in Section 42-404 (5) that would apply to a restaurant parking lot that was adjacent to or opposite residential zoning/land use and Section 42-405 (b) that would apply to a nonresidential use abutting a residential zone/use. Commission members agreed that no additional standard is necessary.

Following Planning Commission discussion, it was agreed that the proposed clarifications of the definitions and the proposed amendment to | Public Hearing:
Text Amendment -
Restaurants |

Section 42-376 (10) address the use/design issues previously raised.

Motion was then made by Thomas, **supported** by Bogen, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendments to Section 42-3 – Definitions and Section 42-367 (10) – Drive In Restaurant. All members present voting yes. The motion **carried unanimously**.

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to allow the keeping of bees and chickens in the Village. She noted that draft text had been considered in November and January, including consideration of review comments provided by Village staff.

**Public Hearing:
Text Amendment -
Keeping of Animals**

No public comment was offered on the matter.

Planning Commission discussion of the draft text ensued regarding allowing accessory buildings to be located on the streetside of waterfront lots, noting that the proposed Section 42-407 (b) (4) limits the location of ‘covered and fenced enclosures’ to the rear yard. It was agreed that the first sentence in Subsection (b) (4) should be deleted so that ‘covered and fenced enclosures’ are treated similarly as accessory buildings/structures by Section 42-370 (5) for waterfront and non-waterfront lots.

Bogen questioned the proposed definition of ‘livestock’ . . . and whether such a definition would inadvertently allow the keeping of commercial livestock within the Village. It was agreed that the definition is intended to address only the ‘non-commercial keeping of animals’ and so distinguishes between ‘household pets’ and ‘livestock’. It was further noted that the proposed definition of ‘livestock’ includes the statement ‘. . . primarily for the use of the owner of the animal and not for commercial purposes.’

Motion was then made by Pioch, **supported** by Bogen, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendments to Section 42-3 – Definitions and Section 42-407 (10) – Miscellaneous addressing the keeping of bees and chickens within the Village, as revised. All members present voting yes. The motion **carried**.

8. Harvey reported that the Planning Studio class at Western Michigan University has selected a project within the Village of Paw and Paw Paw Township and has requested the opportunity to present the project to the Planning Commission in April.

New Business

It was determined that a special meeting of the Planning Commission will be scheduled for the week of April 16th. Harvey stated that she

will provide the Commission with date options for that week after consultation with the class. Given the nature of the project, it was noted that the Village Council and members of the Paw Paw Township Board and Planning Commission will also be invited to attend.

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the proposed *‘review and revision of the residential zoning districts (and related Ordinance provisions) so as to implement the residential policies set forth in the Master Plan, specifically as they relate to ‘missing middle housing’*. She noted that the item had been placed on the Planning Commission Work Plan in response to the residential policies established in the recently adopted Master Plan; the findings of the recently completed Target Market Analysis for the Village; and, the reported conclusions of Project Rising Tide.

New Business

Harvey gave an overview of the premise of the proposal and highlighted the concept of ‘missing middle housing’. Lengthy Planning Commission discussion ensued regarding the concept of ‘missing middle housing’ and how it is impacted by current residential land use standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance.

It was agreed that the matter was ripe for Planning Commission consideration. Harvey was directed to prepare a memo on the topic outlining suggested amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that would respond to the residential policies/conclusions set forth in the plans and give the Planning Commission a framework for moving forward on the topic.

10. Larson referenced a recent article in Planning/Zoning News regarding available options to communities for addressing ‘vacant buildings’. It was agreed that the article would be distributed for Planning Commission consideration and the matter placed back on the Work Plan for additional consideration.
9. No staff comments were offered.
10. There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Member Comments

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

Adjournment