Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, March 2, 2017

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, March 2, 2017 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.

Meeting Convened

2. Present: Larson, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey and Assistant Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale.

Members Present

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

Approval of Agenda

4. Motion by Thomas, supported by Jarvis, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of February 2, 2017 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 no Public Hearing Item was scheduled for consideration.

Public Hearing Item

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was Board discussion of the proposed Waterfront Overlay District prepared by the WMU Planning Studio Class and presented in April, 2016. She noted that the Planning Commission had initiated review of the proposed text in May, 2016 and had expressed support for the proposed approach and the suggested district depth of 100 ft at that time. It had then been agreed that an in-depth review of the text would be placed on the next available agenda.

OnGoing Business: Waterfront Overlay District

Harvey provided a new overview of the proposed Waterfront Overlay District. Lengthy Board discussion of the following elements ensued:

- the definition/application of ‘ordinary high water mark’;
- the proposed 100 ft district depth;
- the 15 ft vegetative buffer requirement – specifically, its application to existing land use, adopting it as a guideline vs. a requirement, the objective of a vegetative buffer, implementation through the SPR process, the 15 ft buffer dimension, and the nature of a ‘vegetative buffer’.

In response to Board questions, Harvey noted that the requirements of the proposed Overlay District would not apply to existing development. She
clarified that applicable standards of the district would, however, apply to new construction on developed sites.

Pioch agreed that the vegetative buffer requirement should not be required for existing development but added that the standard has merit and should be encouraged on all waterfront property.

In response to Board questions, Harvey stated that the model ordinance prepared by MDNR, sample ordinances from other communities, and a review of the existing waterfront properties in the Village were studied in the development of the draft text and the proposed 15 ft vegetative buffer and 100 ft district dimensional standards.

It was noted that a boardwalk-type improvement would be allowed within the required shoreline vegetative buffer pursuant to D.3. of the proposed district. Review of the photos set forth in the draft district were referenced to confirm the nature of the vegetative buffer envisioned by the standard.

There was general consensus regarding the merit of using illustrations of desired vegetative buffers to educate property owners about the standard. Moyer-Cale advised that the Village can also provide assistance in obtaining the necessary natural vegetation through the natural shoreline program with MDEQ.

In review of the balance of the draft text, the following was noted:

- photos for subsection D.3. would be helpful
- subsection E. is satisfactory
- consider making subsection F. – Items 1. – 3. requirements instead of guidelines
- support for the approach set forth in subsection F.6.
- the draft Waterfront Overlay District Map is satisfactory

It was agreed that a public hearing on the draft text would be tentatively scheduled for May, or the next available Planning Commission meeting.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was Board discussion of the revised draft sign ordinance. Harvey stated that the draft text (dated March 2, 2017) reflects revisions made pursuant to the Board’s last review.

Larson noted that additional revisions from the last Board review are needed. Harvey stated that she will confirm that the draft text has received all requested updates and proceed with submission to Village legal counsel.

It was agreed that a public hearing on the draft text would be tentatively scheduled for April, or following receipt of legal counsel review.
9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was review of the Village of Paw Paw Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Moyer-Cale distributed the ‘final draft’ of the CIP and a memo on same dated February 27, 2017. She provided an overview of the CIP, noting the following:

- purpose/development process
- required review by Planning Commission
- proposed CIP projects with land use implications
- the CIP is updated/adopted annually
- 2017 projects have been included in the budget
- Village Council action is scheduled for March 13, 2017

Motion by Pioch, supported Jarvis, to affirm that the proposed CIP is consistent with the Village of Paw Paw Master Plan. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.

10. Larson distributed a draft of the 2016 Planning Commission Annual Report and requested Board member review of the document in preparation for action at the April meeting.

11. No staff comments were offered.

12. There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.