

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, September 7, 2017**

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, September 7, 2017 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. | Meeting Convened |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Pioch and Rumsey. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey and Assistant Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale. | Members Present |
| 3. | Motion by Pioch, supported by Hildebrandt, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Approval of Agenda |
| 4. | Motion by Jarvis, supported by Pioch, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of August 3, 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 the next item for consideration was the proposed amendments of the Zoning Ordinance associated with the establishment of the Waterfront Overlay District | Public Hearing:
WF Overlay District |

Larson noted that a public hearing on the proposed text was held at the June 1, 2017 and July 6, 2017 Planning Commission meetings and was further postponed to the September meeting to allow for continued consideration of the proposed vegetative buffer requirement. She noted that the rest of the proposed text had generally received support.

Harvey presented 'shoreline vegetative buffer' text modified in response to public input received to date and Planning Commission discussion. She explained that the revised provision essentially establishes the vegetative buffer as a guideline instead of a requirement, allows for a lot coverage increase as an incentive to establish a vegetative buffer, and provides additional information on the benefits of a vegetative buffer and the elements of good buffer design. Copies of the proposed revised text were provided to the public in attendance.

Lengthy Planning Commission discussion ensued wherein support for the revised approach was expressed. It was noted that the vegetative buffer provision should be relocated to the General Design Standards/Guidelines section of the District. Minor revisions to Subsections C. and E. were also suggested.

Larson referenced a letter received from Frank Walters noting opposition

to the proposed WF District. Mr. Walters was present and stated that he objects to any new requirements, even the revised vegetative buffer provision.

Jeff Brown stated that he finds the proposed WF District acceptable with the revised vegetative buffer provision.

Anne Smith noted that many properties that front Maple Lake cannot accommodate a vegetative buffer. She added that the Maple Lake Association has better knowledge as to what is appropriate for Maple Lake.

Deb Slazer expressed support for the revised vegetative buffer provision. Don Welch suggested that the vegetative buffer provision be considered a requirement only for commercial properties.

General discussion ensued regarding the definition of 'lot coverage', the application of the lot coverage standard, and appropriate vegetative buffer materials. Dave Jones expressed appreciation for the proposed revision to the vegetative buffer provision.

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

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Rumsey, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed WF Waterfront Overlay District, with the noted revisions to the vegetative buffer provision and Subsections C. and E. All members voting yes. The **motion carried**.

7. Larson referenced correspondence received dated July 19, 2017 regarding a '*Proposal to Amend Village Ordinance to Allow Honeybees and Certain Fowl/Livestock in Village Limits*'. It had been agreed that discussion of the request would be scheduled for the September meeting.

**New Business:
Text Amendment
Request – Keeping
of Animals**

Harvey noted that there is a trend in allowing the 'keeping of animals' in urban areas and that many communities have structured their Zoning Ordinance to allow them within certain parameters. She noted that if the Planning Commission felt that it was appropriate for the Village of Paw Paw to consider allowing the 'keeping of animals', a review of sample ordinances would be in order. Moyer-Cale stated that she receives many inquiries regarding the keeping of bees and chickens within the Village.

Dave and Ellen Jones expressed support for allowing chickens within the Village and supported the idea of regulating it based on lot size.

Following general discussion of the request, the Planning Commission

noted interest in looking at how other communities are currently allowing for the keeping of bees and chickens. It was agreed that consideration was in order given the request received, the public comments noted, and a recognition of trends on the keeping of animals. A review of sample ordinances was scheduled for the October meeting.

- 8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the proposed amendment to the definition of ‘Lot’ set forth in Section 42-3. She noted that draft text had been provided for Planning Commission discussion.

**New Business:
Text Amendment -
Definition of ‘Lot’**

Harvey provided an overview of the questions raised regarding the existing definition of ‘lot’ and the recent ZBA interpretation on the matter. She noted that clarification of the existing definition had been added to the Planning Commission Work Plan. Harvey referenced the draft text provided.

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

- 9. Larson noted that the proposed revisions to the DOD (and PUD) sign standards (Section 42-259) and the definition of ‘Lot Area’ (Section 42-3) had been finalized in August and are scheduled for public hearing in October.
- 10. Larson requested an update on the ‘dog park’ proposed within the Village Revitalization Area. Moyer-Cale advised that detailed design of the park has not yet received final approval. She noted that the future of the abutting railway is unknown and is causing some delay in the project.
- 12. No staff comments were offered.
- 13. There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Ongoing Business:

Member Comments

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

Adjournment