

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, December 1, 2016**

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, December 1, 2016 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. **Meeting Convened**
2. Present: Larson, 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 Thomas, 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 October 6, 2016 as presented. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**. **Approval of Minutes**

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of November 3, 2016 as presented. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**
5. No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered. **Public Comment**
6. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by Van Buren County for Site Plan Review for the proposed Van Buren County Jail Addition and Renovation Project. The subject property is located at 205 South Kalamazoo Street and is within the CBD District. **SPR – Van Buren County Jail Addition**

Doug Cultra, County Administrator and DLZ, project architects, were present on behalf of the application. DLZ provided an overview of the project, highlighting the proposed building design and site improvements. It was noted that the building addition has been designed to appear similar to the existing building. Building elevations and renderings were reviewed.

In response to questions, it was noted that limited inside parking is proposed in the building addition and that the existing driveway will be used primarily for drop off. It was further noted that the site plan proposes the use of fencing with slats in the service area. It was confirmed that the service area will not be used for storage and only requires limited security.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Section 42-402 – Site Plan Review, with additional reference to the Planning/

Zoning Report.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Jarvis, to recommend Village Council approval of the site plan for the proposed Van Buren County Jail Addition and Renovation Project on property located at 205 South Kalamazoo Street based upon a finding that the proposal meets the criteria for Site Plan Approval set forth in Section 42-402 (4), Zoning Ordinance, and **subject to the following conditions:**

1. The fencing/gates proposed in the new service area shall comply with Section 42-405 (c) and shall not include privacy slats.
2. Proposed outdoor lighting shall comply with Section 42-405 (a) – *Lighting*.
3. The proposed building addition is found to meet the building design requirements set forth in Section 42-245.
4. Village Fire Department review/approval.
5. Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and Local codes/ordinances.

All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by the Village of Paw Paw for Site Plan Review for the proposed Trail Head Park Recreational Facility. The subject property is located in the Village Revitalization Area, on the west side of Gremps Street, and is within the Village Revitalization Area Planned Unit Development District.

**SPR – Trail Head
Park Recreational
Facility**

Brandon Hebard, Wightman & Associates, was present on behalf of the application. Hebard provided an overview of the project, referencing site renderings and photos. The cross-parking/access arrangement and shared storm water disposal design with the adjacent site (Paw Paw Brewery) were highlighted.

In response to questions, it was noted that the outdoor lighting design will be dictated by the Village but is intended to match that provided downtown and slated to be provided throughout the PUD. It was further noted that the Village does not own the trail and so trail improvements are not reflected on the site plan.

Thomas questioned if the Revitalization Area was the appropriate location for the proposed park. He opined that the area is only 35 acres in size and represents valuable development space within the Village.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Section 42-349 I.3. – PUD District, with additional reference to the Planning/Zoning Report.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to recommend Village Council approval of the site plan for the proposed Trail Head Park Recreational Facility located within the Village Revitalization Area, on the west side of Gremps Street based upon a finding that:

- a) the proposed trail head park is a public recreational facility and does not qualify as a *nonresidential use area* or a *residential use area*, as regulated in the Revitalization Area PUD District;
- b) as neither a *nonresidential use area* nor a *residential use area*, the following provisions were held as not applicable to the proposed use:
 - Building Height & Placement (Section 42-346 C. 1.)
 - Parking Location Requirements (42-346 D. 3. & 7.)
 - Architectural Requirements (42-347 A.)
- c) the proposal meets the criteria for Site Plan Approval set forth in Section 42-402 (4), Zoning Ordinance;

and conditioned upon the following:

- 1. Submission of a revised site plan that reflects the additional required information noted in the *Review Report* and subject to an administrative determination of compliance with Ordinance standards;
- 2. Village Fire Department review/approval;
- 3. The storm water disposal proposal shall be subject to compliance with Section 42-402(3)q. and Village review/approval;
- 4. Village Public Utilities Department review/approval of all proposed utility extensions/connections;
- 5. All utilities (telephone, electric, cable) shall be placed underground;
- 6. Proposed street lighting shall comply with Section 42-348 C. – *Street Lights*; site lighting detail shall be provided and shall be subject to compliance with lighting standards set forth in Section 42-405 - *Lighting*;
- 7. The provision of street trees along Gremps Street as required by Section

42-348 ;

8. Placement of benches and trash receptacles within the plaza area along the 'proposed trail' and near the cross-access sidewalks to benefit pedestrian activity;
9. Consideration of alternate building materials that will be consistent with the requirements of Section 42-347 A. 3. – *Building Materials*;
10. Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and Local codes/ordinances.

The **motion carried 4 to 1**, with Thomas dissenting.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by Freeman Kirby for the amendment of Section 42-367 of the Village of Paw Paw Zoning Ordinance so as to modify Subsection 23 (a) regarding the minimum lot size standard applicable to a 'private open air business'.

**New Business:
Text Amendment
Request**

Harvey provided a review of the request, noting the history/basis of the application. General discussion ensued wherein the Planning Commission determined to consider the application. **Motion** by Rumsey, **supported** by Pioch, to schedule a public hearing on the requested text amendment for the January Planning Commission meeting. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

9. Larson stated that no Ongoing Business was scheduled for consideration.
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 8:47 p.m.

Ongoing Business

Member Comments

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

Adjournment

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, January 4, 2017**

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, January 4, 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, Rumsey and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey and Assistant Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale. | Members Present |
| 3. | Motion by Jarvis, supported by Hildebrandt, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried . | Approval of Agenda |
| 4. | Motion by Thomas, supported by Rumsey, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of December 1, 2016 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 of Section 42-367 (23) a., Zoning Ordinance, to modify the one acre minimum lot size standard applicable to a ' <i>private open air business</i> '. | Public Hearing
Item: Text
Amendment -
Open Air Business |
- Freeman Kirby was present on behalf of the text amendment request. No public comment was offered on the matter.
- Larson referenced a memo dated January 3, 2017 received from the Village Manager wherein the Planning Commission is requested to postpone consideration of the request until ownership of property occupied by the Kirby Truck Parts operation can be clarified and identified use violations on said property addressed.
- Rumsey opined that the status of the applicant's property has no bearing on the request to consider amending a provision in the Zoning Ordinance. The Board agreed that the requested text amendment is not specific to a particular use or site and should proceed outside of the enforcement issues raised regarding the applicant's property.
- Larson then referenced the Planning/Zoning Report developed to provide an outline for discussion and a resolution to the request. Lengthy Board discussion ensued wherein the following was noted:
- Is a lot size standard necessary for a '*private open air business*' if

such a use is a Special Use and controlled by the special use criteria and the review of the Planning Commission?

- A lot size standard has the result of controlling the prevalence of '*private open air businesses*' throughout the Village, which is important along its commercial gateways,
- A lot size standard helps ensure that adequate land area will be provided to meet desired design standards, which will also important to the character of the commercial gateways in the Village.

Larson stated that she had researched area ordinances to identify generally accepted approaches to outdoor retail activity in the area and found that the standards in effect in the Village are lenient in comparison.

Jarvis opined that a decision to reduce the requirement will support future requests for further reductions from new projects. Bogen stated that it would be appropriate to review the standards applicable to a '*private open air business*' as a whole but that he is unwilling to address the lot size standard separately and in a vacuum.

At length, a **motion** was offered by Thomas, **seconded** by Rumsey to recommend approval of an amendment to Section 42-367 (23) a. so as to reduce the one acre lot size standard to .75 acres. The **motion failed 2-5, Bogen, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Larson and Pioch dissenting.**

Motion then made by Pioch, **supported** by Hildebrandt, to recommend that the existing one acre minimum lot size standard applicable to a '*private open air business*' not be modified. The motion **carried 6 to 1, Rumsey dissenting.**

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by Mark Lipson for Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review for a proposed Indoor Recreation Facility. The subject property is located at 1027 East Michigan and is within the B-2 General Business District.

**Public Hearing
Item: Performance
Fieldhouse (Lipson)**

Mark Lipson was present on behalf of the application. Lipson provided an overview of the project, noting that the subject site is ideal for the proposed use given its proximity to the highway, major corridors, commercial uses, and schools and the presence of outdoor ball fields already existing on the site. He provided research completed identifying a need in the area for the proposed use. Referencing the proposed site plan and building elevations, Lipson outlined the details of the proposed development.

Jack Arlen stated that he owns the property adjacent to the east and expressed concern with the proposal given past problems with the ball fields on the site and issues related to trespass, noise, property damage, interference

with tv reception, storm water runoff, and the lack of a buffer between the properties. He stated that the site is too small to be used for ball fields and that it serves to limit the use and devalue his adjacent residential site.

Harvey provided an overview of the status of the subject 6.8 development site, noting the recent annexation of the rear 5.7 acres from Antwerp Township and the likely status of the existing outdoor ballfields as lawful nonconforming uses. She noted that, pursuant to Section 42-104, the recently annexed property retains its existing zoning (R-2) for 1 year unless it is rezoned by the Village. Harvey stated that the Planning Commission is scheduled to consider a request to rezone the subject property from the R-2 District to the B-2 District in February. She confirmed that the requested B-2 District allows the proposed 'indoor recreation facility' as a special land use. The existing outdoor ballfields are not allowed uses within the B-2 District but may remain as a nonconforming use on the site.

No further public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Section 42-366 and 42-367 (4) and noted the following:

- The site is currently served by 2 driveways; the eastern-most drive is proposed to be closed and the existing driveway adjacent to the west property line improved. The existing drive is located at least 75 ft from an intersection as required;
- The proposed building will be located a minimum of 100 ft from any residential use (ie. the adjacent house);
- Parking is provided in compliance with Ordinance requirements;
- Proposed light fixtures will be sharp cut-off with shields and proposed foot-candle levels reveal compliance with lighting standards;
- The existing sidewalk along East Michigan will be improved;
- The proposed building complies with applicable building size, height, setback and design standards (per the ClearSpan building rendering);
- The retention of the existing trees and limited plantings along the east and north property lines is proposed;
- Compliance with applicable landscaping standards has not been met due to the size of the site; a request for variance approval from the landscaping standards will be considered by the ZBA in February.
- The outdoor ball fields are an existing nonconforming use and are proposed to be used but are not proposed to be modified or expanded.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Jarvis, to grant Special Use Permit for the proposed 31,200 sq ft indoor recreation facility (Performance

Fieldhouse) located at 1027 East Michigan based upon a finding of compliance with the Special Use Permit Criteria set forth in Section 42-366 and the Special Use Permit Standards applicable to an 'indoor recreation facility' set forth in Section 42-367 (4), and conditioned upon the rezoning of the rear 5.7 acres, or portion thereof, of the subject site to the B-2 District. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Rumsey, to recommend Village Council approval of the Site Plan for the proposed 31,200 sq ft indoor recreation facility (Performance Fieldhouse) based upon a finding of compliance with the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Rezoning of the rear 5.7 acres, or portion thereof, of the subject site to the B-2 District.
2. The provision of required parking lot screening along the east boundary.
3. Compliance with outdoor lighting requirements set forth in Section 42-405.
4. Compliance with applicable building design requirements.
5. Submission of a final landscape plan that meets applicable landscape requirements.
6. Fire Department review/approval.
7. Village Department of Public Works review/approval of utility extensions/connections and the proposed method of storm water disposal.
8. Proposed signage shall comply with the applicable provisions of Article VI and shall be reviewed/approved through the permit process.
9. Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and Local codes/ordinances.

All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

9. Larson noted that the Waterfront Overlay District was presented to the Board in April, 2016 and that the Board had expressed support for moving the proposed district forward. To that end, a review of the proposed text had been initiated in May 2016. Due to the application schedule during the latter part of 2016, the review has not been completed and remains a priority item for the Board.

**Ongoing Business:
Waterfront Overlay
District**

Board members agreed to place the matter on the next available meeting

agenda to allow for completion of the review and a determination of a public hearing date.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 10. | Larson stated that no New Business was scheduled for consideration. | New Business |
| 11. | No member comments were offered. | Member Comments |
| 12. | No staff comments were offered. | Village Manager/
Planning Consultant |
| 13. | There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m. | Adjournment |

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, February 2, 2017**

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, February 2, 2017 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. **Meeting Convened**
2. Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey and Assistant Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale. **Members Present**
3. **Motion** by Rumsey, **supported** by Thomas, 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 January 4, 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 rezoning of approximately 5.7 acres recently annexed from Antwerp Township and owned by Lipson (Performance Fieldhouse) located north of 1027 East Michigan from GC General Commercial District (Antwerp Township) to B-2 General Business District. **Public Hearing:
Rezoning - Lipson**

Harvey reported that the subject property is currently being addressed in the update to the Master Plan and is proposed to be classified as Gateway Commercial.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposed rezoning pursuant to Section 42-33 – Amendment Review Criteria. The following conclusions were noted:

 1. The proposed Future Land Use Map identifies the subject property as Gateway Commercial which supports the proposed B-2 District.
 2. A change of conditions in the area is recognized, namely the annexation of the subject property into the Village of Paw Paw.
 3. The proposed B-2 District is consistent with the surrounding commercial zoning/land use pattern and recognizes the role of the abutting corridor as a commercial gateway into the Village of

Paw Paw.

4. The subject property is/has been occupied by nonresidential land use and can be developed in compliance with District standards.
5. The proposed B-2 District is consistent with the trends in land development in the area.
6. Given the existing use of the subject property, the proposed rezoning will not serve to negatively impact traffic, public facilities or environmental conditions in the area.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Rumsey, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed rezoning of the subject 5.7 acres to B-2 General Business District based upon the conclusion of the rezoning criteria set forth in Section 42-33 – Amendment Review Criteria. All members present voting yes. **The motion carried.**

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the proposed rezoning of approximately 5.8 acres owned/occupied by MDOT located north of 1003/1011 East Michigan to rezoned from R-2 Single Family Residential District (Antwerp Township) to B-2 General Business District, I-1 Light Industrial District, and/or I-2 General Industrial District and

**Public Hearing:
Rezoning - MDOT**

Harvey reiterated that the subject property is currently being addressed in the update to the Master Plan and is proposed to be classified as Gateway Commercial.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposed rezoning pursuant to Section 42-33 – Amendment Review Criteria. The following conclusions were noted:

1. The I-2 District would allow the existing use of the property but the proposed Future Land Use Map identifies the subject property as Gateway Commercial, which supports the proposed B-2 District.
2. A change of conditions in the area is recognized, namely the annexation of the subject property into the Village of Paw Paw.
3. The proposed B-2 District is consistent with the surrounding commercial zoning/land use pattern and recognizes the role of the abutting corridor as a commercial gateway into the Village of Paw Paw.

4. The subject property is/has been occupied by nonresidential land use and can be developed in compliance with District standards.
5. The proposed B-2 District is consistent with the trends in land development in the area.
6. Given the existing use of the subject property, the proposed rezoning will not serve to negatively impact traffic, public facilities or environmental conditions in the area.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Pioch, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed rezoning of the subject 5.8 acres to B-2 General Business District based upon the conclusion of the rezoning criteria set forth in Section 42-33 – Amendment Review Criteria. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by AR Engineering LLC/Midwest V, LLC for Site Plan Review of a retail building. The subject property is located at 711 East Michigan and is within the B-2 General Business District.

New Business:
SPR - Dollar
General

Andrew Rossell was present on behalf of the application. Rossell provided an overview of the project, referencing a revised site plan package dated January 31, 2017 and highlighting the following elements:

- Sheet 1 illustrates the existing driveway arrangement; Sheet 2 has been revised to propose the elimination of the existing driveway onto Dykeman Street; the consolidation of the two East Michigan driveways into a single driveway; and, an upgrade to the existing Elm Street driveway to facilitate on-site circulation and loading operations.
- Sheet 2 has been revised to show sidewalk connections to the proposed building and additional plantings to meet landscape requirements.
- Public utilities are proposed to serve the site. The utility and storm water proposal has been submitted to the Village DPS for review/approval. (Sheet 3)
- Application for a Soil Erosion & Sedimentation Permit has been filed. (Sheet 4)
- Sheet 5 demonstrates compliance with parking lot and dumpster design requirements.
- Sheet 6 reflects trees added along East Michigan and Elm Street and additional side/rear yard vegetation to meet landscape requirements.
- Building Elevations have been added to allow for discussion of building design requirements.

Harvey provided an overview of the fencing standards and their application to the subject site. It was determined that vegetation will be used to provide

a buffer in those areas where fencing is not allowed.

Lengthy Board discussion ensued regarding the proposed driveway arrangement, with concern noted regarding the proposed number of driveways and the use of Elm Street for nonresidential traffic.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Section 42-366 and 42-367 (4) and noted the following:

- The revised access arrangement reduces the number of proposed driveways and facilitates adequate on-site circulation;
- Sidewalk is required to be extended along the east side of Dykeman Street and along Elm Street;
- Revised building elevations are required to confirm that the building design elements presented at the meeting (header detail and vertical siding elements) comply with Section 42-245;
- A revised landscape plan is required to confirm that the modifications to the fencing proposal, additional plantings, and landscape calculations comply with B-2 requirements.

Motion by Rumsey, **supported** by Bogen, to recommend Village Council approval of the Site Plan for the proposed 9100 sq ft retail building (Dollar General) at 711 East Michigan based upon a finding of compliance with the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Submission of a revised site plan demonstrating compliance with sidewalk and screening/landscape requirements prior to Village Council consideration.
2. Submission of building elevations that demonstrate compliance with applicable building design requirements set forth in Section 42-245 prior to Village Council consideration.
3. Village Fire Department review/approval.
4. Village Department of Public Services review/approval of utility extensions/connections and the proposed method of storm water disposal.
5. Proposed signage shall comply with the applicable provisions of Article VI and shall be reviewed/approved through the permit process.

6. Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and Local codes/ordinances.

All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the proposed Draft Master Plan Update presented by the Master Plan Update Steering Committee. Harvey stated that the Steering Committee requests the draft Master Plan Update be accepted by the Planning Commission and forwarded to the Village Council with a request for approval to distribute to begin the review/adoption process.

**New Business:
Master Plan Update**

The Planning Commission noted support for the draft document with the correction of minor errors/inaccuracies. **Motion** by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis to the accept the draft Master Plan Update, as revised, for submission to the Village Council with a request for approval to distribute. All present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

10. Larson noted that no *Ongoing Business* was scheduled for consideration.
11. Bogen questioned how accessory outdoor equipment, such as coolers, is regulated. Harvey will confirm the applicable Zoning Ordinance provisions.

Ongoing Business

Member Comments

Jarvis stated that she will begin to provide Village Council updates at Planning Commission meetings.

12. No staff comments were offered.

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

12. There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Adjournment

**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 <i>Public Hearing Item</i> 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.

**OnGoing Business:
Sign Ordinance**

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:

**New Business:
Overview of CIP**

- : 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.

Member Comments

11. No staff comments were offered.

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

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

Adjournment

**Minutes, Paw Paw Village Council
Regular Meeting, April 10, 2017**

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The regular Village Council meeting of Monday April 10, 2017 convened at 7:31 p.m. at the Paw Paw Community Library 609 West Michigan Avenue, Paw Paw, Michigan. President Roman Plaszcak presiding. | Meeting Convened |
| 2. Present: President Roman Plaszcak, President Pro-Tem Eric Larcinese, and Trustees Douglas Craddock and Mary McIntosh (Marcos Flores, Nadine Jarvis, and Donne Rohr excused). Also, present: Village Manager, Larry Nielsen, and Assistant Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale. Director, Department of Public Services, John Small. | Members Present |
| 3. Motion by Larcinese with support of Craddock to approve the Agenda for Monday, April 10, 2017. All members present voting yes, motion carried. | Approval of Agenda |
| 4. Motion by McIntosh with support of Larcinese to approve the regular session meeting minutes of March 27, 2017 with corrections to items number 16 and 37. All members present voting yes, motion carried. | Approved Minutes |
| 5. Motion by Larcinese with support of Plaszcak to approve accounts payable in the amount of \$200,096.68. All members present voting yes, motion carried. Next claims, Jarvis and McIntosh. | Accounts Payable |
| 6. Douglas Turnbull was in attendance to express that Village ordinances should be more readily accessible and to inquire by what process a citizen can suggest an ordinance amendment, particularly in regard to beekeeping regulations. It was determined that Manager Nielsen would follow up with Mr. Turnbull about his concerns after the meeting. | Audience
Participation
Douglas Turnbull |
| 7. Judge Dufon gave an update to council about Van Buren County courts including the cross training of judges, technological improvements, and the public safety millage to fund courthouse expansion. Judge Dufon answered questions from council and received their comments. | Presentations &
Guests, Judge Jeffrey
J. Dufon |
| 8. Motion by Larcinese with support from McIntosh to close the regular session at 8:12 and enter into a public hearing to take comments regarding Village Ordinance 456 establishing a Farmers Market Board. All members present voting yes, motion carried. | Public Hearing
Farmers Market
Board Ordinance 456 |
| 9. Hannah Borton addressed the council about the Farmer Market's preliminary budget and spoke in support of the market. She commented that she believed requiring insurance from vendors would discourage vendor participation. | Comment by Hannah
Borton |
| 10. Douglas Turnbull spoke in support of the market and mentioned some of the discussions the potential board members had about administering the market including the budget and insurance requirements. | Comment by Douglas
Turnbull |

**Minutes, Paw Paw Village Council
Regular Meeting, April 10, 2017**

- | | |
|--|--|
| 11. Motion by Larcinese with support of Croddock to close the public hearing at 8:24 and reconvene regular session. All members present voting yes, motion carried. | Reconvene Regular Session |
| 12. Discussion was held regarding the proposed Farmer's Market ordinance. It was the consensus of council to have Manager Nielsen modify the draft ordinance to reflect changes discussed including the means by which the council will approve the board's decisions and the number of board members and revisions to the insurance requirements. | Farmer's Market |
| 13. No report | Committee Reports
Finance & Admin |
| 14. No report | DPS |
| 15. No report | Master Plan Steering |
| 16. No report – April meeting was cancelled. | Parks & Recreation |
| 17. No report | Downtown Develop |
| 18. Larcinese reported that the Fire Board is considering extending the current agreement for one year while more research on fire boards and fire authorities can be done. | Fire Board |
| 19. Plaszczak reported that the Corkers have cancelled their season for 2017. The Historical Commission is working on a historic walking tour of Paw Paw. | Historical Board |
| 20. No report | Housing Board |
| 21. No report | Economic Develop |
| 22. No report | Planning Commission |
| 23. No report | Wellhead Protection |
| 24. No report | Wine & Harvest |
| 25. McIntosh emphasized the need for more development in Paw Paw, particularly housing development because people are leaving the village due to lack of adequate housing. She encouraged the economic development committee to meet in the near future to discuss housing concerns and plan for future development. | Council Comments
McIntosh |
| 26. McIntosh also congratulated Manager Nielsen on his recent award from the Chamber of Commerce. | |

**Minutes, Paw Paw Village Council
Regular Meeting, April 10, 2017**

27. Manager Nielsen noted that both the DPS Committee and Finance & Administration committee will meet prior to the next council meeting.

Manager's Comments

28. Motion by Larcinese with support by Craddock to adjourn the meeting. All members present voting yes, motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Adjournment

Respectfully submitted:

Village President
Roman Plaszczak

Village Clerk,
Christopher Tapper

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, June 1, 2017**

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, June 1, 2017 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding. | Meeting Convened |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Pioch and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey and Assistant Village Manager, Sarah Moyer-Cale. | Members Present |
| 3. | Motion by Pioch, supported by Jarvis, 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 April 6, 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 rezoning of approximately 1 acre (4-5 parcels) located immediately west of South Niles Street and south of Berrien Street, from the R-2 Single Family and Two-Family District to the RO Restricted Office District and/or B-2 General Business District. | Public Hearing:
Rezoning – Niles
Street |

Larson noted that the applicant (Thomas Demarest) owns the .2 acre lot on the corner of South Niles and Berrien Streets and has requested the subject lot be rezoned from the R-2 District to the B-2 District. She explained that the area to be considered was expanded by the Planning Commission to include the 3 adjacent .2 acre lots and the portion of the 5th lot currently zoned R-2 and to consider the RO District in addition to the requested B-2 District.

Thomas Demarest was present on behalf of the application. He stated that he requested rezoning of the property to B-2 to facilitate office development on the site. Demarest noted that surrounding and adjacent land use is largely nonresidential, with neighboring views that include the County Court House and parking lots.

Sherry Gordon (neighbor) stated that the proposed rezoning will have a negative impact on the current residential use of the property under consideration and the area in general.

Jason Harloff noted that he purchased one of the residential properties under consideration to provide housing for his employees and he does

not want to lose the residential capacity of the property. He referenced the goal of Project Rising Tide (PRT) to preserve/provide affordable housing in the Village and opined that the requested rezoning is in direct opposition to this goal.

Lucy Beal stated that she resides opposite the area under consideration and expressed concern that the Village would consider rezoning these occupied residential lots when there are vacant commercial properties in town currently available.

Ellen McGuire (neighbor) stated that Van Buren County has already negatively impacted the area with the existing buildings/parking lots. However, the general residential character is still intact and represents a long-standing neighborhood. She reiterated the lack of demand for commercial zoning in the Village.

Dennis Glidden expressed concern with the impact the requested rezoning would have on property taxes for surrounding properties.

Pam Posten stated that she feared the abutting residential street grid would turn into primary traffic routes if the commercial rezoning was approved.

Dawn Grady expressed support for comments previously made in opposition to additional commercial activity in the area.

In response to questions, Harvey provided an overview of the rezoning process and the basis for the Planning Commission's expansion of the area/districts to be considered.

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

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposed rezoning pursuant to Section 42-33 – Amendment Review Criteria. The following conclusions were noted:

1. The proposed rezoning will not be in accordance with the basic intent and purpose of the RO or B-2 Districts, the B-2 District specifically referencing businesses with large lot requirements and major thoroughfare locations.
2. Both the existing and proposed Future Land Use Maps and Master Plan goals/objectives support continued residential use in this neighborhood area adjacent to the downtown core.
3. The only change in conditions that has occurred in the area has

resulted primarily from the expansion of County buildings, which are not subject to local zoning. The area zoning and residential land use pattern has not been altered.

4. The rezoning will not serve to correct an inequitable situation but rather to introduce non-residential zoning into an area of existing residential zoning/land use.
5. Rezoning the subject property for commercial land use will likely set the course for the conversion of the residential neighborhood adjacent to the east.
6. The requested rezoning will not be consistent or compatible with the adjacent established residential neighborhoods.
7. The size of the property will limit the ability of site development to comply with B-2 District standards.
8. The area represents a mixed-use development trend, with the strong commercial element fronting Kalamazoo Avenue and the established residential neighborhoods to the east.
9. The TMA and studies done in conjunction with PRT advise affordable housing is difficult to find in the Village while vacant commercial property is plentiful. A rezoning would promote the loss of existing affordable housing.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Thomas, to recommend Village Council denial of the proposed rezoning of the subject 1 acre (4-5 lots) from the R-2 Single Family and Two-Family District to the RO Restricted Office District and/or B-2 General Business District. based upon the conclusion of the rezoning criteria set forth in Section 42-33 – Amendment Review Criteria. The **motion carried** 4 to 1, Jarvis dissenting.

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration were the proposed amendments of the Zoning Ordinance associated with the establishment of the Waterfront Overlay District.

**Public Hearing:
Waterfront
Overlay District**

Harvey provided an overview of the process applied in developing the proposed waterfront overlay approach and the specific elements of the WF Overlay District. Through the use of a power point presentation, she provided examples of shoreline vegetative buffers that would be consistent with the vegetative buffer standards set forth in the District.

Larson noted that a letter of support for the District had been received from Two Rivers Coalition. The letter was read into the record.

Sue Danielson questioned how the vegetative buffer requirement would apply to waterfront property with steep slopes. She stated that waterfront property is of high value and involves high taxes and should not be restricted in its use. She added that there are already too many regulations in the Village.

Ron Bartlett noted his objection to the vegetative buffer requirement noting that it will occupy too much of small waterfront lots.

Sharon Stevens questioned how the WF Overlay District standards would be applied and how they would be enforced on existing developed lots.

Harvey reviewed the applicability elements of the WF Overlay District and explained that the proposed standards would apply to new development and redevelopment but would not apply to existing development, in that zoning is not retroactive.

Roman Plaszczyk stated that he is in the process of establishing a 'natural seawall' along his waterfront property on Maple Lake and that he has found the process to be lengthy and expensive. He urged the Planning Commission to consider the impacts a vegetative buffer requirement may have on waterfront lots in the Village and not adopt standards that may deter development in the Village.

Kevin Haight, Two Rivers Coalition, explained that the 'natural seawall' referenced by Plaszczyk is an MDEQ-regulated approach and is different than the vegetative buffer requirement set forth in the District. He explained that vegetative buffers are valuable and effective in filtering storm water runoff and protecting water quality. He stated that the application of such an approach should be viewed as a responsibility of a waterfront property owner.

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the distinctions between the MDEQ standards for 'natural seawalls' and the vegetative buffer requirement set forth in the WF Overlay District.

Barb Carpenter stated that waterways add value to property and that it is crucial that we protect them. She noted support for the vegetative buffer requirement but suggested that the 15 ft width could be reduced and still achieve the same objective.

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

Planning Commission discussion ensued wherein it was agreed that there was continued support for the objectives of the WF Overlay District and its value as a watershed protection strategy. It was further noted that review of the specific standards set forth in the District should continue to confirm feasibility of application.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Pioch, to postpone the public hearing on the proposed WF Overlay District to the July meeting so as to continue discussion regarding the basis for the 15 ft depth of the vegetative buffer and the 20 ft lake access metric. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration were the proposed amendments to the sign regulations to comport with the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Reed v Town of Gilbert* and to make additional changes to the sign provisions and provide additional definitions.

**Public Hearing:
Sign Regulations**

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

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Bogen, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendments to the sign regulations set forth in the Village of Paw Paw Zoning Ordinance. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by Van Buren County for Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review for a proposed storage building on property located at 753 Hazen Street. The subject site is located within the R-1 District.

**Public Hearing:
SLU/SPR -
Van Buren County**

In response to the applicant's request, **motion** by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to postpone consideration of the application to the July 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting to allow for completion of the required site plan. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

10. Larson stated that consideration of the proposed amendment to the definition of 'lot area' will be postponed to the July meeting.

**New Business:
Definition of 'Lot
Area'**

11. Planning Commission members agreed that the public hearing for the proposed Master Plan Update will be scheduled for the August meeting.

**Ongoing Business:
Master Plan PH**

12. No member comments were offered.

Member Comments

13. No staff comments were offered.

**Village Manager/
Planning Consultant**

14. There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Adjournment

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission
Regular Meeting, July 6, 2017**

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, July 6, 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. 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 Hildebrandt, 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 June 1, 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 request by Freshwater Community Church for Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review for the establishment of a church/community center within an existing building, including a proposed parking lot expansion and related site improvements. The subject property is located at and in the vicinity of 600 East Michigan/610 East Main and is within the R-1/R-2 Districts. | Public Hearing:
SLU/SPR -
Freshwater Church |

Jason Bull was present on behalf of the application. He explained the mission of the church and outlined the history of their use of the subject property. Bull emphasized that the central location of the site is key to their community service objective.

Bull referenced a rendering of the project, noting the proposed building changes are intended to improve building/site access and flow to allow the church to grow and better serve the community.

Alex Frasier, project engineer, provided an overview of the project, noting the following:

- : proposed building additions are designed to establish main entries and improve flow within the building;
- : the new building entries will establish ADA compliance;
- : proposed site improvements are designed to provide additional parking and improve the safety of parking patterns;
- : the proposed drop-off drive and sidewalk extensions are intended to improve pedestrian safety in the area.

In response to Commission questions, Frasier confirmed that 100 parking spaces exist on the building site and that the parking lot expansion will provide an additional 57 spaces. He added that the additional parking spaces will assist in reducing the on-street parking that currently occurs on Sunday mornings.

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

The Commission proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Sections 42-366 and 42-367 (8) and noted the following:

- : the proposed building/site improvements will not result in a major change to the appearance of the building or property;
- : the additional sidewalk and landscaping will be consistent with the development of the surrounding properties;
- : though classified in the Master Plan as a residential area, the presence of the bus garage on nearby property was noted;
- : the public services and facilities serving the site are adequate;
- : the proposal meets the Special Use standards applicable to a 'church' set forth in Section 42-367 (8);
- : the proposed 'future drive' is not being presented for approval at this time;
- : building height and setbacks for the proposed building additions, existing/proposed outdoor lighting, and existing/proposed fencing and landscaping elements should be detailed further for approval.

Bogen questioned if Section 42-404 (4) allows for the proposed 57-space parking lot to be located off site of the church facility. The Commission noted that the proposal complies with Section 42-404 (6) – Parking Areas in Residential Zones. Confirmation that the proposed parking lot complies with Section 42-404 is required.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Rumsey, to grant Special Use Permit for the proposed establishment of a church/community center within an existing building, including a proposed parking lot expansion and related site improvements, located at and in the vicinity of 600 East Michigan/610 East Main, based upon a finding of compliance with the Special Use Permit Criteria set forth in Section 42-366 and the Special Use Permit Standards applicable to a 'church' set forth in Section 42-367 (8), and conditioned upon confirmation that the proposed 57-space parking lot complies with Section 42-404. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Jarvis, to recommend Village Council approval of the Site Plan for the proposed establishment of a church/community center

within an existing building, including a proposed parking lot expansion and related site improvements (Freshwater Church), based upon a finding of compliance with the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with building height and setback requirements applicable to the proposed building additions.
2. Establishment of the proposed parking lot screening (fencing; existing vegetation) along the east, west and south boundaries of the 0.7 acre site proposed for parking lot development.
3. Demonstration of compliance with outdoor lighting requirements set forth in Section 42-405.
4. Fire Department review/approval.
5. Village Department of Public Works review/approval of utility extensions/connections and the proposed method of storm water disposal.
6. Proposed signage shall comply with the applicable provisions of Article VI and shall be reviewed/approved through the permit process.
7. Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and Local codes/ordinances.

The **motion carried 6 to 1**, with Bogen dissenting.

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request by Van Buren County (Building & Grounds Department) for Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review for a proposed storage building pursuant to Section 42-123, Zoning Ordinance. The subject property is located at 753 Hazen Street and is within the R-1 District.

**Public Hearing:
SLU/SPR -
Van Buren County**

A representative of the application was not present.

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

The Commission proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Sections 42-366 and noted the following:

- : the proposed 32 ft x 64 ft storage building represents an additional storage building on the site; no building demolition is proposed;
- : building elevations have not been provided to demonstrate building height or design;
- : the building is proposed for storage;
- : plans for the shipping containers currently stored outdoors on the site

are unknown;

: the existing fence along the south property line does not provide adequate screening;

: the public services and facilities serving the site are adequate;

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Thomas, to grant Special Use Permit for the proposed 32 ft x 64 ft storage building for Van Buren County Building & Grounds Department to be located at 753 Hazen Street, based upon a finding of compliance with the Special Use Permit Criteria set forth in Section 42-366. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

Motion by Pioch, **supported** by Rumsey, to recommend Village Council approval of the Site Plan for the proposed storage building for Van Buren County Building & Grounds Department to be located at 753 Hazen Street, based upon a finding of compliance with the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with applicable building height requirements.
2. Fencing along the south property line shall comply with Section 42-405 (c) – *Fences*.
3. Establishment of screening in compliance with Section 42-405 (b) along the south property line, extending west from Hazen Street to the west end of the proposed storage building.
4. Any proposed outdoor lighting shall comply with Section 42-405 (a).
5. Extension of a sidewalk along Hazen Street, the width of the subject property, in compliance with the Village of Paw Paw Sidewalk Ordinance.
6. Village Fire Department review/approval.
7. Village Department of Public Works review/approval of the proposed method of storm water disposal.
8. Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and Local codes/ordinances.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration were the proposed amendments of the Zoning Ordinance associated with the establishment of the Waterfront Overlay District.

**Public Hearing:
Waterfront
Overlay District**

Larson noted that the public comment portion of the public hearing was held at the June 1, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, however, it was agreed that additional public comment would be received at this meeting given the presence of four (4) interested Village residents. Larson read

into the record correspondence received from Dale Wills and Ron Bartlett noting their objections to the proposed amendments.

The Commission then proceeded with a review of the draft Waterfront Overlay District. The following was noted:

Purpose – no objections noted; no modifications suggested

Applicability – no objections noted; no modifications suggested

Definitions – no objections noted; no modifications suggested

Development Requirements:

Allowed Uses – no objections noted; no modifications suggested

Dimensional Requirements – the 35% lot coverage standard represents an existing Zoning Ordinance standard; the 35 ft waterfront setback requirement represents an increase in the existing 30 ft waterfront setback requirement

Shoreline Vegetative Buffer – this proposed standard has received the most resistance; the following objections have been voiced:

- takes up too much land area on small lots;
- is not an effective way to improve/protect water quality;
- will be difficult to enforce;
- who decides what can be planted in the buffer area;
- no support for a mandate . . . only for education efforts

Lengthy discussion ensued regarding the vegetative buffer requirements and the input received to date. It was agreed that research shows that the proposed 15 ft vegetative buffer width is considered a minimum . . . and that Michigan recommends a greater width to be effective. It was further noted that the proposed text provides clarity as to what constitutes ‘natural vegetative cover’, which includes all natural vegetation except a lawn. Commission members further referenced the numerous ‘buffer strip’ examples that were presented at the June meeting demonstrating ease of compliance and effectiveness in shoreline protection. Moyer-Cale reminded that the Conservation District will also provide assistance on recommended plants.

The Commission noted that the proposed Waterfront Overlay District primarily reinforces the lot coverage and shoreline setbacks that already exist; provide better use restrictions; and establish minimum parameters and some guidance for shoreline development that will manage storm water discharge, minimize shoreline erosion, improve water quality, and protect/increase the value of

waterfront properties to the community.

It was questioned if more education on the elements of the Waterfront Overlay District are needed or if there simply is disagreement on the idea of a 'vegetative buffer' requirement.

Mike Pine, Brenda Wills, and Ron Bartlett questioned if the draft text could be modified to apply a vegetative buffer requirement that is proportionate to the size of the lot as a solution to the concerns expressed.

Motion by Thomas, **supported** by Pioch, to further postpone the public hearing on the proposed WF Overlay District to the September meeting to allow for continued consideration of the vegetative buffer requirement and the remaining provisions of the draft text. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 9. | Larson stated that consideration of the proposed amendments to the sign standards for the Downtown Overlay District set forth in Section 42-259 will be postponed to the August meeting. | New Business:
Text Amendment -
DOD Sign
Standards |
| 10. | Larson noted that no Ongoing Business was scheduled for consideration. | Ongoing Business: |
| 11. | No member comments were offered. | Member Comments |
| 12. | No staff comments were offered. | Village Manager/
Planning Consultant |
| 13. | There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. | Adjournment |