

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, February 5, 2015**

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, February 5, 2015 convened at 7:05 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.  | <b>Meeting Convened</b>  |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.   | <b>Members Present</b>   |
| 3. | Motion by Thomas, supported by Pioch, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>  |
| 4. | Motion by Rumsey, supported by Pioch, to approve the minutes of the special Planning Commission meeting of December 18, 2014 as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.  | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>   |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.   | <b>Public Comment</b>  |
| 6. | Larson stated that no <i>Public Hearing Item</i> was scheduled for consideration.   | <b>Public Hearing Items</b>  |
| 7. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration was review/discussion of Draft #3 of the Village Revitalization Area PUD District. She noted that the Board had received the draft text in the January meeting material but that the January meeting had been canceled due to weather. | <b>Ongoing Business:<br/>Village<br/>Revitalization Area<br/>PUD</b> |

Harvey provided an overview of the proposed draft text, noting that Draft #3 incorporates the Board's review comments of Draft #2 in November; design standards that reflect the results of the 'visual preference survey'; and considers recent conversations with the Village Manager regarding land use scenarios for existing buildings and trailhead development plans within the Revitalization Area.

Lengthy Board discussion then ensued wherein **support for the draft text was noted**, with the following questions/comments:

- Pg 3 – (4.b.) how can 'designated green space' be located along the interior street system of the PUD where the required 'build-to' line is 0 ft; **revise**
- Pg 5 – (c.2.) **add text** that allows for an exception to building height requirements for 'buildings within nonresidential use areas' with the use of a 'false façade';
- Pg 6 – (c.3.) **establish** a 6 ft maximum front yard setback for

- 'buildings within residential use areas';
- Pg 8 – (6) **remove** reference to 'a lot with frontage on 3 public road rights-of way' and the corner location requirement;
- Pg 10 – (4.d.) **emphasize** that 'fabric awnings' are encouraged;
- Pg 11 – (g.1.b. and d.) **replace** 'porch' with 'landing' . . . and include sidewalk requirement;
- Pg 14 – **require** the establishment of a 'public waterfront walkway' within the required greenbelt.

Harvey was directed to revise Draft #3 to reflect the Board's discussion. It was further determined that a public hearing on the final draft text would be tentatively scheduled for the March meeting.

- |    |   |                     |
|----|---|---------------------|
| 8. | Larson stated that an update to the 2014 Planning Commission Work Plan had been provided to facilitate preliminary discussion on potential 2015 Work Plan Items. Harvey noted that discussion of priority work items would also provide direction for preliminary research. | <b>New Business</b> |
|----|---|---------------------|

The Board agreed to review the updated Work Plan for discussion at the March meeting.

- |     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| 9.  | No member comments were offered.  | <b>Member Comments</b>                          |
| 10. | No staff comment was offered.   | <b>Village Manager/<br/>Planning Consultant</b> |
| 11. | There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. | <b>Adjournment</b>                              |

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, March 5, 2015**

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, March 5, 2015 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.  | <b>Meeting Convened</b>  |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.   | <b>Members Present</b>   |
| 3. | Motion by Jarvis, supported by Rumsey, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>  |
| 4. | Motion by Thomas, supported by Jarvis, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of February 5, 2015 as presented. All members present voting yes. The motion carried.   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>   |
| 5. | Judge Buhl was present and provided an overview of the 2014 Annual Report for Wings of God, Inc., pursuant to a condition of their Special Land Use Permit. Extensive discussion was provided regarding the results experienced at the facility to date and of the program as a whole.                           | <b>Public Comment</b>  |
| 6. | Larson stated that no <i>Public Hearing Item</i> was scheduled for consideration.  | <b>Public Hearing Items</b>  |
| 7. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration was review/discussion of Draft #4 of the Village Revitalization Area PUD District. She noted that the Board had reviewed Draft #3 in February and provided extensive comment and that Draft #4 reflected the Board's conclusions and requested modifications. | <b>Ongoing Business:<br/>Village<br/>Revitalization Area<br/>PUD</b> |

Harvey provided an overview of the draft text noting the proposed revisions. The Board agreed that the modifications accurately reflect the discussions of the Board. It was further noted that the sign standards developed for the Downtown Overlay District were appropriate for the PUD District and agreed that a provision should be added to the draft text setting forth such a standard.

Harvey then referenced the draft public hearing notice for the proposed text amendments and related rezonings. She requested Board clarification regarding the land area to be considered for rezoning to the proposed PUD District. She presented the Village Revitalization Area Concept Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and Village of Paw Paw Zoning Map for reference.

Following lengthy Board consideration of the parcel layout of the area and the maps provided, it was agreed that the area envisioned for consideration by the Master Plan and the subsequent planning study of the Village Revitalization Area could be described as follows:

*Properties located within the area of Paw Paw generally bounded on the north by Lily Street; on the east by Gremps Street; on the west by Briggs Pond and the Paw Paw River; and extending south beyond the railroad right-of-way to include undeveloped properties north of Ampey Road (approximately 35 acres).*

The identified properties were noted to currently be located within the R-2 Residential District; the R-O Restricted Office District; the B-2 General Business District; and, the I-1/I-2 Industrial Districts.

It was then determined that a public hearing on the draft text and the proposed rezonings would be scheduled for the April 2, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. Harvey was directed to finalize the draft text and requisite notice to facilitate the public hearing.

8. Larson stated that an update to the 2014 Planning Commission Work Plan had been provided to facilitate preliminary discussion on potential 2015 Work Plan Items. Harvey noted that discussion of priority work items would also provide direction for preliminary research.

**New Business:  
PC Work Plan**

The Work Plan was reviewed wherein it was determined that the Priority #1 work item should be revised to include a review of the sign ordinance as a whole and that the required 5-year review of the Master Plan should be added as the Priority #2 work item. The remaining items were discussed and confirmed for continued inclusion on the Work Plan.

Harvey was directed to prepare the 2015 Planning Commission Work Plan pursuant to the Board's discussion for final review and approval at the April meeting.

9. Larson distributed a draft of the 2014 Planning Commission Annual Report and requested Board review of the document in preparation for Board action at the April meeting.

**Member Comments**

The anticipated vacancy of the Michigan Avenue Academy building and future use options were briefly discussed.

10. Harvey advised the Board of proposed improvements at the Paw Paw Middle School (football field team building project) and the Cedar Street facility (parking lot improvements).

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

11. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

**Adjournment**

Draft

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, April 2, 2015**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, April 2, 2015 convened at 7:20 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.  | <b>Meeting Convened</b>   |
| 2. Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas.<br>Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.   | <b>Members Present</b>  |
| 3. <b>Motion</b> by Rumsey, <b>supported</b> by Jarvis, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>   |
| 4. <b>Motion</b> by Pioch, <b>supported</b> by Jarvis, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of March 5, 2015 as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>  |
| 5. No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.  | <b>Public Comment</b>   |
| 6. Larson stated that a public hearing was scheduled to consider the proposed Village Revitalization Area Planned Unit Development District and related rezonings.<br><br>Harvey referenced the public hearing draft text and noted that it had been revised to incorporate the Board's review comments provided at the February and March meetings.<br><br>The Board conducted a final review of the proposed text.<br><br>No public comment was offered on the matter.<br><br><b>Motion</b> by Rumsey, <b>supported</b> by Jarvis to recommend approval of the proposed Village Revitalization Area PUD District (Sections 42-431 through 42-439) as referenced in the April 2, 2015 Notice of Public Hearing. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .<br><br>The Board then considered the proposal to amend the zoning district boundaries so as to apply the Village Revitalization Area PUD District to properties located within the area of Paw Paw generally bounded on the north by Lily Street; on the east by Gremps Street; on the west by Briggs Pond and the Paw Paw River; and extending south beyond the railroad right-of-way to include undeveloped properties north of Ampey Road (approximately 35 acres). | <b>Public Hearing:<br/>Village<br/>Revitalization<br/>Area PUD District<br/>and Related<br/>Rezonings</b> |

The identified properties were noted to currently be located within the R-2 Residential District; the R-O Restricted Office District; the B-2 General Business District; and, the I-1/I-2 Industrial Districts.

Harvey referenced the Village Revitalization Area Concept Plan set forth in the Village of Paw Paw Master Plan, the Future Land Use Map, and the Village of Paw Paw Zoning Map.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

**Motion** by Pioch, **supported** by Bogen, to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the zoning district boundaries so as to apply the Village Revitalization Area PUD District to properties located within the area of Paw Paw as set forth in the April 2, 2015 Notice of Public Hearing. It was noted that the proposed rezonings are supported by the policies of the Master Plan and the Subarea Plan for the subject area, as well as the Future Land Use Map and Village Revitalization Area Concept Plan. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 7.  | <b>Motion</b> by Pioch, <b>supported</b> by Bogen to nominate and elect the following slate of Planning Commission officers for the 2015-2016 fiscal year: Chair – Kathy Larson; Vice-Chair – Chuck Rumsey; Secretary – Mike Thomas. The <b>motion carried</b> . | <b>New Business:<br/>Election of<br/>Officers</b>  |
| 8.  | <b>Motion</b> by Pioch, <b>supported</b> by Bogen to adopt by resolution the proposed 2015-2016 meeting schedule of the Planning Commission. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>New Business:<br/>Meeting Schedule</b>          |
| 9.  | The Board noted the accuracy and completeness of the 2014 Annual Report prepared by Chairperson Larson. <b>Motion</b> by Rumsey, <b>supported</b> by Bogen to accept the 2014 Annual Report as presented. The <b>motion carried</b> .                            | <b>New Business:<br/>2014 PC Annual<br/>Report</b> |
| 10. | Larson referenced the draft 2015 Planning Commission Work Plan prepared pursuant to Board discussion in March and scheduled for final review and approval.   | <b>New Business:<br/>PC Work Plan</b>              |

Board discussion ensued wherein the following was noted:

: A review of the sign ordinance was added as a Priority #1 work item. It was agreed that specific sign provisions had been reviewed in recent years but a review of the sign ordinance in its entirety is warranted. Harvey was directed to provide an overview of sign ordinance issues to provide structure for Board discussion of same in May.

: The required 5-year review of the Master Plan was added as the Priority #2 work item. It was agreed that Board members would review the Master Plan in preparation for a discussion of same in May.

: Work Item c. – *‘develop a waterfront overlay district’* was given a priority #3 ranking and Work Item b. – *‘review the zoning/land use patterns of the community ‘gateways’ to determine necessary improvements’* was given a priority #4 ranking.

The Board then adopted the 2015 PC Work Plan as prioritized.

11. Rumsey inquired how the Village might move forward in extending the ‘public waterfront walkway’ along Briggs Pond that is required by the new PUD District . . beyond the boundaries of the PUD. The ‘nonmotorized links’ identified in the Village Revitalization Concept Plan and how they are envisioned to provide connections in the area were reviewed. General board discussion ensued regarding the trailway plans in adjacent communities and possible future extensions/connections.

**Member Comments**

Larson raised the issue of Board review of landscape proposals in conjunction with site plan reviews. It was noted that the Ordinance currently allows for submission of landscape plans within 90 days after receiving site plan approval. The Board noted general support for removing that option from the Ordinance so as to require the provision of a landscape plan with the site plan for Board review. It was agreed that the such an amendment would be added to the 2015 Work Plan.

Rumsey inquired regarding terms for Planning Commission members. Larson advised that she will provide confirmation at the next meeting.

10. No staff comment was offered.

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

11. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

**Adjournment**

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Special Meeting, May 13, 2015**

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | The special Planning Commission meeting of Wednesday, May 13, 2015 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.   | <b>Meeting Convened</b>                         |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.  | <b>Members Present</b>                          |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Thomas, <b>supported</b> by Bogen, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>                       |
| 4. | <b>Motion</b> by Pioch, <b>supported</b> by Jarvis, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of April 2, 2015 as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .  | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>                      |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.   | <b>Public Comment</b>                           |
| 6. | Larson stated that no <i>Public Hearing Item</i> was scheduled for consideration.   | <b>Public Hearing Items</b>                     |
| 7. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request for site plan review for the proposed expansion of the existing Village Pharmacy and related site modifications. The subject site is located at 320 East Michigan and is within the Downtown Overlay District (DOD). | <b>New Business:<br/>SPR - Village Pharmacy</b> |

Joe Romph was present on behalf of the application. Also present were Kris Nelson of Schley Architects and Peter Skornia of Bazzani. Romph commented on the growth of the Village Pharmacy and the need for additional space.

Nelson then provided an overview of the site plan. He noted the role that the existing drive-thru plays in the success of the pharmacy and explained that the existing drive-thru operation essentially drove the proposed building expansion and site designs.

Nelson highlighted the following elements of the proposal:

- the modified property lines that resulted from land acquisition from the Berkshire property;
- the relationship of the proposed site design to the approved design of the Berkshire project;

- efforts to meet the intent of the design standards of the Downtown Overlay District . . . even though several variations are required to support the proposed site plan;
- the relationship of the proposed floor plan to the site design; and,
- how the proposed building/site designs meet the purpose statements of the District set forth in Section 42-251.

Nelson then detailed the requested modifications to the architectural requirements. He stated that the DOD establishes a 2-story minimum building height requirement. He explained that the existing Village Pharmacy building is a 17 ft single-story structure and provides the framework for the proposed additions.

Referencing the building schematics, Nelson reviewed the proposed design elements of the East Michigan and LaGrave Street facades. He noted that existing downtown buildings were used in developing the façade proposals. He summarized that though the building height standard is not proposed to be met, the remaining architectural requirements have largely been incorporated so as to achieve consistency in appearance with existing downtown buildings.

Nelson further noted that the DOD establishes a 70% transparency requirement for storefronts/facades and that the East Michigan and LaGrave Street façades are provided 40% and 21% transparency, respectively. He gave an overview of the transparency percentages for existing downtown buildings using the graphics contained within the Design Guidelines Booklet. He demonstrated that though many buildings meet the 70% standard . . . there are many that are consistent with the proposed East Michigan façade design and transparency percentage.

Nelson reviewed the difficulty in complying with the 70% standard on the LaGrave Street façade . . . noting the existing drive-thru element, the use of the rear addition for storage and loading, and the proposed 10 ft setback from the property line/sidewalk.

In response to Board questions, Nelson explained that application has been made requesting variance approval from the 0 ft build-to line for LaGrave Street; the 100% building frontage requirement for East Michigan and LaGrave Street; and, the 60 ft parking lot frontage limitation along East Michigan and LaGrave Street. He noted that the variance requests will be considered at the June 1, 2015 ZBA meeting.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the provisions of the Downtown Overlay District set forth in Sections 42-452 through 42-459, with additional reference to the Planning/Zoning Report. Lengthy Board discussion ensued wherein the following was noted:

Site Layout:

- a shared access easement is in place between the applicant and Berkshire to accommodate the cross-access and cross-circulation elements of the proposal;
- the proposed off-site drive improvements are currently under discussion with Berkshire;
- the parking layout has been revised from that approved for the Berkshire project given the modified property boundaries;
- a cross-parking agreement exists to accommodate the parking proposal;
- with the exception of parking lot frontage, the parking lot elements comply with design requirements;

Building Height

- the Village Pharmacy proposal represents the first application of the Downtown Overlay District standards;
- the existing drive-thru element is crucial to the success of the pharmacy; the use of the existing building and drive-thru element is guiding the expansion design;
- the existing building is single-story (17 ft in height) and provides the framework for the two building additions;
- the subject site is on the far east end of the block and represents the beginning of the Downtown Overlay District. The single-story building (as designed) will serve as a positive transition from the residential buildings to the east to the 2-story downtown buildings to the west;
- the proposed architectural design and placement of the building along East Michigan is consistent with existing downtown buildings; (*Section 42-257 B. and C.*)
- the proposed building height of 19 ft is taller than a typical single-story building; the proposed architectural design features give the building an appearance of height similar to existing 2-story downtown buildings. (*Section 42-257 A. and E.*)

**Motion** by Rumsey, **supported** by Bogen to approve the requested modification to an architectural requirement (building height) based upon the noted findings of support. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried.**

Transparency (70% clear glass panels and doorway):

- the Village Pharmacy proposal represents the first application of the Downtown Overlay District standards;

***East Michigan –***

- the proposed building storefront/façade will be provided a 0 ft front setback allowing for the storefront windows to effectively provide transparency to pedestrians; (*Section 42-257 B. and E.*)
- the proposed building storefront/façade meets all other applicable architectural requirements - - ie. building materials, window placement, integrated design; (*Section 42-257 A.*)
- the proposed 40% transparency is consistent with many storefront ratios on existing downtown buildings. (*Reference Design Guidelines Booklet Measurements*)

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Jarvis to approve the requested modification to an architectural requirement (70% transparency) for the East Michigan façade based upon the noted findings of support. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried.**

***LaGrave Street –***

- The existing building and drive-thru constitute a major portion of the LaGrave storefront/façade and limit available space for windows;
- the proposed building expansion to the south is designed for storage - - windows have been limited due to the proposed building use;
- the Village Pharmacy will constitute the only commercial building on the block along LaGrave (with the Berkshire proposal) and will be setback to accommodate the drive-thru - - pedestrian traffic adjacent to the building will be limited and the need for transparency reduced;
- the LaGrave storefront/façade windows could be redesigned consistent with the East Michigan façade architecture to increase the percent of ‘clear glass panels’ provided.  
(*Section 42-257 A., B., and E.*)

**Motion** by Pioch, **supported** by Rumsey to approve the requested modification to an architectural requirement (70% transparency) for the LaGrave Street façade based upon the noted findings of support and subject to submission of a revised elevation reflecting a redesign/enlargement of the windows consistent with the East Michigan façade architecture. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried.**

The Board then considered the application of the streetscape design requirements set forth in Section 42-458. The following was noted:

- street lights exist in the area of the subject property and new/additional street lighting is not required;
- sidewalk reconstruction is proposed to match existing sidewalk widths and allow for connection/alignment;
- street trees along both East Michigan and LaGrave Street are proposed as required;

- a bike rack is proposed to be provided as required.

Board discussion ensued regarding the need for benches and trash receptacles per Section 42-458. Larson opined that providing them in the public realm (along public sidewalks) would further the goal of improving pedestrian activity on the block. Though general Board agreement was noted, it was determined that neither benches nor trash receptacles would be required as part of site plan approval. It was suggested that the applicant consider voluntary placement of same. It was also noted that there may be merit in having the provision of such 'street furniture' considered by the Downtown Development Authority.

It was noted that the signage reflected on the site plan was shown to highlight building architecture and demonstrate signage possibilities. The Board confirmed that any signage proposal will be subject to the sign standards set forth in Section 42-459 and shall be reviewed/ approved through the permit process.

**Motion** was then made by Thomas, **supported** by Hildebrandt to recommend approval of the site plan, based upon a finding of compliance with the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, and subject to the following conditions:

- Approval of the proposed modifications to the architectural requirements pursuant to Section 42-257 and in consideration of the noted 'Findings of Support'.
- Receipt of variance approval from the maximum front yard setback, building frontage, and maximum parking lot frontage requirements set forth in Section 42-254.
- Village Fire Department review/approval.
- Demonstration of compliance with the storm water disposal design criteria set forth in Section 42-402 (3) q. and the review/ approval of the Village Department of Public Works.
- Village Department of Public Works review/approval of all proposed utility extensions/connections.
- Any proposed signage shall be subject to compliance with Ordinance standards and shall require a sign permit.

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

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request for site plan review for the proposed construction of a 23,890 sq ft 1-story assisted living facility. (Phase 2 - Maple Lake Assisted Living Facility) The subject site is located at 677 Hazen Street and is within the R-M Multiple-Family Residential District.

**New Business:  
SPR – Phase 2  
Maple Lake  
Assisted Living  
Facility**

Neil Kraay was present on behalf of the application. Also present was Aaron Neitling of Wightman & Associates.

Neitling provided an overview of the site plan. He stated that the special use permit for the project had been granted on August 4, 2011 and that site plan approval had been granted for Phase 1 at that time. He noted that the applicant now requests site plan approval for the construction of Phase 2.

Neitling highlighted the following elements of the site plan:

- the storm water management plan for the entire site was developed with the construction of Phase 1; the site plan reflects the storm water management design;
- the Phase 3 area will be prepped at the time of Phase 2 construction;
- the existing tree line will be preserved as shown to maintain a buffer and retain the character of the outdoor areas for facility residents;
- the sidewalk network and fencing in Phase 1 will be extended into Phase 2; *(a revised site plan showing sidewalk and fencing changes was distributed)*
- the applicant is currently working with the Village on utility sizing.

He noted that a parking variance has been requested to allow for the establishment of a total of 66 parking spaces to serve the facility at build-out (1 space/unit) - - 36 parking spaces were provided with Phase 1 and an additional 30 spaces are proposed to be established with the development of Phase 2. The variance request will be considered at the June 1, 2015 ZBA meeting.

Kraay reviewed the proposed floor plan of Phase 2 and the general operations of the facility. He noted that Phase 2 will largely serve as a 'memory care' facility.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, with additional reference to the Planning/Zoning Report. It was confirmed that the Special Land Use Permit granted in 2011 had classified the proposed facility as 'housing for the elderly' pursuant to Section 42-367 (16).

**Motion** was then made by Pioch, **supported** by Hildebrandt to recommend approval of the site plan, based upon a finding of compliance with the Site Plan Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-402, and subject to the following conditions:

- Receipt of variance approval from the parking requirements set forth in Section 42-404.
- Compliance with the outdoor lighting standards set forth in Section 42-405 (a).
- Submission of a landscape plan demonstrating compliance with the landscape requirements set forth in Section 42-406 within 90 days of site plan approval.
- Demonstration of compliance with the storm water disposal design criteria set forth in Section 42-402 (3) q. and the review/approval of the Village Department of Public Works.
- Village Fire Department review/approval.
- Village Department of Public Works review/approval of all proposed utility extensions/connections.

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

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request for site plan review for the proposed expansion of the existing Multani Marathon Mart and related site modifications. The subject site is located 186 West Michigan and is within the B-2 General Business District.

**New Business:  
SPR - Multani  
Marathon Mart**

Harvey noted that the proposed expansion will require a special use permit/site plan review and that the application had not been received in time to complete the requisite noticing for this meeting. The Board agreed to place the special use permit public hearing on the June 4, 2015 meeting agenda.

10. Larson stated that no *Ongoing Business* was scheduled for consideration.
11. No Board member comments were offered.
12. No staff comment was offered.

**Ongoing Business**

**Member Comments**

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

13. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

**Adjournment**

Draft

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, June 4, 2015**

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, June 4, 2015 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.  | <b>Meeting Convened</b>                  |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.  | <b>Members Present</b>                   |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Pioch, <b>supported</b> by Rumsey, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>                |
| 4. | <b>Motion</b> by Thomas, <b>supported</b> by Pioch, to approve the minutes of the special Planning Commission meeting of May 13, 2015 as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>               |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.   | <b>Public Comment</b>                    |
| 6. | Larson stated that a public hearing was scheduled to consider the request of Amrit Paul Singh (Marathon Mart) for Special Land Use Permit/Site Plan Review for the proposed occupancy and expansion of an existing gasoline station and convenience store. Subject site is located at 186 West Michigan Avenue and is within the B-2 General Business District. | <b>Public Hearing:<br/>Marathon Mart</b> |

Harvey stated that the applicant received Special Land Use Permit/Site Plan Approval on May 2, 2013 for the construction of a cooler and utility room on the subject site with minor site-related improvements. She noted that the approved construction did not occur and that the site plan approval had expired pursuant to Section 42-402 (7).

Harvey explained that the applicant now proposes the construction of a larger building addition to be occupied by the previously approved cooler and utility room . . . resulting in a total building size of 1728 sq ft. The proposed site-related improvements remain similar to those approved on May 2, 2013. She noted that Special Land Use Permit/Site Plan Review is required for the proposed expansion pursuant to Section 42-367 (13) and Section 42-402.

Amrit Paul Singh was present on behalf of the application. In response to Board questions, he stated that the existing small shed on the site is proposed to be removed. He added that the larger shed will stay in its current location.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Section 42-366 – Special Use Permit Criteria, Section 42-367 (13) – ‘gasoline filling stations’, and Section 42-402 – Site Plan Review, with additional reference to the Planning/Zoning Report. The following was noted:

**: Section 42-367 g. requires a raised curb along all street frontages;**  
no curbing along a portion of the Hazen Street frontage is accepted given the following:

- *The curbing will serve no safety or circulation purpose in that area of the property;*
- *Curbing will be provided along the remainder of the street frontage;*
- *The establishment of curbing in that area will disturb recent improvements made to Hazen Street and serve no purpose,*

**: Section 42-367 j. requires a 5 ft masonry wall along the north property line where the site abuts residentially-zoned property;**  
a 2-row arborvitae screen is accepted in lieu of the wall given the limited extent of abutting residential-zoning, the use of the adjacent residential-zoning as open public space; and, the preference for natural screening in that area.

The landscape requirements for the B-2 District set forth in Section 42-406 were reviewed for application to the subject site. It was noted that the subject property is a developed site and that the elements of the built environment do not allow for compliance with the provisions of Section 42-406. It was agreed that the landscaping proposal set forth on the site plan, with the addition of the arborvitae screen, was acceptable given the limitations of the site.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Rumsey, to grant Special Use Permit 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 ‘gasoline filling stations’ set forth in Section 42-367 (13), noting the following:

1. No curbing along a portion of the Hazen Street frontage is accepted given the following:
  - The curbing will serve no safety or circulation purpose in that area of the property;
  - Curbing will be provided along the remainder of the street frontage;

- The establishment of curbing in that area will disturb recent improvements made to Hazen Street and serve no purpose.
2. A 2-row arborvitae screen is accepted in lieu of a 5 ft masonry wall along the north property line where the site abuts residentially-zoned property given the limited extent of abutting residential-zoning, the use of the adjacent residential-zoning as open public space; and, the preference for natural screening in that area.

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

**Motion** was then made by Rumsey, **supported** by Thomas, to recommend Village Council approval of the site plan 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. Establishment of a double row ‘arborvite screen’ along the north property line where the site abuts residentially-zoned property;
2. Acceptance of the proposed on-site landscaping pursuant to Section 42-406;
3. Village Fire Department review/approval;
4. Demonstration of compliance with the storm water disposal design criteria set forth in Section 42-402 (3) q. and the review/approval of the Village Department of Public Works;
5. Village Department of Public Works review/approval of all proposed utility extensions/connections;
6. Any proposed signage shall be subject to compliance with Ordinance standards and shall require a sign permit.

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

7. Larson stated that a public hearing was scheduled to consider the request of Charles Friese (TNT Fireworks) for Special Land Use Permit/Site Plan Review for the proposed establishment of an ‘open air business’ (temporary fireworks tent sale) at the existing Wal-Mart Store. Subject site is located at 1013 South Kalamazoo Street and is within the B-2 General Business District.

**Public Hearing:  
TNT Fireworks**

Charles Friese was present on behalf of the application. Referencing the application material provided, he gave an overview of the proposed operation and the related-site improvements for the sales area, noting

compliance with the State's applicable safety standards. He explained that TNT Fireworks is the only fireworks vendor associated with Wal-Mart sites. Friese requested that a June 19 – July 11 permit period be considered . . . with said permit to be valid for the next 3 to 5 years.

In response to Board questions, Friese explained that the Letter of Authorization from Wal-Mart references a June 17 – July 8 project timeline to accommodate set-up and tear-down of the sales tent.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the proposal pursuant to Section 42-366 – Special Use Permit Criteria, Section 42-367 (23) – ‘open air business’, and Section 42-402 – Site Plan Review, with additional reference to the Planning/Zoning Report.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Rumsey, to grant Special Use Permit 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 ‘open air business’ set forth in Section 42-367 (23), noting the following:

1. A *‘5 ft fence or wall along the rear and sides of the lot to contain debris’* is not required given the following:
  - the tent area is surrounded by the Wal-Mart development and parking lot;
  - the applicant commits to *‘making sure the environment will be kept clean and safe’* and *‘trash will be removed daily from the site’*
2. The applicant's proposal to use Wal-Mart's restrooms and not provide portable toilets is accepted;
3. The proposed 800 sq ft tent is accepted as the *‘500 sq ft building for office use connected with the open air business’*;
4. A performance bond is determined to be unnecessary.
5. The Special Use Permit is granted for a 3-week period (June 19 – July 10) for the years 2015, 2016 and 2017.

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

**Motion** was then made by Pioch, **supported** by Thomas, to recommend Village Council approval of the site plan 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. The proposed temporary signage is acceptable and shall require a sign permit;
2. Village Fire Department review/approval;
3. Compliance with all Federal, State and Local Ordinances;
4. The Site Plan Approval is for a 3-week period (June 19 – July 10) for the years 2015, 2016 and 2017.

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

8. Larson stated that no *New Business* was scheduled for consideration. **New Business**
9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the review and discussion of the questions raised by the Village Council in their recent review of the recommended Village Revitalization Area PUD District. She referenced the memo prepared by Harvey that sets forth responses to the noted questions. **Ongoing Business:  
Village  
Revitalization Area  
PUD District**

Lengthy Board discussion ensued regarding Question #5 and the proposed 25% transparency requirement for residential buildings. It was concluded that the standard allows for the consideration of ‘windows and doors’ in the calculation of front façade transparency and was reasonable. The Board also noted their support of the proposed building materials requirement referenced in Question #6 citing its application only to residential buildings within the District.

Larson reminded Board members that the Village Council would be considering the proposed text again at the June 8, 2015 Village Council meeting and that Planning Commission members were invited to attend to discuss same with the Council. Harvey advised that she will be in attendance.

10. Larson referenced the site plan review of the proposed Village Pharmacy addition/improvements recently conducted by the Board. She noted that in the application of the Downtown Overlay District, the Board had recommended that neither benches nor trash receptacles be required as part of site plan approval. She expressed concern that there were standards in the new Overlay District that the Board was hesitant to apply. **Member Comments**

Board discussion ensued regarding the Streetscape Design Requirements set forth in Section 42-258. It was determined that the street furniture required within the District would be located within the ‘public realm’ and

may be more appropriately accomplished by the Village. It was agreed that the topic should be raised with the Village Council for feedback.

11. No staff comment was offered.

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

12. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

**Adjournment**

DRAFT

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, July 2, 2015**

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, July 2, 2015 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 609 West Michigan, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.  | <b>Meeting Convened</b>   |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.  | <b>Members Present</b>  |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Pioch, <b>supported</b> by Bogen, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .  | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>   |
| 4. | <b>Motion</b> by Thomas, <b>supported</b> by Pioch, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of June 4, 2015 as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>  |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.   | <b>Public Comment</b>   |
| 6. | Larson stated that no <i>Public Hearing Item</i> was scheduled for consideration.   | <b>Public Hearing Items</b>   |
| 7. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the review and discussion of the revised draft of the Village Revitalization Area PUD District. She noted that the recommended text had been revised pursuant to the Village Council’s review comments provided at their June 8, 2015 meeting. | <b>Ongoing Business:<br/>Village<br/>Revitalization Area<br/>PUD District</b> |

Harvey referenced the draft text (*Public Hearing Draft: Revised per 6.08.15 Village Council Review*) and provided an overview of the proposed revisions, namely the addition of ‘publicly owned and operated park and recreational facility’ as a Permitted Use and ‘farmers’ market’ as a Special Land Use within the District.

She also noted additional Zoning Ordinance amendments proposed in conjunction with the addition of a ‘farmers’ market’ as a special land use. Specifically, a definition for a ‘farmers’ market (Section 42-3) and special land use design standards for a ‘farmers’ market’ (Section 42-367, Item 28) were reviewed. Harvey stated that similar language was recently adopted by an area community and had received legal review and guidance for compliance with State law and recognized GAAMPS.

Board discussion ensued wherein support for the proposed additional uses within the PUD District was noted. It was further agreed that the addition

of a 'farmers' market' as a special land use should also be considered for the CBD and B-2 Districts.

In review of the proposed definition and design standards for a 'farmers' market', the Board recommended the following changes: add a reference to 'homemade products' in the definition (Section 42-3); refer to 'total stall area' as 'individual vendor space' in Section 42-367 (28) a. for consistency; and, revise Section 42-367 (28) c. to refer to '30 feet in depth' instead of '30 feet in length'.

It was then noted that the proposed modifications to Section 42-3 and Section 42-367 (28) and the addition of a 'farmers' market' as a special land use within the CBD and B-2 Districts would require a public hearing before a recommendation on same could be made to the Village Council.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Rumsey to schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 42-3 and Section 42-367, Zoning Ordinance for the August 6, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

**Motion** by Bogen, **supported** by Thomas, to schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the CBD and B-2 Districts so as to add a 'farmers' market' as a special land use for the August 6, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

In further review of the revised PUD District, general discussion ensued regarding the parking standards set forth in Section 42.346 D. It was agreed that minor revisions should be incorporated that clarify the application of existing parking standards and parking lot paving requirements, as well as afford the opportunity to propose common/shared parking facilities within the District. Harvey was directed to make the aforementioned revisions to the draft text for resubmission to the Village Council.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the review of draft text prepared in response to the Planning Commission's discussion at the April meeting regarding the submission of landscape plans.

**New Business:  
Text Amendment -  
Landscape Plans**

It had been noted that the Ordinance currently allows for the submission of landscape plans within 90 days after receiving site plan approval . . . and that Board support had been expressed to remove that option from the Ordinance and require the provision of a landscape plan

with the site plan for Board review. Harvey referenced draft text and provided an overview of the proposed revisions.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Bogen to schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendment to Section 42-406 (8), Zoning Ordinance for the August 6, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**

9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was Board discussion regarding the sign ordinance. She noted that the Board had agreed (at the April meeting) that a review of the sign ordinance in its entirety was warranted. It had been determined that Harvey would develop an overview of the sign ordinance issues to provide structure for that discussion.

**Ongoing Business:  
Sign Ordinance  
Review**

Due to the lateness of the hour, it was agreed to consider the matter at the August meeting, agenda permitting.

10. Larson stated that she had raised the Planning Commission's recently noted concerns regarding the application of the Streetscape Design Requirements set forth in the Downtown Overlay District with the Village Council at their June 8, 2015 meeting.

**Member Comments**

She advised that the Council indicated continued support for the standards but recognized the merit in the application of same at the Village Council level where design could be coordinated and funding determined. Larson stated that the Village Council has agreed to consider the concerns/questions of the Planning Commission.

11. No staff comment was offered.

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

12. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

**Adjournment**

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, August 6, 2015**

1. The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, August 6, 2015 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. **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 Pioch, **supported** by Rumsey, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of July 2, 2015 with the following correction: Pg 3, Item 10, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – add ‘. . the application of the Streetscape Design Requirements **for benches and trash receptacles** set forth in the Downtown Overlay District (**Section 42-258 F.**) with the Village Council . . ‘ 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 scheduled for consideration was the request by Black River Enterprises (Paw Paw Brewing Company) for Special Land Use Permit/Site Plan Review for the proposed establishment of a brewery and restaurant (Paw Paw Brew Pub) within an existing building (formerly Warren Frank Cannery). Subject site is located west of Gremps Street and south of Industrial Drive and is within the I-1 Industrial District (*to be rezoned to the Village Revitalization Area Planned Unit Development District*). **Public Hearing  
Items: SLU/SPR  
Paw Paw Brewing  
Company**

Ben Fleckentstein was present on behalf of the application. Also present was Andrew Rossell of AR Engineering. Fleckenstein provided an overview of the project and proposed use of the building/site. Harvey noted that the proposed ‘brew pub’ is a permitted use within the PUD District and requires only site plan approval; the proposed ‘brewery’ and ‘outdoor seating area’ are special land uses within the PUD District and require special land use permit and site plan approval. She advised that the envisioned ‘farmers market’ will require separate application for a special land use permit/site plan approval.

Rossell then presented the site plan and related development plans/

building elevations. In response to review comments set forth in the Planning/Zoning Report, he offered the following:

- : the subject site is 1.83 acres in area and will represent a 5.3% nonresidential development area of the 35 acre PUD District area;
- : a cross access/cross parking design is proposed in consideration of the Village trailhead park design on the adjacent site;
- : dumpster facilities will be provided on the west side of the building;
- : the proposed stormwater management design accommodates all on-site discharge; an agreement with the Village for shared disposal will likely be forthcoming;
- : a landscape plan was presented, with special reference to the use of 'vegetable garden areas' as landscaped areas;
- : the north wall of the building currently has a brick façade; no changes to the north end of the building are proposed at this time;
- : the renovated building façade will include the use of brick and barnwood;
- : details for an open kitchen and outdoor pizza oven were provided;
- : lighting design will be consistent with the site lighting proposed for the Village Trailhead Park;
- : benches and trash receptacles will be placed within the plaza area along the proposed trail and near the cross-access sidewalks as suggested;
- : signage will be designed in accordance with applicable Ordinance standards.

Rossell also provided a review of the demolition plans for portions of the site and building. He noted that Phase 1 will include the brew pub and outdoor seating area and Phase 2 will largely incorporate the brewery area.

He explained that the west side of the building is close to the kitchen and brewery areas and will be used for loading activity and the dumpster location. In discussion regarding the north property line, he confirmed that access to the site can be made from Factory Street but that property boundaries in that area are in flux and parking space layout will be modified as they are finalized.

In response to Board questions, Harvey stated that the proposed PUD District and related rezonings are scheduled for Village Council consideration/adoption at the August 10, 2015 Village Council meeting. She noted that the project has been designed pursuant to the proposed PUD District design standards in anticipation of the upcoming text change/rezoning.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

Board discussion ensued regarding the relationship between the proposed site development and the proposed Village Trailhead Park on the adjacent property. It was noted that shared parking and cross access agreements could be required as conditions of approval even without a specific design proposal for the park site. Harvey confirmed that the Village currently owns the adjacent property and that such agreements could be provided regardless of the future of the trailhead park.

The Board proceeded with a review of the provisions of the proposed PUD District set forth in Sections 42-341 – 42-348, the Special Land Use Criteria set forth in Section 42-366, and the proposed PUD Procedural Guidelines set forth in Section 42-349.

**Motion** was then made by Rumsey, **supported** by Jarvis, to grant Special Use Permit for the proposed establishment of a brewery and outdoor seating area and recommend Village Council approval of the site plan for the proposed establishment of a brewery and restaurant with outdoor seating (Paw Paw Brewing Company/Paw Paw Brew Pub) within an existing building located at 828 DuoTang (*formerly Warren Frank Cannery*).

Approval is granted/recommended based upon a finding of compliance with the Special Use Permit Criteria set forth in Section 42-366 and the PUD Procedural Guidelines set forth in Section 42-349, and **conditioned upon the following:**

1. Village Council adoption of the PUD District and related rezonings within the Village Revitalization Area;
2. Provision of the following additional information and an administrative determination of compliance with Ordinance standards;
  - : *doorway and window calculations* for the portion of the renovated building area that will face the adjacent trailway or parking areas
  - : *exterior finish materials* for the portion of the renovated building area that will face the adjacent trailway or parking areas
3. Acceptance of a cross access and shared parking arrangement with the property adjacent to the east to meet access and parking requirements;
4. Acceptance of the proposed on-site landscaping;
5. Village Fire Department review/approval;
6. Demonstration of compliance with the storm water disposal design

criteria set forth in Section 42-402 (3) q. and the review/approval of the Village Department of Public Works;

7. Village Public Utilities Department review/approval of all proposed utility extensions/connections;
8. All utilities (telephone, electric, cable) shall be placed underground;
9. Any proposed signage shall be subject to compliance with Ordinance standards and shall require a sign permit;
10. Compliance with lighting standards set forth in Section 42-405;
11. Placement of benches and trash receptacles within the plaza area along the 'proposed trail' and near the cross-access sidewalks to benefit pedestrian activity.

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

7. Larson stated that a public hearing was scheduled to consider proposed amendments of the Zoning Ordinance so as to provide for 'farmers' markets'. Specifically, a definition for a 'farmers' market' (Section 42-3); special land use design standards for a 'farmers' market' (Section 42-367, Item 28); and, the addition of a 'farmers' market' as a special land use within the CBD and B-2 Districts are proposed.

**Public Hearing  
Items: Text  
Amendment -  
Farmers' Markets**

No public comment was offered.

The Board noted that the proposed amendments had received extensive discussion at the July 2, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Pioch to recommend approval of the following proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance:

: Amend **Section 42-3 – Definitions**, so as to add:

*Farmers' Market:* A marketing facility at which multiple local farmers sell fruit and vegetables and often meat, cheese, bakery, and homemade products directly to consumers.

: Amend **Section 42-367 – Special land uses**, so as to add:

(28) Farmers' market.

- a. Brokered produce and products may not exceed 10% of the individual vendor space. Brokered produce must be labeled with the farm where it originated. Brokered products are only allowed if locally owned and produced by the vendor in Michigan.
- b. Vendors shall meet State of Michigan Guidelines for 'cottage food' items.
- c. A vendor space shall not exceed 12 feet in width and 30 feet in depth.
- d. There shall be provided adequate area at each vendor space to park a single vehicle, but not a vehicle plus a trailer.
- e. A single vendor may occupy a maximum of 2 vendor spaces.

: Amend **Section 42-223 – Special land use (B-2 District)**, so as to add:

(12) Farmers' market.

: Amend **Section 42-243 – Special land use (CBD District)**, so as to add:

(7) Farmers' market.

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

- 8. Larson stated that a public hearing was scheduled to consider a proposed amendment of the Zoning Ordinance regarding landscape plans.

**Public Hearing  
Items: Text  
Amendment -  
Landscape Plans**

No public comment was offered.

The Board noted that the proposed amendment had received extensive discussion at the July 2, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Pioch to recommend approval of the following proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance:

: Amend **Section 42-406 – Minimum Landscaping Requirements** so as to read:

- (8) Landscaping plans shall be submitted as part of the required site plan (Section 42-402 (3) h.) and shall be subject to the site plan review and approval process set forth in Section 42-402 (1). Landscaping plans may be submitted as an amendment to the site plan, thereby not requiring an additional review fee but shall still be subject to the required review and approval process. A phased landscaping plan may be submitted for a project that is contemplated for staged or phased construction.

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

- 9. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was Board discussion regarding the sign ordinance. She noted that the Board had agreed (at the April meeting) that a review of the sign ordinance in its entirety was warranted. It had been determined that Harvey would develop an overview of the sign ordinance issues to provide structure for that discussion.

**Ongoing Business:  
Sign Ordinance  
Review**

Due to the lateness of the hour, it was agreed to consider the matter at the September meeting.

- 10. No member comments were offered.
- 11. No staff comment was offered.
- 12. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

**Member Comments**  
**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**  
**Adjournment**

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, October 1, 2015**

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, October 1, 2015 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 404 East Michigan Avenue, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.   | <b>Meeting Convened</b>                            |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Hildebrandt, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas.<br>Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.   | <b>Members Present</b>                             |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Rumsey, <b>supported</b> by Thomas, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>                          |
| 4. | <b>Motion</b> by Jarvis, <b>supported</b> by Hildebrandt, to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of September 3, 2015 as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>                         |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.  | <b>Public Comment</b>                              |
| 6. | Larson stated that no Public Hearing Item was scheduled for consideration.   | <b>Public Hearing Items</b>                        |
| 7. | Larson stated that no New Business was scheduled for consideration.  | <b>New Business</b>                                |
| 8. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration was continued review of the Village sign ordinance. She referenced the Ordinance Overview developed by Harvey that was presented to the Board in September. She further noted that the <i>Michigan Sign Guidebook: The Local Planning and Regulation of Signs</i> developed by Scenic Michigan and Planning & Zoning Center (MSU) had been secured by the Village. Copies of the guidebook were distributed to Planning Commission members. | <b>Ongoing Business:<br/>Sign Ordinance Review</b> |

Larson explained that the Ordinance Overview had been developed to identify existing sign ordinance issues and to provide structure for Board discussion of same.

Board review of the existing sign ordinance ensued wherein the following conclusions were noted:

- The Description and Purpose statements (42-431) are important; existing text is satisfactory.
- Existing provisions regulate many temporary signs by 'content' classification; this should be a major consideration in the ordinance

rewrite;

- The metrics for temporary signs in residential districts should be 6 sq ft maximum size; 3 ft maximum height; no setback requirement.
- Can time limits be attached to temporary signs?
- The 'home occupation' sign provision was recently reviewed/revise and is satisfactory.
- The key to an effective sign ordinance is enforcement; 'what are we willing and able to enforce' should frame the rewrite effort.
- The sign ordinance should be simplified and exclude sign standards that are difficult to enforce.

The Board directed Harvey to continue with the preparation of a draft ordinance that is consistent with the recommendations of the Overview and responds to the Board's discussion points. Consideration of draft text is tentatively scheduled for November.

9. Harvey noted that the public hearing for the Plan amendment and related rezoning regarding property in the vicinity of 204 South Kalamazoo Avenue is scheduled for the November meeting. She noted that all required noticing had been completed.

**Member Comments**

Larson reminded that updated copies of the Zoning Ordinance for Planning Commission members is needed.

11. No staff comment was offered.

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

12. There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

**Adjournment**

**Minutes, Paw Paw Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting, November 5, 2015**

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | The regular Planning Commission meeting of Thursday, November 5, 2015 convened at 7:00 p.m. at 404 East Michigan Avenue, Paw Paw, Michigan. Chairperson Larson presiding.   | <b>Meeting Convened</b>  |
| 2. | Present: Larson, Bogen, Jarvis, Pioch, Rumsey, and Thomas. Also present: Village Planning Consultant, Rebecca Harvey.   | <b>Members Present</b>   |
| 3. | <b>Motion</b> by Thomas, <b>supported</b> by Hildebrandt, to approve the agenda as presented. All members present voting yes. The <b>motion carried</b> .   | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>  |
| 4. | Consideration of the minutes of the October 1, 2015 Planning Commission meeting was tabled to the December meeting.   | <b>Approval of Minutes</b>   |
| 5. | No public comment regarding non-agenda items was offered.   | <b>Public Comment</b>  |
| 6. | Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request of Brenda Atkinson to rezone approximately .3 acres located at 204 South Kalamazoo Street from the R-O Restricted Office District to the B-2 General Business District. It was noted that an amendment to the Village of Paw Paw Master Plan Future Land Use Map so as to reclassify the subject property from the MXD Density classification to a Commercial (CC, HC, or C/O) classification is required. | <b>Public Hearing:<br/>Master Plan<br/>Amendment/<br/>Rezoning - 204<br/>Kalamazoo Ave</b> |

Larson stated that, after review of the surrounding zoning and land use, and in consideration of the Future Land Use Map, it was determined that it would be reasonable to expand the area under consideration to include the 2 parcels adjacent to the north and the 2 parcels adjacent to the south of 204 South Kalamazoo Street. She noted that the subject 5 parcels represent the only R-O zoning in the area and abut commercial zoning to the north and south. Including all 5 parcels for consideration will allow for a comprehensive review of the area in responding to the specific rezoning request.

Brenda Atkinson was present on behalf of the application. She stated that 204 Kalamazoo Ave is currently zoned for 'offices' and that the requested B-2 District will be a better fit for the proposed use of the property as a salon and spa.

An adjacent property owner was present and indicated support for the requested rezoning. He noted that the B-2 District will afford the area greater use options.

No further public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the zoning/land use pattern in the area. The following was noted:

- The subject 5 parcels are adjacent to commercial zoning on the north and south and opposite commercial zoning to the east;
- The requested rezoning will remove the option of providing residential land use near the downtown;
- The 'downtown overlay district' is available to achieve mixed use/density in the area;
- Leaving the lot furthest west within the R-O District would provide a buffer for the limited residential zoning adjacent to the west.

Referencing the Planning/Zoning Analysis prepared by Harvey, the Board continued with a review of the request pursuant to the Amendment Review Criteria set forth in Section 42-33, Zoning Ordinance.

Harvey stated that a letter had been received from the VanBuren County Planning Commission noting that the Commission unanimously concurs with the proposed Plan amendment.

**Motion** by Rumsey, **supported** by Pioch, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendment to the Village of Paw Paw Master Plan Future Land Use Map to change the planning classification of property located in the general vicinity of 204 South Kalamazoo Street (5 parcels totaling approximately 1 acre located on the west side of South Kalamazoo Street, between Paw Paw Street and St Joseph Street) from the MXD Mixed Density planning classification to the C/O Commercial/Office planning classification . . based on the surrounding zoning and land use pattern and the development trends along that portion of the corridor. All members present voting yes. The **motion carried**.

**Motion** by Thomas, **supported** by Hildebrandt, to recommend Village Council approval of the proposed amendment to the Village of Paw Paw Zoning Map, as made part of the Village of Paw Paw Zoning Ordinance by Section 42-102 thereof, to rezone the eastern-most 4 parcels of the above-described property from the existing R-O Restricted Office District zoning classification to the B-2 General Business District zoning classification.

The recommendation to approve is based upon the conclusions of the rezoning criteria set forth in Section 42-33, with specific reference to the surrounding zoning and land use; development trends along that portion of the corridor; and, a recognition that the size of the 4 parcels will dictate the design and intensity of commercial use in the area. All

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

7. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was the request for site plan review for the proposed conversion of an existing 2100 square foot residence to a salon/spa/yoga studio. The subject property is located at 204 South Kalamazoo Street and is within the R-O District. (Under consideration for rezoning to B-2 District)

**New Business:  
SPR – 204 South  
Kalamazoo Ave**

Brenda Atkinson was present on behalf of the application. She provided an overview of the proposed occupancy of the existing building and related site improvements. The details of the proposed on-site and off-site parking layout were presented.

No public comment was offered on the matter.

The Board proceeded with a review of the Site Plan Standards set forth in Section 42-402 (4), with specific reference to the Planning/Zoning Report. Board discussion ensued wherein the following was noted:

- No changes are proposed to the existing access arrangement;
- The existing driveway is narrow and only allows for 1-way traffic . . . parking should not be located along the driveway due to limited parking space maneuverability and poor site circulation;
- On-street parking can be used in meeting parking requirements;
- Outdoor lighting has not been detailed;
- Refuse disposal has not been indicated;
- On-site landscaping has not been shown;
- The paved parking area is required to be designed to demonstrate compliance with storm water runoff standards;
- The proposed barrier-free ramp has not been shown.

Atkinson stated that she would like to return with a revised site plan that responds to the Board's review comments for consideration in December or January. She noted that she is not anticipating construction until Spring, 2016 and that she would prefer to return with an adequate site plan within the next two months. The Board agreed and tentatively scheduled continued consideration of the site plan for the December or January meeting.

8. Larson stated that the next item for consideration was Board discussion regarding the sign ordinance. Due to the lateness of the hour, it was agreed to consider the matter at the December meeting.
9. Larson referenced the invitation received for the Wings of God facility tours.

**Ongoing Business:  
Sign Ordinance  
Review**

**Member Comments**

11. Harvey stated that the ZBA met on November 2, 2015 and considered a request from Berkshire – Paw Paw for variance approval from the first story height requirement in the Downtown Overlay District. She advised that the variance was granted.

**Village Manager/  
Planning Consultant**

Harvey further provided an update on the Village's participation as a Rising Tide Community.

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

**Adjournment**

*Draft*