

Clarence Board of Appeals Minutes  
Tuesday, June 14, 2005  
7:00 PM

On Tuesday June 14, 2005 at 7 PM the Town of Clarence Zoning Board of Appeals heard the following requests for variances:

APPEAL NO I David Reinecke Agricultural Flood Zone	Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a fifty-five foot (55') variance to allow the construction of a new garage (26' x 28') in the front yard of 8075 Tonawanda Creek Road.
--	--

APPEAL NO I is in variance to Section 3.1.6 setbacks.

APPEAL NO II Michael Wrobleski Ag Rural Res/Industrial	Request the Board of Appeals approve and grant two variances: 1. A four hundred foot (400') variance to allow up to a six hundred (600') yard setback for the construction of a new single-family home at 9520 Wehrle Drive. 2. A use variance to allow for the new residential home to be built in the Industrial Zoning District.
--	---

APPEAL NO II is in variance to Section 3.2.6 setbacks and Section 3.9.2 permitted uses.

APPEAL NO III Walgreens Drug Store Traditional Neighborhood	Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant an area variance to allow parking spaces to be located in the front yard of the proposed structure at 6785 Transit Rd.
---	--

APPEAL NO III is in variance to Section 3.4.11(B-1) design standards for parking lots.

APPEAL NO IV Berkshire Homes PURD	Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a seven foot (7') variance creating a forty two foot (42') peak of residence to be constructed at 4745 Goodrich Road.
---	---

APPEAL NO IV is in variance to section 3.3.9 building height.

APPEAL NO V Jeff Schwartz Residential Single Family	Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant an eight hundred forty square foot (840 sq ft) variance to allow the construction of a one thousand five hundred sixty square foot (1560 sq ft) pole barn at 5645 Thompson Road.
---	--

APPEAL NO V is in variance to Section 3.3.10 accessory structures.

Board of Appeals members present were:

Ronald Newton  
John Gatti  
Arthur Henning

John Brady  
Raymond Skaine  
Eric Heuser

Other Town officials present were:

James Callahan, Director of Community Dev.  
James Hartz, Asst. Director of Community Dev.

Other Interested Parties Present:

David Reineke  
Sean Hopkins  
Dave White  
John Chmiel  
Jerry Metz  
Carmen Cimato  
Christina Karl

Mike Wrobleski  
Andy Hunt  
Mark Obuhanych  
Cheryl Chmiel  
Marianne Metz  
Shelagh Thomas  
Jeff Schwartz

Motion by Raymond Skaine, seconded by John Brady, to approve the minutes of the meeting held on May 10, 2005, as written.

ALL VOTING AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

**APPEAL NO I**  
David Reinecke  
Agricultural Flood Zone

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a fifty-five foot (55') variance to allow the construction of a new garage (26' x 28') in the front yard of 8075 Tonawanda Creek Road.

Discussion:

Mr. Reinecke explained that he wants to construct a garage in the front yard of his property because he has future plans to demolish the existing house and build another house. He said the new house would sit pretty much where the existing house is, allowing a side entry into the garage. He doesn't want to move it back much further because there would be more driveway to plow. Ron Newton stated that he was the only property owner sitting that close to the road. Mr. Reinecke said that there are others across the road, some being 30 or 40 feet from the road and one being 300 feet from the road. He said there doesn't seem to be any consistency. He said the people to the west of him are about 200 feet. Mr. Newton asked Jim Callahan what the general setback was for this area. Jim Callahan replied that it varies in that area. Mr. Newton mentioned that there are many trees/hedges on either side of his property and in front; it would be difficult to even see the garage from the road. Ron Newton said that the immediate problem in granting this

variance is that it would be allowing Mr. Reinecke to move his house forward. John Gatti asked the applicant how much land he owned. Mr. Reinecke replied that it was 2.2 acres; about 100 feet wide by 1,000 feet deep. He said about 200 feet back is cut and the rest is heavy woods. Ray Skaine asked the applicant if he notified the neighbors, getting their consent forms. Mr. Reinecke replied yes. He added that there is no building on the property to the east, which is owned by Niagara Produce. Mr. Skaine asked if Mr. Reinecke would object to a motion that the building only be used forever as a garage. Mr. Reinecke said that he would not object. Eric Heuser asked what hardship Mr. Reinecke would have if this wasn't approved. Mr. Reinecke said there would be more driveway to shovel and he wanted to be able to come into the side of the garage. He said the house is unlivable. He added that the woman who owned it was evicted; she had animals living in the house – donkeys, horses and chickens. He said the house would be knocked down next year, and he would be building a new house. Mr. Newton said he was having a hard time picturing how the garage would be attached to the house, and Mr. Reinecke said that it was going to be a detached garage. Mr. Newton asked if the house would be to the rear of the garage. (Mr. Reinecke indicated on the survey/plan exactly where the garage and new house would be positioned.)

**Action:**

Motion by Ray Skaine, seconded by John Gatti, to approve Appeal No. I, as written, with the stipulation that the structure to be built, a 26' x 28' garage, will remain as a garage as long as it exists on the property.

ALL VOTING AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

**APPEAL NO II**

Michael Wrobleski  
Ag Rural Res/Industrial

Request the Board of Appeals approve and grant two variances:

1. A four hundred foot (400') variance to allow up to a six hundred foot (600') front yard setback for the construction of a new single-family home at 9520 Wehrle Drive.
2. A use variance to allow for the new residential home to be built in the Industrial Zoning District.

**Discussion:**

Ron Newton expressed a concern that the property wasn't staked; he said it was difficult to find the property (there was no sign) and maneuver on the property. Mr. Wrobleski apologized for the property not being staked. He said that he doesn't own the property and didn't want to cut anything down or change it in any way. Mr. Wrobleski stated that he wants to build a single-family home, about a 2,000 to 2,500 sq. ft. ranch. He said that the first 300 feet or so of the property is mostly clear and then it becomes a very dense woods. He said he would like to be set back in there, far enough so that the home would not be visible from any direction, just to have a private setting. He said this lot is very close to work, as opposed to going further to an outer ring suburb. He said he was able to talk to all of the neighbors, except the neighbor at 9510, and they were all overwhelmingly supportive of this project. He said they all have serious concerns about a major development going in there. He added that most of them didn't know that the

property was zoned industrial, and they didn't want any kind of industrial site to be there. He said they were all very willing to sign the documentation that he enclosed.

John Gatti asked if the applicant owned the property right now. Mr. Wrobleski replied that there are several contingencies to be considered before he purchases the land. John Gatti asked for clarification regarding where the property is located and the size of the property. (Mr. Wrobleski indicated on the survey/site plan exactly where the property is located.) The applicant indicated that it is the third lot in off of Gunville Road, and is 14.2 acres and has 280 feet of frontage on the road. It also goes back about 270 feet, widens to 405 feet, and then goes back to 1,620 feet (according to the unofficial survey that the seller gave him). Mr. Gatti asked the applicant if his intent was to build one house. Mr. Wrobleski replied yes. He said he is looking for property that is a little bit quieter, with a little bit more room.

Ray Skaine asked the applicant if he has a binding contract with the owner to buy the property. The applicant replied that he did not yet have a contract. Mr. Skaine said that he has a problem granting a variance on a piece of property that this applicant does not own. Jim Callahan stated the applicant has permission from the owner to pursue this variance. Mr. Skaine asked the applicant what other issues needed resolving. Mr. Wrobleski stated that the only other issue needing resolution is the final price. He said that, in his opinion, it is rather odd that the property is zoned industrial with all the other residential houses in the area. Jim Callahan said that, upon the public hearings on the Zoning Law, it was determined that the area along the frontage should remain residential. He said the front area was zoned rural/residential, and the back part was left industrial. He said that it doesn't make sense to have residential on the front and industrial on the rear. He said the triangle piece, where the cell tower is located, is the only piece that has frontage that is Industrial. He said that everything to the east of that piece is Residential. Mr. Skaine asked the applicant if there was any chance that the deal on the property might not go through. The applicant stated that there is a chance. Jim Callahan stated that a letter (Representation of Property Authorization) is included in the file. Mr. Skaine's read the letter into the minutes.

John Brady asked if this property was the same property that was given a variance for a greenhouse a few years ago. Jim Callahan stated that this property is unrelated to that property.

Arthur Henning asked if all this property is zoned residential. Jim Callahan stated that it is all residential on the frontage, but when you get back 400 feet, it's industrial. It's left over from the future land use plan out of the Master Plan. He said, when it got to the rezoning, the residents out there wanted it to remain residential. Mr. Henning asked about the uses along the road frontage. Mr. Callahan said they would remain the same. Mr. Henning asked the applicant if there are any other homes nearby that would be visible from a new home on the property. Mr. Wrobleski replied that his home would be built within the dense forest and would be invisible from any angle. Mr. Henning asked the applicant what his intent was for the remaining property. He replied that he had no other plans for it, other than to enjoy it.

Mr. Skaine asked if a clause could be added to the approval in case the petitioner doesn't purchase the property. Jim Callahan said that a condition could be put on it. Mr. Skaine said he's not against what the applicant is proposing, but he doesn't like giving

someone carte blanche for something he doesn't own. Mr. Wrobleski said it was fine with him.

Mr. Newton asked what would happen if the applicant wanted to build an automobile repair shop on the back of the property or a windmill for power. Jim Callahan said he wouldn't be allowed and would still require Town Board approval. He added that because the front is zoned residential, it really limits the back use because you wouldn't be able to access the industrial through residential. He said that the industrial zoning on this particular piece is land locked. Mr. Wrobleski said he wouldn't care if the whole property were zoned Residential because he doesn't need it for industrial purposes. He worries that if someone sees that half of his lot is industrial, could the Town usurp this so they can get more money from the land as industrial. Jim Callahan said that it could just be conditioned to be residential.

**Action:**

Motion by Ray Skaine, seconded by John Brady, to approve Appeal No II (Part 1 and Part 2) as requested, with the following stipulations:

1. Appeal is subject to the petitioner being the final owner of the property; if this should fall through, the Appeal becomes null and void; and
2. This property can only be used for residential and accessory use.

ALL VOTING AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

**APPEAL NO III**

Walgreens Drug Store  
Traditional Neighborhood

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant an area variance to allow parking spaces to be located in the front yard of the proposed structure at 6785 Transit Rd.

**Discussion:**

Sean Hopkins started the discussion by introducing all interested parties present. Andy Hunt, of Myron M. Hunt, Inc. introduced the proposed elevation and the proposed site plan. He said the proposed elevation is a result of many meetings, including the planning board and the executive planning board, and reiterations in response to criticisms of the original design of the building. He said they have come up with one that fits the character of Clarence and the neighborhood, and one that is unique to Walgreens. (He gave a brief description of the building.) He stated that the Executive Planning Board requested that they look at a number of representative examples of local architecture that they liked, and this was the end result, after a number of variations. He stated the elevation is a prototypical elevation, very similar to the one at Transit and Greiner. He said the building is a much more expensive building, but worth the investment. He discussed the site plan, also subject to a lot of discussion. He said it was a compromise in meeting the Town's new zoning code, specifically in regard to the location of parking. He said, "what we have been able to do, based upon an earlier version, which was consistent with the original zoning, is to come up with a masonry screen wall, ... designed with the input of some planning

members." He said the wall is intended to prohibit any kind of view of the parking lot from an automobile or passing traffic. He said, "another feature that breaks up the parking is the L-shaped configuration, which is consistent with a prototypical Walgreens. It distributes the parking around the sides so that you don't have this big mass of asphalt. It also makes it more pedestrian-friendly. We've tried to address the pedestrian-friendly goal of the new zoning. The goal of the Traditional Neighborhood is to try to keep the rural character of the neighborhoods. It's our contention, that when you look at the other uses on the other corners (the car lot, Top's, Kenyons), that it is much closer than the other structures." He said that it might even look unusual to see it set so close to the street, when the others are set back. He described Transit Road as a five-lane thoroughfare at the intersection, and just north a two-lane, being more rural in character. He said, "for these reasons, this design is very consistent with this intersection, even if it is not in compliance, strictly speaking, with the current zoning." He said the site is a large one, which could support additional development, but they would be leaving all the remaining space open, about a third of the space open. He said it would allow them to put a 60 foot setback from the pavement to the lot line to the nearest adjoining residence (the Metz family residence). He added that they have agreed to install a privacy screened fence and landscaping. He said Exxon-Mobile currently owns the site and they are under contract to purchase it, subject to getting approvals. He said they considered other sites in the Town of Amherst, but thought this site was very well suited to their use. He said they could all think of less desirable users to locate on that corner. He said that the parking was the sole feature of the zoning that they were not able to accommodate. He added, "we're looking at approximately a \$3 million capital investment, which translates into a significant tax revenue. We don't know what the sales volume will be, but if it were to generate the average store volume for the Walgreens chain, it would contribute nearly \$700,000 a year in sales tax revenue."

Dave White, of Walgreens, handed out information on focus groups. He explained that 40% of the people come into the store for a quick stop or convenience. He said that "convenience" was their niche, and that's why they're trying to pick great "corners" as they expand. He said Transit and County is a great corner. He said 87% of their customers drive and 8% walk. The 8% is generated from places like downtown Chicago. He said the one thing they found from their focus was that people want convenience and safety. He said that they have found that when the parking is in the rear, it appears less lighted, and the female customer (the majority of their customers) doesn't feel safe when they park at their store. But if they park on the traffic side of the store, more people are watching and they feel safer going into the store. Thirty percent of their business is done at night, however they are not anticipating this store to be a 24-hour store, like the one at Transit and Greiner. He said it starts getting dark at 4:30 and they are a 4 to 7 store (that's where the 30% comes from). When people get off from work, it is convenient to stop in. He said that he is a resident of Clarence and is also concerned about what goes on that corner. He said that he manages ten different stores and has been in all types of situations, as far as trying to be a good neighbor. He said the company does everything they can to be a good neighbor. Regarding jobs, he said that market research is done and their people are paid competitively. He said there will be at least 2 and a half pharmacists, making \$95,000 to \$100,000 per year. Looking at the whole store, the average wage is approximately \$12.00 to \$15.00 per hour (excludes pharmacists but includes management). He said an assistant manager earns about \$35,000/year and a manager makes considerably more than that. He said they will have approximately 12 to 14 employees on the front end of the store, 2-1/2 pharmacists, and 3 to 5 technicians. He said they have full benefits and encourage full-time employees.

Sean Hopkins brought up Town Law Section 267-b-3. He said it is the balancing test and the Board's job is to balance the benefits that will be realized by Andy Hunt and Walgreens, if the variance is granted that allows them to park in the front, versus any resulting detriment. In other words, what harm will result if this variance is granted. He said, "pursuant to that balancing test, there's five criteria that are to be considered, which support the granting of the variance:

1. Would the granting of the variance result in an undesirable change in the character of that area? As Andy has already indicated, clearly the character of that area is commercial. There is the large Top's plaza, the Kenyon's gas station and the car rental agency. We feel that this will be the nicest corner of the four, unequivocally. We hope the neighbors will feel the same way. When viewing the character, it's also important to consider what is there now. If you go to that site today, you will see a dilapidated structure that is not well maintained. It has been that way for several years. We are confident that, if we are given the opportunity to move forward, the site will be cleaned up quickly. In fact, one of the neighbors has asked us when we are going to start the project. It may end of being next spring, but when we close on the site, after getting the approvals, we will get that structure out of there and clean up, making sure it's not a nuisance to the adjoining property owners and the Town of Clarence. We think this criteria justifies a break in the variance. What is the purpose of that TND zoning? The only aspect of that zoning classification that we do not comply with is the parking in the front yards. Unfortunately, we are a corner location so that includes along Transit Road and County Road. We understand that it is an aesthetic aspect of the zoning code. The Town does not want either pedestrians or those driving past the site to see the 'sea of parking' that Andy mentioned. We won't have a 'sea of parking' but we will have parking in front. What we have done to address and mitigate that concern is to propose the decorative brick wall. I think that will be fairly unique along Transit Road. I also believe that it will be quite attractive. The Town is also interested in encouraging the development of pedestrian-friendly sites. As Dave and Andy indicated, 90% of Walgreen's customers arrive by motor vehicle. At this site, we know it will be much higher than that. Nonetheless, we have made it a pedestrian-friendly site and maybe, as Swormville continues to develop in the future, there will be more people walking along Transit Road and we will be prepared for that.
2. Can the benefits sought by the applicant be achieved by some other method? We've spent a lot of time looking at various alternatives, but, at the end of the day, the design that provides parking in the front yards is really all that works here. The perception of a large number of customers is that, if the parking isn't in the front, they will simply not use the site. You can see how elderly and female customers, typical customers for Walgreens, could feel that way. We really do need to provide parking close to the front of the building.
3. Is the requested area variance substantial? Given the fact that we are providing the screen wall on both Transit and County Road, and that not all the parking is in the front of the building, it is our position that it is not a substantial variance. It is also important to keep in mind, despite the fact that this project was begun 4 to 5 months before the zoning code was adopted, that it complies with every other aspect of the TND zoning classification in terms of the layout, the landscape, and a set back that is 3 times what would be required.

4. Would there be adverse, physical, or environmental impact that would result from the granting of the variance? It is our position, as a result of that decorative screen to be provided, that there will not be a negative adverse impact in terms of character or environmental consequences. We will have to go through further review with the Town Board ...
5. Was the difficulty self-created? Obviously the change in zoning was not created by the applicant."

Mr. Henning said there are so many banks and drug stores along Transit Road and he doesn't understand why we need another drug store.

Mr. Hunt explained that grocers have gotten in the drug store business, leaving a void in the neighborhood locations. There has been a demand for a local market niche. He said that even though there has been a proliferation of these free standing drug stores, there is also an attrition going on of the old ones, in line, that are closing. You end up with more drug stores, in part driven by medicine today being based on pharmaceuticals and needing an outlet to distribute them.

Mr. White said the trade area is about two miles, and when you get outside that trade area, it's not as convenient for the customer. He added that they aren't planning to put a store every two miles, but this area, based on their research, is a different trade area.

Mr. Henning asked how long the store at Transit and Greiner had been there and if it was profitable. Mr. White said that it was built in 1998 and wasn't their best store. Mr. Henning said he goes in there a lot but never sees anyone in there. Mr. White said the traffic for that store is in the upper third for the Buffalo area; it depends on the day and time you are going in there.

Mr. Skaine asked about the unused area on the site and if something could be built. Mr. Hopkins replied that they are willing to agree, as a condition, NOT to build there. He added that it is close to the creek and you could run into floodway issues and floodplain issues. Mr. White said that it was theoretically possible but they would deed-restrict it, or do whatever was necessary to back up their promise. Mark Obuhanyer added that he has been with Walgreens for 21 years, moving 8 times, and has never seen that much green space on any property.

Mr. Brady said he's not wild about the idea and thinks it's suicide (for pedestrians) to get anywhere near the cars on Transit Road. Mr. Hopkins said to keep in mind that the 10% pedestrians is a nationwide statistic, and that they are not envisioning ... He reminded everyone, respectfully, that the issue before the board tonight is the parking and whether it should be in the front or behind the building. Mr. White added that the pedestrian traffic for this location is estimated to be less than 2%.

Mr. Skaine agreed with Mr. Hopkins that they were to be addressing only the TND subject. He said he felt it would be a very good project, and personally, probably wouldn't go to a drug store where he had to park and walk around to the front of the building.

John Gatti said he couldn't find anything wrong with the project and added that it is important to help out the people who want to develop in our Town. He said the project is



similar to what happened at Greiner and Transit. There were problems with the neighbors east on Greiner, but nothing ever came of it.

Mr. Newton stated that the zoning for the Transit/Greiner store is different that it is for this store. Mr. Gatti said he understood that. Mr. Newton mentioned Concept #2 and why Walgreens couldn't live with it. He said because of the way the property is configured, there is no way they can justify sticking totally to the zoning. He said the building would have to be way up in the front corner and everything else behind it. He didn't understand why they need that much parking; Transit/Greiner doesn't ever fill their parking lot. He said concept #2 seems to be the approach to give us what we want. A discussion ensued comparing concept 2 and 3, specifically in regards to the parking scenarios. Mr. Newton said that this use will be different than what Amherst did with Tops and Kenyons. He said it will even be different than what's across County because it's not in the same zoning. Mr. Newton asked about traffic studies and Mr. Hunt replied that they were 15,000 one way and 7,000 – 10,000 the other way. Mr. Newton said that he has gone to the Transit/Greiner store on a weekly basis and has never had trouble finding a parking space close to the door. He said, "you've got a big parking area, and not a whole lot of people using it." A Walgreen's representative said that he bases his information on prescription count and customer count. Mr. Newton said there are 10 to 15 cars in that parking lot at any given time.

Sean Hopkins said that if the project goes through, the parking area along County Road, closest to the nearest resident, may not be needed. But, he said, we need to address now that it MAY be needed. He said he shared Mr. Newton's belief that when he goes to drug stores, there seems to be excess parking. He said that there is a perception that if there is plenty of parking, the customer will be able to get in and out quickly. Mr. Hunt said, "we could lose that row back there." He added that retailers do a disproportionate amount of business at holiday time and that's when the overflow is needed. Mr. Newton asked, "how many more spaces are you picking up in concept 3 versus the one you are showing?" Mr. Hunt responded that there were 45 spaces in the front, and if you look at the L-shaped distribution, there are 60 spaces.

Action:

John Gatti made a motion to move to the previous question and Arthur Henning seconded it. Mr. Newton asked if there were any questions on the motion. There were none. ALL AYES. MOTION CARRIED.

Motion by John Gatti, seconded by Ray Skaine, to approve Appeal No III as written.

John Brady	AYE
John Gatti	AYE
Ray Skaine	AYE
Arthur Henning	NAY
Ron Newton	NAY

MOTION CARRIED.

**APPEAL NO IV**  
Berkshire Homes  
PURD

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a seven foot (7') variance creating a forty two foot (42') peak of residence to be constructed at 4745 Goodrich Road.

Discussion:

Ron Newton asked the applicant to explain why she is requesting a variance. Shelagh Thomas, Berkshire Homes, stated that the property is part of Spaulding and understood that Spaulding had a blanket variance. Jim Callahan said that there had been a few variances granted, but there is no blanket variance. Ms. Thomas explained that without the variance, there would have to be a large area of flat roof that is not conducive to the Buffalo weather, and it is also very expensive to construct. Mr. Newton stated that the area she is talking about is a very large expanse and not just a peak. John Gatti asked Jim Callahan about an open development area on Stahley Road and what the peak size was. Mr. Callahan said that it was 50 feet. Mr. Gatti asked the applicant how large the house was, and she replied that it is 8,900 sq. ft. The applicant asked about the height variance that was granted on the house two lots north, which also has a large section of flat roof. Mr. Callahan responded that it was 39. Ms. Thomas said that the house is being built on a 400-foot lot, and they will be doing other things on the property to help the roof not look so high. Mr. Newton asked what the applicant would do if the variance is denied. Ms. Thomas said they would then ask for a 39-foot variance. Mr. Newton noted that there were four neighbor notifications that would be added to the file.

Action:

Motion by John Gatti, seconded by Ray Skaine, to approve Appeal No. IV as written.

John Brady	AYE
John Gatti	AYE
Ray Skaine	AYE
Arthur Henning	AYE
Ron Newton	NAY

MOTION CARRIED.

**APPEAL NO V**  
Jeff Schwartz  
Residential Single Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant an eight hundred forty square foot (840 sq ft) variance to allow the construction of a one thousand five hundred sixty square foot (1560 sq ft) pole barn at 5645 Thompson Road.

Discussion:

Mr. Schwartz explained that he has antique cars that he works on. He said he discovered last week that the zoning had been changed. It used to be zoned agricultural. Mr. Skaine asked for a drawing of what would be put up. Mr. Schwartz added that the roof

would be metal, with a two-car garage door on the front and a single door on the back. He said he doesn't want a stone driveway; but may put some patterned cinder blocks down. He would just be taking the cars out on weekends. Mr. Newton noted that there is one neighbor notification. Mr. Henning asked about the property ownership behind the applicant's property. Mr. Newton said that he felt it was excessive for the neighborhood. He said that no one else in his area is putting up large structures like he is. He mentioned that there are some old barns which were put up under the old zoning. Mr. Schwartz added that a neighbor just put one up two years ago and it has a business in it. Mr. Callahan stated that, for the record, Mr. Schwartz's use is for a hobby and not a business.

Action:

Motion by John Gatti, seconded by Ray Skaine, to approve Appeal No. V as written.

John Brady	AYE
John Gatti	AYE
Ray Skaine	AYE
Arthur Henning	AYE
Ron Newton	NAY

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM in honor of, and thanks to, John Gatti for his years of service to the Town of Clarence.  
Ron Newton, Chairman