

Town of Clarence  
One Town Place, Clarence, NY 14031  
**Planning Board Minutes**  
Wednesday, July 16, 2025

**Work Session 6:00 pm**

Status of SEQR Coordinated Reviews  
Review of Agenda Items  
Miscellaneous

**Agenda Items 7:00 pm**

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Robert Sackett called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Councilman Shear led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Planning Board Members present:

Chairman Robert Sackett  
2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair Wendy Salvati  
Jason Geasling

Vice-Chair Richard Bigler  
Gregory Todaro

Planning Board Members absent:     Jason Lahti  
   Daniel Tytka

Town Officials Present:

Director of Community Development Jonathan Bleuer  
Councilman Paul Shear  
Councilman Bob Altieri  
Deputy Town Attorney David Donohue

Other Interested Parties Present:

Richard Hartman	Jacob Metzger	Rose Massaro	Gary Sheldon
Olivia Paulo-Lee	Core Lee	Anthony Bonaventura Jr.	Lisa Bonaventura
Karen Mazikowski	Greg Mazikowski	Jeff Ferger	Ron Trigilio
Narciso Martinez	Karen McMahon	John Liebner	Michael Zang
Stan Barnas	Pat Dolan		

Motion by Richard Bigler, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to **approve** the minutes of meeting held on June 18, 2025, as written

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Abstain	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

**MOTION CARRIED**

Jason Lahti	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

**Item 1 – Sign Variance**

Samuel’s Grande Manor, Inc.  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests a Variance to allow an LED sign within the Traditional Neighborhood District at 8750 Main Street.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project at 8750 Main Street, located on the north side of Main Street, west of Overlook Drive. It is an existing 9.6-acre property in the Traditional Neighborhood District and Residential-Single-Family zone, containing a banquet facility and multiple-family housing units.

The applicant is requesting a Variance to allow an LED sign within the Traditional Neighborhood District. The upper static sign face is proposed to be 14 sq. ft., and the lower LED panel is proposed to be 18 sq. ft., resulting in a 32 sq. ft. sign.

The Planning Board has authority to act upon signage variance requests. LED sign panels are prohibited in the Traditional Neighborhood District.

Charles Pezzino, applicant and owner of Samuel’s Grande Manor, was present to represent this request. Mr. Pezzino expressed his desire to install an LED sign due to his business expanding, and the need to disperse information better. He has had Samuel’s Grande Manor for 48 years in Clarence, and has never needed to request a sign variance. The proposed LED sign will help get information out about the newly proposed patio bar and potential concerts.

Mr. Pezzino stated that he needs this sign to help his business do better.

Mr. Todaro thanked Mr. Pezzino for all of the years of business in the Town of Clarence, and what he does for the community.

Mr. Todaro asked Mr. Pezzino to explain why he needs this proposed sign.

Mr. Pezzino stated that the reason he needs a different sign is because when they were just a banquet facility, he did not need additional signage, the existing sign did the job. Now that they are potentially expanding and putting on the patio bar, the public has to know exactly what he is doing. Also, they are working with concert managers to hopefully bring in some entertainment. The proposed sign would do a better job at getting the information out and advertise.

Mr. Todaro explained that based on the application that Mr. Pezzino submitted, the proposed sign is out of code in both size and function. The maximum size for a sign in the Traditional Neighborhood District (TND) is 20 sq. ft., this proposed sign is 32 sq. ft. Also, not only is this proposed sign an LED sign, it is multi-colored.

Mr. Todaro asked Mr. Pezzino to explain why this particular technology is needed rather than some other technology that could be used in this TND.

Mr. Pezzino explained that the reason they would like this particular sign is because they want to put up colored photos of the entertainment that is scheduled, and photos of food and drink specials.

Mr. Pezzino noted that these types of signs are all over town, including Salvatore's on Transit Road, and would not hurt traffic at all.

Mr. Todaro explained that Salvatore's is in the Major Arterial zone, and not the Traditional Neighborhood District (TND) where Samuel's is located. One of the things that he has to look at when considering this request, is that what they set here with this sign becomes precedent that other applicants can refer to when they submit a request for a similar sign within the TND.

Mr. Pezzino stated that if other people want to spend the money, he does not see why there is an issue. They are putting a lot of effort and money in to the proposed patio bar, and he wants people to know what they will have.

Mr. Todaro asked Mr. Pezzino if he considers this type of proposed sign something that is needed to sustain his business.

Mr. Pezzino stated for the potential patio bar and concerts; yes. Not the two existing businesses.

Regarding the proposed sign itself, Mr. Todaro asked Mr. Pezzino to explain the columns and the actual sign.

Mr. Pezzino explained that the columns are just a fill-in as he attempted to get it as small as he could to fit within the allowable square footage. The sign is 3' by 6' and is the smallest he is able to do with what he plans to have it advertise.

Mr. Todaro asked Mr. Pezzino if the panel can be purchased in a smaller size that meets code, and still accomplish what he wants it to.

Mr. Pezzino responded no; this is the smallest sign he is able to get with what he would like it to do.

Chairman Sackett asked Mr. Pezzino to elaborate on his statement regarding what he would like the proposed sign to do.

Mr. Pezzino stated that he would like the sign to advertise patio bar specials, entertainment dates, and food and drink specials.

Mr. Geasling asked Mr. Pezzino if his proposed sign allows for both images and text.

Mr. Pezzino responded yes; according to the sign company, this is the smallest he can go to still be able to display what he plans to.

Mrs. Salvati stated that this Board has had other businesses along Main Street request LED signs in the past that they have denied because they have been significantly out of what the Town of Clarence Code allows. Mrs. Salvati explained to Mr. Pezzino that the largest he would be able to have within

code would be a 10 sq. ft. LED panel with a standard sign above it. They have not allowed any signs that have movement or color.

Mrs. Salvati added that she is concerned that if the Board approved this request, it would open the door for other businesses to apply for similar signs, requesting hardship variances.

Explaining that the Town of Clarence adopted the Vision Main Street plan a few years ago, Mrs. Salvati added that one of the things that they considered in the plan was the community character in different areas of Main Street.

Mrs. Salvati continued to talk about the Vision Main Street plan. The Vision Main Street plan laid out how aesthetically they would like to see Main Street be developed and protected. Signs of this nature are not necessarily consistent with the recommendations of Vision Main Street. She has concerns about going against what they have established in the plan, and also for setting a precedent.

Mrs. Salvati explained that if Samuel's was in a Major Arterial Zone, she would look at this sign request would be looked at much differently due to the area and character of the area which is much different than this TND area.

Chairman Sackett asked Mr. Pezzino why he feels his project is unique for the TND zone and would not set a precedent.

Mr. Pezzino stated that he is bringing thousands of people in to his property, for example on Wednesdays in the summer there are food trucks each week which bring in approximately 900 people. In order to bring guests in to the restaurant and also in to the concerts that he wants to bring, he has to advertise and tell people by showing them. Not everyone goes to the internet to see what has going on at Samuel's Grande Manor, but they will see the sign when they drive down Main Street.

Mr. Pezzino added that Samuel's Grande Manor has brought approximately 5.5 million people in to the Town of Clarence since it was built 48 years ago.

Referring to Mr. Pezzino's statement that there are approximately 900 people at Samuel's tonight for the food trucks, Mr. Bigler asked him how he advertised for that without an LED sign.

Mr. Pezzino stated that they have been advertising it on their website and everywhere, including the little sign that is out by Main Street that they use for advertising their events. Any time they use that they need to change the letters and the numbers, and it is not easy especially in the winter. They would like an LED sign that they are able to control via a computer.

Mrs. Salvati stated to Mr. Pezzino that he could advertise with a smaller sign, other businesses along Main Street that have LED signage are able to do that. The other businesses are able to accomplish what they want to without exceeding the limits of the code.

Discussion continued regarding what type and size of LED sign might be considered based on other signs in the area.

Mrs. Salvati explained the regulations that the Planning Board needs to follow in regard to signs and the code. Mr. Pezzino's request is significantly more than what the code allows.

Mr. Donahue interjected to note the square footage of the proposed sign.

Discussion continued.

Chairman Sackett asked Mr. Bleuer about a previous sign variance approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) for a fire company.

Mr. Bleuer confirmed that a local fire company received a variance for their LED sign.

Chairman Sackett explained that the ZBA previously handled sign variances, now the Planning Board does.

Mr. Geasling asked Mr. Pezzino to expand on what Mr. Todaro asked regarding if the sign is a requirement for the continuation of his business. It appears that Mr. Pezzino is planning to expand his business, is this being done to grow the business, or because the banquet business is not as it used to be.

Mr. Pezzino stated that his banquet business is better than ever, they are booked through 2026.

Mr. Todaro asked if that proposed project has been approved yet.

Mr. Pezzino responded no; it is in review.

Mr. Todaro commented that this sign request might be putting the cart before the horse, if the patio bar is not yet approved, they are discussing a sign for a business that is not operating yet.

Mr. Pezzino stated that the patio bar is not affecting anything, and he is certain it will be well received.

Mr. Donohue asked Mr. Pezzino to explain the size of the property, such as road frontage, acreage, square feet of the entertaining space that he currently has on the property and how many people can occupy the inside of the property at any given time.

Mr. Pezzino asked Mr. Donohue if he was referring to the banquet hall or the proposed restaurant.

Mr. Donohue replied the restaurant.

Mr. Pezzino stated that the restaurant will have a capacity for 120 people, in the front and a patio all outdoors. The proposed bar will have a capacity for 52 people. A metal roof will be proposed, and doors for inclement weather.

Mr. Donohue asked what the capacity would be for the proposed concert area.

Mr. Pezzino responded that will be in the back room of the banquet hall, which holds between 800-850 people.

Mr. Donohue asked Mr. Pezzino how much road frontage his property has on Main Street.

Mr. Pezzino was unsure, but suggested approximately 500' of Main Street frontage.

Mrs. Salvati asked if this sign was approved tonight, would Mr. Pezzino discard the other changeable copy sign that he currently uses.

Mr. Pezzino responded that there are plans to building apartments to the rear of Samuel's, he will give the sign to them if that project is approved.

Regarding Public Participation, no one spoke.

With no one wishing to be heard, Public Participation was closed for this project at this time.

## ACTION:

Motion by Gregory Todaro, seconded by Wendy Salvati to **Deny** the request of the applicant, Samuel's Grande Manor, for an LED sign within the Traditional Neighborhood District, at 8750 Main Street.

## ON THE QUESTION:

Mr. Todaro stated that in making its determination, the Planning Board takes into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood community by such action. In making its determination, the Board also considers:

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance;  
**The area features a variety of traditional hamlet land uses, including residential single-family properties.**
2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than a variance;  
**The applicant may pursue manual changeable copy or other legal advertisement methods to achieve the desired result.**
3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial;  
**The maximum allowable size of freestanding signage in this zone is 20 square feet. This 32 square foot sign, inclusive of the 18 square foot LED panel, is substantial.**
4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; and  
**The Codified intent of Traditional Neighborhood District is to create a small-town historic style mixed-use district. LED signage does not further this intent.**
5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the variance.  
**While the difficulty is self-created, this is not the only factor that the Board has considered in its action.**

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED

**Item 2**

VisoneCo Site Development, LLC.  
Residential Single-Family

Requests Concept Plan approval of a proposed mixed-use project containing multiple-family housing and commercial space at 4880 Ransom Road.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project at 4880 Ransom Road, located on the west side of Ransom Road, south of Main Street. It is an existing 3.16-acre vacant parcel located in the Residential Single-Family zone.

The applicant is requesting Concept Plan approval of a mixed-use project containing twenty multiple-family housing units and approximately 10,124 sq. ft. of commercial space. Five buildings are proposed, each containing four multi-family units. Three of the buildings contain commercial space in the form of live-work space.

During the annual Master Plan review in 2014, the Town Board referred this property to the Planning Board for review. The applicant then gave this parcel consideration, meeting with various Town departments and committees to understand the constraints and requirements of the area. In March of 2024, the applicant submitted an updated proposal. In April of 2024, the Planning Board initiated a coordinated review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). Since that time, the applicant has addressed comments received, reduced the number of multi-family units from 23 to 20, reduced the size of the buildings to better match the character of the area, and committed to offer the units for-sale with deed restrictions and condominium association rules to protect the intended use of all spaces if approved.

The Planning Board has the authority to act on this request, after an action through the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

To construct this project, the property must be rezoned to Traditional Neighborhood District and receive a Special Exception Use Permit for the multiple-family housing.

Jacob Metzger with Metzger Civil Engineering, Narcisco Martinez representing the applicant, and Brianne Fowley were present to represent this project.

Mr. Metzger reviewed some highlights of the review to this point, adding that they have revised the placement of the proposed buildings to better suit the area. They have moved the buildings more towards the center of the proposed site, making a better buffer for the neighbors, and they have reduced the number of proposed units to make the project less dense.

Mr. Metzger explained that the proposed units are smaller, ultimately fitting in with the character of The Hollow better. They have reduced the parking as a result of the number of proposed units that were reduced, and they have also added a sidewalk for a connection to Main Street, allowing the community access by foot.

As a result of working with the Town Engineer, Mr. Metzger noted that they have revised the proposed stormwater system. They have also worked with the Town of Clarence Fire Code Inspector to ensure that the site as-is complies with all town zoning code of the proposed zoning, as well as fire codes.

Mr. Geasling noted that there have been many changes to this proposed project to make it fit better in this neighborhood.

Mr. Geasling stated that the Board has received correspondence from residents regarding this proposed project, one of them addressed a question that Mr. Geasling also has regarding the townhouse buildings, specifically the rear of them which would face the businesses on Main Street. The owner of STEM Automotive reached out with his concerns because they have a Temporary Conditional Permit (TCP). His concern is potential issues in the future with residents complaining about noise from the businesses along Main Street.

Mr. Metzger stated there is significant relief considering the elevation from the property down to Main Street. Also, there are existing trees and vegetation to offer a buffer. Landscaping will be taken into consideration along the property line and will be proposed in the developmental phase. He believes residents moving to this neighborhood should expect commercial activity due to the proximity of the location to Main Street. Some noise should be expected.

Mr. Geasling asked if there were concerns raised regarding incoming and outgoing traffic in relation to the neighborhood to the north and the pedestrian trail overpass to the south.

Mr. Metzger stated there were concerns from local residents at the initial April meeting and that is the reason for the SEQRA process. The Town sent materials to the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Erie County Department of Public Works for comments. The DOT responded the project did not reach the threshold of a traffic study. It was far enough from the intersection and does not warrant further involvement by the DOT.

Mrs. Salvati asked for clarification if the units will be sold individually.

Mr. Metzger said the units will be sold and not leased.

Mrs. Salvati questioned the use of the first floor for commercial use only. She asked if the business owner could rent the upper unit.

Mr. Metzger said the intention is for the buyer to use the first floor for business purposes and the second floor for residential. It was established for the business owner to live where they work.

Mrs. Salvati thanked Mr. Metzger for extending the sidewalk to Main Street.

In Regard to Public Participation, the following residents spoke:

1. Jeff Ferger of 4870 Sawmill Road presented his concern for the increased residential and commercial traffic flow and additional noise created by the increasing number of businesses with garbage removal and delivery trucks. Another big concern is the width of the bridge over



Ransom Road going into the property. There is a guardrail that runs right to the edge of the south entrance. He states the noise will echo off the escarpment and the bridge for the bike path and will echo. He is also concerned for the change in the neighborhood dynamic to include commercial businesses in this area.

2. Anthony Bonaventura of 10550 Stoneway Drive and owns the property at 10570 Stoneway Drive. The total is 4.1 acres and he understands this property is zoned single family residential but questions if it may be rezoned. He believes the change in zoning will be an undesirable change and not within the character of the neighborhood. The second issue is if the approval will set a precedent for other applicants to further develop this area with multiple unit housing.
3. Gary Sheldon of 10611 Main Street spoke regarding his concerns for traffic issues including commercial traffic and he believes a traffic study would be appropriate regarding the impact to Ransom Road. The traffic currently backs up at the Main Street intersection and will most likely get worse. Allowing businesses in the area may set an unreasonable precedent. He also brought up concerns about stormwater with a cavern accumulating water flowing to the creek, which already seems to back up to the top.
4. Rose Massaro of 4920 Ransom Road spoke regarding noise and traffic concerns. She also hears the garbage dumpsters being emptied. She has traffic and noise concerns about the ambulances that travel to Brothers of Mercy. The noise and traffic are multiplying in the area. As Mr. Sheldon stated, the traffic backup on Ransom Road has increased. She prefers a traditional neighborhood.

With no one else wishing to be heard, Public Participation was closed for this project at this time.

Chairman Sackett asked Mr. Bleuer to clarify the zoning. Mr. Bleuer stated the property is currently zoned Residential Single Family. The applicant has requested rezoning to Traditional Neighborhood District and that request does comply with the future land use map of the Town of Clarence Comprehensive Plan 2030 which was adopted by the Town in 2016 after approximately four years of community engagement.

Chairman Sackett asked the applicant to refer to the questions about dumpsters, stormwater and the bridge, if he could speak to design and width and explain why the project requires rezoning.

Mr. Metzger addressed the commercial traffic concern as the DOT did not require a traffic study. The businesses coming in are smaller retail and offices and should not generate a high volume of traffic as you would typically see in the bigger commercial stores and restaurants. He agreed they do need to rezone the property. The Town's comprehensive plan wants these hamlets to be more dense and mixed use. That is what the Town envisioned for these types of properties that are in proximity to The Hollow.

Mr. Metzger explained that any time there is a proposed development, the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) regulates the stormwater management. The Town Engineer needs to review and approve all of the DEC regulations during the development phase.

Regarding the bridge, Mr. Metzger stated that they did receive a permit through the Army Corp of Engineers to install a culvert in the ditch. In its current state, it is a very narrow, metal, rickety old bridge that they will be improving not only in function and structure, but also in capacity of the ditch.

Chairman Sackett explained that Ransom Road is a county road, and Main Street is a state road. This Planning Board and the Town do not have regulatory authority over those roads, only the county and the state do. There are many projects before the Planning Board that we hear from the residents, and while we fully understand their concerns, if those agencies approve the project without requiring a traffic study, it is outside the bounds of our authority. It exceeds the Planning Board's authority to comment or discuss.

Chairman Sackett added that he would like the residents to appreciate the fact that while we understand what they are saying, he would also like them to appreciate the fact that it is not within the Planning Board's authority to make decisions based on it.

Following up on Chairman Sackett's statement, Mr. Bleuer added that as part of the SEQR process, the Town analyzes traffic on every project, and we are one of three agencies that do in this instance, the State, the County, and the Town. Ultimately, the County and the State would determine if there are any mitigation strategies associated with the project. When there is no comment, or there is comment to the affirmative of the applicant, what that means is that the roads are designed to accommodate the proposed traffic flow.

Regarding potential dumpster dumping noise concerns, Mr. Bigler asked for clarification on whether there are dumpsters planned.

Mr. Metzger stated that there are currently no dumpsters planned. There may be, but because they are currently unsure of the types of use, they do not have the plans for that yet. The intent is to not have the collection of garbage totes, but rather one dumpster pick up per week. While this has not reached the point of the project development where it is thought out, there will be the need for some sort of garbage collection. It will not be any different from any other business or resident along Main Street than it is now.

Mr. Geasling asked if the drainage will be all open drainage, will the sidewalks be graded with the roadways or will they be raised.

Mr. Metzger responded that the intent is that they will be flush with the road.

Mrs. Salvati stated that she has a concern regarding the resident directly to the north of this site because their driveway is almost touching the driveway apron for the proposed project. Mrs. Salvati asked how much of the existing vegetation will remain to provide some vegetative buffer between the driveways and the bridge.

Mr. Metzger explained that their goal is always to not make things worse. There is a driveway there now, and to the best of their ability they will go as far south while still complying with design

standards of the county for driveways on to their access. They will leave as much vegetation as possible; the plan is to put the sidewalk directly on the right-of-way, which will need to be reviewed and approved by the county. He knows there is an existing sidewalk to the north that is not in the best condition, and a broken shoulder that vehicles park on. They will work to do the best that they can to preserve as much as they are able to.

## ACTION:

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Richard Bigler that pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, to **accept** the Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form as submitted and **approve** the Part 2 & 3 Environmental Assessment Forms as prepared and to **issue a Negative Declaration** on the proposed VisoneCo Site Development proposal at 4880 Ransom Road, in the Residential Single-Family zone. This Type I Action involves the rezoning of the property to Traditional Neighborhood District, and construction of 20 multiple-family residential units and approximately 10,124 sq. ft. of commercial space. After thorough review of the submitted plans, documents, meeting minutes, reports, letters, and Environmental Assessment Forms, it is determined that the proposed actions will not have a significant negative impact on the environment.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

## MOTION CARRIED

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Richard Bigler, to **approve** the VisoneCo Site Development, LLC. **Concept Plan**, located at 4880 Ransom Road, per the submitted plan by Metzger Civil Engineering, dated November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024, with a final revision date of June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2025, and to **approve** the **Conceptual Architectural** drawings by Sutton Architecture and James Fahy Design, dated January 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, all subject to the following conditions being met:

1. Applicant meeting the grading and drainage standards and requirements of the Town of Clarence Engineer.
2. Applicant meeting the fire code standards and requirements of the Town of Clarence Fire Inspector.
3. Subject to Development Plan review by the Town, including a technical review of the final Development Plan by the Town Engineering Department.
4. Subject to Town Building and Engineering Departments approval prior to any permits being obtained for site work activity.
5. Subject to Erie County Department of Public Works approval for the proposed access point to Ransom Road.
6. Subject to Town of Clarence Engineering review and approval, and additional regulatory agencies, as required, for connection to the sanitary sewer system.
7. Landscape Committee approval of a final landscape plan, prior to Development Plan approval, including any planting and dumpster or tote fencing where applicable. In addition, a maintenance plan shall be submitted as part of the landscape plan to ensure landscaping and fencing remain in perpetuity, and are maintained or replaced in kind should there be any deterioration, or death and disease to plantings.
8. Review of a photometric lighting plan prior to Development Plan approval. All site lighting shall comply with the Town Code, be dark sky compliant and shielded to prevent spillage onto

adjoining properties. No building lighting shall extend above the roofline and no freestanding lighting shall be elevated above 15'. All lighting shall be turned off no later than one hour after business hours except for any residential and necessary security lighting. Any and all security lighting shall be depicted on the lighting plan.

9. Final building elevations to be submitted as part of the Development Plan review, including the labelling of material types and colors with the addition of detailing and material variety for any monotonous or blank wall areas. Building materials to be used shall be of industry standard high quality for durability and appearance.
10. Any exterior building mechanicals shall be identified, detailed, and shielded from view on any future Development Plan submittals.
11. Site curbing plan shall be submitted as part of Development Plan review.
12. Applicant shall install a 5' wide sidewalk along Ransom Road from the proposed site access point to the existing sidewalk on Main Street, in lieu of the Recreation Fees and on-site recreational component.
13. For the purpose of ensuring that the commercial space does not become used as residential space, the applicant shall submit deed restrictions, and Condominium Association rules to the Town Legal Department and Planning Office for review and approval. Once approved by the Town, the applicant shall properly file and/or execute such documents and provide to the Town Legal Department and Planning Office by the specified date or threshold as determined by the Town prior to Development Plan approval.
14. Building and site shall be maintained as approved, in perpetuity, and any building and site deficiencies shall be repaired or replaced as approved.
15. Paved areas to be striped and maintained in perpetuity. No parking of vehicles outside the designated parking areas.
16. No outside storage or display of any kind on the property unless same shall have been pre-approved by the Town, including, but not limited to vehicles, goods, materials, and debris.
17. Any permanent signage subject to review and approval by the Sign Review Committee, and any temporary signage subject to review and approval by the Office of Planning and Zoning.
18. Subject to Open Space, and any other applicable fees as required by Town Code.

Mr. Metzger confirmed that he has heard, understands, and agrees to the conditions.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

#### MOTION CARRIED

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Richard Bigler, to **recommend** to the Town Board, **Rezoning** of 4880 Ransom Road from Residential Single Family to Traditional Neighborhood District.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

#### MOTION CARRIED

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Richard Bigler, to **recommend** to the Town Board approval of **Special Exception Use Permit** and **Architectural Style** for the VisoneCo Site Development project at 4880 Ransom Road, containing multiple-family housing units and commercial space as per the approved Concept Plan and associated conditions.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

**Item 3**

Zang Ventures, Inc.  
Commercial

Requests Concept Plan approval of a proposed building addition to accommodate warehousing and complimentary commercial uses at 6204 Goodrich Road.

Mr. Donohue recused himself from this item.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project at 6204 Goodrich Road, located at the southwest corner of Goodrich Road and Pine Breeze Lane. It is a 2.1-acre parcel containing an existing business operation in the Commercial zone.

The applicant is requesting Concept Plan approval of a proposed 9,000 sq. ft. warehouse addition to the rear of the existing building, with associated facilities. The space is proposed to be used for complimentary business operations such as existing warehousing, athletic training, and sales.

The Town Board referred the proposal to the Planning Board in March of this year. In April, the Planning Board initiated a coordinated review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). Since that time, the applicant has addressed comments received.

The Planning Board has the authority to act on this request, after an action through the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

The applicant is requesting a side yard setback Variance for the proposed addition, which will be subject to review and approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the applicant chooses to make an appeal to the Zoning Board and is successful, this proposal must return to the Planning Board for Concept Plan review.

Michael Zang with Zang Ventures, Inc. was present to represent this project. Mr. Zang provided additional background on this property, stating 1.2 acres on the east side of the property is developed, 0.8 acres in the rear and west side are undeveloped and plentiful with trees.

Mr. Zang continued to give additional history on the building, noting that through the decades, the building has always served the purpose of commercial sales. In the late 2000's an approximately 3,000 sq. ft. addition was added on to the original building.

Mr. Zang stated that his family business has operated out of this building for approximately 17 years, with both he and his brother putting significant investments in to the property.

Mr. Zang added that the tenant currently occupying the front 7,000 sq. ft. space was added in 2020.

Mr. Zang explained what they are anticipating this proposed addition to look like, stating that their family business would utilize approximately 1/3 of the proposed building, essentially an additional 9,000 sq. ft., almost doubling the space that they have now. This is not to necessarily expand the employee base of the building, but rather for the purpose of dry storage.

The other 2/3 will continue to be utilized by the current leaser which is the sports facility, Mr. Zang explained. He added that the small staff with Zang Ventures hours are 8:00a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. He does not anticipate the volume coming in and out of the warehouse will increase the tractor trailer loading dock usage.

Mr. Zang noted that the general operating hours of the athletic trainer utilizing the front space of the building are approximately 3:00 p.m. to 8:00-9:00 p.m. on weekdays, with daytime hours on the weekends. Typically, they begin around 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 or 5:00 p.m. most of their training is small volume; one-on-one and small group sessions. There have been a few larger volume groups, but the majority of the time there are small groups utilizing the space.

Mr. Zang stated that as they proceed with this proposed expansion, they would like to keep the community and neighbors in mind. They do have two residences adjacent to their property line to the west, and two homes across the street on the north side, facing this proposed building. These are the homes that will be most impacted by this proposed building from a visual standpoint. They will have a 45' greenbelt, and they intend to include additional landscaping.

Mr. Zang noted that they are very aware of the lighting on the site as well as the building. They need to provide lighting for the parking lot for safety, but are aware that they can not have any lighting bleed off-site and on to neighboring properties. Years ago, they planted Evergreens along the Pine Breeze property line, and changed the lighting last year to downward facing lighting standards.

Regarding the request for the setback variance, Mr. Zang explained that part of the request would allow them to optimize the utilization of the property and the square footage but also so that they can have a building that is in-line with the current building.

Mr. Geasling asked about the grading, stating that the plans appear to show it potentially pushing water currently in a swale between Mr. Zang's property and the southern property that extended west to the rear of the property and potentially pushing it to the south.

Mr. Zang explained that he has learned that in preparing for this potential addition, they needed to take a utility down that ran from Pine Breeze behind their building heading from north to south that not only services this building but also the neighboring property. It now runs along the south side, which required a significant amount of digging. They are aware that it is a problem area and needs to be dealt with, and may not reflect properly on the plans that were submitted.

In regard to Public Participation, the following residents spoke:

1. Patrick Dolan of 9421 Douglas Fir Court:
  - there have been a lot of changes in this area
  - this proposed addition will come right to the edge of his property
  - the sports facility contributes to a lot of cars parking in the Pine Breeze neighborhood especially on weekends
  - concerns with drainage
  - concerns with vehicles entering and exiting the parking lot
2. Stan Barnas of 9431 Douglas Fir Court
  - concerns with traffic and lights that comes along with the sports aspect of the building at all hours
  - excessive amount of traffic and lights in his backyard
  - would like as much of the natural buffer to remain as well as an additional buffer to help mitigate the light pollution

With no one else wishing to speak, Public Participation was closed for this project at this time.

Mr. Zang thanked Mr. Dolan and Mr. Barnas for voicing their concerns.

Mr. Zang explained that Mr. Dolan is not adjacent to his property, but does have a view of the property. Currently his view is of Tribuco's property and the back of Zang's building that has been there since the 1970's, and his view should not change with the proposed new building. Mr. Zang added that Mr. Dolan has a view of the south side, which is not part of the 45 ft. buffer area.

Mr. Zang stated that they would be open to planting on the south side in order to provide additional buffer. He can appreciate a view of more steel is not ideal, he would be open to doing a better job on the south side with evergreens and similar.

Regarding the traffic on the weekends in the Pine Breeze neighborhood, Mr. Zang explained that the organization that works with the tenant of their building brings in a larger volume of people. Mr. Zang stated that they have had discussions with them, advising them to temper the activity and volume of people. There is an area for improvement, and they will continue to work on that because they do not want the parking lot overflowing or people driving on their grass.

Mr. Zang continued to explain their plan to address the parking in the Pine Breeze neighborhood, spilling out from their property.

Mr. Zang explained he understands there is a lot of development in the town, as much as the Town of Clarence tries to temper it, this is a natural thing that happens. He does feel that the addition they are proposing will not change the aesthetic of the area, and the lighting scheme will not be on the west side of the proposed building.

Mr. Zang reiterated his buffering and lighting plans for the neighbors.

Chairman Sackett asked Mr. Zang if he would be willing to submit a Landscape Plan that addresses the noise, light, and views cape concerns, should this proposed project moves forward.

Mr. Zang responded that they would be willing to do that to the best of their ability.

Chairman Sackett added that there are professional landscape architects that are schooled in addressing noise, lighting, and other landscape issues.

Mr. Zang stated that he would be willing to do that, and further explained that the .8 acre that abuts the neighbor's property has dead ash, vine, and is all deciduous. It serves as a block but nothing more. He would like to get in there and put in some evergreens, it would be better.

Mr. Geasling asked Mr. Zang what his current garbage situation is.

Mr. Zang responded that historically what was there when they moved in was dumpsters, uncovered, no fence, and exposed. They have elected to go with a no-dumpster policy which has worked well, so they will continue to manage the garbage with the totes.

Mr. Geasling explained that a dumpster was his main concern, with pushing the driveway further back and closer to neighbor's property lines. He is pleased to hear that they will be using totes.

Mr. Bigler commented to Mr. Zang that he is attempting to achieve a great deal in a 5' area to the south. There will be drainage issues, some type of landscaping to help shield the building from view of the neighbors, he feels that it is quite a pinch point. Mr. Bigler agreed with Chairman Sackett in that hiring a professional landscape architect to best shield the neighbors that will be affected. Possibly considering some type of fencing as well, to help mitigate the light concerns.

Mr. Zang responded, stating that while he agrees with Mr. Bigler, the southwest corner is that it abuts with the Trabuco property, which is all greenspace. They could potentially do plantings in that area, but any property two parcels down will still see the building, just as they do currently.

Mr. Bigler continued to state that he would like to see all neighbors protected back in that area, and expects Mr. Zang to put some work in to it. The views cape of the metal building from the south will also need to be adjusted, and there is a small area to work with.

Discussion continued regarding the landscaping and mitigation of views for the neighbors.

## ACTION:

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Richard Bigler that pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, to **accept** the Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form as submitted and **approve** the Part 2 & 3 Environmental Assessment Forms as prepared and to **issue a Negative Declaration** on the proposed Zang Ventures project at 6204 Goodrich Road. This Unlisted action involves a building addition to accommodate existing warehousing and complimentary uses in the Commercial zone. After thorough review of the submitted plans, documents, meeting minutes, reports, letters, and Environmental Assessment Forms, it is determined that the proposed actions will not have a significant negative impact on the environment.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED



Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Richard Bigler, to deny the Zang Ventures Concept Plan per the submitted drawing by Carmina Wood Design dated January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

**ON THE QUESTION:**

The applicant has proposed a side yard setback that does not meet Town Code. If the applicant chooses to make an appeal to the Zoning Board and is successful, this proposal must return to the Planning Board for Concept Plan review.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

**MOTION CARRIED.**

Mr. Donohue returned to the meeting.

**Item 4**

VisoneCo Site Development, LLC.  
Commercial

Requests Conceptual review of the rehabilitation of an existing detached accessory structure into a mixed-use project containing multiple-family housing and commercial space at 9300 Main Street.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project at 9300 Main Street, located on the north side of Main Street, east of Thompson Road. It is an existing 5.2-acre parcel in the Commercial zone, containing a dwelling complex and detached accessory structure (barn) to the rear of the property.

The applicant is requesting Conceptual review for the rehabilitation of the barn into a mixed-use project containing approximately 1,358 sq. ft. of commercial space on the first floor and two multiple family housing units on the second floor.

The Town Board referred the proposal to the Planning Board in June of this year.

The initiation of a coordinated review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) will allow for involved agency and interested party comment.

Jacob Metzger with Metzger Civil Engineering, Architect for the project Ronald Trubino, and the owner's representative Narcisco Martinez were present to represent this project.

Mr. Metzger explained that this proposed project is in the very beginning of the review process, the owners have been trying to determine what to do with the site for quite a few years, and have finally decided to salvage the building. The plan is to reinvigorate the property with a mixed-use building that holds commercial units on the bottom and two-units on the upper level.

Mrs. Salvati asked how old the barn is.

Mr. Metzger stated that he is unsure of the age of the barn.

Noting that tonight's meeting is to start the SEQRA process.

Referring to the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), Mrs. Salvati asked about the question as to whether the proposed action will connect to a wastewater utility. The proposed plan shows a septic system, which she assumes is not an existing septic system.

Mr. Metzger confirmed that to be true. They will be proposing an on-site septic system, as they are not connected to a municipal system. They will update the EAF before it is distributed.

Mrs. Salvati asked how stormwater will be handled, noting that on the EAF it was mentioned that storm sewer pipe, a catch basin and on-site swale. A preliminary grading and drainage plan will need to be prepared and submitted for review and approval.

Mr. Metzger responded that they will be sure to include that for review.

Mrs. Salvati asked if there is any site-lighting on the property currently.

Mr. Metzger responded no; there are proposals for lighting, they do have a photometric plan that will also be reviewed, they will include it for SEQR, and they are aware they will need to be dark-sky compliant.

Because this building is so old, there are concerns for the structural integrity, therefore they will request that some kind of building analysis is conducted. This will assure that if two residences are put on the second floor, the building can handle it. There are nice changes being proposed, and they want to make sure the building can withstand the changes.

Chairman Sackett stated that it should be a structural engineer to perform the analysis.

## ACTION:

Motion by Wendy Salvati, seconded by Gregory Todaro, that pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, to **accept** the Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form as corrected and to seek Lead Agency status and **commence a coordinated review** among involved and interested agencies on the VisoneCo Site Development project at 9300 Main Street. This Unlisted action involves the rehabilitation of an existing detached accessory structure into a mixed-use project containing multiple family housing and commercial space in the Commercial zone.

Mr. Bleuer stated that the Planning Office will await an updated submittal of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) as corrected.

Daniel Tytko	Aye	Jason Lahti	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye

MOTION CARRIED

## Item 5

Rock Bottom Estate, LLC.  
Agricultural-Rural Residential

Requests a Minor Subdivision of land to create one (1) new good lot of record at 0 Jones Road, SBL 84.00-2-14.2.

## **DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this unaddressed project, 0 Jones Road, SBL 84.00-2-14.2 located on the south side of Jones Road, east of Ransom Road.

Existing 6.37-acre parcel containing approximately 90' of road frontage and located in the Agricultural Rural Residential zone. The lot was previously approved to exist as an unbuildable frontage lot lacking the necessary road frontage, and was created as a result of adjacent frontage lot splits leaving this exception parcel.

The applicant is requesting a Minor Subdivision of land to authorize one new good lot of record. The applicant has adjusted the adjacent land and proposed to modify lot lines whereby allowing this exception parcel to contain the necessary road frontage to become a good frontage lot of record. No new lots are being created, rather four pre-existing lots are being adjusted and merged where necessary to create this conforming parcel containing two lots.

The Planning Board has the authority to act on this request, after an action through the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA").

Olivia Paulo-Lee, sole owner of Rock Bottom Estate, LLC was present to represent her request, explaining that her plan is to sell Parcel B for the purpose of a single-family residence, and build her own home on Parcel A.

Mr. Todaro noted that this proposal cleans up lot lines that have been in disarray for some time.

Regarding the existing easements, Mr. Todaro asked if the sliver of land that reaches inward on Lot A, has there been any attempt to acquire that sliver of land to make it a solid block.

Ms. Paulo-Lee responded no; not yet.

Mr. Todaro noted that it was evidently an easement that was used for the prior property line.

Ms. Paulo-Lee stated yes; to her knowledge it still exists.

Mr. Todaro confirmed that there is no desire to attain that sliver of land.

Ms. Paulo-Lee confirmed no; not at this time.

Mr. Todaro asked Ms. Paulo-Lee if she has any development plans for Parcel A, besides selling off Parcel B.

Ms. Paulo-Lee responded no; not at this time.

Regarding drainage easements, Mr. Todaro asked if there will need to be an assessment of drainage on the properties.

Mr. Bleuer responded, explaining that as part of any Building Permit review, the Engineering, Highway or Building Departments may require certain drainage easements. Should the Planning Board consider approval tonight, that is expected to be a condition.

In regard to Public Participation, no one spoke.

### ACTION:

Motion by Gregory Todaro, seconded by Wendy Salvati, that pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, to **accept** the Part 1 Environmental Assessment Form as submitted and **approve** the Part 2 & 3 Environmental Assessment Form as prepared and to **issue a Negative Declaration** on the proposed Rock Bottom Estate Minor Subdivision at 0 Jones Road, SBL 84.00-2-14.2. This Unlisted Action involves a lot line adjustment and a Minor Subdivision of land to recognize one (1) new good lot of record in the Agricultural-Rural Residential zone. After thorough review of the submitted plan and Environmental Assessment Forms, it is determined that the proposed actions will not have a significant negative impact on the environment.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion by Gregory Todaro, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to **approve the Rock Bottom Estate Minor Subdivision** at 0 Jones Road, SBL 84.00-2-14.2, per the submitted application received in the Planning Office on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, subject to the following conditions:

1. Review and approval by the Town Building and Engineering Departments for any future construction on the properties
2. Review and approval by the Erie County Health Department for any future on-site sanitary facilities for the properties.
3. Subject to the issuance of a Lot Line Adjustment approval by the Clarence Planning Office for the modification of line lines per the submitted application.
4. Subject to Clarence Highway Department approval for any new street access to the properties.
5. Should any drainage easements be required by the Town to address on-site drainage issues on the properties, appropriate easements shall be submitted by the applicant and reviewed and approved by the Town Engineering, Highway and Legal Departments. If required, applicant shall file same in the Erie County Clerk's office and provide a stamped "FILED" copy to the Town Attorney's Office after recording and prior to any Building permit(s) being issued by the Clarence Building Department.

Olivia Paulo-Lee confirmed that she has heard, understands, and agrees to the conditions.

Jason Geasling	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting **adjourned** at 8:42 p.m. with a motion by Gregory Todaro.

MOTION CARRIED.

Amy Major  
Senior Clerk Typist