

Town of Clarence
One Town Place, Clarence, NY 14031
Planning Board Minutes
Wednesday, May 20, 2026

Work Session 6:30 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
2nd Vice-Chair Wendy Salvati
Jason Geasling
Keith Lukowski

Vice-Chair Richard Bigler
Gregory Todaro
Daniel Tytko

Planning Board Members absent: Jason Lahti

Town Officials Present

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

Other Interested Parties Present:

Michael Zang
Chris Wood

Kevin Coppola
Steven Dale

Clemente Toffolo
Ed Hazard

Dave Sutton

Item 1

Zang Ventures, Inc.
Commercial

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

David Donohue recused himself from the Item, the proper paperwork will be filed.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project at 6204 Goodrich Road, located at the southwest corner of Goodrich Road and Pine Breeze Lane, it is an existing 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 sqft warehouse addition to the rear of the existing building, with associated facilities. The space is proposed to be used by an existing business on-site, H. C. Zang Agency, Inc., and potentially other future complimentary users, subject to Town review.

The Town Board referred the proposal to the Planning Board in March of 2025. In April of 2025, the Planning Board initiated a coordinated review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). In July of 2025, the Planning board issued a Negative Declaration under SEQRA. In January of this year, the Zoning Board of Appeals issued a side yard setback Variance for the project. Throughout this review period, the applicant has addressed comments received.

The Planning Board has the authority to act on this request.

Present to represent this request are the applicant Michael Zang, and from Carmina Wood Design, Clemente Toffolo.

Mr. Tytka asked if the materials for the proposed addition will match what is on the existing building. It is a nice-looking building; he would like to see it continue to look that way.

Mr. Zang responded that generally speaking, that is the plan. The goal from the beginning has always been to make it look like it is part of the existing building.

Mr. Tytka asked Mr. Zang if he knows how many of the proposed bays he will be using for his business.

Mr. Zang stated that at this time, his best guess is approximately 1/3 of it will be kept to their family business.

Mr. Tytka noted that when he went to the site, he noticed pallets sitting out and recognizes that they do need additional space.

Mr. Zang stated that it has been an ongoing issue, COVID really pushed it along because of extensive delays in getting some equipment, so they had to order larger amounts which caused the backup in to the parking lot.

Mr. Zang added that he does anticipate holding on to some degree of inventory, despite being far past the COVID days. The situation fluctuates, and he does not want to be caught needing the space but not having it available. Lately his brother who runs the family business, has been leaning more in the direction of using the entire proposed addition for themselves.

Mr. Tytko asked Mr. Zang if he anticipates any semi-trucks going in to the back, or will they continue to use the bay that they currently use.

Mr. Zang explained that the game plan for any semi-trucks would be that they continue to use the current loading dock. If they were to push further back, or someone takes the back section that is built, they thought possibly they would put one on the opposite side of that dock, so that they can go straight across.

Mr. Tytko stated that if there are cars parked in the back, there would not be any room for a semi-truck to get back there.

Mr. Tytko asked about the parking situation for the soccer training that rents the front part of the existing building.

Mr. Zang stated that it is currently a drop-off and pick-up situation, with one-on-one and small group sessions being conducted. The hours are typically 3:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m. or 9:00 p.m.. Additionally, the soccer instructor sublets the space out other organizations. Those are situations where there are more cars there, and although he does not think it has been a problem, they recognize that there are parking limitations on the site.

Mr. Tytko explained that one of their concerns is parking, and making sure there is no overflow on to the street, or the municipal lot across the street. If the other bays end up being leased out, they may need to re-evaluate the parking situation at that time.

Mr. Tytko asked if there will be any new mechanicals or air conditioners going in to the proposed bays.

Mr. Zang stated that there is no intent for air conditioning at the moment, as far as heat source, they use gas fire ceiling units so they would use that or radial heat.

Referring to the approved landscape plan, Mr. Tytko noted that the plan is to screen the current air conditioners from the street.

Mr. Zang responded yes.

Mr. Tytko asked how stormwater management will be managed.

Mr. Toffolo explained that the area on the south side will be moved to the north side.

Mr. Tytko asked if it will be a wet or dry pond.

Mr. Toffolo stated that it will be dry.

Mr. Tytko asked if there is a plan to have a dumpster on site.

Mr. Toffolo stated that currently they do not use a dumpster, but if that changes, then they will update the plans.

Mr. Zang stated that they have been using the roll-out totes for the past few years. He does not anticipate there being an expansion back to dumpsters, but if there was, he would be interested in placing it on the west side of the parking lot. It would be a straight shot in, and it would be surrounded with a vinyl fence.

Mr. Tytko asked about the proposed man doors on the south side of the proposed addition, and if they will be on every unit. Per the code, they will each require a security light above each door, without spilling on to adjoining properties.

Mr. Zang stated that he would by putting them where they are, one at the furthest west point, on the east side of that particular bay so that they have a little space to escape if necessary. He does not think they would be used except for emergency situations to access the outside.

Mr. Zang added that he would prefer to keep them as is, one in each potential bay is unlikely right now that he would want to divide it in to 6.

Mr. Geasling asked if the intent is to potentially open the loading dock to the other side, what is the need for such a wide area of pavement in the back. Mr. Geasling asked if it is 43' from the building to the nearest parking space.

Mr. Toffolo responded yes.

Mr. Geasling asked why they need that much width.

Mr. Zang stated that was the recommendation from the architect when this was developed; he thought that would provide ample space.

Mr. Geasling noted that when he read the discussion from the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, that was one of the points that was discussed – why one of the potential options for this building was not considered viable. Angling the building would leave 34' feet from the building to the closest parking space, and a typical travel lane between parking spaces if on both sides, is 24'.

Mr. Toffolo stated that they will look in to that.

Mr. Zang explained that for a vehicle that wants to back in to one of the bays, there is enough space for them to be able to back their vehicle, up to the bay. Larger vehicles or a vehicle with a trailer will also need the additional space to use for backing up to a bay, which this space would be efficient for.

Mr. Zang stated that aesthetically, it is in line with the rest of the parking lot, aside from one small area.

Mr. Geasling agreed, and stated that it would be a lot more work to connect the front corner to the back corner, it would cut the center and jut. But then all the spots would be angled. He understands why Mr. Zang is doing it this way.

Mr. Zang stated that where the loading dock is, is definitely as narrow as it can be.

Discussion continued regarding the extra parking area.

Mrs. Salvati asked Mr. Zang what the nature of his business is.

Mr. Zang stated that his family's business is selling commercial electrical equipment.

Mrs. Salvati stated that she is hoping as this proposed project progresses closer to development plan review, that they may have a more solid idea of how the bays will be used. How many they will use themselves, and how many, and what type of use the other users will be. That will give them a bit more comfort in knowing that there will be sufficient parking.

Mr. Zang explained that if history serves as record, they are not looking to have too many cars in there. They do not want to be in the business of large quantities of the general public coming in, and particularly back there. What he sees around this community and others with flex-type spaces, is that they are usually for someone who has a small business and needs a space to operate, to store their vehicles, their product, and similar things like that.

Mrs. Salvati added this would be perfect for that.

In regard to Public Participation, the following resident spoke:

1. Steven Dale of 4309 Cameron Drive:
 - will they be putting restroom facilities in the 6 bays

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

In regard to the restroom question, Mr. Zang stated that no; they do not anticipate needing to install plumbing in the units. Should that change, then they will re-evaluate.

ACTION:

Motion by Daniel Tytko, seconded by Wendy Salvati, to **approve** the Zang Ventures, Inc. **Concept Plan**, located at 6204 Goodrich Road, per the submitted plan by Carmina Wood Design, dated January 8th, 2026, and to **approve** the **Conceptual Architectural** drawings by Dean Architects, dated February 24th, 2026, 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 Town Engineering review and approval for any proposed increase of flows into Clarence Sewer District 2.
6. Limits of clearing and disturbance shall be shown on any future Development Plan submittals.

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. Dumpster or tote enclosure shall remain closed at all times when not in use. Garbage service shall occur in conformance with Town Code. No garbage or debris shall accumulate outside of the dumpsters or totes.
9. 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 necessary security lighting. Any and all security lighting shall be depicted on the lighting plan.
10. Final building elevations to be submitted as part of the Development Plan review, including the labelling of material types and colors, and depiction of such. Building materials to be used shall be of industry standard high quality for durability and appearance.
11. Any exterior building mechanicals shall be identified, detailed, and shielded from view by approved screening and/or landscaping, shown on any future Development Plan submittals.
12. Site curbing plan shall be submitted as part of Landscape and Development Plan review.
13. Building and site shall be maintained as approved, in perpetuity, and any building and site deficiencies shall be repaired or replaced as approved.
14. Paved areas to be striped and maintained in perpetuity. No parking of vehicles outside the designated parking areas.
15. Other than licensed vehicles, 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 equipment, goods, materials, and debris.
16. Beyond that of H. C. Zang Agency Inc., any proposed business operation or operators shall be subject to review and approval by the Town.
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.

ON THE QUESTION:

This proposal has previously received a Negative Declaration from the Planning Board, and a Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for a reduced side yard setback.

Keith Lukowski	Aye	Daniel Tytka	Aye	Jason Geasling	Aye
Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Robert Sackett	Aye				

MOTION CARRIED

Item 2

7631 Transit Road, LLC.
Restricted Business

Requests Concept Plan approval of a commercial retail building for Lenco Supplies at 7631 Transit Road.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project at 7631 Transit Road, located at the southeast corner of Transit Road and Wolcott Road.

An existing 6.88-acre property in the Restricted Business zone formerly home to Bitterman's Automotive complex of buildings and two residential structures, all of which have since been demolished apart from one warehouse building on the east side of the property.

The applicant is requesting Concept Plan action of an approximately 43,000 sq. ft. commercial retail building for Lenco Supplies at the center of the property, fronting Transit Road.

The northwest corner of the property is reserved for an outparcel/lease area, which would be subject to another review entirely. The southern portion of the property is proposed to be a natural open space area. Finally, the existing warehouse building on the east side of the property is proposed to be preserved and used as part of the retail operation.

The Town Board referred this new proposal to the Planning Board in January of this year. In February, 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").

Note: Apart from small scale retail operations in a mixed-use setting, commercial retail operations are not allowable in the Restricted Business zone. 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.

Present to represent this request was Chris Wood with Carmina Wood Design, and Kevin Coppola with Lenco Supplies. Mr. Wood added that they plan to pursue a use variance, as Mr. Bleuer noted.

Mr. Geasling asked about the rear building that is remaining, and if there are any intentions to do anything with the building, or will it be left as-is as far as façade improvements.

Mr. Coppola noted that that is the only remaining building on the property, which has been updated already. If given the opportunity to develop the property, they will also develop that piece of land, and the building.

Mr. Geasling acknowledged the amount of existing pavement found throughout the site, and asked if outside of the proposed improvements, are there any plans to remove them from the site to give the site a nice clean appearance.

Mr. Coppola responded yes.

Regarding the proposed building dimensions; Mr. Geasling noted that there are two different sizes on the plan. They appear to be the same as the previous plan that they have seen, but with different shapes. Mr. Geasling asked if they are interior / exterior dimensions.

Mr. Wood responded, stating that the rear portion is correct, the front portion is a little smaller now. They will update the plans accordingly.

Mrs. Salvati agreed with Mr. Geasling's question, also noting that she appreciates the updated placement of the floodway which is on the opposite side of the site, away from the adjacent neighbor.

Mr. Todaro asked if there are any areas that will have outside storage of inventory.

Mr. Coppola responded no.

Referring to the photograph of the proposed building, Mrs. Salvati noted that several bay doors are shown, and asked if they will all remain.

Mr. Coppola explained that they have currently sided with the exact same material over the bay doors, with the exception of 2 of them. Those have been redone and made accessible.

Mr. Todaro asked if there is a plan or need to include security fencing around the property.

Mr. Coppola responded no.

In regard to Public Participation, the following resident spoke:

1. Ed Hazard of 8055 Wolcott Road:

- referring to the photo, asked what the circular area is, and if it is a parking area
- asked if the retention basin that was originally on the corner is being moved
- the area is very low, with standing water about 6 months of the year
- concerns with the traffic at Wolcott Rd. and Transit Rd., will there be a traffic signal traffic flow is already heavy

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

Referring to the circular area that Mr. Hazard questioned, Mr. Wood noted that it is the Stormwater Management area.

Chairman Sackett asked if there is any intention to alter that ground in any way.

Mr. Wood noted that they will adjust the grade within the site to make it work, but that up against the neighbor's property cannot be changed too much, due to the existing building that is located there. Mr. Wood noted that they need to be within the floodplain development permit requirements, which is why they are leaving the southern portion as is.

Chairman Sackett asked Mr. Wood if he anticipates the oval area being wet for several months a year.

Mr. Wood responded no; it is designed as a dry retention basin.

Chairman Sackett asked if the traffic at Transit and Wolcott Roads has been anticipated.

Mr. Wood explained that when they submit to the Department of Transportation (DOT) for the driveway permit, he assumes they will consider it, and provide any feedback. This project is not a huge traffic generator.

Mr. Bleuer stated that as part of the coordinated review, we coordinated with the New York State Department of Transportation for Transit Road, they had no concerns with this project. They did not require a warrant analysis for Wolcott Road for potential signalization, which they would do if there was the perception that this would meet the warrant. Reading between the lines, there will be no improvements to Transit Road and Wolcott Road as part of this project, per DOT.

Chairman Sackett added that the DOT does have to approve the proposed curb cut during development stage.

Mrs. Salvati noted that when reworking drainage on the site, the stormwater is not allowed to be worse than what it is in its' current state.

Mr. Wood noted that it will be controlled much better after the development, than how it is today.

ACTION:

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Gregory Todaro, 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 7631 Transit Road, LLC. project at 7631 Transit Road. This Unlisted Action involves the proposed construction of an approximately 43,000 sqft commercial retail building and associated facilities in the Restricted Business zone. After thorough review of the submitted plans, documents, meeting minutes, and Environmental Assessment Forms, it is determined that the proposed action will not have a significant negative impact on the environment.

Keith Lukowski	Aye	Daniel Tytka	Aye	Jason Geasling	Aye
Gregory Todaro	Aye	Wendy Salvati	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye
Robert Sackett	Aye				

MOTION CARRIED

Motion by Jason Geasling, seconded by Gregory Todaro, to **deny** the 7631 Transit Road, LLC. **Concept Plan** per the submitted plan by Carmina Wood Design, dated May 1st 2026.

ON THE QUESTION:

Apart from small scale retail operations in a mixed-use setting, commercial retail operations are not allowable in the Restricted Business zone. If the applicant chooses to seek a use variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals and is successful, this proposal must return to the Planning Board for Concept Plan review.

Keith Lukowski	Aye	Daniel Tytka	Aye	Jason Geasling	Aye
----------------	-----	--------------	-----	----------------	-----

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

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting **adjourned** at 8:31 p.m. with a motion by Wendy Salvati.

MOTION CARRIED

Amy Major
Senior Clerk Typist