

Town of Hamburg
Planning Board Meeting
August 19, 2026, Minutes

The Town of Hamburg Planning Board met for a Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM, on Wednesday, August 19, 2026, Room 7A/7B of Hamburg Town Hall.

REGULAR MEETING

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Cynthia Gronachan led the meeting attendees in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present: Member Chmura, Member Clark, Chair Gronachan, Member Ryan, Member Stewart, Member Zajac

Absent: Member Geraci (Excused), Member Quandt (alternate)

Staff: Joshua Rogers, Planning Department; Planning Board Attorney Joseph Gogan; Camie Jarrell, Engineering Department

Kevin Wyse- Requesting Sketch Plan Direction on a proposal for a 400 sq-ft automated coffee shop with a drive-thru pickup and other associated site improvements, to be located on a 0.43-acre vacant parcel at 0 Southwestern Blvd (SBL #: 170.16-4-7)

Jacob Metzger of Metzger Civil Engineering Inc. appeared on behalf of the project along with Kevis Wyse and Alex Wyse.

Mr. Metzger explained to the Planning Board that the Applicant is proposing the development of a 0.43-acre parcel on Southwestern Boulevard located at 4840 Southwestern Boulevard, across the street from Uncle Joe's and Michaels. The location is currently zoned C-1, which does allow for this use. They are looking to have a 400 sq-ft automated coffee shop with a drive thru and walk-up shop. They have accounted for all setbacks and there are no variances needed.

Mr. Rogers added that this proposal is a little different than the 7 Brew, in that this is entirely autocentric. During a preliminary meeting with the Planning Department, Mr.

Wyse was told that the Planning Board would be inquisitive about the landscaping buffering, because there are businesses and residential homes nearby. If this were to move forward with a full site plan application, it could be considered a Type II Action under SEQRA, as it is only 410 sq-ft. However, it is recommended that the project be sent to the State DOT due to the fact that this is located on Route 20. Code Enforcement has already determined that this is a permitted use in C-1.

Member Stewart stated when looking at the rendering, there is only a single lane drive thru, which was a concern with 7-Brew. If there is someone who is a few cars back and they have to get out, is there enough room to put another lane in for a car to exit?

Mr. Metzger and Mr. Wyse explained that there is a way for a car to exit the queuing lane halfway through the line.

Member Ryan asked how many parking spots are there for the mobile pickup?

Mr. Metzger responded there are five (5).

Member Chmura added for clarification, the way in which people are picking up products is through a drive thru lane or through a mobile pickup. She asked if there is no interaction into the building?

Mr. Metzger responded that is correct, the public will not be going into the building. If someone does a mobile order, the order will be placed into a smart locker and to open the locker, the customer would enter the last four digits of their phone number.

Member Chmura asked if the five parking spaces are solely for mobile.

Mr. Metzger answered that is correct.

Member Chmura had a question regarding the condition of the curb cut and the DOT's involvement.

Mr. Rogers stated that he does not believe there is an existing curb cut onto the property right now. Should the Applicant get approval, they would have to work with DOT on the highway work permits. That is why he suggested reaching out to the DOT for their preliminary comment.

Chair Gronachan stated this is a wooded lot, and asked the Applicant if they have any idea how many trees they will be removing?

Mr. Metzger responded there has not been a tree survey done yet, but they anticipate leaving a ten (10) foot buffer in place.

Chair Gronachan asked would the Applicant apply for the curb cut first?

Mr. Rogers answered that when they come to the Planning Board with a full site plan application, the Planning Department will alert DOT, with the applicant simultaneously reaching out to DOT on their own accord.

Attorney Gogan added that on the GIS map, it shows somewhat of an apron between the gutter of Route 20 and the sidewalk that appears to be about ten feet from the southwest corner of the lot. This would mean that there is a curb cut and it would mean moving an existing curb cut.

Chair Gronachan asked Mr. Rogers how do we move this project forward?

Mr. Rogers asked as the applicant moves forward, does the Chair want a memo or narrative on tree clearing and maybe an estimate of how many trees would be cleared?

Chair Gronachan responded yes.

Mr. Rogers also asked does the Planning Board want a stacking plan?

The Planning Board concurred.

Mr. Rogers asked the Planning Board are there any other materials that the Planning Board would like the Applicant to put together as they prepare their full site plan application?

The Chair authorized the Planning Department to reach out to the DOT.

Project is tabled indefinitely until the Applicant submits a full site plan application.

Chuck Kluckhohn-Requesting Preliminary Plat Approval for a 2-lot subdivision to be located at 6670 Taylor Road

This project was tabled until September 2, 2026.

A.K. Kaid- Requesting Change of Use and Site Plan Approval on a proposal for a retail cannabis dispensary and associated site improvements to be located at 3233 Lakeshore Road

No one appeared on behalf of the project.

Chair Gronachan stated the architect for this project appeared before the Planning Board at the last meeting and provided the Planning Board with the following changes:

- The garage door was removed.
- The patio is still there.
 - Chair Gronachan feels that the patio and the overhang associated with it should be removed.

- Member Chmura, Member Ryan and Member Stewart are in agreement.

Member Chmura asked if the applicant provided a signage plan?

Mr. Rogers informed the Board that the Applicant has not provided a signage plan. However, one of the conditions that have been added is that any signage must fall into conformance with the existing Sign Code in the Town Code. Should the Planning Board wish, they could also make a condition that specifies what kind of lights are prohibited or signage is prohibited.

Member Chmura asked is there the ability to limit or prohibit flag signage?

Ensuing discussion confirmed that the Planning Board could not restrict flag signage.

Member Zajac stated due to the fact that there is a music studio across the street that is within 500 ft, he asked wouldn't we have to mitigate the signage for the kids i.e. no bright colors, flags etc.?

Mr. Rogers answered that the Planning Board can take a lot of the special use permit standards, which the Zoning Board did not apply, and add conditions to site plan approval. Based on past precedent with other dispensaries, the Planning Board has never put a condition limiting their signage or banners.

Chair Gronachan said that she was under the impression that the Supreme Court ruled several years ago that a Planning Board cannot control the verbiage on signage.

Member Zajac added he would like the Applicant to address how security is going to work. He is wondering if they are going to have monitors on site where they can view the cameras or is it going to just be cloud storage?

Member Ryan asked why are there two entrances going into the building? Are they looking at the other half of the building to be something else that has not been discussed with the Planning Board yet?

Mr. Rogers stated he will send the question to the Applicant and ask for clarification, along with the other requests the Board made.

The project was then tabled to the September 2, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Dave Manko- Requesting Amended Site Plan Approval of revised dumpster locations for the Mission Hills Villas Phase IV project, located on the east side of Camp Road

Attorney Sean Hopkins appeared on behalf of the project along with David Manko.

David Manko stated this is the fourth phase of Mission Hills that was built last year. During the building process and near the first completion of Phase I, they realized there was no location for the dumpsters. The Applicant arbitrarily looked at the site and decided where would be the best spot to put dumpsters. They then put in pads, fenced in the dumpsters with vinyl fencing and gates, and provided walkways for the tenants to use. Engineering brought to the attention of Mr. Manko that the Planning Board wanted a revised Site Plan showing the locations of the current dumpsters.

It was brought to his attention by Bob Haag in Engineering that the Planning Board may also want him to file a Map Cover for the project. Mr. Manko does not feel that this is needed as this project is an apartment complex.

Mr. Rogers added that this project was originally approved back in 2023 for Phase IV. At that point in time, the Planning Board did show interest in having Mr. Manko submit a Map Cover for Phase IV of Mission Hills. Mission Hills has always been rental units and has never been townhomes or condos. Engineering has been doing inspections and that is when they noticed the dumpsters.

Chair Gronachan stated to make a determination on the Map Cover, the current Planning Board would have to look at the minutes from the February 15, 2023, meeting when Phase IV was approved.

Mr. Manko informed the Planning Board that conceptually it was approved in 2012.

Member Clark asked when was the Map Cover provision put in place?

Mr. Rogers answered that it never was, it was only a discussion in 2023. Mr. Rogers pulled the minutes from February 15, 2023, and there is no condition of a Final Map Cover.

Town Engineer Camie Jarrell clarified the confusion is coming from the fact that this project is called Mission Hills subdivision. Subdivisions require Map Covers unless the Planning Board waives the Final Plat and Map Cover. Due to the fact this is a phase of a larger subdivision, it triggered in Engineering the requirement for a Map Cover. She is under the impression that it needed to have a condition waiving a Map Cover.

Attorney Sean Hopkins stated Camie is correct. However, although the project is called Mission Hills Subdivision, he feels the Map Cover would not have applied because there was no need for a waiver because the Applicant was not creating any new parcels.

Ms. Jarrell stated the revised dumpster locations were flagged by Engineering because the Planning Board is responsible for all parking decisions and this was done around some parking spaces that were part of the approval.

Due to the fact that there were four (4) dumpsters in the applicant's site plan that the Planning Board did not review, Engineering felt it was important to have them come back before the Planning Board to discuss the as-built conditions.

Chair Gronachan asked does the location of the dumpsters remove or hinder any parking whatsoever?

Mr. Manko answered no.

Ms. Jarrell explained that they did not lose a parking space, however, they did add a space that is now the dumpster "parking space". Because of that, there needs to be signage or striping to ensure that someone does not park there long term.

It was determined because this is an Amended Site Plan Approval, a public hearing is needed.

Ms. Jarrell added when a change to a site plan comes in, Engineering requests that it be submitted to their department, where she reviews it with the Planning Department and Building Department and they determine if it is something that should come before the Planning Board. If Mr. Gogan were to agree with this, the Planning Board could disagree with them and see the changes as minor and not significant enough for them to review.

Mr. Rogers did state that in the past, there have been a number of times the Planning Board has granted a Site Plan waiver or that the Planning Board did not have an approval to give and the Applicant should continue to work with Engineering. He offered this is something that the Planning Board could do.

Chair Gronachan felt that due to the size of the project and the fact that this was not on the original Site Plan, they should move forward with the Public Hearing.

Member Chmura disagreed and felt that it has such little significant impact on the overall project that if they are able to waive the amended Site Plan they should.

Member Clark felt that the way that the Town Code is written, there has to be a Public Hearing.

The Planning Board was asked if draft resolutions should be prepared for the September 2nd meeting?

The Board authorized the Planning Department to produce draft resolutions.

The project was then tabled to the September 2, 2026 Planning Board meeting, and a public hearing was scheduled.

Planning Board to discuss the draft Final Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Parker Road Developers, LLC regarding a proposed subdivision to be located on the west side of Parker Road, south of Big Tree Road

Attorney Sean Hopkins appeared on behalf of the project along with David Manko.

Mr. Hopkins stated at the previous meeting, some additional comments were presented and the FEIS was updated. The Applicant is requesting that the Planning Board issue the FEIS as complete, which would trigger the need to publish a notice and then the step of issuing the SEQRA findings statement.

Chair Gronachan stated additional information was provided to the Planning Board at a late hour on the afternoon of August 19, 2026, which the members have not been able to review. It is her suggestion that this project be tabled until September 2, 2026, to allow the Applicant to attach the Engineering memo as an appendix, as well as update the comments that were received on August 19th. By postponing this, the Planning Board would have one cohesive document to go through and accept.

Mr. Rogers added there were three (3) public comments that Mr. Hopkins and GPI did not originally have a copy of. Those comments were provided and the responses are now in the full FEIS. The memo which was provided from Engineering could be attached as an appendix.

Mr. Rogers explained it is up to the Planning Board if they feel the FEIS has been completed and everything has been answered.

Sean Hopkins added that at the last Planning Board meeting, Mr. Rogers stated that someone in his office had prepared a summary of comments that they were willing to share with the applicant. In those comments were emails from October 4, 2024, that the applicant's team had not seen. The comments were minor in nature and the changes to the FEIS were done. The comments are part of categories that had previously been addressed.

Chair Gronachan said that she understands what Mr. Hopkins is saying, however, the Planning Board just received the information from him that afternoon and did not have time to review it.

Member Clark stated that he does feel that the FEIS is complete.

Member Chmura wanted to take a moment at the meeting to review the changes to the FEIS.

The Planning Board decided to have Mr. Hopkins address the changes during the meeting.

Sean Hopkins summarized the following changes to the FEIS:

- Email 1- concerns about esthetics along Parker Road and tax implications.
 - Aesthetics issue- it was addressed that with the clustering development they are not showing development along the Parker Road frontage.
 - Tax implications- this is not something that is addressed in SEQRA.
- Email 2- expressed concerns about traffic and construction, specifically the duration.
 - Traffic impacts were already thoroughly addressed and were cross-referenced.
 - Construction- the applicant is envisioning a single phase for the installation of all infrastructure with the houses being built over the course of several phases.
 - In a one-year period all improvements in terms of roadways, sewer improvements, stormwater management, etc. would be installed.
- Email 3- concerns about the location of the stormwater pond and flooding as well as a question about the permanent open space
 - Pond- it has been addressed in terms of the location, the sizing and the manner that stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces will be handled in accordance with the DEC and their stringent standards as well as the Town of Hamburg standards
 - Open Space- under the clustering plan, they are proposing that there would be protected permanently via the recording of a Declaration of Restrictions at the Erie County Clerk's Office.
 - Per Mr. Hopkins it is 59 lots.
- The three individuals that wrote the emails also spoke during the Public Hearings.
- For the record, the Cluster Plan is a total of 59 lots.

Member Ryan informed the Planning Board that the FEIS still reflects 57 so that would have to be changed.

Member Ryan had a question regarding the impact of traffic in relationship to the Buffalo Bills Stadium.

Mr. Hopkins responded that the impact was addressed within the Traffic Impact Study dated December 2024. The analysis was that due to the fact that there was a reduction in the number of seats at the stadium, it would not have any traffic impacts that would be relevant for this project. The Traffic study is included in the appendix and was reviewed and vetted by the New York State Department of Transportation.

Chair Gronachan asked the rest of the Board members is the Planning Board prepared to accept the FEIS the way it is and move forward with additional comments?

Member Ryan, Member Stewart, Member Chmura, Member Clark and Member Zajac answered they all were prepared to move forward and accept the FEIS as complete.

The Planning Board made a motion to accept the Parker Road FEIS as complete, with additional comments and revisions being due to the Planning Department by September 2, 2026.

Mr. Rogers concluded at this point, since the Planning Board is comfortable accepting the FEIS as complete, the following will happen:

- He will start the filing requirements. There will be a ten (10) day Public Comment period where anyone can comment on the FEIS (which will be on the Town's website).
- At the closing of the 10 days, the Planning Board has thirty (30) days to make its SEQRA findings.
- The ten-day period comment period will end on September 4, 2026.

The project was then tabled to the September 16, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

Planning Board to discuss the draft Final Environmental Impact Statement submitted by Wetzl Development, LLC regarding a proposal by Glenn Wetzl to rezone property located east and south of 4255 McKinley Parkway

Attorney Sean Hopkins appeared on behalf of the project with Glenn Wetzl.

Mr. Rogers provided background for the Planning Board that they should have received a copy of the FEIS for this project, and the Board can start its review. The Planning Department has electronic copies of the FEIS and is waiting for the hard copies.

Mr. Rogers added that this project is a little more complicated than the Parker Road project due to the fact that there are numerous alternatives. It is his recommendation that this project be tabled until September 16, 2026, due to the case load on September 2, 2026.

Chair Gronachan summarized that both of the FEIS cases will return on September 16, 2026, and Mr. Hopkins will drop off the hard copies with the appendices for the Wetzl FEIS.

Town Engineer Camie Jarrell asked would the Planning Board like GHD to review its previous position and provide a similar comment letter before September 16, 2026?

The Planning Board was in agreement with the request.

The project was then tabled to the September 16, 2026 Planning Board meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Member Chmura made a motion, seconded by Member Ryan, to adjourn the meeting.
The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
August Geraci, Secretary