

Town of Hamburg Planning Board
Meeting - April 15, 1998
Actions Taken

Richwood Acres Part I
McKinley & Fairgrounds

Tabled for revisions

Hamburg Mobile Home Park
Southwestern Blvd.

On agenda for May 6th

Benderson Development
Former Service Merchandise Bldg.
McKinley & Milestrip

On agenda for May 6th

Dennis Griffin Storage Bldg.
St. Francis Drive

On agenda for May 6th

Brierwood Handouts

Item to be on May 6th

Approved 5/6 Received 5/12/98
George Danylek

Meeting - Town of Hamburg
Planning Board - April 15, 1998

The Town of Hamburg Planning Board met for a regular session on April 15, 1998, at 7:30 p.m. in Hamburg Town Hall. Those attending included: Vice-Chairman David Phillips, Gerard Koenig, Secretary, Sue Ganey, Paul Eustace, Don Fitzpatrick, Dick Pohlman. Others attending Rich Whipple, Drew Reilly, Rick Lardo, Attorney Don McKenna, and Stenographer Judy LaRosa. Excused: R.Crandall

Richwood Acres Part 1 - Phase I - McKinley & Fairgrounds Road

Mr. Reilly noted that Mr. Tyne from Pratt & Huth called and advised that he is still working on amendments to the plans for Richwood Acres. Therefore, he will not be available this evening and requested a tabling.

On Phase I, a request was made for a berm and the issue of the tot lot or money in lieu of was still outstanding. We have requested money in lieu of and Mr. Tyne expressed concern and wants to discuss the matter with Mr. Donato. Conceptual approval was given for the entire parcel, and on the preliminary he is yet to amend the plan. Once that is resolved, we can then proceed to Public Hearing and move forward.

Motion was made by Mr. Koenig, seconded by Mr. Eustace to Table. Carried.

Hamburg Mobile Park - Southwestern Blvd.

Mr. Phillips stated that this is a continuation of site plan review and a modification to the Hamburg Mobile Home Park to bring it more in conformance with the Town standards.

The applicant did not appear. New information has been presented by the Planning Board Attorney, Mr. McKenna, who did research on the question of the public right of way acquisition. This has since been put on the drawing, which only affects the setback of the buildings. They are now 40' back. The drawing now shows the correct measurement. A question was raised as to whether the Fire Dept. is aware of this drawing. Item is to be on the agenda for the May 6th meeting for potential approval.

Motion was made to Table by Mr. Fitzpatrick, seconded by Mr. Eustace. Carried.

**Benderson Development (former Service Merchandise Bldg.)
McKinley & Milestrip**

Mr. Phillips stated that this is a continuation of the site plan revisions for the Benderson project on McKinley & Milestrip. This is for a renovation and expansion of the former Service Merchandise facility. Mr. Tony Battista was present with revised drawings.

Mr. Reilly noted that there have been comments and a meeting

was held with the Traffic Safety Coordinator, Tim Ellis. I also spoke with the Dept. of Transportation and we have a letter from them. Several issues were then related to Mr. Battista to consider amendments. The first issue relates to the south and east side of the building. There was continuous parking along the building which did not allow for fire lane access. There has been a shift in the handicap parking with doubled access to correct the problem. Another issue was the entrance on McKinley with the turn. They drew something that is now acceptable. Traffic Safety still has concern with this entrance. We believe that we have come up with the best solution at present to mitigate the problem. The other issue relates to Milestrip which has 4 entrances. Our original concerns were the problems of vehicles making left hand turns & car stacking. The DOT has problems with this also as they believe that entrance will be problematic because it is not lined up with anything across the street. Traffic Safety feels that this entrance is not necessary. They would like to see 3 entrances.

Comments from the DOT are: The relocation of the existing driveway on Milestrip is not acceptable as proposed. We do not agree with the statement on Page 26 of the TIS that the "offset" between the new driveway and the existing Toys R' Us driveway is not expected to present a significant conflict. Given the offset and the short distance between the driveways, there will be conflicts between vehicles simultaneously utilizing the two way left hand turn lane while attempting to turn into the proposed driveway and the existing Toys R' Us driveway. Due to the significant accident potential of this situation, the department will not approve the driveway at this location that allows left turning vehicles to either enter or exit. A right in, right out driveway would be acceptable at the proposed location.

Mr. Battista then responded from EMS, the traffic consultant: We do not believe the left turns to or from the relocated driveway would create any unusual hazard or conflict. The driveway offsets of this type are extremely common on urban and suburban arterials. Experience has demonstrated that offset driveways are not associated with high accident rates when a two way left turn lane is provided on the arterial. Our report stated that there will be storage on the Milestrip Rd. center lane for about 2 cars between the relocated driveway and the Toys R Us driveway. With calculations provided and the capacity analysis indicate that the 95th percentile during the Saturday peak hour will be .4 vehicles for eastbound left turns into the Toys R Us driveway and 1.5 vehicles for westbound left turns into the relocated site driveway. Accordingly, the available 2 car storage lanes will be sufficient to accommodate the highest anticipated traffic flow. We also note that there are no site distance restrictions along this section of Milestrip Rd. Motorists will have adequate visibility of other vehicles turning to or from the driveways in the area. There does not appear to be any need to prohibit left turns out of the

relocated driveway. For motorists turning left from the relocated driveway would typically enter the inside travel lane on Milestrip Rd. whereas the motorist turning right from Toys R Us would usually enter the outside travel lane. Furthermore, there would be no conflict between left turns from the relocated driveway and left turns from the Toys R Us driveway. Concentration of turning movements in this area would not be unusual for a suburban arterial.

Mr. Reilly responded that the DOT has a problem with this, which must be resolved, the Planning Board had a problem with the configuration of the problem of traffic; Traffic Safety feels this should be eliminated. You have solved the issue of McKinley and we must solve the other to get the entities facilitated to agree to the best solution.

Mr. Battista responded that they will set up a meeting with the State. Mr. Reilly noted that the Town would like representation also. Please inform us of the day and time of that meeting.

Mr. Reilly stated that the DOT suggested that there be an east west connection where people could cut across and get to the light instead of driving in the back. This could be achieved by elimination of some of the parking.

The last issue relates to BJ's Plaza. The dept. has received a complaint regarding the traffic operation of Builder's Square/BJ's intersection. As you are aware, Benderson Development also owns that plaza. The specific point is during peak plaza times. It is difficult to enter the BJ plaza parking lot due to vehicles queue to the exit. The driveway blocking the parking lot entrance. This is caused by the parking lot layout. The thru aisle does not line up with the driveway exit lanes. There is a blockage which causes potential for an accident on Milestrip Rd. In light of this complaint and the additional traffic from the new retail business that will be using this intersection, in view of modifications, corrections should be required.

Mr. Phillips noted that revisions need to be addressed. Item is to be on the May 6th meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Pohlman, seconded by Ms. Ganey to table. Carried.

Dennis Griffin Storage Bldg. - St. Francis Drive.

Mr. Reilly noted that at the last meeting we tabled Mr. Griffin's application for an addition. The Building Inspector and the Engineering Dept. noted that he was not in compliance with the original site plan approval. Mr. Griffin feels he has taken care of the issues. He would like to be on the May 6th agenda.

Planning Board - 4, 4-15-98

Information Concerning Brierwood Project

Mr. Reilly noted that packets have been provided to the Planning Board. We had a scoping meeting of April 9th, you received public comments. We put a packet together consisting of my notes, my ideas on the scoping issues. Then you will see a copy of all the letters that were received that night. You will also see your notes on the subject. There is a packet of all correspondence. We have a document which is a verbatim record of the meeting, of which there are only 3 copies. We will not hand out meeting minutes. If you wish to read the transcript, you may come into the office and read it. The purpose of the handouts is for review and be ready to discuss on May 6th what you believe the scope SEIS should be. This is a mini scoping document on what should be done. It is not a synopsis and read what the applicant has submitted. The only thing that is not in there are 2 faxes. One is from the Mr. Burke which is a letter saying he cannot attend, and we received a fax from Mr. Vogel's office. This is a document on a study of the need for senior housing in the Hamburg area. The fax was sent with no one's name other than for Drew Reilly. This must be addressed to the Planning Board. I cannot make copies. I think Mr. Vogel just wants me to look at. It is a 12 page study on needs for apartment senior living in the Hamburg area. There were photos submitted. These have not been copied.

Mr. Reilly noted that requests for information should be done thru the Freedom of Information Act. If people want a copy, they must make a FOIL request. An interested agency receives material that is sent to other involved agencies.

Attorney McKenna stated that he received a letter from Attorney Arthur J. Giacalone. I will be sending copies to Mr. Walsh and would like to meet with the staff on this. Mr. Reilly stated that the legal issues that were brought up by Mr. Giacalone and would be referred to Mr. McKenna, myself, or the Town Attorney. The Planning Board is not the legal body on this matter. We are dealing with the scoping document. The legal questions will be addressed by Mr. McKenna. We will research and comment as to what was in the PUD originally and present.

In 1990, there was a compromise on the green space issue. What was requested, planned, and built were issues raised at that time. We are required to make a determination within 60 days that will take place either May 6th or May 20th. Notices will be sent to the interested agencies. Scoping is very open and can be done many different ways.

A resident noted that several items were addressed to Mr. Crandall and is concerned with the closure of things on scoping. Mr. Reilly noted that a copy of this packet will be made available for review. The fax today has no cover sheet and it cannot be made available to anyone else. Normally the department uses this building for the document depositories. Given the level of

information locally, and that this building is actually not really open in the evenings, we would ask that when the DEIS comes in, a copy be sent to the Lake Shore Library. Mr. Reilly responded that this document will be sent to the libraries and all interested agencies.

Motion was made by Mr. Pohlman, seconded by Mr. Fitzpatrick. to adjourn. Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerard Koenig
Gerard Koenig, Secretary
Planning Board