

Village of Geneseo  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Public Hearing for:  
Kircher Construction Inc.  
For Geneseo Hospitality LLC  
4250 Lakeville Road  
Tax Map Id.# 81.10-1-19.12  
January 4, 2011; 4:30 p.m.  
Meeting # 1

Present:

Carolyn Meisel, Chair  
Marlene Hamilton  
Ronald Palmer  
Paul Schmied  
Thomas Wilson

Secretary:

Debra Lund

Public Present:

Sue Richardson  
John & Thelma Gillette  
Daniel & Elizabeth O'Mara

Code Enforcement Officer:

Ronald Maxwell

Applicant:

Kircher Construction, Inc. Rep.:  
Jon Flannery, James Olverd  
Geneseo Hospitality, LLC  
owner: Martin Estruch

Chair C. Meisel opened the public hearing at 4:30 p.m. Board members were introduced. The purpose of the hearing was application for permission to a) erect a freestanding sign approximately eight (8') feet high with forty-two (42) square feet per side when Section 130-90 [B] (4) states such signs shall not exceed sixteen (16) square feet per side and the highest point may not exceed six (6') feet above grade; and b) to place a wall sign on the third floor of the building when wall signs shall only be permitted on the ground floor of multiple-story buildings and when said signs exceed the maximum total square footage of sixty (60) square feet per sixty (60) linear feet of the building frontage per Section 130-90 [B] (1) (a) of the Code of the Village of Geneseo for property located at 4250 Lakeville Road, Tax Map Id#: 81.10-1-19.12. Proper notices were published and four letters were sent certified mail and four responses returned. The Board received correspondence regarding the proposed signage.

Livingston County was notified and the decision was left to the Village Board. The Livingston County letter follows:

*Livingston County  
Planning Board  
Livingston County Government Center  
6 Court Street, Room 305  
Geneseo, NY 14454-1043*

*Telephone: (585) 243-7550  
Fax: (585) 243-7566  
E-mail: [aellis@co.livingston.ny.us](mailto:aellis@co.livingston.ny.us)*

December 16, 2010

Debra Lund  
Village of Geneseo ZBA  
119 Main Street  
Geneseo, NY 14454

Re: Zoning Referral #2010-108, Village of Geneseo, Area Variance for signs at 4250  
Lakeville Road ( Applicant: Kircher Construction, Inc. representing Geneseo  
Hospitality, LLC)

Dear Ms. Lund,

We have received the above zoning referral in accordance with the provisions of Section 239-l and m of the  
NYS General Municipal Law.

The Livingston County Planning Department has reviewed this application and determined that it has no  
significant Countywide or inter-municipal impact in regard to existing County plans, programs, and activities.  
Therefore, approval or disapproval of this application is a matter of local option.

Please be aware that a determination of “No Significant Countywide Impact” should not be interpreted as  
either approval or disapproval by the County Planning Board.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 243-7550.

Sincerely,  
Angela Ellis  
Planning Director

cc: Pat McCormick, Chairman, Livingston County Planning Board  
David Matthews, Village of Geneseo representative, Livingston County Planning Board  
Kircher Construction, Applicant

A letter was received from the Village of Geneseo Planning Board:

Planning Board  
Matthew W. Griffio  
Chair  
Dori J. Farthing  
Member  
Claren Kruppner  
Member  
Susan B. Richardson  
Member  
David Woods  
Member  
Aprile S. Mack  
Secretary

December 21, 2010

Carolyn Meisel, Chair  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
119 Main Street  
Geneseo, NY 14454

RE: Geneseo Hospitality/Hampton Inn sign variance requests

Dear Zoning Board of Appeals,

At the Village of Geneseo Planning Board meeting on Wednesday, December 15, 2010, the Planning Board reviewed the proposed signage for the Hampton Inn. After careful consideration, the Board voted against the proposal.

The Board believes that the signs should be no larger than what Code allows. The Board also believes that the building wall sign could be placed on the portico.

Thank you in advance for taking our vote under consideration.

Sincerely,  
Matthew W. Griffo  
Planning Board Chair

CC: Geneseo Hospitality/Hampton Inn

(Received Dec. 21, 2010)

Chair C. Meisel invited the applicants to state their case.

J. Flannery directed the Board to the handouts presented by J. Olverd. Page one was a colored printout of the proposed freestanding sign that included a color and size rendering with measurements and placement site. Page two was a printout of the proposed building sign that also included measurements, placement and size of the sign.

C. Meisel asked where the freestanding sign was in relation to the driveways and building. J. Flannery said it is in the northeast corner of the property with the off set required by the code as shown on page one. New York State Department of Highways (NYS DOT) required that the sign be placed on that side of the property. J. Olverd commented there are two entrances to the bowling alley property. NYS DOT would like to eventually eliminate the western most drive when and if a traffic light is installed at Ryan Drive opposite the eastern entrance to the property. Sign placement would be just east of the western entrance. The Board asked if a copy of this letter could be provided and the answer was it would be.

T. Wilson asked how this lined up with the existing bowling alley sign. J. Olverd noted it was west of that sign. M. Hamilton asked if it would interfere with the bowling alley driveway. J. Flannery said the sign would not interfere and would be east of that entrance.

J. Flannery stated the signage requested is the standard for Hampton Inns. M. Estruch said he had a contract with the agreement the signage would be like all the approximately twelve hundred (1200) other Hampton Inn signs. J. Flannery noted a smaller sign more in keeping with the Village Code had been proposed to Hampton Inn (Hilton Worldwide) but they had rejected it. C. Meisel asked if they would not give some leeway if told the ZBA would not allow that large a sign, the sign must be much smaller. The zoning code was revised recently specifically to clarify signage regulations and the Board must adhere to its mandates as closely as possible.

M. Estruch said Hampton Inn did reduce the size of its sign in East Aurora after the community objected. He approached the Inn with a reduced sign proposal but was told no; he apologized for the sign being so large but noted they insisted the standard size be maintained.

R. Palmer asked if a letter had been sent by Hampton Inn expressing their position. M. Estruch thought one had been sent to the Village Planning Board. C. Meisel noted S. Richardson, a Planning Board member was present and asked if she remembered such a letter being received. S. Richardson said she did not remember one having been received.

C. Meisel asked CEO R. Maxwell how much of a variance would be needed. The code says sixteen (16) square feet per side for freestanding signs, forty-two (42) square feet was being requested. T. Wilson noted the freestanding sign was not much taller at eight (8') feet than the six (6') feet allowed by code but at forty-two (42) square feet in size was much larger than the allowed sixteen (16) square feet.

P. Schmied asked if M. Estruch was required by Hampton Inn to have a freestanding sign as well as the building sign. He replied he had asked and the response was that he did need it.

M. Hamilton commented there were not a lot of hotels in the area and the only other one on Lakeville Road is located right next door and also owned by M. Estruch. She does not see the need for both the freestanding sign and the building sign. T. Wilson did not believe any one would miss seeing the building. There are not many other three-story buildings in the vicinity.

Chair C. Meisel suggested the Board consider the building sign. She asked if the third floor sign was just the letters or an actual separate sign. M. Estruch replied it was just letters.

J. Flannery said sixteen (16) square feet is allowed on the freestanding sign and on square foot of sign is allowed per linear foot of building frontage, the area is sixty-five (65) square feet and the code says no sign may be on the third floor. The letters are three (3') feet high.

C. Meisel asked if they had considered putting the sign on the lower level. J. Flannery said it would not fit on the portico at sixty-five (65) square feet but might fit if reduced. The area is six (6') feet tall but not wide enough with the letter spacing. M. Hamilton asked the width of the portico. It is thirty (30') feet wide but recessed. M. Hamilton asked if it would fit on the port-cochere. It was still quite high above ground level. J. Flannery said it also is six (6') high but he is not sure of the width.

C. Meisel noted the Board would be more comfortable if both signs could be reduced in size. J. Olverd said they could go back and talk with Hampton Inn. C. Meisel suggested a straw vote. Three members were in favor of smaller signs, one did not believe the signs should be approved as presented and one asked if the freestanding sign was really necessary; no one was in favor of the signs as presented.

M. Estruch said his major concern was the road sign- he felt it could be reduced to the six (6') foot above grade height requirement. Hampton Inn does not like to move the logo sign on its buildings. The building is designed specifically with room for the sign at the third floor location. He will push to get permission to put the sign on the parapet but felt Hampton would be adamant that the building sign remain. He might be able to reduce the freestanding sign size.

T. Wilson asked if the building letters were lit and the reply was affirmative. J. Olverd said the letters are internally lit. T. Wilson noted this would make them more noticeable. P. Schmied asked R. Maxwell what the code stated. He replied sixteen (16) square feet is allowed per side for a freestanding sign; one square foot for each linear foot of building frontage is allowed but cannot exceed sixty (60) square feet total signage. P. Schmied stated the building is imposing, therefore if the sign were allowed on the third floor it would be easily visible. The sign at the roadside would not really be necessary. M. Estruch agreed but noted the sign by the side of the road is a signature for Hampton Inns. J. Olverd reminded the Board the other drive might be eliminated in the future and the freestanding sign would be needed to designate where customers should turn in.

C. Meisel suggested the hearing be tabled to give M. Estruch and Kircher Construction time to consult with Hampton Inn regarding possible signage changes. They could then return to the Board with the revisions for the Board's consideration. She noted the new zoning is now in place and the Board needs to follow it as much as possible.

P. Schmied moved to table the public hearing until Thursday, January 20, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. to be reconvened in the Geneseo building boardroom. M. Hamilton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Chair C. Meisel, aye; M. Hamilton, aye; R. Palmer, aye; P. Schmied, aye; and T. Wilson, aye. The motion carried and the hearing was tabled at 4:54 p.m.

Debra Lund  
Secretary

\*\*Attachments will follow at the end of the reconvened minutes:

To be included: letter from NYS DOT to D. Young, Larson Design Group; Js. Coniglio-Underberg & Kessler, LLP

Email correspondence between: J. Flannery, Kircher Construction; L. R. Creswell, Hilton Worldwide ( January 05, 2011); letter from Code Enforcement Office to ZBA Board.

Village of Geneseo  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Public Hearing for:  
Kircher Construction Inc.  
For Geneseo Hospitality LLC  
4250 Lakeville Road  
Tax Map Id.# 81.10-1-19.12  
January 20, 2011; 4:30 p.m.  
Meeting #2: reconvened Public Hearing

Present:

Carolyn Meisel, Chair  
Marlene Hamilton  
Paul Schmied  
Thomas Wilson

Code Enforcement Officer:

Dean O'Keefe

Applicant:

Kircher Construction, Inc. Rep:  
Jon Flannery

Public Present:

Sue Richardson, Planning Board  
Ben & Wanda Ahern

Geneseo Hospitality, LLC  
owner: Martin Estruch

Secretary:

Debra Lund

Chair C. Meisel reconvened the tabled public hearing and opened the meeting at 4:30 p.m. The Board and the applicant, M. Estruch, introduced themselves for the benefit of a student guest attending the meeting for his government class.

Chair C. Meisel invited M. Estruch to present the results of his discussion with Hilton Worldwide corporate representative and other issues questioned at the first meeting. M. Estruch noted he had forwarded the letters originally sent to the Planning Board for the Zoning Board's review. New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT) stated both driveways would remain at this point with the sign to be placed on the east side of the western most entrance. They suggested the Inn could use a roadway exiting to Reservoir Road if a light was installed at some future date and one Lakeville Road exit was closed. M. Estruch said it was not and is not his intention to use the Reservoir Road driveway.

A copy of the franchise agreement signed between Hilton Worldwide Corporate and M. Estruch was presented to the Planning Board (February 23, 2010) and stated what the franchise allows. A November 2010 letter was written by M. Estruch to Corporate stating the Planning Board's desires. Corporate responded with what they want and stated he had signed an agreement with them to that effect.

At the last Zoning Board meeting, the Board told him what they would like. He then approached Corporate with these suggestions. M. Estruch asked to be allowed to reduce the size of the freestanding sign. It has been brought down in size to meet code- six feet in height and sixteen square feet per side per the revised

drawings sent to the Board for review on January 05, 2011. Corporate representative L. Ray Creswell stated in the email attached to the new freestanding sign drawing, they would in turn, expect to maintain the building sign on the front third floor parapet as shown on Laurentano's presentation drawing. All newer Hampton Inns have the signature sign on the third floor parapet. The new buildings must be three stories. Some older buildings, two stories and under, had signage on the front porticos or port-cocheres but this has not been allowed for approximately fifteen years.

M. Estruch looked at other signage in the vicinity of his Inn and noted that while Wal-Mart's sign is on the first floor, the first floor rises about thirty (30') feet from the ground. His third floor sign would not be any higher than their first floor sign. He had to provide Corporate pictures of other freestanding signs in the area, a copy of Geneseo's sign regulations, and minutes of any meetings he has had with the Village's boards. He did in good faith get corporate to work with him on the freestanding sign but cannot get them to budge on the building sign placement. He is to meet with Ray Creswell at some point in February but an exact date has not been set. J. Flannery proposed to R. Creswell that if the freestanding sign were reduced in size it would no longer need a variance and would now meet code. M. Estruch noted the parapet letters would not fit on the front portico, as they are too large.

C. Meisel asked CEO D. O'Keefe what the total allowed signage was. He responded it would be one (1) square foot for each linear foot of building frontage and is sixty (60) square feet in this case. M. Hamilton asked how large the building sign was. D. O'Keefe responded that it was approximately fifty-eight (58) square feet. The freestanding sign alone would total thirty-two (32) square feet, leaving twenty-eight (28) square feet for the rest of the signage. Approximately a thirty (30) square foot variance would be needed for the building sign. Directional signs (arrows) would be allowed if NYSDOT requested them but cannot have any logos on them. The new requirements do not appear to have a size limit but he will look into this.

M. Hamilton would be willing to allow the lit building sign if the freestanding sign was eliminated. However, she does feel there is a need for some kind of signage to designate the drive entrances. T. Wilson has driven by often and does not feel anyone could miss the Hampton Inn with or without signage. He had reviewed the pictures taken by R. Palmer of the Eastview Hampton and liked the portico sign better. He would be in favor of the freestanding sign with a smaller portico sign. M. Estruch said he agreed everyone would recognize the Hampton but the sign on the third floor is the brand's signature. The Victor (Eastview) Hampton is an older two story building.

P. Schmied asked when M. Estruch had signed his original contract with Hilton Worldwide to construct the Hampton Inn and when the new signage regulations were adopted. M. Estruch said he had signed the contract about two years ago and could document it if necessary. C. Meisel said the new signage regulations went into effect in January 2010, just a year ago. They were implemented just because of situations like this one. P. Schmied felt there could be the argument made that there were extenuating circumstances since M. Estruch signed his contract with Hilton Worldwide in good faith under the old zoning regulations and now is not able to follow through under the new regulations. The new Hampton Inn will be a significant landmark in Geneseo and easily identified when coming in from the west but will need identification if coming in from the East, as it is not seen as well from this approach. M. Estruch was negotiating his contract with Hilton Worldwide as the Village was addressing new signage requirements. P. Schmied would be in favor of allowing the building signage for this reason. It is a new three-story building that does violate the code not an existing renovated building. C. Meisel wondered if the signage would have been o.k. if it had been asked for at the beginning of construction as it would have been under the old code requirements.

S. Richardson (Planning Board member) looked on the Internet for pictures of other Hampton Inns, such as some in the Buffalo area (print out of East Aurora Hampton Inn was presented). She felt there was too much sky pollution with the signage on the third-story of the building and would actually be higher than the third-story if the property elevation were considered. M. Estruch commented he did not agree with S. Richardson's dark sky assessment as he feels the Inn will only face businesses and not a residential area so the lit sign would not be an issue but respects her right to her opinion. C. Meisel had also researched other Hampton Inns on the Internet. She noted Amelia Island and Morris, Pennsylvania had no sign but the Morris location was only one story and Amelia Island was a resort community and as such might have more stringent regulations. T. Wilson

asked S. Richardson if the Hampton Inns she reviewed were three stories the same as this one. She replied the one in Binghamton, New York was but the color was a little different.

M. Estruch noted the port-cochere on his building has a cantilevered ceiling without room enough for the sign. R. Creswell, the Hilton Worldwide east coast representative was supposed to be here next week but no specific date was given. T. Wilson said the steel for the portico was just being installed and it might not be late to enlarge or flatten the roofline such that the letters would fit. M. Estruch said that would be fine with him but he had signed an agreement and it was not his choice. He personally felt the third-floor sign identified the building to those coming from Route 390 and that corporate would not allow him to not identify the building. He could go back and suggest the freestanding sign be done away with in favor of getting approval for the building sign.

P. Schmied said the Wegmans and Wal-Mart lights can be seen from Lima Road. The Zoning Board of Appeals is to interpret the law and follow it to the letter unless there is a unique reason not to do so. Usually matters that come before the Board involve renovations in older sections of the Village where properties often do not fit the new law. It is harder to justify giving a variance in a new area and with new construction.

M. Estruch said he would look back and document when he signed the contract for the Inn with Hilton Worldwide. He would also see if they would allow him to do away with the freestanding sign if the building sign was allowed and with the possibility of directional signs being allowed at the entrances. There really was no place for the building sign but on the third floor.

Chair C. Meisel noted the Board was considering three issues: a freestanding sign; a building sign size, and building sign placement. T. Wilson noted he would only be in favor of the building sign if it were located on the first floor. C. Meisel asked how small the building sign could be on the third floor. M. Estruch said the letters were thirty-six (36") inches high. These would be within the boundaries of the code if he withdraws his request for a freestanding sign and just asks for directional signs. CEO D. O'Keefe stated directional signs are just that and do not allow verbiage; NYS DOT would have to approve them. If Hilton Worldwide wanted Hampton Inn on the directional signs, M. Estruch would have to come back for another variance.

M. Hamilton asked the square footage of the proposed building sign. T. Wilson said it would be sixty-five (65') square feet according to his calculations and still outside the maximum sixty (60) square feet allowed for the sixty (60) linear feet of building frontage. J. Flannery said the actual building frontage was sixty-five and three-quarters (65 3/4') feet not the aforementioned sixty (60') feet and therefore the sign would be within code. He noted M. Estruch might find it in his best interest to withdraw the freestanding sign request, ask for the building sign on the third story and come back to the Board later for directional signs. It takes months to get signs made and M. Estruch would like to open this spring. M. Estruch could then approach NYS DOT for their input. D. O'Keefe commented the third floor building sign would use up all of the allowed square footage for the property.

M. Hamilton asked what the square footage allowance was for directional signs. D. O'Keefe did not believe there was any specific figure and will look into it; they would need to be reviewed by the Planning Board and be approved by NYS DOT.

With no further discussion, the questions were reviewed:

1. Will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or will a detriment to nearby properties be created by granting the variance? Yes 2. The freestanding sign is not out of line but this would be the first third-floor sign on Rt. 20A; another freestanding sign makes the highway more of a narrow corridor. No 2. It is a commercial district; there are other signs in the neighborhood.
2. Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some feasible method other than a variance? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_. Size could be reduced and location moved.
3. Is the requested variance substantial? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_. The request is about 50% greater than the allowed 65 sq. feet. There were complaints on the third floor building sign of light pollution.
4. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district? Yes 2. A larger sign is being requested than the rest of the area. Lights impact the area similar to Wal-Mart and Wegmans complex. No 2. Complaint of light pollution but there is other commercial light pollution in the area.

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created? Yes  X  No \_\_\_\_\_.

T. Wilson asked if it would be better to process some of the signage variance request. If the Board votes no on part of it, does M. Estruch have to start from scratch? P. Schmied wondered if M. Estruch takes the freestanding sign off the table, what happens when corporate says he still needs it? Can the Zoning Board approve one part of the request and table the rest to give the applicant more time to look into the other part of the request or must the decision apply to all of it at one time. J. Flannery said it would be best if the building sign could be approved and table the freestanding sign until they could talk with corporate representative R. Creswell. M. Estruch would like the Board to consider the building sign and he would withdraw the request for the freestanding sign. He would then be within Code size limits for the building sign and only be requesting a variance for placing the sign on the third floor as J. Flannery suggested.

Chair C. Meisel suggested the hearing be tabled until R. Creswell could attend a meeting. Most of the Board are retirees and could attend a meeting set up on short notice. It might help clear up issues to be able to speak with a corporate representative.

M. Estruch replied he wanted the building signage and would remove his request for a freestanding sign. This would bring him in compliance except for the third floor placement issue. D. O'Keefe asked if corporate would allow the freestanding sign only and M. Estruch replied in the negative. He directed attention to the email from R. Creswell (January 05, 2011; 10:26 a.m.) stating he felt Brand would be willing to reduce the size for the ground mounted monument sign if the village would work with them on maintaining the building sign on the front parapet as shown on Laurentano's presentation drawing (received by Code Officer on November 17, 2010).

M. Hamilton asked if M. Estruch was formally removing his request for a freestanding sign from the table. M. Estruch replied in the affirmative, he was. C. Meisel noted the third story sign used all the signage allowed on the property.

M. Hamilton moved to approve Kircher Construction Inc. representing Geneseo Hospitality, Inc.'s application for a third floor sign with thirty-six (36") inch lettering for the Hampton Inn at 4250 Lakeville Road as specified in the drawings received by the Code Office on November 17, 2010 (#04548R) when the Village of Geneseo Code only permits wall signs on the ground floor of multiple-story buildings and it is noted the application for a freestanding sign has been withdrawn. P. Schmied seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Chair C. Meisel, aye; M. Hamilton, aye; P. Schmied, aye; and T. Wilson, nay. The motion carried.

M. Estruch thanked the Board and will let the Board know when Hilton Worldwide representative R. Creswell is in town. He and J. Flannery exited the hearing at 5:30 p.m.

P. Schmied moved to close the public hearing at 5:32 p.m. T. Wilson seconded the motion. The vote was as follows: Chair C. Meisel, aye; M. Hamilton, aye; P. Schmied, aye; and T. Wilson, aye. The motion passed and the hearing closed.

Minutes of the January 04, 2011 O'Mara Public Hearing were reviewed. M. Hamilton moved to accept the minutes as presented. P. Schmied seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows: Chair C. Meisel, aye; M. Hamilton, aye; P. Schmied, aye; and T. Wilson, aye. The motion carried.

P. Schmied moved to close the meeting at 5:40 p.m. M. Hamilton seconded the motion. All were in favor and the meeting closed.

Debra Lund  
Secretary

*Received via email: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 12:12 PM*

From: Kircher Construction , kircherconstruction@frontiernet.net.

To: Dean O'keefe, dokeefe@geneseony.org.; Ron Maxwell, rmaxwell@geneseony.org.

Cc: dlund@geneseony.org.

Sent: Wednesday, January 05, 2011 12:12 PM

Subject: Fw: Proposed Hampton Inn Geneseo, NY

All

FYI - Letter concerning exterior signage sent from Hilton Corporate to Village of Geneseo Planning Board.

Thank you

Jon Flannery  
Project Manager  
Kircher Construction  
(585)658-4070  
(585)658-4072 - Fax  
(585)370-8077 - Direct

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Jim Olverd](#)  
**To:** [Jon Flannery](#)  
**Cc:** [Jon Ladelfa](#) ; [Martin Estruch](#)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 05, 2011 11:38 AM  
**Subject:** Fw: Proposed Hampton Inn Geneseo, NY

This went to the Geneseo Planning Board on February 23, 2010.

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Marty](#)  
**To:** [Coniglio, James A.](#) ; [jokircher@frontiernet.net](mailto:jokircher@frontiernet.net)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2010 9:04 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Hampton Inn Geneseo, NY

**From:** Ray Creswell [<mailto:Ray.Creswell@hilton.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 23, 2010 12:37 PM  
**To:** [amack@geneseony.org](mailto:amack@geneseony.org)  
**Cc:** [meriver52@frontiernet.net](mailto:meriver52@frontiernet.net)  
**Subject:** Proposed Hampton Inn Geneseo, NY

Aprile,

I have been asked to contact you regarding the building sign for the proposed Hampton at Geneseo and the height restrictions by the city to limit the sign's height to 24". The 24" building sign is not allowed per the Brand and the minimum height we will allow as the Franchisor is 36". There are several reasons for the minimum size, which we can discuss at a later time. As the Franchisor, the minimum height requirement is across all 4000 plus hotels in our system domestically and internationally. There is currently 1700 plus Hampton Brand hotels in the US and internationally and none have a 24" high building sign. Please feel free to contact me at any time regarding the sign requirements for the Hampton Brands. You may also access the sign requirements on our web site too for further understanding of the registered trade mark signage.

If you have time to discuss this further, please call me. I look forward to talking with you and to make sure our Brands provide a successful hotel for the Franchisor as well as represent the cities in which they are located. Also, would you please forward a copy of the City's sign restrictions for our files?

Respectfully,

Ray Creswell

**L. Ray Creswell, R.A.**  
Director, Focused Service Brands  
Architecture & Construction  
Northeast Region

Hilton Worldwide  
755 Crossover Lane  
Memphis, TN 38117

United States of America

P: (901) 374-5960

F: (901) 374-5008

Ray.Creswell@hilton.com

---

This transmission is not a digital or electronic signature and cannot be used to form, document, or authenticate a contract. Hilton and its affiliates accept no liability arising in connection with this transmission. © 2009 Hilton Worldwide Proprietary and Confidential

---

**From:** KircherConstruction [mailto:kircherconstruction@frontiernet.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 05, 2011 4:58 PM

**To:** Jim Olverd; 'Martin Estruch'; Ron Maxwell; Dean O'keefe; dlund@geneseony.org

**Subject:** Fw: Emailing: Binder1.pdf

All

As requested see attachment. Included in this document are letter's from the NYS DOT to Dave Young and Underberg and Kessler (Geneseo Hospitality Attorney) to Tom Reynolds (Village Attorney). The letters are concerning the location of the signage due to future traffic entrances and flow of traffic, with the possibility of adding a road from Livingston Lanes property to Reservoir road.

Please furnish the attached document as well as the previously sent letters, which included the letter from Hilton Corporate to Planning board, the letter from Hilton Corporate regarding brand standard, and the letter from Hilton Corporate concerning working with the village to meet monument signage requirements as long as building sign is maintained. Please include these documents in the zoning board meeting minutes as they were discussed at the zoning board of appeals meeting on 1/4/10 at 4:30pm.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Thank you

Jon Flannery

Project Manager

Kircher Construction

(585)658-4070

(585)658-4072 - Fax

(585)370-8077 - Direct

----- Original Message -----

**From:** [Kircher Construction, Inc.](#)

**To:** [Flannery, Jon](#)

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 05, 2011 4:16 PM

**Subject:** Emailing: Binder1.pdf

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

Binder1.pdf

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

STATE OF NEW YORK  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
REGION FOUR  
1530 JEFFERSON ROAD  
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14623-3161

[www.nysdot.gov](http://www.nysdot.gov)

ROBERT A. TRAVER, P.E.  
ACTING REGIONAL DIRECTOR

STANLEY GEE  
ACTING COMMISSIONER

January 7, 2010

Mr. David Young  
Larson Design Group  
34 Denison Parkway West  
Corning, NY 14830

Re: Geneseo Hampton Inn  
Route 20A, Village of Geneseo  
Livingston County

Dear Mr. Young,

We have completed our review of the September, 2009 Traffic Impact Study and site plans for the proposed Hampton Inn in the Village of Geneseo.

The proposed Geneseo Hampton Inn is located adjacent to the existing Livingston Lanes Bowling Alley and access is proposed from two existing bowling alley driveways on Route 20A, one driveway is located across from Ryan Drive and the second driveway is located approximately 120 feet west of the first driveway. Through our previous review of a site plan we stated that the second driveway should be removed and cross access should be provided to the property west of the site, which the developer also owns.

Based on a more detailed site review, we have determined that there is a significant drop in elevation on the west of the site. Providing cross access to the west in the front of the building would be difficult and removing the existing site driveway may negatively impact site access. Therefore we will allow each of the existing bowling alley driveways to access the proposed Geneseo Hampton Inn. As a condition of approval, the owner will be required to remove the westerly driveway in the event that a traffic signal is installed at Ryan Drive and the easterly driveway. This removal and any reconfiguration of internal circulation patterns will be the sole responsibility of the property owner. We request the village incorporate this as a condition of approval.

To encourage westbound vehicles on Route 20A destined to the Hampton Inn to utilize the existing left turn lane at the site driveway located across from the Wal-Mart driveway, we strongly recommend placing the "Hampton Inn" sign on the easterly side of the property.

We agree that the traffic projected for the Hampton Inn will have little to no impact on the need for a three color traffic signal at the Route 20A and Ryan Drive/site driveway intersection. However it should be noted that during peak periods, specifically in the PM peak hours, left turns exiting a site driveway may experience delays. The proposed cross-access to the property to the west is a desirable feature for access management.

It is our understanding that right-of-way exists to access Reservoir Road south of the property. A secondary access (full or partial) to Reservoir Road will provide traffic an alternative to exit this site and may be a desirable traffic flow improvement.

If there are any questions regarding our review please contact Mr. Robert Duennebacke at 272-3475.

Sincerely,  
David C. Goehring, P.E.  
Regional Traffic Engineer

DCG/RLD/jmw

c: R. Hatheway, Mayor, Village of Geneseo  
D. Aycock, Resident Engineer, Livingston County  
Martin Estruch, Mt. Morris, NY

underberg kessler

JAMES A. CONIGLIO,

PARTNER

(585) 258-2856  
[jconiglio@underbergkessler.com](mailto:jconiglio@underbergkessler.com)

January 11, 2010

J. Thomas Reynolds, Esq.  
Village Attorney  
Village of Geneseo  
5779 Avon-Lima Road  
P.O. Box 190  
Avon, New York 14414

Re: Geneseo Hampton Inn Proposal

Dear Tom:

Enclosed please find a letter dated January 07, 2010 from the New York State Department of Transportation (the "DOT") regarding the proposed driveways to serve the Hampton Inn development.

The DOT has agreed to allow the Hampton Inn to utilize the existing bowling alley driveways for access to the hotel. This approval is conditioned upon the removal of the westerly driveway in the event a traffic control signal is installed at the intersection of Ryan Drive and the easterly bowling alley driveway.

The letter also indicates a preference for using the existing right-of-way which intersects with Reservoir road for an alternate exit from the site. The proposed site plan does not anticipate utilizing that right-of-way and my clients have no present plans for doing so. However, in the event that the DOT directs the removal the westerly bowling alley driveway my clients will reserve the right to follow the advice of the DOT and utilize the right-of-way as an exit route if the circumstances so warrant.

The Rochester Museum & Science Center also completed an archaeological study of the site. Their report has been filed with the Planning Board. The study made no significant findings of archaeological resources on the site.

I believe that these two major items complete any outstanding issues before the Planning Board. If you are aware of any other items please advise me accordingly.

Otherwise, it would be our request that the Planning Board take final action in adopting their seeker findings and approving the site plan and subdivision.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,  
James A. Coniglio

JAC/tmc  
Enclosure

cc: Matt Griffo, Planning Board Chair  
April Mack, Planning Board Clerk  
Mr. Jon M. LaDelfa  
Mr. Martin Estruch  
Mr. James Olverd  
David W. Young, P.E.

*Town/Village of Geneseo  
Code Enforcement Office  
4630 Millennium Drive  
Geneseo, NY 14454  
(585) 991-5008  
Fax (585) 991-5001*

**Ronald Maxwell**  
**Code Enforcement Officer**  
[rmaxwell@geneseony.org](mailto:rmaxwell@geneseony.org)

**Dean O'Keefe**  
**Code Enforcement Officer**  
[dokeefe@geneseony.org](mailto:dokeefe@geneseony.org)

Date: January 5, 2011

Re: Kircher Construction/ Geneseo Hospitality Variance Request

Clarification of the Zoning Board Sign Variance Requests

The sign variances requested are for two signs with a total of one hundred forty-four (144) square feet.

1. A free standing sign of eight (8) feet in height and with forty-two (42) square feet of signage per side.
2. A wall sign of approximately sixty (60) square feet on the parapet wall of the third floor at the front of the building.

Section 130-90 [B](4) of the Code of the Village of Geneseo allows for:

1. Two signs of a total square footage not to exceed 60 square feet, 1 square foot allowed for every linear foot of building frontage.
  - a. A freestanding sign that can not exceed six (6) feet in height and sixteen (16) square feet of signage per side
  - b. A wall sign that is only allowed on the first (1<sup>st</sup>) floor of the building.

The maximum total combined square footage of the two signs may not exceed sixty (60) square feet.

Ronald Maxwell

Dean O'Keefe