

Village of Geneseo  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Public Hearing for:  
The Homestead, Rep.: William S. Wadsworth  
Address: 2-12 South Street  
Tax Map ID #: 80.20-1-1.21  
June 18, 2013, 4:30 p.m.

Present:

Carolyn Meisel, Chair  
Marlene Hamilton  
Paul Schmied  
Thomas Wilson

Code Enforcement Officer:

Ronald Maxwell

Applicant:

The Homestead, Rep.: William S. Wadsworth

Public:

Larry Kelley

Secretary:

Debra Lund

Chair C. Meisel opened the meeting and the Public Hearing at 4:30 p.m. The members of the Board were introduced. It was noted proper notice was published and thirteen certified return receipt requested letters were sent and thirteen green cards were returned. Livingston County Planning Board responded with “No Significant Countywide Impact” and has stated final approval or disapproval is a matter of local option. The applicant seeks permission to a.) erect a five (5’) feet by three and one-half (3.5’) feet two sided free standing sign, totaling thirty-five (35) square feet in an MU1 District where free standing signs are not allowed per Section 130-91; and b.) to attach two signs, two (2’) feet by four and one-half (4.5’) feet, totaling eighteen (18) square feet, to a stone wall where Section 130-91-C does not allow signs to be attached to stone walls/fences per the Code of the Village of Geneseo. Chair C. Meisel asked the applicant, W. Wadsworth, to state his case.

W. Wadsworth commented that although the legal property tax address used by the Village Office for the notices was 2-12 South Street, the Homestead uses 4 South Street for less cumbersome identification purposes. The Homestead has had several unanticipated visitors as GPS units give their location for many visitors searching for 4 East South Street – the Country Lane Apartments. He hopes to eliminate this confusion and to make it easier for the Homestead’s guests to locate the property. They have been in business for two years and working on the preparation to open officially for about five years. At year two, with business picking up, W. Wadsworth would like signs to direct people to the location and for traffic control. There already are internal signs on the property directing east bound traffic to exit from the east entrance on Route 20A. The Homestead would like to see all traffic enter at the light. There were approximately 150 guests recently coming in from the Mt. Morris and there was a very good traffic flow.

A rendering of the proposed signs was presented to the Board. The picture shows the two proposed wall signs and the proposed placement of the free standing sign at the west entrance by the traffic light opposite Main Street. The proposed signs would be black with gold detailing. The free

standing sign has columns painted a lighter shade of yellow and gold finials. W. Wadsworth said he wanted the sign to be tasteful and thought the lighter touches would offset and compliment the black background; he did not want the sign to be oppressive. The wall signs were requested to make it easier for guests to find The Homestead as the free standing sign would not be legible to anyone approaching the property from the north on Main Street. The “4” sign would be placed on the wall on the west side of the eastern driveway across from the post office, making it easier to find this entrance. It was noted that a variance was not needed for this sign.

T. Wilson asked about the “Land Office” sign. Chair C. Meisel asked how large this sign could be and if the size was within limits. CEO R. Maxwell stated the sign was not part of the variance and commercial buildings are allowed a building sign, the size determined by the building frontage. W. Wadsworth said in the past, all leases were signed there. General discussion of the property’s past history followed.

M. Hamilton noted the requested signs were very similar to other proposed signs the Board had reviewed in the past. C. Meisel asked if the public present would like to comment. L. Kelley is a neighbor on Crossett Road and said he had no problem with the proposed signs. He had spoken with some of his neighbors and no one had expressed any disapproval. CEO R. Maxwell noted the Code Office had not received any comments regarding the proposed signs.

T. Wilson commented the Village seems to favor green and gold signs and wondered why The Homestead was not looking at a similar color scheme. He thought it would be more in keeping with what the Village has come to expect. W. Wadsworth said the signs do have an alternate color version featuring a dark blue background with the gold lettering accents. He had looked at the College’s entrance sign and did not want to be confused with being a part of either the College or the Village. However, the goal was for a classic sign with a turn-of-the-century feel to it. A dark green or dark blue background could be used. T. Wilson remarked he could understand how the confusion with the Village or College might occur and was therefor satisfied with the presented sign colors. CEO R. Maxwell reminded the Board that the Planning Board would make the determination on the colors. M. Hamilton suggested and the Board agreed to recommend the presented color scheme to the Planning Board.

P. Schmied asked if the signs would be lit. W. Wadsworth replied they would not be as there was no good way to get power to them. Most of their business starts early enough that this has not been a problem. CEO R. Maxwell suggested the Board consider lighting at this time as part of the variance so a future variance would not be needed. CEO R. Maxwell recommended ground lighting if this were to happen. P. Schmied was not in favor of granting ground lighting as a future board might prefer something else. He noted technology and the code might change in the future making the ruling unnecessary. T. Wilson agreed with P. Schmied and felt the lighting should be left for future boards to consider should the need arise.

Chair C. Meisel asked how tall the finished sign would be. W. Wadsworth said it would be six (6’) feet or just under that as the Code specified free standing signs had a maximum height requirement of six (6’) feet.

At this time, the area variance 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 \_\_\_ No X.

2. Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some feasible method other than a variance? Yes \_\_\_ No X.
3. Is the requested variance substantial? Yes X No \_\_\_. It is a 100% variance.
4. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district? Yes \_\_\_ No X.
5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created? Yes X No \_\_\_.

Chair C. Meisel asked if there was further discussion and there was not.

M. Hamilton moved to approve the variance request for permission to erect a five (5') feet x three and one-half ( 3.5') feet two sided free standing sign, totaling thirty-five (35) square feet, not to exceed six (6') feet in height and to be placed behind the Route 20A (South Street) right-of-way; and to attach two signs, two ( 2') feet x four and one-half (4.5') feet, totaling eighteen (18) square feet, to a stone wall. All signs are to be located as per the drawings and locations presented to the Zoning Board of Appeals at the June 18, 2013 Public Hearing. The Board recommends that the Planning Board accept the color scheme presented to the Zoning Board. 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 passed.

Board is only required to note this is an area variance and a type two action that does not require a SEQR. C. Meisel stated it was so noted that the proposed action has been considered under SEQR and has met the requirements for a Type II action: the proposed action is not environmentally significant.

W. Wadsworth noted the business has taken an upturn within the last year. The number of calls for parties has been growing. He was asked if a caterer is used and said that was so. A commercial kitchen had been installed two years ago for that purpose and has been working out very well. He thanked the Board and L. Kelley and he exited the public hearing at 4:55 p.m.

General discussion of upcoming projects within the Village and possible Zoning Board involvement followed.

T. Wilson moved to close the public hearing at 4:46 p.m., M. Hamilton 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.

The April 23, 2013 Johnson minutes were reviewed. P. Schmied moved to approve the minutes as presented, M. Hamilton 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.

T. Wilson moved to close the meeting, 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 passed and the meeting closed at 5:10 p.m.

Debra Lund  
Secretary