

**Village of Geneseo Zoning Board of Appeals
December 3, 2026 @ 4:30pm**

Members Present:

Carolyn Meisel, Chair
Robert Meyers, Member
Gretchen Crane, Member
Paul Schmied, Member
James Kier, Member

Other Village Representatives Present:

Janna O'Brien, Secretary
Craig Wadsworth, Code Enforcement Officer

Applicants/Public Present:

Jake Caplan, Cosmic Charlie/Sunrise Boulderling
Kelly Helpler, UPS

At 4:30pm, Chair Meisel called the meeting to order.

The meeting minutes from September 3, 2025, were reviewed. *Member Kier moved to approve the minutes, Member Meyers seconded.* With no further corrections, additions or discussion, the minutes were approved with the following votes: Meisel-aye, Meyers- aye, Crane- aye, Schmied, aye, Kier- abstained.

The meeting minutes from October 1, 2025, were reviewed. *Member Crane moved to approve the minutes, Member Meyers seconded.* With no further corrections, additions or discussion, the minutes were approved with ayes from all.

**Public Meeting- Area Variance
Cosmic Charlie Cafe
2 School Street, Geneseo
Tax Map #80.16-1-32.1**

At 4:50, *Chair Meisel opened the Public Meeting for an area variance for Cosmic Charlie Cafe.* The Board introduced themselves. It was recorded that all proper notices were sent via US Mail, return receipt requested, as well as published in the Livingston County Newspaper, as follows: NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that a public hearing will be held by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Geneseo on December 3, 2025, at 4:35pm, in the Geneseo Building, 119 Main Street, Geneseo, NY, to hear an application for an area variance. Jake Caplan, on behalf of the Cosmic Charlie Cafe, is seeking a variance to install a window sign that exceeds 10% of glass area Chapter 130 App 10E.

Chair Meisel noted that five green cards were sent and four were returned. Jake Caplan explained that the Café wants to install new signage on the door and provided images of the sign decal for the Board to review.

Chair Meisel asked her Board if they had any additional questions. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Meisel asked for a motion to close the hearing at 4:40 pm. *Member Schmied moved to close the Public Hearing. Member Crane seconded the motion.*

This was followed by the Board discussing and answering the five variance questions.

(1) Will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or will a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting the area variance?

Chair Meisel: No. It fits the character of its location.

Member Meyers: No. Sign is tastefully done.

Member Crane: No, because the area is commercial and ties in with what is there.

Member Schmied: No. Sign is not opaque. A sign blocking view may have been a concern.

Member Kier: No. It's within the character of the neighborhood and you can still see through the window.

(2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some other method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance?

Chair Meisel: No, wants 26% coverage when only 10% is allowed.

Member Meyers: No.

Member Crane: No.

Member Schmied: No, not really.

Member Kier: No. They are achieving their desired result this way.

(3) Is the requested area variance substantial?

Chair Meisel: No. Less than 50%.

Member Meyers: No. Amount requested is minimal.

Member Crane: No, only 2%.

Member Schmied: No, less than 50% therefore no problem.

Member Kier: No, only 2%. The % is less than 50%, so it's not substantial.

(4) Will the proposed area variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?

Chair Meisel: No. Fits right in.

Member Meyers: No, signage is tastefully done.

Member Crane: No. It is tastefully done to exist with the business logo.

Member Schmied: No.

Member Kier: No. There is no impact on the environment.

(5) Is the alleged difficulty self-created? (Which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.)

Chair Meisel: Yes.

Member Meyers: Yes.

Member Crane: Yes, they could leave the door blank.

Member Schmied: Yes.

Member Kier: Yes. They are choosing to install this.

With no further discussion, the following votes were recorded to approve the variance: Chair Meisel- aye, Member Meyers- aye, Member Crane-aye, Member Schmied- aye, Member Kier-aye.

Member Schmied moved to grant the area variance for sign decal for Cosmic Charlie Café. Member Crane seconded the motion, and the variance was approved with ayes from all.

**Public Meeting- Area Variance
Sunrise Bouldering
2 School Street, Geneseo
Tax Map #80.16-1-32.1**

At 4:50pm, *Chair Meisel opened the Public Meeting for an area variance for Sunrise Bouldering.* The Board introduced themselves. It was recorded that all proper notices were sent via US Mail, return receipt requested, as well as published in the Livingston County Newspaper, as follows: NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that a public hearing will be held by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Geneseo on December 3, 2025, at 4:35 pm, in the Geneseo Building, 119 Main Street, Geneseo, NY, to hear an application for an area variance. Jake Caplan, on behalf of the Sunrise Bouldering, is seeking a variance to install a window sign that exceeds 10% of glass area Chapter 130 App 10E.

Chair Meisel noted that five green cards were sent and four were returned. Jake Caplan explained that the Café wants to install new signage on the door and provided images of the sign decal to the Board.

Chair Meisel asked her Board if they had any additional questions. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Meisel asked for a motion to close the hearing at 4:55 pm. *Member Schmied moved to close the Public Hearing. Member Crane seconded the motion.*

This was followed by the Board discussing and answering the five variance questions.

(1) Will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or will a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting the area variance?

Chair Meisel: No. It complements the larger portion of the sign.

Member Meyers: No. Sign is tastefully done.

Member Crane: No, it exists within the business district.

Member Schmied: No. Sign is not opaque.

Member Kier: No. It does not affect the character of the neighborhood.

(2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some other method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance?

Chair Meisel: No, larger than allowed.

Member Meyers: No.

Member Crane: No. They need a variance to proceed.

Member Schmied: No, variance required to do it.

Member Kier: No. They are achieving their desired result this method.

(3) Is the requested area variance substantial?

Chair Meisel: No. 2%.

Member Meyers: No. Requested variance is minimal.

Member Crane: No, less than 50%.

Member Schmied: No, @% over the 10% allowed.

Member Kier: No, it is not substantial as it's less than 50%..

(4) Will the proposed area variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?

Chair Meisel: No. Fits right in.

Member Meyers: No, signage is tastefully done.

Member Crane: No. Ties in nicely with existing logo.

Member Schmied: No. No affect or effect.

Member Kier: No. It ties in nicely with the business.

(5) Is the alleged difficulty self-created? (Which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.)

Chair Meisel: Yes.

Member Meyers: Yes.

Member Crane: Yes.

Member Schmied: Yes.

Member Kier: Yes. They are choosing to install this.

With no further discussion, the following votes were recorded to approve the variance: Chair Meisel- aye, Member Meyers- aye, Member Crane-aye, Member Schmied- aye, Member Kier-aye.

Member Kier moved to grant the area variance for a sign decal for Sunrise Boulderling. Member Crane seconded the motion, and the variance was approved with ayes from all.

Public Meeting- Area Variance

UPS

80 Main Street, Geneseo

Tax Map #80.12-2-3

At 5:05pm, *Chair Meisel opened the Public Meeting for an area variance for the UPS Store.* The Board introduced themselves. It was recorded that all proper notices were sent via US Mail, return receipt requested, as well as published in the Livingston County Newspaper, as follows: NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that a public hearing will be held by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Geneseo on December 3, 2025, at 4:35 pm, in the Geneseo Building, 119 Main Street, Geneseo, NY, to hear an application for an area variance. Kelly Hepler, on behalf of UPS, is seeking a variance for a window decal that covers 76% of the window.

Chair Meisel noted that eight green cards were sent and two were returned. Kelly Hepler introduced herself and explained that the UPS store received a variance in July to install a tinting that covered 100% of the window. She believed that this also covered the logo that was installed on the covering. This was not included as part of the approval in that variance thus the need to seek the additional variance. There was discussion regarding redesigning the logo to fit into the code. UPS has not offered an alternative for the business, so they are requesting the variance.

Chair Meisel asked her Board if they had any additional questions. Hearing no further discussion, Chair Meisel asked for a motion to close the hearing at 4:25 pm. *Member Kier moved to close the Public Hearing. Member Schmied seconded the motion.*

This was followed by the Board discussing and answering the five variance questions.

(1) Will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or will a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting the area variance?

Chair Meisel: Yes, it might cause conflict.

Member Meyers: No. Sign is tasteful and necessary to identify the business.

Member Crane: Yes. It does not tie into the historic district it is located in. The color is alarming and distracts from the character of the building.

Member Schmied: No. Requirement of UPS, not the franchisee.

Member Kier: Yes. There will be more “sign noise” than what’s been generally allowed on Main Street.

(2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some other method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance?

Chair Meisel: No, UPS determines what franchise can or can’t do.

Member Meyers: No, alternatives have been explored and no viable solution came forward.

Member Crane: No, they need the variance to proceed.

Member Schmied: No. Parent organization demands the sign.

Member Kier: Yes. UPS would have to approve another idea in-line with Board approvals.

(3) Is the requested area variance substantial?

Chair Meisel: Yes, 25% allowed when request is 100%.

Member Meyers: Yes, 100% of what is allowed.

Member Crane: Yes, beyond 100%.

Member Schmied: Yes, 72% over allowable, way over reasonable.

Member Kier: Yes. It’s considered substantial since it’s 100% of the window and over the limit.

(4) Will the proposed area variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?

Chair Meisel: Yes, does not fit in with the historical district

Member Meyers: No. Again, signage is tasteful.

Member Crane: Yes. It does not blend into the historic district and the coloring that is there.

Member Schmied: Yes. Not compatible with historic district zoning.

Member Kier: Yes. It does not tie in to the historic nature of the historic district.

(5) Is the alleged difficulty self-created? (Which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.)

Chair Meisel: Yes.

Member Meyers: Yes.

Member Crane: Yes. They were approved for a window variance in covering, not signage.

Member Schmied: Yes. Only alternative it go out of business.

Member Kier: Yes. They chose to open the store that now requires the covering.

With no further discussion, Member Meyers moved to grant the area variance for the UPS window decal. Member Schmied seconded the motion. The following votes were recorded: Chair Meisel-nae, Member Meyers-aye, Member Crane-nae, Member Schmied- aye, Member Kier- nae. The variance was denied.

With no further discussion, Member Kier moved to close the meeting at 5:46pm. Member Crane seconded the motion. The meeting was closed with ayes from all.

Janna O'Brien
Secretary