

Village of Geneseo Zoning Board of Appeals

Public Hearing

Property Address: 50 East South Street/U of R/Nayes

Tax Map#: 81.13-2-30.121

May 01, 2024 @ 4:30pm

Members Present:

Carolyn Meisel, Chair
Tom Wilson, Member
Robert Meyers, Member
Gretchen Crane, Member

Other Village Representatives Present:

Shawn Forrester, Deputy Clerk/Treasurer
Craig Wadsworth, Code Enforcement Officer

Applicant Present:

Terence J Zappia, Pierrepont Visual Graphics
Kevin Reilly, U of R

Public Present:

Barbara Mahood

4:30pm Chair Meisel called the Board to order it is noted that Member Schmied is excused, but there is a quorum.

Chair Meisel opened the public hearing for U of R/Noyes followed by the Board introducing themselves It is noted 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 Village of Geneseo Zoning Board of Appeals on May 1, 2024, at 4:35 pm, pursuant to Chapter 130 Zoning, Section 130-12, Section 130-17 and, 130-90 Attachment 10 Table of Sign Regulations and any other sections of Village Code which may apply on the application of U of R/Noyes Health Services. The applicant is seeking two area variances to install a 64" by 156.5" wall sign that per Village Code is over the maximum sq ft allowed and the number of signs allowed for the M-2 Zoning District. This request is for the property located at 50 East South St, Tax Map # 81.13-2-30.121 in the Village of Geneseo, NY.

Barbara Mahood expressed her concern over the signs being a pandora's box and being garish.

Kevin Reilly explained that the only change to the monument sign would be to add an address number for the addition. The proposed sign would be only on the addition facing the parking lot.

CEO Wadsworth explained that the original Noyes plan included a variance for the signs. He continued that this new sign is over the limit of signs allowed and the previous variance.

There is discussion regarding the proposed sign's lighting and continued with whether another sign was necessary. Mr. Reilly stated that the addition was not part of Noyes but UPMC and the Department of Health requires a separate sign for each entity.

Mrs. Mahood stated that she was not opposed to the proposed sign.

Chair Meisel asked the public if there were any questions or comments. Hearing none, Member Crane moved to close the public hearing. Member Wilson seconded. The hearing was closed with ayes from all.

This was followed by the Board discussing and answering the five Area 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 granting the area variance?

Chair Meisel: No. The main building is already there.

Member Crane: No. The other buildings look similar. It faces away from the residential area.

Member Wilson: No. No change to the neighborhood.

Member Meyers: No. Signage is tasteful and not overbearing.

(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. Have to have a sign.

Member Crane: No. They need a sign and the variance is necessary to get it.

Member Wilson: No. Need a sign on the new wing of the building.

Member Meyers: No. Have to have a sign on a business.

(3) Is the requested area variance substantial?

Chair Meisel: Yes. 16 sq ft over.

Member Crane: Yes. 16 sq ft over the allotment plus it's an extra sign.

Member Wilson: Yes. Over the size limit and one more sign than allowed.

Member Meyers: No. Given the size of the building, signage seems appropriate.

(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. Noyes building was there first and made the impact.

Member Crane: No. Again, it faces away from the residential street.

Member Wilson: No. Other signs in the area and the building is off the main street.

Member Meyers: No. Signage is appropriate.

(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 Crane: Yes. They could make the sign smaller. They built the building connecting to the existing building.

Member Wilson: Yes.

Member Meyers: Yes. With a new building signage is needed.

Member Wilson moved to approve the Area Variance Applications to install a 64” by 156.5” wall sign. Member Meyers seconded. With no further discussion the Area Variances were approved with ayes from Chair Meisel, Member Wilson and Member Meyers, and a nay from Member Crane.

The minutes from the April 3, 2024, meeting were reviewed. Member Crane moved to approve the minutes with one correction. Member Meyers seconded. With no further additions, corrections, or discussion the minutes were approved with ayes from all.

Member Wilson moved to close the meeting. Member Meyers seconded. The meeting was closed with ayes from all at 5:01pm.

Shawn Forrester
Deputy Clerk/Treasurer