



# Department of Planning, Housing, & Community Development

Mayor, Richard C. David  
Director, Dr. Juliet Berling

SUMMARY OF MINUTES CITY OF BINGHAMTON COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN	
<b>MEETING DATE:</b> April 9, 2019	<b>LOCATION:</b> City Council Chambers, City Hall
<b>CALLED TO ORDER:</b> 12:00 PM	<b>RECORDER OF MINUTES:</b> S. McGee

ROLL CALL	
<b>BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	<b>BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ K. Ellsworth (Chair)</li> <li>▪ P. Klosky</li> <li>▪ S. Edwards</li> <li>▪ M. Lombardini</li> <li>▪ M. Mauro</li> <li>▪ M. Atchie</li> <li>▪ J. Darrow</li> <li>▪ Robert Murphy (ex-officio)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ None</li> </ul>
<b>STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	<b>TITLE &amp; DEPARTMENT:</b>
S. McGee	Historic Preservation & Neighborhood Planner, PHCD
J. Berling	Director of Planning, Housing & Community Development

BUSINESS ITEM	
<b>ADDRESS:</b> 95 Court Street	<b>CASE NUMBER:</b> CAUD-2019-04
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b> Certificate of Appropriateness - Signage	
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>	
<p>Staff provided a summary of the application and reviewed the materials submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>F. McCarthy provided an overview of the business. He explained that the reason that there are two separate signs on the same building is because they are for two separate sides of the same business, which are also on separate floors of the building.</p> <p>F. McCarthy explained to the Commission where the different business divisions were located in the building.</p> <p>M. Lombardini asked about the amount of people accessing the business.</p> <p>F. McCarthy explained.</p> <p>K. Ellsworth asked if there is signage on the entrance to the second floor.</p> <p>Frank McCarthy said there was not.</p> <p>M. Lombardini asked about how people enter the building.</p>	

F. McCarthy explained.

M. Atchie stated the window signage on the second floor appeared inappropriate for the building.

K. Ellsworth spoke about the Historic Design Guidelines and stated that second floor signage is usually considered inappropriate.

Staff explained that there have been circumstances when businesses have been allowed to have similar signage.

P. Klosky stated that in historic photographs of downtown Binghamton there was a tremendous amount of signage

F. McCarthy asks whether the size of the sign or the location on the building is the main issue with the proposed signage, and asked what he could do to still have representation of his company on the building.

Staff and K. Ellsworth explained to F. McCarthy that the issue was not with the storefront signage.

S. Edwards asked about signage on the primary entrance to the building.

P. Klosky recommended keeping the sign on the second-story, but changing the background of the sign to make it more appealing if it is not possible to have a sign on the door.

Frank McCarthy said that he is allowed to have a sign on the door.

The Commission discussed P. Klosky's recommendation.

J. Darrow asked how many windows are located along the space occupied by Eastern Temporaries.

B. Murphy asked about reaching an agreement about signage with the landlord.

F. McCarthy indicated he wasn't sure, but it might be possible.

M. Lombardini asked about having a transparent sign rather than a white sign.

F. McCarthy indicated he was open to that.

K. Ellsworth asked if they were operating out of the building presently.

F. McCarthy stated they were.

J. Darrow and K. Ellsworth raised concerns about setting a precedent for this type of signage.

J. Darrow made a motion.

K. Ellsworth stated he would like the Landlord to propose a signage program for the building.

Staff explained the Commission had previously asked for that.

J. Darrow spoke about the Historic Design Guidelines.

K. Ellsworth referred back to Peter's comments about historical signage.

K. Ellsworth asked the Commission about how detailed the requirements needed to be for these types of signage proposals.

The Commission discussed window space for the different tenants.

F. McCarthy provided his knowledge about the building's tenancy.

K. Ellsworth asked about requesting the landlord to come before the Commission.

Staff indicated the Commission could ask, but likely not compel the owner to do so.

M. E. Mauro asked about the BCAC's former application.

S. Edwards asked about a temporary sign.

K. Ellsworth spoke about what the Commission found acceptable about the application.

J. Darrow asked about the interior stairwell behind the window.

F. McCarthy indicated that it was not a shared stair.

J. Darrow asked how many of the Commissioners were comfortable with the proposal with amendments.

S. Edwards said she was.

R. Murphy thought it was likely the landlord could appear before the Commission.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Frank McCarthy speaking on behalf of the application

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To approve the Chenango Street façade signs along the first story of the building as presented with the understanding that they appear opaque and that the approval is limited to Eastern Temporaries.**

FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M. Lombardini	VOTE: (7-0-0)
AYE(S): All	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To table the second-story window signage as presented pending further response from the owner of the building in regard to uniform window sign program with the following condition:**

**1) Staff contact the property owner and request that he attend the next meeting.**

FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M. Atchie	VOTE: (7-0-0)
AYE(S): All	NAY(S): All	ABSTENTION(S): None

**BUSINESS ITEM**

<b>ADDRESS: 181 Clinton Street</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2019-06</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b> <b>Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>	
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>	

Staff provided a summary of the application and updates from the previous meeting.

Ron Rogers explained that his business bought the building with the intention of knocking it down. He indicated they have outgrown their current facility. He further explained that the process of designing a record storage building involves measuring the land that it will be built on in order to design for the maximum amount of storage space as possible, and this cannot be done while the current building is there.

K. Ellsworth spoke about the future use of the property.

J. Darrow talked about the quality of Ron Rogers' previous buildings.

K. Ellsworth stated that a building should not be knocked down until plans for a new building are made, however he recognized that that could not happen in this instance due to the way the new building was to be designed.

M. E. Mauro stated for the record she had a familial relationship with the Rogers family.

B. Murphy asked about the nature of the relationship.

P. Klosky stated that there is no lack of this type of architectural style on Clinton street.

The Commission reviewed the SEQR criteria.

J. Darrow then read the criteria for issuing a determination of historical significance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Ron Rogers speaking on behalf of the application.

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To issue a finding of no historical significance.**

<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: P. Klosky</b>	<b>VOTE: (7-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): All</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**SEQR DETERMINATION**

**ADDRESS: 181 Clinton Street**      **CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2019-06**

**DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition**

**DISCUSSION POINTS: See above.**

**VOTING**

**MOTION: Motion to declare CAUD as Lead Agency for historic review purposes.**

<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (7-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**MOTION: Motion to declare the action as an Unlisted Action.**

<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (7-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

<b>MOTION: The Commission then reviewed all relevant SEQR criteria and found no or small impact for each. Motion to issue a Negative Declaration for 181 Clinton Street. No on all criteria.</b>		
<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (7-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

<b>BUSINESS ITEM</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 20 Mendelssohn Street</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2019-07</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>  The applicant was not present at the meeting and the application was tabled.		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b> ▪		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: to table this item until the end of the meeting is made</b>		
<b>FIRST: N/A</b>	<b>SECOND: N/A</b>	<b>VOTE: N/A</b>
<b>AYE(S): N/A</b>	<b>NAY(S): N/A</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): N/A</b>

<b>BUSINESS ITEM</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 7 Hawley Street</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2018-09</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Certificate of Appropriateness</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>  Staff provided a summary of the application and updates from the previous meeting.  M. Gestwick further described the changes made to the application since the last meeting.  K. Ellsworth asked staff to bring up images of the proposal on screen.  K. Ellsworth asked whether or not the brick inlay is expensive, and if the brick inlay were to be done away with, could screening be used.  M. Gestwick said that the addition of the screen would probably add significant costs.  J. Darrow asked what the total cost of the projects was.  M. Gestwick said the total cost was between nine and nine and a half million dollars.  J. Darrow asked what the price of the faux windows or a façade would cost.  M. Gestwick said that it could cost between a couple hundred thousand to half a million dollars depending on how intricate the design is.		

J. Darrow described what the Commission had been expecting based on previous comments.

J. Darrow asked staff to pull up an image of Washington Street.

M. Gestwick explained the budgetary restrictions and that they were due increasing costs, particularly, in precast, as well as unforeseen issues such as the load bearing capabilities of the soil.

R. Murphy mentioned that many of the design comments being discussed were considered.

J. Darrow asked if the building would be structurally sound with the soil issues.

M. Gestwick said the building would be structurally sound. He explains that the aforementioned were problems that they can fix but also put stress on the budget.

R. Murphy stated the City had also hired a consulting engineer.

J. Darrow asked about the contract.

R. Murphy provided further detail.

J. Darrow asked about the archaeology.

S. Edwards asked staff about what specifically needed CAUD review.

Staff explained.

K. Ellsworth asked about the design process for the Washington Street elevation.

M. Gestwick explained the options that were originally explored before the current design was put forth.

Staff explained the site's location in relation to the local historic district.

J. Darrow stated that although the Commission had requested different designs, parking downtown was needed.

S. Edwards and M. Atchie stated that they thought the current design was an improvement over the original.

M. Lombardini stated that it was not the Commission's job to review the project from a budget standpoint.

J. Darrow said the Commission had not seen the specific costs.

R. Murphy said many different costs had been reviewed.

J. Darrow stated that the Commission had not seen those costs.

R. Murphy provided further detail.

M. Lombardini spoke about how well the form of the structure fits into the urban fabric of downtown Binghamton. He expressed that he thought the design could be better.

S. Edwards spoke about how the structure would be viewed.  
 J. Darrow spoke about the modern cityscape and the historic district.

M. Atchie spoke about adhering to the past but also recognizing new development.

P. Klosky spoke about the spatial relationship of the proposed structure to the other adjacent buildings.

P. Klosky indicated he thought the current design was better than what was previously presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**  
 ▪ **Mike Gestwick, project manager with PIKE Development, speaking on behalf of the application**

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To approve the design of the parking garage as presented at the 4/9/19 special CAUD meeting.**

<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. Atchie</b>	<b>VOTE: (7-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION: To approve the March 5, 2019 Regular CAUD Meeting Minutes.**

<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): K. Ellsworth, J. Darrow, P. Klosky, and M. Lombardini</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- Staff mentioned that there were still CLG scholarships available for the NYS Historic Preservation Conference.

**ADJOURNMENT**

<b>Motion to adjourn.</b>	<b>TIME: 1:19pm</b>	
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>VOTE: (7-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>