



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	
MEETING DATE: March 5, 2019	LOCATION: City Council Chambers, City Hall
CALLED TO ORDER: 12:00 PM	RECORDER OF MINUTES: S. McGee

ROLL CALL	
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ K. Ellsworth (Chair) ▪ J. Darrow ▪ M. Lombardini ▪ P. Klosky ▪ Robert Murphy (ex-officio) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M. Mauro ▪ S. Edwards ▪ M. Atchie
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	TITLE & DEPARTMENT:
S. McGee	Historic Preservation & Neighborhood Planner, PHCD

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 95 Court Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2019-03	
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Certificate of Appropriateness		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
The applicant was not present at the meeting.		
K. Ellsworth stated that when the owner had been the applicant for the property previously, both he and J. Darrow had recused themselves. He explained that since that this applicant was a tenant of the building, neither he nor J. Darrow saw the need to recuse themselves in this case.		
PUBLIC COMMENT:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ N/A 		
VOTING		
MOTION: N/A		
FIRST: N/A	SECOND: N/A	VOTE: N/A
AYE(S): N/A	NAY(S): N/A	ABSTENTION(S): N/A

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: ROW (Park Ave. & Morris)	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2019-05	
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Certificate of Appropriateness		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		

Staff provided a summary of the application and reviewed the materials submitted by the applicant.

Eric Kallio explained that the small cell installation would help Binghamton transition to the new 5G internet that most internet providers are moving towards.

K. Ellsworth asked about if the proposal would add a wire across the street for power which would cause a visual impact.

Eric Kallio explained an alternative was pulling power from the existing pole.

M. Lombardini asked for clarification.

Eric Kallio explained that the only other option would be trenching the street to put the wire underground, which is not ideal.

K. Ellsworth asked if there were other similar installations planned.

Eric Kallio explained more of these small cells will be proposed in the future to improve internet access in Binghamton.

M. Lombardini spoke about the overhead wiring.

K. Ellsworth spoke about the overhead wiring being addressed in the previously applications.

Eric Kallio explained there is already a wire hanging over that street, so a second small wire would not cause much more visual impact.

K. Ellsworth asked the applicant if the equipment can be put on the opposite side of the street so a wire across the street would not be needed.

Eric Kallio explained explains that the poles on the opposite side of the street are primary poles and utilities do not want them on those poles.

He then asked the Commission if he could inquire if it was possible to able to use the power from the wire already hanging across the street so a second wire wouldn't be necessary.

K. Ellsworth stated that this would set the precedent for future small cell installations.

K. Ellsworth asked if the board has any issues with the equipment going on the pole; none of them did.

A motion was made.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Eric Kallio spoke on behalf of the application.

VOTING

MOTION: To approve the application as presented of plans and information with the following condition:

- 1) The applicant reviews the opportunity to provide power his equipment and that pole from the same side of the street to eliminate the guide wire and power wire as necessary.
- 2) The applicant provides their findings to Planning Staff. Planning Staff will then provide the information to the Commission.

FIRST: K. Ellsworth	SECOND: J. Darrow	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): All	NAY(S): All	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 181 Clinton Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2019-06
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<p>Staff provided a summary of the application and reviewed the materials submitted by the applicant.</p> <p>Ron Rogers stated he purchased the DMV building with no intention of using it. They own four acres around the building. He indicated a new building there will be constructed as a storage facility and that the frontage along Clinton Street was desired. He mentioned that the County had owned the building previously.</p> <p>Ron Rogers stated that he had already stripped the building and said that it had no value, and that he had no knowledge of any historical relevance that would stop him from knocking it down until recently.</p> <p>K. Ellsworth asked the applicant if there are any plans for the building he was planning on building.</p> <p>Ron Rogers explained that a record storage building would be constructed on the site followed by two warehouse distribution center buildings. He stated that record storage buildings are built at a certain size to most effectively store the records.</p> <p>K. Ellsworth asked if any plans had been submitted for the buildings.</p> <p>Ron Rogers explained that the building plans were changing. The building will be as tall as possible in order to use as small of a footprint as possible. He explained the size of the building.</p> <p>M. Lombardini asked who Andrew Horvatt was.</p> <p>Staff explained, based on the Staff Report, the historical significance of the building.</p> <p>J. Darrow asked if the building had local landmark status or any designation.</p> <p>Staff explained that it did not have any formal designation assigned to it.</p> <p>J. Darrow explained his thoughts regarding the building's association with Horvatt and the architectural style.</p> <p>M. Lombardini asked about similar buildings that had been demolished in the City.</p> <p>Staff provided further information.</p> <p>P. Klosky mentioned the new buildings matching the character of the area.</p> <p>Staff informed the Commission that the particular decision before them is whether or not the building is historically significant, not whether it should be torn down.</p>	

M. Lombardini asked about the architectural style of the building.

J. Darrow answered that he did not believe the building was an “outstanding example” of an architectural style. He also said he didn’t think that it was the only remaining example of the Style. He also mentioned that he thought it was possible that many buildings in that area could have been related to Horvatt.

M. Lombardini asked if this was the only known building that Horvatt financed.

Staff indicated that they were not sure of that.

K. Ellsworth explained to the applicant that they can vote on the building’s historical significance and if it is deemed historically significant the current building cannot be torn down, however if it is not deemed historically significant it appeared that an alternative motion would fail and that he would have to return to CAUD when there are more CAUD members present.

Ron Rogers explained that there are no definitive plans for the new development on the property, and asks the Commission to clarify if he is allowed to tear the current building down.

Ken Ellsworth explained that the Commission did not appear to have the votes to carry a decision on the application at the current meeting.

R. Murphy explained to the applicant the impact of tabling the application.

Ron Rogers says that he will probably not be able to have plans drawn up within the next month.

M. Lombardini asked about tabling the application.

Staff explained the potential outcomes of tabling the application.

A motion to table is made.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Ron Rogers spoke on behalf of the application.

VOTING

MOTION: To table the application until the next meeting.

FIRST: J. Darrow

SECOND: P. Klosky

VOTE: (4-0-0)

AYE(S): All

NAY(S): None

ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM

ADDRESS: 7 Hawley Street

CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2018-09

DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:

Certificate of Appropriateness

DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:

Staff reminded the applicant of previous project details and presented updates to the application.

Michael Gestwick presented the updates on project. He stated that he was appearing on behalf of the application. He spoke about attempting to improve both the Hawley and Washington Street facades. He spoke about the glazing along the Hawley Street façade.

K. Ellsworth asked if the Staff Report had been reviewed.

The Domenic Emilio indicated the Staff Report from the previous year had been reviewed.

K. Ellsworth asked applicants if they can view renderings of the mixed-use building so both the mixed-use building and the garage can be reviewed at the same time

The Michael Gestwick stated that the parking garage is their main focus at present and the mixed-use building will follow. They did not have an updated version of the mixed-use building's rendering.

M. Lombardini asked about seeing both components of the application.

Mike Gestwick stated that they were not at that point yet.

P. Klosky expressed hesitancy in reviewing the application without both buildings being presented.

Domenic Emilio stated that the property will be subdivided, so in the future the parking garage and mixed-use building will be on separate parcels, and the buildings are not connected and will have different owners

K. Ellsworth asked if both of the buildings were connected.

Mike Gestwick stated they were not and eventually both buildings would have different ownership structures.

Staff explains that the mixed-use building and the parking structure will need different applications

Mike Gestwick explained the mixed-use building in further detail.

K. Ellsworth asked about how many stories the garage and mixed-use building would be and also how many stories there are in the closest building on Washington Street (2)

Michael Gestwick answered six and four stories respectively.

K. Ellsworth asked how tall the first adjacent building is.

Domenic Emilio answered two stories.

M. Lombardini stated that seeing the materials along the Hawley Street façade are needed.

M. Lombardini discussed the need for the parking garage and mixed-use building to fit into the fabric of the neighborhood, and that the angle of the garage does not seem to fit this criteria.

P. Klosky mentioned that although they are separate buildings, they will be perceived together.

M. Lombardini spoke about some of the requests the Commission made previously and treating the façade like a building and not like a parking garage.

P. Klosky provided further comment and mentioned the angle of the brickwork.

Michael Gestwick stated that the brickwork and some design elements were due to the structure being made of precast concrete, and explains the limitations of this type of construction.

P. Klosky further clarified his comments.

Domenic Emilio spoke about the pre-cast limitations.

Mike Gestwick spoke about working with the pre-cast manufacturer.

M. Lombardini spoke about his previous comments about the parking structure as whole.

Mike Gestwick said those comments had been considered.

J. Darrow discussed faux windows as a way to make the parking structure appear less like a parking structure and more like a building.

Domenic Emilio explained that faux windows would lead to issues with open space and ventilation.

P. Klosky discussed the function of the building driving the design of the structure.

Mike Gestwick spoke about the other considerations made in regard to design and materials.

K. Ellsworth asks for a timeframe of development.

Mike Gestwick stated that they are trying to have the parking garage open to the public by the end of the year, which would require construction to start in April.

K. Ellsworth asked when the next meeting was.

Staff stated April 2nd.

J. Darrow asked about seeing the rendering of the mixed-use building and seeing something that is more conducive to the Washington Street neighborhood.

Mike Gestwick asked for an example.

J. Darrow spoke about screening the garage to make it appear more like a building façade and then further about the Urban Renewal history of the area and how the parking garage looked like a 20th century parking garage rather than lending itself to the surrounding 19th century neighborhood. He mentioned other cities that have developed parking garages that fit their neighborhood's fabric.

Mike Gestwick explained that the lack of space makes it difficult to have an interior ramp, which would make having a more neighborhood-like façade possible.

K. Ellsworth asked if seeing the previous rendering of the mixed-use building with the parking structure would help.

M. Lombardini answered that it would not help him.

Megan Brockett, speaking on behalf of the Mayor's Office, stated that the City has worked with the developer to make the parking lot have a historic feel and indicated the efforts made to make it distinct from the other parking

garages. She indicated that the Mayor would like development of the parking garage to be completed as soon as possible.

She further explained why the developer was just at the meeting for the parking structure and the anticipated project timeline.

M. Lombardini stated that this was an improvement over the existing parking garages but that having “splashes of brick” does not necessarily make the design appropriate for the area. He explained that he did not think the “design solutions of the garage had been fully considered.

Staff explained that the Commission would lose quorum when P. Klosky had to leave for another commitment and that in circumstances like this, it is appropriate for the applicant to request a special meeting.

Megan asked if the applicant would still have the right to request a special meeting if the application was tabled.

Mike Gestwick asked for clarification on M. Lombardini comments.

M. Lombardini said that CPL should have designed something that fits within Binghamton’s Downtown area.

Mike Gestwick explained that M. Lombardini’s comments had been considered and that budget was the primary constraint.

M. Lombardini stated that that he understood.

Megan Brockett said it would be helpful for the Commission to provide specific recommendations.

Quorum was lost at 1:28pm.

Staff explained how the CAUD committee can send their suggestions to the applicant.

K. Ellsworth stated that Commission members should submit comments to Staff.

Mike Gestwick requested a special meeting.

M. Lombardini mentioned having more Commissioners present at the next meeting would be helpful as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Michael Gestwick and Domenic Emilio speaking on behalf of the application.

VOTING

MOTION: N/A

FIRST: N/A

SECOND: N/A

VOTE: N/A

AYE(S): N/A

NAY(S): N/A

ABSTENTION(S): N/A

OTHER BUSINESS

- N/A

ADJOURNMENT

TIME: N/A

FIRST: N/A	SECOND: N/A	VOTE: N/A
AYE(S): N/A	NAY(S): N/A	ABSTENTION(S): N/A