



Department of Planning, Zoning, & Historic Preservation

SUMMARY OF MINUTES THE CITY OF BINGHAMTON THE COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN	
MEETING DATE: November 7, 2023	LOCATION: City Hall; 38 Hawley St, Binghamton, NY. 13901
CALLED TO ORDER: 12:15 p.m.	RECORDER OF MINUTES: Dylan Pelton

ROLL CALL		
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	PRESENT:	ABSENT:
J. Darrow (chair)	X	
M.E. Mauro	X	
D. Nead		X
R. Heary	X	
D. Whalen		X
B. Haas	X	
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	TITLE & DEPARTMENT:	
J. Berling	Director, Planning Department	
S. Patel	City Planner, Planning Department	
D. Pelton	Historic Preservation Planner, Planning Department	
Patrick McGinnis	Commissioner of Parks & Recreation	

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 25 Court Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-41	
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Pamela Van Putte, would like to renovate the façade of the building.		
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant moves to table pending drawings of plans. 		
VOTING		
MOTION: To table the case until adequate information can be provided.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M.E. Mauro	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 47 Court Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-37	
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Ghazala Ihslad, would like to replace the recessed front entry with a flat, plate glass entryway.		
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant moves to table pending drawings of plans. 		
VOTING		
MOTION: To table the case until adequate information can be provided.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: R. Heary	VOTE: (4-0-0)

AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None
---	---------------------	----------------------------

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 196 State Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-33	
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Thomas Haines, would like to build a deck protruding from the second story of the structure. The deck will be supported by footers on all sides and will be independent of the façade of the building.		
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant moves to table pending drawings of plans. 		
VOTING		
MOTION: To table the case until adequate information can be provided.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: B. Haas	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 65 Court Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-62	
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Emma Cheek, would like to install building and window signs to identify business.		
Certificate of Appropriateness		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant states her client is State Farm Insurance and they want to install an internally powered, halo backlit sign as well as vinyl decals on the windows for advertisement. Staff asked for an explanation on how the sign was going to be illuminated. Applicant states each letter is internally illuminated halo backlit through led packs in the letters and on the wall of the building. Staff asks if they can physically explain the mechanics of where the illumination is coming from. Applicant states that it is internally powered, but the lights for the letters are actually facing towards the building. Staff asks if the letters themselves are glowing. Applicant states that they are not, just the wall behind them will be illuminated. Commissioner states that the only criticism he has is to center the sign over the columns instead of the windows. Applicant asks if new renderings would be necessary. Commissioner states that they will not be necessary for voting on this agenda item. 		
VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the signage for 65 Court Street as presented with the suggestion of the centering of the sign taken into account.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: R. Heary	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 134 Court Street		CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-60
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Michael Lombardi, would like to display a window sign for his business.		
Certificate of Appropriateness		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states it is not two windows, only one window will display the logo of the business. • Commissioner asks if we are approving the one on the left with the white trim. • Applicant states that it is the one he was planning on using. 		
VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the signage for 134 Court Street as presented.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: R. Heary	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM		
ADDRESS: 25 Main Street		CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-58
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Paul Price, would like to install a fence on the exterior entrance to his law office.		
Certificate of Appropriateness		
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states that the fence in question is wrought iron and would be placed in the front of the building. It would have three sides with the north, street facing side having a gate to exit. It would resemble the fence in front of the Roberson Museum. The gate on the fence would open inward towards the building. If you reference one of the pictures, you can see a fenced in area with greenery on the interior of the fence. I have tried to put plants on the front of the building before, but it never lasted due to vandalism. I am hoping with a new fence, landscaping won't get destroyed. • Applicant went on the state that his window has been broken a couple of times, his door has been kicked in and he would like to make it safer while keeping it historically consistent with the neighborhood. • Commissioner asks how high the fence is going to be. • Staff replied that when the property is not residential, any fence on the property line can be up to ten feet and the plans for this fence put the highest spot, at the gate at nine and one-half feet. • Applicant states the color is going to match the trim, windows and the doors. He has links to several sites showing historic colors and will match them accordingly. • Commissioner asks if the driveway is owned by him. • Applicant states that it is on the deed to the property, but the fence is only going to be in front of the building where new concrete has been previously poured. • Staff states that technically, historic guidelines prohibit building a fence where there is not a historic precedent for a fence existing before. That said, if it is for the safety and security of the business and the rest of the tenants of the building, the city will not stand in the way of public safety. • Commissioner states that he believes that he saw a picture of the building in the late 1890's and there was a short fence out front with some landscaping. • Commissioner states that he would encourage the applicant to stand in front of an eight-foot fence and consider that the height of the fence may be imposing considering the front of the building. • Staff states that the fence is not going to be affixed to the façade in any way and is a freestanding structure with a bit of space between the fence and the building. 		

VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the fence design for the front of the building at 25 Main Street.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: R. Heary	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 201 Oak Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2023-59
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Damand Wilson, would like to tear down a residential structure for a church parking lot.	
Certificate of Appropriateness	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states that he is the pastor of a local church that owns the property and has been managing the property for a few months. The property has received numerous code violations and the church is considering the future of the property in regard to it's renovation or possible demolition. The renovation of the property will take hundreds of thousands of dollars, which the church does not have, or demolition of the house so the property can become a parking lot and community garden for the church congregates. Many of the congregates are over 65 and the only parking for the church is currently street parking. • Commissioner asks what the code violations were for the property. • Applicant states that most of the code violations were pertaining to the front stairs and the roof needing to be replaced. • Commissioner asks if there is money available from the city to rehabilitate the structure. • Staff replies that funding is available, but we need to find a management entity for the property once the rehabilitation is complete. Greater Opportunities for Broome was contacted for the opportunity but could not commit because of their current caseload. The city of Binghamton is still looking at other entities to manage the property. • Commissioner states that it could be used as affordable housing for the congregates if their mobility issues get worse as they get older. • Staff mentions that if the house is renovated, parking will be available for the congregates of the church as well as the residents of the rehabilitated structure. • Staff also mentions that they have been in the structure in question and the floors, wall and framing of the house are all solid. There is also a sump pump in the basement that could be replaced to alleviate any flooding issues. • Commissioner states that generally the commission is opposed to knocking down any structures for the building of parking lots. If the applicant were to do that, a site plan would have to be presented to the Planning Commission as well as the CAUD Commission for evaluation. 	
VOTING	
MOTION: To table the discussion of 201 Oak Street until a decision is reached and either a entity is found to manage the property or a site plan can be evaluated by the CAUD Commission and the Planning Department.	
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M.E. Mauro
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None
VOTE: (4-0-0)	
ABSTENTION(S): None	

- Old business
 - Staff reminds the Commission that the minutes were not voted on this session yet.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: To approve the minutes as recorded for the October 3, 2023 CAUD meeting

FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M.E. Mauro	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, D. Nead	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Haas

- Commissioner states that he believes a Walnut Street property was bought recently and the new owners need to be aware that the structure is in a historic district and is a listed landmark property as well as being state and national registered.
- Motion to adjourn.

VOTING

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting

FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: R. Heary	VOTE: (4-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, R. Heary, M.E. Mauro, B. Haas	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None