



Department of Planning, Zoning, & Historic Preservation

SUMMARY OF MINUTES THE CITY OF BINGHAMTON THE COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN	
MEETING DATE: May 7, 2024	LOCATION: City Hall; 38 Hawley St, Binghamton, NY. 13901
CALLED TO ORDER: 12:22 p.m.	RECORDER OF MINUTES: Dylan Pelton

ROLL CALL		
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	PRESENT:	ABSENT:
J. Darrow (chair)	X	
M.E. Mauro	X	
D. Nead	X	
J. Weissberg	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	
R. Heary	Corporate Council	
W. Crawford	Building Inspector, Code Enforcement	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES		
MOTION: To approve the minutes as recorded for the April 2, 2024 CAUD meeting		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Nead	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, B. Hass, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

- Announcement of public meeting

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 99 Collier Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-5
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Tamer Osman, would like to install a sign above his business.	
Certificate of Appropriateness	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representative was at the prior meeting and could not attend due to schedule conflict. • Staff states that Brian Haas must recuse himself from voting because he works for the client. • Brian Haas recuses himself from the case. • Although quorum could not be reached at the last meeting, it was unanimous that the sign was appropriate. • Does anyone have anything to add to the information in the staff report? If not I will make a motion. 	

VOTING		
MOTION: To approved of the sign at 99 Collier Street as presented.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Nead	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Haas

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 142 Court Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-11
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Mark Yonaty, would like to create a window sign on the front of the business and on the entrance door located at 142 Washington Street.	
Certificate of Appropriateness	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states the case is made, the sign is up with the window decal, we may consider putting additional signage down the street. • Commissioner asks if it conforms to the sign regulations. • Staff replies that is does. 	

VOTING		
MOTION: To approved of the window and door sign as presented for the business at 142 Washington Street.		
FIRST: B. Haas	SECOND: J. Darrow	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, B. Hass, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 213 State Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-14
ADDRESS: 213 State Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-15
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Luba Djurdjinovic, would like to install lighting above the entrance to the Cooperative Gallery. The applicant would also like to replace a sign above the door with a hanging sign perpendicular with the building.	
Certificate of Appropriateness	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states she is not Luba Djurdjinovic, but Regina Losinger the project manager representing the Cooperative Gallery. • Applicant states that they would like to install three gooseneck lights to go over each of the historic panels above the entrance. • Applicant states that they are also looking at replacing the A.C. Moore lettered sign with a new sign that hangs above the door to the gallery. • Applicant states that it would likely be wrought iron and hang above the entrance. 	

- Applicant states that the arm for the sign would likely mimic the wrought iron flag poles that are on the current lampposts across the street.
- Applicant states that they are in the historic State and Henry Street District and their goal is to “step it up” and look as good as the rest of the galleries.
- Commissioner asks that after the sign is removed, the panel where it was would be painted to match the other two historic panels.
- Applicant states that it will.
- Commissioner states that the existing banner sign must be removed because it was never shown to the CAUD commission for approval.

VOTING		
MOTION: To approved of the project as presented for 213 State Street, for the removal of the preexisting sign and the restoration of the façade to match the other two panels, for the immediate removal of the existing banner sign, which is non-conforming to the City of Binghamton, for the addition of the hanging sign as presented in the diagram.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M. E. Mauro	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, B. Hass, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 34 Lisle Avenue	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-12
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Richard Greco, would like to demolish the building at 34 Lisle Avenue for the YWCA housing in the downtown district.	
Determination of Significance	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states the building is being demolished for a low-income housing apartment complex funded by the YWCA. • Commissioner asks if there is a rendering of what the building will look like. • Applicant states that the building will have 68 new units and will repurpose the Broome County Urban League building into a daycare center. • Staff asks applicant if the building has already gone through Planning Committee and Zoning Board of Appeals. • Applicant states that it has. • Staff states that the original building was a part of another two attached row buildings that had since been demolished. The “Rock-bottom Hose Co. #7” fire station. • Commissioner asks if there is a site plan for the construction of the new complex. • Commissioner asks if there is anything architecturally significant remaining on the building. • Staff and commissioner replies that there is very little left of the original building. The first-floor storefront was augmented and much of the remaining building had been removed. • Commissioner commented that there was significant damage to the back and foundation masonry. • Commissioner asks if there are any interior conditions such as water damage or black mold to the building. • Applicant states most of the water damage to the building is in the basement and an environmental survey was done. Any environmental pollutants will be abated before demolition. • Staff comments that there are pigeon droppings on the top floor and the roof has significant holes in it. • Commissioner states that he is more worried about the compromise to the foundation. 	

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare CAUD as lead agency.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: J. Weissberg	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, B. Hass, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare demolition as an unlisted action.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Nead	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, B. Hass, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the demolition of 34 Lisle Avenue given that reasonable efforts cannot be made to restore the building and the post demolition plan is very specific.		
FIRST: D. Nead	SECOND: J. Darrow	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, B. Hass, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 18 Broad Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-9
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, The Broome County Land Bank, would like to demolish the building at 18 Broad Street.	
Determination of Significance	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Brian Haas states that he must recuse himself because the representative from the Broome County Land Bank, Jessica Haas, is his wife. • Staff states that the residential structure is in an I-3 Zoning district which is generally heavy industrial. • Commissioner asks if there are any questions or concerns about the building's demolition, there are none. • Commissioner asks the parcel has any possible future use. • Applicant states that the neighbors are interested into making it greenspace or expanding their current parcels. 	

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare CAUD as lead agency.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: J. Weissberg	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Haas

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare demolition as an unlisted action.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Whalen	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Hass,

VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the demolition of 18 Broad Street given that it is structurally unsound and not of any architectural significance.		
FIRST: D. Nead	SECOND: J. Darrow	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Hass

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 61 Park Avenue	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-10
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, The Broome County Land Bank, would like to demolish the residential house at 61 Park Avenue.	
Determination of Significance	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Brian Haas states that he must recuse himself because the representative from the Broome County Land Bank, Jessica Haas, is his wife. • Applicant states that the Land Bank acquired the property with the intent on renovation with a funding opportunity through HCR. Unfortunately, the Land Bank was deemed ineligible and other funding sources were explored, but the asbestos abatement alone would cost an estimated \$45,000. • Commissioner asks if that is just for remediation, not black mold and water damage. • Applicant states that is just for the asbestos abatement, nothing else. The house also has a considerable amount of lead. • Applicant states that the Land Bank has tried to salvage the property for several years and the only practical option now is demolition. • Staff asks if this was the property with the hoarder living in the house. • Applicant states that it was, and it was one of the worst hoarding situations she ever witnessed. • Commissioner states that there is a lot of visible black mold in the building. 	

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare CAUD as lead agency.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: J. Weissberg	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Haas

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare demolition as an unlisted action.		

FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Nead	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Hass,

- Commissioner asks if they have any future use for the land.
- Applicant replies that they do not, but there is a very interested party that would like to acquire the land from the land bank after demolition.

VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the demolition of 61 Park Avenue given that it is beyond reasonable rehabilitation and the environmental damage to the structure is significant.		
FIRST: D. Nead	SECOND: J. Darrow	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Hass

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 8 Cypress Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-9
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Opportunities for Broome, would like to demolish the building at 8 Cypress Street.	
Determination of Significance	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Brian Haas states that he must recuse himself because the representative from the Broome County Land Bank, Jessica Haas, is his wife. • Jessica Haas remained as representative for Opportunities for Broome. • Applicant states that this house was purchased in the hopes that a Homes and Community Renewal grant could rehabilitate the property, but they were declined, which is rare. • Applicant states that there are two structures on the parcel, both having unsafe structure condemnations. • Staff states there are no pictures of the interior of the first house because of significant structural damage to the foundation. There was a twenty-foot hole in the foundation on one side and a fifteen-foot hole on the other straight through. • Staff explains the roof of the second structure is severely damaged and collapsed in the kitchen of the structure in the back of the property. 	

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare CAUD as lead agency.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: J. Weissberg	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Haas

VOTING		
MOTION: To declare demolition as an unlisted action.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Nead	VOTE: (5-0-1)

AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Hass,
---	---------------------	--------------------------------

- Commissioner asks what the future of the parcel of land will be.
- Applicant states that interest letters were handed out, but they got no replies. In this case, they assume it will stay greenspace until an interested party comes forward.
- Commissioner states that the compromised foundation and the roof disintegration, from the photos, is too significant for any reasonable rehabilitation effort.

VOTING		
MOTION: To approve of the demolition of 8 Cypress Street		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: D. Nead	VOTE: (5-0-1)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): B. Hass

- At this time, Brian Haas is reinstated as Commissioner as he has no conflict of interest going forward.

BUSINESS ITEM	
ADDRESS: 188 Court Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2024-4
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: The applicant, Phillip Akel, would like to demolish the residential structure and replace it with a parking lot.	
Determination of Significance	
DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states the criteria for historic significance and distributes SHPO handout. • Applicant compares the Phelps mansion to the structure at 188 Court Street. • Applicant reads the opinion of the state that the building has no architectural significance. • Applicant states that a parking lot would be appropriate in the area surrounding the building. • Applicant states the church may use the parking lot, but insurance will not allow general off-street parking. • Applicant states that they would allow the PAST representatives remove certain features to the house. • Staff presents a letter from PAST stating that the house should be preserved. • Chair of the commission reads the letter out loud to the commission. • Applicant states the house has no architectural significance. • Commissioner states that the interior of the mansion cannot be duplicated. • Staff inquires about the SHPO inquiry and if the SEQR part of the examination had to do with the demolition being part of a type II action. • Applicant states that the determination is that the building is not eligible for the State/National registry. • Staff states that it is not eligible under SEQR. • Staff reads SHPO’s email regarding eligibility for structure in regards for CAUD commission. • Staff states that historical significance is mostly left to the community. • Applicant states that just because the structure is old, does not make it historic. • Commissioner states that it is the last remaining residential structure on the North side of the block that survived urban renewal which makes it historic. • Applicant states that previous demolitions were approved with no regard for post demolition plans. • Commissioner states that the other properties under consideration were in much worse condition. 	

- Staff replies that the building in question is very structurally sound.
- Commissioner states that the guidelines indicate reasonable efforts must be made to restore the property and from estimates given, that has not even been considered. What comparison has been made between demolition and construction of a parking lot versus restoration.
- Applicant states that a registered architect from SHPO determined that it isn't historic and that it should not be considered historic.
- Commissioner asks if the siding can be removed to see what state the underlying clapboard is in.
- Applicant states there is no purview for removing the siding.
- Commissioner asks if the SHPO representative came to see the house in person.
- Applicant states that they did not.
- Commissioner states that past use of the property is a problem considering it was always going to be considered for a parking lot.
- Applicant states that the state determined it had no architectural significance.
- Staff replies that the state can make it's determination as to architectural significance but CAUD has to make it's own determination of historical significance.
- Commissioner states that this building was occupied a year ago, wouldn't it be possible to rent it out for a reasonable return.
- Applicant is concerned they will not be able to maintain the economic vitality of the building they own next door if the parking lot is not constructed.
- Applicant states that there is not adequate parking for the building.
- Staff you mentioned 297 Main Street last meeting, this is the parcel that the commission allowed you to demolish. It was destroyed and it was never developed into a parking lot.
- Applicant asks if anything else would be required to foster a determination at this time.
- Staff responds that it would be easier to make a determination if a comparison could be made between demolition and rehabilitation.
- Commissioner asks if the contents considered historic can be removed.
- Applicant states that should the demolition go through, they can be removed.
- Staff asks if they would like the parking lot site plan reviewed unofficially to see if it meets requirements.

VOTING		
MOTION: To table the determination of 188 Court Street until further notice.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: M. E. Mauro	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None

VOTING		
MOTION: To adjourn this meeting of the CAUD commission.		
FIRST: J. Darrow	SECOND: J. Weissberg	VOTE: (6-0-0)
AYE(S): J. Darrow, J. Weissberg, D. Nead, D. Whalen, M. E. Mauro	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None