



# Department of Planning, Zoning & Historic Preservation

SUMMARY OF MINUTES THE CITY OF BINGHAMTON THE COMMISSION ON ARCHITECTURE & URBAN DESIGN	
<b>MEETING DATE:</b> October 4, 2022	<b>LOCATION:</b> City Council Chambers, City Hall; Zoom
<b>CALLED TO ORDER:</b> 12:35 p.m.	<b>RECORDER OF MINUTES:</b> S. McGee

ROLL CALL		
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	PRESENT:	ABSENT:
K. Ellsworth (chair)	X	
J. Darrow (vice-chair)	X	
M. E. Mauro		X
M. Atchie		X
M. Lombardini	X	
D. Nead	X	
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	TITLE & DEPARTMENT:	
J. Berling	Director, Planning Department	
T. Martinez	Assistant Director, Planning Department	
S. McGee	Historic Preservation & Neighborhood Planner, Planning Department	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES		
<b>MOTION:</b> To approve the August 2, 2022 CAUD regular meeting minutes.		
<b>FIRST:</b> J. Darrow	<b>SECOND:</b> D. Nead	<b>VOTE:</b> PASSED (4-0-0)
<b>AYE(S):</b> All	<b>NAY(S):</b> None	<b>ABSTENTION(S):</b> None

BUSINESS ITEM	
<b>ADDRESS:</b> 55 Main Street	<b>CASE NUMBER:</b> CAUD-2022-24
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b> Certificate of Appropriateness	
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff presented the application.</li> <li>• K. Ellsworth asked about the deterioration of the porch.</li> <li>• M. Lombardini asked if all columns would be replaced.</li> <li>• Staff indicate four would be replaced as indicated in the application form.</li> <li>• M. Tumminia spoke the existing columns and the condition of the porch at present.</li> <li>• He mentioned that he planned to use original materials on the front of the porch and synthetic materials on the side of the porch.</li> <li>• M. Lombardini noted that eight columns required attention.</li> <li>• M. Tumminia discussed duplicating the roof system of the porch.</li> <li>• J. Darrow indicated the roof system should be repaired in-kind.</li> <li>• M. Lombardini asked about the column replacement.</li> </ul>	

- M. Tumminia clarified the proposed treatment approach.
- K. Ellsworth asked about who determines whether the columns are structurally sound.
- Staff indicated it was the Building Department.
- The Commission agreed that having all synthetic columns at this point appeared most appropriate.
- The Commission discussed the condition of the roof and roofing materials.
- M. Tumminia asked about placing the originals materials on the front of the porch.
- J. Darrow indicated he wanted to see how similar the two columns were and that they should be presented to the Commission.
- M. Lombardini asked about the trim work.
- M. Tumminia said he could likely rebuild the molding in-kind.
- M. Lombardini asked about the balusters.
- M. Tumminia asked about the height of the baluster.
- J. Darrow spoke about the building code relevant to the project.
- M. Lombardini asked if all railings needed to be replaced.
- M. Tumminia said he had enough material to return the front of the porch back to its original appearance.
- M. Lombardini and J. Darrow recommended using all composite materials.
- J. Darrow asked about the skirting.
- M. Tumminia indicated he would be removing the non-sympathetic skirting and replacing it with a sympathetic appearance.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Matthew Tumminia, MFT Maintenance & Remodeling, speaking on behalf of the application.

**VOTING**

**MOTION: To approve the project at 55 Main Street with the following conditions:**

- 1. The eight existing columns and capitals will be replaced with composite columns and capitals as presented in the application so that the appearance is consistent across the front face of the porch.**

<b>FIRST: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**VOTING**

**MOTION: The Commission recommends that if the railings cannot be replaced in-kind, that they should be replaced with either a composite material or the same material and profile as existing on the porch today. The Commission also recommends the salvage of original materials when possible.**

<b>FIRST: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**VOTING**

**MOTION: The Commission recommends that the entablature and skirting of the porch be replaced-in kind or that a composite material be utilized if the species and materials original to the porch could not be utilized and that the replacement materials conform to the pre-existing dimensions.**

<b>FIRST: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

**VOTING**

**MOTION: The Commission recommends that the Yankee gutter system be maintained and that an EDPM roof be utilized and wrapped around the internal gutter system and that downspouts would come down the fluted columns and daylighted to a French drain and divert water away from the house. The Commission strongly recommends that the internal gutters be reconstructed as originally constructed.**

<b>FIRST: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: To repair and replace the tongue and groove flooring and beadboard ceiling with in-kind material.</b>		
<b>FIRST: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: To replace the skirting in a sympathetic manner to match the historically appropriate skirting extent on the porch.</b>		
<b>FIRST: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

<b>BUSINESS ITEM</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 89 Walnut Street</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2022-25</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b> <b>Certificate of Appropriateness</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff presented the application.</li> </ul>		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nick Taro, 3i Graphics and Signs, speaking on behalf of the application.</li> </ul>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: To approve the two proposed signs as presented with the following condition:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 12" x 18" sign will be rearranged so that "Hemingway House" text is placed above "NoMa" and "Lourdes" text.</li> </ul>		
<b>FIRST: D. Nead</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>

<b>BUSINESS ITEM</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: Station SQ.</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2022-27</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b> <b>Certificate of Appropriateness</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff presented the application.</li> <li>• A quorum was not present to act of the application.</li> <li>• K. Ellsworth asked if the applicant would like to add any additional details.</li> <li>• M. Yonaty stated no, whatever the Commission decides, they decide.</li> <li>• K. Ellsworth asked for any further discussion.</li> <li>• D. Nead asked if the sign could be used without internal illumination.</li> <li>• M. Yonaty asked about a sign on Court Street and what type of sign was in use at that location.</li> <li>• Staff clarified that the building in question was not located within the Court Street Historic District and, as a result, not subject to Commission review.</li> <li>• J. Darrow mentioned that the Commission could not act on the application due to quorum.</li> <li>• K. Ellsworth restated that the conflict with the guidelines were sign's location on the building and what it hides, its massing, and the internal illumination. He mentioned that the Commission would need to consider if this application is distinct from other sign applications to address precedence and that the Commission should consider what makes this location unique.</li> </ul>		

<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b>		
▪ Mark Yonaty, Station 45, speaking on behalf of the application.		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: N/A</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: 128 Prospect Avenue</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2022-28</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA:</b>		
<b>Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS &amp; THOSE SPEAKING:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff presented the application.</li> <li>• R. Pornbeck spoke about the existing condition of the house.</li> <li>• J. Darrow asked about the post demolition plans.</li> <li>• R. Pornbeck stated that the plan was to convert the area to green space and to adjoin it with the neighboring property.</li> <li>• CAUD reviewed the SEQR criteria.</li> <li>• The Commission discussed the Criteria for a Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition.</li> </ul>		
<b>PUBLIC COMMENT:</b>		
▪ Robert J. Pornbeck, building owner, speaking on behalf of the application		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: To issue a Determination of No Historical Significance for the residential building located 128 Prospect Avenue.</b>		
<b>FIRST: J. Darrow</b>	<b>SECOND: M. Lombardini</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>SEQR DETERMINATION</b>		
<b>ADDRESS: 128 Prospect Avenue</b>	<b>CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2022-28</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition</b>		
<b>DISCUSSION POINTS: See above.</b>		
<b>VOTING</b>		
<b>MOTION: Motion to declare CAUD as Lead Agency for historic review purposes.</b>		
<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>
<b>MOTION: Motion to declare the action as an Unlisted Action.</b>		
<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</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 residential building at 128 Prospect Avenue. Voice vote, no on all criteria.</b>		
<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: PASSED (4-0-0)</b>

AYE(S): All	NAY(S): None	ABSTENTION(S): None
-------------	--------------	---------------------

<b>BUSINESS ITEM</b>		
----------------------	--	--

ADDRESS: 28 Clarke Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2022-29
---------------------------	---------------------------

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

**DISCUSSION POINTS & THOSE SPEAKING:**

- Staff presented the application.
- R. Smith did not wish to add anything to staff's presentation.
- The Commission had no comments.
- CAUD reviewed the SEQR criteria.
- The Commission discussed the Criteria for a Determination of Historical Significance for Demolition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- Robert Smith, building owner, speaking on behalf of the application

<b>VOTING</b>		
---------------	--	--

**MOTION: To issue a Determination of No Historical Significance for the rear addition 28 Clarke Street.**

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

<b>SEQR DETERMINATION</b>		
---------------------------	--	--

ADDRESS: 28 Clarke Street	CASE NUMBER: CAUD-2022-29
---------------------------	---------------------------

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

**DISCUSSION POINTS:** See above.

<b>VOTING</b>		
---------------	--	--

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

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

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

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

**MOTION: The Commission then reviewed all relevant SEQR criteria and found no or small impact for each. Motion to issue a Negative Declaration for the residential building located at 28 Clarke Street. Voice vote, no on all criteria.**

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

**MOTION: The Commission then reviewed all relevant SEQR criteria and found no or small impact for each. Motion to issue a Negative Declaration for the residential building located at 28 Clarke Street. Voice vote, no on all criteria.**

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

<b>OTHER BUSINESS</b>		
-----------------------	--	--

- Staff mentioned that both properties that the Commission reviewed at the September meeting were approved by the State Review Board.

- M. Lombardini asked about attending the special meeting.
- J. Darrow mentioned an upcoming community event.

**ADJOURNMENT**

<b>Motion to adjourn.</b>		<b>TIME: 1:45 p.m.</b>
<b>FIRST: K. Ellsworth</b>	<b>SECOND: J. Darrow</b>	<b>VOTE: (4-0-0)</b>
<b>AYE(S): All</b>	<b>NAY(S): None</b>	<b>ABSTENTION(S): None</b>