

**City of Binghamton**  
**Commission on Architecture and Urban Design**  
**22 October 2015**  
**Minutes**

---

**Date:** 22 October 2015  
**Location:** Planning Department Conference Room

**Members Present:**

J. Darrow  
K. Ellsworth  
P. Klosky  
M. Mauro  
S. Edwards (entered at approximately 12:09)

**Others Present:**

J. Boyd, Assistant Director of Economic Development  
T. Costello, Supervisor of Building and Code  
D. Hamlin, Broome County Real Property  
J. Kraham, Deputy Mayor  
R. Markoff, City resident and advocate  
A. Martin, Chairman Broome County Land Bank  
T. Martinez, Assistant Director of Planning  
R. Murphy, Director of Economic Development  
C. Snyder, Historic Preservation Planner  
M. Webster, City resident and advocate

**Absent:**

M. Atchie  
J. Smith

K. Ellsworth called the meeting to order at approximately 12:05PM.

**Approval of Minutes:** None to be approved for October 22 Special Meeting

**Items Heard:**

**47 North Street-** (Determination of significance) (2015-73)

J. Darrow recused himself for the 47 North Street project and S. Edwards had not arrived at the time of deliberation. Since there was no longer a quorum because of J. Darrow's involvement in 47 North Street, the case was placed at the last section of part one of the deliberations to await S. Edwards's arrival.

## **75 Liberty Street-** (Determination of significance) (2015-75)

K. Ellsworth solicited comments from the County and Land Bank representatives, A. Martin and D. Hamlin. R. Murphy noted that the representatives were taking place of Margaret Scarinzi who could not make the meeting because of a previous engagement. A. Martin spoke regarding funding sources for the demolition. J. Darrow spoke in concern to the large list of demolitions. R. Murphy addressed the concern noting that there are few or no alternatives or opportunities for the properties, citing the historical shrinking of the city and large inventory of substandard housing. J. Darrow argues that the buildings are salvageable and viable structures, and wanted to see interior photos of all structures, and addressed unknown locations of asbestos. A. Martin addressed the issue stating that Ms. Scarinzi placed a bid for environmental services of all buildings to assess hazards. J. Darrow stated that asbestos in its self is not harmful when left alone, and that it should not be addressed as a negative aspect of the buildings themselves. A. Martin explained that the Broome County Land Bank does not have a program to sell properties to individual landowners and program the buildings at this time; as many other Land Banks do. A. Martin added that the Land Bank does not view the buildings as historically significant and that they are a negative impact on the neighborhood.

S. Edwards addressed this building specifically, and explained that some other buildings on the street, and in the neighborhood, are still in salvageable condition based on her personal experiences with building development and renovation. J. Darrow asked the Applicants what would happen to the money allocated to demolitions if not spent by the end of this year. A. Martin addressed the question stating that the money would be returned to the Attorney General's Office and that the Land Bank wanted to use the money before losing the years funding, adding that they are not required to spend it and that the money is specifically for demolition purposes. K. Ellsworth asked if the Applicant would be open to offers for future re-use of the buildings. A. Martin addressed the question stating that they would consider serious plans for purchase and re-use plans for all of the buildings adding that an application has been developed to process proposals.

P. Klosky questioned if the Commission was able to make a determination without interior photos of the building, and if the Commission should defer to the Staff opinion. J. Darrow stated that there could be interior features that contribute to the historic integrity of the building that have not yet been determined. S. Edwards stated that she agreed with the Staff position and that just because a building is determined "not significant" does not mean it will immediately be demolished without hearing offers or proposals for rehabilitation. K. Ellsworth asked senior members of CAUD for precedent on these cases. J. Darrow stated that usually there is interior and exterior evidence of structural and/or dilapidation to assist in making a determination. J. Darrow moved to table discussion the item until there was further information about the interior condition of the building, P. Klosky seconded, and the decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**  
Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro  
Nays: None  
Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith  
Recused: None

**113 Liberty Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-76)**

J. Darrow described the architecture and reiterated the historic features of the building. S. Edwards stated that she didn't believe the building to be historic. C. Snyder provided information detailing the difficulty of dating the buildings, and many others in the area, because of little primary source information on the neighborhood. Materials and styles suggest pre-1890. J. Darrow asked the Applicants if they have contacted PAST regarding salvage work on the proposed demolitions. The Applicant stated that they had not, but showed interest in getting involved with the organization and salvaging the buildings. P. Klosky noted that all applications for the majority of buildings have the same language - copied or pasted. C. Snyder noted that one application had an error, but that the information for many of the properties were similar in nature as submitted by the Land Bank. P. Klosky added that there is some tendency to table all the properties because he is unsure about the information presented. J. Darrow agreed, R. Murphy stated that the charge of the Commission is to only identify historic significance and not the 'salvage-ability' of the buildings. C. Snyder restated the criteria for significance. S. Edwards made a motion for "no historic significance", based off of experience with these types of buildings and lack of historic integrity. M. Mauro questioned if a community member came forward with an idea or proposal the Land bank would review or consider a proposal. The Applicant promised that they would evaluate any realistic proposal that comes before the Land Bank. M. Mauro seconded the motion based off of the criteria presented, and the decision was unanimous. J. Darrow wanted to note that he believed that the determination was inappropriate and not sufficient for the discussion, S. Edwards agreed.

Moved by S. Edwards, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**  
Ayes: J. Darrow, K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky  
Nays: None  
Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith  
Recused: None

**128 Liberty Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-77)**

J. Darrow motioned that the building be determined to have "no historic significance" with the same discussion and notes of 113 Liberty Street taken into account. S. Edwards seconded the motion. The decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by S. Edwards

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith

Recused: None

**15 Munsell Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-78)**

K. Ellsworth asked for conversation regarding this building. J. Darrow commented on the history of the building, and motioned for “no historic significance”. T. Costello explained this building could be consolidated to other vacant lots of the area for future development. S. Edwards seconded, and the decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by S. Edwards

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith

Recused: None

**34 Munsell Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-79)**

J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance”, seconded by S. Edwards. The decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by S. Edwards

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith

Recused: None

**20 Pearne Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-80)**

J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance”. S. Edwards commented on the issues with the building from previous associations to the structure. J. Darrow rescinded his motion because of the carriage house associated with the building. S. Edwards motioned for “no historic significance”. J. Darrow asked how many carriage homes stand in the City. C. Snyder stated that he did not have that information with him, and added that there was no evidence that it was the original carriage house, and it was most likely that it was an early, but not original carriage house to the structure. J. Darrow seconded the motion with noted reluctance.

Moved by S. Edwards, seconded by J. Darrow

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith

Recused: None

#### **47 North Street-** (Determination of significance) (2015-73)

K. Ellsworth asked that the Commission review 47 North Street now that a quorum is present. J. Darrow recused himself from the discussion because of his association with the building and future projects or proposals. C. Snyder distributed photos of the building's interior from one year ago. Images, from a year ago, showed newly rehabilitated building interior with drywall and no historic features on the interior. Another document was submitted in support of saving the building, submitted by Joseph Swartz. S. Edwards questioned the Applicants about the building. The Applicant provided general information about the buildings vacancy, explaining that the building was purchased at auction by the Land Bank, and that a community group stated interest in the building one year ago, but has not submitted a substantial proposal. The Applicant stated that the Land Bank is now at a point where they need to make a final decision on an empty and dilapidating structure. J. Darrow submitted photos of the building and restoration work completed in the 1980's. J. Darrow provided information about the restoration project as a recused member of the board. The Applicant stated the building has been vacant for seven to eight years. The Applicant stated that the current state of the building's interior is uninhabitable based on reports from a third party environmental firm. The Applicants understanding is that a feral cat colony is living in the building, and the environmental conditions of the building are severe. C. Snyder also presented the Land Bank with a check from Monaco Construction for a deposit on the building and negotiation of a purchase price for the structure. The Applicant stated that they would not be able to make an immediate decision on the proposal, and would have to present the proposal before their board. T. Costello added that after speaking with the third part environmental consultant for the building that he was confident that the building was dangerous and that the interior was in a dilapidated condition. The Applicant has added that they have had to turn away the public from entering the building because of the environmental and structural conditions of the buildings. T. Costello added that his comment was not based on the structural safety or viability of the building, but simply the issues of environmental and historical integrity.

S. Edwards stated that she had though the building had "no historic significance". J. Darrow disagreed. P. Klosky added that the building does meet the criteria for listing as a Local Landmark and is historically significant because of the buildings history, people who have lived there. C. Snyder stated that the building is eligible based off of staff review of the history and features with City law and criteria. T. Costello said the scale of the building is unique for the area (larger footprint, style etc.). C. Snyder added that the criteria are open to interpretation by the

board. The Applicant asked if the Commission would rather table the discussion until interior information is made available. K. Ellsworth stated that there is discussion from the board that the building is significant based on the criteria, but determining significance does not necessarily stop any current processes including any proposals pending. K. Ellsworth asked if a Commission member would make a “determination of significance for the building. J. Boyd added that the industrial history of the building is important to local history. P. Klosky motioned for a determination of “historic significance”. The Applicant reiterated preference that the Commission tabled the discussion to have more time to review proposals and provide more information to the Commission. P. Klosky added that there is really nothing other than historic significance to be evaluated, not the viability of the building. R. Murphy argued that interior and exterior must be historic for a determination. C. Snyder added that local ordinance is cut and dry, and very basic to leave room for conversation among the Commission as to historic significance of buildings. P. Klosky reaffirmed his motion to determine the building “historically significant”. S. Edwards seconded the motion. R. Murphy read the criteria for listing a local landmark. S. Edwards noted that the building in questions meets four of the five criteria for listing. The decision was unanimous with J. Darrow recused.

Moved by P. Klosky, seconded by S. Edwards

**Motion carried (4-0-1)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith

Recused: J. Darrow

#### **75 Liberty Street-** (Determination of significance) (2015-75)

K. Ellsworth asked the Commission to reevaluate the earlier determination of the property in light of new conversation on the other building determinations. P. Klosky moved for “no historic significance”. J. Darrow seconded the motion, and the decision was unanimous.

Moved by P. Klosky, seconded by J. Darrow

**Motion carried (5-0-0)**

Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, J. Smith

Recused: None

*The Commission stopped deliberations for a 10 minute recess at 1:18 PM.*

*The Commission resumed deliberation at 1:26 PM*

*S. Edwards leaves Commission Meeting for the day*

**6 Charles Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-63)**

J. Boyd provided a recent background of the building and the City’s ownership and use of the structure J. Darrow motioned to determine the structure “not historically significant” based on the quality of architecture, or lack thereof, and condition of the building. P. Klosky seconded the motion, and the decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky,

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

**510.5 Chenango Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-71)**

J. Darrow asked about the construction site on the south side of the parcel. C. Snyder responded that the site is under excavation for a previously demolished structure. C. Snyder also explained that the current building at 510.5 Chenango Street was constructed when the parcel of 510 Chenango was split sometime in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. J. Boyd recommended that the City contact PAST regarding the salvaging of columns and a transom window on the building. J. Darrow commented that the demolition of the structure would allow for consolidation of parcels on Chenango and that the salvaging of the columns and other historical materials be retrieved before demolition. J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance”, M. Mauro seconded, and the decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

**30 Carroll Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-64)**

J. Darrow stated that the building is unique in that it is a multi-family dwelling structure in the Victorian style, but that the structure is not historically significant and lacks many historic features changed over time. J. Darrow made a motion of “no historic significance”, seconded by M. Mauro, and the decision was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

### **125 Susquehanna Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-67)**

C. Snyder summarized the history and design of the building. J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance”, seconded by M. Mauro, and the determination was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

### **16 Second Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-68)**

C. Snyder summarized the history and design of the building. J. Kraham noted that the building was deeded to the City when after foreclosure. J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance” based on little to nothing to salvage, seconded by P. Klosky, the determination was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

**Motion carried (4-0-1)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

### **10 Alfred Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-65)**

J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance”, seconded by P. Klosky, the determination was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith  
Recused: None

**5 Williams Place - (Determination of significance) (2015-66)**

T. Costello gave background to the buildings ownership stating that the City attempted to attain the property from the previous owner, and there are currently title issues with the building. C. Snyder and R. Murphy agreed that the City would need to prove a clear title before demolition and before PAST could salvage any items from the building. J. Darrow motioned for a determination of “no historical significance”, M. Mauro seconded, and the determination was unanimous. T. Costello noted that PAST would have to work with the demolition contractor to obtain the right to salvage.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

**12 Gaines Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-70)**

C. Snyder presented the structural and cosmetic dilapidation of the structure. J. Darrow motioned for a determination of “no historic significance”, seconded by M. Mauro, and the determination was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky,

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith

Recused: None

**11 Baltimore Street - (Determination of significance) (2015-70)**

J. Darrow motioned for “no historic significance”, seconded by P. Klosky, the determination was unanimous.

Moved by J. Darrow seconded by P. Klosky

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, M. Mauro

Nays: None  
Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith  
Recused: None

**Other Business:**

**191 Court Street – Phelps Mansion Signage**

Review of conditional changes to signage for approval from previous meeting.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky,  
Nays: None  
Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith  
Recused: None

**1 N. Depot Street – Repointing brick for north façade**

Review of conditional brick and appropriate mortar for approval.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky,  
Nays: None  
Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith  
Recused: None

**Outdoor Cafe Guidelines**

To be reviewed at next meeting. K. Ellsworth gave more time because of the length of the current meeting and the current time constrictions for Commissioners.

**257 Washington Street – Alterations**

Non-conforming changes to the building. J. Darrow stated past issues with the Applicant not following up on his buildings through CAUD. R. Murphy agreed that the Applicant needed to send the proper conditional materials for full approval and completed work without doing so - this is unacceptable. K. Ellsworth agreed that the Applicant should not be placed on CAUD until current issues are resolved.

**Adjournment:** 1:57 PM

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

**Motion carried (4-0-0)**

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky,  
Nays: None  
Absent: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, J. Smith  
Recused: None