

**City of Binghamton
Commission on Architecture and Urban Design
29 December, 2015
Minutes**

Date: 29 December, 2015
Location: Planning Department Conference Room

Members Present:

J. Darrow
S. Edwards
K. Ellsworth
M. Mauro
J. Smith

Others Present:

S. Donnelly, The Printing House
R. Murphy, Ex-officio member & Director of Economic Development
C. Snyder, Historic Preservation Planner
J. Taber, Jax Signs & Neon Inc.
E. Olson, 3i Graphics and Signs
D. Waylan, BCK-IBI Group

Absent: M. Atchie, P. Klosky

K. Ellsworth called the meeting to order at approximately 12:08 PM.

Approval of Minutes: Nov 24th Meeting

November minutes were approved with corrections noted by K. Ellsworth and J. Smith. C. Snyder acknowledged these corrections and made the necessary changes for the Commission.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by K. Ellsworth

Motion carried (3-0-1)

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

Items Heard:

K. Ellsworth recommended that the board move to the second item on the agenda, 41 Chenango Street, because there were not enough members present for quorum on the first item listed. J.

Darrow needed to recuse himself because of association with the project. All members present agreed and the Commission moved to the second agenda item.

41 Chenango Street - (Signage Review) (2015-88)

The sign designer, Eric Olson, spoke on behalf of the Applicant. E. Olson presented signage for the project and briefly described the proposal. Dan Waylan of BCK-IBI Group was present to support the project. J. Darrow commented on the appropriateness of the signage applauding the design, and noting that the signage is more appropriate than most signage brought to CAUD.

J. Darrow motioned to approve the signage as proposed, M. Mauro seconded the motion. J. Smith added that there was no other signage to be proposed including that of obtrusive and unnecessary marketing signage. The motion was carried and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

Motion carried (4-0-0)

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, J. Smith

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, P. Klosky, S. Edwards

Recused: None

Other Business:

K. Ellsworth recommended that the Commission review other business while awaiting the arrival of missing members of CAUD. C. Snyder noted that he would call the missing members if they still had not arrived before the end of the Commissions discussion of other business.

Corporation Council Ethics Training Session:

C. Snyder noted that Kenneth Frank, Corporation Council, would not be able to give the ethics training session this meeting because of a conflict. The meeting will be rescheduled for the January 2016 CAUD meeting. J. Darrow asked how much time CAUD should allow for the session. C. Snyder noted that the session would not take that long and would just be a short review of ethics and situations that board may face where a recusal may be the necessary course of action.

Comments on Outdoor Café Guidelines:

C. Snyder will be sending out an RFP next week for café materials; including bollards and chains. J. Darrow asked if the Commission could see samples of the materials. R. Murphy agreed that this was important for the Commission to make a decision regarding the agreed upon materials. C. Snyder will order samples of the materials for the next CAUD meeting before creating an RFP for CAUD approved materials.

Historic Design Guidelines Reference Manual:

K. Ellsworth asked if C. Snyder would want to talk about signage and the historic design guidelines. C. Snyder decided to push this item to the end of the meeting and instead contact the missing CAUD members to see if they will be arriving to make quorum.

K. Ellsworth motioned to temporarily adjourn the meeting at 12:22pm to wait for the missing CAUD members to arrive for quorum.

K. Ellsworth called the meeting back to order at 12:33pm when S. Edwards arrived to make quorum.

21 Chenango Street - (Signage Review) (2015-52)

J. Darrow recused himself for involvement with the project. K. Ellsworth asked for the Applicant to explain the project and the reasoning and need for an extension of the temporary signage period. Stephen Donnelly, marketing agent for the project, spoke on behalf of the Applicant, *The Printing House*. S. Donnelly briefly explained the reason for their attendance of the meeting highlighting the following goals: [1] to address the issues of compliance [2] to address the issues of the damaged façade and necessary repairs [3] to request an extension of temporary signage from the previously approved date of 30 April, 2016 to a new date of 31 August, 2016.

K. Ellsworth clarified that the need for the signage is to market the business during the longer than expected construction period to complete the structure. S. Donnelly agreed, explaining that the summer months are most critical for marketing because students make housing decisions during this period. K. Ellsworth also clarified that the intent of the signage was temporary in nature, and that after the temporary signage period new permanent signage would be proposed. S. Donnelly confirmed this to be their intentions and that they would remove the intensive graphics and marketing materials and instead create a more static and simplified logo for the purposes of permanent signage. J. Smith explained that the City will be responsible for policing this signage as temporary until the ending date of 31 August, 2016, and the Commission should take this into account when making their decision.

K. Ellsworth opened up discussion about the non-compliant projecting banner signage, and the mounting of signage into the facing of the stone, rather than into the mortar joints. Jim Taber explained that there were no mortar joints and it was necessary to drill into the façade. J. Taber explained an alternative bracket would allow for the attachment of the bracket to mortar joints on the façade. R. Murphy asked why the Applicant did not contact the City when it was clear the signage was not to be mounted into a mortar joint as the conditional approval required. J. Taber said it was most likely a communication issue. R. Murphy state that J. Smith was fairly clear with the decision and that it was also clear that the signage should go over the alleyway. S.

Donnelly stated that there was some amount of oversight in the work that was completed, but claimed that the conditions of approval were not entirely clear. K. Ellsworth stated that in the future there needs to be a detail of how signage will be mounted for all other projects that propose projecting banner signs on historic buildings.

K. Ellsworth asked for J. Smith to give his opinion on the best way to repair the holes in the building. J. Smith said that if the Applicant was to just mortar in the holes that were drilled is sufficient to patch the spots that are affected. J. Taber asked if a fifty-year silicone would be recommended as it wouldn't be as susceptible to cracking or breaking. J. Smith said there are materials made specifically for patching and matching stone, but that it wouldn't be cost effective for the purposes of this minor repair. C. Snyder recommended a more flexible mortar, preferably something that would be used for brick.

After discussion on the arrangement of signage and the possible and available mortar joints for mounting signage, J. Smith recommended that the Applicant mount both projecting banner signs on the southwest corner of the building with one sign projecting over Press Alley, and the other projecting over Chenango Street. K. Ellsworth and J. Smith asked what the color and arrangement of the brackets would be. J. Smith recommended it to be black to go with the overall color scheme and windows. S. Donnelly and J. Taber discussed the technical arrangement of how the brackets would be mounted for the 90 degree angle of the projecting signage on the buildings southeast corner. R. Murphy clarified that the signage would be mounted lower than the discussed image portrayed to ensure attachment to the mortar joint. S. Donnelly and J. Taber agreed.

K. Ellsworth asked for a motion to approve the remounting of the signage, patching of holes, and arrangement of the new projecting signage on the façade. J. Smith motioned to approve the projecting banner sign modifications on the southwest corner of the building with one sign projecting over Chenango Street and the other over Press Alley, and that brackets be installed into mortar joints with intermediate steel support to hold the banners, and that the banner rods, brackets and fasteners be black in color, and that the current holes on the façade be patch with the appropriate mortar; type N or equal, and that any other modification of signage or changes to the currently agreed upon arrangement be brought before CAUD prior to the work being carried out completed. The motion was seconded by M. Mauro and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Smith, seconded by M. Mauro

Motion carried (4-0-1)

Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, P. Klosky,

Recused: J. Darrow

K. Ellsworth opened discussion of the Applicants request to extend the term of temporary signage from 30 April, 2016 to 31 August, 2016. S. Edwards expressed her support in the extension of temporary signage. J. Smith again noted that the City would be responsible for the policing of that signage and that the Applicant must be held accountable if the signage is not removed at the agreed upon date. M. Mauro expressed her concerns of temporary signage and the setting of precedent in signage for historic districts in recent meeting. M Mauro reiterating the importance of the planning departments policing efforts to ensure that the signage is removed at the agreed upon time. K. Ellsworth added that this case is not typical, and that because of the longer than expected construction process the temporary marketing signage can be extended. M. Mauro recommended that the Applicant propose a permanent signage arrangement before the end of the temporary signage period to ensure a smooth transition between temporary and permanent signage periods for the Applicant. C. Snyder agreed and recommended that the Applicant submit materials to the Commission for permanent signage review by the beginning of August 2016 for that months CAUD review.

J. Smith motioned for approval of the extension of temporary signage from 30 April, 2016 to 31 August, 2016. The signage is to be considered temporary because of longer than expected construction period, and signage must be removed by the deadline of 31 August, 2016, and permanent signage must be proposed for the August CAUD meeting. M. Mauro seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Smith, seconded by M. Mauro

Motion carried (4-0-1)

Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, P. Klosky,

Recused: J. Darrow

Other Business (continued):

J. Darrow rejoined the Commission meeting. M. Mauro noted that she would not be at any of the Commission meetings until April, as she will be on vacation. J. Darrow mentioned John Latronica and the historic restoration job that he completed on a porch on Front Street. J. Darrow mentioned that CAUD and Planning Staff should write a letter thanking John and possibly look at giving awards for good preservation work around the City in the future. C. Snyder said it would be possible to write something up thanking him, and it could be worked on over the next month and sent to CAUD members for review before sending the formal letter to Mr. Latronica.

Historic Design Guidelines Reference Manual:

C. Snyder asked for the Commission to review the section of Historic Design Guidelines regarding signage to see if the guidelines fit with what the Commissioners believe

signage should look like in the historic districts and on historic buildings. J. Smith stated that the guidelines are fairly generic and don't appear to address a lot of the more complicated issues if signage. R. Murphy asked if *Maryam's Mart* in the downtown is legal signage. C. Snyder stated that it is not, but enforcement of signage is difficult to handle with the amount of scofflaws in the City. The issue of what can be displayed in windows came up during the meeting. C. Snyder stated that the City and Commission can really only look at the exterior of the building and how they relate to the street and are not able to necessarily regulate content in windows. S. Edwards asked who was responsible for enforcement of signage. C. Snyder and R. Murphy explained it is the Zoning Officers responsibility, but that there are other pressing issues that make enforcement of signage a difficult undertaking for one person. J. Darrow mentioned that window treatments and the application of window treatments and shop windows can be considered signage. R. Murphy and C. Snyder stated that this is a grey area and that there is a clear distinction between the interior of the building and the expressed advertising and marketing signage of a building. C. Snyder mentioned that there is need for having tenants and building owners show good examples of signage for others to follow, and that there is an endemic nature to allowing signage that is not necessarily appropriate in the historic district. J. Smith addressed the thirty day temporary signage stipulation in the code as being the answer to the issues of *Maryam's Mart* and other temporary signage that is not necessarily permanent or appropriate for the historic downtown.

Adjournment: 1:49 PM

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by J. Smith (5-0-0)

Unanimously approved