

City of Binghamton
Commission on Architecture and Urban Design
30 July 2014
Minutes

APPROVED – 26 August 2014

Date: 30 July 2014
Location: PHCD Conference Room, 4th Floor City Hall
Members Present: Jeff Smith, Chair
Sean Massey
Mike Haas
Larry Borelli
Mike Atchie
Members Absent: Peter Klosky
John Darrow
Others Present: H. Peter L'Orange – Historic Preservation Planner
Jennie Skeadas-Sherry – Director, PHCD
Leigh McCullen – Senior Planner
Thomas Costello – Supervisor, Building Construction
Robert Murphy – Directory, Economic Development
Joel Boyd – Economic Development
Mayor Richard C. David

The meeting was called to order at approximately 12:08 PM.

The minutes from the 24 June 2014 regular meeting were reviewed. Mr. Borelli made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted; it was seconded by Mr. Atchie. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the minutes were approved as submitted.

Items Heard:

159 Washington Street – Rear Entrance: The Applicants and their representatives presented this case. Staff reminded everyone that the proposed project required a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, and that the case was scheduled to be heard at the ZBA's August meeting. The Applicants proposed to redesign the existing rear entrance to this building, as it will now be accessible from a proposed new parking lot at 162 Water Street. The Applicants proposed to construct a new metal stair, with a covered canopy. There would be signage installed on the canopy. The Applicants would also repaint the rear façade, which is already painted; the same color would be used. The Applicants would also install some new lighting on the façade. The Commission determined that because the rear façade of this building is not readily visible from the public right-of-way, they did not have any major concerns about the proposed project. Mr. Massey made a motion to approve the project as proposed with the condition that the Applicants obtain the necessary variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals prior to any work being done; it was seconded by Mr. Borelli. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the project was APPROVED with conditions.

162 Water Street – Parking Lot: The Applicants and their representatives presented this case. Staff reminded everyone that the proposed project required site plan approval from the Planning Commission and a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, and that the case was scheduled to be heard at the PC's and ZBA's August meetings. The Applicants proposed to install a new parking lot on the site of a building which was destroyed by fire in April. As part of the project, the Applicants would obtain ownership of the existing public alleyway, which runs east-west between 162 Water Street and the rear of the buildings at 25 through 33 Court Street. Staff explained that the exact ownership of the alleyway was still being determined, but that Corporation Counsel had given the go ahead for the review proceed, with an understanding that any approval should be contingent upon the Applicants providing proof of clear ownership of the alleyway before any work being done. There was some discussion of the proposal's impact on the adjacent property owners's ability to access the rear of their properties. There was also a detailed discussion of the design of the parking lot. Mr. Massey made a motion to approve the project with the following conditions: (1) that the Applicant obtain the necessary variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals and the necessary site plan approval from the Planning Commission prior to any construction of the parking lot beginning; (2) that the Applicants shall provide to the Planning Department clear evidence that they have obtained clear title to the twenty-foot wide alley located adjacent to the south of 162 Water Street and shall provide a metes and bounds description of the alley and legal descriptions of any easements or rights of ingress and egress to said alley, prior to any permit being issued; (3) that the Applicants provide to the Planning Department written details on the proposed technique(s) to be used to project the existing historic masonry from the installation of the asphalt surface of the parking lot; (4) that the Applicants modify the planting schedule to include, at a minimum, single-trunk trees of 2.5-3" caliper and 2 gallon plantings; (5) that the Applicants modify the southern interior landscaping area to remove the pointed edge on the western end of the landscaping area in favor of a rounded corner to match the eastern corner; (6) that the Applicants mound the landscaped buffers along the Water Street sidewalk to increase the visual break between the sidewalk and the parking lot; (7) that the Applicants install appropriate curbing around the landscaped areas, both interior and perimeter; (8) that the Applicants install black metal bollards and chain in the landscape buffers abutting Water Street, and that the bollards shall be of a complementary design to the lamppost proposed as part of the project; (9) that the Applicants may install, along the rear property line, either the fencing as proposed or black metal bollards and chain to match the bollards and chain to be installed in the front landscape buffers; and (10) that the Applicant remove the benches as shown in the proposed plans. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haas. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the project was APPROVED with conditions.

1 Hawley Street – Façade: The Applicant and their representatives presented this case. The Applicant proposed to install a new façade on the northern and western elevations of the building. The façades would be EIFS with an aluminum storefront window system. The project would also include modern sun shades on the upper windows and new signage. There was a detailed discussion of alternate design options. The Commission expressed concern about the use of EIFS in general, and specifically on the first floor. Mr. Massey made a motion to approve the project as proposed, with the following conditions: (1) that the Applicant obtain the necessary site plan approval from the Planning Commission prior to any work beginning; (2) that the Applicant use an alternate, more durable material for the first floor façade in place of the

proposed EFIS, which is to match proposed EFIS as closely in color as possible; and (3) that the alternate material be reviewed and approved by the Commission via email. The motion was seconded by Mr. Borelli. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 5-0-0; the project was APPROVED with conditions.

Commercial Alley – Project Design: Mr. Haas recused himself from this case. Staff presented this case. The proposed project had previously been discussed by the Commission at their March 2014 meeting; at that time, the Commission supported the concept but wanted to see some changes made. It was the determination of the Commission that the Applicant had made the necessary modifications to the plans. Mr. Borelli made a motion to approve the project as shown in the plans dated 3 July 2014; it was seconded by Mr. Massey. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-1, with Mr. Haas having recused himself; the project was APPROVED as presented.

[Mr. Borelli departed at this time.]

81 State Street – Signage: Staff presented this item. The Applicant proposed to install a new wall sign for Terra Cotta Catering at this location. Staff reported that it met the requirements of the sign ordinance. Mr. Massey made a motion to approve the sign as proposed; it was seconded by Mr. Haas. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-0; the project was APPROVED as proposed.

162 Court Street – Electrical Service: The Applicant’s representative presented this item. The Applicant had installed conduit for new electrical service on the Carroll Street façade of the building with review or approval from the Commission. There was detailed discussion of possible alternatives and/or mitigation techniques. The Commission ultimately decided that the service as installed was not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Mr. Massey made a motion to deny the project as installed; it was seconded by Mr. Atchie. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-0; the project was DENIED.

Ross Park Amphitheater – Project Design: Phil Krey, the City Engineer, presented this case. The City has received funding to construct a new amphitheater at Ross Park. The proposed design was subject to CAUD review. There was a detailed discussion of the design and the landscaping. It was agreed that the color of the concrete should pick up on the colors in the natural stone wall adjacent to the site; that “knuckles” or brackets should be installed to prevent skateboarders from damaging the new benches, and that the landscaping should be designed so as to ensure that the seats are adequately shaded during summer afternoons. Mr. Massey made a motion to approve the project with the addition of the items discussed; it was seconded by Mr. Atchie. There was no further discussion. The motion was carried 4-0-0; the project was APPROVED with conditions.

Staff provided a few brief updates on Blueprint Binghamton and some Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness reviews.

There was no further business.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:45 PM.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission on Architecture and Urban Design is scheduled for Tuesday, 26 August 2014.