



# Department of Planning, Housing, & Community Development

*Mayor, Richard C. David*  
*Director, Dr. Juliet Berling*

**Meeting Date:** 24 November, 2015  
**Sent To:** Commission on Architecture & Urban Design Members  
**Subject:** **257 Washington Street – Various alterations & Improvements**  
**Tax ID:** 160.33-1-7  
**Case:** CAUD 2015-82  
**Copies:** Kevin Findley – Project Supervisor

---

## **A. Review Requested**

On 16 November, 2015 Kevin Findley, the project manager, submitted an application for Design Review for the property located at 257 Washington Street. This property is a Local Landmark Property; all exterior modifications must be reviewed and approved by the Commission on Architecture and Urban Design (CAUD) prior to any work being done.

## **B. Proposal**

The applicant has proposed converting the existing structure at 257 Washington Street into a multi-family apartment complex. The Applicant received conditional approval of window replacements at the March 2015 meeting of CAUD. Part of the conditions required the Applicant to submit a photo-shopped image of the proposed windows superimposed on the building; as is standard practice for CAUD.

The Applicant placed windows without meeting the conditions, and also performed masonry repointing on the exterior without proper staff approvals. These two items should be discussed as part of the Applicants current project and should be reviewed for consistency with the original conditional approval.

The Applicant has proposed new work to be completed on the building. These include, windows, doors, decorative features (sconces), paint, and an accessibility ramp. The scope of work is listed as line items on a separate sheet and supplements where available.

## **C. Staff Findings**

While most of these items could normally be completed in the form of an Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness, staff has required the Applicant to visit CAUD for the review of work that has been completed in violation of the March decision of windows for the building. Additionally, staff feels it is especially necessary to resolve issues regarding non-reviewed work that the Applicant has completed leading to several other alterations on the buildings exterior, including:

- exterior mechanical protrusions, (completed)
- masonry repointing, (completed)
- The pouring of concrete and construction of a concrete block support system for an accessibility ramp. (in process)

None of the above three (3) items have been approved at the staff or Commission level.

Staff has found that the new items, proposed in the addendum attachment for this project, would have minimal impact on the structure and provide much needed improvements. Staff should evaluate the windows that have been replaced on the structure since the last review.

#### **D. Historic Design Guidelines**

Windows – Guidelines for the City stipulate that original windows should always be repaired and never replaced unless they are deemed deteriorated beyond any reasonable repairs. Windows that are partially damaged should be repaired by splicing or patching the windows with like materials to reinforce the existing materials.

Doors – Like windows, Guidelines state that doors should be repaired and only replaced when completely necessary (and where there is no alternative). Replacement doors should do their best to minimize the negative impact to the historic integrity of the building by attempting to match, stylistically, the original windows if possible.

Masonry – The historic design guidelines for the City stipulate that masonry should always be repaired and not replaced to the best extent possible. Additionally when repointing the mason or contractor should pay close attention to the color, mass and scale of the building and its materials. The guidelines also stipulate that new installation of brick and repointing should match the color and texture of that of which is already on the structure, using no harder than a type N mortar.

Accessibility/Site features – Guidelines generally state that any change in site features should not negatively impact character defining features of a historic building. This includes any features that may disrupt the intent or integrity of ornament, massing or fenestration of the building. Any additional features to the building should be minimal and take care in respecting the qualities of the building, while not looking original.

**E. Property History and Condition**

**Year of Construction** ca. 1926

**Land Use** Recreational

**Significance** The building is a good example of a 20<sup>th</sup> Century Lodge. The building was built by Conrad and Cummings, Architects and was initially used as the Eagles Club Lodge. From 1938 to 2009, the building housed the Binghamton Boys and Girls Club. The building is a good example of a simple neo-classical building, in a Federalist motif. The existing windows are non-original aluminum-frame windows. The gym and pool portion of the building was constructed in the 1960s.

# Addendum of work Items for CAUD Review:

257 Washington Street – Kevin Findley

24 November, 2015

Commission on Architecture and Urban Design

---

1. Replace over time all of the windows on the building.
  - a. Windows have already been replaced on the north façade – same windows will be used elsewhere on the building
  - b. The window manufacturer is Jeldwen windows – specifications on separate sheet.
  - c. Windows are meant to “mimic” historic precedent and are based off of a historic photo of the building – separate supplement.
  
2. To install doors for accessibility and secondary points of ingress and egress.
  - a. Doors will be modern commercial glass doors – see supplement
  - b. Color will be “chestnut bronze” to match windows
  - c. Historic photo shows commercial glass doors of the period for this building – see supplement
  - d. Doors will match existing front doors in color and style
  
3. Accent lighting – front entrance sconces
  - a. See historic photo supplement
  - b. Sconce photo supplement
  - c. Sconce sample to be presented at meeting.
  
4. Penetration of exterior walls for mechanical
  - a. All completed work leading to the penetrations of PVC or ventilation will be painted “chestnut bronze” to match the doors and windows of the building
  - b. Mechanicals penetration of walls are based upon manufacturer specifications for “length of run”.
  - c. No other economic option (according to the applicant)
  
5. Accessibility ramp has begun construction and installation parallel with the secondary point of ingress and egress on north side of the building.
  - a. Sketch attached in supplement
  - b. Concrete ramp with brick pillar and blue stone cap brick pillar will be continued through the concrete ramp on exterior exposed face, no break in brick pillar for concrete ramp
  - c. “Trex Reveal” railing system will be placed between each 10 foot section of the ramp. “Trex real post” will be installed in the middle of each section – sample system in brochure to be presented at meeting.
  - d. Secondary railing system (Trex handrail system) will be installed on the inside of the brick pillar to meet accessibility code - sample brochure to be presented at meeting.
  - e. Color – Charcoal Black

**F. Photographs**



Current building and site conditions, south and east façades (October 2015)



East façade (October 2015)



North Façade (October 2015)



North façade (October 2015)



Conditionally approved windows – condition not met, but installed. These windows are also proposed for the rest of the building window build out. (October 2015)