



City of Binghamton Planning Department

SUMMARY OF MINUTES CITY OF BINGHAMTON PLANNING COMMISSION	
MEETING DATE: December 2, 2025	LOCATION: City Council Chambers, City Hall
CALLED TO ORDER: 5:15PM	RECORDER OF MINUTES: Shalin Patel

ROLL CALL		
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	PRESENT:	ABSENT:
Nicholas Corcoran (Chair)	X	
Timothy Szczesny	X	
Christopher Dziedzic (Vice chair)	X	
Mario DiFulvio	X	
Kyle Nedlik	X	
Kelly Weiss	X	
Emmanuel Priest	X	
STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:	TITLE & DEPARTMENT:	
Tito Martinez	Assistant Director, Planning Department	
Shalin Patel	Planner, Planning Department	
Ryan Matt	Corporation Counsel	
Greg Buell	Zoning Officer, Planning Department	

APPROVAL OF MINUTES		
MOTION to approve November meeting minutes		
FIRST: Szczesny	SECOND: Dziedzic	VOTE: Carried (6-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, DiFulvio, Corcoran, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

SEQR DETERMINATIONS	
ADDRESS: 107 Chapin St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2025-
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit to convert an existing residential building into a Congregate Living Facility with 6 sleeping rooms in the R-3 Residential Multi-Unit Dwelling District	
APPLICANT: A3 Binghamton, LLC	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Paul Mingrino (Owner of property), Mike Major (Engineer, Major Engineering)	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At present, the dwelling consists of 5 bedrooms, the owner would like to convert another room (a living room) on 2nd floor into a 6th bedroom (Major). ▪ Existing four [4] car garage in the rear was demolished due to rotted tree damage and unsafe conditions (Mingrino). ▪ There is now enough space for 6 car parking in the rear yard. Though at the present it is not shown on the site plan (Mingrino). 	

- **Dziedzic** asked the applicant whether or not they will show an updated site plan that shows six [6] compliant parking spaces, where according to the staff report there are [0] spaces shown currently.
 - **Mingino** agreed to provide an updated plan(s) that shows [6] compliant parking spaces.
- **Dziedzic** asked about the plan for waste management/garbage disposal/enclosure.
 - **Mingrino** agreed to provide an enclosure and add it to the updated site plan.
- Applicant (**Mingrino**) commented that they purchased the property with the intention to convert the 2nd living room into a 6th bedroom.

VOTING

MOTION that the Planning Commission intents to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Type II under SEQR

FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Dziedzic	VOTE: Carried (6-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, DiFulvio, Corcoran, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the January regular meeting

FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Priest	VOTE: Carried (6-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, DiFulvio, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

SEQR DETERMINATIONS

ADDRESS: 226 Court St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2025-
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site plan review and special use permit to add 5 dwelling units to the ground floor and basement of an existing building, resulting in 15 total units, in the C-1 Service Commercial District	
APPLICANT: Owen Blye	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Owen Blye (Owner of the property)	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Three [3] of the five [5] dwelling units will be built out in the basement of the building, while the remaining two [2] will be broken up with the current ground floor units (each featuring 3 bedrooms) (Blye). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ground floor will have 4 total units – two units with [2] bedrooms each and two units with [1] bedroom each. ▪ According to Lakeside Engineering and their initial analysis, they said the proposed project is doable for the size and layout of building (Blye). ▪ The basement has 2 natural means of egress: a staircase coming from the back parking lot into the basement and a 2nd entrance going up to the front entrance facing Court St (Blye). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It has approximately 12 windows lining towards east and west side of the building, which can be converted into egress window for the bedroom space(s) easily. - There are no plans at the moment to make changes to the existing façade, it will all be internal changes (Blye). ▪ Dziedzic commented that there are seven [7] parking spaces shown on the plan, in the rear of the building. But according to the staff report, only six [6] are compliant. Why is that? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Martinez replied, parking space number 7 is not compliant in itself and it makes spaces 1 and 2 non-compliant because they cannot back out adequately; it is an assumption because there are no dimensions on the parking plan. There are drive aisle-width requirements for someone to be able to safely back out of a parking space. 	

- The parking lot plan is how it is existing and it was inherited from previous owner. I can get rid of the 7th parking space. There are 10 tenants living in the building at the moment, but only 3 tenants have vehicles. Most of our tenants do not drive a vehicle, they drive electric or regular bicycles to work in the nearby downtown area(s) (**Blye**).
- **Weiss** would like to see the applicant devote some attention to fixing the existing façade of the building.
- There is a park and ride (next to Mirabito gas station) directly across from the building, owned by the city of Binghamton, utilized by the Fire department, which sometimes visitors of the tenants in my building have utilized. And this property is further on the east side of the downtown district, compared to it being directly downtown, where there tends to be parking problems (**Blye**).
- The value of adding more homes downtown is more valuable than having more parking spaces (**Blye**).
- There are set of back porches in the rear that allow you to access different floors of the building from the rear (**Blye**).
- **Priest** asked if the applicant is willing to lease the required parking spaces off-site to meet the needed parking space requirements for this project.
 - **Martinez** commented the offsite parking spaces would need to be located within 500’ of the site. 229 Court St lot is an option for a parking area, but nothing is set in stone regarding that parcel of land (per discussions with the city’s Economic Development department).
 - **Blye** replied, “I had inquired to the city about purchasing the lot across the street, but they said it was not up for sale at the moment.”
- **Martinez** commented that the applicant will need to provide five [5] parking spaces for the proposed project. This building is not located in the C-2 district, in the C-2 Downtown Business District, there is no parking requirements for units with 4 beds or less in an existing building, but since this is in the C-1, you will need to add one space per unit.
- **Dziedzic** asked the applicant about their plan to handle garbage collection on the site.
 - **Blye** replied, presently all the tenants have an enclosed container (plastic bin with a lid) on their back or front porch for collection – and on trash day they take their garbage out to the front. The plan is to continue with that plan seeing that it has not created major issues thus far. A dumpster could be added in the rear if need to be; though it would eat into the parking lot, which is already small as it is.
 - **Martinez** replied, the zoning code states that you would need to provide an enclosure of some kind, whether it’s a dumpster or collection of garbage bins. Because the building existed as is for a long time, the applicant was fine with the garage bins, but now that new units are being added, they would have to meet the current requirements. Either find a location on site to provide an enclosure for all the garbage bins or individual bins would need to have an opaque enclosure on each floor/with tenant.
- The applicant currently has [6] compliant parking spaces; those [6] are allocated to what is there, so they have to only provide parking spaces for the new units, so that is where total of [11] parking spaces number come from (**Martinez**).
- I already have begun working on façade improvement of the building, that project is just not apart of this project in particular (**Blye**) – directing the conversation back to the comment made by Weiss regarding such.
- The basement will also have a laundry center space and a rack for the tenants to store their electric bikes in (**Blye**).

VOTING

MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Type II under SEQR		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Nedlik	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, DiFulvio, Priest	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):
MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the January regular meeting		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Nedlik	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, DiFulvio	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

SEQR DETERMINATIONS	
ADDRESS: 168 Water St	CASE NUMBER: PC-2025-
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site plan review and special use permit for the conversion of the upper stories of an existing building into 20 dwelling units in the C-2 Downtown Business District	
APPLICANT: Owen Blye	
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Owen Blye, David Whalen	
DISCUSSION POINTS:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicants (Blye and Whalen) requesting approval for up to 30 bedrooms – accounting for potential to add another bedroom to existing drawings that were inherited from previously approved project at the site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current count is 20 units and 24 bedrooms total, but the applicants would like to seek an approval that would allow them to potentially put up to 30 bedrooms within those 20 units. ▪ The maximum number of bedrooms per unit would be two [2] (Whalen). ▪ Corcoran asked the applicant(s) to address the plan(s) for waste management. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our intention would be to build a garbage enclosure towards the north-west side of the building, which would contain a dumpster. At the present there is no dumpster, as the building is vacant other than a newly signed commercial tenant (Whalen and Blye). - Applicant (Blye) said he owns a dumpster on the other side of the parking lot for another building he owns, which can be used for overflow purposes. ▪ Will this building be able to hold these many units (Corcoran)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whalen responded, yes, there is more than enough room from the square footage perspective and the smaller one [1]-bedroom unit is about 600 sq ft. 	
VOTING	
MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Type II under SEQR, no further environmental review is required.	
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Dziedzic
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, DiFulvio	NAY(S):
VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)	
ABSTENTION(S):	
MOTION to schedule a public hearing at the January regular meeting	
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Nedlik
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, DiFulvio	NAY(S):
VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)	
ABSTENTION(S):	

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS		
ADDRESS: 1 N Depot St		CASE NUMBER: PC-2025-0019
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Review and special use permit for the conversion of an existing industrial building into 50 dwelling units with 54 total bedrooms in the C-1 Service Commercial District		
APPLICANT: Regan Development Corp		
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Sarah Campbell (Attorney, HH&K), Matt Rowe (Keystone Associates)		
DISCUSSION POINTS:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No changes to the unit count since the previous meeting. ▪ There are two (2) modifications made. The common space has been split into two (2) separate spaces to allow no more than twenty-five (25) people in each space (Campbell). And a dumpster enclosure has been provided. ▪ Applicant will be seeking a variance for residential space on the first 30' of a ground floor of a building in the commercial zoning district, where it is not permitted (Campbell). ▪ Affordable units up to the 80% of Area Median Income (AMI), these units are for people making between \$53,000 - \$75,000 a year. ▪ Construction is scheduled to begin in June 2026, completed in September 2027 with occupancy in late 2027. ▪ The existing building has both the roof and the floor collapsing on each other and may have host of other problems (Campbell). ▪ It is a green building project (though not a LEED certified), but the building will be fully electric. ▪ On site management will include a live-in superintendent. ▪ This building features a basement where the storage of garbage will take place, and the superintendent will then take it from the basement to the dumpster. Furthermore, there is a trash room located on each floor where tenants will take their trash (Campbell). ▪ State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will be reviewing the Historical Tax Credit portion of the project along with the Commission on Architecture & Urban Design (CAUD). 		
VOTING		
PUBLIC COMMENT:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No one spoke in favor nor in opposition of the project. ▪ No letters received. 		
MOTION that the requirements for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit have been met, therefore the application is met and conditionally approved, subject to the following:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant must get the Variance approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). 		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Nedlik	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, Szczesny, Nedlik, DiFulvio, Dzedzic	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

PUBLIC HEARINGS & FINAL DELIBERATIONS		
ADDRESS: 49 Court St		CASE NUMBER: PC-2025-0022
DESCRIPTION FROM AGENDA: Site Plan Modification to construct an additional 4 parking spaces in an existing parking area in the C-2 Downtown Business District.		
APPLICANT: Marchuska Productions LLC		
REPRESENTATIVE(S): Justin Marchuska (Owner of the property)		
DISCUSSION POINTS:		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No site plan changes since the previous meeting. ▪ Applicant has come to an agreement with the neighboring church to close off or lease the particular parking space that lines with their walkway in lieu of a funeral or something of that nature. ▪ The request from staff suggests planting of 8 trees in the landscape buffer along State Street and 4 trees in the landscape buffer along Henry Street (Corcoran). 		
VOTING		
PUBLIC COMMENT:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No one spoke in favor nor in opposition of the project. ▪ No letters received. 		
MOTION that the Planning Commission intends to act as Lead Agency in SEQR review and that the action is Unlisted under SEQR		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Priest	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Dzedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, DiFulvio	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):
SEAF PART 2 IMPACT ASSESSMENT. The <u>Lead Agency</u> is responsible for the completion of Part 2. Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have our responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"		
TYPE OF ACTION: Unlisted		LEAD AGENCY: Planning Commission
<i>The Chairman should make a motion to (1) declare intent to act as lead agency, and to (2) define the type of action under SEQR. The Chairman should then open the public hearing or set the date for the public hearing on the case. Following the closing of a public hearing, the Chairman should lead a discussion evaluating the following potential impacts.</i>		
	NO OR SMALL IMPACT MAY OCCUR	MODERATE TO LARGE IMPACT MAY OCCUR
Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	✓	
Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	✓	
Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy, and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action impact existing:	✓ (No)	

A. public / private water supplies? B. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?		
Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage Problems?	✓ (No)	
Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	✓ (No)	
EAF PART 3 - DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE. For every question in Part 2 that answered “moderate to large impact may occur”, or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.		
BASED ON THE ABOVE, MOTION:	Negative Declaration	
MOTION that the requirements for Site Plan Modification have been met, therefore the application is met and conditionally approved, subject to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant must plant at least eight (8) trees in the landscape buffer along State Street and at least four (4) trees in the landscape buffer along Henry Street within 12 months. 		
FIRST: Corcoran	SECOND: Weiss	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, DiFulvio	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):

ADJOURNMENT		
MOTION to adjourn	TIME:	
FIRST: Nedlik	SECOND: Priest	VOTE: Carried (7-0-0)
AYE(S): Dziedzic, Szczesny, Nedlik, Corcoran, Weiss, Priest, DiFulvio	NAY(S):	ABSTENTION(S):