

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**Monday, August 7, 2006, 7:00 P.M.**  
Approved 9/5/06

**PRESENT:** David Mott, Chairman  
Dean Johnson  
Connie Taft  
Robin Augello

**NOT PRESENT:** Toni Kleist

**ALSO PRESENT:** Susan LaQuay, Secretary

**GUESTS:** Jean Mocyk, regarding Baldwinsville Glass  
John McFall, regarding Baldwinsville Glass  
Jim Patel, regarding 85 East Genesee Street  
Robert Berry, regarding 85 East Genesee Street  
Mike Badwan, regarding 3 West Genesee Street  
Mike Bruske, Oswego 41, LLC  
Geoff Lange, Oswego 41, LLC

Welcome to the Architectural Review Board's newest Board Member, Robin Augello.

The meeting was opened by reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by C. Taft and second by D. Johnson that the minutes of the June 5, 2006 meeting of the Architectural Review Board be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

Upon motion by C. Taft and second by D. Johnson that the minutes of the June 8, 2006 Special Meeting of the Architectural Review Board be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**97 Syracuse Street, Baldwinsville Glass – Jean Mocyk – sign ...**

Jean Mocyk, owner of Baldwinsville Glass, and John McFall are present to address the Board. Mrs. Mocyk stated that her business is located in Nobles Plaza. Mr. McFall noted they have not firmly selected colors as they are not sure what the building, will look like, as it is in the process of being renovated, which will include a new façade that was approved by the ARB on June 8, 2006.

D. Johnson asked for clarification on the sign's location on the building. Mr. McFall stated it will go on the façade above the peaks, but will not be centered on the peaks. Mrs. Mocyk noted there are markers showing the location of the sign. She showed the Board which storefront is Baldwinsville Glass.

Mr. McFall stated the sign will have MDF raised lettering. It will be lighted by goosenecks, which will be placed by the building's owner. Mrs. Mocyk stated is concerned as she has been approached by a lot of people who think she has gone out business due to the lack of signage and she will need the sign up as soon as the façade is finished.

D. Mott stated he has spoken to several business owners in the Village about proposing a “fast track” process regarding signage to avoid holding up potential income for their businesses due to a lack of proper signage. However, he acknowledged this is a volunteer board and the availability of members to meet more often than monthly is an issue. D. Johnson stated he feels this is a good idea and noted that once the code changes are solidified, a business owner who proposes a sign that is in conformance with the code may be able to get a permit for signage without being seen in the setting of a meeting. D. Mott stated this is a possibility in the future.

Mrs. Mocyk stated she is not picky about the color as long as she can have a visible sign from the road. She stated she would like the lettering to be dark in color with a light background and dark trim. She noted the old signs are lighted box signs and some tenants in the building are purchasing the same type of signs for this new façade. She stated she knew she should have her sign redesigned and, therefore, came to the ARB.

D. Mott noted that all that needs to be decided upon are the colors for this sign. D. Johnson stated he thinks T. Kleist should suggest a color as she is involved in the design of the new façade. C. Taft stated she is fine with any colors that are on the approved palate in the ARB guidelines or the same colors that have already been approved for the façade. D. Johnson suggested Friar Brown for the lettering on a sandy colored background.

Upon motion by D. Johnson and second by C. Taft to authorize D. Mott to approve this request for the sign at 97 Syracuse Street based on his receipt and agreement of the color selections as recommended by T. Kleist. The construction of the sign is approved as submitted. **Motion passed.**

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **85 East Genesee Street, S & G Wine and Liquor - sign ...**

Mr. Robert Berry, manager of S & G Wine and Liquor, and Mr. Jim Patel, owner, are present to address the Board. Mr. Berry stated the sign that was approved by the ARB at the June 8, 2006 meeting has been installed and they are not happy with it. He stated it is not adequately visible. C. Taft stated she has seen the signs, both on the post and on the building, and agrees they are not very appealing. D. Mott noted that this is the sign they applied for and agreed to. He stated they should have expressed that they were not pleased with the design at the prior meeting. Mr. Berry stated that he and Mr. Patel are not familiar with sign design and were not aware that the colors chosen for the sign would be ineffective.

Mr. Berry stated that, in addition to the sign being the wrong colors, the size is too small. The sign on the post is 1' W x 6' L. However, this is the size Mr. McFall told him he was limited to. D. Mott stated he is not sure this size limit is accurate. Mr. Berry again stated they are not happy with the colors and feels that a sign they paid \$2000. for should be more visible. He noted many other businesses in this area have lit signs. He stated NAPA Auto Parts, for example, put up a brand new backlit sign just last week. He proposed they be approved for a 2' W x 6' L internally-lit sign on the pole and stated he does not feel this is an unreasonable request given the competition they are face with sign-wise in the area. He noted their sign is virtually invisible given the nature of the surrounding signage. He feels this has impacted their business negatively because their business cannot be easily seen from the road.

C. Taft stated she agrees the sign on the pole is too small and feels she could agree with most of his proposal except for the request that the sign be internally lit. Mr. Berry stated there are no immediate residential buildings near the business and the store will close at 10 pm, so the sign would be turned off at that time. He noted that the majority of their business takes place after typical work hours when it is dark and he feels they will need the sign to be lit for a very limited time, from 4 pm to 10 pm in the winter and later in the summer months. He stated he is not asking to light a huge sign, just the pole sign.

D. Mott stated that signage is not the only mechanism of advertising available to the business. He stated that the ARB cannot do anything about signs that were placed predating the ARB and they have to make their decision based on the codes and guidelines and cannot consider what types of signs the surrounding businesses or other businesses in the Village may have. Mr. Berry stated he only wanted this considered to show that the type of sign he is requesting would not look out of place in the area. He stated that the sign approved by the ARB with gooseneck lighting looks out of place.

D. Johnson suggested the use of neon on the sign and noted this had been suggested at the previous meeting. He noted that the ARB does not typically like neon signage, but this would at least be consistent with the other sign on the pole. Mr. Berry stated he personally does not like neon signs and thinks his proposal is much more attractive and is also more cost-effective and energy efficient.

C. Taft asked how big the Wacky Wyatt's sign on the pole is. Mr. Berry stated it is 4' W x 6' L and showed where their sign, which would be 2' in width, would be in relation to the Wacky Wyatt's sign.

D. Mott noted there is no formal application before the Board at this time and they cannot make any decisions without an application.

D. Johnson noted they are asking the Board to make an exception to their established guidelines and is concerned because this would likely set precedent.

D. Mott noted that as applicants are coming to the board for new signs, any backlit designs are being denied. Anyone who is putting up backlit signs without consent will have to take them down and this is an issue for the CEO to address.

C. Taft noted that Northside Collision and the sign in the video store across the street predate the ARB. Internally lit signs are being turned down consistently by the ARB, which has only been in existence for a few years.

Mr. Berry stated that the gooseneck light will not illuminate the entire sign. The streetlight only illuminates the one side of the sign and it is so bright against the colors of the sign that it makes it unreadable. D. Johnson agreed that the colors do not give the sign very good contrast.

R. Augello asked if they also are requesting to change the sign on the building to match this pole sign. Mr. Berry stated they are not requesting to change that sign because this can be properly lit. He stated they would like to use a dark background on the sign so the letters will stand out. He would like to light up only the letters.

D. Mott stated that the ARB has diligently tried to steer applicants away from internally lit signage and he would have a difficulty time justifying an exception. Mr. Berry stated he cannot understand how the Board would then suggest neon. D. Mott noted that this would not typically be the Board's recommendation, but this situation is unique in that a neon sign would better match the Wacky Wyatt's sign. Mr. Berry asked if they could have neon just outlining the letters. D. Johnson stated they Board would be more inclined to approve this and again noted that the Board has been working for three years to get away from having internally lit signage in the business district of the Village.

C. Taft asked if there are any other options that are within the guidelines. D. Johnson state there are not.

Mr. Patel stated he feels their new proposal for the sign is really attractive and would really like to see a sign like that approved. Mr. Berry stated the light on the pole cannot be relocated and that the pole is owned by the building owner. He noted the Wacky Wyatt's sign is almost completely neon.



D. Mott suggested they make their sign the same size as the Wacky Wyatt's sign. Mr. Berry stated this could compromise the integrity of the pole. D. Mott suggested they not actually make a new hole in the pole, but make the post the signs hang from longer to go through the pole so their sign can hang off one side and the Wacky Wyatt's sign can hang off the other side.

Mr. Patel asked how big the sign can be and stay within code. D. Mott stated they should check with Rolf Beckhusen, CEO. D. Johnson stated their sign should be the same length as the Wacky Wyatt's sign, but not necessarily the same width.

D. Johnson stated he is surprised the street light is working against them in regards to the visibility of the sign. Mr. Berry stated it is because the background color of the sign is so light that the entire sign gets washed out and is unreadable. He stated gooseneck lighting will not rectify the problem.

D. Johnson stated he feels they would have a pretty good chance of having a neon sign approved. D. Mott suggested they balance out the Wacky Wyatt's sign in dimension. As proposed, it would be the same length and half the width. C. Taft stated she agrees that she would be swayed to accept a neon sign because this is the type of sign that is already on the pole and there would be consistency in this particular instance. She stated she thinks it should hang from the pole rather than being attached to the pole with straps.

D. Johnson suggested the Applicant discuss the appropriate dimensions for the sign to meet code and make an application for next month. Mr. Berry agreed to do this.

#### **NEW BUSINESS (continued)**

##### **3 West Genesee Street, On the Go Wireless – Mike Badwan – sign ...**

Mike Badwan of On the Go Wireless is present to address the Board. He had with him the actual sign he would like to put on the front of the building. He would also like to paint the building a different color.

Mr. Badwan stated this sign is actually a temporary sign and he plans to replace it with a permanent one when the business is better established. He stated he would like to paint the building white. The sign has a white background with black and red lettering and a blue/teal design.

D. Johnson noted the application says it will be a 2' x 4' sign with a white background, black letters and red numbers. He asked where it will be mounted. Mr. Badwan stated it will be mounted where the banner currently is located. D. Johnson stated he would like to see a border around the sign to offset it from the building as a white sign will not show up well on a white building. Mr. Badwan again stated this sign is a temporary sign until the business is established. C. Taft asked how long this particular sign will be on the building. Mr. Badwan stated two to three months and then it will be replaced with a permanent sign. He stated he would like a 3' x 3' neon sign for the permanent sign. C. Taft stated neon signs and internally lit are not looked upon favorably and he may want to rethink the design for the permanent sign.

D. Johnson stated he would like to see a gooseneck light for this sign. D. Mott suggested he look at Keely's and the jewelry store across the street to get an idea of what would be appropriate.

Mr. Badwan noted he has to avoid using Verizon signage as he is not directly affiliated with that company.

D. Johnson stated he thinks the selection of white for the building color is very stark. He noted that "China White" is on the approved color palate and is a softer color. Mr. Badwan stated he is open to the suggestion of the Board and is willing to any color the Board would prefer.

D. Johnson stated again that he would like to see a border around the sign and suggested a 1” wood border in a darker color. Mr. Badwan agreed that this would be appropriate. D. Johnson suggested the border be the same color as the words “On the Go” and Mr. Badwan stated he has plenty of that color on hand.

Upon motion by D. Mott and second by C. Taft to approved the sign as depicted in the submitted pictures with the exception that it include a border matching the charcoal/black “On the Go” lettering and the color of the paint for the building be the equivalent of Benjamin Moore 515-1(China White) from the preapproved color palate. **Motion passed.**

Mr. Badwan asked if the Board would prefer a color other than white for the façade. D. Johnson stated he would prefer to see a color in the beige/tan color family for the building and another contrasting color on the door. He noted there is no trim on the building. D. Mott agreed that this would bring it more in line with Keely’s Bridal across the street. R. Augello stated that a beige color may not look good with the teal color on the sign. D. Johnson asked if the teal color is his logo color. Mr. Badwan stated it is.

Upon motion by D. Johnson and second by C. Taft to amend the previous motion above in that the building color will now be Benjamin Moore HC-78 (Litchfield gray) and the door will be painted Benjamin Moore HC-76 (Davenport tan). **Motion passed.**

**OTHER BUSINESS (continued)**

Mike Bruske and Geoff Lange of Oswego 41, LLC were present at the meeting. Mr. Lange had to leave earlier in the meeting. Mr. Bruske stated they had wanted to sit in on the meeting and see what the Board may be looking for. He stated they have purchased the Gazette building. They have no immediate plans for the building, but do intend to redo the façade. D. Mott asked what they intend to use the building for. Mr. Bruske stated it will be a mixed use building. They will likely have commercial use in front and residential/commercial use in the back.

D. Johnson stated, to summarize the goal of the ARB, that they want to maintain the character of the business district of the Village as it might has looked 100 years ago during the canal period. He emphasized that the Board does not want to see brightly illuminated signs. Mr. \*\*\* stated that from reading prior meeting minutes online and sitting through this meeting that he has a good idea of what the ARB has in mind for this area of the Village. They will be back before the Board in the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m. The next Architectural Review Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 5, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay  
Architectural Review Board Secretary