



March 8, 2016

Robert Fornataro
SWBR Architects
387 E. Main Street
Rochester, NY 14604

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a two-family dwelling at the front of the property and a garage with a one-family dwelling above at the rear of the property.

On the premises at:	37 Eagle Street
Zoning District:	R-3 High -Density Residential District Corn Hill Preservation District
Application Number:	A-025-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	D. Beardslee Approve (motion) B. McLear Aye (second) E. Cain Aye C. Carretta Aye J. Dobbs Aye J. Schick Aye B. Mayer Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of March 2, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as submitted.

With this approval and that of the Zoning Board of Appeals, I will soon issue Site Plan Approval to finalize our review process. When your construction documents are complete, please submit them to Peter Siegrist for review. For questions, please contact Peter at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov.

Rochester Preservation Board

By: Zina Lagonegro
Zina Lagonegro, AICP, EIT
Director of Planning & Zoning

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

MAR 10 AM 9:50

Hearing Date:



I. FINDINGS OF FACT:

- A. In reviewing applications for certificates of appropriateness in a preservation district, the Preservation Board considers quality of design and site development in terms of the relationships to the street, building facades and overall neighborhood character.
- B. Architect Robert Fornataro described changes made to the design since the earlier hearing:
- The carriage house was moved four feet east and the house two feet east.
 - The driveway was moved to the west side of the carriage house, and a green space created between the carriage house and the main house.
 - Access to the carriage house apartment would now be from the west, off the relocated driveway, rather than from the courtyard.
 - Steps to the rear porch of the main house were moved from the west side to the north, to be reached by a brick walkway from Beaver Street.
 - On the main house, to reduce the space above the second floor windows, the roof was lowered 12 inches and the windows raised and enlarged.
 - In the gable end of the main house, a triangular window was reduced in size, and a matching window added to the gable of the carriage house.
 - On the front porch of the main house, the cutouts in the metal panel railings are to replicate lilac flowers.
- C. In response to Board questions about the main house, Mr. Fornataro provided the following answers:
- The roof of the front porch is intended to be thin, as drawn, and would be made of metal channels to maintain this thinness.
 - The front steps are intentionally designed to be about 10 feet wide, because the homeowners enjoy stoop sitting and talking with their neighbors.
 - Parking is provided for only three or four vehicles, but is thought to be adequate.
- D. Mary Howard, who introduced herself as a 6-year resident of the corner of Eagle and Troup Streets, spoke in support of the proposal, stating it looks to the future, not just the past. She noted that the project has an artistic flair that fits with the character of the Corn Hill Arts Festival.
- E. Virginia Browne, who introduced herself as a 35-year resident at 103 Adams Street, spoke against the proposal, saying that it doesn't fit the neighborhood. She feels it is too large, sticks out like a sore thumb, uses materials that belong in California rather than Corn Hill, has casement windows not typical of an historic district and has too little parking. She said that there are few basement apartments in the neighborhood.
- F. Ted Forsyth, of 79 Atkinson Street, agreed with Ms. Browne. He stated that he feels the project is simply too large for the lot.
- G. In response to the neighbors' concerns, Board member McLear explained that "fit" in historic areas is not necessarily about copying older buildings, but about creating new buildings that are compatible in scale, form, mass, etc. He said that the proposed development is clearly contemporary, but alludes to other styles nearby.
- H. Adding to Mr. McLear's comments, member Schick stated that this is an issue the Board thinks about carefully and often. He stated that styles come and go, that materials change, that older buildings are changed when styles change, and all this can fit together. Copying older buildings is easy, he said, but it is challenging to try

something new. He finds that the proposal does this well and meets the standards in the preservation code, including forms and elements that reflect the character of the area. He agreed that the materials are unusual and the colors bold, but they are of their time, which is a tenet of historic preservation. He commended the owner for making the investment, feeling it may spur other needed development nearby.

- I. Member Carretta stated that he lives in a newer building in the Grove Place Preservation District, and that it fits well into the historic context.
- II. RESOLUTION:
The Board found that the proposal meets the standards for new construction set forth in section 120-194 of the Rochester Zoning Code, and that the development will be visually compatible with the historic character of the preservation district.
- III. EVIDENCE:
 - A - Application
 - B - Minutes from Preservation Board hearing of Nov. 4, 2015
 - C - Drawings of previous and current proposal
 - D - Colored rendering of current proposal
 - E - Letters in opposition from L. Pumputis, J. and P. Fraver, V. Browne, Claudia Bly et al
 - F - Letter in support from C. Iannazzi
 - G - Appearances by Robert Fornataro, Mary Howard, Virginia Browne, Ted Forsyth
 - H - Site visits by Board members