

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Assessment

Erie Harbor Development

Conifer Realty, LLC
183 East Main Street, 6th Floor
Rochester, NY 14604

Contact: Allen Handelman
(585) 324-0512
ahandelman@coniferllc.com

Prepared For:

Art Ientilucci
(585) 428-7091
Director of Zoning, City of Rochester
Lead Agency
ientiluc@cityofrochester.gov

Prepared By:



Stantec

Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
2250 Brighton-Henrietta Town Line Road
Rochester, NY 14623
(585) 475-1440

Contact: Michael Flanigan, Project Manager
(585) 413-5624
MFLANIGAN@STANTEC.COM

December, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 List of Speakers at the May 19, 2008 Public Hearing.....	1
1.2 List of Written Comments Received.....	3
2.0 REVISED SITE PLAN.....	3
2.1 Revised Design Rationale – Erie Harbor.....	4
3.0 RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY.....	6
3.1 Project Description.....	6
3.2 Architecture and Site Design	7
3.3 Use and Density	14
3.4 Public Access	15
3.5 Parking	15
3.6 Antidisplacement Plan.....	16
3.7 Alternatives.....	17
3.8 Miscellaneous.....	18

FIGURES

	<u>Figure No.</u>
Site Plan	1
Project Views and Renderings.....	2-8
Site Map	9

APPENDICES

	<u>Appendix</u>
Written Comments Received	A
DEIS Comment Summary/Disposition Recommendations	B
Correspondence	C

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document, in combination with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) dated April 2008 for the Erie Harbor Development, comprise the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the proposed project. The project proponent is Conifer Realty, LLC.

The purpose of the FEIS is to incorporate all comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) during the comment period between April 23, 2008, and June 6, 2008, and to provide responses to these comments. The FEIS provides additional information, analyses, and responses to the comments and questions received on the DEIS. Written comments about the proposed project and the DEIS were received from the general public, various organizations and agencies (see Appendix A). Oral comments on the DEIS were presented at a Public Hearing on May 19, 2008. The City of Rochester's Environmental Commission's Comment Summary/Disposition Recommendations report is provided in Appendix B.

The intent of the FEIS is to address each substantive comment as sufficiently and specifically as possible given the current information developed in the review process to date.

This FEIS has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and its implementing regulations, 6 NYCRR 617, for the Erie Harbor Development. This FEIS is issued and filed by the City of Rochester Director of Zoning as the Lead Agency. This document was also prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Title 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508.

1.1 List of Written Comments

Written comments were received during the public comment period ending on June 6, 2008, from:

Joanne Arany, Executive Director Landmark Society 133 S. Fitzhugh Street Rochester, NY 14608	Steve Baldwin Corn Hill Neighbors Association 133 S. Fitzhugh Street Rochester, NY 14608
Tanya Mooza Zwahlen, AICP 139 Caroline Street Rochester, NY 14620	Maranne McDade Clay 190 Highland Parkway Rochester, NY 14620
John Hart Dennis 82 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620	Mary Ellen Dennis 82 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620
Noel Chavez Integrative Design and Architecture 38 Nelson St. Rochester, NY 14620	R. Bruce Colburn 96 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620

David Halter 161 Caroline Street Rochester, NY 14620	Reverend Judy Lee Hay, Pastor Calvary St. Andrew's Presbyterian Parish 68 Ashland Street Rochester, NY 14620
Christina Jones 210 Linden Street Rochester, NY 14620	Gayle Lynch 42 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620
Abirdirashid Mohamud, President Somali Community Outreach and Education Center	Joni Monroe, AIA, Executive Director Rochester Regional Community Design Center 1115 E. Main Street Rochester, NY 14609
Jayne S. Morgan 25 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620	Nancy O'Donnell 36 Benton Street Rochester, NY 14620
Dan Palmer 248 Pinnacle Rd. Rochester, NY 14620	Lindsay Phillips 66 Crawford St Rochester, NY 14620
Steven Rebholz, Vice Chair City Planning Commission 30 Church Street Rochester, NY 14614	George and Peter Stam 85 San Gabriel Drive Rochester, NY 14610
Joann Thomas, Vice President River Park Commons Tenants Association 265 Mt. Hope Avenue, Apt. 1541 Rochester, NY 14620	John Van Kerkhove 99 Hickory St Rochester, NY 14620
Robert Boyd, Executive Director South Wedge Planning Committee 224 Mount Hope Ave Rochester, NY 14620 (Second correspondence received from Mr. Boyd and cosigned by Lyjha Wilton, Board Chair)	Gary Bogue, President Hickory N.U.T.S.
Form Letters from 120+ residents of the Community;	Form Letters from 6 residents of River Park Commons

Copies of these letters are provided in Appendix A.

1.2 List of Speakers at the May 19, 2008 Public Hearing

Verbal comments were received at the May 19, 2008 Public Hearing from:

Steve Baldwin Corn Hill Neighbors Association 133 S. Fitzhugh Street Rochester, NY 14608	Best Batchateu The Btier Group, LLC 1253 Lyell Avenue Rochester, NY 14606
Robert Boyd, Executive Director South Wedge Planning Committee 224 Mount Hope Ave Rochester, NY 14620	John Hart Dennis 82 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620
David Halter 161 Caroline Street Rochester, NY 14620	Reverend Judy Hay Calvary St. Andrew's Presbyterian Parish 68 Ashland St Rochester, NY 14620
Dan Hurley	Monica McCullough 370 Federick Douglass St Rochester, NY 14608
Nancy Sawyer Molina Coffee Connection 681 South Avenue Rochester, NY 14620	Cheryl Stevens 133 Averill Avenue Rochester, NY 14620
Joann Thomas 265 Mt. Hope Avenue, Apt. 1541 Rochester, NY 14620	

2.0 REVISED SITE PLAN PROPOSAL

Throughout the public comment period, many residents of the South Wedge neighborhood and various organizations offered their comments and concerns about the proposed project. Most noted that the project was needed and worthwhile. Their primary concerns related to the overall design, layout and architectural features of the project. In summary, the major concerns expressed over the proposed site plan include, but were not limited to the following:

- The placement of the proposed buildings does not provide enough integration between the river and the neighborhood;
- The architectural design should blend with the architecture of the community, the design is not consistent with the architecture in the South Wedge;
- The vistas from the diagonal streets are not good and contribute to further separating the new units from the neighborhood;

- The proposed number of parking spots is inadequate for the number and type of housing units proposed; and
- The front facing the river should tell people on the river side that they are welcome into the neighborhood; the Mt. Hope side should have the feel of any street while encouraging the use of the river.

In response to these and other comments, Conifer LLC and its design team developed a new site plan that incorporates as many of these comments as practical, while still realizing the goals and objectives of the Project Sponsor. The new site plan proposal is provided in Figure 1. Various views of the proposed buildings that depict their architectural style proposed, landscaping, internal circulation, parking and the project's overall context with the river and neighborhood are provided in Figures 2-8.

2.1 Revised Design Rationale – Erie Harbor

The following narrative presents the design criteria and rationale prepared by Barton Partners (Project Architect hired by Conifer LLC) to explain the basis for the design of the new site plan pursuant to the Project Sponsor's goals and objectives, site limitations and the collective comments received.

The conceptual design for the proposed project is a response to the site's relationship to the surrounding neighborhood, its proximity to the downtown area and of course the Genesee River. The site's current design is characterized by addressing the river's edge more than the surrounding neighborhood. It thereby acts to cut off the neighborhood from the river's edge. The proposed design attempts to reconnect the neighborhood to the river by inserting view corridors and pedestrian links through the site

The long narrow proportions of the site do not lend themselves to creating a feeling of an intimate community; this is exaggerated by the existing development which resembles a train sitting on a riverside siding, blocking all access to the water. The architectural expression of the existing buildings exacerbates this barrier. A sewer easement that extends the entire length of the site, effectively reducing the developable depth, further constrains site development.

The proposed development, as depicted in Figure 1, bridges the dichotomy between the river front and neighborhood by strengthening the connections across Mt. Hope Avenue (both visual and pedestrian) and referencing the eclectic neighborhood vernacular in the mixed building types and massing.

To enhance the new developments' sense of community, the parcel is divided at the proposed Averill Avenue easement (located along the Averill Avenue axis for the purpose of providing public access to and from the river), into two parts. While the new development exploits the economic advantage of reusing the existing building foundations, the design utilizes a number of smaller buildings to create view corridors. The clustering of these smaller buildings further enhances the sense of community by breaking down the institutional feel created by the existing structure. The connection to the neighborhood is strengthened with the additional view corridors and pedestrian access through the site. A hierarchy is created for these corridors; major connections are made at the southern and northern ends and at Averill Street, whilst secondary connections are made at Hamilton and Hickory.

Within the project itself, the connection to the river is enhanced by providing many of the units with direct views of the river. Ground floor units are raised not only to provide a sense of privacy, but also so that the views from these units are not obstructed by an existing berm. Units are also afforded a view of the city where possible, with some of the townhomes incorporating roof-top decks.

A conscious effort was made to bound the southern end of the site by mirroring the high-rise Hamilton building that anchors the northern end with a new mid-rise building at the southern end. This ensures a strong identity to the site by positively defining the limits of the development.

The contemporary architectural style of the new development was chosen to bridge the connection between the modern feel of the city center and the more traditional, yet pleasantly urban feel of the South Wedge community. While the architectural style of the neighborhood was not literally interpreted, the row-home like pattern created by the building's proposed fenestration and massing reflect the form of a traditional urban residential neighborhood.

The buildings reference the Craftsman, Victorian and Queen Anne styles prominent in the South Wedge community with their interpretation of the asymmetrical massing, corner towers, shaded recessed entries, broad porches and their soft warm color palette.

We believe that the design, both in plan and massing, creates a vibrant and exciting project that reflects positively upon the Greater Rochester and South Wedge Communities as they move into the 21st Century. The architecture celebrates the future and Rochester's forward evolution. We have made great efforts to meet the community's goals and objectives and feel that we have created a design that they can embrace.

3.0 RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

All of the written and oral comments received were reviewed and categorized by the City of Rochester’s Environmental Commission. Responses are provided to those respective comments in accordance with the Comment Summary/Description Recommendations Report provided in Appendix B.

It is important to note that the responses provided are based upon the new site plan presented in Section 2.0 and Figure 1.

3.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
1. Would like to know why it [market rate/subsidized unit ratio] can't be 50/50 unit instead of 80/20?	Thomas	The development plan is based upon a Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Rochester and Conifer that specified an 80-20 project. The 80-20 model, 80% market rate and 20% affordable, has been established as standard for mixed income communities. It is also accepted by the lenders that are financing the redevelopment plan.
2. Patios on the first floor and balconies on the rest would encourage usage of the river side.	Halter	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
3. There was no attempt to discuss how the project will benefit the South Wedge neighborhood.	Boyd, Baldwin	The project will benefit the South Wedge Neighborhood by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of the current failed and blighting development and replacement with a unique and contemporary development. • Influx of an economically diverse community. • Enhancement of public access to the River and Genesee Gateway Park • Increase in population of residents to increase patronage of the local businesses.
4. There are two adjacent park lands – one is the river trail and the other is the city park north of the high rise. There is no discussion in the EIS of how the project incorporates the park for the benefit of the residents.	Boyd, Baldwin	The development provides enhanced access to the park for the community and likewise, the new residents will benefit from their proximity to parkland.

<p>5. In Figure 7, is it assumed that the limits of the Former Railroad are the same as the limits of the Brownfield Cleanup area? It's unclear what the boundaries of the cleanup area are on this map. If the area of cleanup goes beyond the property line, is Conifer responsible for all areas of cleanup within the cleanup program limits? What's the relationship between this Figure and Figure 21?</p>	<p>Rebholz</p>	<p>Figure 7 in the DEIS shows the property line of Erie Harbor. The property line is the limit of the Brownfield Cleanup Program. Figure 7 in the DEIS also shows some of the historic uses, such as the former railroad. Conifer is only responsible for cleanup activities within the Brownfield Cleanup Program Limits. Figure 21 in the DEIS shows the property line (Program Limit Line) and proposed areas of remedial activity. The legend further defines the type of proposed remedial activity. Attached is a tax map of the site from the City of Rochester, which shows the property line. (Figure 7a)</p>
<p>6. The retention of the tower is inconsistent with a good design plan. This building has no architectural merit and cannot possibly be in a better condition than the other buildings which have been deemed unsuitable for habitation or rehab.</p>	<p>Jones</p>	<p>No Response Required - not a substantive issue</p>

3.2 ARCHITECTURAL AND/OR SITE DESIGN

COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
<p>1. All of the proposed buildings have the same architecture and height with variation in color only. This is a modernization of what is there today.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin Letters from 120+ residents, Colburn, O'Donnell, Bogue, Monroe, Thomas, Jones, Mohamud, Hay</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal addresses this issue. See the Architect's Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>
<p>2. The architectural design should blend with the architecture of the community. This could mean height, roof styles, doorways, massing and space between buildings. The singular design is not consistent with the varied architectural styles in the Wedge.</p>	<p>Halter, Boyd, Morgan, Baldwin, Lynch, Hay, Van Kerkhove, Jones, Letters from 120+ residents, O'Donnell, Bogue, Mooza Zwahlen</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal features flat roofs that are reflective of many of the buildings on Mt. Hope. The eclectic nature of the architecture of the South Wedge does not lend itself to modern interpretation. The Revised Proposal presents a variation in building height, massing and spacing. See the Architect's Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>

3. The buildings do not integrate the river or the neighborhood.	Boyd, Baldwin, Lynch, Thomas, Mohamud, Monroe, Jones, Letters from 120+	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
4. The vistas that are perpendicular to Mt. Hope are good. The vistas from the diagonal streets are not good and contribute to further separating the new units from the neighborhood.	Letters from 120+ residents, O'Donnell	In the Revised Proposal vistas are highlighted along the diagonals. Perpendicular vistas are maintained in 3 out of 4 locations.
5. The buildings should tie together so that walking is encouraged from end to end and out to the river.	Halter	A sidewalk along the buildings can be located in the Revised Proposal. Clearly delineated walkways connect to the river.
6. The front facing the river should tell people on the river side that they are welcome [into the neighborhood]	Halter	In the Revised Proposal, a central plaza provides a welcoming passage to and from the river.
7. The river side should encourage people to walk to the river and use the park land as a front yard.	Halter	Same as #6. Most of the apartments have balconies.
8. The Mt. Hope side should have the feel of any street, with the five functions of an urban street. A street whose width is tied to the height of the building. On curb parking to form a semi-wall. Curb lawns with trees. Front lawns. Semi-permeable building faces with windows and doors of human scale.	Halter, Letters from 120+ residents, O'Donnell	In the Revised Proposal, the townhouse buildings which represent 80% of the frontage are 3-story. This is scaled more closely to other buildings on the street. Mt. Hope is in the process of a realignment that will provide on-street parking. Landscaping will add additional lawn area along with street trees along the Avenue. The townhouses will provide individual entryways for a more human-scale.
9. We might even consider having parking on the river side to follow the urban feel	Halter	In the Revised Proposal there is sufficient parking in the site plan that permits the River side of the site to remain green. All apartment entrances face Mt. Hope.
10. There should be no more than a five minute walk to any destination. This would include stores, bus transit, bike racks, bars, the river.	Halter	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
11. The river is and should be the major selling point of these buildings. Everything should point to the river and should encourage the use of the river.	Halter	No Response Required - not a substantive issue

<p>12. The roof lines are similar to those seen in the neighborhood however in the neighborhood they are at different heights. The proposed buildings have a flat façade without porches and detail which are seen throughout the South Wedge. The six over one window scheme is more similar to a Tudor style than Victorian. The neighborhood consists primarily of four over four, four over one and one over one window designs</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal has varying rooflines height. It includes porches with a varied façade. See the Architect’s Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>
<p>13. The architectural style attempts to use single family vernacular and apply it to a multi-family building. There are other examples of existing multi-family architecture that may serve as a better model (477 South Avenue or 16 to 24 Walton Street)</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal provides a contemporary approach to townhouses and multifamily houses. See the Architect’s Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>
<p>14. The design and site plan do not effectively tie into the adjacent tower nor is there any attempt to explain how it does.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal’s design includes an “L” shaped multi-story apartment building on the south end of the site. This acts, in conjunction with the tower, as a “Bookend”. A unified color scheme will integrate the Erie Harbor Development with the Hamilton. See Figure 4 of the FEIS.</p>
<p>15. The proposed is not of “people” scale.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin, Letters from 120+ residents, Colburn, Van Kerkhove, O’Donnell, Bogue</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal offers a people-scale plaza. Most of the frontage is 3-story with individual entrances to the units.</p>
<p>16. The terminal vistas perpendicular to Mt. Hope provided are wide but not inviting. The vistas are limited from the diagonal streets (Hamilton, Averill and Hickory). Improved vistas on the diagonal will provide better connectivity between the neighborhood and the project. There was no discussion of how these were determined or how they improve the connectivity of the neighborhood or to the river.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin, Bogue</p>	<p>All three diagonal vistas have been enhanced in the Revised Proposal. The central terminal vista has been transformed into a pedestrian plaza. See the Architect’s Design Rationale (Section 2.1).</p>

<p>17. There is a concern that the applicant has drawn a final conclusion that existing foundations must be re-used and that new foundations are cost prohibitive. The Preliminary Geotechnical Analysis stresses that the “general parameters are preliminary.” The additional cost to the project as described in 4.3.3 assumes that the alternatives would not re-use any of the existing foundations. Alternatives should be developed that consider some new foundations along with the substantial reuse of existing foundations to allow building placement to better address Mt. Hope Avenue.</p>	<p>Rebholz, Chavez, Palmer</p>	<p>The applicant has considered the economic impact of reuse of existing foundation and has determined that to the greatest extent feasible they should be reused. The Project Sponsor, however, recognizes the merits of moving of the foundations to connect the development to the street. This can be seen in the Revised Proposal.</p>
<p>18. Maintaining parking along the Mt. Hope Avenue frontage is undesirable. If the proposed buildings are better sited then the parking can be located between buildings. It is even less desirable to place parking along the river.</p>	<p>Rebholz</p>	<p>No Response Required - not a substantive issue</p>
<p>19. Proposed building footprint is huge and still presents a dividing line between the River and the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Hay, Baldwin, Bogue</p>	<p>No Response Required - not a substantive issue</p>
<p>20. The views of the site from across the River are very important.</p>	<p>McCullough</p>	<p>The views from the west side of the River have been considered in the Revised Proposal. The five-story building on the south side of the site helps balance the site with respect to The Hamilton Tower. Breaks between the buildings provide greenspace that can be seen from the west.</p>
<p>21. Shorten up the buildings and rotate them to open up views to the River.</p>	<p>Hurley</p>	<p>In the Revised Proposal buildings at key location are rotated to open up views of the river.</p>
<p>22. The proposed placement and configuration of the buildings does not provide enough interaction between the neighborhood and the river.</p>	<p>Arany, Mooza Zwahlen</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal highlights the diagonal vistas. The central promenade provides a focus for interaction and connectivity with the neighborhood and the river.</p>
<p>23. The current and proposed massing (even with its breaks and openings) and orientation of the buildings parallel with the river creates a wall effect that implies that the river along the site is private property and inaccessible to the general public.</p>	<p>Arany</p>	<p>In the Revised Proposal signage, landscape and sculptural elements will make clear where access will be encouraged and the presence of a public park (Genesee Gateway Park). See the Architect’s Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>

<p>24. The proposed design of the housing units, although sympathetic in its fenestration, does not reflect the architecture and historic character of the neighborhood. There is no variation of design, massing, scale or materials from building to building; the repetition of the same design gives the development the appearance of a suburban apartment complex rather than a new-urbanist redevelopment project in a historic urban neighborhood. Each building could benefit from a variation of design, materials and color and could provide further variety by incorporation two, three and four story products. The variations in height could also serve to meet the project's density requirement while reducing the footprint of some of the buildings to accomplish more substantial news from the neighborhood and from Mt. Hope Avenue.</p>	<p>Arany</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal provides variation and massing. There will be a five-story building, five three-story buildings and a two-story clubhouse. See the Architect's Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>
<p>25. We urge a revision of the plan to decrease the size of the project from 12 buildings to 9 to open up the River vista.</p>	<p>Hay</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal development has been reduced to seven buildings.</p>
<p>26. Landscaping attention should be given on Mt. Hope to reduce the visual impact of the proposed parking lot.</p>	<p>Hay</p>	<p>In the Revised Proposal, landscaping and architectural elements will be used to help reduce the visual impact of the parking lot.</p>
<p>27. The design is largely inconsistent with the tenets set forth in the South Wedge Design Guidelines. Section 2.5 suggests that this design plan is consistent with the South Wedge Revitalization Plan. (See below**)</p>	<p>Jones</p>	<p>Consultation with Robert Boyd, Executive Director of the South Wedge Planning Committee, revealed that the Committee is pleased with the Revised Proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The existing residents have been adequately accommodated. - The parking supply has been increased to a ratio closer to 2 spaces per unit. - The access to the River is substantially improved. - The contemporary design is unique and compliments the character of the South Wedge. - Varied roof heights are part of the revised proposal. <p>He added, however, that the quality of the facade materials, architectural details and</p>

		landscaping must be scrutinized to ensure a quality residential development.
28. Varying the design of each building in some manner, would also be more consistent with the flavor of the neighborhood, and would serve to alleviate the monotony of a string of twelve identical buildings in a row.	Jones	In the Revised Proposal the buildings will have varying heights and orientation to the street.
29. The setback from Mt. Hope Avenue, with parking in between the building and the street, creates a suburban feel that is also inconsistent with the character of the commercial district up the street and on block over on South Ave. There should be more consideration given to bringing this project closer to Mt. Hope Avenue to remain consistent with the design guidelines [City Zoning Code].	Jones	The existing 30 feet sewer easement precludes siting of buildings at the street line. However, the Revised Proposal brings a portion of the buildings as close to the street as possible.
30. Given the importance of the site, we question the proposed layout of the buildings and the site plan, which seem to be limited by a requirement to construct the new structures on existing building foundations. The configuration and layout of the buildings in the current plan, the repetitiveness of their form, shape size and architectural detailing and character could be markedly improved. Some of the buildings could be reoriented and positioned in a less monotonous manner. Some could be moved closer to the road alleviating the extreme linear quality of the parking areas, offering some welcome interruption in the relentless and suburban-like lots along the street that are currently featured in the plan. Opportunities for variety in color and detailing and consideration of the context of the design of the structures should be further explored. We believe that there are many positive aspects of the site and its surroundings that should inform this project and its design.	Monroe	The Revised Proposal provides variety of orientation to the street and moves off the foundations at key locations. See Architect's Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).
31. Regarding function and scale, there is possibility for mixed use and higher density. The community building should be, at the very least, two or three stories in height with apartment or commercial space in the upper floors. The carriage house buildings might be made into live-work	Monroe	The development of commercial space is not part of the project sponsor's program for which Federal, State and Local funding is being allocated. In addition, a mixed-use development would increase parking demand at the

<p>units with commercial space on the ground floor instead of garages for cars. Widening spaces between the buildings, creating attractive and interesting pathways in the interstitial spaces in between that allow people to get to the river and finding opportunities for axial connections to pedestrian crossing intersections would create views and effective access to the riverfront.</p>		<p>site, limiting density, and the influx of residents at this site at the density being proposed can only help the struggling businesses that already exist in the South Wedge. In the Revised Proposal the community building is now two stories with the primary community space on the second floor with vistas of the sky line and the River. The central plaza provides key axial public space and access to the River.</p>
<p>32. Realign Mt. Hope Avenue closer to the River. The existing side streets would be extended to meet the relocated Mt. Hope Avenue. This new alternative would effectively integrate this site into the neighborhood as well as offer a structured framework to the neighborhood street pattern. This structured street pattern would also act as active corridors from the neighborhood to the riverfront.</p>	<p>Stam</p>	<p>Realignment of Mt. Hope Avenue closer to the River would require a substantial level of municipal capital improvement. This alternative has not been explored, as this type of funding is not available. The proposal does not preclude this alternative for the future.</p>
<p>33. The proposed design of the low rise residential units is neither reflective of any of the architectural styles prevalent in the South Wedge neighborhood or of the existing high-rise building which will be immediately adjacent. The new residential units have no clear, identifiable historic architectural style nor are they contemporary. (Two Examples of excellent design are presented in the commenter’s letter.) The City should be looking for a design reflective of the recommendations of the recent “City-wide Rochester Housing Study.” One such recommendation is, “As a ‘City of Design,’ Rochester would set an innovative example in promoting housing designs that blend with the context yet provide a contemporary and optimistic viewpoint of the City’s future. Creativity will be expected and architectural experimentation should be encouraged and appreciated.”</p>	<p>Chavez</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal is guided by the principal that its design should provide an optimistic viewpoint on the City’s future. The examples provided by the commentator were considered in the development of Revised Proposal. See the Architect’s Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>

<p>34. From our perspective on the west bank of the river, the new project will have a similar effect as the existing one of serving as a barrier between the South Wedge and the river and Corn Hill. The spaces between the buildings and the confusing network of sidewalks do little to improve the perception of “keep out.” The new units do have balconies over looking the river, but there is still this confusing network of walks if a resident actually wants to take a walk along the river bank. We want our neighborhoods to be open and inviting, not gated communities.</p>	<p>Baldwin</p>	<p>In the Revised Proposal clear delineation of access points, breaks between building and shorter buildings will serve to break the barrier that exists now.</p>
<p>35. The building design and minimal parking will not attract the rental candidate they expect for the market rate units. There are enough units available in the city currently, that tenants can expect something special for their money. I am sure that with little additional cost it would be possible to make some design changes that would address all o f these concerns.</p>	<p>Baldwin</p>	<p>No Response Required - outside DEIS purview</p>
<p>36. Today we feel isolated from the neighborhood, the river and our neighbors. I hope that the new development will create a neighborhood and be tied to the South Wedge and the river.</p>	<p>Letters from 6 residents of River Park Commons</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal is better tied to the South Wedge. See the Architect’s Design Rationale (Section 2.1 above).</p>

3.3 USE/DENSITY:

COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
<p>1. The South Wedge neighborhood is a mix of residential and commercial. A Central City Zoning designation also envisions a mix of business, commercial and residential. There is no commercial included nor is there any discussion as to why there is none. Where are the commercial/business venues that would provide residents and visitors with dining and shopping along one of the most valuable assets that this City has, the Genesee River?</p>	<p>Morgan, Baldwin, Boyd, M. Dennis, Letters from 120+ residents, Lynch, Colburn, Van Kerkhove, Jones, O’Donnell, Bogue</p>	<p>A mixed-use development at the site would be much more parking intensive. This would limit the density. It is contemplated that the redevelopment of the site would spur commercial development on the east side of Mt. Hope. See response to #31 above.</p>
<p>2. The layout of the parking relative to the housing units may present an inconvenience and perceived security risk for tenants thus potentially impacting the success of the project.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin</p>	<p>No Response Required - not a substantive issue</p>

3. The current project is not consistent with the adjacent neighborhood or the intent of the CCD classification.	Boyd, Baldwin	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
4. Less density in housing, all three stories high, built in a row marching down Mt. Hope Avenue will create an isolated environment, which will still not encourage neighborhood use of the river, or ever be part of our community.	J. Dennis, Morgan	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
5. Over the last few years the South Wedge has been finally growing as a successful Urban Village. If this project is not designed properly that growth will stop. We need this project to become part of our neighborhood. We need reasons for going there. It needs commercial opportunities.	J. Dennis, Morgan, M. Dennis	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
6. There should be commercial hubs at both ends of the development.	J. Dennis	See answer to #1 above.

3.4 PUBLIC ACCESS:

COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
1. The site plan should provide easy, pedestrian-friendly access to the river from Mt. Hope Avenue. The configuration of the sidewalks is confusing and unwelcoming. Ideally, access lanes should be created that are a continuation of each of these streets, to extend them down to the riverfront, instead of the confusing maze of walkways shown in the current plan.	Halter, Boyd, Baldwin, Hay, Hurley, Molina, McCullough, M. Dennis, Letters from 120+ residents, Lynch, Monroe, Jones, Thomas, Mohamud, Colburn, Van Kerkhove, Jones, O'Donnell, Bogue, Mooza Zwahlen	The proposed plan provides for a central plaza and promenade along the continuation of Averill Avenue axis. This will be the focal point of the development and the primary access lane. The project sponsor will formalize one or more public access easements through the site.
2. It is concerning that the proposal for the River Commons area does not provide an aesthetic bridge between existing neighborhood residences and businesses with the waterfront.	Phillips	See above answer.

3.5 PARKING:

COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
1. The proposed number of parking spots is inadequate for the number and type of housing units being proposed.	Letters from 120+ residents, Colburn, Jones, O'Donnell, Bogue, Monroe, Thomas, Mohamud, Baldwin	The proposed plan increases the parking ratio to 1.9-1.

<p>2. The street parking of 93 is questionable. These spots should not be considered in the adequacy of parking for the new units. These spots are shared with visitors to the park, customers of current and future businesses and residents on the east side of Mt. Hope. Some of these spots will be eliminated to provide for bus stops. Additionally visitors and any overflow from the Tower will be parking on the street.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin</p>	<p>Inclusion of the count is intended for information only. The on-street spaces are not included in the calculation of the ratio of 1.9-1.</p>
<p>3. Assuming 2 (parking spaces) for market rate apartments that would be 160 on site spots and assuming 1 for affordable that would be 20+ on site spots needed excluding visitors. That would indicate a shortage of at least 34 spaces.</p>	<p>Boyd, Baldwin</p>	<p>The proposed parking layout provides sufficient parking for the mix of affordable and market rate units.</p> $\frac{104 \text{ market rate units} \times 2 \text{ spaces} + 26 \text{ affordable units} \times 1 \text{ space}}{230} = 246 \text{ spaces}$ <p>Proposed Spaces = 246 spaces</p>
<p>4. Concerned about overflow parking on adjacent streets.</p>	<p>Stevens, M. Dennis, Hay, Bogue, Phillips</p>	<p>No Response Required - not a substantive issue</p>
<p>5. What about underground parking or a parking garage?</p>	<p>M. Dennis</p>	<p>The proposed design includes 43 spaces beneath the proposed apartment building.</p>

3.6 ANTIDISPLACEMENT PLAN		
COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
<p>1. The proposed anti-displacement plan does not go far enough to provide for the residents. The residents have been there between 4 and 30 years. Many of them have become part of the neighborhood – the plan should specifically address how to keep them in the neighborhood if they desire.</p>	<p>Mohamud, Thomas, Boyd, Baldwin, , Hay, Batchateu, M. Dennis, Letters from 120+ residents, Lynch, Colburn, Van Kerkhove, O'Donnell, Bogue, Mooza Zwahlen, Letters from 6 residents</p>	<p>The relocation plan provides for relocation counselors to assist residents in finding housing of their choice. This includes exploring available units within the South Wedge and neighboring communities. The South Wedge Planning Committee, prior to the start of the relocation activity, convened regular meetings with tenant advocacy groups, the Riverpark tenants Association, other neighborhood organizations and the relocation consultant to ensure a smooth and fair relocation process. Activities also included informational meetings with local</p>

		South Wedge landlords.
2. The plan does not provide a process to give existing residents priority to return to the new income qualified units.	Mohamud, Thomas, Boyd, Baldwin, Hay, Molina, Batchateu, M. Dennis, Letters from 120+ residents, O'Donnell, Bogue, Letters from 6 residents	The plan does provide existing residents priority to return to new income qualified units.
3. A large number of Somalian families live there. Provision needs to be made to keep them together as much as possible and to provide necessary translation services for all displaced residents.	Mohamud, Thomas, Boyd, Baldwin, Hay, Batchateu, Lynch, Letters from 120+ residents, O'Donnell, Letters from 6 residents	A Somali Representative is a consultant to the relocation team. One of the relocation team's goals is to identify apartment complexes and communities that have a Somali population and can accommodate Somali residents of River Park.
4. Riverpark Commons is like a "village" to the Somalies who live there so they want to come back to the new development. They need a community center where they can come back "home."	Batchateu	No Response Required - not a substantive issue

3.7 ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS:

COMMENTS	COMMENTER	RESPONSE
1. An analysis of or reasons for eliminating the other alternatives needs to be provided.	Rebholz	Because of public and agency comments, a new design has emerged as the Preferred Alternative that is intended to respond to concerns and issues.
2. The EIS did not address the potential use of an R-3 designation.	Boyd/Wilton	Refer to Section 4.4.1 of the DEIS. R-3 would require significant variances and would limit the use of certain funding sources that could make this project more successful.
3. The developer should consider CCD-Riverfront for the proposed zoning district. The purpose of this district is to promote the river, provide access to the river and reduce the barrier effect.	Boyd/Wilton	CCD -Riverfront the preferred alternative to be considered by the City Planning Commission and City Council.

3.8 MISCELLANEOUS:

1. Figure 9 indicates three view sheds toward the project from neighboring streets, but there are only two renderings. A rendering of a view from Hickory Street needs to be provided.	Rebholz	The FEIS provides a variety of renderings that illustrate the Revised Proposal. See Figures 2-8 of the FEIS.
2. Figure 13 is a cross section, but there is no map to indicate where the cross section is located.	Rebholz	N/A – due to Revised Proposal
3. The historical significance of the buildings should be explored before demolition occurs. While we are not advocating their preservation, and we are aware that they are less than 50 years old, there still may be some historic significance in the development as a whole as it relates to larger development patterns, specifically Urban Renewal and public housing.	Arany	No Response Required - not a substantive issue
4. The inclusion of state and federal funding in this project subjects it to review by the Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation. This agency is not listed as an involved agency for this project.	Jones	The State Historic Preservation Officer is not an Involved Agency as defined by the State Environmental Quality Review regulations (NYCRR Part 617). SHPO was consulted and the subsequent correspondence is included in the FEIS appendix C.
5. The close proximity of a listed State and National Historic District, the Mt. Hope-Highland Historic District; and another that has been approved for listing, the Linden-South Historic District, should also be a factor in the design consideration.	Jones, McDade Clay	No Response Required – this is not a substantive issue. The historic districts are not in close proximity to the project site.
6. The FEIS should include the production of a three-dimensional (“sketch up”) model of the site. This will help everyone understand the proportions, massing, the vistas, access to the river and the integration with the neighborhood.	Boyd/Wilton, Hay, Thomas, Mohamud, Monroe, Jones, Baldwin	The Revised Proposal provides a variety of renderings that illustrate the project, including 3-dimensional sketch-ups. See Figures 2-8 of the FEIS.
7. An additional public hearing prior to the final acceptance of the EIS should be held due to the significant impact on the community of this project.	Boyd/Wilton, Hay, Thomas, Mohamud, Monroe, Jones, Baldwin	No additional hearings will be held on the Environmental Impact Statement. Public hearings are, however, conducted by the City Planning Commission and City Council with regard to the rezoning.

<p>8. The developer should establish a community design team to obtain input as the project progresses. This will keep the project moving faster and lead to better integration with the neighborhood. The team should include representatives with different backgrounds and skills.</p>	<p>Boyd/Wilton, Hay, Thomas, Mohamud, Monroe, Jones, Baldwin</p>	<p>No Response Required - outside DEIS purview</p>
<p>9. It is incumbent upon the City of Rochester to responsibly steward the public funds the City has received for both preservation and urban renewal projects, including Main Street Revitalization funds for the South Wedge neighborhood. This responsibility must be considered when evaluating and approving any proposed development, particularly if the City of Rochester is to remain eligible and competitive for public funding in the future.</p>	<p>McDade Clay</p>	<p>No Response Required - outside DEIS purview</p>
<p>10. As a municipality in receipt of public funds for preservation and rehabilitation projects, the City must require private development to contribute towards and complement publicly funded efforts in order to ensure and maintain the planned vision and preservation of our neighborhoods, main streets, river access and historic landmarks.</p>	<p>McDade Clay</p>	<p>No Response Required - outside DEIS purview</p>
<p>11. Has anyone noticed the questionable scale and design are very similar to the Brooks Landing project? Why are we building another set of “River Wall” buildings at the end of S. Plymouth? Is everything based on maximum profit at the cost of quality and civic responsibility?</p>	<p>Palmer</p>	<p>The Revised Proposal is substantially different from Corn Hill and does not propose to create a wall between the community and the River.</p>

FIGURES

APPENDICES