City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester
Preservation Board

April 15, 2016

Mr. Andy Ocasio
66 Park Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to legalize the replacement of front walkway, steps and, to replace metal railings with wooden railings, and to add a walkway across the front yard.

On the premises at:	66 Park Avenue
Zoning District:	R-2/O-B Medium-Density Residential District With Boutique Overlay East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-035-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	D. Beardslee Approved as presented (motion) B. McLear Aye (second) E. Cain Aye C. Carretta Aye J. Dobbs Aye J. Schick Aye B. Mayer Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of April 6, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as presented.

A building permit is required to install the new handrails and to legalize the steps. This may be obtained at the Buildings & Zoning office, room 121B in City Hall. A copy of your drawings are on file there.

For questions or concerns, please contact Peter Siegrist of my staff at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

Filing Date: 2016 APR 20 AM 11:13
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

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. At its hearing on February 3, 2016, the Board found that the main walkway and front steps are appropriate to the visual historic character of the property and preservation district, but that the metal handrails and stone landing are not. The Board found that the railings are too thin and the stone landing is too massive. It directed the applicant to work with City staff to find solutions.

C. Owner Andy Ocasio testified that his contractor was unable to attend but that he had worked with City staff to prepare the drawings now before the Board. The drawings show that the metal guardrails would be replaced with heavier ones more in keeping with the Park Avenue area. The new guardrails would be wood or synthetic material like Trex© and be painted white. A metal handrail would be mounted on the inside of each guardrail to comply with commercial building codes.

D. Mr. Ocasio proposed to install short guardrails between the top newel posts and the columns to close the gap. The railings would be angled, because the posts and columns are offset from one another. City staff had recommended against this, since angled railings are not a traditional detail. Instead, staff had suggested leaving this small gap open, with the required metal handrail extension providing a barrier. Code official Raymond stated that since the landing is less than 30" above the surrounding grade, the guardrail is not required by code.

E. Mr. Ocasio proposed to install guardrails between the porch columns and the house, rather than filling the gap with planters as City staff had suggested.

F. Mr. Ocasio requested approval to add a narrow walkway across the front lawn, made of pavers to match the new front walk.

G. There were no public speakers.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the proposal to retain the stone steps and landing, install guardrails on the steps and landing, and install a paver walkway across the front yard, is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and district.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of previous and existing conditions
C - Photographs of staff suggestions
D - Elevation of steps and landing
E - Plan of walkway across yard
F - Appearance by Andy Ocasio
G - Site visits by Board members

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester
Preservation Board

April 15, 2016

Mr. Shawn Lessord
Renewable Rochester
780 Ridge Road
Webster, NY 14580

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install 30 solar panels on the garage roof and 13 on the house roof.

On the premises at:	780 University Avenue
Zoning District:	R-2 Medium-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-037-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	J. Dobbs — Approve as submitted (motion) B. Mayer — Aye (second) B. McLear — Aye E. Cain — Aye C. Carretta — Aye J. Schick — Aye D. Beardslee — Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of April 6, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as submitted. A building permit and a separate electrical permit have been issued.

For questions or concerns, please contact Peter Siegrist of my staff at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

Filing Date: 2016 APR 20 AM 11:14
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

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. Solar installer Shawn Lessord testified that the plan he presented to the Board in March included 30 panels on the house but none on the garage. Board members were opposed to seeing panels from the street, and requested a different plan. Now, Mr. Lessord proposes to install 30 panels on the garage and just 13 on the house. The panels on the garage would be slightly tilted up, about 10-15 degrees from level, and be barely visible. Those on the house would be at the rear, northeastern corner of the roof, and not be visible from the street. The panels would be all black, with a black back sheet, black cells and black frame.

C. There were no public speakers.

D. Board member Dobbs praised Mr. Lessord's skills in rendering the panels realistically.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the proposal, as presented, is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Schematic roof plan
C - Photosimulation of panels on house and garage
D - Catalog sheets of panels, inverter and racking system
E - Appearance by Shawn Lessord
F - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2016 rpb\decisions\april 6, 2016\a-037-15-16.docx

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester
Preservation Board

April 15, 2016

Mr. Josh Kneer
Rochester Zen Center
7 Arnold Park
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace slate roofing on the carriage house cupola with asphalt shingles, and to remove dormer details.

On the premises at:	5-7 Arnold Park
Zoning District:	R-2 Medium-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-040-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	D. Beardslee Denied (motion) J. Dobbs Nay (second) E. Cain Nay C. Carretta Nay B. McLear Nay J. Schick Nay B. Mayer Nay

Please take notice that at its hearing of April 6, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board DENIED your application. Therefore, the slate roofing of the cupola cannot be replaced with asphalt shingles, and the metal details cannot be removed. As always, the Preservation Board encourages repair, rather than removal, of historic details.

For questions or concerns, please contact Peter Siegrist of my staff at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

2016 APR 20 AM 11:14
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
Filing 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. Applicant Josh Kneer testified that the Zen Center seeks approval to replace the damaged slate roofing on the cupola with asphalt shingles to match those on the carriage house roof, and to remove the metal dormer-like details on the cupola. He stated that some slates are missing and some are broken, allowing rainwater into the structure. He estimated the cost to install GAF "Camelot 2" asphalt shingles would be about $6,000, and that the slate would be somewhat more. Contractor Charles Cook has worked on the campus before, and may be hired to do this work.

C. Board members commented that the cupola is very visible from surrounding areas and is a truly special feature of the property and the preservation district. Members felt that installing asphalt shingles may be acceptable, but that removing the metal details would greatly change the cupola's character.

D. Staff noted that the ridges of the cupola roof would have had metal caps, and these are missing, thus allowing water into the wood framing. Mr. Kneer stated that he climbed up inside the space and found it to be solid, but water is getting in.

E. Staff noted that if asphalt shingles are used, the ridges would have 'cap' shingles, which lay across the ridges. The ridges would not be as sharp edged as the slate ones, and the intersection of the caps at the peak would look messy. Members commented that the cupola looks too delicate to have this type of look.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that removing the slate and details would degrade the architectural integrity of the cupola and therefore is not appropriate to the historic visual character of the building and site.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of existing conditions
C - Catalog sheet of roof shingles
D - Letters from the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association and Jim Aimers and Donald Symer
E - Appearance by Josh Kneer
F - Site visits by Board members

City of Rochester
City Hall Room 125B, 30 Church Street
Rochester, New York 14614-1290
www.cityofrochester.gov

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester
Preservation Board

April 15, 2016

Ms. Andrea Gordon
1009 Park Avenue
Rochester, NY 14610

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a 6'H wood fence around the rear yard.

On the premises at:	1009 Park Avenue
Zoning District:	R-1 Low-Density Residential District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-041-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	B. Mayer — Approved as presented (motion) D. Beardslee — Aye (second) E. Cain — Aye C. Carretta — Aye J. Dobbs — Aye J. Schick — Aye B. McLear — Aye

Please take notice that at its hearing of April 6, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED your application as presented.

A fence permit is required to install the fence. This may be obtained at the Buildings & Zoning office, room 121B in City Hall. A copy of your drawing is on file there.

For questions or concerns, please contact Peter Siegrist of my staff at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

Filing Date: 2016 APR 20 AM 11:14
RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE

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. Applicant Andrea Gordon testified that she has a new dog, and that she has found can collectors and neighbors in her back yard. She would like to install a stockade fence to control access. The fence would jog around large trees at the back corners, creating inaccessible spaces behind. She would install gates or removable panels to reach these areas from her side.

C. Member McLear noted that the carport has a distinctive look, and running the fence tight to the back side, as drawn, would affect the appearance. He recommended starting the fence at the southeast corner of the house, rather than at the carport.

D. There were no public speakers.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that the fence, as presented, is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and district.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of backyard
C - Site plan showing fence location
D - Catalog sheet of fence
E - Appearance by Andrea Gordon
F - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2016 rpb\decisions\april 6, 2016\a-041-15-16.docx