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

one city ROCHESTER

Rochester
Preservation Board

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 MAY 19 PM 3:36

May 12, 2015

Mr. Walter Cavatassi
350 Fairport Road
East Rochester, NY 14445

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a fence with a 6'H wood fence, remove a tree at the northwest corner, and replace paving and a walkway.

On the premises at: 28 Sibley Place

Zoning District: R-2 Medium-Density Residential District
East Avenue Preservation District

Application Number: A-011-15-16

Record of Vote(s):

Install Fence		Remove Tree	
B. Mayer	Approve (motion)	B. Mayer	Deny (motion)
J. Dobbs	Aye (second)	J. Dobbs	Deny (second)
D. Beardslee	Aye	D. Beardslee	Deny
E. Cain	Aye	E. Cain	Deny
B. McLear	Absent	B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent	C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent	J. Schick	Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED installation of a wood fence but DENIED removal of a tree. The Board found that paving a parking lot and replacing a walkway are repairs not needing the Board's review.

In addition to this approval, a fence permit is required. This may be obtained at the Buildings & Zoning office, room 121B in City Hall. No permits are needed for the parking lot and walkway, provided they are not reconfigured or enlarged.

For questions or comments, please contact with 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:

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 Pat Cavatassi testified that the renovations to the building where put on hold when her husband suffered an accident. They would like to restart the project, beginning with improvements to the land. Their first request is to replace a stockade fence with a new board fence, which would help reduce trespassing. It would be pressure-treated wood, and would be stained dark after a year of weathering. A chain link fence along the west side would remain, as it appears to belong to the city-owned Goodwin Park (Mrs. Cavatassi has ordered a survey to confirm this). The second request is to add 2½" of asphalt topping on the existing parking lot and replace a walkway. And the third request is to remove a Black Locust tree at the northwest corner of the building. Mrs. Cavatassi explained that while she doesn't favor tree removal, this one is large and messy. She said that it drops small leaves on the building and cars, and is pushing up the pavement. She considered having it trimmed, but that doesn't resolve the cracked pavement.

C. John Lembach, speaking for the board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, opposed the application. He stated that the 'application pending' sign is not posted, so that neighbors may not know of the hearing. He said that he has several Locust trees and appreciates the problem, but said that he trims them to limit their impact. He suggested reorienting the parking layout to allow the tree to remain, and cutting back the surrounding asphalt. And he asked that the fence posts be specified.

D. Mrs. Cavatassi responded, stating that the sign had been installed at the beginning of the project but must have been inadvertently removed. She said that the tree's small leaves form a blanket on the parking lot that causes problems for tenants. She said that there are many other trees on the property that would remain. And she said that the fence posts would be 4 x 4s, including those along the Sibley Street side.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board determined that the fence, as proposed, is appropriate to the historic visual character of the preservation district, but that removing the tree is not appropriate. Board members urged the applicant to remove pavement around the tree to allow room for the tree to grow. The Board determined that repaving the parking lot and replacing the walkway is considered repair, not needing the Board's approval.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of existing conditions
C - Site plan
D - Catalog sheet of fencing
E - Appearances by Pat Cavatassi and John Lembach
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

May 12, 2015

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 MAY 19 PM 3: 37

Ms. Melissa Powers
Banas Mortgage
383 Park Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a ground sign reading "Haus Funding" and "Crego Realty Group", a wall sign reading "Haus Funding", plantings in the front, and stairs and railings on a rear deck; and to modify the parking lot.

On the premises at: 383 Park Avenue

Zoning District: C-1 Neighborhood Center Commercial District
East Avenue Preservation District

Application Number: A-042-15-16

Record of Vote(s):

Building sign and parking lot		Ground sign, rear steps, landscaping	
J. Dobbs	Approve (motion)	J. Dobbs	Hold (motion)
B. Mayer	Aye (second)	B. Mayer	Hold (second)
D. Beardslee	Aye	D. Beardslee	Hold
E. Cain	Aye	E. Cain	Hold
B. McLear	Absent	B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent	C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent	J. Schick	Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED the building sign reading 'Haus Funding' and the parking lot reconfiguration, but HELD decisions on the ground sign, rear steps and landscaping, pending revised drawings.

Your case will be reviewed at the June 1 hearing, and is first on the agenda. Please provide the requested drawing to Peter Siegrist of my staff by close of business Wednesday, May 25. Please contact him at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

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. Owner Sam Dipiano testified that he and his wife purchased the property in December for their new business, Haus Funding, and would like to:

1. Refresh the front landscaping by adding new shrubs and mulch, and beef up the existing wall;
2. Replace the existing ground sign;
3. Replace bamboo panels on a rear fence with wood panels;
4. Install steps at the rear;

Mr. Dipiano stated that he already replaced a previously-approved wall sign with a similar sign reading 'Haus Funding'. Regarding the ground sign, he explained that the brick base is intended to match the brick of the building.

C. Craig Schneider testified that he bought the adjacent property at 389 Park Avenue, which shares a parking lot with Mr. Dipiano's property at #383. The lot is accessed from Park Avenue across #383, exiting to Rutgers Street across #389. Together, the two owners propose to eliminate the exit to Rutgers Street and reconfigure the parking surface to create more efficient parking. Mr. Schneider stated that he would add landscaping to screen the lot from Rutgers Street.

D. Staff Peter Siegrist stated that the NYS Building Code requires a commercial building to have handicap access. The previous owner was issued a Conditional Certificate of Occupancy that required this, but he sold the property before complying. The current Certificate of Occupancy does not include this condition.

E. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association (PMNA), expressed support for the driveway and parking lot. He noted that the curb would need to be replaced to match the adjacent curb as required by city code. He expressed concern with excessive pavement along the driveway between the two houses, which he fears could provide illegal front-yard parking. He asked that the Board require a reduction in driveway width in exchange for the added rear-yard parking. He also asked that the proposed landscaping be better defined.

Mr. Lembach expressed support for the wall sign, which the PMNA found to be well designed. He opposes the monument sign, on the grounds that it would intrude on the historic architecture of the building and be the only monument sign on Park Avenue. He stated his organization's general opposition to ground signs.

F. Rob Rose of Pierrepont Signs described the ground sign as a 7" wide aluminum-faced, double-sided cabinet with acrylic letters pushed through the faces, mounted between brick piers. The sign would be illuminated by ground lights.

G. Board members commented that the monument sign is incompatible with existing signage in the neighborhood and is too large. Members recommended a sign similar to others on the Avenue, which are typically one post with a small hanging sign or two posts flanking a small sign board. Member Beardslee directed the applicant to coordinate the colors and graphics of the signs with one another and with the colors of the building, with a preference for simple graphics and a single color.

H. Members requested a comprehensive landscape plan with a list of plants, and a clearer idea of the fence proposal.

I. RESOLUTION(S):
The Board determined that the sign on the building reading 'Haus Funding' and the parking lot reconfiguration are appropriate to the visual historic character of the property and the preservation district, but that the ground sign is too large. The Board held its decisions on the rear steps, front and rear landscaping, and fence. The Board requested a revised sign design, a landscape plan with planting list, more detail on the fence location, and a design for the rear steps.

III. EVIDENCE:
A - Application
B - Plan of current site @ 389 Park Avenue
C - Plan of proposed site @ 389 Park Avenue
D - Photosimulation of front landscaping
E - Drawing and photosimulation of wall sign
F - Drawings of two options for the ground sign, with photosimulations of each
G - Appearances by Sam Dipiano, Craig Schneider, Rob Rose and John Lembach
H - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2016 rpb\decisions\may 4, 2015\a-042-15-16.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

May 12, 2015

Mr. Max Gianniny
620 Park Avenue, No. 213
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove two trees and shrubs in the front yard, one tree and shrub on the south side, and three trees near the garage.

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 MAY 19 PM 3:37

On the premises at: 14 Arnold Park

Zoning District: R-2 Medium-Density Residential District
East Avenue Preservation District

Application Number: A-043-15-16

Record of Vote(s):

Trees/shrubs along house and garage	
D. Beardslee	Approve (motion)
J. Dobbs	Aye (second)
B. Mayer	Aye
E. Cain	Aye
B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent

Trees at south line and NW corner	
D. Beardslee	Denied (motion)
J. Dobbs	Denied (second)
B. Mayer	Denied
E. Cain	Denied
B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED the removal of trees and shrubs along the wall of the house and garage, but DENIED the removal of trees at the property's south line and northwest corner. Replacing the fence panels in kind is considered repair, not needing review or approval.

The enclosed Certificate of Zoning Compliance is your approval to proceed.

For questions or comments, please contact with 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:

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 Max Gianniny testified that he and his brother bought the property about a year ago and that he now lives there. He stated that he would like to remove trees and overgrown shrubs to clean up the yard. On the east side facing the street, he would like to remove the two trees and the shrubs fronting the porch, which would allow better access for building repairs. He finds that the shrubs are overgrown and that the trees aren't thriving, an opinion shared by an arborist from Birchcrest Tree & Landscape. Once these are removed, he would repair the porch and then install planting beds with flowers and low shrubs. Around the corner along the south wall of the building, he would like to remove a tree that is not growing properly. Here he would install raised beds due to the ample sunlight.

Mr. Gianniny requested approval to remove a Locust tree on the south side near the property line. He stated that this tree is relatively healthy, but it overhangs his and his neighbor's house. On the south side of the garage, he would like to remove one unattractive tree and one larger tree that is damaging the garage. This would give him access to a dilapidated fence on the west property line that he would replace in kind. At the property's northwest corner, Mr. Gianniny would like to remove a large tree that he stated has a significant number of dead branches. He said that neighbors expressed concern for the safety of their vehicles. The cost of removal is high, however, so he is willing to trim the tree.

C. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, stated his organization is pleased to have a new owner for a property that was poorly maintained for 20 years, but does not approve of wholesale removal of trees, especially large ones.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board determined that the removal of the trees and shrubs along the east and south walls of the building is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district on the condition that planting beds are installed in these two areas. The Board also found it appropriate to remove the trees on the south side of the garage and to replace the adjacent damaged fence panels. The Board found no justification to remove the locust tree near the south property line and the large tree at the northwest corner of the property.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of existing conditions
C - Site plan showing tree locations
D - Appearances by Max Gianniny and John Lembach
E - 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

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 MAY 19 PM 3:37

May 12, 2015

Mr. Tom Beaman
California Rollin'
695 Park Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install an awning above the center storefront and graphics on the windows, for California Rollin'.

On the premises at:	695 Park Avenue
Zoning District:	C-2 Community Center Commercial District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-044-15-16
Record of Vote(s):	D. Beardslee Hold (motion) B. Mayer Hold (second) J. Dobbs Hold E. Cain Hold B. McLear Absent C. Carretta Absent J. Schick Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board HELD its decision pending receipt of a single, accurate drawing of the awning and windows showing consistent fonts and graphics.

Your case will be reviewed at the June 1 hearing, and is second on the agenda. Please provide the requested drawing to Peter Siegrist of my staff by close of business Wednesday, May 25. Please contact him at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

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. Susan Michal attended for Mr. Beaman, who was away. She stated that the restaurant is a new concept, somewhat like Chipotle. The visual goal is to have a lively storefront, with symmetrical windows and awning panels similar to neighboring Marty's Meats. She stated that the logo on the awning would have a round, white background instead of the square shown. The fish logo may change, as it might be violating a copyright.

C. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, expressed support for the awnings and window signs, but concern for the proposal to paint the exterior bright colors to match the interior.

D. Board members debated whether the proposal is too busy and should be simplified, or whether the busyness enhances the character of the street. In either case, members felt that it is better to have more consistency between the awning and the windows. One suggestion was to eliminate 'California Rollin' on the windows, and have the name only on the awning, and to use one fish logo rather than two. Board members agreed that the awning company should prepare a more accurate drawing, showing actual logo and font sizes.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board determined that the concept is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and the preservation district, but that the details need improvement. Board members asked that the entire proposal be shown in one picture, with consistent fonts and graphics on the windows and awning.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Photographs of existing window graphics
C - Photosimulation of awning on building
D - Appearances by Susan Michal and John Lembach
E - 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

May 12, 2015

Ms. Carmen Zatreanu
12 Vick Park A
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to expand the detached garage in the rear yard by 14'W x 22'D, and to replace basement windows with glass blocks and 1st floor windows to match existing.

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 MAY 19 PM 3: 37

On the premises at: 12 Vick Park A

Zoning District: R-2 Medium-Density Residential District
East Avenue Preservation District

Application Number: A-045-15-16

Record of Vote(s):

Basement windows		Garage addition and 1st floor windows	
B. Mayer	Approve (motion)	B. Mayer	Hold (motion)
D. Beardslee	Aye (second)	D. Beardslee	Hold (second)
J. Dobbs	Aye	J. Dobbs	Hold
E. Cain	Aye	E. Cain	Hold
B. McLear	Absent	B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent	C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent	J. Schick	Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED the replacement of four basement windows with glass blocks, but HELD its decision on expanding the garage and replacing windows on the first floor of the house.

Your case will be reviewed at the June 1 hearing, and is third on the agenda. Please provide the requested information to Peter Siegrist of my staff by close of business Wednesday, May 25. Please contact him at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

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 Carmen Zatreanu testified that none of the four basement windows opens, and all are cracked. She would like to replace them with glass blocks and vents, to concurrently provide air movement and security. Only two of the four are visible along the driveway, and she would add evergreens and hydrangea to hide them.

Ms. Zatreanu testified that none of the first floor windows opens either, and the floor-to-ceiling windows in the dining room lack tempered glass. She would like to replace all of these windows with new units by Renewal by Andersen. She noted that the upstairs windows in the house were already replaced with vinyl units.

Ms. Zatreanu testified that the driveway is shared with the adjacent house that has 7 tenants, all of whom have cars. She said that there is insufficient space to park all of these cars, and she can't park within her side of the garage. Even though the garage looks large, it is split by the property line, so she owns just one side. She wants to extend the garage by matching the other side. She provided a letter from the other owner explaining the difficulties with parking and snowplowing.

C. Emanuel Ardelean submitted new drawings of the garage showing the proposed framing, and he described the planned construction method. He indicated that the adjacent owner has no plan to improve his side of the garage, which looks unstable.

D. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association (PMNA), testified that this is a very special house that the PMNA would like retained in its current state, as much as feasible. He noted that the first floor windows have curved tops, which may not be replicable in new windows. He stated that glass block windows have not been traditionally approved by the Preservation Board. Instead of using glass blocks, he recommended adding vertical iron bars on the windows, and installing a dehumidifier to reduce basement moisture.

Mr. Lembach testified that the PMNA is not opposed to expanding the garage, but is aghast at the proposal of what he called an inappropriate addition. He stated a preference for two 8' wide garage doors instead of one 16' wide door, which he feels would be more appropriate in an historic setting. He noted that the 'application pending' sign had not been posted, which did not give neighbors proper notice.

E. Ms. Zatreanu responded, saying that she appreciates the importance of the house and the comments of Board and the PMNA, but that it is difficult to live in a house where the windows don't open and the garage can't be used.

F. Board members commented that Ms. Zatreanu should pay close attention to the details of the windows, such as the curved tops and moulding, when considering replacement units. Members requested evidence that the existing windows cannot be repaired. Members also expressed doubt that a 16' wide door on the garage would be appropriate, feeling that it may appear too suburban.

II. RESOLUTION(S):
The Board found that replacing four basement windows with glass blocks is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district, but that further details of the garage and windows are needed before a decision can be made.

III. EVIDENCE:
- A - Application
- B - Photographs of existing garage, house and site
- C - Site plan
- D - Site survey map
- E - Floor plan and elevation of garage addition, with narrative description of construction methods
- F - Letter from Frank Murano, owner of 14-16 Vick Park A
- G - Appearances by Carmen Zatreanu, Emanuel Ardelean and John Lembach
- H - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2016 rpb\decisions\may 4, 2015\a-045-15-16.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

May 19, 2015

Ms. Gail Morrelle
MC Management of Rochester LLC
550 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish the parking lot at #586 and the building at #600, and construct a 3-4 story apartment and office building and implement a landscaping plan.

On the premises at:	586 and 600 East Avenue
Zoning District:	PD16 Planned Development District East Avenue Preservation District
Application Number:	A-047-15-16

Record of Vote(s):

Demolition of parking lot at #586 and building at #600

D. Beardslee	Approve (motion)
J. Dobbs	Aye (second)
E. Cain	Aye
B. Mayer	Aye
B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent

Conceptual approval of replacement building and landscaping

J. Dobbs	Conceptual approval (motion)
B. Mayer	Aye (second)
E. Cain	Aye
D. Beardslee	Aye
B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent

Removal of trees as presented

D. Beardslee	Approve (motion)
J. Dobbs	Aye (second)
E. Cain	Aye
B. Mayer	Aye
B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2015 MAY 19 PM 3:36

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED the demolition of the parking lot at 586 East Avenue and the building at 600 East Avenue, APPROVED removal of 5 trees as noted in the findings below, and CONCEPTUALLY APPROVED the design of the landscape plan and replacement building.

A demolition permit is required to remove the building at #600 and may be obtained in room 121B in City Hall. A copy of the approved plan is on file there.

Your case is scheduled to return to the Board's hearing of June 1, and is 5th on the agenda.

Please contact Peter Siegrist at 428-7238 or peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov with any questions or concerns.

Rochester Preservation Board

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

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. Architect David Hanlon introduced the project, stating that the massing is similar to what the Board had seen before, and that materials have been selected. He requested approval to demolish the existing building and parking lot, and for conceptual approval of the proposed building. Architect Steve Cullum described the materials as including 12" Roman brick and ACM panels and column wrap.

C. Landscape architect Michael Rossetti of Fisher Associates presented a revised landscape plan. He testified that materials are still to be determined, and that he would return with those and more details. At this point, he is concentrating on a plan for tree removal and preservation. He presented recent findings by an arborist from Urban Forestry LLC that discusses conditions of the trees.

Mr. Rossetti stated that the most important tree is the large beech, which will be retained despite having bleeding cankers and signs of fungal and insect problems. He stated that the next most important tree is a horse chestnut at the corner of East Avenue and Goodman Street. The arborist found it to be in good health, but in need of pruning. This tree will be retained.

Mr. Rossetti requested approval to remove the following 5 trees:

1. A Silver Linden on the east side the driveway from East Avenue. The tree appears to have been girdled, but was actually grafted early on. It looks odd, is hollow and is in serious distress;
2. Two magnolias in front of the Century Club that are too large and close to the building and are damaging the roof;
3. A Norway spruce on the west side of the driveway from East Avenue that is in good health but is not in keeping with architecture of the proposed Victorian garden;
4. A Kwanzon Cherry on the east side of the Century Club is declining and has some rot.

D. Board member Cain noted that a tree behind the carriage house was removed last fall without the Board's approval. He stated that there are two remaining trees in this area that don't appear on the site plan. He asked that any other removals come before the Board. Mr. Rossetti acknowledged this request.

E. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association (PMNA), testified in support of the application, stating that his organization approves the demolition of the existing building and the concept of the replacement building. He stated that the plan is spectacular, and that everything works well together.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board found that removing the parking lot at 586 East Avenue, the building at 600 East Avenue and 5 trees is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district. The Board found that the garden and replacement building are conceptually appropriate, and requested that the applicant return to a future hearing with additional details.

III. EVIDENCE:

- A - Application
- B - Photosimulation of proposed building in situ
- C - Floor plans, elevations and wall sections
- D - Existing and proposed site plans and proposed site details
- E - Site survey map
- F - Landscape plan
- G - Tree evaluation by Urban Forestry LLC
- H - Images of material and product selections
- I - Photographs of existing conditions
- J - Letter from Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association
- K - Appearances by Steve Cullum, David Hanlon, Michael Rossetti and John Lembach
- L - Site visits by Board members

g:\planning&zoning\bldgzng\zoning\rpb\2016 rpb\decisions\may 4, 2015\a-047-15-16.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

May 19, 2015

Mr. David Palusio
474 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14607

RECEIVED
CITY OF ROCHESTER
CLERK/COUNCIL OFFICE
2016 MAY 19 PM 3:36

NOTICE OF DECISION

In the matter of a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to legalize the construction of a 20' x 20' rooftop sunroom and the installation of a sign reading "Pitkin-Powers House"

On the premises at: 474 East Avenue

Zoning District: R-3 High-Density Residential District
East Avenue Preservation District

Application Number: A-048-15-16

Record of Vote(s):

Legalize sunroom on condition that lamps removed and cornice painted		Legalize ground sign	
D. Beardslee	Approve (motion)	D. Beardslee	Deny (motion)
J. Dobbs	Aye (second)	J. Dobbs	Deny (second)
B. Mayer	Aye	B. Mayer	Deny
E. Cain	Aye	E. Cain	Deny
B. McLear	Absent	B. McLear	Absent
C. Carretta	Absent	C. Carretta	Absent
J. Schick	Absent	J. Schick	Absent

Please take notice that at its hearing of May 4, 2016, the Rochester Preservation Board APPROVED the sunroom ON THE CONDITION that the street lamps are removed and the cornice is painted. The Board DENIED the ground sign, and ordered it removed.

In addition to this approval, a building permit is required for the sunroom. Drawings of its construction must be brought to the Buildings & Zoning office, room 121B in City Hall for review by building code officials.

For questions or comments, please contact with 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:

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 Randall Peacock testified that the sunroom was added during renovations to the building, but had not been approved by the Preservation Board. The design concept was to carry the existing cornice over the sunroom, and to install sliding windows. Mr. Peacock testified that the sign was modified to eliminate an image of the building and the words "Palusio Holdings".

C. Developer David Palusio testified that he changed the sign in response to the Board's comments at the previous hearing. He stated that he retained the address, and wanted to retain the name of the building to highlight its historic importance. He stated further that the streetlights are furniture, not permanent parts of the building.

D. John Lembach, speaking for the Board of the Park-Meigs Neighborhood Association, noted that the "application pending" sign was not posted. He stated that since there had been no opportunities for public comment on the sunroom, his organization cannot support the application.

E. Marilyn Tedeschi, representing the American Association of University Women (AAUW) next door at 494 East Avenue, testified that the AAUW had an agreement with Mr. Palusio to install a garden on the AAUW site alongside the new garage. She stated that the garden was not installed by a landscape architect as promised and that water runoff is a problem. She asked the Board to compel Mr. Palusio to honor the agreement.

F. Mr. Palusio responded by saying that he had planted exactly what was proposed and approved, and that he had cared for the plants when the AAUW failed to do so. He said that no water comes off the garage roof onto the AAUW property, since the roofs sheds the other way and has drains.

G. Board members expressed support for the sunroom, but stated that the cornice needs painting. Members stated that most signs along East Avenue are for commercial establishments, not apartment buildings.

II. RESOLUTION(S):

The Board determined that the sunroom is appropriate to the historic visual character of the property and preservation district on the condition that the cornice is painted. The Board found that the ground sign is inappropriate, and must be removed immediately.

III. EVIDENCE:

A - Application
B - Site Plan
C - Plan of third floor
D - Elevation of sign
E - Photographs of existing conditions
F - Appearances by Randall Peacock, John Lembach and Marilyn Tedeschi
G - Site visits by Board members