

Summary Report of Revisions to the May 2019 Draft of
Rochester 2034 Comprehensive Plan

Presented to the City Planning Commission

September 9, 2019

Mayor Warren released the draft of Rochester 2034 for community review on May 16, 2019 at a community celebration that included over 300 people. Over the next three months, the community was invited to view and comment on the plan on line, at libraries, recreation centers, Neighborhood Service Centers, and at five community meetings held throughout Rochester. During the comment period, city planners also met with many stakeholder groups (advocacy groups, non-profits, industry experts, etc.), neighborhood groups, and City Hall professionals. The comments received during the comment period generated many changes to the Plan, including many great new ideas for additional Strategies. Some comments resulted in a simple revision and some comments generated a substantive revision or several revisions. This report provides an overview of the major recurring issues that came up through feedback and conversations with stakeholders.

Part A of this report summarizes the substantive revisions that resulted from the review process. Conversely, there are a couple cases where an issue generated many comments, but the Plan did not change. Part B presents the rationale for those cases. Lastly, Part C lists all the Placemaking Map changes since the draft Plan was presented. [Note that, unless otherwise specified, page numbers and strategy codes (e.g., PMP-1A) referenced in this document reflect those of the latest draft of the Plan, and may have changed from the initial draft released in May 2019.]

A. Substantive revisions

The following narrative is organized in the same order and with the same titles as the Sections in *Rochester 2034*. This will assist readers with cross referencing this report with the Plan.

1. Laying the Groundwork
 - a) Comments raised the question of how the *Rochester 2034* Guiding Principles relate to the RMAPI principles, which are: Build and support our community, Address structural racism, and Address trauma. In response to that question, *Rochester 2034* was revised on p. 10 to include reference to the RMAPI principles and directs the community to include these overarching principles, along with the *Rochester 2034* Policy Principles, as we together to support RMAPI and implement *Rochester 2034*. Additionally, many of the Strategies set forth in the Plan also align directly with the RMAPI principles and initiatives.
 - b) The Placemaking Principles were modified to add more reference to accessibility.
2. Placemaking Plan (PMP)
 - a) In response to public comment, a new Character Area entitled “Streets” is added to the PMP. The design of the right-of-way has a tremendous impact on community character and a sense of place, whether positive or negative, and directly affects the comfort and pleasure of all modes of transportation, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and people in wheelchairs. While not a land use category in the same sense as other Character Areas, streets and associated elements in the right-of-way make up about 12% of the land in the city and impact the daily lives of all residents and visitors. Throughout the *Rochester 2034* process, the overwhelming majority of residents and stakeholders expressed a strong desire for pedestrian-scaled development and streetscape design, commonly referred to as “walkable streets” and/or “bike-friendly streets”. That mandate is clear and the response is to raise the use and design of the public rights-of-way to the same level as the other Character Areas in *Rochester 2034*.

- b) The draft *Rochester 2034* included a recommendation for maximum height limitations in the Neighborhood Mixed-use (NMU) and Boutiques Mixed-use (BMU) Character Areas as five (5) stories or 60 feet and three stories (3) or 40 feet, respectively. This recommendation generated community concern that the heights were out of character with the neighborhoods. Planners revisited this recommendation and agreed that the maximum allowable height should be reduced to four (4) stories in the NMU and the reference to 60 feet is removed. In the BMU, three (3) stories is still recommended, but reference to “40 feet” is removed. As illustrated on pages 35-36, it is important to strike a balance between the impacts of commercial buildings on adjacent houses while recognizing that almost all of the city’s mixed-use corridors are a single property deep, with the next property off of the corridor almost always being a house. Retaining and promoting density along our mixed-use corridors is critical for promoting the use of and access to transit as well as restoring the critical mass of residents needed to support businesses in these corridors. Those pages present design options that allow for slightly more density while mitigating impacts, when possible, to adjacent homes. It’s also important to recognize that these are “maximum” heights and do not require that a building be built to these heights. The current Zoning Code does not include maximum height requirements in the Neighborhood Center District (C-1) or Community Center District (C-2) so these recommended height maximums are more restrictive than the current code. *Rochester 2034* recommends that the Zoning Code continue to set a standard for minimum building heights.
- c) Concerns were raised regarding the lack of clear direction for new development that could be proposed in the Flexible Mixed-Use (FMU) Character Area. In response to this concern, recommendations were added to the Plan to provide additional guidance to the Zoning Code revision process. Given that FMU areas are meant to create design and use flexibility in a wide variety of settings, and that uses in those settings are evolving more than traditional mixed-use corridors, building height minimums and maximums established during the Zoning Code update should be based on street typologies and local context. This is addressed both on the FMU Character Area pages (57-60) and on the aforementioned sidebar on building heights (35-36).
- d) The language in the draft Plan related to revising lot size requirements was imprecise and caused concern in the community. The concerns were about property owners potentially creating very small lots and building new houses, thereby causing neighborhoods to be overcrowded. This language is clarified in the final draft Plan to recommend allowing the size of new lots to be driven by context rather than an established minimum or no minimum at all. The new text recommends that consideration should be given to basing the minimum lot sizes on the average size of lots in the surrounding area, allowing for some percentage of variance, rather than dictating a one-size-fits-all approach.
- e) The text related to entertainment regulations was revised to reflect the recent City Code changes that moved much of the regulatory authority to the RPD licensing process. The corresponding Strategy was removed, as it has already been completed.
- f) Many comments were received with many different opinions about how to regulate and not regulate parking. Revisions to *Rochester 2034* present a compromise that is very much like the Buffalo Green Code, in which a transportation demand management strategy is at the center of regulating parking. *Rochester 2034* recommends that the traditional one-size-fits-all minimum parking requirements should be replaced with the requirement for a “Transportation Access Plan (TAP)” for future commercial, mixed-use, and large-scale housing development in all Mixed-Use Character Areas, as well as built-as commercial buildings in residential Character Areas, and

conversion of single-family homes to 4-family homes in the Medium-density Residential District. The TAP would be applicable to projects above a specified scale identified during the Zoning Code update process. This approach offers developers the opportunity to incorporate all modes of transportation into their project planning. It also allows regulators to determine on-site parking needs by reviewing how the applicant is accommodating those modes, along with their business model, and the potential off-site parking impacts.

3. Housing

- a) Several comments were submitted requesting *Rochester 2034* acknowledge the work of the City Roots Community Land Trust. Reference to community land trusts and the importance of their partnership in providing long-term affordable housing was added in a number of places throughout the Plan. A full-page text box was added to page 131, the City Roots Community Land Trust was listed as a partner on pp. 136 and 167 in supporting and expanding access to home ownership, and “Community Land Trusts” was added as a partner in several Strategies in the Housing Action Plan.
- b) The Children’s Agenda requested to have the Plan acknowledge that low-income families need the development of affordable housing to include large units with more bedrooms to accommodate families with children. This was added to *What We Heard* on p. 146 and a new Strategy (HSG-5I) was added. In addition, HSG-4a was reworded to include a reference to “household sizes.”
- c) In response to many comments received related to climate advocacy, references to energy efficiency were added, such as Strategy HSG-2c “Conduct research to inform new strategies and initiatives, on issues such as: Private rental market to develop more creative and effective strategies to engage landlords in neighborhood revitalization and the provision of quality affordable, **energy efficient housing** (particularly for low, very low, and extremely-low income renters).” Additionally, HSG-4f now includes “**energy efficiency, renewable energy, and beneficial electrification improvements**” as a potential community benefit that could be required for projects in return for City support.
- d) Many comments expressed concern that there was not a Strategy focused on protecting the quality of life for Rochester residents. In response, the following Strategy was added: HSG-1e “Prioritize code enforcement around quality of life issues, such as noise, litter, overcrowding, and illegal parking. These issues are critically important to residents of the city and can be the difference between choosing to live in the city and deciding to live elsewhere.” While the City already dedicates substantial resources to these issues, it is important to recognize that there is always room for improvement.
- e) Revisions to *Rochester 2034* bolster the support for facilitating more home ownership and owner-occupancy. HSG-4b, HSG-5b, and HSG-5c were added to the Housing Action Plan for fostering home ownership and owner-occupancy through City and Land Bank policies, advocacy, programming, and procedures.
- f) Rochester has a thriving student population and like other college towns, students live in housing located within neighborhoods. Students can cause disruptions in a neighborhood if they are not considerate of their neighbors. While several commenters asked that *Rochester 2034* recommend a Zoning Code solution to this issue, the reported problems are not related to land use, they are related to behavior. Therefore, we added the Strategy, HSG-1e, discussed in d) above, to support quality of life issues in neighborhoods. Furthermore, the Plan includes several Strategies [see e) above] that support and encourage home ownership and owner occupancy.

Neighborhood Associations can play an important role as well by engaging students and making them feel like they belong, which may inspire them to be more considerate, engage in neighborhood activities and volunteerism, and maybe become future home owners in the neighborhood. Local businesses benefit from the presence of students, as does the city overall, and should seek ways to attract them (see Strategy ECN-6c). Students are an important component of our resident population. They need to respect the neighborhood within which they live and neighborhoods must figure out how to embrace what they offer. The overall strategy is to learn to live together cooperatively and respectfully, while ensuring enforcement of behavior problems are reasonable and effective

- g) Short-term rentals, such as Airbnb and VRBO, were the subject of several comments. People expressed concern that the conversion of a single-family home for short-term lodging for visitors is inconsistent with the character of a low-density residential neighborhood. Currently, the Zoning Code allows an owner occupant to house up to two roomers as of right without requiring any zoning approvals and without a Certificate of Occupancy (CofO). These roomers can be short-term or long-term occupants. Other than two roomers in an owner-occupied dwelling, the owner of a rental property must obtain a CofO. This is essentially to protect the health and safety of the person(s) who are renters on the property. The draft *Rochester 2034* did not address the concerns about short-term rental impacts on residential character, largely because case law was still evolving as the draft was being written. The final draft plan, however, now contains the following Strategy: PMP-4n “During the Zoning Code amendment process, establish a definition and appropriate regulations for conversion of an entire dwelling unit to a short-term rental use that is consistently rented to visitors for less than 30 days at a time.”
- h) Comments requested that *Rochester 2034* do more to support the concept of a Tiny Home Village that is currently being proposed in the community, or future proposals as they arise. The following Strategy was added: HSG-5h “Support concepts, such as a cluster of tiny homes that offer individual homes in a permanent supportive communal atmosphere for housing homeless individuals and families. Services that connect residents to service providers, jobs, and long-term housing options should be integral to the operations of this kind of development.” With regards to tiny houses in general, the Plan already included Strategies such as PMP-4i “Account for and encourage emerging and as-of-yet untapped housing types, including tiny houses, (permanent, not mobile in nature), co-housing, attached single-family homes (townhouses), in-law apartments, four-family homes, and condominiums.” Tiny houses are also addressed in HSG-2c and HSG-5e.
- i) In response to comments received on behalf of people with disabilities, revisions were made to *Rochester 2034* to better address accessibility needs and goals. While all of the changes made throughout the Plan are not being specifically listed in this report, some of the more substantial changes in the Housing section is the addition of the following new Strategies:
- HSG-5i. Continue to implement the City’s Visitability Guidelines and continue to support NYS-funded projects that require 10% of their housing units to be fully accessible and at least 4% to be designed for those that may be visually or hearing impaired.
 - HSG-5j. Advocate for additional state/federal funds and philanthropic funds to add to the City’s property rehabilitation program funding (CDBG) for providing support to landlords to produce rental units that are fully accessible to people with disabilities.
 - HSG-5k. Revisit Zoning Regulations to minimize regulatory barriers to making a house fully accessible to people with disabilities.
- j) A reference to “workforce housing” was added to HSG-4c and HSG-4d.

4. Vacant Lands

A major effort of *Rochester 2034* is to reduce the number of vacant lots and put them back into productive use in a way that will benefit the people of Rochester. To that end, a new strategy that resulted from the comments is VNT-1b “Work with developers on how to improve City demolition practices and real estate policies to make development on vacant lots more cost effective.”

5. Arts and Culture

Commenters offered many recommendations to make the Arts and Culture section of *Rochester 2034* more complete and accurate. As a result, many changes were made to the narrative portion of this section and several new Strategies were added to the Action Plan, including:

- AC-1b Work with existing and emerging artists and arts leadership groups to develop an arts and creative sector master plan. The plan would serve as a collective vision for the community, laying out a collection of strategies for advancing arts, culture, and the creative economy. This plan should make recommendations for an organizational structure within City government to support the arts community. It should also clarify the City Arts Policy, also known as the Percent for Arts Ordinance.
- AC-3e Develop a program for enabling local artists to add installations or artistic programming to strategically-located vacant lots.
- AC-3h Advocate for representation of the arts and cultural community on regional initiatives and working groups.
- AC-3i Partner with Monroe County to display art at Greater Rochester International Airport, including public art and student exhibits.
- AC-3j Develop a transparent system for tracking City investments in public art.

6. Historic Preservation

To support the efforts of some commenters who are trying to advance museums, monuments, memorials, etc. to commemorate Rochester’s important role during the Civil Rights Movement, the following Strategy was added: HIS-1f. “Support efforts to highlight and celebrate Rochester’s role in the Civil Rights movement.” A recommendation was also added to the Placemaking Plan Map 7 (#75), supporting the creation of a Civil Rights Park in Baden Park.

7. Schools and Community Centers

a) Comments received on this section resulted in the following substantive changes to the Action Plan:

- New SCC-1i Continue to train staff and deploy progressive strategies related to school culture and behavioral challenges such as restorative practices, de-escalation techniques, and trauma-informed approaches.
- New SCC-4j Facilitate city planners and other design professionals going into schools and rec centers to educate students around careers and current issues in city planning and urban design. Identify opportunities for *Rochester 2034* to be part of the curriculum for student engagement."
- New SCC-4k Continue to implement cross-district / cross-municipal programs and initiatives that encourage regional partnerships, address concentrated poverty, and promote racial and socio-economic diversity in educational settings. Such efforts could include regional magnet

schools, inter-district programming, college/university partnerships, and strengthening the urban-suburban program.

- b) In response to comments received on behalf of people with disabilities, another change made to this Section included adding the language in bold to SCC-3g “Create after-school programs for students and adult community members that incorporate a variety of educational and recreational activities, such as art programs, English as a Second Language (ESL), **adaptive athletic programs**, and General Education Development classes.”

8. Public Health and Safety

- a) In response to comments received on behalf of people with disabilities, the Action Plan was modified to include adding the language in bold to PHS-1a “Continue to enact and enhance RPD's model of Community Policing to better engage with the community on safety issues, and ensure that enforcement is a partnership with all members of the community, **including people with disabilities or other challenges.**”
- b) Commenters recommended that *Rochester 2034* do more to protect vulnerable road users so the following Strategy was added: PHS-2c (repeated in TRN-5) “Work with New York State Department of Transportation to develop a multi-modal traffic safety initiative modeled on “vision zero” that includes specific laws that are adopted and enforced to protect vulnerable road users (e.g., bicyclists, pedestrians, people in wheelchairs, scooter users, etc.). This safety initiative would have the overreaching aim to eliminate traffic injuries and deaths in Rochester.”
- c) To, again, support the commenters who asked for more emphasis on quality of life issues, the following Strategy was added: PHS-5d “Educate the community on “Quality of Life” laws and regulation, such as the City Noise Ordinance (Chapter 75 of the City Code) and the Littering and Smoking Ordinance (Chapter 69 of the City Code).”

9. Parks and Recreation

- a) Public comment resulted in one substantive change to the Action Plan of this Section, the addition of PR-5f “Continue ongoing professional development for all City employees that engage with youth and encourage other groups who work with children to be trained in: Restorative Practices, De-escalation Techniques, and Trauma-informed approaches.”
- b) Other revisions related to specific parks, e.g. Baden Park, were added to the Placemaking Plan.

10. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaption

- a) Commenters mentioned that *Rochester 2034* did not make the statement that urban development and density, in and of itself, is a more sustainable way to live and grow a population. Therefore, a new paragraph was added on p. 309 that states: “It is important to note that one of the greatest ways that a community can reduce its carbon footprint and become more resilient is to encourage compact, mixed-use, and walkable land use patterns. The very nature of a city is far more environmentally-friendly than suburban-style sprawl that is more resource intensive (per capita and per square mile) and auto dependent. *Rochester 2034* contains an overarching theme to grow the population of the city, with a particular emphasis on walkability and mixed-use development, which in effect can make the region more resilient in the face of climate change.”
- b) A new sidebar was added on p. 314 that describes the NYS Leadership and Community Protection Act that was signed into law in June 2019. This law will prioritize reducing greenhouse gas

emissions by 2040, requiring 70% of electric generation to be produced by renewable energy sources by 2030, creating green jobs and protecting vulnerable communities, and building climate change resilience across the state.

- c) CC-4a was revised to include fuel switching/beneficial electrification in the list of targeted education and community engagement campaigns to be developed.
- d) CC-4b was revised to say “Continue to support beneficial electrification through education, incentives, upgrading City facilities, and incorporating it into a Requests for Proposals scoring process.”

11. Urban Agriculture and Community Gardens

Public comment resulted in the addition of the following new Strategies:

- UAG-2d Work with refugee and immigrant service providers to use City-owned vacant land in low-demand market areas for community gardening and programming.
- UAG-3c Explore support for installation of high tunnels, hoop houses, and other season-extending production aids on City-owned and private land. Specifically, work with USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service New York to extend High Tunnel Initiative to urban farmers.

12. Transportation

- a) A new sidebar was added to page 338 about the City’s new Street Design Guide, an outcome of the Comprehensive Access and Mobility Plan. The Street Design Guide was created to support implementation of Rochester’s Complete Streets Policy, which calls for streets that are safe and accessible for all modes of transportation. The Guide provides information on street design considerations. This addition was in part a response to the numerous comments that called for stronger and more consistent adherence to the Complete Street’s Policy, a request that is reinforced by TRN-1c and TRN-1k that were in the original draft.
- b) Many comments were received requesting a better explanation of the recommendation in *Rochester 2034* related to transit, specifically streetcars and light rail. There is substantial support within the community for exploring these options within the next several years. The narrative on page 339 has been substantially rewritten to better explain the vision for the evolution of transit in Rochester.
- c) TRN-1 was reworded as follows: “Expand and strengthen Rochester’s multi-modal planning, policy, programming, and infrastructure maintenance.” This wording incorporates infrastructure maintenance which is a critical component of Rochester’s multi-modal network.
- d) As a result of public comment, the following Strategies were added to this Section:
 - Add TRN-1m Support the use of the trail system as a transportation corridor by installing lighting, wayfinding signage, and providing all-season maintenance and litter services along key segments to start and expanding as resources allow.
 - Add TRN-4e Explore opportunities to improve transit service in and around downtown Rochester, providing enhanced connections between the Transit Center, employment centers, destinations, and perimeter parking lots.
- e) TRN-5a was reworded to include the following bolded language: “Work with New York State Department of Transportation to develop a multi-modal traffic safety initiative modeled on “vision zero” that includes **specific laws that are adopted and enforced to protect vulnerable road users**

(e.g., bicyclists, pedestrians, people in wheelchairs, scooter users, etc.). This safety initiative would have the overarching aim to eliminate traffic injuries and deaths in Rochester.”

f) TRN-6d was reworded to include the following bolded language:

Work with existing employer-based TDM programs (e.g., at University of Rochester, Rochester Institute of Technology) to support their efforts and identify additional entities that could be good partners to implement TDM strategies. **Have City Hall be a model of best practices for employer-based non-monetary incentives to encourage staff to choose alternative ways to commute to work.**

13. Economic Growth

a) The draft *Rochester 2034* did not place enough emphasis on the importance of supporting existing and building new industrial/manufacturing businesses in Rochester. This is a critical sector of the city economy, bringing a high density of jobs. Therefore, ECN-4 was reworded to say “Continue to support and attract job-generating economic development.” Strategies were added as follows:

- ECN-4d Increase outreach efforts to the industrial/manufacturing sector to maintain and enhance strong business relationships. Rochester's manufacturing base provides well-paying entry-level and mid-skill level jobs to neighborhood residents.
- ECN-4e Support and facilitate private capital investment projects for existing and new industrial/manufacturing businesses in the City through financial incentives and technical assistance.
- ECN-4f In accordance with the Finger Lakes Forward: United for Success Plan, increase program focus on industries such as optics/photonics, food production, advanced manufacturing, and technology. These industries are gaining regional momentum in large part due to the growing prominence of RIT and UR.
- ECN-4g Develop strategies and approaches to help increase the amount of venture capital available to invest in business startups, including those in the technology, optics and imaging sectors.
- ECN-4h Continue to support the redevelopment of Eastman Business Park through their master plan and business development strategies.
- ECN-6f Collaborate with FLREDC and other regional partners to focus on increasing job density in the city. Recent work from the Brookings Institution shows that businesses, workers, and urban economies thrive more when there is intentional and collaborative focus on policies and investments that advance more concentrated job growth patterns, combined with transformative placemaking.

14. Workforce Development

The predominant comments received for this Section were from advocates for children and for people with disabilities. As a result two new Strategies were added:

- WRK-1g Continue the "Summer of Opportunity Program" and develop additional opportunities to engage youth in workforce skills building.
- WRK-3f Foster partnerships with disability organizations and local employers to increase employment of Rochesterians with disabilities and understanding of ADA accommodation requests.

15. Smart City Innovations

Comments that resulted in substantive comments for this Section were largely generated by City staff working on advancing technological innovations to better serve customers. The following three Strategies were added to *Rochester 2034* in Goal SC-4:

- SC-4a Continue to deploy and promote online tools and open data to the maximum extent possible and become a recognized leader in sharing data in informative, easy to use, and compelling ways with the public.
- SC-4b Expand existing and develop new municipal online payment, permitting, and licensing systems, as well as subscription-based public notifications.
- SC-4c Advance City permitting, inspection, and enforcement operations through digital transformation.

16. Implementation and Stewardship of *Rochester 2034*

- a) Added a new Strategy: IMP-1f “Require land use boards and commissions to specifically reference Principles/Sections/Goals/Strategies of *Rochester 2034* in decisions.”
- b) A very important implementation process was inadvertently left out of the Action Plan for this Section and that is the budget processes. This has been corrected with the addition of the following Goal and Strategies:

IMP 2 Use Rochester 2034 to inform City budgets and programming

- IMP-2a Connect the “Key Performance Indicators” of the City Operating Budget to *Rochester 2034*.
- IMP-2b Provide a reference in the CIP budget allocation requests to *Rochester 2034*.
- IMP-2c Align the 5-year Consolidated Community Development Plan with Goals of *Rochester 2034*.

17. Building Community Capacity

- a) Recognizing that Rochester’s community has many stakeholders that will implement *Rochester 2034*, the Section title was broadened to “Building Community Capacity.”
- b) In response to comments received on behalf of people with disabilities, the following Strategies were added to this Section:
 - BCC-3c Improve the accessibility of City communications, including developing a protocol for when webpages and online documents need to be 508 compliant, and implementing training for City web coordinators on how to improve the accessibility of pages they manage.
 - BCC-3e Leverage City Hall relationships and permitting to support improved accessibility provisions at special events, festivals, and other community gatherings throughout the city. This could include offering training for event organizers in ways to make events more accessible.
- c) In response to comments received from youth advocates, the following Goal and Strategies were added to this Section:

BCC-5 Increase youth engagement and empowerment

- BCC-5a Prepare a citywide youth master plan to assist the community in prioritizing the needs of children, establishing goals, aligning resources, and maximizing youth potential and outcomes.

- BCC-5b Engage youth in community organizations, such as Neighborhood Associations.
- BCC-5c Continue ongoing professional development for all City employees that engage with youth and encourage other groups who work with children to be trained in: Restorative Practices, De-escalation Techniques, and Trauma-informed approaches.

18. Overall Plan

Community stakeholders (advocacy groups, non-profits, industry experts, etc.) and residents were extremely helpful in helping us fill out and revise the “Partners” column throughout the Action Plans. This will go a long way to ensuring our Implementation Teams will have a diverse collection of relevant people and organizations represented as we prioritize and execute the Action Plans of *Rochester 2034*.

19. Appendices

- Added the *Rochester Public Library Branch Facilities & Operations Plan* as Appendix H.
- Added the City’s *Climate Action Plan* as Appendix I.
- Added the *Commercial Corridor Study* and the *Comprehensive Access and Mobility Plan* documents so they are now linked appendices.

Section II. Issues raised that did not generate a revision to the Plan

A. Accessory Dwelling Units

Rochester 2034 states, “Over time, if Rochester’s population increases, the City should consider additional affordability strategies that increase housing options, such as allowing one extra (subordinate) unit” in the Low Density Residential Character Area. These suggested subordinate units are known as accessory dwelling units (ADUs) – also referred to as accessory apartments, in-law apartments, or granny flats. ADUs are additional living quarters on single-family lots that are independent of the primary dwelling and can be either attached or detached from the main residence. While many comments were submitted that applauded the introduction of this housing option, many comments expressed concern.

Across the U.S., there is a growing awareness and acceptance of ADUs as an inexpensive way to increase the affordable housing supply. Elderly and/or persons with disabilities who may want to live close to family members or caregivers, empty nesters, and young adults just entering the workforce find ADUs convenient and affordable. ADUs benefit homeowners by providing extra income that can assist in mitigating increases in the cost of living and maintenance of their single-family home.

Many ordinances that allow ADUs require that the property owner live on the property in either the main dwelling unit or the ADU. This requirement would help to mitigate some of the concerns in Rochester about bringing absentee landlords into a neighborhood.

Rochester currently has room to grow its population and can offer this option in large areas of the City, which is why *Rochester 2034* does not recommend that the new Zoning Code entertain ADUs in the Low-Density Residential Districts at this time. However, it is a widely-utilized tool in other cities and Rochester should remain open to its use in future years.

B. Aqueduct/Broad Street

The re-use of the Broad Street Aqueduct has been studied and debated from several perspectives over the past few decades, with no clear solution emerging until the ROC the Riverway Vision Plan process in 2017-2018. The ROC the Riverway Advisory Board, made up of community leaders and stakeholders, led the process and facilitated dozens of community meetings in a variety of settings across the city. Their charge was to identify the guiding principles and primary objectives of investment along the river corridor, leading to the prioritization of projects to be funded by the Phase I award of \$50M from NY State. During the process, the two most significant objectives identified were to:

- Produce seamless and accessible pedestrian and bicycle connections along both sides of the river via the Genesee Riverway Trail and neighborhood linkages to the trail; and
- Create dynamic public spaces, including multi-use gathering spaces as the centerpiece of downtown.

The Broad Street Bridge presented the greatest challenge to achieving the first objective, as it forms a major vertical barrier to connecting a riverfront promenade on both sides of the river. Based on examining alternatives and extensive feedback, the Advisory Board concluded that routing a riverfront promenade over, under, or through the top level of the bridge was not physically feasible, nor would it achieve the objective of creating a highly accessible, dynamic public space. Rather, the optimal design solution would be to remove the top deck of the bridge. This allows for a seamless north-south connection on both sides of the river through downtown at the same elevation as the original aqueduct, without requiring any ramps or stairs for that promenade. It does create an elevation challenge for east-west connectivity at one location (Broad and South), but multiple design options are available to achieve full accessibility, unconstrained by the roof and walls of a tunnel.

The removal of the top deck enables the creation of a dynamic public space that will be substantially more feasible and accessible to far more Rochesterians than any of the various “underground” or “tunnel” concepts explored over the years, thus meeting the 2nd objective above. There was overwhelming community consensus during the process that connectivity along and access to the river are the most important objectives of ROC the Riverway, and that they would not be achievable with the Broad Street Bridge barrier in place in its current form. Moving forward, the actual design of the new pedestrian plaza, and whether or not it has any kind of water feature, will be fleshed out in the design phase. The Advisory Board is also very open to the concept of retaining elements of the top portion of the bridge, such as a few of the arches or some of the street art to reference that part of the bridge’s history. But whether the top deck should be kept or removed has been definitively determined by the ROC the Riverway process. It will result in greater access and connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists as well as a one-of-a-kind public space in downtown.

Regarding transit’s use of the Broad Street Bridge, the City will continue to work with RTS to ensure alternatives are available for the single Reimagine RTS route that will use the Broad Street Bridge and for occasions when the Main Street Bridge is closed.

III. Placemaking Plan Map Changes

Public comments and City Hall staff generated a number of changes to the Placemaking Map. For each of the comments received requesting changes to Character Areas, City staff evaluated their merit based on consistency with the Vision, Guiding Principles, and Goals of *Rochester 2034*, as well as consistency with land use best practices and the rationale used in designating Character Areas across the rest of the city. This effort resulted in the following changes:

1. Changed Flexible Mixed-Use along northern end of Mt. Hope to Neighborhood Mixed-Use
2. Changed Neighborhood Mixed-Use on Hudson near Rte. 104 to Flexible Mixed-Use
3. Changed small portion of Neighborhood Mixed-Use on west side of Hudson near Ave D to Low Density Residential
4. Changed portion of Flexible Mixed-Use around Nassau, Ormond, and Harrison Streets to Industrial
5. Changed Neighborhood Mixed-Use on south end of North St to Flexible Mixed-Use
6. Changed portion of Flexible Mixed-Use around Hudson, Putnam, and Cleveland to High Density Residential
7. Changed Medium Density Residential south of Strong Hospital to Low Density Residential
8. Changed portion of Medium Density Residential around Breck, Chapel, Leighton, and Herkimer Streets to Low Density Residential
9. Changed portion of Medium Density Residential at Portland and Fernwood to Boutique Mixed-Use
10. Changed portion of Institutional Campus along Westmoreland Drive to Low Density Residential
11. Extended Industrial area along Maplewood Drive to include remainder of existing M-1 District
12. Changed Boutique Mixed-Use at Mt Hope and Cypress to Low Density Residential
13. Modified south end of Neighborhood Mixed-Use on South Ave
14. Changed portion of Flexible Mixed-Use on South Clinton between Alexander and Gregory to Neighborhood Mixed-Use

In addition to the above changes to the Character Areas, the following “Other Recommendations” (color-coded circles) were added based on community and City staff feedback:

- Recommendation #16 – changed to “Per the Rochester Public Library Branch Facilities and Operations Master Plan, convene a community visioning process to explore options for upgrading or relocating the Maplewood branch, including the potential to serve as an immigrant and refugee service hub. Explore options to expand, co-locate, or relocate the facility.”
- Added Recommendation #27 at Joseph and Langham: “Continue to support development of the Community Blooms Flower Farm, including the potential for a playful sidewalk connection to the Lincoln Branch Library, a mobility hub, and additional street trees.”

- Added Recommendation #58 at Broad and South: “As part of ROC the Riverway's Aqueduct Re-Imagined and Riverfront Promenade project, identify opportunities to renovate and provide public access to the historic Ely Mill (1827) located in the lower level of RG&E Station #6.”
- Added Recommendation #61 to Gibbs Street: “Work with the Eastman School of Music and other local partners to convert this block of Gibbs Street into a pedestrian-only public space, complete with programming, landscaping/hardscaping, amenities, and accommodations for various events.”
- Added Recommendation #75 in Baden Street Park: “Support the grass roots effort to develop a Civil Rights Park in Baden Park, commemorating Rochester's proud history of civil rights activism.”
- Moved urban ecology center from Genesee Gateway Park to Genesee Valley Park (Recommendation #106)