

**DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT
for
CITYGATE**

**Project Location:
Southeast Quadrant
of East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road
(formerly the Iola Campus)**

**Project Sponsor / Applicant:
Anthony J. Costello and Son (Spencer) Development, LLC
One Airport Way
Rochester International Airport
Rochester, NY 14624**

**Consultant:
Bergmann Associates
200 First Federal Plaza
28 East Main Street
Rochester, New York 14614**

**Lead Agency:
Arthur Ientilucci
Director of Zoning
City of Rochester
30 Church Street, City Hall, Room 125B
Rochester, NY 14614**

October 2008

DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PROPOSED CITYGATE PROJECT
CITY OF ROCHESTER, MONROE COUNTY, NY

Positive Declaration Issued: April 3, 2008

Public Scoping Session Held: April 23, 2008

Comments Accepted Through: April 30, 2008

Final Scope Accepted: May 22, 2008

Contact Person: Dorraine Laudisi
City of Rochester
30 Church Street
City Hall, Room 125 B
Rochester, New York 14614

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
2.0	PROJECT OVERVIEW	9
2.1	Project Location and Setting	9
2.2	Project Description	9
2.3	Purpose, Need, and Benefits	17
3.0	STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (SEQR) PROCESS	18
3.1	Project Classification and Lead Agency Designation	18
3.2	The Scoping Process	19
3.3	SEQR Review Agencies	19
4.0	EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES/ALTERNATIVES	20
4.1	The Environmental Setting	20
4.2	Surface Water Resources	23
4.3	Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology	25
4.4	Visual Setting and Aesthetic Resources	33
4.5	Historic, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources.....	41
4.6	Traffic and Transportation	71
4.6	Utilities and Energy Usage	87
4.7	Noise, Lighting, and Odor Impacts.....	92
4.8	Socioeconomic Considerations	95
5.0	ASSESSMENT OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES	118
5.1	No Action	118
5.2	Alternative Site Plan 2 – Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2000	119
5.3	Alternative Site Plan 3 – Town of Brighton Existing Zoning (Low Density Residential)	123
5.4	Alternative Site Plan 4 – Town of Brighton RHD-2 (High Density District)	124
6.0	TEMPORARY AND SHORT-TERM IMPACTS	127
7.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	132
8.0	GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS	133
9.0	UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	134
10.0	IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES	134
11.0	USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY RESOURCES	135

FIGURES

- Figure 1. Project Location Map
- Figure 2. Proposed Concept Plan
- Figure 3. Proposed Parking Facilities Map
- Figure 4. Proposed Land Use Map
- Figure 5. Rezoning Map
- Figure 6. Existing Structures
- Figure 7. Existing Topography Map
- Figure 8. Soil Types
- Figure 9. Wetland Delineation Map
- Figure 10. Existing Tree Survey
- Figure 11. East Henrietta Road Corridor
- Figure 12. Westfall Road Corridor
- Figure 13. Northwest Corner View of Proposed Plan
- Figure 14. Southeast Corner View of Proposed Plan
- Figure 15. Neighborhood Mixed Use District Southeast Corner View
- Figure 16. Neighborhood Mixed Use District Southwest Corner View
- Figure 17. Alternative Site Plan Preserving Buildings 1,7, and 10
- Figure 18. Area Census Tracts
- Figure 19. Area RTA Bus Routes

- Figure 20. Area RTA Bus Routes
- Figure 21. Existing Land Use Map
- Figure 22. Existing Zoning Districts
- Figure 23. Alternative Site Plan #2 (General Office)
- Figure 24. Alternative Site Plan #3 (Low Density Residential)
- Figure 25. A.J. Costello & Son Projects
- Figure 26. Existing Stormwater Flow
- Figure 27. Proposed Stormwater Flow
- Figure 28. Proposed Construction Phasing Plan
- Figure 29. Alternative Site Plan #4 (RHD-2 Residential High Density District)

Appendices

- Appendix A. Planned District Development #11 Regulations
- Appendix B. Lead Agency Agreement
- Appendix C. Adopted Scoping Document
- Appendix D. Stormwater Management and Water Reports (Bergmann Associates)
- Appendix E. Wetland Delineation Report (Environmental Resources, LLC)
- Appendix F. Threatened and Endangered Species Correspondence Letter
- Appendix G. Design Guidelines
- Appendix H. Historic Images (Saralinda Hooker, Planning Development, Historic Preservation and Market Analysis)
- Appendix I. Iola Campus Historic Resource Evaluation (Bero Associates Architects)
- Appendix J. Structural Condition Report (Torchia Structural Engineering & Design, LLC)
- Appendix K. Iola Campus Architectural Assessment (Razak Associates, LLC)
- Appendix L. Lead Based Paint Inspection Report (Paradigm Environmental Services, Inc.)
- Appendix M. Forensic Building Science and Microbial Investigative Report (Building Science Investigations, Inc.)
- Appendix N. Cultural Resource Management Report (Rochester Museum and Science Center)
- Appendix O. Traffic Impact Study (Bergmann Associates)
- Appendix P. Executive Summary of Site and Building Assessment, Real Estate Market Conditions and Financial Analysis Report (RKG Associates Inc.)
- Appendix Q. Citygate Town Center Retail Market Analysis Cover Page (Gibbs Planning Group) and Market Analysis for the Development of Citygate and Canal Cove (Robert Charles Lesser & Co.)
- Appendix R. Letters to local school districts, fire and police departments.
- Appendix S. United States Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdiction Determination Letter

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Location and Description

The project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road and is situated in two municipalities – the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton, Monroe County, New York. Approximately 44 acres of the 63 acre site are located in the City of Rochester and approximately 19 acres are located in the Town of Brighton. The property is bounded by Westfall Road to the north, Brighton Meadows Office Park to the east, the Erie Canal to the south, and East Henrietta Road to the west. Interstate 390, a major north-south expressway through the Rochester region, is located south of the site, beyond the southern edge of the Erie Canal.

The proposed Citygate project will be a diverse yet complementary mix of residential and non-residential uses, incorporating a variety of multi-family housing options, retail, office, hotels, and recreational opportunities within close proximity to the University of Rochester, Monroe Community Hospital and the Monroe Community College. The proposed Citygate project will be comprised of four design and land use districts – Neighborhood Mixed-Use, Canal Front Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Residential. Incorporating sustainable land use initiatives, the proposed development will promote pedestrian activity and function as a mixed-used center of activity. The development will create pockets of living and office space over first story retail, with a proposed parking structure and surface parking lots in multiple locations throughout the development. Public amenities will include open space areas and access to the Erie Canal and multi-use trails.

Construction of the project will comprise of four phases and is anticipated to be completed within five years. Phase I will include most of the Neighborhood Mixed Use District and residential areas. Phase II will include the construction of a hotel and loft buildings along the Erie Canal. Phase III and IV will complete the development and includes the areas surrounding the Children's Detention Center, Rochester Pure Waters Operation Center and Fleet Garage. A more detailed description of the construction phasing for the proposed project is in section 6.0 and a phasing plan is located in Figure 28.

Purpose, Need, and Benefits

This site has been identified as a prime location for this type of development due to its proximity to a number of large community service uses, as mentioned above. Employees, students, and visitors to these institutions, as well as others within the immediate vicinity need the types of services to be provided by this development – a place to live, work and play. These services are not currently conveniently available within the immediate vicinity of the project site. The proposed project will be developed following the basic principles of Traditional Neighborhood Design and is the first project of this type and scale within the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton.

A primary benefit of the proposed project is the availability of an expanded variety of goods, services, and housing options available to City and Town residents. In addition to benefiting the residents of the greater Rochester area, the project will generate tax revenues to the City of Rochester, the City school district, the Town of Brighton, and the Rush-Henrietta school district. Both temporary employment, in terms of construction and site development jobs, and permanent employment opportunities will be expanded with the completion of this project. In addition to property taxes generated by the proposed site development, the project will also generate additional sales tax revenue.

Existing Conditions

The Citygate project site is the location of the former Lola Medical Complex. Over the years, the Lola Campus has deteriorated and is well positioned for redevelopment. The Lola Campus has an internal road system with several parking lots, fenced storage yards and confinement areas, and a full range of utilities including water supply, sanitary sewers, storm drainage, electric, gas, telephone, a network of steam tunnels. The condition of the asphalt appears worn in many places and the infrastructure and utility systems/lines will require upgrades associated with redevelopment.

During its peak use, the medical complex included 11 structures. Although two of these buildings were demolished in the 1980s, nine buildings remain today. The structures are currently vacant and in disrepair as they are no longer in use. There are several additional buildings that were developed after 1970 and are used for vehicle maintenance/repair operations, workshops, warehouse, or by Monroe County or other municipal agencies.

Some of the physical attributes of the site include a range in elevation from approximately 505 feet at the southeast corner of the property to 585 feet in the northwest corner. Both the northwest and southeast corners of the project site are relatively flat, with the steepest slopes (approximately 10 to 20 percent) running through the center of the site from southwest to northeast. Landscaping and vegetation in the developed areas is typical of other urban developments; much of the undeveloped portion of the site is sparsely vegetated with opportunistic species consistent with successional old field and forest pioneer communities typical of disturbed sites. Additionally, while no rare, threatened, or endangered species were identified within the project boundaries, the Developer's wetland consultant has identified that four small wetlands totaling 0.33 acres are present.

The predominant land use in this area is that of Community Services, defined as property used for the well being of the community (e.g., Monroe Community Hospital, Monroe Community College). Commercial services also comprise a considerable portion of the area's land use, including the Corporate Woods Office Park located southwest of the project site, across I-390. A second cluster of commercial

land uses exists along the Mount Hope Avenue corridor, situated between two single-family residential neighborhoods. In addition to single-family residential uses, several multi-family apartments are located directly north of the proposed project site, on the north side of Westfall Road.

Traversing the municipal boundary between the City of Rochester and the Town of Brighton, the project site is subject to the zoning ordinances of both communities. The portion of the site located in the City of Rochester is currently zoned as IPD #12 (Institutional Planned Development District No. 12). The Town of Brighton has zoned this area as RLB (Residential Low Density District). The following uses are permitted in IPD #12:

- Waste Water Management Operations and Storage Building;
- Vehicle Maintenance Garage;
- Expanded Parking Areas;
- Backflow Prevention Buildings for Community Hospital; and
- Parking Lot for Community Hospital.

The RLB District in the Town of Brighton permits the following uses:

- Single-family detached dwellings not to exceed one dwelling on each lot.
- Family day-care homes.
- Buildings, structures and uses owned or operated by the Town of Brighton for municipal use.

In addition to the project site's current zoning status, seven City zoning districts are within a ½ mile radius of the site. These include IPD (Institutional Planned Development); IPD #11 (Institutional Planned Development No. 11); O-S (Open Space); MIPD #2 (Manufacturing Institutional Planned Development No. 2); C-2 (Community Center); R-1 (Low Density Residential); and R-3 (High Density Residential). Six Town of Brighton zoning districts are within a ½ mile radius from the subject site. These include the following districts: BE-1 (Office & Office Park); BF-1 (Neighborhood Commercial); BF-2 (General Commercial); RHD-2 (Residential High Density D-2); RLB (Residential Low Density B); and RM (Residential Medium Density).

Impacts and Mitigation

Most of the impacts associated with the proposed Citygate development will occur as a result of construction activities. The existing building will be removed and grading of the site will be required prior to construction of the buildings, roads, and other ancillary facilities necessary to implement the proposed project. With the exception of the existing steep slopes, it is expected that changes to the existing

topographic character will be limited. As such, no significant adverse impacts to topography are anticipated to occur.

Grading and construction activities will also impact existing drainage due to the impervious area added to the site. However, since the project site is currently developed, the net increase in impervious area is substantially less than the development of a “green” site. Stormwater will be captured and conveyed by means of a closed storm sewer system of pipes and catch basins. Stormwater will then be directed to a proposed detention pond at the southeast corner of the site. By following the stormwater design guidelines published by NYSDEC, the design of the ponds will mitigate the adverse effects of water quality issues. The applicant also proposes to explore methods to collect stormwater for reuse (e.g., rain gardens etc.) during final design as part of a comprehensive program of green initiatives.

The wetlands located within the project boundaries will also be impacted during construction. However, given the disturbed nature of these wetlands, in conjunction with the potential for mitigation, no significant adverse impacts are expected. The applicant will work with the USACE on an appropriate mitigation plan in accordance with current regulations and guidelines pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Construction of the proposed development will result in the loss of buildings identified as part of the original Iola Medical Complex. To memorialize the importance of the Iola Campus, the applicant is considering the following mitigation:

- Publishing a book to preserve and interpret the history of the Iola Sanitarium and its architecture
- On-site interpretation program
- Retention of historic site features where possible within the context of the Citygate development
- Use of architectural design elements recalling the original Iola structures in the Citygate buildings
- Architectural salvage
- Alternative site planning

In terms of archaeological resources the project site exhibited a distinct lack of prehistoric Native American cultural material and more than 50 historic Euro American cultural artifacts were recovered from the project area during the Phase 1B Archaeological investigation. However, this material is not located within its primary context and is unlikely to contribute significantly to either the archaeological record or common knowledge and history. Thus, no significant adverse impacts are expected.

Although construction activities will result in the removal of existing buildings, the proposed development will include significant site improvements and aesthetic enhancements through the installation of new landscaping, new building construction, improved internal circulation and additional parking areas. While

the density of the site will be increased, the appearance of the property from those viewing it from outside the site and within the site will be enhanced. Design Guidelines for each proposed district have been developed to ensure a high-quality, visually appealing mixed-use style development that promotes pedestrian access and connectivity, the integration of open space and public gathering areas, and access to the Erie Canal and waterfront opportunities. These Design Guidelines are consistent with the rezoning proposed for the Citygate development.

With respect to financial impacts and benefits, it is anticipated that Citygate will create more than 1,500 construction jobs during the project's five-year build out period and increase monies received through income tax, property tax and sales tax. Project construction will also generate an additional \$16 million in sales tax on construction materials and commerce for the County and other affected municipalities and school districts.

Additionally, new retail development is projected to generate over \$61 million a year in new retail sales, creating 700 permanent jobs and \$3.9 million in new sales tax annually. In terms of property taxes, the City will realize annual property taxes in the amount of more than \$5.4 million, while the Town is expected to receive \$618,640 in new tax revenues. In addition to City and Town property taxes, the development will generate over \$2.5 million a year in new county property taxes.

In terms of other municipal services, it is anticipated that the Citygate project will result in a greater number of service calls to local police, fire, and ambulance providers than each currently experience. The applicant will work with the appropriate emergency service providers to ensure that the current level of service provided is maintained. Additionally, to avoid increased cost burdens to affected municipalities, Citygate will be managed by a development company that will budget for, and maintain, all internal streets, landscaping (trees), and street lighting, as well as coordinating utility repair, maintenance, and improvements.

As previously noted, the area surrounding the project site consists primarily of land uses classified as community services, with commercial and residential uses also comprising a considerable portion of the area's land use. As the development associated with the Citygate project will be community-based and offer additional goods, services, and amenities to residents in both the City and Town, the proposed land use changes to the site are less intrusive to surrounding areas than current land uses.

Proposed Alternatives

To ensure that the development of the former Iola Medical Complex is the most appropriate re-use of the site, the applicant has considered four alternatives in addition to the main proposal; a) the No Action Alternative; b) Alternative Site Plan 2, consistent with the Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2000; c)

Alternative Site Plan 3, consistent with the Town of Brighton Existing Zoning (Low Density Residential); d) Alternative Site Plan 4, proposing RHD-2 High Density Residential in the Town of Brighton portion . Of the four alternatives, the plan that shows high density residential in the Town of Brighton portion is preferred.

More specifically, this alternative plan was prepared after discussions with City of Rochester and Town of Brighton officials. It was expressed that a mix of residential with some general office would be desirable in the Town of Brighton portion. After further consideration and market analysis, the developer prepared a plan which shows residential apartments and townhome units on the Town of Brighton portion of the site, as it was found to be the most supportive of the overall development plan and appropriate for this location. When compared to the original proposed plan, this option has a lower density of residential units and removes the live-work units. This alternative strikes a balance of between the Town of Brighton's desires for a lower density of residential housing, while also being economically feasible for the developer. This alternative does not impact any development or site design on the City of Rochester portion of the project site. Moreover, the massing and configuration of the buildings would be compatible and complementary to surrounding land uses and would be designed in a style that fits in with the overall architectural context of Citygate.

Cumulative Impacts

Currently there are two projects under review in the Town of Brighton which are relatively close in proximity to the Citygate development – The Reserve and Clinton Crossings Corporate Center (Corporate Center). Both projects are also being developed by AJC and Son Development and have been intentionally planned and designed to complement and work in tandem with one another.

The Reserve, located along the north side of the Erie Canal, south of I-590 is an application to rezone the property from Low Density Residential to Waterfront Development District to allow for the addition of 350 housing units, including 68 detached single family units, 102 clustered townhomes, and 180 loft condominiums. Corporate Center is located on the north side of I-590, on the west side of South Winton Road. The development runs parallel between I-590 and Senator Keating Boulevard. Corporate Center is an application for site plan approval to allow for the development of seven office buildings, a fitness facility, hotel and conference center, restaurants, and mixed use structures that will contain both retail and office space.

The impacts of the Citygate project on the Reserve are positive for future residents within that development. Due to the proximity of Citygate, goods and services will be within walking distance to the Reserve, limiting the amount of time that residents need to spend in their cars to reach shopping, offices, and entertainment, and enhancing the quality-of-life for residents in this development. The impacts of

Citygate on the Corporate Center are intentionally designed to be complementary. The Citygate development will draw Corporate Center workers and visitors beyond the typical workday. Corporate Center will have a direct trail connection to the Reserve, which will continue to the Erie Canal, along the Canal, and ultimately to Citygate. Creating a clear linkage between Citygate and the other identified projects is a priority and will help establish a regional pedestrian trail network through the Town, to the City of Rochester.

There are no other known development projects in the Town of Brighton or City of Rochester that will be potentially impacted by Citygate.

Use and Conservation of Energy Resources

The redevelopment of the Iola Medical Complex in itself is a form a sustainable development – redevelopment of an existing facility that has utilities and a surrounding transportation infrastructure that can support development will minimize the amount of new construction, thus minimizing energy and material use.

The proposed development will reuse demolition debris such as concrete, bricks and pavement for general fill where possible, reducing the amount of material that will need to be transported offsite and to landfills. The applicant will explore new technologies in building construction and materials to further reduce energy demands, including alternative wall systems that have higher “recycled product content” than traditional cavity wall systems.

Newly constructed buildings will be designed to meet all New York State Energy Codes and will require significantly less energy per square foot for heating and cooling than the current structures located on-site. The applicant will also investigate whether any New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) initiatives can be implemented into the proposed development, allowing for further possibilities to incorporate green technology.

Finally, opportunities for implementing sustainable site design techniques will also be explored, including grass pavers, porous pavements, “rain gardens”, and bio-retention swales. Landscaping will also be used to create microclimatic areas for people to retreat from the heat and wind, reducing the need for conditioned interior space. Incorporating a bus transit station will further reduce energy demands for transportation.

Conclusion

As proposed, the Citygate project will not pose any significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated to the maximum extent practicable. Citygate is a unique opportunity to provide a variety of

new housing options, office, retail and recreational opportunities as part of a high quality mixed use development that will serve the City of Rochester, Town of Brighton and beyond.

2.0 PROJECT OVERVIEW

2.1 Project Location and Setting

The project site is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road. The subject site is located in two municipalities, the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton, Monroe County, New York. The property is bounded by Westfall Road to the north, Brighton Meadows Office Park to the east, the Erie Canal to the south, and East Henrietta Road to the west. Figure 1, a project location map, identifies the location of the subject site. Interstate 390, a major north-south expressway through the Rochester region, is located south of the site, beyond the southern edge of the Erie Canal.

2.2 Project Description

The proposed Citygate project will be a diverse but complementary mix of residential and non-residential uses, including a variety of multi-family housing options, retail, office, hotels, and recreational and open space opportunities located in close proximity to a number of large community service uses, including University of Rochester, Monroe Community Hospital and the Monroe Community College (see Figure 2). Incorporating sustainable land use initiatives, the proposed development encourages pedestrian activity and interactions by functioning as a mixed-used center of activity, with live-work units and more typical residential townhouse space; balanced with pedestrian friendly mix of consumer oriented spaces for retail, offices, hotels and services. The development will create pockets of living and office space over first story retail, with a proposed parking structure and surface parking in multiple locations throughout the development. Public amenities include open space and direct connections to the Erie Canal with trails, sidewalks and an overlook.

Vehicular access to the site is provided from East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. Three vehicular access points are identified off of Westfall Road, none of which currently exist. The easternmost access point filters traffic directly into the residential area, with the other driveways providing access to Main Street and a surface parking lot in the Mixed Use district. There are also two

access points identified from East Henrietta Road into the site, both of which are existing. The northernmost intersection, which lines up with the hospital access on the west side of the road, is improved with a traffic signal.

Internally, a system of roadways will be developed on the site. The majority of proposed roadways do not currently exist, with the exception of the road that currently extends north-south connecting the access drives from East Henrietta Road. Existing roadways within the site will be reconfigured and redeveloped. Pedestrian linkages and a sidewalk network will provide internal pedestrian connections to and from all development areas internal to the site. Pedestrian connections will also extend externally to East Henrietta Road and south to the canal front, where people will also have the opportunity to connect to the Town of Brighton trail system and New York State Canalway Trail.

Parking facilities are proposed throughout the site in the form of surface lots and a multi-level parking structure. The parking structure, located in the center of the site, will be available for visitors to Citygate with some parking spaces designated to the University of Rochester as part of their off-site parking program. A University shuttle service will provide transportation from the parking garage to the campus at regular intervals throughout the day. Surface lots on the site, located along Westfall Road, internal on-street parking, and individual development sites, such as the hotel, provide additional parking spaces. Figure 3 shows the location of the on-site parking facilities.

The proposed Citygate project will be comprised of four design and land use districts – Neighborhood Mixed-Use, Canal Front Mixed-Use, Commercial, and Residential (see Figure 4). The total project site is approximately 63 acres and lies within both the City of Rochester (approximately 44 acres) and Town of Brighton (approximately 19 acres). A more detailed discussion of each district can be found below.

CITYGATE DISTRICTS

Neighborhood Mixed-Use

The Citygate Neighborhood Mixed-Use District is located in the northwest portion of the site and is the largest of the districts, encompassing approximately 27.3 acres, or forty-three percent of the total project area. The Neighborhood Mixed-Use District is located solely within the City of Rochester.

The focal point of this district is the large public plaza located just off the Citygate Main Street, a pedestrian-oriented environment consisting of a mix of first floor retail and restaurant uses supported by upper story office and residential uses. In addition to the public plaza and Main Street area, uses within this district will include commercial, multi-family residential, retail, restaurants, office space, and parking, as well as open space dedicated for public and recreational use.

The mix of uses proposed within this district includes 210,000 SF of retail space, 180,000 SF of office use, and 200 multi-family residential units.

Canal Front Mixed-Use

Located along the Erie Canal in the southern portion of the project site, the Canal Front Mixed-Use District includes 12.3 acres of land (19.5 percent of the total project area) and will include residential and commercial uses, in addition to a waterfront hotel. The Canal Front Mixed-Use District is intended to have a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere that is designed to capitalize on its unique canal-front location. Accordingly, the proposed site design calls for pedestrian-oriented circulation patterns marked by interpretive and wayfinding signage with connections to nearby multi-use trails and creating continual public access to the Erie Canal. The Canal Front Mixed Use District includes lands within the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton.

Specific to this district, proposed uses include 50,000 SF of retail, 10,000 SF of office, 200 residential units, and 200 rooms in a national chain hotel. Four loft buildings are located directly adjacent to the canal and designated pedestrian routes, with first-floor retail spaces opening directly to the Canalway Trail.

Commercial

The Commercial District accounts for 5.2 acres, or approximately 8%, of the total project site. The Commercial District includes a national hotel franchise as well as the potential for 50,000 SF of commercial uses. The exact design and configuration of the commercial uses along East Henrietta Road has not been established, pending the feasibility of preserving the Power Plant buildings that currently exists on the parcel to the north of the hotel site. At full build-out, the Commercial District is expected to include 50,000 SF of commercial uses, 3,000 SF of office and 150 hotel rooms. The Commercial District is located wholly within the City of Rochester.

Residential

The Residential District, comprising 18.2 acres (28.9 percent of the total project area) is located along the eastern boundary of the project site and is largely located within the Town of Brighton

though it does extend into the City of Rochester. Within the Residential District a variety of multi-family housing options will be made available to future residents. This new multi-family development is an integral part of the overall community and will be designed to create a comfortable living environment for residents that fosters social interaction through strong connections to other districts and through the integration of open and green space. A total of 700 multi-family residential units are proposed within this district.

Construction of the project will comprise of four phases and is anticipated to be completed within five years. Phase I will include most of the Neighborhood Mixed Use District and residential areas. Phase II will include the construction of a hotel and loft buildings along the Erie Canal. Phase III and IV will complete the development and includes the areas surrounding the Children's Detention Center, Rochester Pure Waters Operation Center and Fleet Garage.

CURRENT ZONING

The proposed Citygate site spans the municipal boundary between the City of Rochester and the Town of Brighton and is thus subject to the zoning ordinances of both communities. The 44 acres of the site located in the City of Rochester is currently zoned as IPD #12 (Institutional Planned Development District No. 12); the 19 acres of land located in the Town of Brighton is zoned as RLB (Residential Low Density District).

City of Rochester

Section 115-68 of the Code of the City of Rochester sets forth the general development standards for all Institutional Planned Developments (IPD). The purpose of the IPD district is "to recognize and permit the creation of defined areas for the unified and orderly development of major cultural, educational, medical and governmental institutions in order to support and enhance their benefit to the community". The following uses are permitted in all IPD districts:

- Universities, colleges and theological schools;
- Hospitals;
- Medical and health service facilities;
- Cultural facilities;
- Governmental facilities and properties; and
- Support uses or structures.

Institutional Planned Development No. 12, specific to the Iola Campus, was approved to allow only for the following uses:

- Waste Water Management Operations and Storage Building;
- Vehicle Maintenance Garage;
- Expanded Parking Areas;
- Backflow Prevention Buildings for Community Hospital; and
- Parking Lot 4 for Community Hospital.

It should be noted that Chapter 115 (Zoning), adopted on September 23, 1975 by Ordinance No. 75-377 was repealed on October 15, 2002 by Ordinance No. 2002-326; City zoning ordinances are now found under Chapter 120 of the City Code and do not include IPD districts.

Town of Brighton

According to Code of the Town of Brighton (Article II, Section 203-8), the purpose of the Residential Low Density District is “to promote and encourage a suitable environment for family living by protecting and stabilizing the residential character of the Town's established neighborhoods”. The following uses are permitted in the RLB District:

- Single-family detached dwellings not to exceed one dwelling on each lot.
- Family day-care homes.
- Buildings, structures and uses owned or operated by the Town of Brighton for municipal use.

PROPOSED ZONING

There are notable differences between the proposed land uses and permitted uses on the subject site. In order to create consistency between the proposal and existing zoning regulations, the applicant proposes to rezone the parcels within the Citygate project area to allow for a diversity of land uses (see Figure 5).

City of Rochester

To accommodate this unique development, the applicant is proposing to rezone the portion of the site located in the City of Rochester (approximately 44 acres) to Planned Development District No. 11 (PDD #11) in accordance with Article XVII of the City Zoning Code. Planned Development Districts are intended to create more flexible development opportunities and offer diversification in amenities, services, building design and a complementary transition from one area to another. This proposed district will provide for a range of uses, including retail, office, housing, hotels, and recreational opportunities (see Appendix A). Additionally, PDD #11 regulations will ensure a

high-quality mixed-use style development that promotes pedestrian access and connectivity, multi-modal transportation opportunities, creates dedicated open space areas for residents and visitors, and enhances access to the Erie Canal and waterfront. Uses to be permitted within this district include:

- Single-family attached dwellings.
- Multifamily dwellings.
- Live-work space subject to the additional requirements for specified uses in §120.142.1.
- Retail sales and service when conducted entirely within an enclosed building except as provided in §120-163.
- Health clubs and similar facilities.
- Offices.
- Motels and hotels.
- Bar, cocktail lounge, and tavern including accessory outdoor seating and/or assembly areas.
- Restaurants and banquet facilities including accessory outdoor seating and/or assembly areas.
- Drive-thru facilities as accessory to permitted uses or special permit uses.
- Community center, public or private.
- Semi-public uses.
- Mixed-uses, as listed within this Section.
- Dwelling units when part of a mixed use development but only on the second story or above.
- Community garages and parking lots.
- Accessory parking lots.
- Public garages and parking lots.
- Residential care facilities, subject to the Additional Requirements for Specified Uses in §120-146.
- Parks and recreational areas.
- Public and semi public uses, including school uses, museums, and public meeting halls.
- Research laboratories.
- Boat dock facilities, temporary.
- Boathouse.

Town of Brighton

The proposed plan which is the basis for the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement and the positive declaration that was issued for SEQR purposes is based on rezoning the Town of Brighton portion of the project to Residential High Density District 1 (RHD-1). The proposed plan maximizes the density for residential housing under the Brighton Town Code and includes several apartment buildings, live/work units and loft buildings. The RHD-1 district is intended to promote and encourage multifamily residential development at a high-density range (more than 8 units per acre). The following uses are permitted within the Town RHD-1 district:

- Two-family dwellings.
- Townhouses and garden apartments
- Single-family detached dwellings not to exceed one dwelling on each lot.
- Family child-care homes.
- Buildings, structures and uses owned or operated by the Town of Brighton for municipal use.
- High-rise apartments and garden apartments are conditional uses allowed in the RHD-1 district.

As the SEQR review process has progressed, so have discussions regarding the proposed plan and potential alternatives. A series of alternative plans have been prepared and analyzed based on input from City of Rochester and Town of Brighton officials. More specifically, the developer has considered four alternatives in addition to the main proposal; a) the No Action Alternative; b) Alternative Site Plan 2, consistent with the Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2000; c) Alternative Site Plan 3, consistent with the Town of Brighton Existing Zoning (Low Density Residential); d) Alternative Site Plan 4, proposing RHD-2 High Density Residential in the Town of Brighton portion. These alternatives are described in more detail in Chapters 4 and 5.

Through discussions and meetings with Town of Brighton Officials, it was expressed to the developer, that a mix of residential with some general office would be desirable in the Town of Brighton portion. After further consideration and market analysis, the developer believes that proposing exclusively residential housing in the Town of Brighton portion is the most supportive of the overall development plan and appropriate for this location. As a “new urbanism” development, a diverse mix and concentration of uses are needed. Conceptually, the Town of Brighton portion has been designed for housing since the inception of the project which complements and creates a good transition from the retail services, offices and other public amenities located in the City portion of the project. Alternative Site Plan 4 is a culmination of this concept which shows residential apartments and townhome units on the Town of Brighton portion

and proposes rezoning to the RHD-2 district (see Figure 29). The permitted uses remain the same as for RHD-1 district, however high-rise apartments and garden apartments are *not* allowed as conditional uses.

When compared to the proposed plan, Alternative Site Plan 4 has a lower density of residential units and removes the live-work units. This alternative proposes eight apartment buildings on the northern section of the Town of Brighton parcel and several 3-6 unit attached townhomes in the southern section. Based on recommendations from Town Officials to limit the height of the buildings, the developer has chosen to rezone the Town of Brighton portion to a RHD-2 district which restricts the height of buildings to a maximum of 40 feet or three stories tall. This alternative does not impact any development or site design on the City of Rochester portion of the project site. The massing and configuration of the buildings would be compatible and complementary to surrounding land uses and would be designed in a style that fits in with the overall architectural context of Citygate. Other benefits of this plan include a small reduction in impervious area and stormwater runoff, as well as reduction in traffic generation. Alternative Site Plan 4 is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.4

Given the reasons discussed above, this alternative has become the preferred option to the proposed plan as it strikes a balance of between the Town of Brighton's desires for a lower density of residential housing, while also remaining economically feasible for the developer. Moreover, rezoning the Town of Brighton portion to a RHD-2 district is more compatible with the current zoning RLB district (low density residential).

In addition to rezoning the proposed site, the applicant will be required to obtain a number of approvals from agencies, as well as both the City and Town in order to implement the proposed site development. Regulatory approvals required to enable the development of Citygate include:

Table 1. Approvals and Permits Required

Municipality / Agency	Approval / Permit
City of Rochester Mayor	Rezoning
City of Rochester City Council	Rezoning
City of Rochester Director of Zoning	Site Plan Approval
City of Rochester Commissioner of Community Development	Demolition Permit Site Preparation Permit
Town of Brighton Town Board	Rezoning Sewer and Water District Extensions
Town of Brighton Planning Board	Site Plan Approval Subdivision Approval EPOD Permit
Town of Brighton Zoning Board of Appeals	Possible Variances
Monroe County Water Authority	Water Supply Approval
Monroe County Pure Waters	Sanitary Sewer Use Approval Utility Extensions
County of Monroe Industrial Development Agency	Economic Incentives
New York State Department of Transportation	Highway Work Permit
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation	Water Quality Certification SPDES Permit
New York State Canal Corporation	Land Sale
Dormitory Authority of the State of New York	Funding

2.3 Purpose, Need, and Benefits

The proposed project will provide local residents, students and faculty of nearby universities, visitors and staff of Monroe Community Hospital, and others who live and work in the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton, as well as surrounding communities, an expanded range of goods, services, and amenities. The proposed project, which will be developed following the basic principles of Traditional Neighborhood Design, will be the first project of this type and scale within the City.

AJC & Son Development has identified this site as a prime location for this type of development due to its strategic location and proximity to a number of large community service uses, such as the Monroe Community Hospital, and large-scale educational facilities, such as Monroe Community College, the University of Rochester, and Rochester Institute of Technology. Employees, students, and visitors to these institutions, as well as others within the immediate

vicinity need the types of services to be provided by this development – a place to live, a place to spend the night when visiting a student or patient, places to eat, places to buy groceries, places to shop for a wide range of everyday and specialty goods. These services are not currently conveniently available within the immediate vicinity of the project site.

AJC & Son Development has undertaken a significant site evaluation and has completed market analyses and associated studies to determine what the best use for the subject property is. More specifically, studies were done regarding the housing and retail aspects of the project, however for proprietary reasons the full reports have not been included (see Appendix Q). The mixed use proposal for the site is a result of the findings of these studies. Given the surrounding markets that need to be satisfied, access to the site, availability of utilities, and the physical characteristics of the property, the proposed development of the site is both feasible and desirable.

The primary benefit of the proposed project is the provision of an expanded variety of goods, services, and housing options available to City and Town residents. In addition to benefiting the residents of Rochester, as well as visitors to the region, the project will generate significant tax revenues to the City of Rochester, the City school district, the Town of Brighton, and the Rush-Henrietta school district. Both temporary employment, in terms of construction and site development jobs, and permanent employment opportunities will be expanded with the completion of this project. In addition to property taxes generated by the proposed site development, the project will also generate additional sales tax revenue.

3.0 STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW (SEQR) PROCESS

3.1 Project Classification and Lead Agency Designation

The applicant, AJC and Son Development, formally submitted a rezoning application to the City on February 25, 2008. In accordance with 6 NYCRR, Part 617 of the SEQR implementing regulations the Proposed Project is a Type I action. Since the Project Site crosses over municipal boundary lines, the City and Town entered into a Lead Agency Agreement (see Appendix B). The City and Town agreed that the City would be the designated Lead Agency for SEQR purposes and due to the complexity of the Proposed Project a Positive Declaration would be issued. The Lead Agency Agreement also established a coordinated review procedure between the City and Town. The Director of Zoning coordinated Lead Agency with all Involved Agencies

and was officially established as Lead Agency. A Positive Declaration of Environmental Significance in accordance with SEQR was issued on April 3, 2008 (see Appendix B).

3.2 The Scoping Process

Under 6 NYCRR, Part 617.8 Scoping is optional, and the goal is to focus on the potentially significant adverse impacts and eliminate impacts that are irrelevant. The City and Town decided to conduct Scoping and the applicant submitted a Draft Scope on April 4, 2008. A Public Scoping Meeting was held on April 23, 2008 and a final Scoping Document was issued by the Lead Agency on May 22, 2008 (see Appendix C).

3.3 SEQR Review Agencies

The following is a list of the Known Involved Agencies:

- City of Rochester Mayor
- City of Rochester City Council
- City of Rochester Director of Zoning (Lead Agency)
- City of Rochester Department of Community Development
- Town of Brighton Town Board
- Town of Brighton Planning Board
- Town of Brighton Zoning Board of Appeals
- Monroe County Water Authority
- Monroe County Pure Waters
- County of Monroe Industrial Development Agency (COMIDA)
- New York State Department of Transportation
- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
- New York State Canal Corporation
- Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY)

The following is a list of the Known Interested Agencies:

- Monroe County Department of Transportation
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation
- Monroe County Planning Department
- Town of Brighton Conservation Board
- Town of Brighton Historic Preservation Commission

- Town of Brighton Architectural Review Board
- Town of Brighton Fire District
- City of Rochester Planning Commission
- City of Rochester Preservation Board
- City of Rochester Water Bureau
- City of Rochester Department of Environmental Services
- Upper Mount Hope Neighborhood Association
- Lilac Neighbors
- South East Area Coalition
- Rush-Henrietta Central School District
- Rochester Police Department
- Rochester Fire Department
- Rochester Regional Community Design Center (RRCDC)
- Rochester Environmental Commission

4.0 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES/ALTERNATIVES

4.1 The Environmental Setting

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Site Improvements and Infrastructure

The Lola Campus has an internal road system with several parking lots, fenced storage yards and confinement areas, and a full complement of utilities including water supply, sanitary sewers, storm drainage, electric, gas, telephone, and a network of tunnels for steam and other lines. The condition of the asphalt appears worn in many places and the infrastructure and utility systems/lines are likely suspect and will receive necessary upgrades with redevelopment.

Water service within the City is provided by the City of Rochester Water Bureau; within the Town of Brighton, service is typically provided by the Monroe County Water Authority. Wastewater collection is under the control of the Monroe County Pure Waters District and is separated from stormwater drainage flows. The stormwater system captures runoff from building roofs, pavement, and landscaped areas – removal is accomplished via buried pipes ranging in size from 6-inch to 24-inches in diameter.

Overhead electric is provided by Rochester Gas and Electric (RG&E) and extends along the site frontage along both East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. RG&E also provides natural gas service via a 12-inch main along Westfall Road and a 3-inch main along East Henrietta Road. Both services are supplied to the existing on-site structures.

Buildings

The project site comprises approximately 63 acres of land and is improved with fifteen buildings, nine of which were initially developed as a tuberculosis sanatorium during the early 1900s.

The existing project site was the location of the former Iola Medical Complex. During its peak use the medical complex included 11 structures. Although two of these buildings were demolished in the 1980s, nine buildings remain today, as well as the system of tunnels that connects them. A vast majority of the structures are currently vacant and in disrepair as they are no longer in use. The location of each building is depicted in Figure 6, while Table 2 provides the year built and gross square footage. See Section 4.5 for a more detailed discussion of the site’s historic, archaeological and cultural resources.

Table 2. Iola Medical Complex Structures

Building	Year Built	Size (gross ft ²)
1 Nurses' Home	1927	23,548
2 Dormitory Pavilion	1911	5,890
3 ¹ --	--	--
4 Dormitory Pavilion	1911	5,890
5 Children's Building	1927	58,386
6 ¹ --	--	--
7 Staff Home	1931	14,360
8 Superintendent's House	1924	2,775
9 Dormitory Pavilion	1911	5,890
10 Service Building ²	1924	11,911
11 Power Plant ³	1930	35,000
<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>163,650</i>

1. demolished in the 1980s
2. Currently used as shop/garage/office
3. Currently used to provide steam for all buildings at the Iola Campus, Monroe County Hospital, Monroe Community College, and correctional facility

The remaining six buildings were developed after 1970 and used for vehicle maintenance/repair operations, workshops, warehouse, or group quarter's purposes by Monroe County or other municipal agencies. These structures are located primarily in the southern portion of the site and comprise approximately 146,000 square feet.

Table 3. Project Site Other Structures

Building	Size (gross ft ²)
Rochester Pure Waters District	63,800
Recycling Building	6,400
Household Hazardous Waste Recycling Center ¹	1,548
Fleet Garage	17,887
Children's Detention Center	35,600
Sheriff's Warehouse	20,768
TOTAL	146,003

1. recently removed for new construction

Topography

Site elevations on the subject property range from approximately 505 feet in the southeast corner of the property to 585 feet in the northwest corner. Both the northwest and southeast corners of the project site are relatively flat, with the steepest slopes (approximately 10 to 20 percent) running through the center of the site from southwest to northeast (see Figure 7). These steeper slopes demarcate the boundary between the former Monroe County Iola Campus and Pure Waters Rochester, the Monroe County Children's Detention Center, and the undeveloped portions of the project site.

Natural Resources

The southern project site boundary is directly adjacent to the Erie Canal and Canalway Trail. The remaining undeveloped portions comprise approximately 19 acres and are located along the eastern edge of the project site. Landscaping and vegetation in the developed areas is typical of other urban developments; whereas much of the undeveloped portion of the site is sparsely vegetated with opportunistic species consistent with successional old field and forest pioneer communities typical of disturbed sites. Additionally, four small wetlands totaling 0.33 acres were identified within the project boundaries (see Section 4.3)

The proposed Citygate development encompasses seven soil types as indicated in Table 4; Figure 8 depicts the location of these soils within the project site. A more detailed discussion can be found in Section 4.3.

Table 4. Project Site Soils

Soil Type		Area (acres)
HIB	Hilton loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	34.90
Ng	Niagara silt loam	22.36
OnC	Ontario loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	2.73
SeB	Schoharie silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	2.52
OnB	Ontario loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	0.85
GaA	Galen very fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0.67
Mb	Made land	0.13
Total Area		64.15

4.2 Surface Water Resources

Appendix D contains the full text of the Stormwater Management Reports for the project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The project site is located at the western tip of the Irondequoit Creek Watershed. The overall watershed is broken up into smaller sections and this site is considered a part of the Allens Creek tributary area. The parcel to be developed consists of woods, underbrush, grass areas, multiple vacant and occupied buildings and their associated parking facilities and utilities.

The existing site consists of four drainage areas totaling about 65 acres, which includes a small portion of off-site drainage along the southern property line. The largest area is 45 percent of the development and is located on the west side of the site, which discharges into the Erie Canal. The remaining three drainage areas drain towards the east property line before entering the NYSDOT pond located at the I-390 interchange. One of these three areas drains off-site through the on-site storm system to the area east of the property. The existing drainage flow is described on Figure 26.

IMPACTS

This project will impact existing drainage as a large amount of impervious area will be added to the site. However, since the project site is currently developed, the net increase in impervious area is substantially less than if a “green” (i.e. undeveloped site) were to be developed instead. The increase in impervious surfaces will result in an increase in stormwater runoff following rain events. This runoff water also may contain pollutants that are often found on impervious surfaces such as rooftops and parking lots.

It is proposed that stormwater be captured and conveyed by means of a closed storm sewer system of pipes and catch basins. Stormwater will then be directed to a proposed detention pond at the southeast corner of the site. Figure 27 illustrates the proposed water courses will be similar to the existing, except that one course will no longer enter the off-site stormwater system. The resulting discharges for full development potential of all lands associated with this site are computed and depicted in Table 5.

Table 5, Project Site Stormwater Discharge

Storm Year	Flow Rate Off-Site (cfs)	
	Existing	Proposed
1	77.55	1.20
2	95.45	3.06
10	163.74	24.26
25	195.46	57.88
100	246.52	117.38

MITIGATION MEASURES

Forty-five percent of the site discharges into the Erie Canal, which according to a report prepared by the USGS in 2005 does not discharge into the Irondequoit Creek Watershed. However, the stormwater management analysis assumes that all discharge ends up in the Irondequoit Creek Watershed. Complying with the more stringent water quality goals of the Irondequoit Creek Watershed Collaborative increases the water quality size of the stormwater management pond over the Phase II federal stormwater regulations.

The stormwater pond is located within the natural flow of stormwater at the lowest point of the site. It will enhance the existing adjacent open space that is currently wet and/or classified as

wetlands. The pond will be oversized to create a visual amenity. A walking trail as well as grasses, plantings, shrubs and trees will be placed around the pond.

The pond will be designed to meet the water quality and quantity requirements of the Irondequoit Creek Watershed and NYSDEC State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges, GP-08-001. The pond will include two outfall structures that will divert roughly 50 percent of the pond outfall towards the Erie Canal and the remainder will be directed to the NYSDOT pond, which is similar to the existing conditions.

While the proposed mitigation easily meets design requirements, the applicant proposes to explore methods to collect stormwater for reuse (e.g., rain gardens, green roofs, porous pavement) during final design as part of a comprehensive program of green initiatives.

Finally, as required, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be created to comply with the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (GP 08-001) and the stormwater management objectives of the Irondequoit Creek Watershed Collaborative. This SWPPP will describe how stormwater will be managed during and after construction. It will also describe how the stormwater pond will be completed during the first phase of construction; as well as describe the stormwater management requirements for each phase of construction.

4.3 Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The majority of the site consists of developments associated with the former Monroe County Iola Medical Complex, the Monroe County Children's Detention Center, the Monroe Newpower Corporation, and Rochester Pure Waters. The remaining undeveloped portions comprise of approximately 15 acres and are located along the eastern edge of the project site.

Much of the undeveloped portion of the site appears to have been utilized as a storage area for maintenance equipment and construction materials. Although no buildings are currently present, evidence of past disturbance includes extensive fills resulting from the construction of parking areas, and driveways, as well as disposal, construction and demolition of buildings, and storage of construction materials. Those areas evidencing historic fill material are sparsely vegetated with opportunistic species consistent with successional old field and forest pioneer communities typical of disturbed sites. The dominant vegetation in these areas includes eastern cottonwood

(*Populus deltoids*) and box elder (*Acer negundo*) trees, honeysuckle (*Lonicera tatarica*) shrubs, summer grape (*Vitis aestivalis*), and white avens (*Geum canadense*) groundcover. Other upland species included mugwort (*Altissima vulgaris*), garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*), Queen Anne's lace (*Daucus carota*), and teasel (*Dipsicus sylvestris*). Pockets of common reed (*Phragmites australis*) are widespread across the study area, as this opportunistic species is taking full advantage of the disturbed nature of the project site.

In addition to these upland communities, grading and other disturbance activities have altered site hydrology and resulted in several pockets of standing water, which now exhibit wetland character. More specifically, survey efforts conducted during January and June 2008 identified four emergent wetlands totaling 0.33 acres within the project boundaries, of which two have been identified as jurisdictional Waters of the United States (see Table 6 and Figure 9). Emergent wetlands are characterized by low-growing emergent vegetation such as grasses, rushes, reeds, sedges, and other herbaceous plants. These wetlands often lack woody vegetation.

Table 6. On-site Wetlands

Wetland ID	Wetland Type	Waters of the United States	Area (acres)
A	Emergent	Yes	0.12
B	Emergent	Yes	0.07
C	Emergent	No	0.09
D	Emergent	No	0.05
Total Area			0.33

Environmental Resources, LLC prepared a wetland report and has coordinated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the NYSDEC Natural Heritage Program to determine whether any rare, threatened, and endangered species occur at the project site (see Appendix E and F respectively). Based on a review of the USFWS database, it was determined that the bog turtle (*Clemmys muhlenbergii*) may occur in western Monroe County. Inhabiting bogs, swamps, and wet meadows, Muhlenberg's turtles are habitat specialists requiring full sunlight, an abundance of grassy or mossy cover, and spring seepage. Field investigations conducted on January 7 and June 26, 2008 failed to identify individuals or habitat for the Muhlenberg's turtle within the project area.

Tree Inventory

In accordance with the Town of Brighton Code, a tree inventory was conducted for the approximately 19 acres of the project site located in the Town of Brighton. The inventory was conducted in those areas within the site boundaries where the potential to impact trees exists. All trees with a diameter at breast height (DBH) greater than six inches were inventoried. Based on the results of the survey (Table 7 and Figure 10), approximately 266 box elders and Eastern cottonwoods will be impacted as a result of construction of the proposed development. See Figure 9 for a more detailed breakdown of trees. As is evidenced by the average DBH values presented in Table 7, the existing trees are of a relatively young age.

Table 7. Tree Inventory Summary – Town of Brighton

Scientific Name	Common Name	Number	Average DBH (inches)
<i>Acer negundo</i>	Box elder	116	8.2
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	Eastern cottonwood	150	13.1
<i>TOTALS</i>		266	11.0

Additionally, based on discussions with the City, it was requested that the Applicant consider removing and relocating the existing sycamore trees located along Iola Circle in the northwest corner of the project site. Given the age and apparent health of these trees, relocation is not feasible; thus these trees will be permanently removed. The Applicant, however, will consider planting new sycamore trees in areas determined to be appropriate at a later date.

Soils

The proposed Citygate development encompasses seven soil types as indicated in Table 8; Figure 8 depicts the location of these soils within the project site.

Table 8. Project Site Soils

Soil Type	Area (acres)
HIB Hilton loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	34.90
Ng Niagara silt loam	22.36
OnC Ontario loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	2.73
SeB Schoharie silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	2.52
OnB Ontario loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	0.85
GaA Galen very fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0.67
Mb Made land	0.13
Total Area	64.15

A brief description of each soil type can be found below:

H1B – Hilton loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

The Hilton series consists of very deep, moderately well drained soils formed in till of Wisconsin age, derived from sandstone and limestone. They are nearly level to sloping soils on till plains and glaciated dissected plateaus. Depth to the top of a seasonal high water table ranges from 18 to 24 inches. Shrink-swell potential is low. Available water capacity is high.

The structural stability and suitability for development (roads, parking lots, building foundations, etc.) for this soil type is classified as somewhat limited. The reasons for this rating include frost action and the depth to the saturated zone.

Ng – Niagara silt loam

The Niagara series consists of very deep, somewhat poorly drained soils formed in silty glacio-lacustrine deposits. These soils are in level to slightly concave areas on lake plains and in valleys. Depth to the top of a seasonal high water table ranges from 6 to 18 inches. Shrink-swell potential is low. Available water capacity is high.

The structural stability and suitability for development (roads, parking lots, building foundations, etc.) for this soil type is classified as very limited. The reasons for this rating include low strength, frost action and the depth to the saturated zone.

OnC – Ontario loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes

The Ontario series consists of deep or very deep, well drained soils formed in till which is strongly influenced by limestone and sandstone. They are nearly level to very steep soils on convex upland till plains and drumlins. Depth to the top of a seasonal high water table ranges from 34 to 46 inches. Shrink-swell potential is low. Available water capacity is moderate.

The structural stability and suitability for development (roads, parking lots, building foundations, etc.) for this soil type is classified as somewhat limited. The reasons for this rating include slope and frost action.

SeB – Schoharie silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

The Schoharie series consists of very deep, moderately well drained soils formed in clayey lacustrine sediments. They are on glacial lake plains and uplands mantled with lake sediments. Depth to the top of a seasonal high water table ranges from 18 to 36 inches. Shrink-swell potential is moderate. Available water capacity is high.

The structural stability and suitability for development (roads, parking lots, building foundations, etc.) for this soil type is classified as very limited. The reasons for this rating include low strength, swell, frost action, and depth to the saturated zone.

OnB – Ontario loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes

The Ontario series consists of deep or very deep, well drained soils formed in till which is strongly influenced by limestone and sandstone. They are nearly level to very steep soils on convex upland till plains and drumlins. Depth to the top of a seasonal high water table ranges from 34 to 46 inches. Shrink-swell potential is low. Available water capacity is moderate.

The structural stability and suitability for development (roads, parking lots, building foundations, etc.) for this soil type is classified as somewhat limited. The reason for this rating is frost action.

GaA – Galen very fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

This soil is very deep and moderately well drained. Depth to the top of a seasonal high water table ranges from 18 to 24 inches. Shrink-swell potential is low. Available water capacity is moderate. The Galen series occupies nearly level or gently sloping areas associated with sandy deltas and sand mantled till "islands" within lacustrine landscape.

The structural stability and suitability for development (roads, parking lots, building foundations, etc.) for this soil type is classified as somewhat limited. The reasons for this rating are frost action and depth to the saturation zone.

Mb – Made land

Soil characteristics of this component can vary widely from one location to another. On-site investigation is needed to determine the suitability for specific use.

Based on a preliminary review of available soil information the subsurface profile is expected to consist of reworked near surface soils over native glacial till. The till deposit is somewhat variable with loose to compact till in the upper 15 to 25 feet; and dense to very dense till underlying the upper till zone. The depth to bedrock is estimated at 75 feet below the surface. Groundwater levels are expected to be perch on the dense till deposit 15 to 25 feet below grade.

Worth additional note is the quality of the soil in terms of farmland productivity. Although this urban area has not been actively farmed in many decades, 60.8 percent of the soils on-site

comprise prime farmland, 34.9 percent are considered prime farmland when drained, and 4.3 percent are classified as farmland of statewide importance.

IMPACTS

Grading of the site will be required prior to construction of the buildings, roads, and other ancillary facilities necessary to implement the proposed project. Although not currently developed, a detailed grading plan will be prepared as part of the planning process. With the exception of the existing steep slopes, it is expected that changes to the existing topographic character will be limited and no unique geologic or physical features will be significantly affected. As such, no significant adverse impacts to topography are anticipated to occur.

Based on the proposed site layout, construction of the Citygate project will likely impact 0.33 acre of wetlands, of which 0.19 are considered jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. On May 5, 2008 the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) conducted a field visit to confirm the wetland delineation prepared by Environmental Resources, LLC. A jurisdictional determination letter from the USACE dated September 22, 2008 has confirmed that they are in agreement with the assessment (see Appendix S).

Regarding impacts, Wetland A will be disturbed during construction of the lake/stormwater retention facility, which is scheduled to occur during Phase 1. Wetland B will be impacted during the latter phases of the project during construction of the five live/work structures and the associated infrastructure (e.g., parking, roads). While the applicant has attempted to reduce wetland-related impacts, the size, form, and location of these wetlands makes avoidance and minimization infeasible. Given the disturbed nature of these wetlands, in conjunction with the potential for mitigation, no significant adverse impacts are expected.

In addition to wetland impacts, project development will result in the loss of natural vegetation in the undeveloped portion of the site. While these sparsely vegetated, disturbed areas do provide wildlife habitat, no threatened or endangered species were identified during the field reconnaissance.

Specific to the Town of Brighton portion of the project site, 116 box elders with an average diameter-at-breast-height (DBH) of 8.2 inches and 150 Eastern cottonwoods with an average DBH of 13.1 inches will be removed during grading activities. Given the disturbed nature and through site visits, these young trees are of relatively low-quality.

As is depicted in Table 8, approximately 35 percent of the site comprises Niagara silt loam, which, according to the Monroe County Soil and Water Conservation District, has a seasonally high water table that ranges from 18 to 24 inches from the surface. Hilton loams, with a seasonally high water table ranging from 18 to 24 inches from the surface, cover almost 55 percent of the site. As this area is served by public water, in conjunction with the stormwater facilities proposed for the site, it is not anticipated that the quality of seasonal high ground water will be adversely affected.

Additionally, given that farming has not occurred on-site in many decades and is generally no longer practiced in Rochester or Brighton, it is improbable to expect that farming activities on this land will be viable in the future given the distance to any facilities that support farming.

Proposed building construction is slab on grade, with the exception of the parking garage and buildings immediately north and west of the parking garage (see Figure 3). Deep excavations will be limited to footings for buildings with slabs on grade, foundations for the parking garage and the aforementioned buildings and utilities. Where isolated occurrences of bedrock are encountered, heavy construction equipment will be used to remove as much of the fractured/weathered rock as feasible. If additional rock removal is required, blasting may be necessary. All National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and Occupational Safety and Health Association (OSHA) requirements will be followed.

The majority of the Citygate site comprises vegetation typically associated with developed areas, including- manicured grass lawns and ornamental trees. The remaining portions are sparsely vegetated by opportunistic typical of disturbed sites. Grading activities associated with project construction are expected to remove some vegetation located on-site.

MITIGATION MEASURES

As noted above, project development activities will result in the loss of 0.19 acre of wetlands identified as jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. It is likely that the project would qualify for either Nationwide Permit 29 (Residential Development) or Nationwide Permit 39 (Commercial and Institutional Development).

Nationwide Permit 29 (Residential Development) – this NWP authorizes the discharge of dredged or fill material into non-tidal waters of the United States for the construction of building foundations and building pads and attendant features (e.g., roads, parking lots,

garages) that are necessary for the use of the residence or residential development. Impacts may not exceed 0.50 acre to non-tidal jurisdictional waters of the U.S., or 300 linear feet of stream bed. The permittee is required to submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer prior to commencing the activity.

Nationwide Permit 39 (Commercial and Institutional Development) – this NWP authorizes the discharge of dredged or fill material into non-tidal waters of the United States for the construction or expansion of commercial and institutional building foundations and building pads and attendant features (e.g., roads, parking lots, garages, yards, utility lines, storm water management facilities) that are necessary for the use and maintenance of the structures. Impacts may not exceed 0.50 acre to non-tidal jurisdictional waters of the U.S., or 300 linear feet of stream bed. The permittee is required to submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer prior to commencing the activity.

Applicable to both NWPs, compensatory mitigation at a minimum one-for-one ratio is required for all wetland losses that exceed 0.10 acre and require pre-construction notification, unless the district engineer determines in writing that some other form of mitigation would be more environmentally appropriate and provides a project-specific waiver of this requirement. The exact amount of mitigation that will be required has yet to be determined. The applicant will propose compensation for the loss of these aquatic resources and their functions in accordance with current USACE regulations and guidelines pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Such mitigation could include the purchase of mitigation credits from an approved wetland mitigation bank or the construction of a mitigation wetland specific to this project.

To mitigate for the loss of trees and other natural vegetation on the Town of Brighton portion of the project site, the project has developed a series of design guidelines that incorporate the following natural landscape elements:

- Street trees and planted islands to provide shade and comfort to pedestrians.
- Informal public green space for gathering and recreation.
- Container gardens at appropriate commercial locations.
- Informal public green space for gathering and recreation.
- Formal landscape plantings
- Pocket parks.
- Tot lots and playgrounds.

Although no significant adverse impacts to the existing site topography are expected, the applicant will use best management practices and follow all necessary regulatory requirements during grading to minimize any associated impacts (e.g., soil runoff).

Any potential impacts to residents resulting from seasonal high ground will be mitigated by the proposed drainage collection system. To ensure that the project site soils can support the proposed development, a geotechnical engineer will evaluate soil borings that will be obtained and make recommendations for the design of the roads, parking lots, and building foundations. To offset the impact associated with the removal of existing vegetation, the Citygate project will incorporate the following landscaping elements throughout the proposed development:

- Informal public green space open space.
- Visual, high impact plantings
- Street trees to provide shade and comfort to pedestrians.
- Container gardens at appropriate commercial locations.
- Formal landscape plantings
- Pocket parks
- Tot lots and playgrounds

4.4 Visual Setting and Aesthetic Resources

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing visual setting of the site includes a variety of building types and uses which range from a Children's Detention Center to a power plant (please refer to Section 4.1 for a more detailed discussion of the existing buildings on-site). These uses, including a number of vacant and deteriorating buildings are within a greater visual setting that includes two major, heavily traveled roadways, the Monroe Community Hospital complex, and multi-family residential uses. Figures 11 and 12 depict images of the E. Henrietta Road and Westfall Road corridors in the vicinity of the subject site.

The existing project site was the location of the former Iola Medical Complex. Existing buildings and facilities of the medical complex are visible from East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road, as well as internal site roadways and parking areas. Existing buildings range in size from 1,548 SF to 63,800 SF and are from one to four stories in height. There is minimal landscaping on the site, mainly in the form of mature trees.

Buildings show significant signs of aging, including structural deterioration, crumbling exterior walls and missing windows. Grass and ground cover is overgrown in some areas. Natural vegetation is sparse, consisting predominately of opportunistic species typical of disturbed sites.

IMPACTS

Following completion of the proposed Citygate development, the properties will include significant site improvements and enhancements through the installation of new landscaping and aesthetic improvements, new building construction, and enhanced internal circulation and parking areas. Figures 13 and 14 provide three-dimensional views depicting full build-out of the site as seen from the northwest and southeast corners; Figures 15 and 16 present more detailed three-dimensional views of the proposed Neighborhood Mixed-Use District from the southeast and southwest.

MITIGATION MEASURES

To ensure a high-quality mixed-use style development that promotes pedestrian access and connectivity, a complementary architectural vocabulary, multi-modal transportation opportunities, the integration of open space and public gathering areas, and enhances access to the Erie Canal and waterfront opportunities, Design Guidelines were developed for each of the four proposed districts – Neighborhood Mixed-Use, Canal Front Mixed-Use, Residential, and Commercial. These Design Guidelines are part of the rezoning proposal for the Citygate development (see Appendix G). A discussion of each can be found below.

Neighborhood Mixed-Use Design Guidelines

As previously noted, uses in this district may include hotels, multi-family residential, parking, retail, restaurants, office space, and public, open space, and recreational uses. The general design character of this district is that of a festival-like atmosphere with active streetscapes and pedestrian gathering areas. Retail and restaurant uses on the ground level will be supported by residential and office uses on upper levels; public uses on the ground level will help to maintain vibrancy of streets and public areas. To maximize pedestrian access to the variety of proposed uses, parking shall be provided in lots, garages, and along internal roadways. The design of these uses shall be centered on guiding pedestrians to the large public plaza suitable for special events and community gatherings.

To achieve the desired design character, the following site and landscape amenities shall be incorporated within the Neighborhood Mixed-Use District:

- Pedestrian amenities including lighting, benches, bike racks, and trash receptacles
- Visual, high impact plantings
- Street trees to provide shade and comfort to pedestrians.
- Public art and sculpture
- Ample seating opportunities
- Public plaza and open space that can accommodate a variety of uses.
- Iconic focal element that personifies Citygate.
- Wide pedestrian walkways.
- On-street parking.
- Hardscape elements
- Clear delineations between pedestrian and vehicular spaces.

In terms of architectural “vocabulary”, or style, the Neighborhood Mixed-Use District shall comprise features that promote and capitalize on the public plaza to make it appealing to pedestrians. This includes the full integration of residential, retail, restaurant, and office uses to create a consistent composition and true mixed-use environment. Additionally, buildings located around the public plaza shall not exceed a height that deters from the pedestrian-oriented character desired for this district and will provide overhangs at the ground floor to accommodate pedestrian activity. Entrances to all buildings and uses shall be well defined.

Other key architectural elements include:

Colonnades or covered walkways

- Covered entrances.
- Façade articulation with vertical elements.
- Large glazed façade at main entrance, making it visible from the street or main site access.
- Rigid frame or fabric awnings
- Articulation of building materials defining base, middle & top or base and top.
- Façade subdivision into proportional bays.
- Dormers and bay windows.
- Variations of roof lines.

- Decorative parapets and cornices.
- Balconies with decorative railings

To further integrate the variety of proposed uses, all buildings shall be constructed of similar materials, including one or more of the following – brick, stucco, natural dimensional stone, cast stone, masonry units (integrally colored, textured, or glazed), pre-finished/pre-stressed concrete, or glass framing systems. In addition to the use of consistent building materials, building design will incorporate complementary accent colors to be applied throughout the district.

Finally, a series of sign guidelines have been developed to create aesthetically pleasing and cohesive sign standards while reinforcing the existing context of the development. In addition to ensuring that the height and width of letters and logos is properly proportioned to the sign area, signage must be of the appropriate scale to appeal to both pedestrians walking on adjacent sidewalks and to vehicles. When located on buildings, signage shall be incorporated into the overall design of a building and shall complement the façade or architectural element on which it is placed. Additionally, marquee signage locations shall be clearly defined in the design of commercial building facades. For those retail and restaurant establishments in and around the plaza, sign extending perpendicularly from the building shall be allowed.

Canal Front Mixed-Use Design Guidelines

While the same mix of uses will comprise the Canal Front Mixed-Use District as those within the Neighborhood Mixed-use District, the general design character of this district will consider, and capitalize on, the unique waterfront location of this area. Building design will be compatible with, and complementary to, the adjacent districts to create a cohesive built environment that has a definable character and sense of place.

To achieve the desired design character, the following site and landscape amenities shall be incorporated along the canal front:

- Pedestrian oriented circulation patterns.
- Pedestrian amenities including planters, lighting, benches, bike racks, and trash receptacles.
- Pedestrian oriented location, interpretive, and wayfinding signage
- Formal public gathering areas.
- Informal public green space for gathering and recreation.
- Multi-use trails to create continual public access to Erie Canal

The following site and landscape amenities shall be incorporated in those areas within this district but not located along the canal front:

- Community gathering areas
- Defined pedestrian connections to internal uses and canal.
- Pedestrian amenities including planters, banners, lighting, benches, bike racks, and trash receptacles
- Pedestrian oriented location, interpretive, and wayfinding signage.
- Connections to multi-use trails to create continual public access to Erie Canal.
- Sculptures and other focal elements
- Site furnishings with waterfront character.
- Container gardens at appropriate commercial locations.
- Hardscape materials consistent with waterfront and overall Citygate development

The architectural vocabulary of the Canal Front Mixed-Use District includes arcades or covered walkways at the ground floor level of retail areas to create cover for pedestrians and façade features that contribute to the creation of a pedestrian friendly character. Additionally, balconies and planes shall be encouraged on upper levels to take advantage of the waterfront location. Other key building elements to be integrated into the design of this district include:

- Clearly defined, visible covered entrances which maintain the proportional scale of the building
- Entrances shall have a definable architectural expression, except when they are retail storefronts under covered walkways
- Facade articulation with vertical elements
- Articulation of building materials defining base, middle, and top or base and top
- Division of façade into proportional bays.
- Dormers and bay windows.
- Rigid frame or fabric awnings
- Variations of roof lines.
- Decorative parapets and cornices.
- Balconies with decorative railings.

Guidelines requiring the use of consistent building materials and accent colors, as well as those governing signage in the Canal Front Mixed-Use District are the same as those noted above for the Neighborhood Mixed-use District.

Residential Design Guidelines

The residential district will provide multi-family housing through the development of low- and mid-rise apartments and townhomes. This new multi-family development shall be an integral part of the overall community and will be designed to create a comfortable living environment for residents and foster social interaction. Additionally, each residential neighborhood may have some individual identity within the larger development, to be accomplished by creating distinctive entries, roof treatments, through breaks in the building form, or use of materials and colors.

To achieve the desired design character, the following site and landscape amenities shall be integrated throughout the Residential District:

- Sculptural elements and fountains.
- Pedestrian scaled gateways.
- Pedestrian amenities including lighting, signage, bike racks, and benches.
- Formal landscape plantings
- Areas for gathering and recreation
- Internal sidewalks and trails to link residences to other areas within Citygate
- External sidewalks and trails which connect to surrounding neighborhoods, multi-use trail systems, and Erie Canal
- Pocket parks.
- Tot lots and playgrounds.

The standards developed to guide the architectural vocabulary of the Residential District include the creation of visual interest through the articulation of facades, forms, and use of color; the use of varied rooflines and different roof heights, shapes, shapes, and directions to visually break up large structures; and the division of larger buildings into smaller modules. Balconies, pop-outs, bay windows, and arches shall also be used to break up massing. Specific to façade design, the following guidelines shall apply:

- All facades shall be well composed and articulated in order to create visual interest.
- Facades shall be consistent with architectural styles and themes used throughout the development.

- Buildings with large facades shall be visually divided into smaller sections by subdividing the façade into proportional bays through the application of vertical divisions and materials
- The composition of the building shall present a clearly recognizable base, middle, and top.

To provide a sense of continuity within this district, all buildings shall be constructed of similar materials, including one or more of the following – brick, natural or synthetic stone, integrally-colored stucco and hardboard siding. Painted surfaces shall use colors that reinforce architectural concepts and are compatible with natural materials such as brick or stone, used within the development. Additionally, building design will incorporate complementary accent colors throughout the district.

In addition to the elements identified above, the following key components shall be integrated into the architectural design for residential buildings:

- Clearly defined, visible entrances which maintain the proportional scale of the building.
- Covered entrances
- Varying roof heights and wall planes.
- Large facades divided into modules to create smaller sections.
- Bay windows
- Pop-outs & projections.
- Balconies
- Chimneys.
- Dormers.
- Window shutters.
- Articulation of wall surface materials & colors.

In addition to the sign guidelines discussed above, signage located in the Residential District shall be integrated within the overall design of adjacent buildings and its surrounding landscape. Monumental neighborhood signage located on a street frontage shall be a material and color that is consistent with overall design of adjacent buildings and the overall development.

Commercial Design Guidelines

The uses proposed for the Commercial district include freestanding retail establishments, hotels, office buildings, and freestanding parking garages. The general design character provides a consistent architectural style to be used throughout the development and builds on the design vocabulary established for the Neighborhood Mixed-Use District.

To achieve the desired design character, the following site design features shall be integrated throughout the Commercial District:

- High quality landscape materials
- Pedestrian scale lighting, banners, and signage.
- Various outdoor seating opportunities.
- Major entry gateway feature.
- Consistent design palette for all amenities.
- Container plantings at office and storefront entrances on ground level.
- Planted islands and street trees.

The architectural vocabulary of the Commercial District dictates that buildings with façades exceeding 75 feet in length shall have repeating wall recessions or projections in order to provide visual articulation; the composition of buildings shall present a clearly recognizable base, middle, and top, base and top, or a clearly-defined alternative building composition; any commercial building located with 75 feet of a residential structure shall have architectural elements and/or materials that integrate the characteristics of the residential building façade; parapets or other architectural features shall be used to conceal rooftop mechanical equipment; and that hipped, gable, and shed roofs shall be used in conjunction with flat roofs.

Guidelines requiring the use of consistent building materials and accent colors, as well as those governing signage in the Commercial District are the same as those noted above for the Neighborhood Mixed-Use District.

In addition to the elements identified above, the following key components shall be integrated into the architectural design for commercial buildings:

- Portico or canopy
- Covered entrance
- Raised corniced parapets over the entrance.
- Vertical entry feature

- Facade articulation with vertical elements
- Facade subdivision into proportional bays.
- Peaked roof forms.
- Arcades.
- Display windows.
- Awnings compatible with the overall color scheme of the building façade

4.5 Historic, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources

This section summarizes the existing historic resources, analyzes the potential impacts to those resources, discusses alternatives and mitigation measures, and identifies unavoidable impacts of the proposed Citygate project.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Historic Resources

The proposed Citygate mixed use development covers a roughly 63 acre property, of which 44 acres is in the City of Rochester and 19 acres is in the Town of Brighton. For most of the 20th century the property was owned by the County of Monroe. Formerly farmland, it was originally developed between 1911 and 1931 as the site of the Monroe County Tuberculosis Sanatorium, also known as *Iola*, a Seneca word meaning “Never Discouraged”. The nine buildings which comprise the remaining historic resources from the *Iola* campus occupy the northwest corner of the property and are grouped in an area of approximately 20 acres (see Figure 6). The Town of Brighton portion of the property, along the eastern edge, is undeveloped. The remaining lands are occupied by buildings built since 1970 by Monroe County, which continued to use the property after the closing of the hospital in 1964, and by Monroe Newpower, which acquired the Power Plant and surrounding lands in 2004. The New York State Barge Canal frontage along the southern edge of the property has no structures and is unimproved except for an asphalt-paved walking and biking path.

Context and Site History

The founding of the Monroe County Tuberculosis Sanatorium and the construction of the *Iola* Campus took place in the context of a nationwide struggle to contain and conquer tuberculosis, a disease known as the “white plague,” between the 1880’s and the 1960’s. Tuberculosis was

identified as a bacterial disease in the 1880's, and public health officials responded with programs to prevent transmission, particularly in urban areas.

The "fresh air cure" for treatment of the disease was popularized in the late 19th century by Dr. Edward Trudeau with his sanatorium at Saranac Lake in the Adirondacks. The notion of treating tuberculosis through specialized facilities took hold in the first decades of the 20th century, as the number of tuberculosis hospitals in the United States expanded from twenty in 1905 to 500 in 1915.

Upon the passage of a state law authorizing counties to establish and operate tuberculosis sanatoriums, the Rochester community entered into a vigorous debate over City or County control of the new facility. After much discussion of the relative merits of a wide range of prospective sites, the site at the corner of Westfall and East Henrietta Roads was selected, and a temporary facility was erected in 1909 consisting of a tent with kerosene heaters. The following year the operation was expanded to include a barn and a portable house, and ten patients were admitted. In 1911 four buildings were built - the Administration Building (no longer extant) and three one-story pavilions, now known as Buildings 2 and 4 (for advanced cases) and 9 (for incipient cases), stretched along a northeast-southwest diagonal which followed the contours of the site. The campus' diagonal entrance drive, perpendicular to the internal roadway and terminating at the intersection of Westfall and East Henrietta Roads, was part of the original layout. The first power plant serving the complex was also built at this time. Upon completion of this original phase of construction the capacity of the sanatorium was 60 patients. The treatment regimen consisted of rest, fresh air, regular exercise and nursing care. The original appearance of the complex is well recorded in photos published in the Rochester Herald, June 8, 1911.

Over the next twenty years the Iola campus underwent frequent expansion. In 1915 the three-story Infirmary was built along the Westfall Road frontage, increasing the patient capacity to 220. Contemporary photos of the new Infirmary are shown at Appendix H Figures 6-9, note the original barn and wood-frame wings in the background of the Ribbon Cutting photo, Appendix H Figure 8.

From the early years of Iola a significant part of the patient population was children. Temporary wooden structures served as the original children's wards; these structures and the children's outdoor activities are shown in the 1917 photos at Appendix H Figures 10-12. A construction program in 1924 added the Services Building (Building 10) and the Superintendent's House (Building 8), along the East Henrietta Road frontage, employing similar yellow brick facade materials. Two years later a more extensive expansion was authorized by the County, resulting in

the 1926-28 construction of the Children's Building (Building 5), the Nurses' Residence (Building 1) and the campus-wide system of utility tunnels. A Medical Wing was added to the Infirmary building at this time. A final building, the 1931 Staff House (Building 7) near the corner of Westfall and East Henrietta Roads completed the construction program and took the campus to its maximum build-out, with a patient capacity of 400. The Power Plant underwent further expansion at this time in connection with the 1930-33 construction of Monroe Community Hospital (Appendix H Figure 17). Contemporary photos of the buildings from the 1920's are shown at Appendix H Figures 13-16.

lola continued to provide high quality in-patient service along with an active dispensary service for outpatients through roughly a fifty-year period. During the 1940's and 50's lola was the headquarters of an active community-based mobile x-ray program. The successful treatment of tuberculosis by means of streptomycin and later isonazid gradually reduced the patient population, and the facility was officially closed in 1964. The sanitarium buildings were adapted to use as office, storage and workshop space for a variety of Monroe County offices during the 1960s through the mid 1990s. In 1985 the original 1911 Administration Building at the center of the site and the 1915 Infirmary, both vacant for twenty years, were demolished. The vacant lands to the south of the lola structures became the site of a series of new County buildings including the 1971 Children's Detention Center and the 1965 County Fleet Maintenance Garage, the 1987-88 Pure Waters Operations Center and the 2000 Household Hazardous Waste Recycling Center, as well as some miscellaneous storage buildings. The sites of these buildings collectively make up an 18.6-acre parcel which is included in the overall Citygate development site, although AJC and Son Development has not yet taken title to this section of the property.

In the mid-1990s Monroe County decided to relocate the roughly 225 County employees working at the lola campus, mostly to the CityPlace office facility at 50 State Street in downtown Rochester. Contributing factors included the desire for greater operating efficiency by consolidating county offices, the desire to support downtown Rochester by bringing jobs to the center city, and a reaction against the high operating costs and costly projected renovation needs at lola, which included asbestos abatement, roof repairs, tunnel renovations, water line work, HVAC and window replacement, handicapped access improvements, and others.

The transfer of county employees out of the lola buildings took place over several years between 1996 and 2000, and the future of the lola property was extensively studied with the goal of eventually transferring some or all of the property to private ownership. In 2000 the County convened the lola Campus Redevelopment Project Advisory Committee to guide the proposed sale and redevelopment of the site. The group included representatives of the City, the County,

the Town of Brighton, the development community (Flaum Management Co., Inc.), and various interested parties from the neighborhood - Brighton Neighbors United, Strong Neighborhood Association, and Mt. Hope Business Association. Representatives from The University of Rochester and Monroe Community Hospital participated. Bergmann Associates was hired as the lead master plan consultant working with a Technical Team providing professional advice in several areas including Historic Preservation (Bero Associates), Environment/Wetlands (The Environmental Collaborative), Rochester Museum and Science Center (Archaeology) and Real Estate Marketing (RKG Associates). Potential uses were discussed, and design options were developed for the full 60-acre parcel, although the extent of the planned privatization remained continually under discussion.

In 2002 the County decided to sell approximately 40 acres of the property through a Request for Proposals (RFP) process. After several months of negotiations with two of the proposers, the County opted to reject all proposals, revise the sale boundaries once again, and sell two parcels totaling approximately 27 acres by auction, retaining the land surrounding all of the County-occupied structures in the southern and south-western portion of the property.

During 2002-03 the County transferred ownership of the Power House (Building 11) and the adjacent Fleet Maintenance Building (Building 15) to Monroe Newpower Corporation, a not for profit local development corporation, which assumed responsibility for power plant operations and constructed a co-generation facility on the site under agreement with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. The auction took place on December 4, 2003, and resulted in the sale of approximately 27 acres to A.J. Costello and Son Development. In August 2006 Monroe County agreed to sell an additional 18.6 acres including the canal frontage to A.J. Costello and Son Development.

Since the time Monroe County vacated the property, the parking lots surrounding Buildings 1, 2, 5, 7 and 9, totaling about 200 spaces, have been in regular daily use under agreement with the University of Rochester, which provides shuttle service from the site to its Medical Center and River Campus.

The condition of the property was well documented in the photo section of the December 22, 2000 Iola Campus Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for Monroe County by Bero Associates Architects, included in Appendix I. Since the time of this report there has been further deterioration due to the deferred maintenance items described in the report. The buildings were re-evaluated in November-December 2007 by a team of structural engineers and architects to evaluate current conditions and assess the cost of environmental and structural remediation.

These reports, by Torchia Structural Engineering and Design, P.C. (structural integrity - Appendix J), Razak Associates, LLC (architectural code compliance – Appendix K), Monroe Piping and Sheet Metal, LLC (HVAC remediation costs), and Paradigm Environmental Services (lead paint assessment – Appendix L) and Building Science Investigations, Inc. (mold assessment– Appendix M). The additional seven-year period of no heat, leaking roofs and periodic vandalism have resulted in severe damage to the interior finishes in most of the buildings, the growth of mold in all buildings, and structural weaknesses in some areas.

National and State Register Eligibility

While not listed on the National and State Registers of Historic Places, the nine extant historic structures of the Iola complex have been evaluated by the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, and have been determined eligible for listing on the National Register. An initial eligibility determination was made as part of the 1985 Mack Survey of historic properties in the City of Rochester; this determination was confirmed by the State Historic Preservation Office (See Appendix I). The survey materials describe the complex as eligible for listing under National Register Criterion A, for its association with the history of American medicine, specifically the early to mid-20th century treatment of tuberculosis, and under Criterion C, as a representation of early 20th century institutional architecture and campus design. At the time of these determinations, the complex was still in use, housing a variety of Monroe County departmental functions. Since that time the County staff at Iola has been relocated, and deferred maintenance has taken a significant toll on the condition of the remaining structures. Nevertheless the complex may retain a sufficient level of physical integrity to maintain National Register eligibility.

The Bero Associates Architects Historic Resource Evaluation Report identifies a suggested boundary for the extent of the property's historic resources (see Appendix I). The Bero report describes the boundary as follows:

Although the sanatorium complex is located on an approximately sixty-five-acre parcel of land owned by Monroe County, the extent of the historic resource is limited to the approximately twenty-acre triangular area occupying a plateau in the extreme northwest corner of the site. This portion of the property includes the bulk of the original sanatorium campus, significant landscape features, and all of the remaining historic buildings. The geographical limits of the historic resource are defined by Westfall Road on the north, East Henrietta Road on the west, and a diagonal line following the base of the hill on the southeast..

Description of Individual Resources

The campus layout and individual structures are described in more detail in the attached Bero report, which includes interior and exterior photos of each building. The sections below provide a summary description and statement of significance for each individual resource. The building numbers follow the County's traditional number system and are not chronological.

Overall Campus Layout

The lola campus was developed over the years between 1911 and 1931 as an informal array of individual pavilion buildings in a sloped park-like setting, befitting its purpose as a residential center which employed the "fresh-air" approach to the treatment of tuberculosis. The first four buildings, built in 1911, were arrayed along the downhill side of a curving diagonal roadway crossing the site from East Henrietta to Westfall Roads. Between 1915 and 1931 seven more buildings were added in a loose ring around the original four – six of them along the frontage on the two adjacent streets, and one stretching across the diagonal on the downhill side of the original pavilions. The complex reached its full development of major buildings in 1931, and the campus remained largely unchanged with the exception of minor service structures as long as the hospital remained in use, through 1964. After the closing of the hospital, the only significant changes to the original lola buildings came with the demolition of the Administration Building, one of the original four, and of the 1915 Infirmary Building, in 1985. The remaining buildings which were built by the County after 1964 detract somewhat from the historic setting of the lola Campus, but are outside the historic resources boundary described above.

Significant Landscape Features

In addition to the eight historic structures on the Citygate site, portions of the campus roadway system and related landscaping have survived. The original road system featured a main entrance drive entering the site at a 45 degree angle from the Westfall-East Henrietta Road intersection. While the corner entrance road was closed to traffic some time after 1957, This road is still connected to the main diagonal drive at the east end, and is lined by curbs, walks and regularly spaced mature sycamore trees, likely planted in the 1911-1920 period, and they are nearing the end of their expected life. The diagonal road, now named lola Circle, originally joined East Henrietta Road between Buildings 7 and 8 , but has been modified to curve to the south, giving access to the newer county facilities. A new connector, Stan Yale Drive, now links lola Circle to East Henrietta Road opposite the entrance to Monroe Community Hospital, at a traffic light. The original road layout included a semicircular drive which wrapped around the Administration Building; the curve of this former roadway now forms the edge of the central parking lot.

The historic landscape features which have survived are limited to the northern part of the Iola Circle roadway, the diagonal entrance drive and its sycamore trees.



Sycamore Alley looking northwest

Building 1 (375 Westfall Road) - Appendix H Figure 14 and Appendix I Photos 5-10

This building, also known as the Nurse's Home or Nurse's Dormitory, was built in 1927-28 and designed by Rochester architects Siegmund Firestone and Joseph P. Flynn. It is a four-story T-shaped building built into the slope, with the ground floor level open to grade on the south side only. The Neo-Classical exterior is clad with brick, and has a symmetrical north façade trimmed with center entrance and a pedimented center section of three bays. The exterior has been altered by the replacement of doors and windows in the 1990s, but otherwise retains its original exterior features.

The building interior is also largely unchanged from its original layout. After its use as a nurses' residence ended in 1964, it was occupied as office space by various County departments, without significant changes to the interior features. The first, second and third floors have straight corridors in a T configuration, with individual rooms off the corridors and a former lounge/sun porch at the end of the south wing. There is a small auditorium at the ground floor level in the south wing. The original oak woodwork and interior doors remain intact. The building has an elevator and two exit stairs.

The historical significance of Building 1 is as a contributing part of the Iola campus. In addition it has architectural significance as one of the surviving structures designed by Siegmund Firestone,

designer of two other Iola buildings (the 1930 Power Plant and the 1931 Staff House) as well as the 1933 Monroe Community Hospital across East Henrietta Road. It is a typical nicely detailed institutional building of the 1920s. Joseph T. Flynn, designer of the Rochester Fire Headquarters, St. Mary's Hospital and other local civic and church structures, collaborated on the design.

The 2007 condition of Building 1 is described in the Torchia and Razak reports as generally good. Challenges to adaptive reuse noted in the Razak report mostly relate to handicapped accessibility. Potential reuse for office or retail purposes is not promising due to the existing layout of small rooms. An apartment conversion could yield three to four apartments per floor, assuming most interior partitions within the wings are removed. The possibility that the corridor partitions may be load bearing could complicate this scenario.



Building 1

Buildings 2, 4 and 9 – Appendix H Figures 3-5 and Appendix I Photos 11-20

The three pavilion buildings which form the heart of the Iola campus were built in 1911. Together with the demolished Administration Building, they formed the original sanatorium complex. The three remaining buildings are Craftsman style dormitory pavilions, two of identical design (Buildings 2 and 4) and the third slightly larger but similar in detailing and layout. All are long and narrow single story structures with sun porches extending the length of the building, facing to the southeast. On the northwest side of each building extend smaller wings of patient sleeping rooms and service spaces. The buildings are of structural clay tile with brick exteriors, and all have gabled entry porches at the center on the southeast facades.

The four original buildings at Iola were designed by Charles F. Crandall, a Rochester architect who also designed commercial and institutional buildings for Kodak and others between about 1880 and 1920. The historical significance of these buildings lies primarily in the manner in which they reflect the prevailing treatment philosophy of the time. As the Bero report describes it,

Crandall's design for a complex composed of several small structures rather than a single large building reflected the philosophy of treatment developed by Trudeau at Saranac Lake. For medical and hygienic reasons, segregating patients made sense. A sanatorium of small cottages mimicking the human scale and intimacy of home was thought to offer psychological benefits for the convalescing. The Craftsman style design, using open rafters, half-timbering and glazed sun porches, was well suited to create a residential scale and atmosphere for the sanatorium. Crandall located the three residential pavilions at the upper edge of a sharp slope, providing an expansive view of open farmlands and distant hills to the southeast. In each of the three residential pavilions, the lounge and sun porches are banked along the southeast side of the building to take advantage of the light and view.

It did not take many years for the home-like atmosphere of the original campus to give way to the larger scale institutional character of the later Lola buildings, and the pavilions were the first buildings to fall out of use. By the time of a 1957 aerial photo of the complex, Buildings 2 and 3 no longer were labeled as contributing facilities. When the complex shifted from hospital use to other county functions after 1964, the three pavilions were used primarily for storage and garage space, requiring the addition of overhead doors and related alterations to interior partitions.

The 2007 condition of these three buildings is described as very poor in the Torchia and Razak reports. The roofs of Buildings 2 and 4 have been actively leaking for a number of years, there are open holes in the roofs, and the roof and floor structures have failed in some areas. The exteriors of these buildings were considered salvageable, though in an advanced state of disrepair. The interior features were not considered salvageable due to the extent of water penetration. Challenges to reuse include the small sizes of the buildings, complete replacement of doors and windows, and concealment of mechanical and electrical systems. Also handicapped access would be difficult, as the floor levels are well below the level of the adjacent road and parking, and the building entrances are on the opposite side from the road.

Building 9 was found to be in better structural condition than Buildings 2 and 4, but has been more heavily altered at the interior than the other two and offers the same challenges to adaptive reuse.



Buildings 4 and 2, with Building 1 in background



Building 9

Building 5 – Children’s Building – Appendix H Figure 15 and Appendix I Photos 21-37

The Children’s Building is the largest of the Iola buildings, built to address a peak patient load of children with tuberculosis. Its facilities included classrooms for the education of resident children, and there were 211 students enrolled at the time the building opened. Before the construction of this building, young patients had been housed in single story wooden buildings on the site (see Appendix H Figures 8, 10, 11) and, after 1924, on one floor of Building 10. The Children’s Building was designed by Horace T. Hatton, an architect who worked in the office of J. Foster Warner during the later 19th and early 20th century and later maintained a largely residential practice. The sprawling three-story Georgian Revival structure is of steel and concrete block, with a brick veneer and extensive cast stone detailing at the symmetrical main façade. The building

was laid out on axis with the now demolished Administration Building, and is sited down the slope from the semicircular parking lot which occupies the former Administration Building site. The symmetrical center section includes a pair of two-story wings with a stepped profile extending to the southeast, and is flanked by two-story side wings at each end, offset in plan by 45 degrees. The ground floor opens out on grade at the southeast side.

The interior has two major spaces – an elaborately detailed lobby at the main (2nd floor) entrance and a less ornate auditorium at the ground floor. The rear wings include some large spaces which were open wards, and the main block and wings otherwise consist of individual rooms, originally patient or treatment rooms and later offices, arranged along single loaded or double loaded corridors. Alterations to the building by Monroe County since 1964 include resilient floors, acoustic tile ceilings, subdivision of the lobby space into two rooms, and replacement of most of the interior oak doors and casings with steel doors and frames. A few spaces including the lobby and auditorium retain elements of the original finishes. This building is similar in the quality of its design and finishes to Building 10, though more elaborately detailed, befitting a building which was conceived of as the centerpiece of the complex (as opposed to Building 1, a staff residence). It has been much more altered at the interior than Building 1, and is in poorer condition.

Building 5 is significant principally for its historical connection with the Iola campus. Its style of design and detailing was typical of that of public and institutional buildings of the 1920s, and there are many more intact examples of Georgian Revival institutional buildings in the area, particularly school buildings. Hatton was not as locally prominent an architect as the others who helped to shape the complex – Crandall and Firestone.

The structural condition of Building 5 is described as fair in the 2007 Torchia report. The major concerns were the condition of the roof and parapets, some of which were in need of reconstruction to prevent outward collapse. The Razak report noted water damage to the exterior masonry allowing water penetration to the interior. The building has extensive mold growth, and interior finishes have been severely damaged due to vandalism and water penetration. Particular challenges to adaptive reuse noted in the Razak report were code compliance due to stair locations, need for insulation and door and window replacement to meet energy code, limited building depth is a constraint to office or retail use, multiple floor levels make handicapped accessibility difficult, and high cost of repairs to the exterior envelope.



Building 5

Building 7 – Staff House - Appendix I Photos 38-46

The Staff House was the last structure to be built as part of the sanitarium. It was also designed by Siegmund Firestone, who at the time was active in the ongoing construction of the adjacent Monroe County Infirmary and Home (now Monroe Community Hospital) and had just completed reconstruction of the Lola Power Plant in 1930. Building 7 is a symmetrical two-story E-shaped brick building with Beaux Arts detailing. It served as a residence for male staff, and is a more highly polished counterpart to the Nurses Home of 1927, befitting its site adjacent to the main entry drive. Exterior features include cast stone quoins, string courses, cornice, copings, chimney caps and door surrounds. The central wing projecting toward East Henrietta Road has a copper hipped roof and rounded dormers. Secondary entrances in the side wings also feature copper roofs. Windows are steel casements with transoms above and hopper sections below.

The building's interior is largely in its original layout, with a central corridor and individual residence rooms facing east and larger suites and lounge spaces facing west, toward East Henrietta Road. Interior features such as original stairs, a fireplace, and decorative moldings remain intact.

This building is significant historically as a part of the Lola campus and architecturally as a part of the grouping of Siegmund Firestone buildings on both sides of East Henrietta Road in this area (the other two being the Power House and Monroe Community Hospital).

No immediate structural issues with Building 7 were identified in the Torchia report, although it was noted that the building had not been weather tight for some years and that unobserved rust

at structural connections was a possibility. The Razak report described the exterior features as in fair to poor condition, with some rapidly deteriorating and hazardous cast stone ornaments parapets. The interior is described as being in a severe state of disrepair due to vandalism and lack of climate control over an extended period. The steel windows are severely corroded, and the building is not weather tight, resulting in mold growth at the interior.

Key challenges to adaptive reuse identified by Razak were the lack of elevator and grade level entrance, difficult layout for office, retail or residential conversion, energy issues, and high cost of exterior repairs.



Building 7

Building 8 – Superintendent’s House – Appendix I photos 47-49

The Superintendent’s House is a two-story single family home built in 1924 along the East Henrietta Road frontage. It was built in the same year as the Services Building (Building 10) and employs the same buff brick of the Services Building and the Power Plant. The house has several Prairie Style elements including a shallow pitched slate-clad hipped roof with wide eaves, leaded casement windows and a header brick belt course at the second floor sill level. It has an entry porch at the first floor and a two-story porch projection at the rear, open on the first floor and enclosed as a sleeping porch on the second floor. The interior has a kitchen, living and dining room on the first floor; a central stair leads to four small bedrooms on the second floor.

The architect for the Superintendent’s House is not known, and the architectural style is eclectic, not directly related to the other Lola buildings except in the use of the yellow brick which characterizes the other East Henrietta Road buildings of the 1924-30 period. Its significance lies in its historical connection to the Lola campus.

The structural condition of the building was noted as fair, with some repairs needed to the brick veneer. There is some evidence of water damage due to roof penetrations. Some original interior features remain intact; others including the main stair have been partially removed or damaged. Principal obstacles to adaptive reuse noted in the Razak report were the small size of the building, inappropriate in scale for anything but residential use, and the undesirability of its high-traffic location, on a small site surrounded by commercial/institutional uses, for a single family home.



Building 8

Building 10 – Services Building – Appendix H Figures 13, 16, and Appendix I photos 50-52

The Services Building was also built in 1924, to address a variety of needs at the Iola facility. Its first floor was a garage and maintenance shop, while the upper floors housed children and male staff (both temporary uses, addressed by the construction of Buildings 5 and 7 over the next 8 years). It is a steel frame building with a utilitarian design employing symmetrical facades, a simplified cast stone cornice and first floor belt course. The interior has been used as a mostly open maintenance garage on the first floor and as office space on the second and third floors, which retain some of their original corridor walls and trim. The original design included a central light well at the third floor level and a large skylight providing light to the second floor spaces; the light well have been roofed over but the exterior walls remain.

The Services Building is significant as a part of the lola campus and as a good example of the use of simplified classical architectural vocabulary as applied to a utilitarian institutional building in the 1920s. Its architect is not known, and the detailing is unrelated to that of the Superintendent's House built nearby in the same year or to the other buildings built in the next few years – Buildings 1 and 5.

The structural condition of Building 10 is noted as poor in the Torchia report. There is evidence of differential settlement which is ongoing, especially at the two stair towers, and the parapet walls are in danger of collapse in some areas. The Razak report notes that the exterior is salvageable but the interior features have been extensively damaged by water penetration and alterations. Adaptive reuse for residential or office use were considered possible with complete interior rehabilitation. The interior walls at the former light well may be load bearing, offering a constraint to the interior layout. There is no elevator at present.



Building 10

Utility Tunnel System – Appendix I photo 55

Another surviving feature of the lola campus which was characteristic of multi-building campuses of the first half of the 20th century is the concrete utility tunnel system. These provided space for steam piping connecting the central power plant to the other campus buildings, and also provided a means of indoor access between buildings in bad weather. The tunnels were accessed from the basement level of each building, and had flat-roofed ventilators projecting above grade at the intersection points, to provide light and air to the tunnels. Similar central steam plant systems were employed at the Nazareth College/ Sisters of St. Joseph campus in Pittsford and the University of Rochester River Campus, among others.

Monroe Community Hospital

Monroe Community Hospital occupies a 22-acre property on the southwest corner of East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. The existing building was built in 1930-33 to replace the earlier County Almshouse, established in 1826 in a small building on South Avenue as a home for the indigent. Overcrowding in the original Almshouse prompted the County to purchase the property on Westfall Road and build a state-of-the-art facility for long-term and chronic care patients. Economies of scale expected to result from the location next to the Tuberculosis Hospital (Iola) likely played a role in siting the facility, which was renamed Monroe County Home and Infirmary at the time of its opening in 1933. Its architect was Siegmund Firestone, also architect of Iola Buildings 1, 7 and the Power House, and to 1925 and 1927 additions to the now demolished Infirmary. At the outset of the project Firestone hired Thomas Boyde Jr., a young architect who had trained in the Lombardy region of Italy, to assist with the design, and Boyde may be responsible for many of the complex's distinguishing Lombardic Romanesque design features. Boyde is considered the first black architect to establish a successful practice in Rochester.

Monroe Community Home and Infirmary functioned as a general hospital from the 1930s through the 1950s, providing a full range of medical and dental services for the indigent. In 1967 the facility's name was changed to Monroe Community Hospital for the Care of the Chronically Ill, and its focus shifted to geriatric care, offered through a staffing partnership with University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry. Changes to the 635,000 square foot facility over the years include the construction of modern stair towers in the second half of the 20th century, and a complete interior and exterior renovation in 1994-95. A County Office Building was built to the west of the hospital in the second half of the 20th century. The hospital is highly visible from the I-390 Interstate, with its Romanesque profile rising above the canal and the lush grounds. It was a highly acclaimed facility when new, and it remains one of the most beloved of Rochester's landmark structures.

Landmark eligibility

Monroe Community Hospital was identified as potentially eligible for the State and National Registers of Historic Places in the 1985 Mack Survey of historic resources in the City of Rochester. Its presumed eligibility was confirmed in June 2008 by Robert Englert of the NYS Historic Preservation Office. See view of Monroe Community Hospital below:



Monroe Community Hospital, south entrance

New York State Barge Canal

The other historic resource adjacent to the project site is the New York State Barge Canal. This section of the canal is not part of the original Erie Canal path, which passed through downtown Rochester, but is part of the revised route developed between 1905 and 1918 when the canal was enlarged and rerouted away from large city downtowns. The section of the canal between the Village of Pittsford and the Genesee River was dug through low lying open farmland during this period, and the downtown section was closed in 1819, with the former canal path eventually being employed for other transportation corridor uses including the Rochester Subway and the I-490 corridor. There is no record of use of the canal frontage during the sanitarium period for recreational or any other purposes.

Landmark eligibility

The entire New York State Canal system, as well as the surviving elements from earlier canal alignments has been determined eligible for the State and National Registers of Historic Places. In addition, the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor, including the full state canal system, has been federally designated as one of 37 National Heritage Areas in the country.

The sections of the New York State Barge Canal between the western terminus in Erie County and Wayne County comprise the Western Erie Canal Heritage Corridor, established in 1999 by the New York State Legislature under its own Heritage Area System. It is overseen by a planning commission of representatives from across the region. It has a Management Plan approved by the legislatures of the five affected counties and by the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, and

implementation of the management plan is administered by the Western Erie Canal Alliance, which operates in partnership with the Landmark Society of Western New York. Projects promoting economic development, tourism and recreational facilities, interpretation and education, and resource stewardship along the canal are encouraged by the Alliance through the Western Erie Canal Heritage Corridor Management Plan (WECHS Plan).

Archeological Sites

A Phase 1B Archaeological investigation was conducted on the proposed Citygate project site during the spring and summer of 2008 (Appendix N). During the investigation a total of 477 soil test pits were excavated within the project area. Although no Native American artifacts were recovered from any of the excavated test pits, more than 50 historic Euro American cultural artifacts were recovered.

The cultural material recovered covered a range of artifact types and functional groups. Thirty-three percent of the recovered material was historic ceramics including 19th century yellowware, pearlware, whiteware, semi-porcelain, and porcelain. One piece of glazed floor tile was also recovered. Thirty-seven percent was glass, mainly bottle glass with a few pieces of window glass and chimney lamp glass. Twenty-seven percent comprised metal artifacts, the majority being square cut and round wire iron nails. Thus, recovered cultural material included artifacts from the kitchen, architectural, and lighting functional groups. However, the majority of this material was located in highly disturbed sections of the project area. In the northwest corner, three iron nails, a brown-glazed refined earthenware, and a single piece of floor tile were recovered from the area surrounding Structure 12 and to the west of Structure 13 (see Appendix N Photos 33-34)). As the majority of material was architectural in nature, the finds were deemed insignificant. It should also be noted that no remnants of map documented structure A or map documented structure B were recovered from the area.

Surrounding Structure 11, artifacts from the architectural and lighting functional groups were encountered (see Appendix N Photos 27-31). These included iron nails, chimney glass, and even several pieces of porcelain which may be fragments of a doll figurine. However, as these were recovered close to a structure which has undergone partial demolition and seen a lot of destruction through trespassing and the like, it is highly probable that the cultural material encountered represents debris from the structure itself rather than a subsurface archaeological site. In the northeast corner of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), four artifacts were recovered. These included fragments of whiteware and bottles. Due to the fact that all the cultural material encountered was from a single functional group (i.e., kitchen group) as well as the test pits' close

proximity to an area which is known to have been cut, filled, and graded since the historic period, it is considered most likely that these artifacts are not in their primary context and were located as a result of disturbance. Along the southern project boundary, a number of artifacts were recovered from six test pits. The majority of cultural material encountered included bottle glass and window glass with a few scattered pieces of ceramic. Recovered artifacts included numerous bottles, both fragmented and whole, several pieces of ceramic, a melted hand mirror, and the like. The remaining soil test pits that contained artifacts were located in disturbed areas located to the south of Westfall Road, to the east of East Henrietta Road, and to the south of an existing asphalt parking lot.

IMPACTS

Lola Campus

The proposed Citygate development will result in the loss of eight, (potentially nine pending the outcome of feasibility studies regarding the Power plant) buildings surviving from the original lola campus.

Monroe Community Hospital

The Citygate project will affect the adjacent Community Hospital landmark by removing three structures across the street from the hospital which were built within 10 years of its construction date, one of them (Building 7) by the same architect. The northernmost section of East Henrietta Road is the only section of this road which contains historic resources, and the loss of Buildings 7, 8 and 10 will reduce this concentration of resources. The Power Plant building and its tall smokestack, also designed by Sigmund Firestone, may remain unchanged. The other lola resources – Buildings 1, 2, 4, 5 and 9 – are barely visible or not visible from East Henrietta Road, and their loss will not affect the view from the hospital or from the street.

The loss of the lola buildings fronting on East Henrietta Road will not have a significant effect on the hospital. East Henrietta Road has developed into a main arterial, with the ramps on and off of I-390 within ¼ mile of the lola entrances. There is little or no pedestrian activity along this roadway, and the lola campus is perceived as an independent entity, unrelated to the Hospital although it is of the same general period.

The Citygate development can generally be expected to have a positive overall effect on Monroe Community Hospital as an institution in two ways. First, through county taxes it will produce additional revenue to support the hospital operations. Second, it will be the site of commercial,

retail, hotel and residential space that are within easy walking distance of the hospital, providing convenient facilities for hospital staff, vendors and visitors. Monroe Community Hospital has a staff of 780 and 566 licensed beds, plus 36 transitional care beds.

New York State Barge Canal

The Barge Canal in this section of Rochester and Brighton is managed by the Canal Corporation to serve seasonal boat traffic and to provide a recreational trail for local and occasionally long-distance walkers and bikers. The Canal Corporation is responsible for promoting the canal as a tourist attraction, with some success. Along most of its length the canal frontage is made up of scrub land or residential back yards. Where the path still follows its historic route, as in the villages of Pittsford, Fairport, Spencerport and Brockport, there is commercial development in both new and historic buildings which complements the canalway by offering marina amenities, restaurants, and other services to local and visiting users of the canal. Several well developed parks such as Genesee Valley Park, Greece Canal Park and Lock 32 Park punctuate the canalway as it crosses Monroe County.

The Citygate canal frontage at present has an asphalt path partway up the bank at the northern edge of the canal. The path goes under East Henrietta Road at the southwest corner of the property, and under I-390 at the southeast corner of the property. Connecting trails also provide bicycle access to East Henrietta Road, and link to the Brighton trail system and Brighton Park, along the northern edge of the I-390 right of way. At the top of the bank are paved parking lots for the county service functions still occupying the southern part of the site. The trail provides the only public access to the canal, and there are no amenities to attract visitors to this section of the canal or to any particular destination along the canal between Genesee Valley Park, about 1 mile to the west, and Lock 32 State Canal Park in Pittsford.

The proposed Citygate project is consistent with the objectives of the Western Erie Canal Heritage Corridor Management Plan (WECHC):

- A Vibrant Regional Economy
- Enhanced Regional Quality of Life
- Resource Conservation
- Increased Appreciation of Natural and Cultural Heritage Resources

The Management Plan notes the general lack of full service or luxury hotel facilities along the Canal, with only one hotel in all of Wayne County and with the Del Monte Lodge in Pittsford

serving as one of the only luxury hotels adjacent to the canal system. Its discussion of economic development priorities cites the following actions needed to encourage economic activity along the heritage corridor:

- Maximize the utilization of canal frontage for appropriate business, residential and public recreational activities
- Expand efforts to attract private capital investment to create wealth and employment opportunities...
- Support the development of new canal harbor or town center mixed-use projects that will serve as community or tourist destinations...

The Plan also encourages development projects which incorporate investment in existing historically and architecturally significant properties along the canalway; while the Citygate project entails the replacement rather than the adaptive reuse of the site's historic resources, it would represent one of the most significant private investments in a canal-front economic development project to be undertaken in the western section of the canal system.

In addition to residential and mixed-use development of the sort envisioned in the WECHS Management Plan, the Citygate project includes full development of the canal frontage including two canal-front hotels (300 rooms) and four buildings with first floor retail and upper floors with loft-style residential units. All canal front buildings will be designed to take advantage of the canalway views, and first floors will offer large windows and seating areas facing the canal. The Citygate concept is inspired by other New Urbanist lifestyle centers with a focus on pedestrian activity, and Citygate residents as well as hotel guests, employees, and local visitors can be expected to use Citygate as a starting point and a destination for traveling the canal on foot, cycling or boating.



Canal trail looking east from Citygate site



Canal trail looking west from Citygate site

Archeological Sites

As previously noted, although the site exhibited a distinct lack of prehistoric Native American cultural material, more than 50 historic Euro American cultural artifacts were recovered from the project area during the Phase 1B Archeological investigation. However, the recovered cultural material, despite warranting the identification of a historic site, is located in areas of extensive disturbance (i.e., next to roads, associated with known areas of grading, etc.). As such, the cultural material is not located within its primary context and is unlikely to contribute significantly to either the archaeological record or common knowledge and history. Thus, no further archaeological work is anticipated at the proposed Citygate development.

MITIGATION MEASURES

The loss of the eight (potentially nine) Iola Campus buildings on the site is an unavoidable impact of the project as proposed. As discussed above, this impact could be reduced by the retention and adaptive reuse of Building 1, 7 and Building 10. However, the benefits of these modifications have serious repercussions for the financial goals of the project and the associated tax revenues to be produced by the project. It is the view of the developer that the historic preservation benefits resulting from the retention of these buildings are outweighed by the financial costs to the project and to the community.

Possible mitigation measures to partially offset the loss of these historic resources are:

1. Educational measures to preserve and interpret the history of the Iola Sanitarium and its architects by
 - Documentation of the existing structures prior to demolition

- Publication of a book of contemporary images of the lola site
 - Collation of historical information about the site including floor plans, historic photos, contemporary accounts of life at lola, and records of the institution's governing bodies. These will be collected and reproduced for local libraries and other interested institutions
 - Funding research into the surviving structures designed by the architects of the lola buildings, with the resulting information to be reproduced for local libraries and other interested institutions
2. On-site interpretation program, including
- Interpretive signage to be located at key pedestrian locations around the Citygate development, describing and interpreting the history of the lola Sanitarium at the Citygate site
3. Retention of historic site features where possible within the context of the Citygate development, including
- Retention of as many of the existing sycamore trees as possible along the diagonal pedestrian path between proposed Buildings 1, 2 and 3, and replacement with new trees of the same species when the originals have reached the end of their useful life. This prominent walkway would be the site of some of the interpretive signage suggested under #2 above. Some other existing trees lining the existing lola Circle or along the canal frontage may also be candidates for retention if grading requirements allow, giving the site the advantage of some mature trees incorporated within the project's otherwise new landscaping.
4. Use of architectural design elements recalling the original lola structures in the Citygate buildings; such elements could include physical artifacts salvaged from the historic buildings, as well as design features recalling the architectural styles or the spatial characteristics of the lola buildings. Typical items may include:
- Cast stone trim elements from Buildings 1, 5, and 7 could be incorporated into Citygate buildings or site features.
 - Use of yellow brick to match the Power Plant/Building 10 color as a key trim element on the Citygate structures or pavements.
 - Use of Craftsman style elements from the original pavilion buildings such as large windows facing south (this is also plus from a Green Building perspective), simplified half tudoring at the exterior, and gable roofs with wide overhangs.

These elements could be incorporated into the Live-Work and Loft buildings toward the southeast portion of the site.

5. Naming - use of the lola name (meaning “Never Discouraged”) in the road system or elsewhere within the complex
6. Architectural salvage – provide an opportunity for the safe salvage and recycling of marketable historic fabric elements within the community

Development Alternative

There are three potential historic structures lining the Westfall Road and East Henrietta Road frontages – Buildings 1, 7, and 10. Alternative Site Plan #1 shows the adjustments which would need to be made in each section of the development to accommodate the retention of these buildings (see Figure 17). The three buildings are each independent cases, and the adaptive reuse of each one has its own consequences. Although Site Plan 1 shows all three buildings remaining, any one or any combination of the three adaptive reuse projects could be undertaken independently. The following information gives a description of each building and summarizes some of the potential reuses as retail, office and residential based on the practical application of a use in each building with the pros and cons of each use.

An easy to follow financial analysis of the impact of adaptive reuse of the buildings as a whole is provided for residential and retail/office (same cost assumptions) with the associated operating cost and projected revenue of the two uses, residential and retail/office, based on current market conditions and market studies performed for the development (See Appendix Q).

Building 1

Several of the reports on the lola buildings have noted that this is the building in the best condition of the eight remaining historic structures on the site. Its location facing Westfall Road, only marginally connected to the internal roadway system, makes it possible to treat this building as a free-standing site to a greater extent than the central buildings, and its distance from the main gateway corner (Westfall and East Henrietta Roads) makes it less critical to the overall image of the Citygate development than Buildings 7, 8 and 10. Building 1 has four floors with 23,500 gross square feet, 17,115 usable (about 4,280 per floor), elevator and stairs. Ground floor is buried on the north side, entered at grade on the south side. Parking for about 20 cars is located at the ground floor level.

If this building were treated as a completely separate entity from the rest of Citygate, without the benefit of a successful Citygate development next door, and if financial viability were not an issue, adaptive reuse would be possible for residential or office space – the two uses it has housed in the past. If renovated as office space, the limited floor area and narrow building footprint and the institutional/dormitory appearance of the building would prevent it from competing successfully with newly developed Class A office space in the office parks to the east along Westfall Road, regardless of how much is spent on environmental remediation and renovation. The maximum projected rental rate would be that of Class B office space in the area.

If renovated as residential space, the resulting building would likely have three to four apartments per floor on the three upper floors (assume one two-bedroom unit per wing plus one across the front) on three floors, with a maximum of two units on the ground floor. The total number of units would be in the range of 12-15 units. The ground floor entrance from the parking lot would become the effective main entrance for most building users; the Westfall Road entrance would be a ceremonial entry for the occasional pedestrian, or would be closed.

Projected annual income and expenses under these scenarios are shown in the analyses below. To put the adaptive reuse option in the best possible light we have pushed the projected revenues to the high end of the expected range, and pushed the expenses toward the low end of the expected range. Even with these preservation-friendly assumptions, the adaptive reuse scenarios show a loss of money.

Building 7

This structure has 14,360 gross square feet (12,762 usable) on two floors, plus a basement. The condition of the building is similar to Building 1, though somewhat worse, as it has remained unused for a longer period of time and underwent no substantial maintenance work during the 1980s and 1990s. There are two stairs and no elevator. Because of its smaller size and its more irregular footprint, its potential for either residential or office use is more severely limited. As at Building 1, parking is at the rear, and the more highly ornamented East Henrietta Road entrances would become ceremonial only in an office scenario. The narrowness of the north-south spine which runs the length of the building on both floors precludes the creation of flats along a corridor. If this were a desirable location for high-end residences, one might consider adding internal stairs to create a series of multi-floor apartments utilizing the wings projecting to the west, which have most of the ornamental interior features, as living spaces at the first floor and bedrooms at the second floor. The number of units to be achieved by renovating this building would likely not

exceed eight, and the location adjacent to a busy intersection would make it difficult to create pleasant yards without fencing, which would compromise the historic character of the site. The required building-wide and site improvements would be spread over only eight units and the rents would likely be below those commanded by the competing townhouse units at the eastern part of the site, because those units incorporate garage space. While the renovation costs for this building would be lower than those of Building 1 because of its smaller size, the income would be correspondingly lower.

The prospects of blending Building 7 into the adjacent retail/office development proposed for this part of the site (proposed Buildings 1 and 2) are not promising. Building 2 is a free-standing structure which requires surface parking in close proximity. Building 7 has the image of just what it was built for – an elegant multiple residence; this image is not readily adaptable to modern retail or office uses.

Building 10

Building 10 is similar to Building 1 in two respects. First, its perimeter location, between Stan Yale Drive and the Power Plant, makes it relatively independent of the rest of the Citygate site plan. Secondly, its highly visible perimeter location makes it a particularly desirable site for a freestanding commercial building. Its architectural style is utilitarian but well-proportioned, giving it potential for adaptive reuse for any of the three principal Citygate uses – retail (first floor only), office or residential (upper floors only). The principal limitations of the site relate to parking. The building is not in as good shape as Building 1, with reported structural problems and water penetration compromising much of the interior historic fabric, which is modest anyway. On the positive side, the building has a steel structure, which allows for more flexibility in designing future uses.

Building 10 has 11,900 square feet on three floors, with stairs and no elevator. The addition of an elevator is not practical for a building of this size, so the likely use would be office or retail at the first floor and walk-up apartments on the two upper floors – approximately 4 per floor. The economics of the project would be similar to those of Building 7 – net annual operating loss, plus the cost of the lost development opportunity for this section of the site, which would otherwise be appropriate for a small free-standing shop or restaurant because of its prominent location adjacent to the main Citygate entrance drive.

Applying an Affordable housing scenario

Another financing option which could make the adaptive reuse of the Buildings more attractive would be to convey it to a non-profit organization as a potential site for affordable rental housing.

In addition to retaining the historic structure, this scenario would have the effect of broadening the income range of households to be served by Citygate's housing options. In this scenario, the developer may be able to take advantage of low-interest financing and equity investment through the New York State Housing Trust Fund or Affordable Housing Corporation, as well as investor equity through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program. If successful, this would reduce the required debt service and result in a project which would break even on an operating basis. Such projects typically entail negotiation of a payment in lieu of taxes, so the anticipated property tax revenue under this scenario would still be well below the revenue under the proposed Citygate plan. Affordable housing projects of this sort typically take several years to bring to fruition, as developers compete annually for Housing Trust Fund and tax credit allocations, and the project may not compete well against other affordable housing projects with lower per-unit costs. Of the three perimeter buildings, Building 1 has the most potential for affordable housing because of its larger size and condition. The impact to the project financially by developing these buildings as affordable housing will be devastating. The three buildings are located on the highest valued property on the site and development as affordable housing through state programs will limit the sales price of the land to a third or less of its appraised value. It is also questionable as to why New York State or any other affordable housing agency would use limited resources on affordable units that will be very expensive to construct when the Citygate development master plan proposes over 1,100 units of market rate and affordable new rental and for sale units. It would be much more practical to use affordable capital resources on new construction units in the development.

Simple Analysis of the Financial Feasibility of Reuse

If you take the potential uses described for each building and the corresponding available usable square footage and number of residential units you can arrive at a simple budget by applying universal construction costs on a square foot and residential unit basis to illustrate the feasibility of reuse. The following illustration takes the three buildings as a whole and applies the two identified uses of residential and retail/office to see what the financial feasibility of reuse could be. The construction costs used are not high and do not reflect the re-adaptive construction costs of buildings in similar condition. The square foot cost used is more typically found in new construction, if re-adaptive use construction costs was used it would increase the cost by twenty to fifty percent. Standard costs were used to illustrate that even if cost were similar to new construction the orientation and relatively small size of the buildings makes it difficult to achieve profitability in either scenario residential or retail/office.

Scenario of Residential Housing in Buildings 1, 7 and 10

RESIDENTIAL INCOME

Assume you have thirty one 2-bedroom apartments with 1,100 square feet of leasable space per unit generating \$1.25 a square foot a month. Each unit would rent for \$1,375 per month or \$16,500 a year. Thirty one apartments will generate \$511,000 a year. So you would have:

Rental Income.....	\$511,000
Misc. revenue (laundry etc.)	<u>\$ 12,000</u>
Total revenue	\$523,000

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Renovation costs at \$85 per square foot (market rehabilitation cost could be 25 to 50 percent higher).

ENVIRONMENTAL COST

Appendix J through M provides reports that describe a number of problems that have to be fixed before the buildings can be rehabilitated. It is estimated that these problems if fixed will cost an additional \$51.00 per square foot. When combined with the construction cost of \$85.00 you arrive at a total renovation cost of:

\$136.00 per square foot

SQUARE FOOT COST OF CONSTRUCTION

The buildings consist of usable and unusable square footage. In a residential project the renovation of the total square footage is included in the construction cost. The total square footage for buildings 1, 7 and 10 is;

49,760 SF x \$136.00 a SF construction =

\$6,767,360.00 renovation cost of the three buildings to create 31 units of housing, or construction cost of \$218,302.00 per unit.

(Note that this is likely a low estimate considering the extraordinary costs associates with asbestos and lead paint abatement, mold removal, removal of the tunnel, and other special conditions of the site)

Now, if you attribute a land cost of 3 acres at \$110,000 an acre and development cost (10 percent of construction) and a profit of five percent the total development cost is approximately:

\$8,112,464.00

The Historic Tax Credit was not applied in these examples due to the fact that compliance with standards necessary to achieve the credits are much more expensive to achieve and the purpose of this exercise is to try make a re-adaptive use scenario work.

Now that we have the total cost to redevelop the three buildings as residential apartments we can look at whether the projected revenue of \$523,000 a year can support the cost of development and the operating cost.

OPERATING ANALYSIS

Total Annual Income	\$523,000
Annual operating costs of \$5,000 per unit.....	\$155,000

After you subtract the annual operating cost from the total available revenue you are left with \$368,000 for the financing cost of the development. If the developer can get a ninety percent of cost mortgage for 30 years the total cost of the annual payments will be approximately \$620,602.00 a year.

Clearly this does not work if you add annual operating cost and debt service you have annual expenses of \$775,602 a year and only have income of \$523,000. This example is based on very conservative cost and revenues based on fairly high rents. The developer will have a loss of \$252,602 a year plus the loss of any profit and further loss through vacancies and turnover of units.

Scenario of offices and retail in buildings 1, 7 and 10

COMMERCIAL AND RETAIL INCOME

When looking at the potential of commercial and retail uses of the three buildings we took all of the available floor space on all floors regardless of whether or not marketable and adaptable. The three buildings present approximately 41,777 square feet of usable space for retail and office. If you assume a Class B rent of \$8.00 a square foot annually that will provide an annual income of \$334,216.00 year.

RENOVATION COST FOR COMMERCIAL AND RETAIL

The renovation cost of retail and commercial space will be impacted by the same factors

described in the residential analysis of re-adaptive use. Likely renovation costs will be in the range of \$151 per square foot. This is based on the sponsor's experience in developing over a million square feet of commercial space in the last twenty five years. Again this number is more reflective of newer construction and the challenges presented by these three buildings could increase that cost by 20 to 50 percent.

At a construction cost of \$151.00 a square foot the build out of the commercial space for the project will be \$6,308,327.00. If you add ten percent for soft cost and a five percent profit the full development cost is \$7,254,576.00.

OPERATING ANALYSIS

It is assumed that the commercial and retail space will be leased as triple net leases, meaning that the developer/owner only pays for borrowing cost and capital improvements. The commercial tenant pays all utilities, taxes and maintenance cost of the space.

If the owner is successful in financing ninety percent of the development cost the annual debt service will be \$581,091.00 a year. Again the annual cost to the developer far exceeds the available income by \$246,875.00. One of the reasons that these buildings do not work as well for commercial uses compared to residential is the high cost to develop competitive commercial space in the market place. The area around Citygate has a lot of Class B commercial space for rent at very competitive rental rates. These buildings do not have an advantage over those properties and cannot compete against the new construction at Citygate for professionals and retail outlets seeking a more upscale venue in the area. The other factor that hurts both uses is the small amount of space to be developed in the buildings compared to the over 400,000 square feet being proposed in the new construction mixed use buildings at similar or less construction cost and greater economy of scale.

Summary

One of the principal reasons Monroe County opted to abandon utilizing the Lola Campus in 2001 was the high cost of needed renovations to address deferred maintenance, upgrade aging systems, and deal with such environmental issues as asbestos and lead paint. The decision to spend their facilities dollars elsewhere was also influenced by the generally obsolete character of the buildings, designed for a pre-automobile era and for entirely different purpose than that of government office space. The prospects for adaptive reuse of the Lola buildings have not gotten any better since that time. The costs are now even higher and the conditions are even worse. Adaptive reuse is not impossible; any building can be reclaimed and put to a productive use if enough money and effort are devoted to the project. In this case, the costs associated with

adaptive reuse are clearly well above the cost of replacing the space with new construction, and beyond this the projected ongoing cost of operating these renovated facilities would constitute a continuing drain on the project.

Outside of the context of a larger development, the renovation of these buildings would not be undertaken unless the land values were underwritten and the projects received heavy subsidy for an independent public purpose such as affordable housing. In the context of the larger project, some of the impacts and costs associated with retaining the historic resources could be absorbed without becoming a major threat to the viability of the project overall, while others clearly are obstacles to the success of the overall project. Buildings 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9 are all positioned in such a way that their retention is incompatible with the overall project concept and design. Buildings 1 and 10 are the structures which require the smallest site plan adjustments if the Lead Agency requires that they be retained, though a requirement to retain both would impose high opportunity costs, as their sites are particularly attractive for new construction given their street frontage. Of these two, the cost to the project of retaining Building 1 is the greater due to the necessary changes to the road configuration.

In addition to failing to pay for themselves on an ongoing basis, the adaptive reuse scenarios for the perimeter buildings would cost the project a significant amount of money in lost land sale revenue, and would result in lost tax revenue to the City, County and School District. The perimeter land values are as high as a million dollars an acre in some cases. The retained historic resources would survive as isolated street-oriented elements, with little about them to recall the character of the original park-like campus setting of the Lola Sanitarium.

4.6 Traffic and Transportation

The information presented in this section was obtained from the *Traffic Impact Study, Citygate, City of Rochester and Town of Brighton, New York* prepared by Bergmann Associates in July 2008 (see Appendix O).

Full build out of the proposed Citygate development is anticipated to be complete in 2013 and will consist of retail, office, residential, hotel and recreational opportunities. The proposed concept plan shows planned vehicular access to the Citygate development. Access will be provided by two streets on East Henrietta Road, as well as one street and two driveways on Westfall Road – three access driveways exist today. The existing access driveways include:

- Stan Yale Drive, intersecting East Henrietta Road approximately 600 feet south of Westfall Road, opposite the Monroe County Hospital driveway,
- The South driveway, intersecting East Henrietta Road approximately 520 feet south of Stan Yale Drive and
- The north access driveway, intersecting Westfall Road approximately 920 feet east of East Henrietta Road.

The new access driveways and street are located on Westfall Road (see Figure 2). The full access Street "B" will be relocated opposite Green Knolls Drive East and will be controlled by a traffic signal. A new right-in (RI) only driveway will be located approximately midway between Green Knolls Drive West and Green Knolls Drive East. The other new driveway is proposed to be a right-in/right-out (RIRO) only driveway. This driveway will be located approximately 100 feet west of Metropolitan Drive.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing Roadway System

East Henrietta Road (Route 15A) borders Citygate site to the west, while Westfall Road borders the north side of the site.

East Henrietta Road (Route 15A)

East Henrietta Road is a north-south City urban minor arterial route in the vicinity of the Citygate site. East Henrietta Road is a four-lane curbed roadway that provides normal two-way traffic flow with two lanes in each direction. Travel lanes are 11 to 12 feet wide. The profile of East Henrietta Road is fairly level with a slight upgrade to the north in front of the project site. Alignment of the road is generally straight near the proposed site. The posted speed limit in the vicinity of the site is 30 mph.

Traffic is controlled by a traffic signal at the intersection of East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road. All four legs of this intersection consist of one exclusive left turn approach lane, one exclusive through approach lane, one shared through/right approach lane, and two departure lanes.

Both Stan Yale Drive and the Monroe County Hospital access driveway consist of two lanes exiting to East Henrietta Road and one lane entering from East Henrietta Road. This four way intersection is signalized with exclusive left turn lanes located on all four approaches. The South

driveway is a two lane road with no exclusive turn lanes at East Henrietta Road. Left turns onto East Henrietta Road are prohibited from the stop controlled South driveway.

Westfall Road

Westfall Road is a City and Monroe County collector road that is oriented in an east-west direction in the vicinity of the project site. The road has two 12-foot travel lanes with two-foot curb offsets in the vicinity of the Citygate site; Westfall Road is a two and three lane road to the east of the site. The posted speed limit is 30 mph in the City of Rochester and 35 mph outside the City. Alignment of the road is generally straight near the proposed site. The road surface is in fair condition with a crest vertical curve in the vicinity of the north access drive. The north access drive is a two lane road with no exclusive turn lanes at the approach to Westfall Road.

Existing Traffic Volumes

Bergmann Associates conducted manual turning movement counts in 2004 at six subject intersections listed below – the counts were updated in 2008. Additional intersections were also included in the 2008 study, as noted below:

- East Henrietta Road with the South Driveway (2004 and 2008)
- East Henrietta Road with Stan Yale Drive (2004 and 2008)
- East Henrietta Road with Westfall Road (2004 and 2008)
- East Henrietta Road with South Avenue (2008)
- South Avenue with Science Park (2008)
- Westfall Road with Mt. Hope Avenue (2008)
- Westfall Road with the north access drive (2004 and 2008)
- Westfall Road with Green Knolls Drive East (2004 and 2008)
- Westfall Road with Metropolitan Drive (2008)
- Westfall Road with Sawgrass Drive (2008)
- Westfall Road with Clinton Avenue (2004 and 2008)
- Westfall Road with Lac de Ville Boulevard (2008)

The traffic counts at the subject intersections described above were collected on Wednesday, December 8, 2004 between 7:00 and 9:00 AM and between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. These time periods were chosen as the combined traffic of the adjacent streets and the subject site generally peaks during these time periods.

Recent count data was obtained from the Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) Westfall Road Reconstruction project (Westfall 2) and the May 2008 University of

Rochester - Planned Development Traffic Impact Study. This data was used to update the 2004 count data.

The 2004 traffic counts were recorded at 15-minute increments to enable identification of specific peak hours and traffic peaking characteristics within the peak hour. Weekday AM and PM peak hours were determined to be 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM and 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM, respectively.

Existing Levels of Service

Level of Service (LOS) analysis is a means of determining the ability of an intersection to accommodate existing and/or forecasted traffic volumes. The analysis is based on intersection street geometrics, traffic controls, and traffic maneuvers. The analysis indicates the LOS at which an intersection is currently functioning, or is expected to function for future conditions. Procedures for conducting the analysis are provided in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) published by the Transportation Research Board (2000). Additionally, Version 7.0 of Synchro was utilized to determine the LOS and vehicle queuing for the subject intersections.

Level of Service is categorized by letter characters that range from A to F, with A representing the best traffic operating conditions that have little or no delay and F characterizing the worst conditions that have significant delay. LOS A through D are usually considered acceptable, while LOS E is usually considered representative of conditions where improvements are needed. LOS F operating conditions are typically unacceptable and indicative that improvements are needed in the form of traffic controls, geometric changes, or some combination of both.

Levels of Service for signalized and unsignalized intersections are identified by the average control delay experienced by vehicles in seconds per vehicle. LOS for signalized intersections is calculated for each traffic movement and the total intersection. LOS for unsignalized intersections are determined for the minor approach (stop sign controlled) traffic movements and major approach left turns. The range of seconds of delay defining LOS is different for signalized and unsignalized intersections; thus, LOS results are not comparable between signalized and unsignalized intersections. Table 9 shows the range of delay defining LOS for signalized intersections. Table 10 shows the range of delay defining LOS for unsignalized intersections.

Table 9. Level of Service for Signalized Intersections

LOS	CONTROL DELAY PER VEHICLE (sec)
A	Less than or equal to 10.0
B	Greater than 10.0 to no more than 20.0

C	Greater than 20.0 to no more than 35.0
D	Greater than 35.0 to no more than 55.0
E	Greater than 55.0 to no more than 80.0
F	Greater than 80.0

Table 10. Level of Service for Unsignalized Intersections

LOS	CONTROL DELAY PER VEHICLE (sec)
A	Less than or equal to 10.0
B	Greater than 10.0 to no more than 15.0
C	Greater than 15.0 to no more than 25.0
D	Greater than 25.0 to no more than 35.0
E	Greater than 35.0 to no more than 50.0
F	Greater than 50.0

Existing Traffic Operations

The existing traffic operations during the peak hours at the intersection of East Henrietta and Westfall Roads range from LOS A to F for critical traffic movements. At the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue and Westfall Road, all lane groups operate at LOS C or better during peak hours, except the eastbound left/through movement and the westbound left movement during the PM peak hour, which operate at LOS D.

At the intersection of East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road, all approaches operate at LOS C or better during the peak hours, except the westbound approach, the eastbound approach, and southbound left turn lane during the PM peak hour. The westbound left turn movement operates with the most delay – LOS D during the AM peak hour and LOS E during the PM peak hour.

The free flow Westfall Road approaches to the north access driveway, Green Knolls Drive East, and Metropolitan Drive operate at LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours. The stop-controlled north access driveway approach to Westfall Road operates at LOS C and LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The stop-controlled Green Knolls Drive East approach to Westfall Road operates at LOS D during both peak hours. The stop-controlled Metropolitan Drive approach to Westfall Road operates at LOS C during both peak hours.

The eastbound and westbound approaches at the intersection of Westfall Road and Sawgrass Drive operate at LOS A during both peak hours. The northbound and southbound approaches operate at LOS D or better. Both the northbound and southbound left turn movements operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. The intersection operates at an overall LOS A.

Three of the four approaches at the intersection of Westfall Road and Clinton Avenue operate at LOS E during one or both of the peak hours. The eastbound left turn movement operates at a LOS F during the PM peak hour and the westbound and southbound through/right turn movements operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour. Overall intersection LOS is LOS E.

All lane groups at the intersection of Westfall Road and Lac De Ville Boulevard operate at LOS C or better with the exception of the southbound left turn lane during the PM peak hour. Overall, the intersection operates at LOS A during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour.

The lane groups at the intersection of East Henrietta Road and the South driveway operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours. At the intersection of East Henrietta Road with the Monroe County Hospital and Stan Yale Drive (Street "U") all lane groups operate at LOS C or better during the peak hours except eastbound and westbound left turns, and the westbound approach during the PM peak hour.

All movements on East Henrietta Road operate at LOS A at the intersection of South Avenue. South Avenue left movement operates at LOS D during both peak hours. Overall intersection LOS is LOS B.

All movements at the signalized intersection of South Avenue and Science Park operate at LOS C or better except the westbound left turn movement during the PM peak hour. This movement operates at LOS D.

A study of corridor sections was performed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS). The following corridors were analyzed:

- Westfall Rd. from East Henrietta Rd. to Citygate
- Westfall Rd. from Citygate to Winton Rd.
- Winton Rd. from Monroe Ave. to Westfall Rd.
- Winton Rd. from Westfall Rd. to I-590 (section is 4 lanes wide)
- South Clinton Ave. to south of Westfall Rd.
- Lac de Ville Blvd. from Westfall Rd. to Senator Keating Blvd.

- E. Henrietta Rd. from Westfall Rd. to I-390 (section is 4 lanes wide)

The results indicate that the corridor sections currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak hours. The volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios are 0.50 or less, indicating that the reserve capacity is at least half for these corridors. The basis for analyzing the four lane roadways, as recommended by the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), is density of vehicles per lane measured in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln). The peak hour density of Winton Road from Westfall Road to I-590 is less than 9 pc/mi/ln, which is representative of LOS A. The density of East Henrietta Road from Westfall Road to I-390 during the peak hour is less than 21 pc/mi/ln which is representative of LOS C.

Trip Generation

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Report, *Trip Generation, 7th Edition*, was utilized for the trip generation analysis of the proposed Citygate development. A summary of land uses proposed for the site is provided in Table 11. Table 12 contains a summary of trips generated by each land use for total build-out of Citygate.

Table 11. Land Uses

Use	Size	ITE Land Use Code
Hotel	350 Rooms	310
Retail	343,000 Square Feet	820
Office	160,000 Square Feet	750
Apartments	990 Dwelling Units	220
Townhouses	110 Dwelling Units	230

Trips generated by Citygate are projected to consist of internal or shared trips (captured within the site) and external trips (entering and exiting the site). The external trips consist of primary (new) trips and pass-by trips. Primary trips are a direct result of the development and represent new traffic to the surrounding traffic system. Pass-by trips do not represent new traffic to the surrounding street system. The source of pass-by trips is traffic that is projected to exist on the adjacent street without regard to the Citygate development. Working closely with MCDOT a 20% shared-trip credit was used to estimate the sharing between the numerous retail stores, and the ITE Report was used to determine the multi-use shared-trip credit (12% AM and 15% PM). The same credit was utilized for the Hotel traffic as the 30% and 29% shared-trip credit provided in the ITE Report seemed high for Hotel. Table 11 depicts the results of the trip generation analysis.

Due to the number of smaller shops/retail stores, a greater degree of retail sharing is expected, compounded with the proximity of office space and apartments in the northwest quadrant of Citygate. The 20% credit was applied to retail because of the self sustaining living/working/shopping environment planned for Citygate.

Table 12. Trip Generation

Land Use	Trips Generated					
	Weekday AM			Weekday PM		
	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Hotel	120	76	196	110	97	207
Retail	208	133	341	648	701	1349
Office	267	33	300	38	232	270
Apartments	99	398	497	382	206	588
Townhouses	9	43	52	41	20	61
Total Trips	703	683	1386	1219	1256	2475
Internal Credits (listed in the order taken):						
Shared Trips Between Retail Uses (20%)	41	27	68	130	140	270
Shared Trips - Multi-Uses (AM-12%, PM-15%)	81	78	159	164	166	330
Trip Credit for Transit Facility (5%)	30	28	58	45	49	94
Total External Trips	551	550	1101	880	901	1781
Total Pass-by Trips	28	18	46	125	136	261
Total New (Primary) Trips	523	532	1055	755	765	1520

Trip Distribution

This phase of the traffic analysis involved distribution of the projected peak hour traffic generated by the proposed development to the surrounding roadway system. The projected traffic volumes calculated during the trip generation phase were distributed onto the roadway system based on the following factors:

- Study area travel patterns;
- The nature of trips generated by each type of land use; and

- The location of each land use within the development site.

The distribution of site-generated primary traffic considered the existing distribution of traffic observed along East Henrietta Road (Route 15A), Westfall Road, and Clinton Avenue. The percent distribution of Citygate pass-by traffic considered the existing pattern of traffic on East Henrietta Road (Route 15A) and Westfall Road.

Sight Distance

The Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) for the proposed development, based upon field investigation for vehicles exiting the Citygate streets and access driveways, meets AASHTO recommendations. ISD's are greater than 500 feet to the left and right, with the location of the driver eye estimated to be 14.5 feet from the edge of pavement of the major roadway and 3.5 feet above the proposed pavement. Table 13 contains the ISD conditions at the Citygate access driveway approaches to major roadways and the AASHTO recommended ISD. The speed limit along East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road in the vicinity of the access driveways is posted at 30 mph. Based upon field measurements, the ISD's are adequate for vehicles exiting the Citygate access driveways according to the AASHTO *Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* (2004). For major roads with a design speed of 35 mph, AASHTO recommends 390 feet of sight distance along the major road for a vehicle turning from the minor road to the major road – 335 feet are recommended for a design speed of 30 mph.

Table 13. Intersection Sight Distances

Major Roadway	Driveway Approach	ISD to the Left	ISD to the Right	AASHTO Recommended
East Henrietta Road Route 15A	Street "T"	>500 ft	>500 ft	412 ft ¹
Westfall Road	Street "B"	>500 ft	>500 ft	390 ft ²
Westfall Road	RIRO Northeast Driveway (Street "D")	>500 ft	NA	390 ft ²

¹ AASHTO recommended intersection sight distance for vehicles to turn left from a minor road to a four lane two-way major road for a design speed of 35 mph along the major roadway.

² AASHTO recommended intersection sight distance for vehicles to turn left from a minor road to a two lane two-way major road for a design speed of 35 mph along the major roadway.

The stopping sight distance of a driver traveling in either direction on East Henrietta Road or Westfall Road in the vicinity of the Citygate streets and access driveways is greater than 300 feet when viewing the location of the driveway, as shown in Table 14. AASHTO recommends a stopping sight distance of 250 feet for a design speed of 35 mph. For a design speed of 30 mph, 200 feet is recommended. Therefore, the sight distance along East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road to the Citygate streets and access driveways is in accordance AASHTO recommended stopping sight distances.

Table 14. Stopping Sight Distances

Intersection	Approach	SSD	AASHTO Recommended for Design Speed of 35 mph
East Henrietta Road with the Street "T"	Northbound	>300'	250'
	Southbound	>300'	250'
Westfall Road with the Street "B"	Eastbound	>300'	250'
	Westbound	>300'	250'
Westfall Road with the RIRO northeast driveway	Eastbound	>300'	250'
	Westbound	NA	250'

Projected Year 2013 No-Build Alternative

Traffic

In close coordination with MCDOT staff, background and growth traffic was determined. The background traffic is the result of the following planned developments:

- Sawgrass Medical Development on Westfall Road;
- Clinton Crossings Development (between Westfall Road, Senator Keating Boulevard, South Clinton Avenue and Lac de Ville Boulevard);
- Senator Keating Boulevard Development south of Westfall Road; and
- The Reserve on South Clinton Avenue.

As these background developments constitute the growth in this corridor for the year 2013, no additional growth was added to the base year 2008 traffic volumes.

Level of Service

For the 2013 No-Build Alternative, no decrease in LOS will be realized at the intersections of East Henrietta Road with the South Driveway, Street “U”, and South Avenue, as well as the intersection of South Avenue with Science Park. The intersection of Westfall Road and Mount Hope Avenue projected only minimal increases in delay. The Westbound through/right lane and approach, however, change to LOS B and LOS D during the PM peak hour, respectively.

Almost half the lane groups at the intersection of Westfall Road and East Henrietta Road are projected to decrease in LOS due to the high volume of background traffic. The eastbound approach will remain operating at LOS C and LOS D in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively; however, the westbound approach will change to LOS E during the PM peak hour. Both the northbound and southbound lefts, as well as the PM through movements are also expected to have increased delays. The overall intersection LOS changes from LOS B to C in the AM peak hour and LOS C to D in the PM peak hour.

Along Westfall Road, the existing North Access, Green Knolls Drive East, and Metropolitan Drive are expected to realize increases in delay. The LOS for these approaches are projected to change to LOS D through F, with up to 79 seconds of delay. Both the intersections of Green Knolls Drive East and Metropolitan Drive are also expected to have left turn lanes available to vehicles turning from Westfall Road. These improvements are anticipated to be made by the MCDOT as part of the Westfall Road 2 improvement project currently in the preliminary design phase.

At the intersection of Westfall Road and Sawgrass Driveway, it is expected that there will be minimal increases in delay during the AM peak hour, with the overall LOS changing from LOS A to LOS B. There are also minor increases in delay during the PM peak hour, with the exception of the northbound approach and the southbound left turn movement. Both the northbound and southbound left turn movements, currently at LOS F, are projected to see an increase of at least 60 seconds of delay. This increase causes the northbound approach to change to LOS F. The overall intersection is LOS B and LOS C during the AM and PM peak hours, respectively.

The Westfall Road and Clinton Avenue intersection exhibits a preexisting poor LOS. Background traffic other than Citygate is projected to worsen the flow of traffic, with some operations at LOS F including the overall intersection LOS. The capacity and signal timing issues at the intersection of Westfall Road and South Clinton Avenue will be address by the MCDOT’s Westfall Road 2 project currently in preliminary design.

The intersection of Westfall Road and Lac De Ville Boulevard is projected to have only small increases in delay. The overall intersection is expected to be LOS B during both peak hours.

The study of corridor sections was performed for the 2013 No-Build Alternative. The following corridors were analyzed:

- Westfall Rd. from East Henrietta Rd. to Citygate
- Westfall Rd. from Citygate to Winton Rd.
- Winton Rd. from Monroe Ave. to Westfall Rd.
- Winton Rd. from Westfall Rd. to I-590 (section is 4 lanes wide)
- South Clinton Ave. south of Westfall Rd.
- Lac de Ville Blvd. from Westfall Rd. to Senator Keating Blvd.
- E. Henrietta Rd. from Westfall Rd. to I-390 (section is 4 lanes wide)

The No-Build results indicate that the corridor sections are projected to operate at LOS E or better during the peak hours as a result of traffic growth other than Citygate. The v/c ratios are 0.65 or less, while the reserve capacity is projected to range from 80% to 35% during the peak hours for the four corridors listed above.

The basis for analyzing the four lane roadways, as recommended by the HCM, is density of vehicles per lane, measured in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln). The 2013 no build peak hour density of Winton Road from Westfall Road to I-590 is projected to be less than 10 pc/mi/ln which is representative of LOS A. The density of E. Henrietta Road from Westfall Road to I-390 during the peak hour is projected to be less than 23 pc/mi/ln which is representative of LOS C.

Projected Year 2013 Full Build-Out

Traffic

Full build-out traffic considerations include background traffic and Citygate traffic. To project the build-out weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the subject intersections for the year 2013, Citygate traffic was added to the 2013 No-Build Alternative traffic.

Level of Service

For the 2013 build-out condition, the lane groups at the intersection of Westfall Road and Mount Hope Avenue are expected to remain at the same LOS as the No Build Alternative, with the exception of the Westbound left movement, which will change to LOS E during the PM peak hour.

The intersection of East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road is expected to have an overall LOS C and LOS E in the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. The southbound left turn lane during both peak hours and the westbound left turn lane during the PM peak hour are predicted to operate at LOS F.

The existing North Access on Westfall Road will be replaced with a right-in-only driveway, which will operate with little to no delay. Green Knolls Drive East and Westfall Road will become a four way intersection with Street "B" and will be signalized. This intersection will operate at LOS C or better for all lane groups, with the exception of the northbound left/through lane group, which will operate at LOS D during both peak hours. An additional driveway, Street "D", will be added just west of Metropolitan Drive as a right-in/right-out. The eastbound and westbound approaches will operate with little to no delay, while the northbound approach will operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour. Metropolitan Drive will operate at nearly the same LOS as the No-Build Alternative. The eastbound left turn average delay will increase slightly, to a total of 18 seconds.

The intersection of Westfall Road and the Sawgrass driveway will operate with minimal changes from the No-Build Alternative. The eastbound approach will operate at LOS B during the PM peak hour, while the westbound left turn movement will operate at LOS D during the AM peak hour and LOS B during the PM peak hour. Overall intersection LOS remains the same.

The Westfall Road and Clinton Avenue intersection exhibits a poor preexisting LOS. Background traffic other than Citygate is projected to worsen the flow of traffic and degrade some LOS to F, including the overall intersection LOS. The full build-out LOS at the Westfall Road and Clinton Avenue intersection include more movements operating at LOS F and one at LOS E (the northbound left turn lane). The capacity and signal timing issues at the intersection of Westfall Road with South Clinton Avenue will be address by the MCDOT's Westfall Road 2 project currently in preliminary design.

The intersection of Westfall Road and Lac De Ville Boulevard will operate at the same LOS as the No-Build Alternative on the westbound, northbound and southbound approaches. The eastbound left movement will operate at LOS C during the AM peak hour. The eastbound through/right movement and approach will also operate at LOS C during the PM peak hour.

The South Driveway (proposed Street "T") will be a signalized intersection with separate left and right turn lanes on the westbound approach due to traffic demand. During the AM peak hour, all

lane groups operate at LOS D or better. During the PM peak hour, all lane groups operate at LOS D or better except the westbound left lane, operating at LOS E, and the southbound approach, operating at LOS F (without mitigation).

Lane groups on East Henrietta Road and Street "U" are expected to operate at LOS C or better, with the exception of the eastbound and westbound left lane groups and the westbound approach; however, LOS for these groups is not predicted to change from the No-Build Alternative. The overall intersection LOS is expected to be LOS B during both peak hours.

South Avenue westbound movement will change to LOS E at the intersection with East Henrietta Road during the PM peak hour. The southbound movement will also change to LOS B during the PM peak hour. Overall LOS at this intersection will remain at LOS B during the AM peak hour and change to LOS C during the PM peak hour. The intersection of South Avenue and Science Park will no change in LOS from the No-Build Alternative.

The study of corridor sections was performed for the 2013 build condition. The following corridors were analyzed:

- Westfall Rd. from East Henrietta Rd. to Citygate
- Westfall Rd. from Citygate to Winton Rd.
- Winton Rd. from Monroe Ave. to Westfall Rd.
- Winton Rd. from Westfall Rd. to I-590 (section is 4 lanes wide)
- South Clinton Ave. south of Westfall Rd.
- Lac de Ville Blvd. from Westfall Rd. to Senator Keating Blvd.
- E. Henrietta Rd. from Westfall Rd. to I-390 (section is 4 lanes wide)

The full build-out results indicate that the corridor sections are projected to operate at LOS E or better during the peak hours, with projected background traffic growth and with Citygate. The v/c ratios are projected to be 0.76 or less. The reserve capacity is projected to range from 79% to 24% during the peak hours for the four corridors listed in above. A slight reduction of v/c is projected but reserve capacity ranging from 79% to 24% will be available.

The basis for analyzing the four lane roadways, as recommended by the HCM, is density of vehicles per lane, measured in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln). During the 2013 build peak hour Winton Road from Westfall Road to I-590 is projected to operate at LOS A. East Henrietta Road from Westfall Road to I-390 is projected to operate at LOS C during the peak hours.

Impacts to 15A/390 Intersection

The New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) currently is in the preliminary design phase with several design alternatives currently being evaluated. Traffic volumes generated by the Citygate Development have been furnished to the NYSDOT for inclusion in their evaluation of design alternatives. A letter from the NYSDOT is expected to address questions concerning planned improvements for this interchange.

Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) Westfall Road Improvement Project

This project will extend from East Henrietta Road to Clinton Avenue. It is currently in the preliminary design phase with construction anticipated for 2010. The MCDOT staff has worked closely with the consultants for Citygate and has provided input into the traffic analysis for background growth and driveway locations on East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. Traffic volumes generated by the Citygate project are being incorporated by MCDOT into the design analysis for Westfall Road.

MITIGATION

The internal street system has been designed to afford vehicle and pedestrian connectivity within the development. Access Management strategies have been incorporated by limiting the predominate ingress/egress traffic movements to signalized intersections and minor driveways on Westfall Road to right-in and right-in/right-out. This will help to maintain throughput capacity on Westfall Road and eliminate potential vehicle conflicts with left turning vehicles into and out of the site. Additionally, the site is located along existing major transit routes and has been designed to encourage and accommodate transit usage. While the traffic analysis indicates that the proposed Citygate development will affect traffic operations on area roadways, implementation of the following mitigation is expected to result in acceptable traffic operations.

Saturday Mid-Day Peak Hour Evaluation

An analysis of Saturday mid-day peak hour conditions was also performed. The ITE Trip Generation, 7th Edition, was utilized for the trip generation analysis of the proposed Citygate development. A summary of land uses is provided in Table 11. Table 15, below, contains a summary of Saturday peak hour trips generated by each land use for total build out Citygate, with Weekday PM peak hour trips shown for comparison.

Table 15. Saturday Peak Hour Trip Generation

Land Use	Trips Generated					
	Saturday Mid-day			Weekday PM		
	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Hotel	141	111	252	110	97	207
Retail	945	872	1817	648	701	1349
Office	16	6	22	38	232	270
Apartments	235	235	470	382	206	588
Townhouses	35	29	64	41	20	61
Total Trips	1372	1253	2625	1219	1256	2475
Internal Credits (listed in the order taken):						
Shared Trips Between Retail Uses (20%)	189	174	363	130	140	270
Shared Trips - Multi-Uses (Sat-16%, PM-15%)	189	173	362	164	166	330
Trip Credit for Transit Facility (5%)	49	47	96	45	49	94
Total External Trips	945	859	1804	880	901	1781
Total Pass-by Trips	181	167	348	125	136	261
Total New (Primary) Trips	764	692	1456	755	765	1520

Trips generated by Citygate are projected to consist of internal or shared trips (captured within the site) and external trips (entering and exiting the site). The external trips consist of primary (new) trips and pass-by trips. A 20% shared trip credit was used to estimate the sharing between the numerous retail stores. The ITE TGH March 2001 was utilized to determine the multi-use shared trip credit (16% Saturday) shown in Table 15. The same credit was utilized for the Hotel traffic because the 30% and 29% credit shown in Table C.4 of the ITE TGH seemed high for Hotel.

A comparison of Saturday peak hour trips to weekday PM peak hour trips reveals a small increase of 1% to the total external trips from 1781 to 1804 as shown in Table 15. The primary trips are projected to be 4% less, i.e. less traffic on the surrounding roadway system. Effectively, the differences on roadways will be even less because trips will be distributed to five separate access points and many separate corridors on the roadway system. The greatest increase would be for entering pass-by traffic with 181 projected for the Saturday peak hour and 125 projected for the weekday peak hour. With recommended mitigation in place enough reserve roadway capacity is expected for the cumulative (background plus Citygate) Saturday peak hour traffic because the volume of street traffic is approximately half the volume of the weekday PM peak hour.

The volume of background street traffic in the surrounding area is low during the Saturday peak hour when compared to the weekday PM peak hour and the projected volume of Citygate traffic is projected to be approximately the same. The overall conclusion of the traffic analysis remains the

same with inclusion of the Saturday peak hour evaluation, the proposed Citygate development will affect traffic operations, but after the recommendations are implemented, acceptable traffic operations are expected.

Projected Year 2013 Full Build-Out

The mitigation recommended for the 2013 Full Build-Out is the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of East Henrietta Road and the South driveway (Street "T") and construction of a second exit lane on the Street "T" to allow one exit lane each for left and right turns. Some adjustments of the signal timings are recommended at the following intersections to accommodate new traffic flow patterns:

- Westfall Road with Mt. Hope Avenue (PM peak hour only);
- Westfall Road with East Henrietta Road, Westfall Road with Sawgrass Drive (PM peak hour only); and
- East Henrietta Road with South Avenue (PM peak hour only)

The capacity and signal timing issues at the intersection of Westfall Road and South Clinton Avenue will be address by the MCDOT's Westfall Road 2 project currently in preliminary design.

Also recommended are a left turn lane on southbound East Henrietta Road at Citygate Street T, a traffic signal at the intersection of East Henrietta Road and Citygate Street "T", and a traffic signal on Westfall Road and Citygate Street "B". Interconnection of the new signals to the existing network of signals will also improve traffic flow.

4.6 Utilities and Energy Usage

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Utilities

Water and Sewer

Water service within the City is provided by the City of Rochester Water Bureau; within the Town of Brighton, service is typically provided by the Monroe County Water Authority. To the west of the site a 24" City water main extends north-south in the middle of East Henrietta Road (NY 15A); it connects to a 12" City water main that extends east-west along the north side of Westfall Road and dead ends near the boundary between the City and Town of Brighton. To the northeast of the site an 8" Monroe County Water Authority water main begins near Sawgrass Road and

extends to the east along Westfall Road. These systems are not connected on Westfall Road or near the site.

Meter vaults along 15A identify connection points from the water main into the site. Eight and six inch diameter mains wend through the site, serving each of the buildings. Hydrants are spaced throughout the site.

Hydrant flow test records indicate the 24" City water main on East Henrietta Road has a capacity of 4,834 gpm at 20 psi; the 12" City water main on Westfall Road has a capacity of 4,141 gpm at 20 psi; and the 8" MCWA water main has a capacity of 1,132 gpm at 50 psi.

Wastewater collection is under the control of the Monroe County Pure Waters District and is separated from stormwater drainage flows. On-site sanitary sewers flow generally south to an existing 16-inch sanitary trunk sewer that drains easterly through the southern portion of the site. This trunk sewer empties into the 20-inch diameter Lola Trunk Sewer, which in turn flows north and northeast to a large sanitary pump station on Elmwood Avenue opposite Goodman Street. The Lola Trunk Sewer has a capacity of approximately 6.5 million gallons per day. The on-site sanitary sewer system is gravity only and is comprised primarily of six-inch and eight-inch diameter pipes, serving all buildings, with manholes located at directional nodes. Ample capacity is available to serve the existing site. Some of the sewers are quite old and may experience infiltration and inflow problems.

Gas and Electric

Overhead electric is provided by Rochester Gas and Electric (RG&E) and extends along the site frontage along both East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. RG&E also provides natural gas service via a 12-inch main along Westfall Road and a 3-inch main along East Henrietta Road. Both services are supplied to the existing on-site structures.

Energy

The energy required to construct, operate, and maintain the existing and proposed buildings and infrastructure for the proposed Citygate development can be divided into three major areas:

- Energy required for the operation of the buildings;
- Energy for transporting employees, customers, and freight to and from the development; and
- Energy consumed during construction of the project.

Energy Required for the Operation of Buildings

At one time, Monroe County's Iola Powerhouse supplied high-pressure steam (120 psig), low-pressure steam (8 psig), and hot water to the following nearby County buildings:

- Monroe Community College
- Monroe Community Hospital
- Monroe County Health and Social Services Building
- Monroe County Correctional Center
- Children's Detention Center
- The Iola Complex buildings.

The steam was used for heating, driving absorption chillers and other facility operations.

In 2003 and 2004, Siemens built two natural gas-fired combined heat and power (CHP) plants for Monroe New Power, Inc., a not-for-profit local development corporation in Monroe County. The two new CHP plants, which generate both steam and electricity, use exhaust heat from the generation of electricity to produce steam for productive purposes, such as heating and cooling. Both CHP facilities have dual fuel capability, operating on either natural gas or oil.

One CHP plant was built at Monroe County Community College. The other plant was built on the Iola Campus – a 4.1 MW power plant with jacket water and exhaust recovery to meet the steam and electrical demands of the Monroe Community Hospital, the Monroe County Health and Social Services Building, as well as some maintenance and storage buildings on the Iola Campus. Construction of the two CHP plants led to the decommissioning of the Iola Powerhouse, a 75-year-old coal-burning plant.

The Iola CHP plant currently provides all the energy needs for the buildings on the Iola Campus as well as the Monroe Community Hospital and Monroe County Health and Social Services Building on the west side of East Henrietta Road.

Energy Required for Transportation

The Citygate site is currently well-served by five existing Regional Transit Service (RTS) bus routes and a parking shuttle sponsored by the University of Rochester. Cumulatively, these routes operate 152 scheduled bus trips per weekday, 56 trips per Saturday and 40 trips per Sunday past the Citygate property. Two of the RTS routes operate seven days per week and the others operate on weekdays only. The remote parking lot shuttle sponsored by the University of

Rochester and operated by a contract service provider (First Transit) runs every 20 minutes from 6:10 am until 6:10 pm between an employee parking lot located near the northwest corner of the property and the Crittenden (Hospital South) Loop. The weekday-only schedule consists of 36 round trips.

IMPACTS

Utilities

On-site water service is provided by the City of Rochester Bureau of Water and the Monroe County Water Authority; the Monroe County Division of Pure Waters is responsible for providing sewer service to the project site; and RG&E provides both electric and natural gas to the site. Based on the proposed site plan, water and sewer service, as well as gas and electric, will be required for approximately 310,000 square feet of retail space, 193,000 of office/commercial space, 350 hotel rooms, and 1,100 residential units.

Appendix D includes estimated demand calculations for water and sewer. These calculations include anticipated needs for the entire development. These calculations have been submitted to the City of Rochester Water Bureau (City Water Bureau), Monroe County Water Authority (MCWA), and Monroe County Pure Waters for their review.

The calculations in Appendix D initially analyzed the scenario with the City Water Bureau providing water to the portion of development in the City and MCWA providing water to the portion of development in the Town. The calculations determined that there is not sufficient pressure in the MCWA water main on Westfall Road to accommodate the portion of the project in the Town of Brighton. Therefore, the City of Rochester and the MCWA are evaluating whether the City Water Bureau can provide water for the entire development. The calculation in Appendix D analyzed the scenario assuming that the City Water Bureau will provide water to the entire development; and the impacts for that scenario are described below.

The anticipated domestic water usage for this project is 235,000 gallons per day (gpd). This represents an anticipates average domestic water flow rate of approximately 161 gallons per minute (gpm) and a peak flow rate of about 650 gpm. The analysis in Appendix D demonstrates that sufficient water supply is available to the development at sufficient pressures.

In accordance with applicable building codes and local standards, buildings will be equipped with fire suppression systems as needed. The water calculations computed available fire flows of 600 gpm, which is sufficient without the need for system improvements. The actual fire protection

flow demands will be determined with the fire suppression system designs of each building; as a result, booster pumps or storage tanks may be added on an as-needed basis.

The Monroe County Pure Waters trunk sewer with a capacity of approximately 6.5 million gallons per day can accommodate the current flow and the estimated 235,000 gpd sanitary discharge from this project.

Energy

Energy Required for the Operation of Buildings

The Iola CHP plant will be displaced by the proposed development.

Energy Required for Transportation

The development will displace the surface parking lot, which is currently being used by U of R employees as an off-site parking lot.

Energy Consumed During Construction of the Project

Energy required to manufacture building materials and construct the proposed development is estimated to be roughly 10 percent of the development's overall energy consumption.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Utilities

For the portion of the site that is in the City of Rochester the developer proposes to build a new 12" water main and 8" sanitary sewer that wind through the site along the proposed major streets. Those major streets, sanitary sewer, and the water main will be built to City standards and dedicated to the City. The new 12" water main will connect to the City's 24" water main on East Henrietta Road as well as to the City's 12" water main on Westfall Road.

As described above the calculations in Appendix D determined that there is not sufficient pressure in the MCWA water main on Westfall Road to accommodate the portion of the project in the Town of Brighton. Therefore, for that portion of the site the developer proposes to build an 8" water service with master meter and backflow prevention device from the City's 12" water main on Westfall Road. A private 8" sanitary sewer will be built that will be connected to the proposed public 8" sanitary sewer built on the City portion of the site.

All water main and sanitary sewer extensions will meet requirements of the Monroe County Department of Health, MCWA, the City of Rochester, and the Town of Brighton.

The applicant will work with the City Water Bureau, MCWA, Monroe County Division of Pure Waters, and RG&E to verify that adequate capacity exists and that the project poses no significant adverse environmental impacts.

Energy

Energy Required for the Operation of Buildings

The Citygate project is not projected to have a negative impact on the energy used by the Monroe Community Hospital and Monroe County Health and Social Services Building. Monroe County will explore options for providing the energy needed to replace the energy provided by the Lola CHP plant to those buildings. This will be completed before development occurs at the Powerhouse.

Additionally, this development will improve energy inefficiencies by replacing older, less energy efficient buildings on the Lola Campus with newer more energy efficient buildings.

Energy Required for Transportation

To reduce the impact on energy consumption that could have resulted from displacing the off-site parking lot for U of R employees this development proposes to build a parking garage with space set aside specifically for their use. The development will also reduce the amount of energy consumed by providing additional parking spaces for the U of R employees; as well as an on-site transit stop for the general public to use.

Energy Consumed During Construction of the Project

To reduce the amount of energy consumed the developer proposes to explore methods (i.e., Energy Star and other green building standards) of energy conservation during final design as part of a comprehensive plan of green initiatives.

4.7 Noise, Lighting, and Odor Impacts

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Noise

The existing site has been fully developed, beginning in the early 1900's with the construction of the Monroe County Tuberculosis Sanitorium. Most of the buildings on the Lola Campus are currently vacant, however there are several buildings that are either in operation namely the Children's Detention Center, Monroe Newpower Corporation's Cogeneration Plant, Rochester Pure Waters. The Monroe County Household Hazardous Waste Recycling Center has recently ceased operations. In addition to the businesses in operation, the University of Rochester also utilizes certain areas of the site for employee parking. Some noise generators from the site are:

- Shuttle buses
- Vehicular traffic
- Noise from the cogeneration plant
- Noise from Rochester Pure Waters
- Noise from residents of the Children's Detention Center

Noise from the surrounding area is also created from vehicular traffic on East Henrietta Rd., Westfall Rd. and NYS Route 590. The existing noise levels can generally be characterized as typical for sites located in an urban area in close proximity to an important arterial highway with significant through traffic and some commercial activity.

Lighting

The existing lighting is partially developed on the site, as the portion of the property in the Town of Brighton remains undeveloped. Some light generated from the site are:

- Headlights from vehicular traffic
- Building lighting and parking area lighting

Light from the surrounding area are created mainly by vehicular traffic and light poles located on East Henrietta Rd., Westfall Rd. and NYS Route 590 and lighting associated with Monroe Community Hospital.

Odors

Ambient odor levels are consistent with that to be expected from a developed commercial property (i.e. vehicular emissions). In fact, odor levels with respect to the facilities are better today than historically. When the Lola power plant was originally constructed in 1925, it was a coal-fired facility and there were concerns over air quality, but in recent times it has been turned

into a cogeneration plant which is powered by engines and boilers engines that run primarily on natural gas to produces the electricity and heat. Evidence of its coal-fired days can still be seen as the 220' smokestack still exists, which was the ash silo that stored burned coal waste and aging fuel tanks. Since the cogeneration plant now runs on natural gas instead of coal, there are no noticeable odors. The same holds true for the other facilities in operation.

IMPACTS

Noise

The proposed project will generate some noise from various on-site activities:

- Construction
- Standard delivery trucks
- Commercial buses
- Vehicular traffic
- Garbage collection
- Parking lot maintenance (sweeping and snow removal)
- HVAC units

Noise resulting from construction is unavoidable and will be temporary in nature. Local, state and federal requirements specify noise emission standards for construction equipment to minimize adverse impacts and will be strictly adhered to. In addition, all construction activities will be done in accordance with local ordinances and regulations regarding limits on construction times.

The other noise generators noted above are already present on site, however their frequency will increase. Despite this increase, the noise levels will remain similar to those encountered by everyday activities in an urban environment such as the existing surrounding area for the project.

Berms and other landscaping techniques, as well as the conceptual plan layout will also help to minimize any noise impacts.

Lighting

As part of the overall project, all existing lighting fixtures will be upgraded and new lighting fixtures will be upgraded to comply with all applicable provisions in the City and Town Codes. Further, the lighting plan will be dark sky compliant. Fixtures will be selected to minimize lighting trespass

and glare onto adjacent properties and residential areas. This will be accomplished through the use of fixtures with specially designed reflectors and flat lenses that will achieve full cut-off classifications as defined by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA). IESNA guidelines state that full cutoff light fixtures cannot shine light above 90 degrees.

The project also will include adding pedestrian trail lighting along the canalway path which may become part of a separate lighting district as part of the Erie Canal Greenway Improvement Project.

Odors

The proposed project will not produce any noxious or strong odors. Ambient odor levels are expected to be consistent with commercial areas that offer similar services and amenities. The most noticeable odors will likely be generated by restaurants, other food-related services and dumpsters or trash compactors.

Emissions from various vehicular traffic will continue to exist on site, however with respect to New York State law, truck idling for delivery trucks is limited to five minutes.

MITIGATION

Noise, Lighting and Odors

Based upon the discussion above and proposed improvements, the project will not produce any significant adverse impacts with respect to noise, lighting and odors.

4.8 Socioeconomic Considerations

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Given the size of the project site relative to the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton, it was necessary to assess socioeconomic conditions at an appropriate scale. Accordingly, U.S Census data was collected for Monroe County, the City of Rochester, the Town of Brighton, and three census tracts (Tract 38.01, Tract 129, and Tract 130.01) which are adjacent to, and include, the project site (see Figure 18). Comparing census data across geographic scales (i.e., county, city/town, and census tract) provides a deeper understanding of the socioeconomic conditions affecting the project site. Note that two adjacent census tracts – Tract 38.03 and Tract 38.04 –

were not evaluated as they wholly comprise the AI Sigl Center and Monroe Community Hospital, respectively. A summary of the relevant socioeconomic data can be found in Table 16.

Table 16. Select Socioeconomic Characteristics

Demographic	Monroe County	City of Rochester	Town of Brighton	Tract 38.01 ¹	Tract 129 ²	Tract 130.01 ²
POPULATION						
Total Population	735,343	219,766	35,588	6,066	5,137	6,519
Median Age	36.1	30.8	40.0	30.9	44.1	31.2
Number of Households	286,820	89,093	15,852	2,707	2,306	2,732
HOUSING						
Vacant Housing Units (percent)	5.9%	10.8%	5.1%	3.6%	3.6%	7.8%
Median Year Structure Built	1960	1940-	1961	1955	1969	1970
INCOME/EMPLOYMENT						
Median Household Income	\$44,891	\$27,123	\$52,066	\$29,427	\$64,063	\$39,383
Poverty Rate, Individual	10.8%	24.9%	5.8%	13.3%	1.9%	14.8%
Unemployment Rate	4.0%	6.4%	1.9%	6.8%	2.4%	1.5%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census

1. Located in the City of Rochester
2. Located in the Town of Brighton

Population and Housing

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the three census tracts encompassing and adjacent to the proposed project site comprise 17,722 people. More specifically, Census Tract 38.01, located in the City of Rochester, is home to 6,066 residents, or 2.8 percent of the City's total population. Census Tracts 129 and 130.01, both within the Town of Brighton, provide residence to 11,656 individuals, or 32.8 percent of the Town's population.

The 17,722 people living in this area comprise 7,745 households with a housing vacancy rate of 5.1 percent. While the housing vacancy rate for this area is equal to that of the Town of Brighton and very close to that for Monroe County, it is less than half of the City housing vacancy rate.

The median age for residents within these three census tracts is 30.9 years (Tract 38.01), 44.1 years (Tract 129), and 31.2 years (Tract 130.01).

Local Economy and Employment

Median household incomes vary considerably among the three census tracts, with households in Tract 129 earning 63 percent more than those in Tract 130.10 and 118 percent more than households in Tract 28.01. Diverging rates of poverty also characterize the three census tracts –

while poverty rates for Tracts 38.01 and 130.01 are similar (13.3 percent and 14.8 percent, respectively), the poverty rate for Tract 129 is only 1.9 percent. The discrepancy in income between census tracts is also represented by the unemployment rate, with 6.8 percent of the population of Tract 38.01 unemployed.

When contrasting the economic conditions between the City of Rochester and Tract 38.01 it is interesting to note that while the median household income for Tract 38.01 is comparable to that of the City as a whole, the individual poverty rate for the City is almost double that of Tract 38.01. This could indicate that fewer income discrepancies exist among residents of Tract 38.01 resulting in a more economically homogenous population.

Comparing the two census tracts located in the Town of Brighton (Tracts 129 and 130.01) with the Town as a whole also yields several discrepancies worthy of note. Most intriguing is the combined differences in the individual poverty rates and unemployment rate for Tract 130.01 when compared to the Town – while the unemployment rate for Tract 130.01 is almost equal to that of the Town as a whole, its poverty rate is almost three times more than that for the Town. Additionally, median household income in the Town of Brighton is 32 percent greater than that for Tract 130.01.

Local Government Finances

City of Rochester

The property tax is the single largest source of revenue for the City of Rochester. Unlike other municipalities in Monroe County, the City collects municipal property taxes, as well as property taxes for the Rochester City School District (the District is financially dependent on the City as it has no independent power to contract bonded indebtedness or to levy taxes). While these two taxes are independent of one another, they are accounted for in the City Budget as a combined total. The City Charter currently fixes the Rochester City School District's share of local tax revenue at \$119.1 million per year.

A second characteristic that distinguishes the City from other municipalities in Monroe County is the apportionment of the tax levy between two different classes of property – Homestead and Non-Homestead. Homestead properties include all one-, two-, and three-family residential real properties, including dwellings used in part for non-residential purposes but used primarily for residential purposes. All other properties are classified as Non-Homestead. Table 17 provides the property tax rates for Homestead and Non-Homestead properties in the City of Rochester.

Table 17. Property Tax Rates – City of Rochester

Property Classification		Tax Rate ¹	
		2006 - 2007 Budget	2007 - 2008 Budget
Homestead	city	6.67	6.83
	school	14.53	14.89
	<i>Total</i>	<i>21.20</i>	<i>21.72</i>
Non-Homestead	city	14.04	13.53
	school	31.14	30.02
	<i>Total</i>	<i>45.18</i>	<i>43.55</i>

According to the Constitution of New York State, the City is permitted to levy taxes up to 2 percent of the five-year average full-assessed valuation for general governmental services (does not include the payment of debt service and capital expenditures). Using a full value system, the City assesses all properties at 100 percent of full market value, resulting in property tax revenues of \$141,934,000 in 2007, or 25 percent of all revenues.

Town of Brighton

Like the City of Rochester, property taxes are the single largest source of revenue for the Town of Brighton, contributing almost 65 percent (\$13,163,010) to the Town's 2008 adopted budget. The proposed 2008 Town Tax Rate is estimated at \$6.07 (per \$1,000 of assessed value), an increase of 2.81 percent from 2007, while the total assessed valuation for 2008 is \$2,090,444.

Community Services

The project site is located in an area that serves as a regional destination for residents and visitors due to its proximity to the Monroe Community Hospital, which is directly adjacent to the site across East Henrietta Road. Additionally, the Genesee Transportation Council has identified East Henrietta Road as part of the I-390 Commuter Corridor due to the large volumes of daily traffic resulting from the location of the hospital and the use of this road as a means of ingress and egress between the City of Rochester and other communities to the south.

Community services for this site are provided by both the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton as portions of the property are located in each municipality. A more detailed discussion of the services provided by each municipality can be found below.

Schools

The site is located within two separate school districts – the Rochester City School District (RCSD) and the Rush-Henrietta School District (note that the Rush-Henrietta School District serves the Brighton portion of the proposed development). Enrollment in the City of Rochester School District totals 34,000, with 2,000 students in pre-kindergarten, 17,000 students in elementary school (kindergarten through 6th grade), and 15,000 students in secondary school (grades 7 through 12). The City of Rochester School District also includes the following schools and programs:

- 55 Pre-Kindergarten Sites
- 39 Elementary Schools
- 19 Secondary Schools
- 1 Program for Young Mothers
- 1 Family/Adult Learning Center
- 3 Parent Information & Student Registration Centers
- 1 Customer Service Center
- 1 Parent Education/Training Center

The Rush-Henrietta Central School District, located in Henrietta, N.Y., has a total enrollment of nearly 6,000 students across five elementary schools (kindergarten through 5th grade), two middle schools (grades 6 through 8), a ninth grade academy, and one high school (grades 10 through 12), which includes an alternative education program.

Emergency Services

Police service for the Rochester portion of the Citygate site is provided by the Rochester Police Department; more specifically, the site is within Beat 254 of the 4 Highland Section Zone. The site is also located in the City's Neighborhood Empowerment Team (NET) Area D (NET Office Area D is approximately 2.6 miles from the site, located at 846 South Clinton Avenue).

Neighborhood Empowerment Teams seek to improve each NET area's quality of life by working with neighbors and groups to identify quality of life issues within neighborhoods, prioritize identified issues so that limited resources are brought to bear on the most chronic or serious quality of life issues, and develop and implement solutions to priority quality of life issues. Each NET includes an administrator and Police Lieutenant, Crime Prevention Officers (CPOs),

Neighborhood Conservation Officers (NCOs), a customer services representative, and clerical support.

The Brighton portion of the project site is within the Brighton Section Zone, Beat 774, served by the Brighton Police Department. The department is located at 2300 Elmwood Avenue, approximately 2.3 miles from the project site.

Fire protection is provided by the Rochester Fire Department and Brighton Fire Department. The Brighton Fire Department serves the eastern two-thirds of the Town of Brighton and the northwestern portion of the Town of Pittsford and is staffed by more than 85 volunteers belonging to 3 companies or stations. The closest Brighton Fire Station is approximately 2.7 miles from the project site, located at 2605 Elmwood Avenue.

The Rochester Fire Department has over 500 uniformed and non-uniformed members in 18 fire companies located in 15 neighborhood fire stations. On average, the Rochester Fire Department responds to all calls within 3 to 4 minutes. The closest Rochester Fire Station is approximately 1.2 miles from the project site, located at 1261 South Avenue.

The following ambulance providers serve, or may potentially serve the project site:

- Rural/Metro Medical Services is the official 911 ambulance service provider for the City of Rochester and also provides back-up service and mutual aid for Monroe County volunteer agencies. This provider has also entered into mutual aid agreements with surrounding suburbs and towns to provide emergency medical services and transportation for scheduled transfers.
- Monroe Ambulance provides Advanced Life Support with area volunteer ambulance and fire departments, ensuring that patients who live in outlying areas have access to life saving paramedic services. This includes back-up Advanced Life Support to area volunteer agencies, fire departments, and ambulance corps.
- Brighton Volunteer Ambulance, Inc. serves the Town of Brighton, and also works with other ambulance services to provide coverage in the Town if it is unable to respond to a call. The 911 Center will automatically dispatch the closest appropriate agency. Brighton Volunteer Ambulance, Inc. works closely with Henrietta Volunteer Ambulance, Pittsford Volunteer Ambulance, Penfield Volunteer Ambulance, Rural/Metro Medical Services, and Monroe Ambulance.

Parks and Recreation

There are numerous park and recreation opportunities in the vicinity of the project site, including seven parks, playgrounds, and trails within one-mile of the subject site:

County-wide Facilities

- The Erie Canalway Trail is directly adjacent to the southern project boundary continues to communities to both the east and west of the subject site. In total, the Erie Canalway Trail consists of approximately 43 miles of trails in Monroe County and includes lands in both the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton.

City of Rochester Facilities

- Eastmoreland Playground (0.70 acre) is approximately ½ mile from the Citygate site in the City of Rochester.
- Highland Park, designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, is located approximately ¾ mile from the project site in the City of Rochester. This park comprises approximately 150 acres and is a completely planned and planted arboretum. Amenities and attractions include the Lamberton Conservatory, historic Warner Castle, John Dunbar Memorial Pavilion (Highland Park Bowl), the Arches Pavilion, a small pond used as a winter ice-skating rink, a warming shelter, and hiking paths.
- The Genesee Valley Park (City of Rochester) is approximately 1 mile from the site via the Erie Canalway Trail. Amenities at this 700-acre park include baseball diamonds, soccer fields, a cricket pitch, two 18-hole golf courses, hiking trails, biking paths, playground areas, cross-country ski trails, and 8 picnic shelters.
- Bausch and Lomb Riverside Park is a 12 acre park in the City of Rochester which offers picturesque views of the University of Rochester and the Genesee River from its eastern bank. A shallow east bank dock allows safe access for canoes. This park is approximately 1-mile from the project site.

Town of Brighton Facilities

- Brighton Town Park is less than ¼ mile east of the site on Westfall Road. Amenities at this 28-acre park include a lodge, two pavilions, a playground, a softball field, a nature

path through a wooded area located next to a 12-acre pond, and a blacktop walkway that connects to the Erie Canalway Trail.

- Meridian Center Park is located approximately 1 mile from the project site in the Town of Brighton. This 24-acre park includes three multiuse fields, two little league fields, one youth softball field, a playground area, two tennis courts, a concession/restroom facility, an amphitheatre, a boat dock, a fishing dock, and a perimeter trail that provides access to the Erie Canalway Trail.

Public Transportation

The Rochester-Genesee Regional Transportation Authority (RGRTA) oversees public transportation in Monroe, Genesee, Livingston, Orleans, Wayne, Wyoming, and Seneca counties. Currently, 22 RGRTA bus stops serving five RGRTA bus routes are within ¼ mile of the Citygate site (see Figures 19 and 20). These routes include:

- *Route No. 5 – South/Saint Paul* (serves Highland Hospital, Strong Hospital, Monroe Community Hospital, Al Sigl Center, Science Park, Highland Park, Monroe Community College, Corporate Woods, Rustic Village Apartments, School #12, and the Department of Social Services).
- *Route No. 11 – South Clinton/Joseph* (serves Urban League of Rochester, Schools #9 and #50, Rochester Educational Opportunity Center, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Loehmann's Plaza, Elizabeth Wende Breast Clinic, Rochester Eye Institute, VA Clinic, Rochester Psychiatric Center, Monroe Developmental Center, Highland Hospital Kidney Dialysis Unit, McQuaid High School, Highland Park, Westfall Park Medical Center, and Westfall Professional Park).
- *Route No. 12 – 19th Ward/MCC* (serves YMCA-Thurston Road, St. Mary's Hospital, Joseph C. Wilson, Foundation Academy, Joseph C. Wilson Commencement Academy, Strong Memorial Hospital, Department of Social Services, Community Hospital, Woodward Health Center, Monroe Community College, and Corporate Woods).
- *Route No. 24 – Market Place Mall* (serves Time Warner, Wegmans-Hylan Drive, Strong Hospital, Strong Ties, Monroe Correctional Facility, Monroe Community College, Rustic Village Apartments, Frontier Commons, Marketplace Mall, RIT, Southtown Plaza, Scottsville, Wal-Mart, Calkins Corporate Park, and Suburban Plaza).
- *Route No. 91 – Suburban Plaza-Lima-Avon* (serves Kodak Office, Suburban Plaza, Frontier Commons, Al Sigl Center, Bryant & Stratton, Rush-Henrietta High School, Monroe Community College, Monroe Community Hospital, Highland Hospital, Southtown Plaza, Marketplace Mall, Rush, Honeoye Falls, Lima, and Avon).

Property Values

Property values were collected for all parcels located within ½ mile of the Citygate project site. Based on the total assessed value for 2007 and 2008, the average residential property value for the selected parcels within a ½ mile radius of the subject site is \$83,164 (includes single-family, two-family, and three-family residences), while the median value equals \$84,000.

Average and median property values for all property types (e.g., commercial, industrial) are depicted in Table 18.

Table 18. Area Property Values

Property Classification	Average Value	Median Value
Residential	\$83,164	\$84,000
Vacant (all parcels)	\$93,245	\$15,800
<i>residential</i>	<i>\$61,319</i>	<i>\$7,500</i>
<i>commercial</i>	<i>\$188,487</i>	<i>\$149,000</i>
<i>industrial</i>	<i>\$101,233</i>	<i>\$99,100</i>
Commercial	\$943,519	\$2,625,800
Recreation & Entertainment	\$331,550	n/a ¹
Community Services	\$10,672,070	\$1,248,000
Industrial	\$1,489,667	\$1,085,000
Public Services	\$761,674	\$682,500

1. Only two Recreation & Entertainment parcels are located within 1/2 mile of the project site

IMPACTS

Population and Housing

The proposed Citygate development will result in the construction of approximately 1,100 new residential units. Based on an assumed number of 1 to 2 occupants per household, area population is expected to increase by approximately 1,100 to 2,200 residents.

Local Economy and Employment

Citygate will have a positive economic impact on the County and will represent a new regional center of commerce in the area of retail, commercial services and housing. The project will also create regional employment in the construction industry, retail and service sector of the economy, while indirectly creating employment through support services and suppliers that will service the new development.

It is anticipated that over 1,500 construction jobs will be created during the project's five-year build out period, creating thousands of dollars in New York State income tax, construction worker generated sales tax, and general consumer spending. Project construction will also generate an additional \$16 million in sales tax on construction materials and commerce for the County and other affected municipalities and school districts.

New retail development is projected to generate over \$61 million a year in new retail sales, creating 700 permanent jobs and \$3.9 million in new sales tax annually. In addition to the property tax detailed below, the development will generate over \$2.5 million a year in new county property taxes.

Local Government Finances

City of Rochester

The proposed Citygate development, comprising over 63 acres and 1.2 million square feet of retail, commercial office, residential and hotel space, represents a construction value of more than \$258 million. Two thirds of the site is located in the City of Rochester and will experience the highest concentration of retail, office and hotel development based on the Concept Plans submitted with this DGEIS. While the City has not assessed the value of the proposed development and the associated tax revenues that will be generated, it is possible to gauge the magnitude of potential revenues by estimating the total construction cost of the development by construction type (e.g., retail, commercial, residential) and applying the proposed Non-Homestead tax rate for 2008/09 fiscal year.

Many proposed developments often result in an increased tax burden to municipalities by creating a need for services that exceeds the tax revenues generated by said developments. As a major metropolitan center in western New York, the City of Rochester is home to many facilities and institutions that do not generate tax revenues (e.g., the educational and civic facilities that define the cultural resources of the region are often tax exempt and do not contribute to City tax revenues). This often results in annual budget shortfalls and, in conjunction with increasing annual operating costs, forces the City to produce additional tax revenue from property taxes.

Although the City does receive financial support from the County in the form of tax sharing (e.g., sales tax, hotel/motel tax) and debt service assistance, the importance of private investment represented by the proposed Citygate development cannot be understated when evaluated within the overall revenue needs of the City of Rochester.

The portion of the proposed development located in the City comprises two distinct areas of the site. The mixed-use area north of the parking garage will most reflect the mixed use new urbanism concept with retail, commercial office and housing located on a main street that enters the development off of East Henrietta Road onto StanYale Drive. The proposed 1,200 to 1,500 car parking garage, while most likely tax-exempt, will provide parking for the mixed use businesses located on the main street. The project developer is also seeking the creation of a COMIDA pilot project to finance the public infrastructure related to the Transit Facility – this program would capture new property tax revenue created by the mixed use development for the payment of debt on financed public infrastructure. The pilot would end once the public financed debt is extinguished and would comprise less than 15 percent of the annual property tax revenue from the development.

A second concentration of development on the City portion of the site is located between the south side of the parking garage and the Erie Canal. This area contains two hotels totaling approximately 350 rooms (including an extended stay hotel), additional residential units, and a 60,000 square-foot office building. Representing the largest joint hotel investment in the City in over two decades, these two hotels will result in a capital investment of \$60 million, create more than 70 jobs, and generate \$2.8 million a year in County sales tax. Accordingly, these hotels will apply to participate in the COMIDA “Jobs Plus” Program. This program abates property taxes, mortgage recording taxes, and construction sales taxes for those facilities that provide services and a venue for tourist destination activities. Program eligibility lasts for ten years, during which time the initially reduced rate increases resulting in full assessment of the Non-Homestead tax levy at the end of the program. Currently, these two buildings are the only proposed facilities that will participate in the COMIDA “Jobs Plus” Program, although an additional 60,000 square feet of office space may become eligible, depending on the end user’s business activity.

Accounting for the property tax exemptions granted through the COMIDA, the total value of construction for these buildings is approximately \$156 million. Based on the Non-Homestead tax rate proposed for the 2008/09 fiscal year (\$40.69 per \$1,000 of assessed value), the projected property tax revenue (based on the construction value) is more than \$6.3 million (note that this does not include land and infrastructure such as streets, utilities, sidewalks, and landscaping that will be dedicated to the City of Rochester in public right of ways). The total City construction

investment represents 2.7 percent of the 2008/09 total assessed value for the City and 3.9 percent of the proposed total tax levy. Fifty three percent (53 percent) of the new tax levy created by Citygate will be realized in the first three years of development with 100 percent of the new levy realized by year five. Assuming that a COMIDA Pilot Infrastructure Program is created for public infrastructure related to the Transit Facility, the City will realize annual property taxes in the amount of more than \$5.4 million until the debt is extinguished.

Overall, the dense nature of the proposed development will result in positive property, sales and mortgage tax revenues to the City of Rochester and not create a burden on City services.

Town of Brighton

The Town of Brighton portion of the site comprises approximately 19 acres and will be developed with residential multifamily apartments, live/work residential units with small offices on the first floor, and lofts with a small amount of retail in the first floor located along the Canal. More specifically, approximately 500 units of multi-family housing at a construction cost of approximately \$102 million are proposed for the Town of Brighton portion (it has not yet been determined how much of the internal infrastructure will be dedicated to the Town).

As previously noted, various types of development can negatively impact community services when the increased demand is not fully offset by the increase in tax revenues. During the update of the Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan (2000), a section was included that evaluated the potential fiscal impacts of various development scenarios as they relate to the Town and its school districts. Of particular note is the evaluation of "The Reserve", a residential development similar to that of Citygate. This analysis indicated that new housing development valued at \$125,000 or less would negatively impact both the Town and school districts budgets. Although the impact resulted in a loss of less than 0.5 percent to the Town, it was noted that the impact could be more like 3 percent for schools. This analysis also determined that new homes valued at more than \$170,000 would result in no impact to the Town budget; home values of more than \$300,000 would result in no impacts to school district budgets. While these values were calculated assuming no aid from the State of New York, the study overall indicated that development of higher priced housing poses less of an impact on a community than development of average-priced homes.

Based on the proposed construction costs of \$102 million, applying the Town's 2008 tax rate of \$606.51 for every \$100,000 of Taxable Assessed Value results in \$618,640 in new tax revenues. This exceeds the 2008 tax levy increase in dollars by almost 74 percent. This simple comparison is provided to illustrate how the proposed development will result in increased tax revenues that

will offset the minimal impact on Town services. More specifically, this analysis indicates that the fiscal impact of Citygate will result in a decrease in the per call cost of police, fire and ambulance, while having a positive impact on special district revenues and tax revenues for the Town.

Community Services

Schools

As noted elsewhere, construction of the proposed Citygate development will result in approximately 1,100 new residential units. Based on the results of the market analysis, it is not anticipated that the development will have many school age children as a majority of these units will be located over retail and adjacent to the transit facility and thus not necessarily marketable to families with children.

Based on the RCSD budget for 2008 (\$638,899,753), the average cost per student is approximately \$18,791. With tax revenues estimated at \$5.4 million annually, combined with 68 percent of property taxes designated for the RCSD, the Citygate development will generate almost \$3.7 million annually in new revenues for the RCSD. More than 195 new students can be funded from the new tax revenue without the inclusion of eligible state school aid for the district. It is not anticipated that the number of new students will exceed this number based on the type of housing proposed. In addition to the information presented, the letters have been sent to the Rochester City School District describing the project and requesting input as to whether they can accommodate potential students from the development (See Appendix R).

The Rush Henrietta Central School District budget for 2007/08 is \$96,289,455, resulting in a cost of \$16,522 per student. New tax revenue generated by Citygate (assessed value of \$72,000,000) will generate approximately \$1.4 million in new tax revenue for the school district. Eighty-four (84) new students can be funded from the new tax revenue without the inclusion of eligible state school aid for the district. It is not anticipated that the number of new students will exceed this number based on the type of housing proposed. In addition to the information presented, the letters have been sent to the Rush-Henrietta School District describing the project and requesting input as to whether they can accommodate potential students from the development (See Appendix R).

Emergency Services

Based on the density and type of development proposed, it is anticipated that the Citygate project will result in a greater number of service calls to local police, fire, and ambulance providers than each currently experience. Letters have also been sent to the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton Police and Fire Departments for their concurrence (See Appendix R).

Parks and Recreation

Seven parks, playgrounds, and other recreational opportunities are located within one mile of the Citygate site. In addition to these existing resources, the site plan and design guidelines call for the following recreation and open spaces within the proposed development:

- Formal public gathering areas.
- Informal public green space for gathering and recreation.
- Multi-use trails to create continual public access to Erie Canal
- Pocket parks.
- Tot lots and playgrounds.
- Internal sidewalks and trails to link residences to other areas within Citygate

Given the site's proximity to a large number of existing facilities, in conjunction with those proposed for the new development, no negative impacts are expected.

Public Transportation

Currently, 22 RGRTA bus stops serving five RGRTA bus routes are within ¼ mile of the Citygate site. According to the market analysis, the target market for this proposed development includes young professionals and empty nesters seeking locations in close proximity to the downtown core, retail and entertainment services, and transportation corridors. Combined with increasing fuel costs, it is likely the future residents of Citygate will generate a large number of public transit origins and destinations.

Property Values

The proposed Citygate development provides a diverse but complementary mix of residential and non-residential uses, including a variety of multi-family housing options, retail, office, hotels, and recreational and open space opportunities located in close proximity to a number of large community service uses and residential neighborhoods. Residents, employees, students, and visitors within the immediate vicinity need the types of services to be provided by this development – a place to live, a place to spend the night when visiting a student or patient, places to eat, places to buy groceries, places to shop for a wide range of everyday and specialty goods – as they are not currently conveniently available in the area. Having this array of goods and services newly available might increase the demand for existing housing, potentially resulting in increased property values.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Population and Housing

As no negative impacts to the area's population and housing are expected, no mitigation is being proposed at this time.

Local Economy and Employment

As no negative impacts to the local economy and employment are expected, no mitigation is being proposed at this time.

Community Services

Schools

As noted above, it is not anticipated that the development will house many school age children. As such, it is expected that anticipated tax revenues will exceed the costs of educating said children. No mitigation is being proposed at this time.

Emergency Services

Based on the density and type of development proposed, it is anticipated that the Citygate project will result in a greater number of service calls to local police, fire, and ambulance providers than each currently experience. The applicant will work with the appropriate emergency service providers to ensure that the current level of service provided is not compromised as a result of the proposed development.

Parks and Recreation

As no negative impacts to the parks and other recreational opportunities are expected, no mitigation is being proposed at this time.

Public Transportation

As it is anticipated that many future residents of the proposed development will use RGRTA bus service, it is proposed that Citygate act as one of RGRTA's Satellite Transit Facilities. This facility will receive more than 120 buses per day and will provide parking for commuters utilizing the RGRTA service to reach other parts of the City, including the University of Rochester campus and Medical Center (a portion of the proposed 1,200- to 1,500-car parking garage will be dedicated to commuters).

Property Values

As it is likely that neighboring property values will increase as a result of the Citygate development, no mitigation is proposed at this time.

Local Government Finances

To avoid and additional cost burdens to affected municipalities, Citygate will be managed by a development company and charges will be assessed to businesses and tenants in the development to address maintenance and annual operating cost of common areas and maintenance of the grounds within the proposed development. Additionally, a special lighting district will be created for the new canal and street entrance lighting assessed to the residents of Citygate and a companion development "The Reserve". A professional management organization will budget for, and maintain, all internal streets, landscaping (trees), and street lighting, as well as coordinating utility repair, maintenance, and improvements.

4.9 Community Character

Community character, as defined for the purposes of environmental review under SEQR, is the size, location, and mix of land uses and amenities and the existence of architectural elements or structures representative of the community.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

The subject site is located along two heavily traveled roadways and is surrounded by intense land uses, including the Monroe Community Hospital. There is no definable community character associated with the site and its varied surrounding land uses, which include the hospital, multi-family residential units, and transportation-oriented commercial uses, such as a gas station. There is no cohesive architectural vocabulary, building scale, land use pattern, landscaping palette, or streetscape character associated with the properties near and abutting the intersection of East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. The roadways themselves are defining features and are heavily traveled by a steady stream of vehicular traffic.

Land Use

The existing land uses within an approximately ½ mile radius of the project site are depicted in Figure 21 and Table 19.

Table 19 Project Area Land Use

Existing Property Classification	Number of Parcels	Total Area (acres)	Average Area (acres)
Residential	543	24.69	0.05
Vacant (all parcels)	71	159.35	2.24
<i>residential</i>	47	65.14	1.39
<i>commercial</i>	15	69.92	4.66
<i>industrial</i>	9	24.29	2.70
Commercial	144	184.11	1.28
Recreation & Entertainment	2	60.69	30.35
Community Services	27	593.22	21.97
Industrial	3	11.75	3.92
Public Services	3	34.13	11.38

1. This data was collected from those parcels located within 0.50 mile of the citygate project site

The predominant land use in this area is that of Community Services, defined as property used for the well being of the community. Examples of this use in the project vicinity include Monroe Community Hospital, Monroe Community College, and the Rochester State Hospital Finger Lakes Developmental Disabilities Services Office.

Commercial services also comprise a considerable portion of the area's land use, the largest of which is the Corporate Woods Office Park located southwest of the project site, across I-390. A second cluster of commercial land uses exists along the Mount Hope Avenue corridor, situated between two single-family residential neighborhoods; of which the eastern-most residential neighborhood is located directly adjacent to the northwest corner of project site. In addition to these single-family residential uses, several multi-family apartments are located directly north of the proposed project site, on the north side of Westfall Road.

Zoning

As previously noted, the project site spans the municipal boundary between the City of Rochester and the Town of Brighton and is thus subject to the zoning ordinances of both communities. The portion of the site located in the City of Rochester is currently zoned as IDP #12 (Institutional Planned Development District No. 12); the Town of Brighton has zoned this area as RLB (Residential Low Density District).

Section 115-68 of the Code of the City of Rochester sets forth the general development standards for all Institutional Planned Developments (IPD). The purpose of the IPD district is “to recognize and permit the creation of defined areas for the unified and orderly development of major cultural, educational, medical and governmental institutions in order to support and enhance their benefit to the community”. The following uses are permitted in all IPD districts:

- Universities, colleges and theological schools;
- Hospitals;
- Medical and health service facilities;
- Cultural facilities;
- Governmental facilities and properties; and
- Support uses or structures.

Institutional Planned Development No. 12, specific to the Iola Campus, was approved to allow only for the following uses:

- Waste Water Management Operations and Storage Building;
- Vehicle Maintenance Garage;
- Expanded Parking Areas;
- Backflow Prevention Buildings for Community Hospital; and
- Parking Lot 4 for Community Hospital.

It should be noted that Chapter 115 (Zoning), adopted on September 23, 1975 by Ordinance No. 75-377 was repealed on October 15, 2002 by Ordinance No. 2002-326; City zoning ordinances are now found under Chapter 120 of the City Code and do not include IPD districts.

According to Code of the Town of Brighton (Article II, Section 203-8), the purpose of the Residential Low Density District is “to promote and encourage a suitable environment for family living by protecting and stabilizing the residential character of the Town's established neighborhoods”. The following uses are permitted in the RLB District:

- Single-family detached dwellings not to exceed one dwelling on each lot.
- Family day-care homes.

- Buildings, structures and uses owned or operated by the Town of Brighton for municipal use.

Home occupations are also permitted within this district, provided that there shall be no substantial increase in noise, traffic generation or electrical interference with television, radio or telephones of adjacent residences, and other than signs as permitted in these regulations, no external changes to the principal building which would indicate a change from the residential character of this district.

Figure 22 identifies the zoning districts located within ½ mile of the project site. It should be noted that existing land uses on properties surrounding the project site are consistent with the current zoning for each municipality.

Seven City zoning districts are within a ½ mile radius of the site. These include IPD, Institutional Planned Development; IPD No. 12, Institutional Planned Development #11; O-S, Open Space; MIPD #2, Manufacturing Institutional planned Development No. 1; C-2, Community Center; R-1, Low Density Residential; and R-3, High Density Residential. Six Town of Brighton zoning districts are within a ½ mile radius from the subject site. These include the following districts: BE-1, Office & Office Park; BF-1, Neighborhood Commercial; BF-2, General Commercial; RHD-2, Residential High Density D-2; RLB, Residential Low Density B; and RM, Residential Medium Density.

Development Trends

The current condition, use, and underutilization of the site does not have any favorable, positive impacts on development trends within the general area. The site is bounded by the canal to the south and properties to the north and west are already developed. There is no indication that either the hospital or multi-family housing on the north side of Westfall Road are currently being considered for redevelopment. The office park to the east of the site is improved with office buildings and there are plans for the future development of office buildings to complete the office park development.

Site Design

The existing site conditions have been identified in previous sections of this DGEIS.

IMPACTS

Land Use

Proposed land use changes to the site are less intrusive to surrounding areas than current land uses. Proposed land uses are intended to be community-based and offer additional goods, services, and amenities to residents in both the City and Town. This is viewed as a benefit for both communities as the site currently consists of vacant buildings which pose a community health and safety risk, as well as municipal service buildings that do not provide direct benefits to area residents.

Land use within the portion of the site in the Town of Brighton is currently identified as Low Density Office. The designation was based on foreseeable traffic impacts and the absence of an identified future land use plan for the lola campus. The comprehensive plan for the Town specifically states that “if the final master plan for the lola campus shows convincing evidence to the Town Board and Planning Board that an alternative use on Area 15 would provide acceptable traffic levels based on the uses proposed for the campus in the master plan, the infrastructure design of the master plan, and the phasing of the plan relative to road and intersection improvements, and that the alternative use is preferable to Low Density Office relative to other uses proposed in the master plan, then the use proposed should be considered.” The comprehensive plan goes on to say, “any development....should include enhancements to the southern portion of the site that benefit the recreational use of the Erie Canal to the south.”

Although general office use is a viable option, the applicant is proposing high density residential uses on the Brighton portion of the site. Residential land uses are being proposed based on appropriateness relative to the overall site redevelopment and uses proposed on adjacent City of Rochester lands. Traffic impacts have been evaluated and were included in section 4.5 of the DGEIS. The proposed redevelopment of the land does clearly indicate enhancements to the southern portion of the site which will enhance recreational opportunities for all Town residents, as well as future Citygate residents. Proposed connections to the Town’s existing internal trail system will be incorporated into the final plan for Citygate.

The portion of the site within the City is primarily designated as Community Service. As proposed, land uses would be modified from Community Service to mixed use associated with rezoning to a Planned Development District.

Due to the variations in surrounding land uses, and the variety of land uses proposed within Citygate which is consistent with surrounding uses, the potential for adverse land use impacts associated with the development on surrounding properties is minimal.

Zoning

Proposed zoning for the Citygate site is not consistent with existing zoning designations and requires the applicant to apply for rezoning of both City and Town parcels. The proposed new zoning designations will allow for a mixed use development that is appropriate given the sites location at the intersection of two major roadways within the City and Town.

Current zoning for the Town of Brighton parcel is RLD – Residential Low Density. This designation is not consistent with the Future Land Use Plan but identifies the Town's vision for residential development on this site. The applicant is proposing to re-zone the property to RHD-1 – Residential High Density. The rezoning will allow for a greater concentration and density of residential development which is consistent with the density and concentration of uses throughout the Citygate project. High density residential also provides an appropriate transition from the office park uses to the east, to the commercial and mixed use oriented uses to the west of the subject property.

The RHD-1 district permits the following uses:

- Any conditional uses permitted in the Residential High Density RHD-2 District.
- High-rise apartments and garden apartments, subject to specified requirements.

The purpose of the district is intended to promote and encourage multifamily residential development. The purpose and intent of this district is consistent with the overarching goals of Citygate and will allow for the development of a variety of residential styles to accommodate a range of future residents.

The City portion of the site is currently zoned Institutional Planned Development No. 12, which is specific to the uses the County once intended for the property. The zoning designation did not account for potential turnover of the lands from the County to an alternative site developer, and as such, is too limiting to allow for any form of redevelopment. The applicant is proposing to rezone to a Planned Development District in order to allow for a creative mix and design of land uses on a single project site. The integration of land uses proposed for the site is not permitted in any standard zoning district within the City Code.

According to the City Code, the Planned Development District is intended to “recognize a defined area for unified and integrated development and is intended to create more flexible development opportunities than would be possible through the strict application of the land use and development regulations of this chapter. Planned Development Districts allow diversification in the uses permitted and variation in the relationship of uses, structures, and open spaces and are conceived as cohesive unified projects with unique standards and regulations.”

The Citygate development meets the specific objectives of the District as defined within the Code:

- Citygate offers an alternative development pattern that is in harmony with the objectives of regional land use and development plans.
- Citygate offers a creative use of land and related physical development with an orderly transition from one land use to another.
- Citygate provides diversification of permitted uses to create a cohesive, unified project.
- Citygate has a defined set of unique standards for site and building design.
- Citygate has identified a means to preserve and enhance desirable site characteristics, such as natural topography and open space.

Rezoning one site for redevelopment could inspire adjacent property owners to also make rezoning requests. However, this is unlikely given the uses surrounding the subject site. The south boundary is a natural feature, the eastern boundary is being developed by an office park that is not yet build-out, though plans have already been developed. The west side of the site is the hospital. Therefore, the potential adverse impacts of this project on zoning of adjacent lands are expected to be minimal.

The impacts associated with the rezoning of the property will be positive within both the Town and City. Before the Citygate project was proposed, there was little visioning in the Town and City regarding this property because it was being utilized and under the ownership of Monroe County and associated organizations. The turnover of land to the applicant allows for a new direction and vision to be established for this site which will allow the lands to be one used for one of the most visionary developments in the region.

Development Trends

Since the site consists of both vacant buildings and underutilized areas, it does differ from surrounding lands which are largely built up and developed. Because there is not a significant

amount of developable land, the potential impacts to development trends within the immediate area are insignificant. Redevelopment potentials of surrounding lands may build on the high quality development, which would result in a positive impact to the overall neighborhood character.

Site Design

The proposed site design envisioned for Citygate creates a pedestrian-friendly, human-scaled development intended to foster walkability and social interactions. Buildings are designed to face East Henrietta and Westfall Roads, with some buildings having double facades so they also address internal roadways as “frontages”. Therefore, there are no negative implications associated with the relationship between buildings and the street frontage.

When a proposed action is in close proximity to natural and recreational features there is the potential that there could be an adverse impact to that feature. The Erie Canal is the most prominent natural and recreational feature associated with the Citygate project. The New York State Canal Recreationway Plan identified opportunities associated with the canal , including “a variety of existing land uses and landscape characteristics adds diversity and interest to the canal experience.” The proposed Citygate project creates diversity and seeks to preserve the natural character of the canal while expanding access opportunities and widespread recreational use of the canal trail.

An existing trail extends from the subject property to Brighton Town Park. When development occurs on a site that is currently covered in vegetation and no buildings, there is the potential for impacts to existing viewsheds and site lines. The applicant does not propose to modify the existing trail, but seeks to enhance the trailway to offer a stronger connection to the canal, as well as to the internal site amenities to be provided at Citygate. In fact, AJC and Son Development has partnered with the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton in securing two New York State Canal Corporation grants to enhance the canalway trail. The grants provide up to \$500,000 in funds available for improvements that include a pedestrian trail lighting system, gathering areas, benches, educational and interpretative information kiosks and tie-ups for boats. These enhancements will encourage public access to the waterfront, tourism and economic revitalization. Moreover, Citygate’s amenities and the canalway improvements will complement each other, as well as attract new visitors the area.

The proposed development will not have any negative, adverse impacts on the Erie Canal or other existing trails which accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians and extend to the subject property.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Land Use

The applicant will ensure that all traffic impacts associated with the site development are mitigated. No other potential impacts have been defined associated with land use on adjacent properties that will require mitigation by the applicant.

Zoning

The applicant will ensure that all traffic impacts associated with the site development are mitigated. No other potential impacts have been defined associated with land use on adjacent properties that will require mitigation by the applicant.

Development Trends

To ensure the highest standard of development is maintained at Citygate, the applicant has developed a series of Design Guidelines to direct future site and building design and construction for the entire property. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

Site Design

The applicant has developed a series of Design Guidelines to direct future site and building design and construction for the entire property. The applicant has proposed a number of specific improvements aimed at enhancing the canal front, including extending improvements similar to those identified at the Reserve, creating strong connections from the internal site to the canal front thereby promoting the canal as a recreational and natural feature, and incorporating appropriate landscape and design elements.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

5.1 No Action

The no action alternative can be interpreted as a project which includes no new development on the site. Essentially, the existing site would remain in its current condition.

No physical action would mean that the site conditions would remain as is, with deteriorating, vacant building stock encompassing a portion of the site and underutilized County-owned

buildings and facilities encompassing the remainder of the site. As previously stated, the existing vacant buildings pose a safety and health risk to the community at large due to years of neglect as they have fallen into various stages of disrepair.

This alternative does not meet the project purpose of providing a single development site where people have an opportunity to access goods, services, recreation, employment, and housing. No new housing alternatives would be provided within the City and Town and the municipalities and associated school districts would receive no economic benefits associated with increased tax revenues. Under the no action alternative, there would be no opportunity to offer additional water-oriented uses along the Erie Canal and to provide additional amenities and enhancements along the Canalway Trail to tie into improvements being undertaken at other locations along the trail system. Connections between the site and Town trails would not be established, thus restricting long-term visions for a cohesive regional trail network. Public access to the canal would not be encouraged under this scenario.

5.2 Alternative Site Plan 2 – Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2000

Alternative Site Plan 2 shows development consistent with the Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan, consisting of low density office development on the east side of the site within the Town of Brighton (see Figure 23). This alternative is a viable option, but not preferred for the redevelopment of the Town of Brighton portion of the Citygate site. This alternative does not impact any development or site design on the City of Rochester portion of the project site. Alternative Site Plan 2 would still require the Town parcel to be rezoned to BE-L Office Low Density District, as it is not consistent with the Town's current zoning of the site as RLB – Residential Low Density.

Alternative Site Plan 2 considers a project that is consistent with the proposed action but identifies general office uses on the east side of the site, within the Town, on the south side of Westfall Road. All constructed general office buildings would be constructed within the constraints of existing bulk and site requirements.

Four general office buildings are proposed on the Brighton portion of the site with the Lake area at the far southeast corner of the site along the Erie Canal. All of the office buildings are proposed to be approximately two stories in height and will result in approximately 174,000 square feet of new office space.

The proposed office use shown in Alternative Site Plan 2 is consistent with the vision for the site as defined by the Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan, however low density office was recommended based on the institutional uses of the former Iola Medical Complex. The Comprehensive Plan does leave open the idea that should the uses at the Iola Complex change, other complementary uses may be considered.

General office on the Citygate site, as shown in Alternative Site Plan 2, would create a smooth transition between the existing Town of Brighton office use and the mix of uses proposed on the Citygate site. Small-scale office uses are typically considered a compatible land use to multi-family residential development, which is proposed to the west of the proposed office buildings. However, as one of the primary goals of the Citygate redevelopment is to foster social interaction and to create a development where people can live, work, and play a careful balance should be considered. Low density office uses in lieu of the originally proposed residential uses does provide an additional employment opportunity at Citygate while replacing some of the residential uses. It does appear though that there still is adequate residential offerings provided at Citygate to create the live, work, and play environment envisioned for the development.

According to the report prepared by RKG Associates, Inc. (see Appendix P) for the Citygate site, absorption trends in the region indicate that certain types of office space may be depleted in the next year, allowing for additional office development in Rochester suburbs, such as the Town of Brighton. Today, the Town is one of the major locations for suburban office users and the development of additional office space at Citygate, however there is also a large number of corporate office space available within close proximity at Clinton Crossings/Senator Keating project site.

The visual setting of the Citygate site would not be negatively impacted by a change from multi-family residential to office use on the Town of Brighton portion of the site. The scale of buildings would be consistent with existing development in the Town to the east of the site (Brighton Meadow Office Park) and would transition to a higher density development on the City of Rochester portion of the site. The massing and configuration of the office buildings would be compatible and complementary to surrounding land uses and would be designed in a style that fits in with the overall architectural context of Citygate.

With respect to infrastructure and utilities, the calculations provided in Appendix D determine that this alternative will result in less impact to the City Water Bureau's water system and Monroe County Pure Water's sanitary system because 64,000 gpd less water would be consumed by Alternative Site Plan 2. Likewise, the average flow rate and peak flows would be less for

Alternative Site Plan 2. The water and sanitary sewer pipe networks for the proposed site plan would have to be modified slightly to accommodate different road alignments and building locations.

This alternative will result in additional impact to the existing drainage as 141,000 square feet of impervious area, would be added compared to the proposed site plan. As described in Table 20, the increase in impervious surfaces will result in an increase in stormwater runoff following rain events. The stormwater pipe system for the proposed site plan would have to be modified slightly to accommodate different parking lot layouts for Alternative Site Plan 2; and the stormwater management pond depth would increase by about one foot.

Table 20, Project Site Stormwater Discharge - Alternative 2

Storm Year	Flow Rate Off-Site (cfs)	
	Existing	Proposed
1	77.55	1.32
2	95.45	3.16
10	163.74	25.76
25	195.46	46.08
100	246.52	131.04

Traffic would also be impacted by Alternative Site Plan 2. An alternative option was studied based on recent interest for office space at the Citygate site. This alternative would replace 376 residential units and 23,000 SF of retail with 174,000 SF of office. A summary of land uses for the alternative plan is provided in Table 21. Table 22 contains a summary of trips generated by each land use.

Table 21. Land Uses – Alternative Plan - Office Space Option

Use	Size	ITE Land Use Code
Hotel	350 Rooms	310
Retail	320,000 Square Feet	820
Office	334,000 Square Feet	750
Apartments	614 Dwelling Units	220
Townhouses	110 Dwelling Units	230

A 20% shared-trip credit was used to estimate the sharing between the numerous retail stores. The ITE Report was used to determine the multi-use shared-trip credit (11% AM and 15% PM); the same credit was use for the Hotel traffic as the 30% and 29% credit provided in the ITE Report seemed high for Hotel. The breakdown of trips projected for the alternative plan is shown in Table 22.

Table 22. Trip Generation – Alternative Plan - Office Space Option

Land Use	Trips Generated					
	Weekday AM			Weekday PM		
	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Hotel	120	76	196	110	97	207
Retail	197	126	323	612	663	1275
Office	524	65	589	71	435	506
Apartments	62	247	309	239	129	368
Townhouses	9	43	52	41	20	61
Total Trips	912	557	1469	1073	1344	2417
Internal Credits (listed in the order taken):						
Shared Trips Between Retail Uses (20%)	40	25	65	122	133	255
Shared Trips - Multi-Uses (AM - 11%, PM - 15%)	97	58	155	144	180	324
Trip Credit for Transit Facility (5%)	38	24	62	39	53	92
Total External Trips	737	450	1187	768	978	1746
Total Pass-by Trips	27	17	44	119	128	247
Total New (Primary) Trips	710	433	1143	649	850	1499

A comparison of trips reveals small changes to the total number of pass by and primary trips. The alternative plan is projected to generate 86 more (7.8%) external trips during the AM peak hour and 35 less (2.0%) external trips during the PM peak hour. The differences will be distributed to five separate access points and many separate corridors on the roadway system, so changes to 2013 build levels of service will be small. The greatest increase would be during the AM peak hour for entering traffic, where, with recommended mitigation in place, there is enough reserve capacity available to handle the traffic.

Under this alternative plan the overall conclusion of the traffic analysis remains the same - the proposed Citygate development will affect traffic operations, but after the recommendations are implemented, acceptable traffic operations are expected.

5.3 Alternative Site Plan 3 – Town of Brighton Existing Zoning (Low Density Residential)

Alternative Site Plan 3 shows development consistent with the Town of Brighton Zoning Code (see Figure 24). The site is currently zoned RLB – Residential Low Density. As shown on Alternative Site Plan 3, all residential lots meet the minimum zoning criteria for lot size, including a minimum lot area of 13,500 square feet and a minimum lot width of 90 feet. This alternative does not impact any development or site design on the City of Rochester portion of the project. Alternative Site Plan 3, though allowed under current zoning, is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan which identifies this site as General Office.

Alternative Site Plan 3 is largely consistent with the proposed project, with the exception of lands located within the Town of Brighton along the east side of the site. Proposed multi-family buildings, live-work units, and canal-front loft buildings have been replaced with forty (40) single family residential lots.

This alternative is similar to the proposed project in that it recognizes residential use as appropriate for this site, though the density and scale of single family residences is not consistent with surrounding land use patterns or the City portion of the Citygate development. Single family residential is a stark contrast to the high density mix of uses on the west side of the site and the office park directly to the east of the subject site.

As a result of surrounding land use patterns, single family residential development at this location would not be viewed as a marketable commodity. Access to the single family homes in the southeast corner of the site would be complicated, and as a result would not be considered as desirable by potential buyers who would be required to traverse a much higher density, mixed use area before arriving at their home. Additional roadways would be required to be developed under this alternative in order to provide access to each of the residential lots. This will increase the amount of impervious surfaces on site and reduce green space areas. The ability to provide publicly available green space and pedestrian connections to all areas of the site is reduced under this alternative.

Because single family residential lots are privately owned, the amount of public green space is significantly restricted under this scenario. Essentially, the public-oriented aspects of the development would be limited to the City of Rochester. However, because of the density of Citygate, and the number of transient users and visitors expected to come to the site, there would be issues associated with the perception of a lack of privacy for the single family residential home owners.

Additionally, Alternative Site Plan 3 reduces public access to the canal when compared to the proposed project, as five single family residential lots would be developed on the canal. This configuration would also impact existing access and views to the canal from the Brighton Town Park trail.

In summary, the constraints associated with Alternative Site Plan 3 include:

- Configuration and surrounding land use patterns do not make single family residential in this location marketable to potential buyers.
- Increased number of roadways results in additional impervious surfaces and a reduced amount of public green space and landscaping.
- Town of Brighton portion of Citygate would essentially become privately owned, creating a very different character than the City side of the development.
- Loss of public open space and connections is not consistent with goals of Citygate project.
- Reduction in density results in a smaller residential population which could impact success of other support services proposed for Citygate.
- Portion of waterfront property becomes privately owned, limiting public access to Erie Canal and Canalway Trail.

5.4 Alternative Site Plan 4 – Town of Brighton RHD-2 (High Density District)

This alternative plan was prepared after discussions with City of Rochester and Town of Brighton officials. It was expressed that a mix of residential with some general office would be desirable in the Town of Brighton portion. After further consideration, the developer has prepared Alternative Site Plan 4 which shows high-density housing (i.e., apartments and townhomes) for the portion of the site within the Town of Brighton, as it was found to be the most supportive of the overall development plan and appropriate for this location (See Figure 29). When compared to the original proposed plan, this option has a lower density of residential units and removes the live-

work units. This alternative is the preferred alternative and does not impact any development or site design on the City of Rochester portion of the project site.

Alternative Site Plan 4 requires the Town of Brighton parcel to be rezoned to RHD-2 (High Density District) as it is not consistent with the Town's current zoning of the site as RLB – Residential Low Density. The 2000 Town Comprehensive Plan identifies this area for General Office, acting as a transition zone from the institutional use of the former County Iola Complex. As part of this development, this institutional use will be changed, making residential a more appropriate use for the Town of Brighton parcel as it relates to the new uses proposed for the Iola Complex.

Alternative Site Plan 4 considers a project that is largely consistent with the proposed action but identifies residential uses at a lower density within the Town of Brighton than was originally proposed. This alternative proposes a neighborhood of townhomes in the southeastern portion of the project site along the Erie Canal. All of the buildings are proposed to be two stories in height and will result in approximately 60 new residential units. The northeastern portion of the project site will accommodate a neighborhood of apartment buildings which will be three stories in height and will result in approximately 260 units.

The proposed residential use shown in Alternative Site Plan 4 will support the goals of the 2000 Town Comprehensive Plan by providing moderate densities of housing to a broad range of residents. The lower daytime population of residential compared to office will be more compatible with the adjacent Canalway and the Town Park and trail system adjacent to the Citygate development.

One of the primary goals of the Citygate redevelopment is to foster social interaction and to create a development where people can live, work, and play. To make the proposed concentration of retail services, offices, public facilities, and other potential uses work, a diverse mix of housing at appropriate densities is necessary. The 19 acres in the Town of Brighton has been conceptually designed as an area for housing since the inception of the project by the developer

As noted in the discussion of Alternative Site Plan 2, absorption trends in the region indicate that certain types of office space may be depleted in the next year, allowing for additional office development in Rochester suburbs, such as the Town of Brighton. This, however, does not account for the large amount of corporate office space currently proposed for the Clinton Crossings/Senator Keating site located within the Town of Brighton.

The visual setting of the Citygate site would not be negatively impacted by a change to lower density residential on the Town of Brighton portion of the site as it is very similar to the originally proposed use. The scale of buildings would be consistent with development proposed for the remainder of the site and would transition to a higher density development on the City of Rochester portion of the site. The massing and configuration of townhomes and apartment units would be compatible and complementary to surrounding land uses and would be designed in a style that fits in with the overall architectural context of Citygate (See Appendix G).

With respect to infrastructure and utilities, the calculations provided in Appendix D determine that this alternative will result in less impact to the City Water Bureau’s water system and Monroe County Pure Water’s sanitary system because 6,000 gpd less water would be consumed by Alternative Site Plan 4. Likewise, the average flow rate and peak flows would be less for Alternative Site Plan 4. The water and sanitary sewer pipe networks for the proposed site plan would have to be modified slightly to accommodate different road alignments and building locations.

To provide more room for development the pond size has been reduced to provide for the essential stormwater management needs. This alternative will not result in additional impact to the existing drainage as the impervious area would be less when compared to the proposed site plan. As described in Table 23, the decrease in the pond size along with the small reduction in impervious area will result in a decrease in stormwater runoff. The stormwater pipe system for the proposed site plan would have to be modified slightly to accommodate different parking lot layouts for Alternative Site Plan 4.

Table 23, Project Site Stormwater Discharge - Alternative 4

Storm Year	Flow Rate Off-Site (cfs)	
	Existing	Proposed
1	77.55	1.28
2	95.45	1.87
10	163.74	22.21
25	195.46	49.30
100	246.52	144.93

Traffic would also be impacted by Alternative Site Plan 4. However, given that this alternative proposes a lower density of development for the Town of Brighton portion of the site than what was originally proposed, impacts will be less than is noted in Section 4.6 (Traffic and Transportation). This alternative is expected to generate less traffic because of the reduction to land use size. The proposed change provided by this alternative is a reduction to residential development and will result in a small reduction to Citygate trips. Under this alternative plan the overall conclusion of the traffic analysis remains the same, the proposed Citygate development will affect traffic operations, but after the recommendations are implemented, acceptable traffic operations are expected.

6.0 TEMPORARY AND SHORT-TERM IMPACTS

The construction of the Citygate project will occur over four phases (see Figure 28) to accommodate the project's large size, multiple uses, and the schedule for building demolition. This phasing will allow for the continual operation of existing uses and preceding phases. The phasing will also contemplate access to and from the proposed and existing facilities that remain; as well as the maintenance and operation of existing utility services and their extensions into the site. To the extent possible mass grading will be balanced, to utilize suitable fill material found on-site, and to reduce the amount of imported materials. The maintenance and protection of traffic will be designed to ensure safe vehicular and pedestrian traffic into the site and along its neighboring roads. The storm water pollution and protection plan (SWPPP) will also be designed to accommodate each phase of the project and to ensure the protection of the City of Rochester and Town of Brighton storm sewers, the canal, wetlands and protected areas.

Demolition within the Citygate project will also occur within phases given the current ownership, tenants and leases. All existing buildings that are currently vacant will be demolished in one phase. Demolition of these buildings and their associated site improvements will take approximately 9 months. The remaining buildings will have the following approximate demolition schedule:

Building 13 (Fleet Garage)	2-3 years
Building 15 (Rochester Pure Waters District)	2-3 years
Building 12 (Children's Detention Facility)	3-5 years

Phase I

Phase IA of the Citygate project will include the construction of the Neighborhood Mixed Use District located in the northwest quadrant of the site. This will also include proposed pad lots for

prospective tenants along East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road. To support the development of Phase IA, the parking garage will also be constructed in Phase I. While the parking garage will provide much needed parking for the Phase I tenants, it will serve an equally important function for the Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority (RGRTA). The parking garage will provide additional parking for the University of Rochester, and the RGRTA will provide the shuttle function to university facilities and the campus.

Phase IB will consist of residential development within the Town of Brighton. This phase will predominately consist of the construction of multi-family housing. The infrastructure for the Citygate project will be substantially complete along the westerly edge of Phase IB and it will be extended into this area. A new access point on Westfall Road (Street D) will be included in this phase (See Figure 2).

A regional stormwater management facility that will be sized to accommodate all stormwater runoff associated with this development. A separate SWPPP will be filed with the Town of Brighton and a separate NOI on this Phase will be obtained, since the Town of Brighton and City of Rochester are separate MS4 operators.

Phase 1 will make all necessary road improvements including traffic signals at the intersection of Westfall Road and Street B; as well as the intersections of East Henrietta Road and Streets T and U for full build-out. This will ensure safe and efficient traffic flow to and from the development for bus traffic and all other motorists (See Figure 2). In addition, the bus shelter at the parking garage will be constructed.

Utilities for all of Phase I will be extended from East Henrietta Road and Westfall Road and will be located within designated "utility corridors" to allow for dedication. These utility corridors will typically follow proposed streets within the Citygate project and will be located within proposed ROW's or utility easements. An attempt will be made to complete the proposed water main loop through the development and connecting the City of Rochester watermains on East Henrietta and Westfall Roads. However, if a complete loop is not possible there is adequate flow and pressure to provide water to Phase 1A from the watermain on East Henrietta Road and provide water to Phase 1B from the watermain on Westfall Road.

It is envisioned that all of Phase I stormwater will be directed to a regional stormwater management basin. The basin will be sized initially to handle the stormwater runoff associated with Phase I and will be expanded in subsequent Phases. The basin will be located in the southeast quadrant of the project site.

Phase II

Phase II of the Citygate project will consist of constructing the hotel located along the canal and the two retail/residential loft buildings located between the hotel and a second hotel along East Henrietta Road which is currently being constructed under a separate approval process with the City. As part of this work, AJC and Son Development will also construct the canal improvements located within the NYS Canal Authority ROW. This will create a very distinct neighborhood and environment within the Citygate project and will provide canal amenities to the community.

Phase III

Phase III will be the demolition and re-development of Buildings 13 and 15 and its surrounding area. This area will be the extension of the Neighborhood Mixed Use Area. This phase may consist of a combination of uses that are permitted in the Neighborhood Mixed Use Area and will further enhance the pedestrian connectivity between Phase IA, IB and Phase II.

Utilities will be well established along perimeter roads surrounding this area and can easily be extended as laterals to service tenants and other uses. The stormwater runoff will be collected via a proposed storm sewer system that will connect to the regional stormwater basin. The SWPPP will be designed specifically to meet the challenges of demolition and the development of this property.

Phase IV

Phase IV will be the demolition of the Children's Detention Center and the redevelopment of its surrounding grounds primarily for residential housing. By this phase access and utilities will be well established along its perimeter and will be simply extended into this area. Stormwater will be directed to the projects regional stormwater basin via an established storm sewer system.

IMPACTS

During construction of this project, certain temporary impacts will occur. Temporary impacts are primarily related to the use of construction equipment to demolish existing buildings and infrastructure and to build site improvements. During the first phase blasting may be required for the parking garage. Blasting for footings and utilities is not likely. Impacts can be classified in four categories: Traffic Flow, Vibration, Noise, and Air; with the following receptors:

- City of Rochester and Town of Brighton residents living nearby
- Workers in the buildings that remain on the Lola Campus during construction; including residents of the Children's Detention Center

- Workers and customers of nearby businesses, agencies, or health care providers
- Visitors to the Brighton Town Park and the Canalway Trail

Traffic Flow

During mobilization large equipment will arrive at the site. This may cause some traffic delays as equipment is moved off the highway. As construction proceeds, materials will be transported onto the site for construction and construction workers will be arriving and departing. This potential impact will typically affect all off-site travelers the same. Potential impact on people in buildings that remain on the Lola Campus during construction will be minimal because their arrival and departure times are different than the construction worker's normal work day of roughly 7 am to 5 pm. Potential impact on users of the Canalway Trail will be minimal as construction will be for amenities located off the trail.

Vibration

Vibration can come from heavy construction equipment and localized blasting of bedrock. Vibration will occur during the normal work day of roughly 7 am to 5 pm. This potential impact will typically affect all off-site receptors the same. Potential impact on people in buildings that remain on the Lola Campus during construction will be greater.

Noise

Construction equipment will also generate noise. On-site noise will occur during the normal work day of roughly 7 am to 5 pm. Some noise will be generated by trucks slowing down and speeding up on Westfall Road and East Henrietta Road. This potential impact will typically affect the off-site receptors the same. Potential impact on people in buildings that remain on the Lola Campus during construction will be greater. Most people will not notice construction noise because it will occur during daylight hours when they are at their jobs; and when ambient noise levels from the adjacent expressway are at their highest levels. The same point can be made for visitors to Brighton Town Park, plus the park is located about a half mile from the site with trees and existing development that provide additional screening.

Air

Impacts on air quality can be from odors, emissions and dust. Most construction equipment is diesel based and there is a noticeable odor at close encounters with diesel exhaust. Idling equipment and start/stop actions also generate the most particulate matter from construction

equipment emissions. While earthwork operations are ongoing, dry conditions can generate dust. Wind can also stir up dust. Demolition of the existing buildings and infrastructure will require the removal of hazardous materials. This potential impact will typically affect all off-site receptors the same. Potential impact for people in buildings that remain on the Lola Campus during construction will be greater.

MITIGATION

Traffic Flow

Signs depicting the construction entrance and warning traveling public of approaching construction will be erected if allowed by NYSDOT and Monroe County. Flagmen may be needed to temporarily direct traffic during brief encounters with construction equipment on public roads. The typical construction day starts at 7 a.m. which will allow workers to arrive prior to peak morning rush hour periods. Departure of workers at the end of the day can be staggered if conflicts occur. The amount of excess earthwork has been minimized, which reduces construction traffic.

Vibration

Location of homes is sufficiently removed from construction activity as to experience little if any vibration. Vibration reduces with the distance traveled and from objects interfering with sound waves. If rock removal is necessary, NFPA and OSHA requirements will be followed including preparation of blasting plans, pre-blast surveys and general public notifications. The on-site project superintendent will also be available to address any complaints on an as needed basis.

Noise

Noise impacts from on-site construction equipment will be minimized by assuring properly maintained equipment with functioning muffler/exhaust systems.

Air

Properly maintained equipment will minimize odors and particulate emissions. Also, keeping construction equipment moving and minimizing idling times will allow diesel engines to run most efficiently, generating less exhaust. It is not feasible to completely eliminate construction equipment emissions although the large separation distances to sensitive receptors and wide open areas allow for significant dilution of particulates and odors. Dust control on site can be minimized by the use of dust palliatives such as calcium chloride, and other dust control provisions as indicated in the New York State Department of Transportation Standard

Specifications for Construction Materials, Latest Edition. Dust control is also necessary to be in compliance with the SPDES General Permit GP-08-001 and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will be prepared for the project. Hazardous materials that are encountered during construction will be removed, transported, and disposed of in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations.

Summary

Some temporary impacts during construction are unavoidable but can be mitigated by the means and techniques described above.

7.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

There are two projects in the Town of Brighton, currently under review, which have the potential to be impacted by the Citygate development. Both projects are also being developed by AJC Costello and Son Development and have been intentionally planned and designed to complement and work in tandem with one another. Figure 25 illustrates the relationship between Citygate, The Reserve, and Clinton Crossings Corporate Center (Corporate Center). The Reserve and Corporate Center are located opposite one another, occupying parcels between Clinton Avenue and Winton Road, physically separated by I-590. Both development sites are approximately one mile from Citygate.

The Reserve, located along the north side of the Erie Canal, south of I-590 is an application for rezoning and site plan approval. The applicant is requesting to rezone the property from Low Density Residential to Waterfront Development District to allow for the addition of 350 housing units, including 68 detached single family units, 102 clustered townhomes, and 180 loft condominiums.

The impacts of the Citygate project on the Reserve are positive for future residents within that development. Citygate will seek to serve future residents of the Reserve with goods, services, and recreational opportunities that will promote and enhance the quality-of-life for residents in this development. Due to the proximity of Citygate, goods and services will be within walking distance to the Reserve, limiting the amount of time that residents need to spend in their cars to reach shopping, offices, and entertainment. This type of development, where walkability is enhanced, has shown to result in community health benefits and an overall higher quality-of-life for residents. Furthermore, improvements being made to the Canalway Trail in association with the Reserve

project will be continued and extended to the Citygate site in order to create a cohesive identity and experience for people using the trail from the Reserve to Citygate.

Corporate Center is located on the north side of I-590, on the west side of South Winton Road. The development runs parallel between I-590 and Senator Keating Boulevard. Corporate Center is an application for site plan approval to allow for the development of seven office buildings, a fitness facility, hotel and conference center, restaurants, and mixed use structures that will contain both retail and office space. There is no residential development proposed within the Corporate Center.

The impacts of Citygate on the Corporate Center are intentionally designed to be complementary. The mix of uses on both sites are similar, with the exception of residential units. However, the type and brand of uses at the Corporate Center will intentionally cater more to office workers and conference center guests, whereas Citygate will provide a greater level of entertainment, recreational, and family-oriented provisions. The Citygate development will draw Corporate Center workers and visitors beyond the typical workday. Corporate Center will have a direct trail connection to the Reserve, which will continue to the Erie Canal, along the Canal, and ultimately to Citygate. Creating a clear linkage between Citygate and the other identified projects is a priority and will help establish a regional pedestrian trail network through the Town, to the City of Rochester. The strategic marketing of both sites that have non-residential uses has been considered in order to ensure there is no duplication with regards to future restaurant, retail, and business tenants. This will result in the long-term sustainability of both sites as they seek to fill, and maintain, available tenant space.

There are no other known development projects in the Town of Brighton or City of Rochester that will be potentially impacted by Citygate. Therefore, further analysis of cumulative impacts is not warranted.

8.0 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Growth is the result of both public and private capital investment into new economic opportunities and is affected by factors such as local government planning, availability of public services, natural resources, the economic climate, quality of life issues, and political and environmental concerns. Direct growth inducing impacts at the local level are often driven by the provision of public services and infrastructure, such as sewer and water, into undeveloped greenfield areas.

Extending public infrastructure to a project site not previously served can reduce development constraints for other nearby areas and can serve to induce further development in the vicinity.

The location and timing of growth is also impacted by political factors such as state and local laws, permitting requirements, and tax incentives designed to attract businesses. Specific to the local level, the adoption and administration of zoning maps and ordinances, location specific planning efforts (e.g., Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan), and other land use regulatory tools all identify the intensity and type of development that is desired in specific locations.

As noted in Section 4.1, the proposed Citygate project site has a full complement of utilities including water supply, sanitary sewers, storm drainage, electric, gas, telephone, and a network of tunnels for steam and other infrastructure. Additionally, the site is located along two well traveled roadways and is surrounded by relatively intense land uses, including the Monroe Community Hospital. Currently, growth in this area is limited by land use and zoning controls – the Erie Canal and I-390 to the south, the hospital to the west, a fully planned office park to the east, and several multi-family apartment buildings to the north. Thus, in terms of inducing growth in previously undeveloped areas through the extension of public utilities, the proposed development will result in no significant growth inducing impacts.

9.0 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Careful consideration has gone into the planning of the proposed development and every effort will be made to avoid or mitigate potential adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable, as described in previous sections. However, the proposed development will result in some unavoidable adverse impacts. These impacts include:

- Some permanent loss of pervious soil surface and vegetative cover
- Minimal loss of wetlands on-site
- Removal of existing buildings
- Altered site appearance
- Increase in vehicular traffic to the surrounding area
- Use of human and energy resources and construction materials

10.0 IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

The proposed development will involve the irretrievable commitment of approximately 63 acres of land, of which approximately 18 acres are currently undeveloped and the remainder of the site which has been disturbed and is occupied by buildings. The entire site will be dedicated to commercial and residential mixed uses. The proposed development will also involve the irretrievable commitment of human resources, construction materials, and financial capital to construct and operate the project. Other resources required by this project will include the use of water, sanitary, energy and improvements to infrastructure.

11.0 USE AND CONSERVATION OF ENERGY RESOURCES

The redevelopment of the Iola Medical Complex in itself is a form a sustainable development – redevelopment of an existing facility that has utilities and a surrounding transportation infrastructure that can support development will minimize the amount of new construction, thus minimizing energy and material use.

The project will reuse demolition debris such as concrete, bricks and pavement for general fill where possible, reducing the amount of material that will need to be transported offsite and to landfills.

Newly constructed buildings will be designed to meet all New York State Energy Codes and will require significantly less energy per square foot for heating and cooling than the current structures located on-site.

The applicant will explore new technologies in building construction and materials to further reduce energy demands. These technologies could include alternative wall systems such as “Tilt-up” which incorporates foam core cells into wall sections increasing the walls r-value, providing greater insulation. Generally, these types of wall systems have higher “recycled product content” than traditional cavity wall systems. The applicant will also investigate whether any New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) initiatives can be implemented into the proposed development, allowing for further possibilities to incorporate green technology.

Opportunities for implementing sustainable site design techniques will also be explored. These techniques will include grass pavers, porous pavements, “rain gardens” and bio-retention swales to allow stormwater to percolate into the earth to recharge groundwater aquifers and minimize runoff. Landscaping will also be used to create microclimatic areas for people to retreat from the

heat and wind, reducing the need for conditioned interior space. Drought tolerant plant species and ground covers such as mulch and stone will be included, minimizing the need for irrigation.

The proposed project allows the opportunity for people to live, work and play within the development, greatly reducing energy needs for transportation. With amenities such as the incorporation of a bus transit station, it will also encourage the public to utilize mass transit, even further reducing energy demands for transportation.