

***(MA) Architectural Review Application for Garage, Uncovered Decks, Pergola, Signs, Facade changes, Shed - Minor changes (no variance) Staff Review -**

Applicant

 Pete Foster
 614-778-4701
 petefastball@aol.com

Location

69 S CASSINGHAM RD
 Bexley, OH 43209

MA-20-49

Status: Active

Submitted: Mar 11, 2020

A.1: Project Information

Brief Project Description

A new two car garage located in the north west corner of the property.

Architecture Review

true

Demolition

--

Planned Unit Dev

--

Special Permit

--

A.1: Attorney / Agent Information

Agent Name

Pete Foster

Agent Address

685 Montrose Avenue

Agent Email

petefastball@aol.com

Agent Phone

614-778-4701

A.2: Fee Worksheet

Estimated Valuation of Project

125000

Minor Architectural Review

true

Major Architectural Review

--

Variance Review Type

--

Zoning

--

Zoning Review Type

--

Sign Review and Architectural Review for Commercial Projects

--

Review Type

--

Appeal of ARB decision to BZAP

--

Appeal of BZAP decision to City Council

--

B: Project Worksheet: Property Information

Occupancy Type

Residential

Zoning District

R-6

Use Classification

R-6 (35% Building and 60% Overall)

B: Project Worksheet: Lot Info

Width (ft)	Depth (ft)
50	142
Total Area (SF)	
7100	

B: Project Worksheet: Primary Structure Info

Existing Footprint (SF)	Proposed Addition (SF)
1336.5	--
Removing (SF)	Type of Structure
--	--
Proposed New Primary Structure or Residence (SF)	Total Square Footage
--	2345

B: Project Worksheet: Garage and/or Accessory Structure Info (Incl. Decks, Pergolas, Sheds, Pool House, Swimming Pool)

Existing Footprint (SF)	Proposed Addition (SF)
--	619
New Structure Type	Ridge Height
garage	20'-0"
Proposed New Structure (SF)	Is there a 2nd Floor
619	Yes
2nd Floor SF	Total of all garage and accessory structures (SF)
337.5	619
Total building lot coverage (SF)	Total building lot coverage (% of lot)
1955.5	28
Is this replacing an existing garage and/or accessory structure?	
Yes	

B: Project Worksheet: Hardscape

Existing Driveway (SF)	Existing Patio (SF)
800	--
Existing Private Sidewalk (SF)	Proposed Additional Hardscape (SF)
60	72

Total Hardscape (SF)

932

B: Project Worksheet: Total Coverage

Total overall lot coverage (SF)

3506.5

Total overall lot coverage (% of lot)

49

Sign Information

Type of Sign

--

Sign Height

--

Sign Width

--

Total square foot of sign

--

what is the Linear width of unit occupied by tenant

--


Attachments (8)



Photographs
Mar 11, 2020




IMG_00001923.jpg
Mar 11, 2020



site plan with neighbors garage.jpg
Apr 03, 2020



east elev with neighbors garage.jpg



volume calculation diagram.jpg

Apr 03, 2020

Apr 03, 2020

pdf Architectural Plan for accessory structure

Mar 11, 2020

pdf Exterior Elevations of what is proposed (includes signage)

Mar 11, 2020

pdf Site Plan for Garage, Deck or Pergola (required)

Mar 11, 2020

Timeline **Payment****Status:** Paid March 11th 2020, 10:39 am**Zoning Officer****Status:** In Progress**Assignee:** Kathy Rose**Kathy Rose** March 18th 2020, 2:51:11 pm

How is this not a variance for a 2-story garage?

Kathy Rose March 27th 2020, 5:24:28 pm

Pete, I think the design is nice based on the detail, I'm still struggling with the mass. it is clearly a 2-story garage that is over 35' long and not typical at all. I know you like to build out structure without the need for a variance. This is an exception to the rule and not the intent of why the height in the code was raised. Also the volume of "gross" space should be used in the calculations and not just the finished area. It appears the peak over the front garage door is excluded. I am basing my decision on those facts and the fact that I'm questioning myself if this is an appropriate structure in every back yard in Bexley, That would be my mistake if it is not. I will defer to the Board. I can forward your construction documents during the review process, which puts you less than 2 weeks behind. I'm happy to get a legal opinion, but at this rate Karen and I have put more time into this review to consider it minor.

Design Planning Consultant**Status:** Pending**Assignee:** Karen Bokor**Kathy Rose** March 18th 2020, 3:22:33 pm

i have concern on the volume and size

Karen Bokor March 18th 2020, 3:24:55 pm

This seems like it should go to the Board for aesthetic review - the volume seems boxy....

Karen Bokor March 18th 2020, 3:26:27 pm

Pete.... Kathy and I both agree that this pushes the edge and it needs to go to the Board for ARB - we are both concerned about the overall massing - better to be safe than sorry.

Kathy Rose March 19th 2020, 11:52:41 am

I see that you are working with the current code; however the resulting design does not align with the intent. The system allows for a second opinion on the structure from the Architectural Review Board. I will defer to them and place it on the upcoming agenda. A hard copy of the plan will allow me to verify the calculations. You are welcome to provide additional options.

 Architectural Review Board**Status:** Pending **Board of Zoning and Planning****Status:** Pending **Arborist**

4/6/2020

Status: Pending

Architectural Review Permit

Status: Pending