2018036 132



Application Cover Sheet: Basic Project Information & Certification Purpose of Application (check all that apply):

Architectural Review	w 🔲	Conditional Use	Demol	ition	Planned U	Jnit Dev.	Rezo	ning [Z Landso	ape Review	Spe	cial Permit
Property & Project In	formation	on:										
Property Address:		291 S. Columbia Avenue, Bexley, OH 43209										
Brief Project Descripti	ion:	Residence - New Construction										
Applicant Informatio	on:											
Applicant Name:		Brian Bernstein										
Applicant Address:	Ī	31 E 5th Avenue	e				Columbus	3		ОН	43201	
Applicant Email & Pho	one:	bbernstein@real	mcollab	orative.co	m				216-647	-5888		
Property Owner Information:												
Owner Name:		Herb & Dee Dee	e Glimcl	ner								
Owner Address:	ĺ	10 N Drexel Avenue Columbus							ОН	43209		
Owner Email & Phone	e: [deedeeg13@gmail.com						614-252	-252-7008			
Attorney/Agent Info	rmation											
Agent Name:												
Agent Address:												
Agent Email & Phone:												
Completed Worksheets: Project Worksheet (Sheet A) Architectural Review (Sheet B) Tree Commission (Sheet						sion (Sheet	D)					
Signatures:												
The attached application package is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the City staff review of this application is dependent upon the accuracy of the information provided and that any inaccurate or inadequate information provided by me/my firm/etc. may delay review.												
Applicant Signature:		Brian Ber	nstei	n Digitally si	gned by Bria 3.10.18 15:50	n Bernstein 0:06 -04'00'	Date:	12/1	3/2018			
Owner Signature:		Dee Dee Glimcher Digitally signed by Dee Dee Glimcher Date: 2018.10.18 15:51:14 -04'00'					Date:	12/1	3/2018			
Agent Signature:		Date:										
Internal Use:												
Application #:				Board Re	feralls:	AR	в 🔲 в	ZAP [City Co	uncil	Tree Com	mission
Staff Signature:				Date:								



Application Cover Sheet: Review Fee Worksheet

	Estimated Valuation of Project:	\$
Minor Architectural Review (Ex. Roof, win Based upon the valuation of the project:	dow, siding) - \$50.00 for 1st \$10,000 valuation - \$5.00 for each additional \$10,000 valuation.	\$
Major Architectural Review (Ex. New Consessed upon the valuation of the project:	struction, Additions, Garages, Decks, Pergola) - \$90.00 for the 1st \$10,000 valuation - \$5.00 for each additional \$10,000 valuation - \$600.00 cap - \$50.00 resubmittal fee	\$
Variance Review Single Family: Commercial Property: Fences or Special Permits: All others:	\$100.00 \$100.00 \$65.00 \$90.00	\$ 100 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$
Zoning Fees Rezoning:	- \$250.00 up to 1 acre site - \$60.00 for each additional acre (or part thereof)	\$
Requests for amendment to PUD Plans:	\$300.00	\$
Split of lot or existing parcel:	\$250.00	\$
Replatting or new plat:	\$250.00	\$
Sign Review and Architectural Review for	Commercial Properties	
Project Value \$0 to \$5,000 \$5,001 to \$25,000 \$25,001 to \$75,000 \$75,001 to \$200,000 \$200,001 to \$750,000 Over \$750,000	Fee \$100.00 \$200.00 \$250.00 \$600.00 \$1,000.00 \$350.00	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$
Fences and walls:	\$65.00	\$
Special Permit, Conditional Uses and All others:	\$90.00	\$
Re-submittal Fee:	\$50.00	\$
Appeals Appeal of ARB decision to BZAP: Appeal of BZAP decision to City Council:	\$50.00 \$250.00 Fee Total	\$ \$

CITY OF BEXLEY UNIFIED PLANNING APPLICATION

Project Worksheet

	Residential Commercial
Property Address:	291 S. Columbia Avenue, Bexley, OH 43209
Zoning District:	R-3
	R-1 (25% Building & 40% Overall) R-6 (35% Building & 60% Overall)
	R-2 (25% Building & 50% Overall) R-12 (35% Building & 70% Overall)
	R-3 (25% Building & 50% Overall) *Overall coverage includes hardscape
Lot Info:	Width (ft.): 190 Depth (ft.): 250 Total Area (SF): 47,500
Primary Structure Info:	Existing Footprint (SF):
	Proposed Addition (SF):
	Removing (SF): (Type of Structure:) SF Residence
	Proposed new primary structure or residence (SF): 5,117
	Total Square Footage: 5,117
Garage and/or Accessory	Existing Footprint (SF): New Structure Type:
Structure Info (Incl. Decks, Pergolas, etc):	Proposed Addition (SF):
	Proposed New Structure (SF): Is there a 2nd floor? Yes No
	Total of all garage and accessory structures (SF): 2nd Floor SF:
	Total building lot coverage (SF):
	Is this replacing an existing garage and/or accessory structure? Yes No
Hardscape:	Existing Driveway (SF): Existing Patio (SF): Existing Private Sidewalk (SF):
	Proposed Additional Hardscape (SF): $6,974$
	Total Hardscape (SF): 6,974
Totals:	Total overall lot coverage (SF): $12,091 = 25$ % of lot
Applicant Initial:	Brian Makeum Bornston
Internal Use: Staff Review	
Staff Comn	nents: Staff Initial:

Variance Worksheet

Variance requests will be heard by the Bexley Board of Zoning and Planning. Varianes are based upon a legal determination of whether the request meets the variance criteria specified by Bexley City Code.

Variance criteria are outlined below in question format. Please provide your narrative response to the variance questions.

Decsription of the Proposed Variance

Please provide a thorough description of the variance being sought, and the reason why.

We are requesting a 3'-0" walkway along the edge of the approved 12'-6" driveway because we will have quite a few walkers going to the side door. Adding the walk along the side of the driveway rather than a separate sidewalk helps maintain even larger expanses of green landscape area. This design maintains an unusually huge green space along the street. And the driveway tucked to the side of the lot to the side facing garage doors also helps to create a lovely long landscape area.

Since this sidewalk along the driveway could be driven on, we felt we should apply for a variance to legitimize a possible interpretation of this driveway plus sidewalk as a driveway wider than 12.5 feet.

Variance Question 1

Does the property in question require a variance in order to yield a reasonable return? Can there be any beneficial use of the property without the variance? Please describe.

The homeowner will install a u-shaped turn-around driveway in the front of the home, if the variance is not approved. It is in the owner's and the city's best interest to limit the overall paved area and to preserve the character of the property and save several mature trees, which is all possible with approval of this minimal variance on this large lot.

Variance Question 2

Is the variance substantial? Please describe.

No, the request is for a 3'-0" walkway along the edge of the proposed 12'-6" driveway. The same size walk not adjacent to the drive would not require a variance, and would include the same or more paving on site. The proposed plan allows the owner adequate utility of the site as part of a spectacular overall landscape design.

Variance Question 3

Would the essential character of the neighborhood be substantially altered or would adjoining properties suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance? Please describe.

The essential character of the neighborhood will NOT be substantially altered. This is one of the larger lots on Columbia and it has just one driveway to the street. Therefore virtually all of the 190 foot frontage is landscaped. Additionally, the curving nature of the proposed driveway even limits the view further from the street. Furthermore, there are other driveways of this width already on South Columbia.

This entire project, with this variance approved only results in a substantial benefit to all the adjoining neighbors, and in fact to this entire block of Columbia. This is a substantial investment in Bexley and will only add to the property values of neighboring properties.

Variance Worksheet (Continued)

Variance requests will be heard by the Bexley Board of Zoning and Planning. Varianes are based upon a legal determination of whether the request meets the variance criteria specified by Bexley City Code.

Variance criteria are outlined below in question format. Please provide your narrative response to the variance questions.

١	/a	ri	a	n	_	6	Q	11	۵	c	ti	^	n	4
٦	ı a		a	Н	L	C	v	u	ᆫ	3	u	v	11	7

Mould the agricus and correly affect the delivery of any appropriate somices (e.g. water sower garbage)? Please describe

would the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g., water, sewer, garbage): Please describe.
No, the location of the driveway or its width do not impact the delivery of these services.
Variance Question 5 Did the property owner purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction? Please describe.
This request is to clarify what could be interpreted as a wider driveway. A U-Shaped driveway meets code with much more on site paving.
Variance Question 6
Can the property owner's predicament feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance? Please describe.
An allowable U-shaped drive would be a detriment of the community and therefore allowance of this variance is a benefit to Bexley and neighbors on Columbia.
Variance Question 7
Is the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement observed and is substantial justice done by granting the variance? Please

Yes, We have to ask why does the code section limiting the width of driveways exist? It must be to limit the amount of paving on a lot and the intersections with the sidewalk. This variance actually IMPROVES on what is allowed by code regarding these issues.