

October 17, 2024

BZAP-24-40

(BZAP)Board of Zoning & Planning Application - Review of Variance requests for Residential and

Commercial

Development
Status: Active

Submitted On: 10/16/2024

Primary Location

2075 FAIR AV Bexley, OH 43209

Owner

William Bundy Fair 2075 Bexley, Ohio 43209

Applicant

Gary Alexander614-487-0637

@ gary@garyjalexanderarchitect.com

1265 Neil Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43201

A.1: Project Information

Brief Project Description - ALSO PROVIDE 2 HARD COPIES OF PLANS TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT.

Zoning variance is needed for the fence in the front yard setback and the encroachment of the mudroom addition into the rear yard setback.

| Architecture Review | Conditional Use |
|--|-----------------|
| | |
| Planned Unit Dev | Rezoning |
| | |
| Variance or Special Permit | |
| | |
| What requires Major Architectural Review | |

Mudroom addition at the rear and the cladding of a storage shed at the rear.

| What requires Minor Architectural Review | |
|---|--|
| Major Architectural Review | Minor Architectural Review |
| Appeal of ARB or Staff Decision to BZAP | |
| State the specific nature of the Appeal. | |
| Upcoming ARB Hearing Date (Hearings held the 2nd Thursday of the month. Application must be submitted 4 weeks prior to the upcoming meeting date) | Upcoming BZAP hearing (Hearings held the 4th Thursday of the month. Application must be submitted 4 weeks prior to the upcoming meeting date)* |
| 11/14/2024 | 11/21/2024 |
| All BZAP (Board of Zoning & Planning) applications that also require ARB (Architectural Review Board) design review must go to the ARB hearing PRIOR to being heard by BZAP | |
| Applicant (or representative of the project) hearings | must be present at the appropriate |
| A.1: Attorney / Agent Information | |
| Agent Name* | Agent Address |
| Gary J. Alexander | 1265 Neil Ave. |

| Agent Email* gary@garyjalexanderarchitect.com | Agent Phone* 614 487-0637 |
|---|--|
| Property Owner Name* | Property Owner Email |
| | |
| William Bundy | nicole.rabidou.bundy@gmail.com |
| Property Owner Address | Property Owner Phone number |
| A.2: Fee Worksheet | |
| Estimated Valuation of Project | Minor Architectural Review |
| 200000 | |
| | |
| Major Architectural Review | Variance Review |
| ✓ | \checkmark |
| | |
| Variance Review Type | Zoning |
| Single Family | |
| | |
| Zoning Review Type | Sign Review and Architectural Review for |
| _ | Commercial Projects |
| | |
| | |
| Review Type | Appeal of ARB decision to BZAP |
| Fences and Walls | |
| | |
| Appeal of BZAP decision to City Council | |
| | |

Conditional Use - Explain type of Use if being requested and fill out Conditional Use Criteria

| Appeal of Zoning Officer determination to BZAP | |
|--|-----------------|
| | |
| Detailed explanation of appeal | |
| | |
| | |
| B: Project Worksheet: Property In | formation |
| Occupancy Type | Zoning District |
| Residential | R-3 |
| Use Classification ② | |
| R-3 (25% Building and 50% Overall) | |
| B: Project Worksheet: Lot Info | |
| Width (ft) | Depth (ft) |
| 243.09 | 371.25 |
| Total Area (SF) | |
| 86146 | |
| | |

B: Project Worksheet: Primary Structure Info

Existing Footprint (SF) Proposed Addition (SF)

5238 386

Removing (SF)

Type of Structure

0 mudroom addition and storage shed

Proposed New Primary Structure or Residence (SF)

Total (footprint) square foot of all structures

combined

5624

B: Project Worksheet: Garage and/or Accessory Structure Info (Incl. Decks, Pergolas, Etc)

Existing Footprint (SF) Proposed Addition (SF)

0 280

New Structure Type Ridge Height

13'-6 3/4"

Proposed New Structure (SF) Is there a 2nd Floor

– No

Total of all garage and accessory structures (SF)

Total building lot coverage (SF)

5624

| Total building lot coverage (% of lot) | Is this replacing an existing garage and/or accessory structure? |
|--|---|
| · · | No |
| B: Project Worksheet: Hards | cape |
| Existing Driveway (SF) | Existing Patio (SF) |
| _ | _ |
| Existing Private Sidewalk (SF) | Proposed Additional Hardscape (SF) |
| _ | 120 |
| Total Hardscape (SF) | |
| 9325 | |
| B: Project Worksheet: Total (| Coverage |
| Total overall lot coverage (SF) | Total overall lot coverage (% of lot) |
| 14949 | 17 |
| C.1 Architectural Review Wo | rksheet: Roofing |
| Roofing | Structure |
| | House or Principal Structure |
| Existing Roof Type | New Roof Type |
| Slate | Metal |

New Single Manufacturer

New Roof Style and Color

natural copper

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Windows

Windows Structure

Garage Only

Existing Window Type Existing Window Materials

Double Hung –

New Window Manufacturer New Window Style/Mat./Color

double hung

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Doors

Doors Structure

✓ House or Principal Structure

Existing Entrance Door Type Existing Garage Door Type

Door Finish Proposed Door Type

aluminum clad wood

Proposed Door Style Proposed Door Color

white

C.1 Architectural Review Worksheet: Exterior Trim

Exterior Trim Existing Door Trim

Std. Lumber Profile

Proposed New Door Trim Existing Window Trim

aluminium clad per door manufacturer Std. Lumber Profile

Proposed New Window Trim Trim Color(s)

wood (on shed) white

Do the proposed changes affect the overhangs?

No

C.2 Architectural Review Worksheet: Exterior Wall Finishes

Exterior Wall Finishes Existing Finishes

✓ Brick

Existing Finishes Manufacturer, Style, Color Proposed Finishes

brick Brick

Proposed Finishes Manufacturer, Style, Color

Panels on the shed will be fiber cement, Hardie panel By checking the following box I agree (as the applicant of record) to monitor this application and respond to any additional information requested by the Zoning Officer, Design Consultant, and Bldg.

Dept Staff, through the email in this application, in order to allow a notice to be written and sent out 2 weeks prior to the next scheduled meeting and to be placed on the Agenda. This includes the ARB meeting when Design Recommendation is needed prior to Board of Zoning and Planning Review. I understand that incomplete applications may be withheld from the agenda or only offered informal review.*



D: Tree & Public Gardens Commission Worksheet

| Type of Landscape Project | Landscape Architect/Designer |
|---|------------------------------|
| _ | |
| A of the LODgetter of Discour | A although Davis as Eq. 9 |
| Architect/Designer Phone | Architect/Designer E-mail |
| | |
| Project Description | |
| | |
| | |
| I have read and understand the above criteria | |
| | |
| | |

D: (Staff Only) Tree & Public Gardens Commission Worksheet

| Applicant has been advised that Landscape Designer/Architect must be present at meeting | | Design Specifications as required in item 3 in "Review Guidelines and List of Criteria" above |
|--|---|--|
| • | | |
| | • | |

E.1 Variance Worksheet

Description of the Proposed Variance. Please provide a thorough description of the variance being sought and the reason why.

Variances are being requested for the mudroom addition at the rear and for a fence in the front yard setback.

The house has no mudroom and the proposed addition is in the logical location for this. The proposed fence is replacing an existing wire fence. The proposed fence, like the wire fence, will have very little exposure to Park Drive due to the proposed landscape and the significant grade change from Park to the property.

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 current fence is unsightly and is in need of repair. The proposed fence represents a significant upgrade over what is present.

2. Is the variance substantial? Please describe.

Neither variance is substantial. The fence is replacing an existing fence. It will be integrated into the proposed landscape plan for Park Drive. The existing fence is 4'-4" +/- in height. The proposed fence is 5'-0" tall. Because of the difference in grade between Park Drive and the fence location, much of the fence will be no taller that 2'-2" above the curb elevation on Park.

| 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. |
|---|
| No. There is a similar fence that is in the front yard at 311 Westland Ave. in the same block as this property. |
| E.2 Variance Worksheet |
| 4. Would the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g. water, sewer, garbage)? Please describe. |
| No. |
| 5. Did the property owner purchase the property with the knowledge of zoning restriction? Please describe. |
| No. |
| 6. Can the property owner's predicament feasibly obviated through some method other than a variance? Please describe. |
| The owners have two large dogs and a concern for personal security. The current fence does not adequately address these issues and is unsightly. |
| 7. Is the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement observed and is substantial justice done by granting the variance? Please describe. |
| This is a very unique property. While Park Drive is considered the front because of the original plat, it is not the functional front of the property. The front of the home faces Fair and the home is addressed to Fair. If this were treated as the rear or side, this variance would not be needed. |

F.1 Fence Variance Worksheet

| Lot Type | |
|----------|-----|
| Corner | lot |

Narrative description of how you plan to meet the pertinent outlined variance criteria

See variance statements. Landscape plan is provided integrating the fence into the landscape. Difference in grades along Park results in very little visible height along that street.

F.1-F.2 Fence Variance Worksheet: Side and Rear Yard Restrictions for Corner Lots

1. Compatibility: Describe how the proposed side yard fence or wall exceeding forty-eight inches in height and on the street side of a corner lot compatible with other properties in the neighborhood?

The fence will not be visible in almost all locations along the property lines.

2. Height: Please verify that the maximum height of such fence or wall shall not exceed seventy-two inches as measured from the average grade, as defined in Section 1230.06. Artificially raising the height of the lot line by the use of mounding, retaining walls or similar means shall be included within the seventy-two inch maximum height.

See attached drawings of 5'-0" fence.

3. Transparency: Fences exceeding forty-eight inches in height should include transparency in the upper 12" to 18" of the fence through the use of latticework, pickets, or other appropriate design elements. Describe how you have satisfied this requirement.

Fence is open.

4. Screening: A landscaping plan must be filed with the application for a special permit, indicating how such fencing or wall is to be screened from the street side elevation. The landscape plan should be designed in such a way as to mitigate the impact of a solid fence or wall as it relates to the street and other properties. Describe how the landscape plan addresses these items.

See landscape plan.

5. Visibility and Safety: The installation of such fence or wall shall not create a visibility or safety concern for vehicular and/or pedestrian movement. Please describe any visibility/safety concerns with your design.

Fence is behind the landscape and is open.

6. Material Compatibility: No chain link, wire mesh or other similar material shall be installed on lot lines adjacent to public rights-of-way. Please verify that your design complies with this requirement.

See fence spec. It complies.

7. Finished Side: Any fence or wall erected on a lot located at the intersection of two or more streets must have the finished and not the structural side facing the adjacent property, alley or street. Please verify that your design complies with this requirement.

All sides of the fence are finished.

F.3 Fence Variance Worksheet

| Front Yard Restrictions | Fences Adjacent to Commercial Districts |
|---|--|
| Require Commercial Fences Adjacent to Residential Districts | |
| F.3 Fence Variance Worksheet: Fro | ont Yard Restrictions |
| The proposed decorative landscape wall or fence is compatible with other properties in the neighborhood. Yes | The height of the fence or wall does not exceed the size permitted as above when measured from the average grade of the yard where the fence or wall is to be installed. Artificially raising the height of the lot line by the use of mounding, retaining walls or similar means shall be included in the maximum height. |
| | No |
| Posts, columns and finials may extend up to 6" above the maximum allowed height of the fence panels. CHAPTER 1264. FENCES AND WALLS City of Bexley Zoning Ordinance No | A landscaping plan shall be filed with the application indicating how such fencing and/ or wall is to be integrated with existing front yard landscaping. Yes |
| The installation of such fence and/or wall shall not create a visibility or safety concern for vehicular and/or pedestrian movement. | No chain link, wire mesh, concrete block or other similar type material shall be installed as a decorative landscape wall or fence. Yes |
| The fence and/or wall shall have a minimum of 50% transparency. Yes | That the lot exhibits unique characteristics that support the increase in fence height. Yes |

G. Demolition Worksheet

| Is your property historically significant? Please attached supporting documentation. Recomended sources include ownership records, a letter from the Bexley Historical Society, etc. | Is your property architecturally significant? Please attached supporting documentation. Recomended sources include a letter of opinion from an architect or expert with historical preservation expertise. |
|---|--|
| _ | _ |
| If you answered "yes" to either of the above two question results from being unable to demolish the primary resident | |
| If you answered "yes" to either of the above two questio circumstances that require the demolition of the primare | |
| I will provide a definite plan for reuse of the site, including proposed replacement structures, by completing Worksheets B & C and any other pertinent worksheets, along with required exhibits. | |
| Provide a narrative time schedule for the replacement p | project |
| Please provide a narrative of what impact the proposed and the neighborhood. | replacement project will have on the subject property |
| | |

Attachments



Architectural Details

 $Bundy_ArchReview_Set.pdf$

Uploaded by Gary Alexander on Oct 16, 2024 at 4:08 PM



Landscape Plan

landscape plan.pdf

Uploaded by Gary Alexander on Oct 16, 2024 at 4:08 PM



Photographs

House Photos.pdf

Uploaded by Gary Alexander on Oct 16, 2024 at 4:10 PM



Site Plan and Vicinity Map of immediate surrounding lots

REQUIRED

Vicinity Plan.png

Uploaded by Gary Alexander on Oct 16, 2024 at 4:12 PM



Appeal supporting information and documents

Fence Photos.pdf

Uploaded by Gary Alexander on Oct 16, 2024 at 4:11 PM



AMERISTAR FENCE SUBMITTAL.pdf

AMERISTAR FENCE SUBMITTAL.pdf

Uploaded by Gary Alexander on Oct 16, 2024 at 4:11 PM

History

| Date | Activity |
|---------------------------|---|
| 10/16/2024, 4:14:50 | OpenGov system completed payment step Payment on Record BZAP- |
| PM | 24-40 |
| 10/16/2024, 4:13:12 | OpenGov system assigned approval step Zoning Officer from to Matt |
| PM | Klingler on Record BZAP-24-40 |
| 10/16/2024, 4:13:12 PM | OpenGov system assigned approval step Design Planning Consultant from to Karen Bokor on Record BZAP-24-40 |

| Activity |
|--|
| OpenGov system altered payment step Payment, changed status from Inactive to Active on Record BZAP-24-40 |
| OpenGov system altered approval step Zoning Officer, changed status from Inactive to Active on Record BZAP-24-40 |
| OpenGov system altered approval step Design Planning Consultant, changed status from Inactive to Active on Record BZAP-24-40 |
| Gary Alexander submitted Record BZAP-24-40 |
| Gary Alexander added file Vicinity Plan.png |
| Gary Alexander added file AMERISTAR FENCE SUBMITTAL.pdf |
| Gary Alexander added file Fence Photos.pdf |
| Gary Alexander added file House Photos.pdf |
| Gary Alexander added file landscape plan.pdf |
| Gary Alexander added file Bundy_ArchReview_Set.pdf |
| Gary Alexander started a draft Record |
| |

Timeline

| Label | Activated | Completed | Assignee | Due Date | Status |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------|
| \$ Payment | 10/16/2024, 4:13:11 PM | 10/16/2024, 4:14:50 PM | Gary Alexander | - | Completed |
| ✓ Zoning Officer | 10/16/2024, 4:13:11 PM | - | Matt Klingler | - | Active |
| ✓ Design Planning Consultant | 10/16/2024, 4:13:11 PM | - | Karen Bokor | - | Active |

| Label | Activated | Completed | Assignee | Due Date | Status |
|--|-----------|-----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| ✓ Architectural Review Board | - | - | - | - | Inactive |
| ✓ Board of Zoning and Planning | - | - | - | - | Inactive |