

**The College Club Renovation and New Townhomes
WXZ Development**

- 1.) 1123.07(a) - *A 30' front yard is required.* - Proposed setback varies from a minimum of 18'-9 1/2" to 35'-10"
- 2.) 1123.12(a)(2) - *A 10' driveway setback is required adjacent to the single-family home/district.* - Proposed Drive Location is 0' from lot line.
- 3.) 1123.07(b)(2) - *for the Type C units, a 25' setback is required from the south property line.* - Proposed setback varies from a minimum of 12'-3" to a maximum of 20'-6".
- 4.) 1123.07(b)(2) - *for the Type C units, a 25' setback from the east property line is required.* - Proposed setback is 10'-0".
- 5.) 1123.08 (a&b) - *A distance of 42'-6" (34'-6" + 8'-0") is required between the A/B building and the D building as the A/B building (the shorter of the two buildings) is 34'-6" high and 48' of those buildings are within that dimension (8' over the 40' allowed).* - Proposed distance varies but a minimum dimension of 25'-0" is proposed.
- 6.) 1123.08 (a&b) - *A distance of 60'-0" (max separation need not be greater than sixty feet) is required between the C building and the D building as the C building (the shorter of the two buildings) is 30'-4" high and 88'-6" of those buildings are within that dimension.* - Proposed distance varies but a minimum dimension of 24'-0" is proposed.
- 7.) 1123.07(b)(1) - *for the new townhomes a 15' side yard setback from the new west property line separating these two properties is required.* - Proposed setbacks vary but minimum dimensions of 0' at the A/B building, 2' at the D building & 1'-9" at the C building are proposed.
- 8.) 1161.03(4) - *The 14 apartment units in the existing college club building and carriage house require 14 total parking spaces ½ which are enclosed.* - Proposal is for 17 surface parking spaces and no enclosed parking spaces.

**The College Club Renovation and New Townhomes
WXZ Development**

A. Special conditions or circumstances that exist.

Response: for items 1-8- The current zoning for the site, MF3, is much denser than the majority of the surrounding property zoning classification which is A (single family). The site zoning could be met by proposing a taller building with a smaller footprint that meets all the setbacks. The north/east site is 40,467 sf (.92 acres) and Cleveland Heights zoning code allows for 58 units/acre. The height of the building allowed is 1.5 x site/building area ratio. The building could realistically have a floor plate of 6,000 sf with 5 units per floor and current zoning would allow for a 10 story - 50 unit apartment building. This allows for this site to be designed to be much denser and not harmonious with adjacent properties. The proposed less dense design is more harmonious with the neighboring properties, but in order to maximize the potential of the site without the much more dense vertical allowable zoning these variances would be required.

Response for item 1 specifically – The site fronts on Overlook road, as well as a large island buffer, with Edgehill road beyond that. We believe this large open space that this creates allows for the proposed plan to address the front lot line in a different manor than the zoning requires. Additionally the building is not consistently, along its entire length, encroaching upon this setback, only at certain locations. The footprint of the building is intentionally varied in order to break up the massing and provide individuality amongst units, in order to complement the nature of Cleveland Heights residential properties and design.

Response for items 7 specifically – The lot line through the middle of the site is required to split the lot into two entities. Though this split is required from a legal standpoint, the entire site is designed to work cohesively. The mews between the new townhomes and the existing building is designed to be used by both, the outdoor patio and lounge as well.

Response for item 8 specifically. –Under the new zoning we would meet the requirement for number of parking spaces, but we reviewed the option of doing garages on the current parking lot, and it would detrimentally affect the historic nature of both the existing house and carriage building. The demographics of the assumed tenancy of the apartments would likely be nurses, doctors, grad students, professors that would likely use other forms of transportation than cars as well. The building will have in door bike storage as well to promote bike usage. To keep with the historic nature of the existing buildings we would request a variance for enclosed parking.

B. Property yield. Response: as noted in item A.

C. Explain whether the variance is insubstantial. Response: The requested variance is insubstantial as the visual and functional character is more compatible with adjacent homes than is required by MF-3; and this property is located on the edge of the MF-3 district and adjacent to a single-family home district.

D. Explain whether the variance is the minimum necessary to make possible reasonable use of the land. Response: The proposed plan does try to meet the intent of the zoning code as much as possible. Many of the setbacks are encroached upon in limited areas, and not along the full length of

the buildings. We have had discussions with City Planning and have adjusted the plan to try to be as cognizant and respectful of the existing zoning requirements.

E. Neighborhood character.

- a. We believe the proposed plan does reinforce the character of Cleveland Heights as a whole and relates better to the adjacent surrounding properties than what is allowable by code. In proposing this plan, WXZ is providing a less dense solution, but one that is prevalent throughout Cleveland Heights. In order to make the project financially feasible it requires the variances requested.

F. Governmental services.

- a. 1-8 – Response: No. Utilities would all be new and the reduced density from zoning allowable would tax the tie in to the public utilities less.

G. Did the applicant purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction?

- a. 1-8 – Response: Yes

H. Are the items in A the result of actions of the owner.

- a. 1-8 – Response: No.

I. Can it be resolved through method other than a variance?

- a. 1-8 – Response: As noted in Item A, A taller building with a smaller footprint, which is allowable by zoning code, could be designed, but the result would be something that doesn't relate to the existing neighboring properties or the College Club historic renovation.

J. Spirit and intent of the zoning requirement.

- a. 1-8 – Response: We believe the proposed plan does maintain the spirit and intent of the zoning of Cleveland Heights as a whole and relates better to the adjacent surrounding properties and existing character of Cleveland Heights. In proposing this plan, WXZ is providing a less dense solution than is allowed, but one that is prevalent throughout Cleveland Heights, but in order to do make the project a financial feasible it requires the variances requested.

In addition to the site plan layout the buildings themselves are designed to be more appropriate to the surrounding properties, and more closely relate to the intent of the zoning requirements. The buildings step up from two story units closer to the lot lines to taller 3 story units internally to the site. They are also varied in heights, footprint, and materials to relate more cohesively with the surrounding properties. The large green front lawn of the College Club is maintained to better promote the grandeur of this stately historic building, and while the new townhomes address the street front with front entries, they also address this open lawn to create a design that respects the historic nature of the adjacent site.

K. Special Privilege.

- a. 1-8 – Response: Not to our understanding.