

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

January 7, 2020

3:00 p.m.

Pre-meeting to begin at 2:30 p.m.

## #1 CONSENT AGENDA

- A. Bryan & Linda Johnson – 3611 W. 63<sup>rd</sup> Street Replace A/C Unit
- B. Luke & Lauren Marvine – 1903 W. 70<sup>th</sup> Terrace Replace A/C Unit
- C. David & Diane Zimmer – 5924 High Drive Replace A/C Units
- D. Joe & Beth Allen – 6516 Aberdeen Rd Replace 7 windows

## #2 Seth & Lyndsay Henson 2609 W. 70<sup>th</sup> Street

Changes to previously approved project  
*Continued from December 3<sup>rd</sup> ARB Mtg*

## #3 Lauren Atterbury 6438 Indian Lane

New white vinyl fence

## #4 David & Diane Zimmer 5924 High Drive

Changes to previously approved project

## #5 David & Terri Bauer 2921 W. 67<sup>th</sup> Street

Outdoor Living Area

## #6 Brian & Allison Bloch 3120 W. 68<sup>th</sup> Street

New paver patio

## #7 Patrick & Katherine Bello \* 6411 Belinder Avenue

Cedar fence

## #8 Anthony & Elizabeth Krsnich 2403 W. 69<sup>th</sup> Terrace

Changes to approved circle drive  
*Continued from December 17<sup>th</sup> ARB Mtg*

\* Variance required

The Mission Hills Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) provides that the BZA shall determine whether or not an ARB decision was reasonable based upon the evidence presented to the ARB and the record of the ARB proceedings. Testimony at the BZA hearing will be limited to a discussion of the evidence presented to the ARB. No new evidence will be considered.

## **#1 Consent Agenda**

### **A. Bryan & Linda Johnson**

**3611 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street**

The Johnsons are proposing to replace their existing A/C Unit with a new unit in the same location.

#### **Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

#### **Summary of Project:**

The proposed unit is located on the right side of the house. Please note that the view from the street has been adequately screened with vegetation.

#### **Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-120.C that requires all accessory structures to be a minimum of 10 feet from the side property line. However, Code Section 5-128.C.1 allows the replacement of certain existing nonconforming structures without a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. A variance is not required.

#### **Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

**B. Luke & Lauren Marvine**

**1903 West 70<sup>th</sup> Terrace**

The Marvines are proposing to replace their existing A/C Unit with a new unit in the same location.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed unit is located on the right side of the house. Please note that the view from the street has been adequately screened with vegetation.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-120.C that requires all accessory structures to be a minimum of 10 feet from the side property line. A proposed, the unit is located 5 feet from the side line. However, Code Section 5-128.C.1 allows the replacement of certain existing nonconforming structures without a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. A variance is not required.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

**C. David & Diane Zimmer**

**5924 High Drive**

The Zimmers are proposing to replace their two existing A/C units with two new units in the same location.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed unit is located on the left side of the house. Please note that the view from the street has been adequately screened with a wing wall.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-120.C that requires all accessory structures to be a minimum of 10 feet from the side property line. However, Code Section 5-128.C.1 allows the replacement of certain existing nonconforming structures without a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. A variance is not required.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

**D. Joe & Beth Allen**

**6516 Aberdeen Road**

The Allens are proposing to replace seven windows at the rear of their house with slightly shorter windows.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

All seven windows are located at the rear of the house in an existing shed dormer. All seven windows are also panned into the existing roof. The new windows are the same style as the existing windows. They also have the same width and have the same head height. The sill of each window is being raised by 4 inches to allow more space between the bottom of the window and the roof pan.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

The Hensons are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project.

This project was continued at the November 11<sup>th</sup> ARB meeting so that updated architectural drawings could be provided. The project was continued at the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting so that a site visit could be scheduled to review the project. That site visit was conducted on December 17<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 p.m.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The City Architect recently failed the Henson's final inspection due to several discrepancies between the approved plans and the project as built. A side dormer window was originally approved as a pair of casement windows and a single casement was installed. Five windows at the rear of the house were supposed to all have transoms. Transoms were installed only at the middle three. The roof pitch of the addition had been changed and the timbering above the transoms was missing. The windows installed on either side of the fireplace are larger than previously approved. The secondary rear entrance was installed with glass doors rather than solid and a new window was added. Photo documentation of the as-built conditions has been provided for ARB review.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

The Atterburys are proposing a new white vinyl fence around the perimeter of their yard.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed fence will be installed along the east and west side of the property in addition to the returns on both sides of the house. The exact height of the fence has not been indicated. Since the fence returns align with the front of the house, a maximum height of 4 feet is allowed by ordinance.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

Assuming there are no issues with height, there are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.7.3.B of the Design Guidelines recommends that fences should be made of finished natural wood or wrought iron. **The proposed fence material does not meet this recommendation.**

The Zimmers are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The Zimmers are proposing to replace their existing brick patio with a new larger patio constructed of limestone pavers. Several new planting beds are being incorporated into the new patio layout.

The Zimmers are also proposing a new artificial turf putting green in their rear yard.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-120.D that requires all patios to be a minimum of 20 feet from the side property line. The existing patio being replaced is 5.6 feet from the side property line. However, Code Section 5-128.C.1 allows the replacement of certain existing nonconforming structures without a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. The portion of the patio that is nonconforming will be replaced in the same location and will be the same size. A variance is not required.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(25)/LS-3
Lot Area:	20,996 SF
Lot Width:	148'

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Proposed
Maximum Height	35'	No Change
Minimum Front Yard:	Average of Adjacent	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	11.13'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	14.7' (Existing)
Minimum Combined Side Yards: (25% of Mean Lot Width)	24.625'	25.83'
Minimum Rear Yard: (20% of Mean Lot Depth)	42.7' (At Closest Point)	42.7'
Lot Coverage:	5,305 SF	3,973 sf (74.9% of Max)



Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used	
5924 High Drive	20,783	2,821	5,305	53.18%	
5920 High Drive	21,330	3,410	5,401	63.13%	
5931 High Drive	20,307	3,369	5,220	64.54%	
2110 Stratford Road	27,616	2,808	6,463	43.45%	
			Average	56.08%	
			50% Increase	84.11%	
5924 High Drive	20,783	Proposed =	3,973	5,305	74.90%
Allowable Lot Coverage reduced by 150% Rule =			4,462	89.04%	

**#5 David & Terri Bauer**

**2921 W. 67<sup>th</sup> Street**

The Bauers are proposing a project that consists of a patio replacement, outdoor grill, pergola and ceiling fan, drains around the patio, and modifying an irrigation system

Outdoor kitchens are substantial construction matters as defined by Code section 5-103.75 and was noticed as such.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

An existing patio will be replaced with engineered concrete pavers over a concrete and rock base. The Bauers are proposing the Dawn Mist color for the pavers. A new cedar pergola will be added and a grill station with stone veneer. Neither the counter top material or the type and color of the veneer has been indicated.

Electrical will be added to the pergola for a ceiling fan and an outlet. The ceiling fan details have not been indicated. Electrical will also be added for an outdoor television.

New drainpipe will be laid around the new patio. Three sprinkler head will be relocated.

A fire feature is shown in the renderings, but there is no indication of a gas line. Clarification is required as to the type of fire feature being installed.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

**#6 Brian & Allison Bloch**

**3120 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street**

The Blochs are proposing a new paver patio at the center of their rear yard.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The new patio is located in the space made available by the recent demolition of a swimming pool. The patio infills a u-shaped area at the back of the house and connects to the existing pool house. A stepping stone walkway is proposed between the pool house and the main house.

The patio is to be constructed of concrete uni-lock pavers.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

While a current survey has not been provided, it is clear that the proposed patio meets all required setbacks. There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

**#7 Patrick & Katherine Bello \***

**6411 Belinder Avenue**

The Bellos are proposing a new cedar fence around the perimeter of their property.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed fence is a 6 feet tall, stockade style. The Bellos failed their final inspection because a portion of the fence is built on top of a retaining wall making the fence 7'-8" tall. There also is a discrepancy between the location of the fence on the survey vs. the installed condition. **Clarification is required.**

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-135.A.2 which limits the height of fences in the rear yard to 7 feet, with ARB approval. **A variance of 8 inches is required.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Design Guidelines.

---

\* A variance is required.

**#8 Anthony & Elizabeth Krsnich**

**2403 W 69<sup>th</sup> Terrace**

The Krsniches are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved circle driveway. *No representative was present at the December 17<sup>th</sup> ARB meeting so the project was continued to January 7, 2020.*

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: None

**Summary of Project:**

The revised layout widens the driveway to 18 feet near the house, and increases the width at the street and at the connection to the existing direct driveway from 10 feet to 12 feet.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

There are no conflicts between the proposed project and the City of Mission Hills Code of Ordinances.

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.5 on pages 72 through 75 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for the Suburban character area.

Subsection G suggest that circle driveways have an inner green that is no less than 80 feet wide and 40 feet deep. The proposed circle drive sits much closer to the street than recommended.

**Discussion is recommended.**