

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

April 3, 2018

3:00 p.m.

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

#1 CONSENT AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. DiPasquale Residence – 6542 Wenonga Road | Changes to previously approved project |
| B. James & Laura Goettsch – 3316 W 68 th Street | Changes to previously approved project |
| C. Kevin & Ann Harlan – 2204 W 59 th Street | Changes to existing screened porch |
| D. Vince Hodes – 2415 W 67 th Street | New spa and water/fire feature in rear yard |

#2 TBL Investments 6640 Indian Lane

New house and pool
Continued from March 20th ARB mtg

#3 Trey & Bethany Humphrey 5800 State Line Road

Changes to previously approved project
including rear yard hardscape changes

#4 Matt & Kristen Holton 5828 Pembroke Court

Changes to previously approved project

#5 Forest & Holly Milledge * 6426 Sagamore Road

Replace A/C unit

#6 Rick & Mary Schultz 3021 W 67th Terrace

New house

* 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. DiPasquale Residence

6542 Wenonga Road

The DiPasquales 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 & Side
- Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The original approval included an outdoor grill/kitchen located within a covered rear porch. The DiPasquales are now proposing to relocate the grill to a small patio adjacent to the covered porch. They are also proposing to add a new outdoor fireplace to the covered porch where the grill was originally located.

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.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-4
Lot Area:	27,033 SF
Mean Lot Width:	146.0'

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Proposed
Maximum Height	35'	33.8'
Minimum Front Yard:	70' (Platted)	70.0'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	20' (Platted)	28.2'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	14.6'	27.8'
Minimum Combined Side Yards: (25% of Mean Lot Width)	36.5	56.0'
Minimum Rear Yard: (20% of Mean Lot Depth)	18.6 (At closest point)	31.0'
Detached Accessory Building Side Yard:	20' (When in side yard)	15.5'
Detached Accessory Building Rear Yard:	10'	44.5'
Detached Accessory Building Max Area:	484 SF	303 SF
Lot Coverage:	6,465 SF	4,550 SF (70.4% of Max)

Address	Lot Area	Lot Coverage	Ordinance Limit	% max used
6548 Wenonga Rd	24,751	2,877	5,989	48.00%
6550 Wenonga Rd	23,611	2,462	5,796	42.50%
6540 Wenonga Rd	23,740	3,561	5,818	61.20%
6538 Wenonga Rd	28,902	3,878	6,671	58.10%
6549 Wenonga Rd	35,390	3,525	7,679	45.90%
6545 Wenonga Rd	45,141	4,004	9,094	44.00%
			Average	47.64%
			50% Increase	71.46%%
6542 Wenonga Rd	27,033	4,550	6,465	70.4%
Allowable Lot Coverage reduced by Design Guideline 150% rule			4,620	98.5%

B. James & Laura Goettsch

3316 West 68th Street

Mr. and Mrs. Goettsch are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The original project included a raised spa centered at the east end of the swimming pool. The Goettsches are now proposing to place the spa off-center and align the north side of the spa with the north side of the pool.

The original project also included multiple walkways connecting the existing patio to the new pool deck. They are now proposing to reduce the width of these walkways from 6'-0" to 4'-6" at most locations.

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.

C. Kevin & Ann Harlan

2204 West 59th Street

The Harlans are proposing modifications to their existing screened porch.

Summary of Property:

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front & Side
- Any Special Frontages: Intersection Green

Summary of Project:

The Harlan's existing screened porch has floor to ceiling screen panels. The Harlans are proposing to modify the panels so the bottom 36 inches of every panel will be solid.

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.

D. Mr. & Mrs. Vince Hodes

2415 West 67th Street

The Hodeses are proposing a new spa with a water/fire feature in their rear yard.

Summary of Property:

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front & Side
- Any Special Frontages: Intersection Green

Summary of Project:

The existing rear yard contains two rear patios connected by a walkway. The owners are proposing to remove the walkway and replace it with a new patio that contains a new spa/hot tub. The spa will have a 20 inch tall seat wall at the perimeter that is clad in brick to match existing seat walls on the property. Near the center of the spa sits a small copper water/fire feature that is 16 inches tall and 32 inches in diameter.

As part of the project, all of the existing fence gates will be modified to meet code requirements for pools.

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.

TBL Investments is proposing a new home with a 5,890 sq. ft. footprint. The footprint is roughly 53% larger than the existing home. The footprint consists of 3,605 sq. ft. of first floor living space, and 925 sq. ft. of covered porches. An additional 2,692 sq. ft. are on the second floor, and 1,360 sq. ft. in detached garages. The project includes a circle drive with an auto-court a new pool and extensive landscape retaining walls.

The proposed project is a substantial construction matter and was noticed as such.

The project was continued at the March 20th ARB meeting so an alternate design could be developed for the gable roof element at the main roof above the front entry. Revised drawings will be presented at the ARB meeting.

Summary of Property:

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front & Side
- Any Special Frontages: Intersection Green

Summary of Project:

The house is all stone with a central vertical massing style. It is 2-stories at the central mass with flanking side wings. The west (left) side wing is 2-stories. The wing steps in and down from the main mass. The east (right) side wing steps from 2-stories to 1-story as it transitions into a porte-cochere. A 2-story rear wing is located near the middle of the house and transitions into an open, covered porch. One of the detached garages is connected to the main house via a porte-cochere. The second detached garage flanks the first creating an auto-court between the two.

The proposed house is maintaining the existing topography, with minimal grading, which is in keeping with the rest of the street. The finished floor of the house will be approximately 5 feet lower than the existing house. This is due to the topography of the lot and the fact that the proposed house is significantly closer to the street than the existing house. To maintain this lower elevation, an extensive retaining wall will wrap around the south and west sides of the house. A portion of this retaining wall will be located in the 67th Street platted side yard.

The main ridge of the house will be approximately 44-6 10.3 feet higher than the 1 1/2-story house to the right, on Indian Lane and approximately ~~9-3~~ 10.6 feet lower than the 2-story home to the left on 67th Street. Please note that due to the slope of the street, the detached garages which sit closest to the neighbor to the right on Indian Lane, are approximately 5.5 feet shorter than the adjacent home.

The house is sided with combination of stone and wood shingle siding utilizing stone and wood trim. Stone quoins, soldier courses, and similar masonry details have been provided across the front façade. The siding transitions to shingle siding at the rear and portions of the sides. The roof is faux slate tile with copper at the dormers and accents. A small cupola is proposed at the front detached garage roof.

Windows are a combination of fixed, double-hung and casements - all with colonial muntin bars. At the front of the house, windows stack from the first to second floor. The window arrangement remains formal for the main mass, and is only slightly less formal at the wings. The windows at the front have solid panels at the bottom and arched tops, some with transoms. The dormer windows have been sized to match the dormer with minimal trim.

The detached garages are sided with a combination of stone and shingle siding to match the main house. The fenestration details are also replicated from the main house.

The driveway is a circle drive just like the existing house. The configuration has changed significantly to pull the driveway closer to the street and to accommodate the house being located closer to the street. The auto-court serves two 2-car side detached garages and a small side-entry porch. The driveway extends past the garages to the northwest creating a small hammer-head. Due to the slope of the property, a landscape wall is located along the northeast side of the driveway in the front yard.

The proposed pool and HVAC equipment is located at the north side of the rear wing of the house. This places the equipment between the main house and the detached garages.

A new patio is proposed at the rear of the house. It will contain the new pool deck. It is directly connected to the large covered porch at the rear of the house. A fence will encircle the patio and porch as required by building code for pools. Two retaining walls form a terrace at the rear of the yard allowing the house and patio to be recessed into the hill side.

Multiple trees are being removed as part of the project, including three large trees on the south side of the property which is highly visible from 67th Street. The proposed plans do not indicate any new trees at this time. The ARB should discuss the future landscape intent.

Ordinance Compliance:

Code Section 5-138 forbids walls located within platted setback areas except for retaining walls. The south walls are located within platted setbacks and must meet the requirements of 5-103.84 to be allowed.

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

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.3 on pages 64 through 67 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for the Neighborhood Estates character area.

Subsection A suggests that the main mass of the house should be between 40% and 50% of the lot width. At 40 feet wide (20% of lot width), the main mass is significantly narrower than recommended, this is further exasperated by the strong presence of the two side wings that are wider than the main mass. The PRP discussed this at length and came to the consensus that the stone portion of the house worked as a unit and is interpreted as the main mass. This section also suggests that the depth of the main mass should not be more than 50% of the width. This recommendation has been met. This section goes on to recommend that the height of the house be limited to 35 feet. This recommendation has also been met.

Subsection C recommends side wings located in the primary building area be clearly shorter than the main mass. The proposed wings are subordinate to the main mass in height and well proportioned.

Subsection D recommends rear wings located in the secondary building area be subordinate in height and clearly less than the main mass. The height should be no more than 30 feet and the depth should be less than the main mass. These recommendations have been met.

Subsection E recommends detached accessory buildings, located in the secondary building area have a maximum height of 2 stories or 24 feet. This recommendation has been met, but please note, the garages have nearly the same ridge height at the adjacent home. The section goes on to recommend that buildings located in the conditional building area be limited to 1 story with 10-foot eaves. The northwest corner of the southern accessory building extends into the conditional area, and while the eave lines are approximately 13.5 feet high, that portion of the building is set into the hillside which makes the eaves considerably lower. The section also limits the maximum area of detached accessory buildings to 720 sq. ft. each. This recommendation has been met. The PRP has requested that the height of the house and detached accessory building be lowered by 16 inches. This lower height does not exactly meet the Design Guidelines, but the PRP feels it is acceptable given the slope of the property.

Section 2.6.3 on page 84 provides specific recommendations for homes with an intersection green frontage. Subsections 1.i&k recommend that homes that front parklets have the house oriented to face the parklet. This particular lot is unique in that it intersects two parklets. While the proposed house is well oriented to the Indian Lane parklet, it shows little relationship to the Tomahawk Road parklet. This orientation also makes the rear and side of the house more visible to 67th Street. Discussion of the home's orientation is recommended. Subsections 1.l&m recommend that there be no fences or grading in the intersection green area. The portion of the wall in the minimum platted setback is 12" tall at its highest point.

Section 2.6.4 on page 89 of the Design Guidelines provides recommendations for lot coverage. The section suggests that lot coverage be limited and should not exceed an increase of 50% over the average percentage maximum lot coverage that is being used by the neighboring properties. This recommendation has been met. Refer to the table below for more information.

Section 2.1.1 E on page 97 discusses architectural aberrations such as multi-styled buildings. The house is designed in the Colonial Revival Style. Per page 117 of the Design Guidelines, this style features double-hung windows with shutters. The house features casement windows with no shutters. The first-floor window openings are wider than 2nd floor windows with arched-top heads and extend to the finished floor. This feature is more representative of the Mediterranean Revival style. Mixing of style elements should be avoided in favor of maintaining the simplistic Colonial Revival style with double-hung windows with shutters, and the alignment of window opening width. The PRP has required the main mass of the house be changed to double-hung windows, with the exception of the first-floor fixed windows and the second floor triple unit. The Panel found that the remaining windows were acceptable as casements.

~~Section 2.1.1 F on page 99 discusses massing aberrations such as complex applied massing. While the front of the house does a good job conveying the relationships between the main mass and the two side wings, at the rear of the house the complicated form results in multiple roof planes. This issue was eliminated during the PRP process.~~

Section 2.72 A on page 101 recommends garages be set behind the façade of the main house mass. This proposed garage is located in a detached accessory building that is located the same distance from the street as the main house. The location of the detached garage is inevitable given that the porte-cochere is an integral part of both the main house and the detached garage. The spirit of this guideline has been satisfied in the fact that the doors of the garage in question face the rear yard and are not visible from the street.

Section 2.72 B 2 recommends that circle driveways be configured to allow a minimum of 80 feet between curb cuts with the drive set back a minimum of 40 feet from the back of curb. While the distance between curb cuts is more than adequate, the distance between the driveway and the street is only 35 feet. This is further reduced by a retaining wall that will sit approximately 30 feet from the back of curb. The PRP has required that the landscape wall associated with the driveway be set a minimum of 40 feet from the back-of-curb. That places the leading edge of the driveway 45 to 50 feet from the back-of-curb. This requirement has been met.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(E1)/LS-6
Lot Area:	44,360 SF
Lot Width:	200.0'

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Proposed
Maximum Height	35'	33.2'
Minimum Front Yard:	65' (Platted)	65.7'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	40' (Platted)	40.5'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	20'	73.0'
Minimum Combined Side Yards: (25% of Mean Lot Width)	50'	113.3'
Minimum Rear Yard: (20% of Mean Lot Depth)	38.0' (At closest point)	49.9'
Detached Accessory Building Min. Front Yard: (When located in the side yard)	60'	65.0'
Detached Accessory Building Min Side Yard:	10'	24'
Detached Accessory Building Max area:	360 SF (Total)	N/A
Lot Coverage:	8,985 SF	5,890 SF (62.52% of Max)

Address	Lot Area	Lot Coverage	Ordinance Limit	% max used
6640 Indian Lane	44,360	3,686	8,985	41.03%
6630 Indian Lane	38,391	4,106	8,126	50.53%
6635 Indian Lane	55,360	3,394	10,480	32.39%
3600 W 67th Street	35,127	6,142	7,639	80.40%
6632 Wenonga Road	40,902	4,196	8,492	49.41%
			Average	50.75%
			50% Increase	76.12%
6640 Indian Lane	44,360	5,890	8,985	65.56%
Allowable Lot Coverage as reduced by 150% Rule			6,840	86.12%

#3 Trey & Bethany Humphrey

5800 State Line Road

The Humphreys are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. The changes include multiple revisions to the rear of the house.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

At the northwest corner of the property, a large portion of an existing driveway will be demolished and turned into lawn space.

An existing pergola and associated support structure is being demolished in its entirety. A new pergola structure has been proposed at the center of the patio. The pergola will have a simple steel structure with cedar rafters

At the rear patio, the existing brick surface will be replaced with limestone pavers. The patio will be expanded 15 feet to the south. An existing rubble stone site wall and steps around the existing patio will be demolished and replaced with a new stucco site wall, 24 inches tall, with limestone steps and a limestone cap. The layout of the wall will have a slightly different configuration.

A new outdoor kitchen is proposed at the north end of the patio. It is incorporated into the site wall, with a thinner secondary stucco wall. Similarly, a new water feature has been proposed at the west side of the patio between the pergola and the outdoor kitchen. The water feature is surrounded on three sides with a wood bench. The top of the water feature is lower than the adjacent perimeter wall.

A new fire pit is proposed at the south end of the patio. The wall around the fire pit will match the patio perimeter wall.

Just to the north of the patio, the Humphreys are requesting approval for an optional hot tub. The tub will sit on a small wood deck that is set on grade.

An iron fence that encircles the existing patio will be partially demolished as part of the project. The portion of the fence that encircles the yard will remain.

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.

#4 Matt & Kristen Holton

5828 Pembroke Court

The Holtons 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 Holtons were originally approved for multiple cosmetic modifications. They are now proposing additional changes.

They are proposing a half-round addition to the front entry. Photos of a similar project have been included in the packet. The addition is a semicircular structure to house the front door and side lights. The construction is almost entirely trim with a domed copper roof.

Additionally, the Holtons are proposing to add copper chimney pots to all of the home's chimneys. The exact design of the pots has not been finalized.

At the rear of the house, the original plan was to replace two small windows with one larger opening. The location of the existing electrical meter did not allow for this change, so the Holtons are now proposing two oculus windows flanking the electrical meter.

Lastly, the original approval included removing a section of flat roof at the main ridge. That area housed two air conditioning units. The Holtons are proposing to relocate these units to the north (right) side of the house adjacent to an existing unit.

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.

#5 Forest & Holly Milledge*

6426 Sagamore Road

The Milledges are proposing to replace an air conditioning unit at the side of their home.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The existing unit is a non-conforming structure because it is located at the side of the house less than 10 feet from the side property line. The exact distance to the side property line has not been provided. Clarification is required.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of City ordinance 5-120 G which requires accessory structures, located in the side yard, to be a minimum of 10 feet from the side property line. A variance of 4 to 6 feet is required. Please note, this is an existing condition.

Design Guideline Review:

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

* A variance is required.

The Shultzes are proposing a new Southern Colonial Revival home with a 4,724 sq. ft. footprint. The footprint is roughly 53% larger than the existing home. The footprint consists of 3,392 sq. ft. of first floor living space, a 320 sq. ft. screened porch and 304 sq. ft. of covered porches and 708 sq. ft. in the attached garage. The project includes a direct drive with a front entry garage. The home has been set back 7 ft. from the front building line so that the front porch will not violate City ordinance.

The proposed project is a substantial construction matter and was noticed as such.

Summary of Property:

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front & Side
- Any Special Frontages: Intersection Green

Summary of Project:

The house has a central vertical massing style. It is 1-story at the central mass with flanking side wings. The east (left) side wing steps in and down from the main mass and contains the 2-car gage. The west (right) side wing steps down from the main mass and has a ridge height similar to the east wing. Two 1-story rear wings flank the rear of the house. One is tight to the west side of the house while the east side rear wing steps toward the center of the house as it goes back.

The proposed house is maintaining the existing topography, with minimal grading, which is in keeping with the rest of the street. The finished floor of the house will be approximately even with the existing house. The main ridge of the house will be approximately 1 foot lower than the 2-story house to the left and approximately 7 feet higher than the 1-story home to the right.

The house is sided entirely with lap siding and wood trim. The siding and garage doors will be painted white and the shutters will be painted black. The roof is a composition shingle in a charcoal or black color. There will be two exterior light fixtures on either side of the front door and the remaining lights will be recessed into the soffits. The front porch material is brick.

Windows are a combination of fixed and double-hung. All the windows have Colonial muntin bars. At the front of the house, the proposed dormers stack over first floor windows. The window arrangement remains fairly formal for the majority of the house. The windows at the sides reflect the rooms they serve. There is brick molding and sill extensions on all the windows without shutters.

The garage is a front entry with a simple direct driveway. Front facing driveways are common in the Suburban character area and are not specifically discouraged.

The HVAC equipment is located at the east side of the house behind a projecting wing.

A new patio is located between the two rear wings. It is a simple concrete rectangle with a brick border.

Three trees are being removed as part of the project.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Design Guideline Review:

Section 1.4.4 on page 52 of the Design Guidelines provides a description of the Suburban character area. This section states that the Suburban area is characterized by the horizontal massing style or mostly 1 story homes. The proposed house uses the central vertical massing style which is not common to this character area. The PRP discussed how the house sits near the transition area where central vertical massing is more prevalent.

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

Subsection A suggests that the main mass of the house should be between 40% and 50% of the lot width. At 36 feet wide (33% of lot width), the main mass is slightly narrower than recommended. This issue is lessened by the two side wings that are well proportioned to the main mass giving the front of the house a front elevation in keeping with the neighborhood. This section also suggests that the depth of the main mass should not be more than 50% of the width. Since the main mass is rather narrow, it is significantly deeper than recommended. Again this is mitigated by the side wings that round out the overall mass of the house. This section goes on to recommend that the height of the house be limited to 30 feet. This recommendation has been met.

Subsection C recommends side wings located in the primary building area be clearly shorter than the main mass. The proposed wings are subordinate to the main mass in height and are well proportioned.

Subsection D recommends rear wings located in the secondary building area be subordinate in height and clearly less than the main mass. The height should be no more than 30 feet and the depth should be no more than 24 feet. This recommendation has been met. This section also suggests that rear wings in the conditional building area be limited to 1-story and 16 feet in height. The screened porch wing is approximately 18 inches too tall. The PRP discussed this and concluded that any design modification that would eliminate the violation would be detrimental to the overall design. This section goes on to suggest that if multiple rear wings are proposed, the spacing between the wings would be no less than the eave height of the taller wing, nor less than half the length of the longer wing. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.6.4 on page 89 of the Design Guidelines provides recommendations for lot coverage. The section suggests that lot coverage be limited and should not exceed an increase of 50% over the average percentage maximum lot coverage that is being used by the neighboring properties. This recommendation has been met. Refer to the table below for more information.

Subsection G recommends all driveways to be direct drives and occupy as little of the primary landscape area as possible. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.2 A on page 101 recommends garages be set behind the façade of the main house mass. This proposed garage is front facing, but the Guidelines do allow for this when unavoidable or common to the neighborhood.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R1(16)/LS-3
Lot Area:	20,208 SF
Lot Width:	109.85'

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Proposed
Maximum Height	35'	28.6'
Minimum Front Yard:	60' (Platted)	66' (59' to covered porch)
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	12.33'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	15.47'
Minimum Combined Side Yards: (25% of Mean Lot Width)	27.56'	27.8'
Minimum Rear Yard: (20% of Mean Lot Depth)	35.0' (At closest point)	43.0'
Lot Coverage:	5,202 SF	4,724 SF (90.81% of Max)

Address	Lot Area	Lot Coverage	Formula	% max used
3021 West 67th Terrace (Existing)	20,208	3,092	5,202	59.44%
3012 West 67th Terrace	15,467	3,118	4,320	72.18%
3002 West 67th Terrace	19,014	4,245	4,987	85.13%
3111 West 67th Terrace	20,890	3,147	5,324	59.11%
3103 West 67th Terrace	20,619	2,974	5,275	56.37%
3011 West 67th Terrace	21,301	4,266	5,396	79.06%
3001 West 67th Terrace	19,196	2,896	5,020	57.69%
3110 West 68th Street	22,787	3,718	5,655	65.75%
3100 West 68th Street	26,444	3,719	6,271	59.30%
3040 West 68th Street	21,350	4,293	5,405	79.43%
			Average	67.35%
			50% Increase	100.00%
3021 West 67th Terrace (Proposed)	20,208	4,724	5,202	90.81%
Allowable Lot Coverage as reduced by 150% Rule			5,202	90.81%