

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

April 30, 2019

3:00 p.m.

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

#1	<b>Jim &amp; Becky Tilden</b> 2500 Arno Road	Replace deck with composite materials
#2	<b>Pamela Wrisley</b> 6545 Overbrook Road	Replace patio; add screened porch
#3	<b>Richard &amp; Sabrina Korentager</b> 2500 W. 65 <sup>th</sup> Street	Patio w/ partial roof; outdoor fireplace
#4	<b>David &amp; Christina Noelle Manica</b> 5933 Overhill Road	One-story addition
#5	<b>Rick &amp; Mary Schultz</b> 3021 W. 67 <sup>th</sup> Terrace	Changes to previously approved project
#6	<b>Pat &amp; Sarah Thelen *</b> 3309 W. 68 <sup>th</sup> Street	Changes to previously approved project
#7	<b>Amy Ortman &amp; Charles Payne *</b> 3130 Tomahawk Road	Convert circle drive to direct drive w/ parking area; new patio and water feature
#8	<b>Michael &amp; Natalie O'Shaughnessy *</b> 6225 Ensley Lane	New patios, sidewalks and fence; replace pedestrian bridge
#9	<b>Kevin &amp; Janell Caponecchi *</b> 6012 Mission Drive	Changes to previously approved project; new iron fencing and trellis; modify bridge rails

\* 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 Jim & Becky Tilden**

**2500 Arno Road**

The Tildens are proposing to replace their existing deck with a new deck in the same location and configuration, using composite materials.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The new deck will have the same footprint and layout, but will use Fiberon composite decking and an iron railing.

**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.

**#2 Pamela Wrisley**

**6545 Overbrook Road**

The Wrisleys are proposing to replace their existing patio and add a new screened porch.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed patio and porch are located near the center of the house at a nook between a rear wing and a side wing. The porch extends 9 feet into the rear yard and the patio extends an additional 13 feet. Both are 17 feet wide. The porch will have a low slope roof with eaves that roughly align with the existing north side wing.

**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.

**#3 Richard & Sabrina Korentager**

**2500 West 65<sup>th</sup> Street**

The Korentagers are proposing a patio and outdoor fireplace at the rear of their home. A large portion of the patio will be covered with a new roof structure.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed patio is located at the middle of the house and extends 33 feet into the rear yard. The outdoor fireplace is located at the rear of the new patio. It is all stone and stands 9 feet tall.

A new panoramic door is proposed at the rear of the house. It will replace an existing screened porch at the rear of the house.

The covered portion of the patio is located to side of the main patio. The covering is a simple post and beam structure with an open truss system. The eaves of the roof sit lower than the eaves of the main house and feature exposed rafter tails. The roofing material is not specified, but appears to match the main roof of the house.

**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 Manicas are proposing a one-story addition at the north side of their home.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

All materials and detailing are to match the existing house. The only difference from the main house is the addition lacks any fenestration. While this is not explicitly forbidden, the ARB does not regularly approve entirely windowless wings.

As part of the project, all of the home's HVAC equipment and generators will be relocated into an equipment yard located behind the new addition.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Design Guideline Review:**

With the exception of Modern homes, the Design Guidelines generally discourage large expanses of windowless walls.

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

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

At the left side of the house, the Shultzes are proposing to omit a window near the screened porch.

At the July 24, 2018 ARB meeting, the Shultzes were approved to extend the screened porch further into the rear yard. They are now requesting to extend the patio next to the porch to match the rear edge of the porch. Similarly, they are proposing to extend the main patio, located between the two rear wings, further into the rear yard.

The original house was designed with a direct driveway that conforms to the Design Guidelines. They are now proposing to maintain the width of the driveway for the full length of the drive.

The Schultzes are also presenting their landscape plan as required. Please note, there are significant differences, regarding the front porch and stoop, between the proposed landscape plan and the approved site plan. Clarification is required.

**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 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 B provides recommendations for driveways. This section suggests that direct width should not exceed 12 feet wide within 30 feet of the curb. **Discussion is required.**

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

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

At the rear of the new addition, the project was originally approved with a series of patio doors. The Thelens are now proposing casement windows over panels. A new door has been added to the west side of the addition.

Originally, a small portion of the existing porch was to remain open. They are now proposing to enclose the porch with a shutter system similar to the second floor.

In the front yard, the Thelens are proposing a hammerhead extension to their driveway at the front walkway.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is an existing non-conforming use that is in violation of City ordinance 5-120.A that requires the sum of the side yards be a minimum of 25% of the lot width. For this lot, the sum of the side yards should be no less than 24.38 feet. As proposed, a variance of 0.48 feet is required. Note: A variance was granted at the February BZA meeting. However, since the portion of the house, currently in violation, is being modified, the BZA must review the project again.

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.7.2 B on pages 102 through 103 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for driveways. Subsections 1 and 2 both recommend direct drives have a maximum width of 12 feet. The existing 14 foot wide drive is already in excess of this recommendation. The Design Guidelines do not specifically address hammer heads, but does suggest that maneuvering areas be located near the garage doors and behind the front building line. The proposed hammer head is in front of the building line. **Discussion is recommended.**

---

\* A variance is required.

The Ortman/Paynes are proposing to convert their existing circle driveway into a direct drive with a parking area near the house.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed parking area is approximately 22 feet deep and 20 feet wide. Directly adjacent to the parking area is a decorative gravel landscape area with large stepping stones and a concrete water feature. The height of the water feature has not been provided. **Clarification is required.**

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-119 C which forbids structures in the front yard. **A variance is required for the water feature.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

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

---

\* A variance is required.



The O'Shaughnessys are proposing multiple patios and sidewalks around their property. They are also proposing to replace an existing pedestrian bridge across the creek.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The main patio is located at the north side of the house. It is proposed to be constructed of brick and bluestone. The patio will be sand set so a variance will not be required despite its close proximity to the north property line.

At the east side of the property, an existing fence will be removed and new fence, of the same style, will be added at the property line. The rear yard is also being terrace with the installation of two 24" tall stone retaining walls. The walls are to match existing stone walls near the driveway. Brick walkways are proposed around the perimeter of the house in the rear yard. New fencing is proposed to screen the existing HVAC equipment and a new window well.

An existing concrete patio, located at the southwest corner of the house, will be resurfaced with flagstone and a brick border.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-119 C which forbids structures in the front yard. **A variance is required for the bridge. A second variance is required for the patio at the southwest corner of the house.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

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

---

\* A variance is required.

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

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Countryside Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: Creekside

**Summary of Project:**

The Caponecchis are proposing to remove three faux dormers at an existing rear wing. In the same area, two existing windows will be replaced with new units of the same size and style. The construction of the new windows will match other new windows used throughout the house. The Caponecchis are also proposing to replace all of the home's gutters with new half-round gutters that will match the home's original gutters.

In addition to the changes at the house, the Caponecchis are also proposing to modify the railings and walls at their existing driveway bridge. The low curb walls at the house side of the bridge are being modified to be 28 inches tall. New oak railings will be added at the span of the bridge.

New four-foot tall iron fencing is proposed around the entire property. A section of fence featuring a trellis is proposed where the pool patio connects to the rest of the yard. The fence also extends in front of the house near the existing pool.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-135 C which forbids fences in the front yard. **A variance is required for the bridge walls and railing. A second variance is required for the portion of fence located in the front yard.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

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

---

\* A variance is required.