

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

July 23, 2019

3:00 p.m.

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

## #1 CONSENT AGENDA

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| A. Scott & Ashley Fillmore – 7030 Belinder Avenue | Eliminate rear columns from project |
| B. Judson Bertsch – 6735 Belinder Avenue          | Replace wood siding with stucco     |
| C. Jan & Patty Stenerud – 6955 Overhill Road      | Replace fence                       |
| D. Anne Darby – 6526 Rainbow Avenue *             | Replace A/C unit                    |

## #2 Todd & Sandra Morgan 2921 W. 69<sup>th</sup> Street

Exterior modifications; new rear patio

## #3 Gary & Janet Hall \* 2901 W. 68<sup>th</sup> Street

Changes to previously approved project; landscape plan

\* 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. Scott & Ashley Fillmore**

**7030 Belinder Avenue**

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

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

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

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

At the rear of the house, the original design includes architectural columns at the edges of selected rear wings. These columns were strictly decorative. The Fillmores are proposing to eliminate these decorative elements.

#### **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.

**B. Judson Bertsch**

**6735 Belinder Avenue**

Mr. Bertsch is proposing to replace existing siding at the north and south sides of his home.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The existing wood siding is weathered. Mr. Bertsch is proposing to replace weathered sections of the wood siding with stucco to match the existing stucco on 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.

**C. Jan & Patty Stenerud**

**6955 Overhill Road**

The Steneruds are proposing to replace their existing fence which is partially single sided wood picket and partial iron.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

All of the proposed fences are 6 feet tall and all along the north side of the property. Approximately 60 linear feet of the fence is wood picket and the remaining 60 linear feet is iron picket.

**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. Anne Darby \***

**6526 Rainbow Avenue**

Ms. Darby is proposing to replace her existing A/C unit with a similar unit.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The existing house is 12.4 feet off of the property line. The A/C unit is 8.5 feet off of the property line.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-120.G which requires accessory structures have a minimum side yard setback of 10 feet. **A 1.5 foot variance 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.

**#2 Todd & Sandra Morgan**

**2921 West 69<sup>th</sup> Street**

The Morgans are proposing a remodel that includes various changes at the exterior of the house.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

At the front of the house, new planter boxes are proposed at an existing bay window. They are also planning to replace the garage doors and the front door. New columns are proposed at the front porch. To the side of the front door, a new window well is proposed.

At the rear of the house, a rear entry is being reconfigured swapping the location of a door and a window. They are also planning to replace the patio with a new scored concrete patio. The grill shown on the elevation drawings is portable and not built-in. A new bar is located on the rear patio under the kitchen window.

At the left (east) side of the house, two existing windows are proposed to be replaced with a new unit of a similar style but smaller size.

**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 Gary & Janet Hall \*

2901 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street

The Halls are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. They are also proposing their landscape plan as required.

#### Summary of Property:

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

#### Summary of Project:

The landscape plan shows extensive plantings throughout the property.

At the front of the house, new coach lamps are proposed to flank the existing entry in lieu of a single lamp over the door. Two small limestone landscape walls are proposed near the front entry. The plan for the front walkway has changed to be wider at the front porch and narrow as it connects to the driveway.

At the east side of the house, a new concrete block retaining wall is proposed near the existing creek wall. The height of the wall varies but is approximately 3 feet tall at its highest point. A small generator yard is proposed near the back of the house, constructed of the same concrete block. The height of the generator wall is not indicated on the plan, but the top of wall sits below the belt course of the house.

The hammerhead at the back of the driveway is now proposed to be considerably wider and extend into the minimum rear yard behind the rear of the house. A new fence is proposed along the driveway, but a height has not been indicated. Another fence is proposed along the creek wall. Clarification is required. Please note, given the placement of the fence, it must be no taller than 4 feet to prevent the need for a variance.

Also at the rear of the house, the rear patio is now proposed to extend further east along the back of the house. Additionally, the Halls are proposing to change the previously approved brick fireplace, at the screened porch, to stone. The other chimney at the main mass will remain brick.

#### Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-103.129 which limits the width of walkways to 5 feet, excluding flares. The proposed walkway is 6 feet wide at the front porch and the driveway.

**A variance of 1 foot is required at both locations.**

#### Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.3 A on page 104 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendation for landscaping. This section recommends seamlessly blending the front landscaping with the adjacent neighbors. The extensive front landscaping could take away from this integration.

**Discussion is recommended.**

Section 2.7.3 B on page 107 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for Garden walls and fences. This section suggests that retaining walls should be clad in brick, stone or stucco and be compatible with the main mass of the house. The limestone landscape walls at the front of the house do this, but the concrete block retaining wall at the rear of the house does not. Considering the use of natural stone on the property and the close proximity to the stone wall of the creek, this wall may be better suited to be stone. **Discussion is recommended.**

\* A variance is required.