

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

March 1, 2022

3:00 p.m.

Site Visit at 5550 High Drive at 1:30 p.m.

Pre-meeting to begin at 2:00 p.m.

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| #1 | <del>Kyle &amp; Karina Ginavan</del> *† CONT'D TO MARCH 15<br>2600 West 68 <sup>th</sup> Street | <del>Addition and pool</del><br><i>Continued from February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</i>             |
| #2 | <del>Bill &amp; Sue Ann Douglas</del> CONT'D TO MARCH 15<br>5832 High Drive                     | <del>Hammerhead and landscape plan</del><br><i>Continued from February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</i> |
| #3 | Todd & Gina Vizthum<br>2225 Stratford Road  | Window replacements  |
| #4 | Heidi Peter<br>5800 High Drive  | New patio / Driveway / Landscaping   |
| #5 | Laura & Charlie Hammond*<br>6439 Ensley Lane  | Perimeter fence  |
| #6 | Willoughby & Christy Johnson-Miller<br>2112 West 61 <sup>st</sup> Terrace                       | Detached garage / Driveway extension /<br>Retaining walls / Stairs                                 |

\*Variance required. † Substantial Construction

The Ginavans are proposing a whole house remodel that includes a new front driveway, new rear covered porch, outdoor kitchen, rear balcony, and a new pool. The project also includes various cosmetic modifications to the existing house.

The pool, outdoor kitchen and the covered porch are all considered outdoor recreation areas which are substantial construction matters as defined by Code Section 5-103.122. The project was noticed as such.

*This project was continued at the November 9, 2021, ARB meeting to allow for further design development. The project was continued at the December 14, 2021 meeting because revised drawings did not arrive in a timely manner. The project was continued at the January 4, 2022 meeting at the owner's request. The project was continued at the January 18, 2022 and February 15, 2022 meetings so a final site plan/survey can be provided.*

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Lot Coverage of roofed structures:**

House Footprint:	3,517 sf
<u>Covered Patio:</u>	<u>874 sf</u>
Total lot coverage:	4,391 sf

**Summary of Project:**

The existing direct driveway will be removed and replaced with a new direct drive that is significantly wider. A new walkway will connect the driveway to the front door, similar to the existing walkway.

The new covered porch spans the majority of the rear of the house, with a gabled portion extending into the rear yard. The gabled portion is a post and beam system that is partially enclosed. The remaining rear porch has a flat roof with a second-floor roof deck. A new stair connects the roof deck to a rear patio. The railings for the terrace and stair are not specified.

The new outdoor kitchen is housed within the rear porch. Two grills are housed within the porch, one of which is contained within a chimney structure. The second, a gas grill, does not have clear venting capabilities.

The pool is located behind the new rear porch and is connected to an existing rear wing by a small concrete pad. The rest of the pool does not have a deck around it. The pool equipment is not indicated on the plan.

**Clarification is required.**

Cosmetic modifications include: A new standing seam metal roof at the front entry. Various new windows throughout the house. New shutters on multiple windows on all sides of the house. New portico roof at all rear wing stoops. Various cedar trim throughout the house.

---

\* A variance is required.  
March 1, 2022

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-123 which sets the maximum lot coverage. For this lot a maximum lot coverage of 4,289 sq. ft. is allowed, and 4,391 sq. ft. is proposed. **A variance of 102 sq. ft. is required.**

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	15,285 sf	
House Footprint:	4,391 sf	
Driveway/walkways:	945 sf	
<u>Pool/Patios:</u>	<u>709 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	9,239 sf	(60.5%)

**Design Guideline Review:**

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

Subsection D suggests that rear wings located in the conditional building area should have a height not to exceed 1 story and 16 feet. The depth should not exceed 24 feet. No more than 1 wing should encroach into the conditional building area. While the first floor portion of the rear wing is existing, the **second floor addition does not meeting the recommendations**. Not only is it a second floor, its eave heights are in excess of 18 feet, which is taller than the entire recommended height. Had the second floor be held back to the secondary building area, it would still be in violation since it is taller than 1 ½ stories and 24 feet.

Subsection G suggests that driveways occupy as little of the Primary Landscape Area as possible and recommends that a side setback be provided no less 8% of the lot width. The ARB typically waves this recommendation for lots narrower than 140 feet. **Discussion is recommended.**

Subsection H allows for compound wings where a secondary wing is attached to a primary wing. The primary wing should follow all the requirements stated above and the secondary wing should be clearly subordinate to the primary wing.

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 not been met.**

Section 2.6.4.A on page 89 discourages overbuilding by suggesting that homes avoid reaching more than 2 minimum/maximum setbacks or limits. This home is an existing non-conforming use.

Section 2.7.1 B on page 94 suggests that the number of different roof pitches should be limited to two. The new covered porch uses a roof slope that is different from the main house.

Section 2.7.1 D on page 96 recommends that all window muntins on the home be the same pattern and proportion, with few exceptions. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.2.B on page 102 recommends drives to be no more than 12 feet wide at the front property line. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-1 and 2 properties have a greenspace no less than 60% of the lot area. This recommendation has been met.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-1
Lot Area:	15,285 sf
Lot Width:	100.00

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	20' (existing)
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	11' (existing)
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	25% = 25'	31' (existing)
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	20% = 30.6'	31.3' (existing)
Patio/Pool Minimum Side Yard:	15'	16'
Patio/Pool Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	31'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	4,289 sf	4,391 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 9,214 sf	9,239 = 60.5%

Drainage Study Required* if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	No
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
Has there been a documented drainage complaint against the property?	No

\*See the Mission Hills website for drainage study requirements – [www.missionhillsks.gov](http://www.missionhillsks.gov)

\*The Architectural Review Board may require the drainage study be submitted before they act on the proposed project.

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
2600 W 68th St	15,285	3,812	4,289	88.88%
2601 W 68th St	21,064	4,772	5,354	89.12%
2517 W 68th St	22,108	2,745	5,537	49.57%
6724 Overhill Rd	18,662	2,649	4,922	53.82%
Average				70.30%
50% Increase				100.00%
<b>Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =</b>		4,289		

The Douglases are returning to the ARB to with changes to their previously approved project and to present their landscape plan as required.

*This project was continued at the January 18, 2022 meeting so the site plan could be revised to eliminate the front hammer head and an alternate driveway proposed. The project was continued at the February 1, 2022 and February 15, 2022 meetings at the owner's request.*

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The Douglases are proposing to add a hammer head in the front yard. As a result, they need to eliminate 259 sf of hardscape to meet the greenspace recommendation (based on their calculations). They are proposing to remove their rear patio to add more greenspace. The owners will walk out of their rear door and terrace stairs onto grass. A portion of the rear driveway surface will be removed and replaced with a plastic paving system which grass will grow in. It is not clear if this product meets the definition of greenspace.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Design Guideline Review:**

The Design Guidelines recommend that 60% of the property be greenspace. The owners are proposing changes that may cause the greenspace to be 66 sq. ft. below the greenspace recommendation depending on how permeable the grass paving system is. **This recommendation may not be met.**

The Design Guidelines recommend that whenever possible, a widened back out and maneuvering area adjacent to the garage door(s) should be behind the front building line. If it is not possible to be placed behind the front building line, it should be located between the main driveway and the nearest side property line. If there is not enough space between the main driveway and the side property line, the back out and maneuvering area can be located off of the main driveway on the interior of the property as long as it is not directly in front of the home's main entry. The size of these driveway expansion areas located in front of the front building line should be no more than 10 ft. x 20 ft. The proposed hammerhead is 22 ft. x 22 ft. **This recommendation has not been met.**

The Vitzthums are proposing multiple window replacements on all sides of their home.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The majority of the windows are being replaced with new units of the same size and style with a less dense muntin pattern. A few other windows are significantly different and listed below.

At the front of the house, the two windows flanking the front door are being replaced. The window to the left will go back with a sash 2 panes wide by 2 tall, while the window to the right is proposed as 2 panes wide by 3 tall.

At the west side of the house, two second floor triple casements are being replaced with single casements that are pushed to the outside corner. Another triple casement and a double-hung, on the first floor, are being replaced with two single casements.

At the south side of the house, a new triple casement will replace an existing single casement. At the left side of the elevation an existing triple casement will be replaced with a single casement and pushed to the outside corner. Also at the left side, an existing triple casement is being replaced and the plate height is being raised along with a roof element. The windows in an existing dormer will be replaced with larger double casement that is egress compliant. Lastly, a single casement, at the right side of the elevation, is being eliminated.

At the east elevation, a triple clear-view window is being replaced with a triple double-hung window. Also at the east side, a triple casement is being eliminated. Please note that this will result in a blank wall.

The documentation includes two windows, numbers 10 & 15, which do not appear to be listed on the elevations. **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:**

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

Ms. Peter is proposing a new patio, driveway, and landscaping.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The property has an existing circle driveway. Ms. Peter is proposing to narrow the drive lanes and move the driveway closer to the house. In the rear yard, the driveway will be squared off to eliminate an existing hammer head. The driveway material is concrete. The front stoop finish material will be changed from brick to bluestone, and an existing front terrace will be eliminated.

The proposed patio will replace a larger patio in the same area. The patio is to be constructed of concrete with bluestone pavers. A landscape bed is proposed between the house and the new patio.

A new 48-inch-tall metal fence is proposed around the perimeter of the property, but an exact fence style has not been indicated. **Clarification is required.**

With the changes to the patio and driveway, Ms. Peter is proposing new landscaping. Notable elements include three new street trees and extensive perimeter plantings. **NOTE:** Street trees are planted by the City. Ms. Peter will need to propose new locations out of the right-of-way. There will be a stepping stone walk from the front around to the south side of the rear patio. Brick steps and a stone patio near the rear property line are being removed.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	20,032 sf	<i>(per survey)</i>
House Footprint:	1,960 sf	
Proposed Driveway:	3,982 sf	
Front stoop walkway:	81.5 sf	
<u>Proposed Patio:</u>	<u>590 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	13,418.5 sf	(66.9%)

**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 G suggests that driveways occupy as little of the Primary Landscape Area as possible. Circle driveways should have an interior green with a width no less than 80 feet wide, measured at the front property line, and depth of 40 feet measured from the curb. The proposed driveway has an interior green 60 feet wide and 66 feet deep. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Section 2.7.2.B on page 102 recommends drives to be no more than 12 feet wide at the front property line. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-3, 4 and 5 properties have a greenspace no less than 65% of the lot area. This recommendation has been met.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)LS-3
Lot Area:	20,032 sf
Lot Width:	100'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 13,021 sf	13,418.5 sf = 66.9%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	Yes
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
Has there been a documented drainage complaint against the property?	No

*\*See the Mission Hills website for drainage study requirements – [www.missionhillsks.gov](http://www.missionhillsks.gov)*

*\*The Architectural Review Board may require the drainage study be submitted before they act on the proposed project.*



**#5 Laura & Charlie Hammond\***

**6439 Ensley Lane**

The Hammonds are proposing a perimeter fence.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed fence is a 4-foot tall, flat top, black iron fence.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-132 B 1 which states that for properties with platted setbacks, the platted setback applies even if the proposed project meets the zoning regulations. The proposed fence sits 13 feet inside the platted setback. **A variance of 13 feet is required.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.6.3 A on page 83 of the Design Guidelines provides recommendations for fences on corner lots. This section recommends that fences not disrupt the streetside greenspace by being placed outside of the building line. **This recommendation has not been met.**

---

\* A variance is required.  
March 1, 2022

#6 Willoughby & Christy Johnson-Miller

2112 West 61<sup>st</sup> Terrace

The Johnson-Millers are proposing a new detached garage, driveway extension, retaining walls, and site stairs.

Summary of Property:

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

Lot Coverage Review:

Main floor living area:	1,869 sf
<u>Detached Garage: (new)</u>	<u>460 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	2,329 sf

Summary of Project:

The proposed detached garage is located at the northwest corner of the property directly behind the existing driveway. It is partially set into the site to keep the garage door close to the same elevation as the existing door. The proposed driveway extension ties the new garage to the existing drive. The proposed stone retaining walls allow for a new stair to be added that provides access from the driveway to the rear patio and the back of the house. A new walkway will connect the stair landing to an existing rear patio.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	13,451 sf	Per Johnson County
House Footprint:	2,329 sf	
<u>Driveway and walkway:</u>	<u>2,456 sf</u>	
Provided Greenspace:	8,666 sf (64.4%)	

Design Guideline Review:

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

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(10)/LS-1
Lot Area:	13,451 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Detached Accessory Building Minimum Side Yard:	10'	10.1'
Detached Accessory Building Minimum Rear Yard:	10'	10.1
Lot Coverage	3,920 sf	2,329 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 8,070 sf	8,666 sf = 64.4%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	No
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
Has there been a documented drainage issue for this property?	No

\*See the Mission Hills website for drainage study requirements – [www.missionhillsks.gov](http://www.missionhillsks.gov)

\*The Architectural Review Board may require the drainage study be submitted before they act on the proposed project.