

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

April 12, 2022

3:00 p.m.

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

## #1 Consent Agenda

- A. **Lucas & Brook Pitts** – 2011 West 70<sup>th</sup> Terrace Exterior modifications / Door changes
- B. **Angie Smith** – 2201 Stratford Road Remove window and move another to front of home
- C. **Cyd Slayton & Madeleine McDonough** – 3021 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street Skylight

## #2 **Bill & Sue Ann Douglas** 5832 High Drive

Changes to previously approved project  
*Continued from March 29<sup>th</sup> mtg*

## #3 **Rob & Silvey Brookby** 6520 Overbrook Road

Replacing retaining walls

## #4 **Jason Walker** 2026 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street

Replace all windows on house with few  
modifications / New garage door

## #5 **Cory & Carie Fisher** 3409 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street

New addition on the side and rear of home

## #6 **Kurt Junger\*** 6612 Overhill Road

Replace retaining wall, fence and walkway

## #7 **Michael & Natalie O'Shaughnessy\*** 6225 Ensley Lane

Gate across driveway /  
Replace garage doors

## #8 **Nick & Clare Blasi** 6640 Indian Lane

Changes to previously approved project  
*Continued from March 29<sup>th</sup> mtg*

\*Variance required. † Substantial Construction

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. Lucas & Brook Pitts

2011 West 70<sup>th</sup> Terrace

The Pitts are proposing to replace their exterior siding and windows as well as their front and back door.

#### Summary of Property:

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

#### Summary of Project:

The proposed siding is a combination of Hardie plank, with a 7-inch exposure, and natural cedar shingles, also with a 7-inch exposure.

All of the windows are being replaced with the same size and style of windows. The majority of the windows are double-hung with full Colonial style muntin bars. They are proposing to replace an existing sliding glass door with a new pair of French doors with sidelights. The front door is proposed as a new  $\frac{3}{4}$  glass door and an existing basement window will be replaced with a clear-view egress casement window.

#### 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. Angie Smith**

**2201 Stratford Road**

Ms. Smith is proposing to remove a window and relocate a second window at the front of her home.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

A single casement window, at the front of the house, will be removed and replaced with a relocated triple casement window from the same façade. The wall where the window was removed will be filled in to match the surrounding construction.

**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. Cyd Slayton & Madeleine McDonough**

**3021 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street**

The Slayton/McDonoughs are proposing to add a skylight at the rear of their home.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed skylight is located at the back of the house. A small dormer-like structure will be added to make a flat spot for the skylight to be mounted into.

This project was submitted and approved in December of 2020 and the approval has since expired.

**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 Bill & Sue Ann Douglas

5832 High Drive

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 has been continued multiple times so the site plan could be revised. The project was continued at the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting 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 and relocate their front walkway. They are also proposing to remove their rear patio and add a stone step at the bottom of exterior stairs. They are proposing to remove their rear patio to add more 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 new home was approved before the greenspace recommendation was adopted but it was approved on the condition that the greenspace be 60% of the lot area. The owners are proposing changes that will cause the greenspace to be below the recommended greenspace area. **This recommendation has not been 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 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 area of hardscape added to the driveway for parking is larger than 10 ft. x. 120 ft. **This recommendation has not been met.**

### Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	17,484 sf	per property survey
House Footprint:	3,334 sf	
Front porch/stoop & stairs:	115 sf	
Driveway	3,616 sf	
<u>Miscellaneous hardscape</u>	<u>529 sf</u>	
Total Non-Greenspace Area	7,594 sf	
Total Greenspace Area	9,890 sf	56.57%

### #3 Rob & Silvey Brookby

6520 Overbrook Road

The Brookbys are proposing to replace 75 sf of railroad tie retaining walls.

#### Summary of Property:

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

#### Summary of Project:

The retaining wall is mostly located in the right side yard stretching from the front yard to the rear. At its tallest point, the wall is 32 inches tall. The wall construction is proposed as segmented concrete blocks with a matching cap.

#### Ordinance Compliance:

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

#### Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.3 C on page 109 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for garden walls. This section recommends garden walls be constructed of brick, stone, or stucco compatible with the design of the main house. Segmented concrete block walls are generally discouraged, especially when visible from the street. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(16)/LS-2
Lot Area:	19,020 sf
Lot Width:	135'8"

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height: (Above average grade)	MHZO-35'/DG-30'	16.5'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	25' platted setback	30.1'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	30.75'
Minimum Side Yard Combined	30% = 41'	60.85'
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	15% = 22.9'	25'4"
Pool/Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	N/A
Pool/Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	20'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	4,522 sf	3,838 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 11,412 sf	12,204 sf = 64.16%
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 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.

## #4 Jason Walker

2026 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street

The Walkers are proposing to replace all the windows in the house with a few modifications and replace the garage doors.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The existing windows are typically casement windows, most with horizontal muntin bars.

All of the proposed windows are clear view, most are casements to match the existing, but several are proposed as sliding windows.

The proposed garage doors are all aluminum full glass doors.

### Ordinance Compliance:

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

### Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.1 D on page 96 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for windows and doors. This section suggests that muntin bars should match the given style of the home. Since all windows are being changed to clear-view, the ARB may find the change acceptable. **Discussion is recommended.** This section also discourages the use of horizontal sliding windows, but allows the ARB discretion at the rear of the house. **Discussion is recommended.**

The Fishers are proposing a new addition on the side and rear of their existing home.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Lot Coverage Review:**

Existing Footprint:	2334 sf
<u>Proposed Addition:</u>	<u>332 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	2,666 sf

**Summary of Project:**

The new addition is 1-story near the front of the house and two stories at the rear. All materials, detailing and fenestration match the main house.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	19,830 sf	
House Footprint:	2,666 sf	
Driveway:	2,499 sf	
Existing Shed:	207 sf	
Equipment pad:	23 sf	
<u>Patios and walkways:</u>	<u>905 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	13,530 sf	68.2%

**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 C suggests that side wings, located in the secondary building area should have a height up to 2-stories and 30 feet, but clearly less than the main mass. These recommendations have been met.

Subsection D suggests that rear wings located in the primary or secondary building areas can be up to 2 stories and 30 feet tall but clearly less than the main mass. Rear wings should have a width clearly less than the main mass and should not exceed 50% of the main mass width. Spacing between wings should no less than the eave height of the taller wing. These recommendations have 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.

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 recommendation has 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-2
Lot Area:	19,830 sf
Lot Width:	97.0'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	8.8'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	16.13'
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	25% = 24.25'	24.93'
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	20% = 41.2'	92' (Existing)
Maximum Lot Coverage:	5,134 sf	2,666 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 11,898 sf	13,530 = 68.2%

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

**#6 Kurt Junger\***

**6612 Overhill Road**

Mr. Junger is proposing to replace an existing retaining wall, fence and walkway at the north side of their property.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed walkway replaces an existing walkway in a new configuration. It is located on the north side of the house and connects the existing driveway to the existing patio. Please note, the other patio replacement work is under a separate permit application.

The proposed retaining wall is 3'-4" tall at its tallest point and will be constructed of stone. The proposed fence is five feet tall. It is located on top of the wall in the rear yard.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

City Code Section 5-138 B states that fences can be constructed on top of a retaining wall provided that the total height of the fence and retaining wall meets maximum height requirements. As such, the project is in violation of City Code Section 5-135 A 1 which limits the height of fences to 6 feet. **A variance of 3 feet is required.**

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	15,379 sf	
House Footprint:	3,362 sf	
Existing Patios & Walkways:	2,044 sf	
<u>Driveway:</u>	<u>2,181 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	7,792 sf	50.6%

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-1 properties have a greenspace no less than 60% of the lot area. This recommendation has not been met. This is an existing condition that is not affected by this project.

---

\* A variance is required

**#7 Michael & Natalie O’Shaughnessy\***

**6225 Ensley Lane**

The O’Shaughnessy’s are proposing a gate across their existing side-entry driveway.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed gate is set between two brick pilasters 34’-7” behind the 63<sup>rd</sup> street curb.

The O’Shaughnessy’s are also proposing to replace their existing garage doors with new carriage style doors.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-135 D 1 which allows a solid fence/gate to be located in the corner lot streetside greenspace provided that it extends no further from the house than 30% of the distance from the house to the curb. The proposed gate extends closer to the street than allowed at 55% of the distance. **A variance of 19.6 feet is required for the proposed location.**

Alternately, if the fence was 75% open, the project would be in violation of City Code Section 5-135 D 2 which allows a fence that is 75% open to be located in the corner lot streetside greenspace provided that it extends no further from the house than 50% of the distance between the house to the back of curb. **A variance of 4’1” would be required.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

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

---

\* A variance is required

The Blasis are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. The Blasis are proposing a new configuration for their pool fence and pool decks.

Please note: There are still outstanding issues regarding:

1. Stacked stone wall – location varies from what was approved by the ARB.
2. The landscape final inspection has not been completed as they are waiting on plant material, but we have discussed 2 issues so far.
  - a. Plantings in the right-of-way
  - b. Variations from landscape plan

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

At the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting, the ARB requested that an as-built survey be provided for the south portion of the property because it appeared that the submitted site plan did not match existing conditions. The as-built survey has been submitted and indicates that the pool fence is located 18 ft. into the platted setback area instead of the 10 ft. granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The Blasis are proposing to move the fence so that it meets the variance granted by the BZA.

The pool deck was reconfigured by moving a seating area from the west/back side of the pool to the south side of the pool. The as-built survey indicates that two portions of the south pool deck are in the platted setback area. These sections will either need to be removed or the revised pool deck will need ARB approval and a variance from the BZA.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

On December 2, 2020 the Blasis presented a different fence configuration to the BZA that was denied, but at that meeting the BZA granted a variance of an alternate fence that extends no more than 10 feet into the platted minimum side yard with the stipulation that the design must also be submitted and approved by the ARB. The newly proposed fence location meets this variance requirement.

**Design Guideline Review:**

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