

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

April 27th, 2021

3:00 p.m.

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

Please join the meeting from your PC, tablet or smartphone at <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/570744237>

You can also dial in using your phone at (Toll Free) 1 (866) 899-4679 or 1 (571) 317-3116
using Access Code: 570-744-237

Note for those calling in: The City does not want any board member or attendee to incur any cost to participate in the meeting. If you do not pay a fee for using the long distance service on your telephone, please consider using the long-distance phone number instead of the toll-free number as the City incurs a cost for each toll-free call that is placed.

#1 Consent Agenda

- A. **Meredith & Collin Cooper** – 2524 Tomahawk Road Play structure
- B. **Lauren Allen** – 6405 High Drive Window/door replacement
- C. **Robert Strohm** – 7000 Overhill Road Window addition
- D. **Mission Hills Country Club** – 5400 Mission Drive Pergola over baby pool

#2 **Dustin & Katherine Stiles** Replace siding with faux shingles / Replace windows
6624 Rainbow Avenue *Cont'd from March 30th & April 13th meetings*

#3 **David & Diane Zimmer*** Changes to previously approved project
5924 High Drive

#4 **Cale & Krista Garverick** New dormers & window changes
1901 West 69th Street

#5 **Anne & Andrew Cusser** Cosmetic modifications to existing patio
2509 West 69th Street

#6 **Anne & Al Simmons †** New screened porch; outdoor fireplace
6505 Overbrook Road

#7 **Lauren Allen** Artificial turf
6405 High Drive

#8 **Ken Block †** 1-story cabana; detached garage; outdoor living area;
2940 Verona Road driveway extension; trash enclosure

#9 **Top Choice Contracting LLC †** New home and swimming pool
2117 Drury Lane *Cont'd from April 13th*

#10 **Mark & Amy Thompson †** New home and swimming pool
3728 West 65th Street

*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. Meredith & Collin Cooper

2524 Tomahawk Road

The Coopers are proposing a new play structure in their rear yard.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The structure is located in the rear yard 12 feet from both the rear and left side property lines. The units are approximately 20 feet wide and just over 10 feet tall. The photographs indicate a dark brown stain.

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. Lauren Allen

6405 High Drive

Ms. Allen is proposing to replace several windows and doors at the rear of her house.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The majority of the replacements will be with new units of the same size and style. The exception is a large pair of French sliding glass doors that will be converted into two large picture windows.

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. Robert Strohm

7000 Overhill Road

Mr. Strohm is proposing an interior remodel that includes the addition of one new window to the side of the house.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The proposed window is located in an existing gable at the north side of the house. It will match a similar window at the south side 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.

D. Mission Hills Country Club

5400 Mission Drive

The Mission Hills Country Club is proposing a new pergola over their existing baby pool.

Summary of Project:

The new pergola is an all cedar post-and-beam structure. It will stand approximately 11 feet tall and is located over a portion of the baby pool.

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 Dustin & Katherine Stiles

6624 Rainbow Avenue

The Stiles are proposing to replace all their existing siding with new faux shake shingles. They would also like to replace all the windows on the front of the home and the easterly most window on the north side.

*This project was tentatively continued at the March 30th meeting so a sample/mockup could be provided to the City for the City Architect and/or City Planner to review. **NOTE: A sample of the proposed siding was provided and was not approved by the City Architect or City Planner. A different product will be proposed.***

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The existing home has a combination of horizontal lap siding, vertical siding, and brick. All of the vertical and horizontal lap siding will be replaced with Hardie shake shingles.

The windows will be the same size and location as the existing windows. The windows will be changed from true divided light to simulated divided light. One window has a 60/40 split between the lower and upper sash and is being replaced with a 50/50 split. There is a triple window that is being replaced with a single fixed window.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Design Guideline Review:

While not specifically forbidden, the ARB has typically rejected several of the Hardie shingle products due to their flat appearance. This is especially true of the panelized products.

Sample/mockup review is recommended.

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

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

Portions of the fence interfere with an existing tree. The fence construction in this area does not match the pre-approved fence style.

Portions of the fence exceed the 6-foot maximum height allowed in the rear yard. The ARB can approve up to a 7-foot fence in the rear yard.

Portions of the fence exceed the 6-foot maximum height allowed in the side yard. This is primarily due to the proximity of the new fence to a neighbor's retaining wall. A shallow swale follows the property line which makes the fence taller on the neighbor's side.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-135 B 2 which limits the height of fences in the side yard to 6 feet. The tallest location found was 7 foot 2 inches. **A variance of 14 inches 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.
April 27, 2021

#4 Cale & Krista Garverick

1901 West 69th Street

The Garvericks are proposing an interior remodel that includes new dormers and window changes.

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, a new dormer is proposed over the garage. A matching dormer is proposed at the rear of the house. At the left side of the house, a new window is proposed in the upper gable.

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 Anne & Andrew Cusser

2509 West 69th Street

The Cussers are proposing cosmetic modifications to their existing patio.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

An existing bar, in a covered portion of the patio, will be eliminated. The patio will be overlaid with a flagstone veneer. The existing steps, fire pit, and brick fence wall will all be overlaid with a 1” thick limestone veneer.

A new countertop is proposed at the back of the covered patio. It will consist of limestone countertop on a flagstone veneer base.

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 owners are proposing a new screened porch at the rear of their home. The project includes a new outdoor fireplace on a previously approved patio.

This is a substantial construction matter as defined by Code section 5-103.122 and was noticed as such.

Summary of Property:

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

Lot Coverage Review:

Existing Lot Coverage:	1720 sf
<u>Proposed screened porch:</u>	<u>335 sf</u>
Total Roofed Coverage:	2,055 sf

Summary of Project:

The proposed porch is located at the rear of the house at the transition from the main mass to a side wing. Due to the slope of the property, the main floor of the porch is approximately 7 feet above grade, and the main ridge is approximately 20'-6" above grade. The roof will be composition to match the main house. All upper walls are screened with the exception of the rear elevation that includes a section of siding to match the main house. The lower portion of the porch will be enclosed with horizontal cedar planks.

The proposed fireplace is at the back of a previously approved patio that is located between an existing rear wing and the new porch.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.4 on pages 68 through 71 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for the Traditional Neighborhood character area.

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. These recommendations have been met.

Section 2.7.1 B on page 94 suggests that the number of different roof pitches should be limited to two. The proposed addition uses a 5:12 pitch when the main house uses an 8:12 in addition to others. **Discussion is recommended.**

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.

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	14,390 sf
Total Roofed Coverage:	2,055 sf
Driveway:	1,033 sf
<u>Patios and walkways:</u>	<u>905 sf</u>
Remaining Greenspace:	10,397 sf (72.3%)

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(10)/LS-1
Lot Area:	14,390 sf
Lot Width:	110'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	No Change
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	25% = 27.5'	No Change
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	20% = 26.8'	38.0'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	15'	N/A
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	38.0'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	4,109 sf	2,055 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 8,634 sf	10,397 sf = 72.3%

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
Will the project cause the greenspace to be within 3% of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No

Ms. Allen is proposing to replace a portion of her rear yard with a 1,100 sq. ft. of synthetic turf material. The primary blade/yarn material is polyethylene.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The location to be replaced is a free form shape at the center of the rear yard.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-132 B 8 (b) that limits the amount of artificial turf, in the rear yard, to 250 square feet or less. 1,100 square feet are proposed. **A variance of 850 square feet is required.**

The project is further in violation of Code Section 5-132 B 8 (c) which prohibits blade/yarn material to be polyethylene or polyethylene blends. **A 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.
April 27, 2021

#8 Ken Block

2940 Verona Road

The Blocks are proposing a new 1-story cabana with a 1,219 sq. ft. footprint in their rear yard and an 809 sq. ft. detached garage located in the north side yard. The project includes a new stone paver pool deck, patio, hot tub and swim spa. A small driveway extension is proposed for the new garage, along with a new trash enclosure.

This is a substantial construction mater as defined by code section 5-103.122 and was noticed as such.

Summary of Property:

- Character Area: Countryside Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front and Side
- Any Special Frontages: Hillside

Lot Coverage Review:

Existing Building Area:	5,156 sf
Cabana:	1,219 sf
<u>Detached Garage:</u>	<u>809 sf</u>
Total Roofed Area:	7,184 sf

Summary of Project:

An existing artificial turf putting green will be eliminated as part of the project.

An existing patio and hot tub will be removed to make way for the new patio. The new cabana is located directly west of the new patio. The patio has multiple levels and various landscape walls. The walls are noted to match existing landscape walls within the property. The stone paver material will match the existing pool deck. A decorative fence and gate separate the main patio from the lower pool deck. The new fencing will match existing fencing on the property. The proposed hot tub is located near the rear of the house and is integrated into the patio paving. Similarly, the swim spa is located near the house and integrated into the transition between the pool deck and the patio.

The new cabana consists of a mostly enclosed structure, with a large open covered patio at the east end. Most of the cabana walls are operable window walls with the exception of the west end and the two fireplaces that flank the two sides. Due to the slope of the property, the west end has a significant exposed foundation that is clad with stone to match existing stone walls on the property. The roof will be tile to match the main house. The cabana is 20.8 feet tall when measured from the new patio and 25 feet at the west end

Ordinance Compliance:

For the purposes of this review, the pool cabana building is being reviewed as a detached accessory building however Code Section 5-103.37 defines accessory buildings as being fully-enclosed with solid immovable walls, therefore the building could be interpreted as an outdoor recreational facility that does not have the same setback and area requirements.

City Code Section 5-132 E limits the height of detached garages to 24 feet or two stories tall. It is the City's policy to measure the height at the street facing side to allow for sloping sites. In this case, the cabana building is located in the center of the rear yard and does not have a street face. As such the mean height would be used which is less than the 24-foot maximum.

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

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.2 on pages 60 through 63 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for the Countryside Estates character area.

Subsection E suggests that Detached Accessory buildings located in the Secondary Building Area should have a height up to 2 stories and 24 feet with a maximum area of 720 SF. The proposed cabana footprint is over 1,219 sf, however the enclosed portion is 825 sf. The detached garage footprint is 809 sf. **Neither of the two structures meet this recommendation.** The section goes on to suggest that there should be no more than 2 Accessory Buildings per lot. 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 2.7.2 A on page 101 recommends garages be set behind the façade of the main house mass. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-6 and 7 properties have a greenspace no less than 70% of the lot area. With the proposed addition, 65.8% has been provided; however, the project is increasing the greenspace. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Greenspace Review:

Lot area: 71,873 sf
 Total roof area: 7,184 sf
Driveways, Patios and walkways: 17,413 sf
 Remaining Greenspace: 47,276 sf (65.8%)

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(E2)/ LS-6
Lot Area:	71,873 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	> 100'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	~ 51' (Existing)
Accessory Building Minimum Side Yard Setback:	10'	Cabana: > 100' Garage: 21.8'
Accessory Building Minimum Rear Yard Setback:	10'	Cabana: 49.5' Garage: > 90'
Accessory Building Maximum Area is Side Yard:	2,814 sf	809 sf
Accessory Building Maximum Area is Rear Yard:	1,876 sf	1,219 sf
Maximum Lot Coverage:	12,565 sf	7,184 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	70% = 50,311sf	47,276 sf = 65.8%

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*
Will the project cause the greenspace to be within 3% of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines?	N/A

*The property currently does not meet the greenspace recommendation.

The new owners are proposing a new 2-story home with a 3,636 sq. ft. footprint. The footprint consists of 2,547 sq. ft. of first floor living space, and an 880 sq. ft. 3-car garage. The project includes a swimming pool with a large patio and an auto-court driveway.

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

The project was continued at the March 2nd ARB meeting with the requirement that the project return to the PRP for further review.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The house is a contemporary style sided in a combination of stone and stucco. The main mass of the house is 2 stories. The main mass is flanked on both sides and the front by one-story side wings. The windows are all clear-view and most are fixed. The window arrangement is fairly formal on all sides of the house. The roof is comprised of multiple planes that all appear to have the same pitch.

The new first floor elevation is approximately 2 feet higher than the existing grade. The main floor sits 5 feet higher than the house to the right and 5 feet lower than the home to the left. The main ridge is 7.4 feet higher than the home to the right and 4 feet lower than the home to the left. Due to the different styles of the adjacent homes, eave lines are significantly different with the proposed house having eaves 14 feet higher than the home to the right and 5 feet lower than the home to the left. Significant grading is proposed at the southwest corner of the lot.

An auto-court is located near the garages and is positioned to accommodate all three garages. A hammer-head portion of the auto-court extends in front of the house along the front walkway.

The pool is proposed at the rear of the main mass. It is surrounded on all sides by a new terrace. A retaining wall is proposed at the west side. There is no indication of a code compliant pool barrier at this time. Pool equipment location is shown to the south of the single-car garage and we assume A/C units will be located there as well, but clarification is required.

Update:

Revised drawings have been provided. Eaves were extended, the ridge line lowered, and windows were changed. The front entry was revised and a 6" metal trim piece was added at the eave line.

Ordinance Compliance:

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 48 feet wide (45%), the main meets this recommendation. This section goes on to suggest that the depth of the main mass should be 25% of the lot width. **At 50 feet deep, the depth of the main mass is significantly more than 25% of the lot width.**

Subsection B suggests that front wings have a width not to exceed 50% of the main mass width. This recommendation has 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 providing that their height is less than the main mass. This recommendation has been met. This section goes on to suggest that rear wings should have a width clearly less than the main mass and should not exceed 50% of the main mass width. 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.

Section 2.7.2 A on page 101 recommends garages be set behind the façade of the main house mass. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.2.B on page 102 recommends drives 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-1 properties have a minimum of 60% greenspace. 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.

Professional Review Panel Recommendation:

The Professional Review Panel recommends approval. See PRP Recommendation.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-1
Lot Area:	15,983 SF
Lot Width:	106'

Ordinance	Allowable/Required by Ord	Proposed
Maximum Height:	35'	24'-10"
Minimum Front Yard:	50'	50'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	11.1'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	16.5'
25% Combined Side Yards:	26.5'	27.6'
Minimum Rear Yard: (20%)	30' (At closest point)	46.5'
Lot Coverage Limit:	4,420 SF	3,395 SF
Minimum Greenspace Required:	60% (9,591 SF)	9,675 SF = 60.5%

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
2117 Drury Ln	15,983	2,761	4,420	62.47%
2100 Drury Ln	18,125	2,212	4,823	45.86%
2032 Drury Ln	13,036	1,998	3,836	52.09%
2020 Drury Ln	21,745	2,994	5,474	54.69%
2035 Drury Ln	13,967	1,825	4,024	45.35%
6101 High Dr	21,239	2,438	5,385	45.27%
6105 High Dr	15,384	1,734	4,304	40.29%
2112 Brookwood	19,653	4,406	5,102	86.35%
2100 Brookwood	14,744	3,052	4,179	73.04%
2040 Brookwood	14,345	1,973	4,100	48.13%
			Average	55.35%
			50% Increase	83.03%
Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =		3,670		
2117 Drury Ln	Proposed =	3,395	76.8%	of City Ordinance Limit
			92.5%	of Design Guideline Limit

#10 Mark & Amy Thompson

3728 West 65th Street

The Thompsons are proposing a new 1 1/2-story Colonial Revival home with a 6,405 sq. ft. footprint. The footprint consists of 3,985 sq. ft. of first floor living space, a 1,015 sq. ft. 4-car garage, and 1,405 sq. ft. of covered porches. The project includes a circle driveway and a rear terrace with an outdoor kitchen.

Summary of Property:

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

Lot Coverage (Roofed Structures) Review:

Main floor living area:	3,985 sf
Main floor garage area:	1,015 sf
Covered porches:	1,405 sf
<u>Detached Accessory Buildings:</u>	<u>0 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	6,405 sf

Summary of Project:

The house is a Colonial revival style sided with brick siding. The main mass of the house is 1 story with second floor dormers. The main mass is flanked on the left side by a one-story wing that includes a 4-car garage wing. The windows are all double-hung or fixed. The window arrangement is fairly formal at the front and becomes less so at the sides and rear of the house. The roof is comprised of multiple planes with multiple pitches. Large areas of flat roofs are used to keep the height down while maintaining steep roofs. Some of these flat areas are surrounded by decorative railings.

The new first floor elevation is approximately 2 feet lower than the previous home. The main floor sits 0.9 feet lower than the house to the right and 2.2 feet lower than the home to the left. The main ridge is 1.4 feet higher than the home to the right and 6.1 feet higher than the home to the left. Both of the adjacent homes have similar eave lines.

The driveway is a simple circle drive with an auto-court located near the garage. A low retaining wall is proposed near the house to allow for a flat spot of the driveway.

The A/C equipment is located in a small equipment enclosure at the rear of the garage.

A wrap around porch encircles the back of the house. Portions are screened in and the outdoor kitchen is integrated into an open portion.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	38,578 sf
House Footprint:	6,405 sf
Driveway:	5,215 sf
Existing Rear Patio and Walls	100 sf
<u>Patios and walkways:</u>	<u>1,695 sf</u>
Remaining Greenspace:	25,263 sf

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.5 on pages 72 through 75 of the Design Guidelines 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 or 65 feet. At 66' (42%) this recommendation has been met. This section goes on to suggest that the depth of the main mass should be 25% of the lot width but need not to be less than 25 feet but should not be more than 40 feet. At 31 feet deep, this recommendation has been met. Lastly this section suggests that the height be restricted to 30 feet. At 27'-1" tall, this recommendation has been met.

Subsection B suggests that front wings have a width clearly less than the main mass unless incorporated into the main mass width using the horizontal massing style. The depth should not be greater than the main mass. The height can be up to 1 1/2-stories but clearly less than the main mass. The location should be near the front building line. There should be no more than two. If you do not count the front porch, this recommendation has been met.

Subsection C suggests that side wings, located in the primary building area, should have a depth and height up to 1 1/2 stories or 24 feet, and clearly less than the main mass. They should also be set behind the front plane of the main mass. Side wings located in the secondary building area should have a height up to 1 1/2 stories and 24 feet, and clearly less than the main mass. A small portion of the house extends into the secondary building area on both sides of the house, but all these recommendations have been met.

Subsection D suggests that rear wings located in the primary building area can have an unlimited depth, but the width should be no more than 50% of the main mass width. Their height should be limited to 1 1/2 stories and 24 feet and clearly less than the main mass. The proposed rear wing meets the depth and height requirements, but the main body of the wing is about 75% of the main mass width. This is further compounded by the large wrap around porch across the rear of the house. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Subsection E suggests that detached accessory buildings, located in the primary building area, can have an unlimited area, but should have a height up to 1 1/2 stories and 24 feet but must be subordinate to the main house. Accessory buildings located in the secondary area should have a height up to 1 1/2 stories and 24 feet with a maximum area of 720 SF. Accessory buildings located in the conditional building or primary landscape areas should be limited to 1 story with 10-foot maximum eave heights. There should be no more than 2 accessory buildings per lot.

Subsection F suggests that dormers located on wings or accessory buildings located in the Secondary or Conditional Building Areas should not be oriented toward any neighboring lots. This recommendation has been met.

Subsection G suggests that driveways occupy as little of the Primary Landscape Area as possible. On lots wider than 140 feet the driveway should be located off the side property line a distance no less than 8% of the lot width. 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. These recommendations have been met.

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. The garage wing is a compound wing that meets the recommendations.

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. The recommendation has been met. The proposed lot coverage is 100% with the future addition of future patio of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines.

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 2.7.1 B on page 94 suggests that the number of different roof pitches should be limited to two. There are three different roof pitches including the large areas of flat roofs. **Discussion is recommended.**

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 A on page 101 recommends garages be set behind the façade of the main house mass. 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. One of the two is set to 12 feet, the other is existing at 12'-7". This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS- 5 properties have a greenspace no less than 65% of the lot area. This recommendation has been met. Please note, the plans indicate a future patio, pergola, fireplace, all of these future structures were included in the greenspace calculations to ensure that the area is available for them.

City Arborist Recommendation:

The City Arborist recommends that at least two large canopy trees be planted in the front yard and two in the rear yard after construction is completed to mitigate the maple, bald cypress, cherry, beech and honey locust that are either planned for removal or likely to be removed by the end of the project. The City Arborist also indicates that a red maple, red oak, pin oak, and swamp white oak (as indicated on his review) be protected during construction.

April 27, 2021

PRP Recommendation

The PRP recommended the project be approved as submitted. They asked for precedent images for a couple of non-traditional details. There is one small trim discrepancy on the west elevation that they also requested be clarified.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(30)/ LS-5
Lot Area:	38,578 SF
Lot Width:	156.5'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35' (30' by DG)	27.1'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	15%=23.48'	27.5'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	15%=23.48'	25.3'
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	N/A	
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	30%=73.3'	77.1'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	23.8'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	>68'
Maximum Lot Coverage Limit:	8,154 by ordinance	6,405
Minimum Greenspace:	65%=25,076 SF	25,263 SF = 65.2%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	Yes
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
Will the project cause the greenspace to be within 3% of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines?	Yes

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
3728 W 65th St	38,578	4,758	8,154	58.35%
3725 W 64th St	34,323	3,818	7,518	50.79%
3715 W 64th St	29,390	3,694	6,749	54.73%
3701 W 64th St	30,211	4,901	6,880	71.24%
3816 W 65th St	37,388	4,195	7,978	52.58%
3800 W 65th St	37,085	4,257	7,933	53.66%
3716 W 65th St	40,551	4,211	8,441	49.89%
3700 W 65th St	52,190	3,004	10,059	29.86%
			Average	51.82%
			50% Increase	77.73%
3728 W 65th St	38,578	Proposed: 6,405	8,154	78.55%
Recommended Lot Coverage as reduced by 150% Rule:			6,405	100.00%