

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

August 3, 2021

3:00 p.m.

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

**The meeting will be held in-person at City Hall.**

If you wish to join virtually, you can find the login on the City Calendar at [www.missionhillsks.gov](http://www.missionhillsks.gov)

<b>#1</b>	<b>Tanya Trost</b> 2520 West 63 <sup>rd</sup> Street	Circle driveway and patio extension <i>Project cont'd from July 20<sup>th</sup> meeting</i>
<b>#2</b>	<b>Monty &amp; Christina Montgomery</b> 5600 State Line Road	Replace circle driveway
<b>#3</b>	<b>David &amp; Catherine Clark</b> 6532 High Drive	Replace driveway, sidewalk and patio
<b>#4</b>	<b>Ryan Ash</b> 6508 High Drive	Replace existing driveway
<b>#5</b>	<b>Bruce &amp; Debra Hoskins</b> 6432 Verona Road	Replace existing driveway
<b>#6</b>	<b>David &amp; Diane Zimmer</b> 5924 High Drive	Light fixtures on front walls
<b>#7</b>	<b>David Hinchman</b> 6430 Willow Lane	Water features in rear yard
<b>#8</b>	<b>Dan &amp; Sarah Sullivan</b> 6606 Willow Lane	Screened porch / Patio / Pergola

\*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 Tanya Trost

2520 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street

The Trosts are proposing a new circle driveway and patio extension. The patio was continued from the June 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting so the drainage study could be submitted and reviewed.

*This project was continued at the July 20<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 new driveway connects the existing 20.5-foot wide driveway to a new drive approach. The interior green is 62 feet wide and 36 feet deep. They are also proposing an additional concrete pad around their previously approved patio. The new pad is at grade so it will be level with the adjacent yard.

### Ordinance Compliance:

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

### Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	22,150 sf	
House Footprint (with Patios):	5,095 sf	
Additional Patio:	100 sf	
Existing Driveway:	2,400 sf	
<u>Additional Driveway:</u>	<u>1,130 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	13,425 sf	60.6%

### 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 circle driveways should have an interior green no less than 80 feet wide and 40 feet deep. **This recommendation has not 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 not been met.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(30)/LS-3
Lot Area:	22,150 sf
Lot Width:	111.94'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 14,398 sf	13,425 sf = 60.6%

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?	Yes
Will the project cause the greenspace to be within 3% of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines?	Yes

## #2 Monty & Christina Montgomery

5600 State Line Road

The Montgomerys are proposing to replace their circle driveway.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The new concrete driveway will replace the existing in the same footprint.

### Ordinance Compliance:

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

### Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	24,091 sf	
House Footprint:	2,777 sf	
Patios:	1,651 sf	
Existing Direct Driveway:	2,194 sf	
<u>Existing Circle Driveway:</u>	<u>997 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	16,472 sf	68.4%

### 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 recommends that circle driveways should have an interior green no less than 80 feet wide and 40 feet deep. The existing circle drive has an interior green 53 feet wide and 25 feet deep. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Section 2.7.2.B recommends that the drive width be no more than 12 feet until it is 30 ft. back from the curb. **This recommendation has not 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(30)/LS-3
Lot Area:	24,091 sf
Lot Width:	125'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 15,659 sf	16,472 sf = 68.4%

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

**#3 David & Catherine Clark**

**6532 High Drive**

The Clarks are proposing to replace their driveway, sidewalk and patio.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The new driveway, sidewalk and patio will replace the existing in the same footprints.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of city Code Section 5-120.D that requires patios, on LS-1 lots, to have a minimum side yard setback of 15 feet. The existing patio is 9 feet from the side property line. However, Code Section 5-128.C.1 allows for the replacement of non-conforming structures without obtaining a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	11,503 sf	
House Footprint:	2,395 sf	
Patio (To be replaced):	728 sf	
Additional Patios:	770 sf	
<u>Existing Driveway and Sidewalk:</u>	<u>952 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	6,658 sf	57.9%

**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.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(10)/LS-1
Lot Area:	11,503 sf
Lot Width:	82'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 6,902 sf	6,658 sf = 57.9%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	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

**#4 Ryan Ash**

**6508 High Drive**

Mr. Ash is proposing to replace his existing driveway.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The new concrete driveway will replace the existing in the same footprint.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	12,280 sf	
House Footprint:	2,104 sf	
Patios:	590 sf	
Driveway:	745 sf	
Remaining Greenspace:	8,841 sf	72%

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.7.2 B. 2. on page 103 recommends that the width of drives should not exceed 12 feet within 30 feet of the curb. **This recommendation has not been met.**

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 been met.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(10)/LS-1
Lot Area:	12,280 sf
Lot Width:	75'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 7,368 sf	8,841 sf = 72%

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

**#5 Bruce & Debra Hoskins**

**6432 Verona Road**

The Hoskins are proposing to replace their driveway.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The new concrete driveway will replace the existing in the same footprint.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	22,934 sf	
House Footprint:	3,199 sf	
Patios & Walks:	825 sf	
Pool:	2,440 sf	
Fish Pond	26 sf	
<u>Driveway:</u>	<u>1,465 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	14,979 sf	65.3%

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.7.2 B. 2. on page 103 recommends that the width of drives should not exceed 12 feet within 30 feet of the curb. **This recommendation has not 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(30)/LS-3
Lot Area:	22,934 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 14,907 sf	14,979 sf = 65.3%

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

**#6 David & Diane Zimmer**

**5924 High Drive**

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

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The original brick return walls included a lantern light. The Zimmers are proposing to reinstall this type of fixture on the new wall. Additionally, they are proposing to add another light on the opposite wall for symmetry. The new fixtures will match the previous fixtures. The light fixtures will be placed on the far end of each of the walls.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Guideline Review:**

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

Mr. Hinchman is proposing new water features in his rear yard.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

At the July 6<sup>th</sup> ARB meeting, Mr. Hinchman withdrew a proposal for a water feature in the rear yard due to variance issues. He is now proposing a series of three smaller water features that do not require a variance.

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	18,402 sf
Existing House Footprint, Driveways & Patios:	5,782 sf
Ramp:	87 sf
Upper Ponds:	83 sf
Koi Pond:	250 sf
Remaining Greenspace:	12,200 sf

**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.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(16)/LS-2
Lot Area:	18,402 SF

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Proposed
Water feature minimum side yard setback	20'	>35'
Water feature minimum rear yard setback	20'	20'
Greenspace: (LS-2)	60% (11,041 SF)	66.3% (12,200 SF)

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



The Sullivans are proposing a screened porch, patio and pergola 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 new screened-in porch creates a new rear wing toward the center of the main mass. The portion of the porch that is not screened will be sided with board-and-batten siding to match the house. The roof is a low slope membrane roof.

The new pergola and patio are located to the side of the new porch. The patio is to be concrete. The pergola is cedar and will stand approximately 9 feet at its highest point.

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	16,961 sf	
Existing House Footprint, Driveways & Patios:	3,270 sf	
Screened-in porch	270 sf	
Patio:	504 sf	
Remaining Greenspace:	12,917 sf	76.2%

**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.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(16)/LS-2
Lot Area:	16,961 SF

Ordinance	Allowable/Required	Proposed
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	28.1' at Porch
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	22.6' (Existing)
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	25% = 30'	No Change
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	20%=28.26'	45.9'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	42'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	45.5'
Greenspace: (LS-2)	60% = 10,176 sf	12,917 = 76.2%

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