

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

September 13, 2022

3:00 p.m.

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

#1 Consent Agenda

A. **Lauri Jones** – 2921 West 67th Terrace

Window replacements

#2 Farid Namin

6520 State Line Road

Circle driveway

Continued from 8.30.22 meeting

#3 Liz Lozier * †

2119 Tomahawk Road

New patio / Sport court

Continued from 8.30.22 meeting

#4 Andrew & Mary Weed †

2509 West 68th Street

Changes to previously approved project

#5 Mike & Shelly Maloney

6545 Sagamore Road

Changes to previously approved project

#6 Scott & Carolyn Ellspermann

2600 Verona Road

Changes to previously approved project

#7 James Blankenship

6500 High Drive

Window replacements

*Variance required. † Substantial Construction

#1 Consent Agenda

A. Lauri Jones

2921 West 67th Terrace

Ms. Jones is proposing to replace two windows at the front of her house.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

At the front of the house, Ms. Jones is proposing to replace a triple casement window with a single casement window and replace an existing pair of French casements with a wider pair of French casements.

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 Namins are proposing a new circle driveway.

This project was continued at the August 16th and 30th meetings so the owner could clear up other outstanding permit issues. The ARB also requested that the driveway be redesigned to reduce the new drive width to be no more than 12 feet at the property line.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The new circle drive will be formed by connecting a new 18-foot wide drive to their existing 18 foot-wide driveway.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	16,267 sf	
House Footprint:	2,794 sf	
Existing Rear Deck:	300 sf	
Existing Driveway:	1,150 sf	
<u>Proposed Additional Driveway:</u>	<u>1,562 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	10,461 sf	(64.3%)

Design Guideline Review:

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

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. The proposed driveway has an interior green 45 feet wide and 51'-5" 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 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. Please note, the owner did not include any rear decks or patios in their greenspace study.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R1(16)/LS-2
Lot Area:	16,267 sf
Lot Width:	116.2'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 9,760 sf	10,461 sf = 64.3%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	Yes
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	
Is there a documented drainage issue for this property?	No

**See the Mission Hills website for drainage study requirements – www.missionhillsks.gov*

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

Ms. Lozier is proposing a new patio and sport court in her rear yard.

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

This project was continued at the August 30th meeting so the layout of the patio could be redesigned to lessen the variances required.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The proposed paver patio is located directly behind the main mass of the existing house. It will replace an existing smaller concrete patio.

The proposed concrete sport court is located behind the existing garage wing and replaces an existing smaller concrete sport court.

A decorative concrete block seat wall is proposed along the side property line. The wall is 30 feet long and 20 inches tall.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-121.D that requires patios and outdoor recreation facilities to have a minimum setback of 20 feet from the side or rear property line. **A variance of 5.5 feet is required for the side setback and a variance of 16 feet is required for the rear setback.**

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	16,486 sf	
House Footprint:	2,390 sf	
Existing Driveway, and Walkways	2,679 sf	
New Retaining Wall	30 sf	
Paver Patio	681 sf	
<u>Sport Court:</u>	<u>519 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	10,187 sf	61.8%

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.3 on page 105 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for Site and Landscape design.

Subsection C recommends that garden walls should be constructed of brick, stone, stucco or material that is compatible with the main house. The proposed wall is modular concrete block.

Discussion is recommended.

Subsection F recommends that patios and outdoor recreation facilities follow the MHKS Zoning Regulations. Multiple variances are required. **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.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(10)/LS-2
Lot Area:	16,486 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio/Sport Court Minimum Side Yard:	20'	14.5'
Patio/Sport Court Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	4.0'
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 9,891 sf	10,187 = 61.8%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	No
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	
Is there a documented drainage issue for this property?	No

**See the Mission Hills website for drainage study requirements – www.missionhillsks.gov*

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

#4 Andrew & Mary Weed †

2509 West 68th Street

The Weeds 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 August 16th ARB meeting, the Weeds were approved for a new patio and fire pit. They are now proposing a freestanding fireplace in lieu of the fire pit. The proposed fireplace is a prefabricated unit standing 8 foot 6 inches tall, and 5 feet 2 inches wide. The finished face material is dove grey stone to match the patio. The stone thickness as not been indicated. **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.

#5 Mike & Shelly Maloney

6545 Sagamore Road

The Maloneys are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. They are proposing a new patio and walkways.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The original house addition was approved in August 2022. They are now proposing a new patio at the rear of the house, and two new walkways.

The patio is located in the center of the rear of the house with a set of stairs connecting to the main house. The patio is concrete with brick borders.

A 3-foot wide walkway extends along the south side of the house connecting the existing driveway to the new patio. Another 3-foot wide walkway connects the patio to a fence gate.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	10,800 sf	
House Footprint:	2,216 sf	
Driveway and Front Walk:	1,104 sf	
<u>Patios and walkways:</u>	<u>938 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	6,542 sf	(60.6%)

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(10)/LS-1
Lot Area:	10,800 sf
Lot Width:	80'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	15'	21.3' (Both Sides)
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	29.0'
Minimum Greenspace:	60%	6,542 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?	No
Will the project cause the greenspace to be less than recommended by the Design Guidelines?	No
EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	
Is there a documented drainage issue for this property?	No

**See the Mission Hills website for drainage study requirements – www.missionhillsks.gov*

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

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

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The previously approval included a large walkway stair connecting the patio to the existing driveway. They are proposing to decrease the width of the stair. Similarly, a stair closer to the house is now proposed slightly wider than previously approved.

At the east side of house, they are now proposing to eliminate the vertical muntin in two first floor sidelights and their associated transoms. This modification will be made to similar sidelights at the north and west sides of the house.

The project originally included the replacement of several windows at the front of the house. Those windows will no longer be replaced.

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.

#7 James Blankenship

6500 High Drive

Mr. Blankenship is proposing to replace eleven windows at the front and side of his house.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

All eleven of the proposed windows match the size and style of the existing windows.

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 recommends that window muntins be simulated divided lites with muntins applied at the exterior, at the insulated air space, and at the interior of the window. The proposed windows only have muntins on the interior face. **This recommendation has not been met.**