

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

November 9, 2021

3:00 p.m.

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

#1 Consent Agenda

A. Chris Anderson – 6400 Ensley Lane

Replace existing driveway and walkway

#2 John Vaglio & Kami Bremyer
6130 Mission Drive

Modifications to existing patio and driveway

#3 Daniel & Marie Pfeifer
6730 Tomahawk Road

Changes to previously approved project

#4 Paul & Lynsey Jager †
6438 Indian Lane

Outdoor kitchen

#5 Kyle & Karina Ginavan *†
2600 West 68th Street

House remodel / New driveway / Covered porch /
Outdoor kitchen / Rear balcony / Pool

#6 Resolution re: Drainage Study Requirements

*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. Chris Anderson

6400 Ensley Lane

The Andersons are proposing to replace their existing driveway and front walkway in the same location.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The driveway will be replaced but the existing approach will remain. A small 7 ft. by 7 ft. pad next to the driveway will be replaced at the same time. The walkway, to be replaced, is near the front porch. The existing stairs to the street will remain.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.7.2 B. on page 102 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for driveways. This section suggests that driveway widths be limited to 12 feet wide. The proposed driveway is 18 feet wide, but the ARB might find this acceptable since it is an existing condition.

#2 John Vaglio & Kami Bremyer

6130 Mission Drive

The Vaglio/Bremyers are proposing modifications to their existing patio and driveway.

Summary of Property:

- Character Area: Neighborhood Estates
- Location of Common Green Space: Front
- Any Special Frontages: Creekside

Summary of Project:

A new bluestone terrace is proposed across the back of the existing house. New limestone retaining walls are proposed along the south side of the terrace. The design of these walls is to match that of existing stone walls in the area. Two new steel arbors will be added to the walkway connecting the terrace to an existing walkway.

A large portion of the existing auto court will be removed to make way for a new smaller auto court set closer to High Drive. The remaining area will be turned back into greenspace, including a new boxwood garden near the existing detached garage. A new detached garage will be presented to the ARB at a future date along with modification to convert the existing garage into studio space.

Ordinance Compliance:

Please note, Mission Hills Ordinances require that all homes include a 2-car (minimum) garage. The proposed project will eliminate the existing 2-car detached garage, but the existing 2 car basement garage remains.

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.

#3 Daniel & Marie Pfeifer

6730 Tomahawk Road

The Pfeifers 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:

At the January 5, 2021 ARB meeting, the Pfeifers were approved to convert their existing rear entry garage into a front entry garage with a circle driveway. They were also approved to add a new addition to the back of the garage and add a new covered patio.

They are now proposing to omit the rear addition and the screened porch and install a new concrete patio at the rear of the house. The rear wall of the house will be modified to include a new pedestrian door at the rear of the garage. They are also proposing to convert four fixed windows into a new pair of French doors with sidelights.

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-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:	22,647 sf
Lot Width:	107.8'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	24.1'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	>92'
Minimum Greenspace:	65% (14,330 sf)	68.3% (15,468 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

The Jagers are proposing modifications to their existing sunroom, a patio extension, a new covered rear porch, and a new outdoor kitchen. Outdoor kitchens are substantial construction matters as defined by Code Section 5-103.78 and 5-103.122 and was noticed as such. The ARB approved everything but the outdoor kitchen at its October 12, 2021 meeting.

Summary of Property:

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

Lot Coverage Review:

Main floor living area:	3,087 sf
Main floor garage area:	823 sf
Covered porches: (existing)	806 sf
Covered porches: (new)	358 sf
Playhouse (existing)	78 sf
<u>Total Lot Coverage:</u>	<u>5,152 sf</u>

Summary of Project:

The outdoor kitchen is located on an existing rear patio. It consists of a grill built into a limestone surround.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	36,407 sf
House Footprint:	5,152 sf
Driveway,	4,299 sf
<u>Patios and walkways:</u>	<u>2,081 sf</u>
Provided Greenspace:	26,675 sf (73.3%)

Design Guideline Review:

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

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(30)/LS-5
Lot Area:	36,407 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	Right: 25.75' Left: 61.0'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	33.0'
Lot Coverage	7,832 sf	5,152 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	65% (23,664 sf)	26,675 sf (73.3%)

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.

Summary of Property:

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

Lot Coverage of roofed structures:

House Footprint:	3,681 sf
Covered Patio:	762 sf
Total lot coverage:	4,443 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.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is violation of Code Section 5-120 D which requires outdoor recreation facilities, located on LS-1 lots, to have a minimum side yard setback of 15 feet. The proposed porch is set 13 feet from the side property line. **A variance of 2 feet is required.** The project is in violation of Code Section 5-123 which sets the maximum lot coverage. For this lot a maximum lot coverage of 4,299 sq. ft. is allowed, and 4,443 sq. ft. is proposed. **A variance of 144 sq. ft. is required.**

* Multiple variances are required.

Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	15,358 sf
House Footprint:	4,443 sf
Driveway/walkways:	1,000 sf
Pool/Patios::	719 sf
Remaining Greenspace:	9,196 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 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 not been met.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-1
Lot Area:	15,358 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'	13'
Patio/Pool Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	31'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	4,299 sf	4,443 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 9,214 sf	8,771 = 57.1%

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?	Yes
Will the project cause the greenspace to be within 3% of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines?	Yes
Have previous projects added more than 1,000 sq. ft. over the last 10 years?	N/A

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
2600 W 68th St	15,358	3,812	4,299	88.68%
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%
Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =		4,299		

#6 Discuss Greenspace Study Requirements

At the Annual Joint Retreat, the group discussed the new greenspace requirement and the concerns that have been expressed to City staff and board members. The main concerns are the cost of having a survey completed with the greenspace calculations, especially when the owner is not adding any hardscape (just replacing) or only adding a few feet of it, and the delay to the project in having the survey completed.

The ARB had previously added driveway replacements in the same footprint on LS-1 and LS-2 lots (whether they meet the Design Guidelines or not) to those projects the City can approve.

Based on the discussion at the Joint Retreat, the ARB may want to consider not requiring a survey with greenspace calculations for direct replacements of driveways, walkways, or patios. We have surveys on file for properties that show these structures, but because the greenspace recommendation is new, most owners need to have their survey updated with the greenspace data. The City will need a survey/accurate site plan for these replacements so we can tell if they meet the Zoning Regulations (walk width or patio setbacks) and Design Guidelines (drive width). However, if you decide to not require greenspace data for direct replacements of these structures, owners will not be required to pay for a new survey just to provide the greenspace data.

Other suggestions are welcome.