

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

March 29, 2022

3:00 p.m.

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

- |     |   |   |
|-----|---|---|
| #1  | <b>Kyle &amp; Karina Ginavan*†</b><br>2600 West 68 <sup>th</sup> Street     | Driveway / New covered porch / Outdoor kitchen / Pool<br><i>Continued from March 1<sup>st</sup> mtg</i> |
| #2  | <b>Bill &amp; Sue Ann Douglas</b><br>5832 High Drive                        | Changes to previously approved project<br><i>Continued from March 15<sup>th</sup> mtg</i>               |
| #3  | <b>Adam Tilton*</b><br>3800 West 66 <sup>th</sup> Street                    | New screened porch and deck<br><i>Continued from March 15<sup>th</sup> mtg</i>                          |
| #4  | <b>Aaron &amp; Rebecca Graham</b><br>2701 West 67 <sup>th</sup> Terrace     | Changes to previously approved project  |
| #5  | <b>William &amp; Mary Beth Zollars</b><br>2501 West 63 <sup>rd</sup> Street | Changes to previously approved project  |
| #6  | <b>Nick &amp; Clare Blasi</b><br>6640 Indian Lane                           | Changes to previously approved project  |
| #7  | <b>Eric &amp; JoAnne Bradley†</b><br>6709 Cherokee Lane                     | Replacing patio / Fire pit / Outdoor kitchen  |
| #8  | <b>Daniel &amp; Marie Pfeifer†</b><br>6730 Tomahawk Road                    | Replacing patio / Covered outdoor kitchen   |
| #9  | <b>Nick &amp; Kate Jones†</b><br>3838 West 64 <sup>th</sup> Street          | New garage / Outdoor kitchen / Outdoor fireplace  |
| #10 | <b>Michael &amp; Natalie O'Shaughnessy*</b><br>6225 Ensley Lane             | Gate across driveway  |

\*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 Kyle & Karina Ginavan\*†**

**2600 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street**

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.

*This project was continued at the November 9, 2021, ARB meeting to allow for further design development. The project was continued at the December 14, 2021 meeting because revised drawings did not arrive in a timely manner. The project was continued at the January 4, 2022 meeting at the owner's request. The project was continued at the January 18, 2022, February 15, 2022 and March 1, 2022 meetings so a final site plan/survey can be provided.*

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Lot Coverage of roofed structures:**

House Footprint:	3,517 sf
<u>Covered Patio:</u>	<u>874 sf</u>
Total lot coverage:	4,391 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.

---

\* A variance is required.  
 March 29, 2022

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of Code Section 5-123 which sets the maximum lot coverage. For this lot a maximum lot coverage of 4,289 sq. ft. is allowed, and 4,391 sq. ft. is proposed. **A variance of 102 sq. ft. is required.**

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	15,285 sf	
House Footprint:	4,391 sf	
Driveway/walkways:	945 sf	
<u>Pool/Patios:</u>	<u>709 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	9,239 sf	(60.5%)

**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 been met.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-1
Lot Area:	15,285 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'	16'
Patio/Pool Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	31'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	4,289 sf	4,391 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 9,214 sf	9,239 = 60.5%

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

\*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.

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
2600 W 68th St	15,285	3,812	4,289	88.88%
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%
<b>Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =</b>		4,289		

## #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 was continued at the January 18, 2022 meeting so the site plan could be revised to eliminate the front hammer head and an alternate driveway proposed. The project was continued at the February 1, 2022, February 15, 2022 and March 1, 2022 meetings at the owner's request. This project was continued at the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting due to lack of representation.*

### 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. As a result, they need to eliminate 259 sf of hardscape to meet the greenspace recommendation (based on their calculations). They are proposing to remove their rear patio to add more greenspace. The owners will walk out of their rear door and terrace stairs onto grass.

### 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 owners are proposing changes that may cause the greenspace to be 66 sq. ft. below the greenspace recommendation. **This recommendation may not be met.**

Section 2.7.2.B on page 102 recommends drives to be no more than 12 feet wide at the front property line and should not exceed the 12 ft. width within 30 ft. of the curb. **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 proposed hammerhead is 13 ft. x 20 ft. **This recommendation has not been met.**

The Tilttons are proposing a new screened porch and deck.

*This project was continued at the March 15<sup>th</sup> meeting due to lack of representation.*

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Lot Coverage Review:**

Main floor living area:	3,771 sf
<u>Screened Porch: (new)</u>	<u>457 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	4,228 sf

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed addition extends out the back of an existing rear wing. It maintains the same roof pitch as the existing wing. The eave line, on the west side, aligns with the existing house. On the east side, the eave lines are slightly higher due to a reduced overhang. All materials and detailing match the existing house.

The proposed deck is located on the north and east sides of the new wing. A raised planter separates the new deck from the yard.

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	20,649 sf	(19,513 sf Per Johnson County)
House Footprint:	4,228 sf	
New Deck and Existing Patio:	1,625 sf	
<u>Driveway and walkway:</u>	<u>650 sf</u>	
Provided Greenspace:	14,146 sf (68.5%)	

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-120 A 1 (b) that requires the sum of the two side yards to be at least 30% of the lot width. **A variance of 9.0 feet is required.** Please note, the house is an existing non-conforming use that already violates this requirement. The proposed addition further exacerbates this condition.

The project is also in violation of Code Section 5-120 D which requires decks, patios and the like to be a minimum of 20 feet from the side property line. **A variance of 8.2 feet is required.**

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.3 on pages 64 through 67 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for the Neighborhood Estates character area.

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.

---

\* Variances are required  
March 29, 2022

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-3
Lot Area:	20,649 sf
Lot Width:	109.0'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	12.7
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	11.0' (No Change)
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	30% = 32.7'	23.7'
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	20% = 42'	71.5'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	11.8'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	69.0'
Lot Coverage	5,281 sf	4,228 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 13,422 sf	14,146 sf = 68.5%

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 documented drainage issue for this 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 Aaron & Rebecca Graham**

**2701 West 67<sup>th</sup> Terrace**

The Grahams are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. Changes include alternate deck materials and prefabricated window wells.

**Summary of Property:**

- Character Area: Suburban
- Location of Common Green Space: Front & Side
- Any Special Frontages: Corner Lot

**Lot Coverage (Footprint of Roofed Structures):**

Main floor living area:	2,490 sf
Main floor garage area:	552 sf
Detached building	252 sf
<u>Covered porches/decks:</u>	<u>544 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	3,838 sf

**Summary of Project:**

The house was originally approved with composite decking at the front entry and back patios. The Grahams are now proposing cast-in-place concrete for these areas.

The project was also originally approved with concrete wall window wells. They are now proposing a composite window well material with a smaller footprint.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	19,020 sf	per boundary survey
House Footprint:	3,042 sf	
Detached Bldg	252 sf	
Covered Porches/Decks	544 sf	
Driveways:	2,343 sf	
<u>Steps, walkways, other</u>	<u>634 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	6,815 sf	(64.16%)

**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:	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.

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
<b>2701 W 67<sup>th</sup> Terrace</b>	19,020	3,046	4,988	61.07%
2700 W 67th Terrace	18,060	2,472	4,811	51.38%
2712 W 67th Terrace	17,754	2,823	4,754	59.38%
2711 W 67th Terrace	16,756	2,588	4,567	56.67%
2700 W 68th Street	18,445	3,601	4,882	73.76%
			Average	60.45%
			50% Increase	90.67%
<b>Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =</b>		<b>4,522</b>		
<b>2701 W 67<sup>th</sup> Terrace</b>	<b>Proposed =</b>	<b>3,838</b>	<b>77.0%</b>	<b>of City Ordinance Limit</b>
			<b>84.9%</b>	<b>of Design Guideline Limit</b>

**#5 William & Mary Beth Zollars**

**2501 West 63<sup>rd</sup> Street**

The Zollars are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved project. Changes include the addition of a new mud room and patio modifications.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed mud room is located at the rear of the house, near the outdoor kitchen. It is a simple single-story structure that replaces a smaller wing in the same area. All materials, detailing and fenestration match the main house.

The patio modifications are a direct result of the mudroom addition. The overall patio size is not changing. The outdoor kitchen is being reconfigured into an L-shape to make way for the mud room addition.

**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 Blasis are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved plans.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The Blasis previously approved pool enclosure held the fence close to the pool patio and outside the platted side yard setback. As installed, the fence projects 10 feet into the platted side yard setback area. Additionally, the patios within the fenced areas have been reconfigured.

**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 proposed fence meets this variance requirement; however, it is in a different location than previously approved by the ARB.

**Design Guideline Review:**

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

**#7 Eric & JoAnne Bradley†**

**6709 Cherokee Lane**

The Bradleys are proposing to replace their existing patio and add a new fire pit and outdoor kitchen. Other site modifications include new walkways, replacing an existing fence and new landscaping.

Outdoor kitchens and fire pits are substantial construction matters as defined by Code Section 5-103.78 and 5-103.122 and was noticed as such.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The rear addition, shown on the plans, was approved in February of 2021.

The proposed patio is located behind the main mass of the house and extends from the rear wing beyond the south edge of the house. The patio will be concrete pavers set on a concrete slab. The proposed kitchen sits at the south edge of the patio and consists of an L-shaped stucco base with a quartz countertop and a built-in grill. The proposed fire pit is a 4-foot square clad in dolomite.

The proposed fence, to be replaced, is a 42-inch-tall picket fence that separates the front and side yards.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot Area:	30,026 sf	per property survey
House Footprint:	3,140 sf	
Detached Garage:	850 sf	
Existing Shed:	230 sf	
Driveway and Walkway:	4,520 sf	
Stepping Stone Walkway:	50 sf	
Proposed Patio:	956 sf	
Existing Patios:	672 sf	
Misc. Gravel & Mulch Areas:	640 sf	
Provided Greenspace:	18,968 sf	(63.2%)

**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 not been met.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-5
Lot Area:	30,026 sf
Lot Width	134'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	>40'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	>150'
Lot Coverage	3,918 sf	3,419 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 19,516 sf	18,968 sf = 63.2%

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?	Yes
Has there been a documented drainage issue for this 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.

The Pfeifers are proposing to replace their existing patio and add a new covered 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.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

A previous project converted the house from having a rear entry garage to a front entry garage. That project included a rear wing that has since been omitted from the project scope.

The Pfeifers are now proposing to cover a portion of their patio and add an outdoor kitchen. The kitchen consists of a brick base, to match the existing seat walls, with a stone countertop.

The patio roof is proposed as a simple wood frame structure with a flat roof.

**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 Joneses are proposing to demolish their existing three car garage and replace it with a new garage in the same area. The project includes new covered terraces, an outdoor kitchen, and outdoor fireplace.

Outdoor kitchens are substantial construction matters as defined by Code Section 5-103.78 and 5-103.122 and was noticed as such.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Lot Coverage Review:**

Main floor living area:	2,826 sf
Main floor garage area: (New)	1,056 sf
<u>Covered porches: (new)</u>	<u>372 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	4,254 sf

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed garage is located in approximately the same location as the existing garage. The new garage is located 5 feet to the west of the current location with a covered porch being add to the east side. All materials, detailing and fenestration matches the existing house. Second-floor dormers are centered above each of the three garage doors. The driveway will be extended to the rear.

The pool side of the garage features a single large dormer centered on the addition. Two secondary gables project toward the pool creating a new covered porch. The outdoor kitchen is located at the south side of the new covered porch.

The proposed outdoor fireplace is located at the east end of the existing patio. A new generator will be located to the west of the existing sport court and will be surrounded by a wrought iron fence in a pre-approved fence style.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-121.A.1.(b) that requires LS-5 lots to have a rear yard setback 30% of the lot depth. A variance of 15.5 feet is required. However, Code Section 5-128.C.2 allows for the reconstruction of an existing non-conforming structure, provided that the footprint or height is not increased. **A variance is not required.**

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	38,552 sf	(per property survey)
House Footprint:	4,254 sf	
Driveway and walkway:	5,844 sf	
Existing Pool/Patio:	2,857 sf	
Existing Sport Court:	1,810 sf	
<u>Misc. Stoops and Pads (Existing)</u>	<u>88 sf</u>	
Provided Greenspace:	23,707 sf	(61.4%)

**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:	38,552 sf
Lot Width:	150'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10% = 15'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10% = 15'	No Change
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	N/A	
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	30% = 75.6'	60.1' (Existing)
Side Yard:	15'	16'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	32'
Lot Coverage	3,918 sf	3,419 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 8,057 sf	8,070 sf = 60.1%

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?	No
Has there been a documented drainage issue for this property?	No



**#10 Michael & Natalie O'Shaughnessy\***

**6225 Ensley Lane**

The O'Shaughnessys 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.

**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.