

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

July 25, 2023

3:00 p.m.

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

- |           |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|
| <b>#1</b> | <b>Cathy Moseley</b><br>2910 W 66 <sup>th</sup> Terrace                 | Column and window modification  |
| <b>#2</b> | <b>Graydon &amp; Patricia Kincaid</b><br>2708 W 66 <sup>th</sup> Street | Enclosing screened porch  |
| <b>#3</b> | <b>Dominic &amp; Lynn Marasco</b><br>6431 Willow Lane                   | Replacing existing patio and retaining walls  |
| <b>#4</b> | <b>Aaron &amp; Lauren Blazer</b><br>5921 High Drive                     | Adding screened porch on existing patio   |
| <b>#5</b> | <b>Tom &amp; Ann Faerber</b><br>6430 Indian Lane                        | Replacing patio / Adding grill counter / Utility courtyard / Generator              |
| <b>#6</b> | <b>John &amp; Kathleen Schirger</b><br>6504 High Drive                  | Replacing deck with patio / Outdoor grill / Outdoor fireplace                       |
| <b>#7</b> | <b>Michael &amp; Dana Kramer</b><br>6629 Overhill Road                  | New front porch / New back patio / New walkway                                      |
| <b>#8</b> | <b>Bret &amp; Erin Knighton</b><br>2040 W 59 <sup>th</sup> Street       | Porcelain tile roof<br><i>Continued from July 11<sup>th</sup> mtg</i>               |
| <b>#9</b> | <b>Timothy &amp; Susannah Sotos</b><br>2504 W 70 <sup>th</sup> Terrace  | Walkway / Patio / Drive extension<br><i>Continued from July 11<sup>th</sup> mtg</i> |

\*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 Cathy Moseley

2910 W 66<sup>th</sup> Terrace

Ms. Moseley is proposing to replace a window at the front of her home, change the columns at the front porch, and replace four exterior light fixtures.

### 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, an existing window has a large picture window with diamond muntins flanked by double-hung windows with colonial muntins. Ms. Moseley is proposing to replace the center picture window with a clear-view window.

The front porch has four round columns. Ms. Moseley is proposing to replace these columns with square columns.

The new light fixtures will be a rectangular shape and bronze in color.

### 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 provides specific recommendations for Doors and Windows. This section generally discourages mixing window or muntin styles, **Discussion is recommended.**

## #2 Graydon & Patricia Kincaid

2708 W 66<sup>th</sup> Street

The Kincaids are proposing to enclose their existing screened porch.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

At the rear of the house, the Kincaids are proposing to replace the existing screens with two new double-hung windows that flank a new large sliding glass door. The remaining walls will be sided with vertical siding to match the existing house. An existing patio door, in the same area, will be removed and replaced with a pair of casement windows. The surrounding brick will be replaced to match.

At the right side of the house, two screen panels will be replaced with double-hung windows of the same size.

The existing house has a combination of casement, and double-hung windows, some have muntins and some are clear view. All of the proposed windows are clear-view.

### 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 provides specific recommendations for Doors and Windows. This section generally discourages mixing window or muntin styles, **Discussion is recommended.**

**#3 Dominic & Lynn Marasco**

**6431 Willow Lane**

The Marascos are proposing to replace their existing patio and retaining walls with new ones.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed patio is roughly at the same location as their existing one. The new patio will have a concrete base with a brick surface. The adjoining stepping-stone walkway will also be constructed of brick.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Greenspace Review	SF
Lot Area:	9112
House Footprint:	-2023
Driveway & Walkway:	-800
Patios & Walkways:	-689
<b>Remaining Greenspace:</b>	<b>5600</b>

**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:	9,112 SF

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	38'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	15'	Right 19' Left 24'
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 5,467 SF	5600 SF = 61.5%

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
<b>EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:</b>	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	Yes
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	No
Is there 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 & Lauren Blazar

5921 High Drive

The Blazars are proposing to add a new screened porch on their existing patio.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The proposed porch is located at the center of the home's rear elevation at the inside corner of the L-shaped mass. The porch includes a flat roof to allow for second-floor access. An existing bank of second-floor casement windows will be replaced with a large patio door for access. A small bump/chimney is required to route the existing kitchen exhaust out of the porch area.

### Ordinance Compliance:

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

### Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	19,830 SF
House Footprint:	3,395 sf
Driveway:	4,195 sf
Walls (ETR):	146 sf
Walls (new):	51 SF
Patios (ETR):	169 SF
<u>Patios and walkways (New):</u>	<u>796 SF</u>
Remaining Greenspace:	11,078 sf 56%

### 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 not been met.** Since the proposed porch is located on the existing patio, there is no change to the previously approved greenspace.

## #5 Tom & Ann Faerber

6430 Indian Lane

The Faerbers are proposing to replace their existing patio, add an outdoor grill counter, create a new utility courtyard, and add a new generator.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The proposed patio is located between two existing rear wings at the back of the house. The outdoor grill area is located along the side of the east wing. The grill consists of a brick base with a stone countertop and a brick backsplash.

The utility yard is located between the new patio and an existing detached garage. It consists of two 68-inch tall radiused brick walls and a wooden gate. The new generator is located within the new enclosure. A new 4-foot wide walkway connects the patio to the existing driveway.

### Ordinance Compliance:

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

### Greenspace Review:

Greenspace Review	SF
Lot Area:	31,610
House Footprint:	-3,631
Detached Garage:	-376
Driveway:	-5,386
Existing Porches:	-387
Existing East Stone Wall:	-33
Existing West Path:	-555
Proposed Utility Enclosure:	-245
Proposed Patio and Walkway:	-888
Existing Patio being removed:	587
Stepping Stone Pathways:	-82
<b>Remaining Greenspace:</b>	<b>20,614</b>

### 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(30)/LS-5
Lot Area:	31,610 SF

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	No Change
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20	No Change
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 20,547 SF	20,614 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
<b>EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:</b>	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	No
Is there 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.*

**#6 John & Kathleen Schirger**

**6504 High Drive**

The Schirgers are proposing to replace their existing wood deck with a new paver patio with a built-in grill area and an outdoor fireplace.

**NEED DIMENSIONS FROM PROPERTY LINES TO PROPOSED PATIO.**

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The proposed patio is located at the rear of their home. The patio sits a few inches above grade and will be faced with 2-inch thin stone veneer. The patio will be accessed from the house via two stone stoops. The stoops are proposed as stone to match the patio.

The outdoor fireplace is all stone and located on axis with the home’s existing chimney. An 18-inch tall stone bench is proposed on both sides of the fireplace.

The built-in grill is located at the northern edge of the patio. It consists of a stone base with a 6-inch tall backsplash and stone a counter.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Greenspace Review	SF
Lot Area:	14,586
House Footprint:	-2,139
Driveway:	-1,168
Proposed Patio:	-1,020
Brick walk, window wells, etc.	-235
Existing stone walkway:	-397
<b>Remaining Greenspace:</b>	<b>9,627</b>

**Design Guideline Review:**

The design guidelines generally discourage the use of thin stone veneer. **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-1
Lot Area:	14,586 SF

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	>65'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	15'	Unknown
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 8,752SF	9,627 SF = 66%

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
<b>EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:</b>	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	Yes
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	No
Is there 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 Kramers are proposing a new front porch, back patio, and new walkway.

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The front porch/walkway is all brick and runs the full width of an existing alcove between two front wings. It projects approximately 32 inches into the front yard.

The back patio is a small brick patio that replaces an existing concrete patio.

A brick walkway is proposed to connect the new back patio to the existing garage.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

The project is in violation of city code section 5-119.C.6. That allows walkways in front yards however the walkway at the left side of the driveway was proposed to be 6 feet wide which does meet the definition of a walkway as indicated in section 5-103.133 which limits walkways to 5 feet wide. **A variance of 1 foot is required.**

The project is also in violation of section 5-12.B.C.3.(d) which allows stoops and porches to extend into the front yard, but limits the area occupied by the stoop to 60 square feet. The proposed porch has 111.2 square feet in the front yard. **A variance of 51.2 square feet is required.**

Greenspace Review	SF
Lot Area:	18,124
House Footprint:	-2,995
Driveway:	-812
Front Porch	-379
Rear Patios:	-550
Side Walkway:	-236
AC	-9
<b>Remaining Greenspace:</b>	<b>13,143</b>

**Design Guideline Review:**

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-1 and 2 properties have a greenspace area no less than 60% of the lot area. This recommendation has been met.

---

\* Multiple variances are required.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(16)/LS-2
Lot Area:	18,124 SF

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	15'	38'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	15'	Right 19' Left 24'
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 10,874 SF	13,143 SF = 72.5%

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

**#8 Bret & Erin Knighton**

**2040 W 59<sup>th</sup> Street**

The Knightons are proposing a new porcelain tile roof.

***The project was continued to the July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting so that a mock-up could be constructed on site for the ARB to view.***

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

The product selected has the look of weathered wood. This is not a product that the ARB has reviewed in the past.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**#9 Timothy & Susannah Sotos**

**2504 W 70th Terrace**

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

*At the July 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, the ARB approved all the proposed changes except for the walkway, patio, and drive extension on the north side of the property. The ARB continued the discussion for the walkway, patio, and drive extension to the July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting so that revisions could be made to the plan.*

**Summary of Property:**

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

**Summary of Project:**

On November 29, 2022, when the Soto’s project was originally approved, the ARB did so with conditions. They were required to move the pool to be 20’-2” from the rear property line, to increase the greenspace by 1 percent, and to plant evergreens along the north side of the pool equipment.

The proposed plan eliminates the pool in its entirety and reworks the patio. The proposed retaining wall and stairs in the rear yard have been removed from the project scope. They are proposing to expand the drive area along the north side yard. The overall greenspace has been improved from 52.9% to 57%

Since all ARB requirements have been met, this project has been placed on the Consent Agenda.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	18,998 SF
Lot Coverage:	3,639 SF (Pergola area is part of patio)
Driveways & walkways:	2,881 SF
Patios, walkways, and walls:	1,652 SF
Remaining Greenspace:	10,826 SF = 57%

**Design Guideline Review:**

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 2.7.3.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. **Discussion is recommended.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(16)/LS-2
Lot Area:	18,998 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	22.0'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	> 35'
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 11,399 SF	<del>10,059 SF = 52.9%</del> 10,826 SF = 57%

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
<b>EXCEPT NO STUDY REQUIRED IF:</b>	
1) replacing existing impervious surface in approximately same footprint, and	
2) project will not decrease existing greenspace on site	Yes
Is there 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.*