

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

July 20, 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

- | | | | |
|----|---|------------------|--|
| #1 | Fred & Lucy Coulson †
6405 Wenonga Road | WITHDRAWN | Subterranean detached accessory building for pool
<i>Cont'd from January 19th meeting</i> |
| #2 | Natalie & Kyle Hartman
6301 Belinder Avenue | | Multiple window changes |
| #3 | Michael & Gina Donnelly
2308 West 70 th Street | | Replace siding and window |
| #4 | David & Diane Zimmer*
5924 High Drive | | Changes to previously approved fence
<i>Cont'd from June 22nd meeting</i> |
| #5 | Dave & Kate Scott
6627 Belinder Avenue | | Changes to previously approved addition |
| #6 | Tanya Trost
2520 West 63 rd Street | | Circle driveway and patio extension
<i>Patio cont'd from June 22nd meeting</i> |
| #7 | Tim & Margaux Blackwell †
3216 West 68 th Street | | Putting green |

*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#1 ~~Fred & Lucy Coulson~~ Withdrawn

6405 Wenonga Road

The Coulsons are proposing a 3,060 square foot subterranean detached accessory building to house a pool in their side and rear yard.

The proposed project is a substantial construction matter and was noticed as such.

This project was continued at the January 19th meeting at the owner's request. NOTE: The owners have withdrawn their project.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The proposed detached accessory building is located partially in the south (right) side yard and partially in the rear yard. It is a non-traditional structure with a flat green roof. A subterranean building is a unique structure in the City. For the purposes of this review, the green roof is not being considered "greenspace" because it is not pervious, although the ARB may take that into consideration as part of their review.

The rear (east) of the building is cut into the existing slope allowing the lawn to flow directly onto the green roof. At the west end (street facing) side of the building, approximately 4'-8" of vertical wall will be exposed, the remainder of the structure is completely underground. A 3-foot guardrail is proposed atop the wall. A berm is being proposed on the south side of the property that aligns with the roof, obscuring any view of the structure. At the north side of the building, the existing patios are being modified to create a sunken stairway to access the pool house. Several new stone retaining walls will terrace the area down to the pool deck level. An all-glass curtain wall is indicated for the majority of the façade, along with stone above grade and the same railing at the west side. A large skylight is proposed over the pool within the new building. An underground tunnel connects the pool building back to the basement of the main house.

The pool equipment is located in a vault on the north side of the pool. The top of the vault will be flush with grade and covered with a grate.

Ordinance Compliance:

Code section 5-120 B allows detached accessory building to be located in the side yard provided that it is at least 60 feet from the front property line and at least 20 feet from the side or rear property line. All of these requirements have been met. The section goes on to limit the size to no more than 20% of the total minimum side yard area for the entire lot. The total minimum side yard area is 6,673 SF. Which makes a maximum area of 1,334 SF. 1,030 SF of the building is located in the side yard. This requirement has been met.

Code section 5-121 B allows for detached accessory buildings to be located in the rear yard provided that it is at least 10 feet from the side or rear property line. All of these requirements have been met. The section goes on to limit the size to no more than 20% of the total minimum rear yard area for the lot. The total minimum rear yard area is 20,508 SF. Which makes a maximum area of 4,101 SF. This requirement has been met.

Section 5-123 restricts the footprint of the principal building and all detached accessory buildings to a specific number based on a formula. For this lot, the maximum area allowed is 12,547 SF and the total area of the principal building and all accessory buildings is 8,958 SF. This requirement has been met.

Design Guideline Review:

Section 2.2 on pages 60 through 63 of the Design Guidelines provides specific recommendations for the Countryside Estates character area.

Subsection E suggests that detached accessory building located in the conditional building area be limited to 1 story with 10 foot eaves and a maximum area of 720 SF. The eave height is not an issue but the area is more than 4 times the recommended area. **Discussion is recommended.** This section also limits the total number of accessory buildings to 2 per lot. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.6.4 on page 89 of the Design Guidelines provides recommendations for lot coverage of roofed structures. 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; however, over 3,000 sq. ft. of new roofed structure will be mostly underground with a green roof.**

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-6 properties have a minimum of 70% greenspace. Because the detached building is not considered greenspace, **this recommendation has not been met.**

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(E1)/LS-6
Lot Area:	71,742 SF
Lot Width:	210'

Ordinance	Allowable/Required by Ord	Proposed
Accessory Building Minimum Side Yard:	20'	20'
Accessory Building Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	66.4'
Accessory Building Maximum Height:	24'	4.7' (Not including railing)
Accessory Building Max Side Yard Area:	1,334 SF	1,030 SF
Accessory Building Max Rear Yard Area:	4,101 SF	2,030 SF
Minimum Greenspace:	70% (50,219 SF)	48,809 SF (68%)

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
6405 Wenonga Rd	72,299	5,600	12,617	44.39%
6335 Wenonga Rd	64,593	4,278	11,666	36.67%
6315 Wenonga Rd	71,972	4,716	12,577	37.50%
6431 Wenonga Rd	56,488	6,767	10,628	63.67%
6340 Wenonga Rd	152,589	4,792	21,203	22.60%
6410 Wenonga Rd	72,520	3,393	12,643	26.84%
			Average	38.61%
			50% Increase	57.92%
Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =		7,307		
6405 Wenonga Rd	Proposed =	8,958	71.0%	of City Ordinance Limit
			122.6%	of Design Guideline Limit

#2 Natalie & Kyle Hartman

6301 Belinder Avenue

The Hartmans are proposing multiple window changes.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

On the second floor, over the front door, an existing window will be removed and a new window added. The new window is larger and will be centered over the front door. An oculus window, in the same area, will be eliminated.

At the rear of the house, an existing series of three casement windows will be replaced with a new series of five casement windows.

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.

#3 Michael & Gina Donnelly

2308 West 70th Street

The Donnellys are proposing to replace all of their home's siding and replace a window at the rear of the house.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

The home's existing shingle siding will be replaced with Hardie fiber cement lap siding.

At the rear of the house, an existing bay window will be replaced with a new smaller window consisting of a picture window flanked by double-hung windows. All will have muntin patterns to match the rest of the house.

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.

#4 David & Diane Zimmer*

5924 High Drive

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

The project was continued from the June 22, 2021 ARB meeting so that the owners could present an alternative plan for the fence location and design.

UPDATE: City staff met at 5924 High Drive/2001 Stratford Road with representatives from J&J Survey (Zimmers' survey company) and BHC Rhodes (City's survey company) to discuss their two property surveys. They both agreed that the property line and fence placement were the same on their recent surveys. The only difference is the distance from the fence to the property line as J&J Survey measured from the south side of the fence post and BHC Rhodes measured from the center of the fence post.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

Portions of the fence are built around an existing tree. The fence construction in this area does not match the pre-approved fence style.

Portions of the fence exceed the 6-foot maximum height allowed in the rear yard. The ARB can approve up to a 7-foot fence in the rear yard. Portions of the fence exceed the 6-foot maximum height allowed in the side yard. A shallow swale follows the property line which makes the fence taller on the neighbor's side.

NOTE: The height of the fence was approved by the ARB at its May 11th meeting but was rescinded at the May 25th meeting due to the location of the fence being questioned.

Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-135 B 2 which limits the height of fences in the side yard to 6 feet. The tallest location found was 7 foot 2 inches. **A variance of 14 inches is required.**

Guideline Review:

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

Greenspace:	60% (9,420 SF)	70% (10,985 SF)
-------------	----------------	-----------------

* A variance is required.
July 20, 2021

#5 Dave & Kate Scott

6627 Belinder Avenue

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

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

This project was originally approved by the ARB in May, with a variance being required. The BZA subsequently denied the variance. The Scotts have redesigned the screen porch to eliminate the variance.

The new screened porch will set behind the existing garage and will encapsulate most of any existing rear patio. The roof is detailed to match the existing. A small portion of the new addition will extend over the existing garage and feature clerestory screens.

Ordinance Compliance:

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

Code section 5-132 B 3. (C) allows vestibules to project into minimum yards not more than 3 feet.

Design Guideline Review:

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

Subsection C suggests that side wings, located in the conditional building area should have a height up to 1 story and 16 feet with no second-floor dormers that overlook the neighbors. These recommendations have been met.

Subsection D suggests that rear wings located in the secondary building areas can be up to 1 1/2 stories and 24 feet tall but clearly less than the main mass and no more than 30 feet deep. The proposed rear wing is incorporated into the main mass and meets these recommendations.

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-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(16)/LS-3
Lot Area:	20,957 sf
Lot Width:	104.0'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	13.0'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10'	11.0' (Existing) 15.7 (New)
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	10'	15.6' (Existing)
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	30% = 31.2'	26.6' (Existing) 31.3' (New)
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	20% = 45.0'	74.0'
Patio/Deck Minimum Side Yard:	20'	21.7'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	5335.3 sf	4,174 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 13,622 sf	62.2% = 13,034 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?	Yes
Will the project cause the greenspace to be within 3% of what is recommended by the Design Guidelines?	N/A

#6 Tanya Trost

2520 West 63rd Street

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

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
Exiting 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 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

#7 Tim & Margaux Blackwell †

3216 West 68th Street

The Blackwells are proposing a small putting green in the rear yard.

Code Section 5-103.78 defines putting greens as outdoor recreation facilities and the project 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 proposed putting green is a 250 square foot circle of artificial turf located in the northwest corner of the property. The green is being set at the minimum side and rear setbacks.

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-5
Lot Area:	31,269 SF
Lot Width:	150

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Accessory Structure Minimum Side Yard Setback:	20'	20'
Accessory Structure Minimum Rear Yard Setback:	20'	20'
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 20,324 SF	20,431 = 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?	Yes