

# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

November 29, 2022

3:00 p.m.

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

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| #1  | <b>Russ &amp; Karen Weltner</b><br>2801 West 66 <sup>th</sup> Street                         | Window and door changes   |
| #2  | <b>Brooks &amp; Amy Pierce</b><br>6333 Verona Road   | Circle Driveway   |
| #3  | <b>Willoughby Johnson &amp; Christy Johnson-Miller</b><br>2112 West 61 <sup>st</sup> Terrace | Changes to previously approved project  |
| #4  | <b>Robin &amp; Lori Ames</b><br>2921 West 68 <sup>th</sup> Street                            | Window changes  |
| #5  | <b>Timothy &amp; Susannah Sotos †</b><br>2504 West 70 <sup>th</sup> Terrace                  | Pool / Outdoor fireplace / Grill stations / Walls / Pergola   |
| #6  | <b>Nancy Lombardino</b><br>5400 State Line Road  | Outdoor fireplace   |
| #7  | <b>Matt &amp; Kerry Adam</b><br>6601 Belinder Avenue   | Changes to previously approved project<br><i>Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</i>          |
| #8  | <b>Craig &amp; Joanne Scurato</b><br>6723 Tomahawk Road                                      | Guardrail on covered porch<br><i>Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</i>                      |
| #9  | <b>Nicholas Hinrichs</b><br>3300 W 69 <sup>th</sup> Street                                   | Concrete/faux slate roof<br><i>Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</i>                        |
| #10 | <b>Farid Namin</b><br>6520 State Line Road   | Multiple window changes<br><i>Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</i>                         |
| #11 | <b>Dave &amp; Dee Dillon †</b><br>6545 Wenonga Road  | New House / Swimming pool / Pergola / Generator<br><i>Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting</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. Russ & Karen Weltner

2801 West 66<sup>th</sup> Street

The Weltners are proposing an interior remodel that includes multiple window and door replacements.

### **Summary of Property:**

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

### **Summary of Project:**

The Weltners are proposing to replace the majority of their home's windows with new units of the same size and similar style. The proposed "Green Room" window changes a pair of French casement windows into a single fixed window, of the same size.

The existing windows are a combination of clear view casements and double hung. All of the new windows will have Colonial style muntin bars. Windows will be simulated divided light with spacer bars.

### **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.

## 2. Brooks & Amy Pierce

6333 Verona Road

The Pierces are proposing to replace their existing driveway and circle driveway.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The Pierces are proposing that the garage access drive be replaced with a new concrete drive in the same configuration. The circle drive will also be replaced with concrete, but the width is proposed to reduce to 14 feet wide.

As part of the project, the Pierces are proposing to remove the short brick courtyard walls and paver area at the front of the house along with the walkway connecting to the lower driveway. The stone wall at the west side of the house is to be replaced with a shorter stone wall to match the wall at the south side of the garage door.

### 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. The proposed changes increase the greenspace from 63.3% to approximately 66%. This recommendation has been met.

### 3. Willoughby Johnson & Christy Johnson-Miller

2112 West 61<sup>st</sup> Terrace

The Johnson-Millers are returning to the ARB with changes to their previously approved detached garage project.

#### Summary of Property:

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

#### Lot Coverage Review:

Main floor living area:	1,869 sf
<u>Detached Garage: (new)</u>	<u>460 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	2,329 sf

#### Summary of Project:

In March of 2022, the Johnson-Millers were approved for a new detached garage and associated driveway.

They are now proposing a driveway extension to allow another car to be parked near the new garage.

#### Ordinance Compliance:

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

#### Greenspace Review:

Lot area:	13,451 sf	Per Johnson County
House Footprint:	2,329 sf	
Proposed additional driveway:	201 sf	
<u>Previous Approved Driveway and walkway:</u>	<u>2,456 sf</u>	
Provided Greenspace:	8,465 sf	62.9%
Recommended Greenspace:		60%

#### Design Guideline Review:

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

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(10)/LS-1
Lot Area:	13,451 sf

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Detached Accessory Building Minimum Side Yard:	10'	10.1'
Detached Accessory Building Minimum Rear Yard:	10'	10.1
Lot Coverage	3,920 sf	2,329 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 8,070 sf	8,465 sf = 62.9%

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

*\*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. Robin & Lori Ames

2921 West 68<sup>th</sup> Street

The Ames are proposing to replace various windows around their home.

##### **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, the owners are proposing to replace the front door with a new pair of all glass doors. To the left of the front door a small window will be replaced with a large picture window. There will be new siding infill where a window is changing.

At the rear of the house all of the first-floor windows are being replaced with new windows in a new configuration. This includes the windows along the east side of the rear wing.

##### **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 windows and doors. This section suggests that window style match the style of the house and are consistent throughout the house. The proposed windows are all contemporary windows with minimal muntin bars. This is not in keeping with the architectural style nor do they match the existing windows. **This recommendation has not been met.**

## 5. Timothy & Susannah Sotos †

2504 West 70<sup>th</sup> Terrace

The Sotos are proposing to replace their rear patio and add a pool, outdoor fireplace, grill station, walls and a pergola.

Pools, outdoor kitchens, and outdoor fireplaces are all substantial construction items, and the project was noticed as such.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The proposed patio is located at the back of the house, to the side of an existing rear wing. The new patio will be slightly smaller than the existing. The patio is bordered on the north side by a tall stone wall. The proposed wall will contain the proposed fireplace and support the north end of the pergola.

The proposed grill station is located closer to the house. It consists of a stone base and counter with an integrated grill.

The pool overlaps the patio and extends into the rear yard. A new retaining wall is proposed to level the rear yard. A portion of the wall extends to 6 feet above grade.

The proposed pergola covers the majority of the patio and has retractable screens on all sides.

### Lot Coverage:

Existing House:	3,739 sf
<u>Pergola:</u>	<u>688 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	4,427 sf

### Ordinance Compliance:

The project is in violation of City Code Section 5-121 which requires pools to be a minimum of 20 feet from the rear or side property lines. The proposed pool is 19.7 feet from the rear property line. **A variance of 0.3 feet is required.**

Per Code Section 5-137.B: In considering all plans and specifications submitted in connection with a building permit application that includes the construction of a **retaining wall**, the ARB shall not approve such plans and specifications as to the retaining wall, unless it finds that the requirements set forth in Section 5-146 exist and in considering such findings shall, in addition to other applicable factors, examine the following factors:

The height and location of the proposed retaining wall recognizing:

That the greater the height of the retaining wall facing an adjoining property or street, the greater the likelihood of an adverse impact on an adjoining property or the neighborhood, particularly if the wall is located in close proximity to an adjoining property or street;

Conversely, that the lower the height of the retaining wall facing an adjoining property or street, the less the likelihood of an adverse impact on an adjoining property or the neighborhood;

The design and materials of the proposed retaining wall recognizing that design and materials should be in general conformity with the style and design of surrounding structures;

The effect of the retaining wall on surface drainage, recognizing that the proposed retaining wall should not cause the surface drainage to change in a manner that would adversely affect surrounding properties; and

The purpose for the retaining wall, recognizing:

That if the retaining wall is being constructed to retain soil that has been relocated from one part of the property to another part of the property creating a change in the topography or soil brought on the property from offsite, the greater the likelihood of an adverse impact on adjoining property and the neighborhood;

That legitimate safety and drainage requirements for a retaining wall may outweigh any negative appearance impact of the retaining wall on the neighborhood; and

That alternative solutions may remove or limit the need for a retaining wall.

The ARB may within its powers, approve or deny a proposed retaining wall of any height, design, materials and at any location, or the ARB may modify the height, design, materials or location of the retaining wall as in its opinion should be done under the circumstances.

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	18,998 sf
Lot Coverage:	4,427 sf
Driveways & walkways:	2,881.5 sf
<u>Patios, walkways and walls:</u>	<u>1,630.5 sf</u>
Remaining Greenspace:	10,059 sf = 52.9%

**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 Side Yard:	20'	22.0'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	> 35'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	4,984 sf	4,427 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 11,399 sf	10,059 sf = 52.9%

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.

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
<b>2504 W 70th Ter</b>	19,021	4,058	4,988	81.36%
2410 W 70th Ter	18,466	3,532	4,886	72.29%
2402 W 70th Ter	17,795	3,324	4,762	69.80%
2411 W 70th Ter	17,573	2,909	4,721	61.62%
2503 W 70th Ter	18,041	3,166	4,808	65.85%
7020 Overhill Rd	18,836	2,963	4,954	59.81%
7010 Overhill Rd	19,077	2,676	4,998	53.54%
7015 Overhill Rd	19,076	3,020	4,998	60.43%
2417 W 70th St	19,300	3,402	5,039	67.52%
			Average	63.86%
			50% Increase	95.79%
<b>Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule</b>		4,778		
<b>2504 W 70<sup>th</sup> Ter</b>	<b>Proposed =</b>	<b>4,427</b>	<b>88.8%</b>	<b>of City Ordinance Limit</b>
			<b>92.7%</b>	<b>of Design Guideline Limit</b>

## 6. Nancy Lombardino

5400 State Line Road

Ms. Lombardino is proposing a new outdoor fireplace on her existing patio.

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

The proposed stone and brick fireplace stands 12'-3" tall. It is located at the west edge of an existing patio.

### 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. Matt & Kerry Adam

6601 Belinder Avenue

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

*Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

### **Summary of Property:**

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

### **Summary of Project:**

They are proposing to shift the circle drive slightly closer to the front entry.

At the rear of the house, they are proposing a new 30-inch-tall stone retaining wall to create a level space for the previously approved sport court.

### **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.

## 8. Craig Scurato

6723 Tomahawk Road

Mr. Scurato is proposing to install a new guardrail atop an existing covered porch.

*Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

### **Summary of Property:**

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

### **Summary of Project:**

The propose railing is a simple square baluster system that will stand 36 inches tall. It is being installed atop an existing covered porch 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.

## 9. Nicholas Hinrichs

3300 West 69<sup>th</sup> Street

Mr. Hinrichs is proposing a new concrete (faux slate) roof.

*Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

### **Summary of Property:**

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

### **Summary of Project:**

The proposed product is a concrete based tile made to look like natural slate. This is not a product that the ARB has included on the pre-approved roofing materials list.

### **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.

## 10. Farid Namin

6520 State Line Road

Mr. Namin is proposing multiple window changes.

*Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

### Summary of Property:

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

### Summary of Project:

In May of 2022, the ARB approved a project for Mr. Namin to replace a few windows throughout his house. The revised layout is adding more windows to the original scope.

Clarification is required about existing windows that have clearly been replaced but are not indicated in this or previous proposals. These windows are of concern because they have snap-in muntin bars, rather than full simulated divided lights as typically requested by the ARB.

### 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 suggests that windows be simulated divided light windows with applied muntins at the exterior, at the insulated air space, and at the interior. **This recommendation has not been met.**

## 11. Dave & Dee Dillon

6545 Wenonga Road

The Dillons are proposing a new 1-story home with a 6,250 sq. ft. footprint. The footprint consists of 4,645 sq. ft. of first floor living space, a 950 sq. ft. 3-car garage, and 546 sq. ft. of covered porches. The project includes a generator, swimming pool, shade pergola, and other landscape structures.

*Continued from November 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

### Summary of Property:

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

### Lot Coverage of Roofed Structures Review:

Main floor living area:	4,660 sf
Main floor garage area:	914 sf
Covered porches:	195 sf
Screened porch:	457 sf
<u>Shade Pergola</u>	<u>240 sf</u>
Total Lot Coverage:	6,467 sf

### Summary of Project:

The proposed house is a Tudor Revival style sided primarily with brick. Wood accents provide additional detail in selected areas. The fenestration is formal and remains uniform on all sides of the house.

The main floor sits 1.15 feet lower than the house to the right and 4.5 feet higher than the home to the left. The main ridge is 6 feet lower than the home to the right and 7 feet higher than the home to the left. The homes on both sides are two stories tall so the eaves are not comparable.

The main central mass is flanked on the left side by a simple subordinate wing. The wing on the right side is a more complex compound wing that houses the 3-car garage. The overall composition of the house is an asymmetrical layout that is common in Tudor designs.

The roof is primarily 10/12 & 14/12 pitch which is in keeping with the Tudor design. The proposed rear wing includes a covered porch that is roofed with a lower pitch standing seam roof. Similar metal roofs are proposed at the various dormers and the large, curved portion of the left side wing.

The organization of the rear yard is a series of formal lawns. The center of these contains a roofed pergola structure. It is a simple post-and-beam structure with a metal shingle roof. The proposed pool is located in the rear most formal lawn. It maintains a small coping around the perimeter and is flush with the ground. Two iron groin vault structures are proposed to the side of the lawn and provide a pathway through the associated plantings.

A utility yard is proposed on the west (right) side of the rear wing and includes a basement access stair.

The driveway is a circle drive located towards the middle of the front yard. A secondary driveway connects to the auto court at the garage entrance. The circle drive approaches are 12 feet wide at the front property line. The driveway widens to 21 feet wide near the house.

**Ordinance Compliance:**

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

**Greenspace Review:**

Lot area:	45,217 sf	
House Footprint:	6,467 sf	
Driveway:	4,785 sf	
Front Walkway:	60 sf	
Pool:	612 sf	
Site Walls:	35 sf	
Miscellaneous site paving:	142 sf	
<u>Patios and walkways:</u>	<u>1,254 sf</u>	
Remaining Greenspace:	31,862 sf	70.5%

**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 A suggests that the main mass of the house should be between 40% and 50% of the lot width. At 52 feet wide it is approximately 25% of the lot width. This section goes on to suggest that the depth of the main mass should be 25% of the lot width but need not to be less than 25 feet. The overall proportions of the main mass are within the parameters of the guidelines.

Subsection B suggests that front wings have a width clearly less than the main mass and the total of all wings should not exceed 50% of the main mass width. The depth should not be greater than the width. The height can be up to 2-stories but clearly less than the main mass. The location should be near the front building line. These recommendations have been met.

Subsection C suggests that side wings, located in the primary building area, should have a depth and height clearly less than the main mass. They should also be set behind the front plane of the main mass. Side wings located in the secondary building area should have a height up to 2-stories and 30 feet, but clearly less than the main mass. These recommendations have been met.

Subsection D suggests that rear wings located in the primary or secondary building areas can be up to 2 stories and 30 feet tall but clearly less than the main mass. Rear wings should have a width clearly less than the main mass and should not exceed 50% of the main mass width. These recommendations have been met.

Subsection F suggests that dormers located on wings or accessory buildings located in the Secondary or Conditional Building Areas should not be oriented toward any neighboring lots. This recommendation has been met.

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. These recommendations have been met.

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. These recommendations have been met.

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 2.6.4.A on page 89 discourages overbuilding by suggesting that homes avoid reaching more than 2 minimum/maximum setbacks or limits. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.1 B on page 94 suggests that the number of different roof pitches should be limited to two. The house has two primary roof pitches and two secondary roof pitches. This was recommended by the PRP to reduce the overall height of the house. This recommendation has been met.

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 not been met;** however, they were revised to be more proportionate.

Section 2.7.2 A on page 101 recommends garages be set behind the façade of the main house mass. The proposed garage is located in line with the front of the house. **This recommendation has not been met.**

Section 2.7.2.B on page 102 recommends drives be no more than 12 feet wide at the front property line. This recommendation has been met.

Section 2.7.3.A on page 106 recommends that LS-6 and 7 properties have a greenspace no less than 70% of the lot area. This recommendation has been met.

**PRP Recommendation:**

The PRP recommends approval of the project with the following modification:

The window muntins should be modified to create vertically oriented window panes (typical for Tudor homes) rather than the large square panes proposed.

And the following condition: add trees or tall vegetation to the front yard landscape plan to help block the view of the garage doors as you are driving north on Wenonga Road.

Lot Information	
Zoning:	R-1(20)/LS-6
Lot Area:	45,217 sf
Lot Width:	203.9'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	30'
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	15% = 30.6'	39.5'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	15% = 30.6'	30.6'
Minimum Combined Side Yards:	N/A	
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	30% = 73.5'	75.0'
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	>54'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	43.3'
Maximum Lot Coverage:	9,092 sf	6,467 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	70% = 31,652 sf	31,862 sf = 70.5%

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
<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	
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

Address	Lot Area	Existing Lot Coverage	LC by Ordinance	% max used
<b>6545 Wenonga Rd</b>	45,127	4,004	9,092	44.04%
6549 Wenonga Rd	35,390	3,724	7,679	48.49%
6539 Wenonga Rd	28,366	2,224	6,585	33.78%
6610 Wenonga Ter	28,188	5,199	6,556	79.30%
6600 Wenonga Ter	41,601	4,383	8,592	51.01%
			Average	51.32%
			50% Increase	76.99%
<b>Allowable LC reduced by 150% Rule =</b>		<b>7,000</b>		
<b>6545 Wenonga Rd</b>	<b>Proposed =</b>	<b>6,467</b>	<b>71.1%</b>	<b>of City Ordinance Limit</b>
			<b>92.4%</b>	<b>of Design Guideline Limit</b>