

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AGENDA

June 22nd, 2021

3:00 p.m.

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

Please join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone at

<https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/255137725>

You can also dial in using your phone at Toll Free: 1 (877) 309-2073 or 1 (646) 749-3129
using Access Code: 255-137-725

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| #1 | Dustin & Katherine Stiles WITHDRAWN
6624 Rainbow Avenue | Replacing existing siding with faux shake shingles / Replacing windows |
| #2 | David & Diane Zimmer*
5924 High Drive | Changes to previously approved fence
<i>Cont'd from May 11th & 25th ARB mtgs</i> |
| #3 | Alison & Eric Jager
3201 West 69 th Street | Changes to previously approved driveway |
| #4 | John & Amber Burgess †
6125 Mission Drive | Fire pit / Outdoor Kitchen |
| #5 | Scott & Carolyn Ellspermann †*
2600 Verona Road | Replace patio and add roof / Outdoor Kitchen /
Outdoor Fireplace |
| #6 | Mike & Lisa Hamilton †
2514 West 65 th Street | 1-Story addition / Patio / Outdoor Kitchen |

*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.

The Stiles proposed to replace all their existing siding with new faux shake shingles. They also proposed to replace all the windows on the front of the home and the easterly most window on the north side.

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

At previous meeting, the windows were approved but the siding portion was continued so a sample/mockup could be provided to the City for the City Architect and/or City Planner to review. A sample of the proposed siding was provided and was not approved by the City Architect or City Planner. The ARB continued the project to the June 22nd meeting; however, the owners have decided to go with Hardie shingles (not panels) which the City Planner approved. **No action is required 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:

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

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

The project was continued from the May 11, 2021 ARB meeting so that the owners could present an alternative plan for the fence location and design.

UPDATE: As requested by the ARB at the May 11th meeting, the City contacted Johnson County and asked what they do when two adjacent private property owners have property surveys that conflict, and do they have someone at the County that can determine which is correct. We also asked if there is another entity that can review surveys to determine if they were done correctly. The County’s Chief Surveyor responded:

“We wouldn’t make that determination and there isn’t a state office that would either. The best solution is an agreement between the landowners and then have a survey done to show the agreed upon boundary. If the land owners cannot come to an agreement then the next step is usually legal action and a judge will determine the boundary line. Let me know if you have any further questions.”

Summary of Property:

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

Summary of Project:

Portions of the fence interfere with 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.**

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.
June 22, 2021

The Jagers 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 June 11, 2019 ARB meeting, the ARB approved the replacement of their existing asphalt circle driveway with concrete. They are now proposing to modify the configuration to include a paver area at the front of the house. This area will widen the driveway to 22 feet wide. It is flanked on both sides with decorative hedges and landscape urns. A new front walkway will connect the new driveway to the existing front stoop.

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 John & Amber Burgess

6125 Mission Drive

The Burgesses are proposing a fire pit and outdoor kitchen on their existing patio.

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:

The proposed fire pit is located toward the rear of the existing patio in an existing semicircular area. The pit consists of a low circular stone wall.

The outdoor kitchen is located near the house and consists of a stone counter and counter top with multiple built-in grills.

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(20)/LS-2
Lot Area:	18,586 sf
Lot Width:	100'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	No Change
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	No Change
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 11,151 sf	No Change

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

#5 Scott & Carolyn Ellspermann *

2600 Verona Road

The Ellspermanns are proposing to replace their existing patio and add a patio roof, outdoor kitchen and outdoor fireplace. They are also proposing a new side entry on the left side of the house.

Outdoor fireplaces 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 & Side
- Any Special Frontages: None

Summary of Project:

The new entry is a 1-story structure located between the driveway and the main house. All materials, detailing and fenestration match the main house.

The proposed fireplace is located at the rear of the property on a terraced lawn. Two locations are proposed, one of which requires a variance. The fireplace is to be constructed of aged brick and stands 10'-10" tall.

The proposed outdoor kitchen is along the west side of the same terraced lawn and consists of a stone counter and countertop with a variety of built-in grills. A small stone patio is proposed in front of the new counter.

In the same terrace, the existing brick patio is being removed and replaced with a stone patio. A portion of the new patio will be covered with a roof deck that is accessed from the second floor of the house. The deck is supported by large wood columns with brackets and the deck features a metal guardrail.

Ordinance Compliance:

The proposed fireplace has two different locations indicated. The first is in violation of City Code Section 5-121.C which requires accessory structures, such as outdoor fireplaces, have a minimum rear yard setback of 10 feet. The proposed is located 7'-8" off the rear line. **A variance of 2'-4" is required.** The alternate fireplace location does not require a variance.

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:	30,879 sf
Lot Width:	169'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Maximum Height:	35'	No Change
Minimum Side Yard (Left):	10% = 16.9'	32.4'
Minimum Side Yard (Right):	Platted	No Change
Minimum Rear Yard: (At closest point)	30%	No Change
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	No Change
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	25' (Existing)
Accessory Structure Minimum Rear Yard Setback:	10'	7'-8" (Proposed) 10' (Alternate)
Maximum Lot Coverage:	6,985 sf	2,922 sf
Minimum Greenspace:	65% = 20,071	23,099 = 75%

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

The Hamiltons are proposing a new 1-story addition, patio, and outdoor kitchen in their rear yard.

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

Summary of Project:

The proposed addition is located near the center of the main mass. It is sided with a combination of brick and shingle siding to match the main house. All detailing and fenestration are in keeping with the exiting house.

The outdoor kitchen is located to the side of the new addition. It consists of a built-in grill set on a brick base with a stone countertop.

The proposed patio is directly behind the new addition and is encircled with a low brick seat wall. A new walkway is proposed at the east end to connect back to an existing side door. Another stoop is proposed at the west side of the patio connecting to an existing walkway.

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-2
Lot Area:	17,473 SF
Lot Width:	106'

Ordinance/Design Guideline	Allowable/Required	Provided
Patio Minimum Side Yard:	20'	26.8'
Patio Minimum Rear Yard:	20'	>45'
Minimum Greenspace:	60% = 10,484 sf	10,938 = 62.6%

Drainage Study Required if any answer below is "Yes"	Yes/No
Is the project adding 1,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface?	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