



Architectural Review Board  
December 3, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. Westwood City Hall

Members Present: David Immenschuh, Chairman  
Mimi Ahsmuhs  
Ryan Bowden  
Mary Hunkeler

Also Present: John Watkins  
Mark Hershman, Impact Illumination  
Bill and Paula Kay  
David Lohrentz, Architect  
John Franken  
Eddie McNeal  
Lynn Munding  
Mike Kneirim  
Jody Cash  
Ramsey Mohsen  
Heather S. Esau Zerger, City Attorney

Chairman Immenschuh called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

**A. 5332 Mission Woods Road**

The first item on the agenda of the ARB was review of the proposed renovation plans to the residence owned by Bill and Paula Kay at 5332 Mission Woods Road. Mr. Lohrentz, Architect for the Kays, presented some demonstratives to the ARB reflecting the plot plan and the size of the proposed addition. Also shown on the plot plan was the 12 x 12 patio of blue stone and the brick-capped stone wall. The existing slab of bricks will be taken out. Mr. Lohrentz then showed a floorplan demonstrative reflecting the addition, which is one level. Next, demonstratives of the exterior of the home were shown from all sides. The windows will be matched. Mr. Lohrentz noted that some existing windows may be replaced but they will be

matched to the existing windows. The Kays plan to use a good quality integrity window made of fiberglass, which can be painted. The windows will be standard white.

On the addition, the Kays plan to use a hip roof rather than a gabled roof in minimize the feel of the addition. Some discussion occurred on the style of roof and the preference of the Board was the hip roof. The basement window will be replaced with glass block. The siding will consist of 10 inch wood shingles, to match what is existing. The roof shingles will also be matched to the existing roof. Examples of the windows, bluestone and paint were shown to the Board. The same color palette will be used on the addition as what currently appears on the home. The brick on the exterior of the home will remain. The low wall on the front of the home will remain limestone but will be capped with bluestone. Bluestone will also be used on the front steps and porch.

The larger concrete pad that exists in the back yard will remain, but be faced with brick and bluestone. The basketball court will be removed.

Mr. McNeal reported that with the addition, lot coverage is at 18%, which is well within the requirements of the City's ordinance.

Mr. Bowden inquired about the location of the sunroom and whether the Kays had considered placing it in another location. The Kays indicated they preferred the southeast corner, with the perennial garden around it, to make the setting a more intimate space.

With no further discussion, Ms. Ahsmuhs moved to approve the plans as presented and Ms. Hunkeler seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

## **B. 5035, Rainbow Blvd**

The Church brought two issues before the ARB: (1) plans for the installation of a new sign in the front of the church, and (2) a request to add another parking lot light on the church property. The ARB took up each issue in turn.

### **1. Signage**

John Watkins presented on behalf of the Church. He provided for the ARB drawings of the proposed sign that would be constructed at the front of the church. The sign would consist of a wooden framework, slightly lower to the ground than the temporary sign that presently appears on the property. A banner could be attached to a wooden backing and presented within the wooden framework. This is essentially a plan to make more permanent and refined the presentation of the temporary banners that are used by the church. The sign is single-sided and would face the street. It would be located essentially where the temporary banner appears now. It will be finished in a manner to compliment the other permanent sign on the property, which bears the name of the church; however the new sign will be smaller and lower to the ground.

Mr. Watkins, upon request, described generally the temporary sign that is there now, for those not familiar with it. The general goal is to provide a more formal and permanent framework for the banners, as requested by the City Council.

Ms. Ahsmuhs asked if there is a way to incorporate this into the already-existing permanent sign in order to make the signage on the property more streamlined. Mr. Watkins responded that there really is no way to accomplish that without starting over from scratch.

Mr. Watkins reported regarding his efforts to provide notice of the plans to neighbors and indicated he was able to reach all three neighbors on each side of the church starting at Rainbow. However, he was unable to reach anyone in the 3<sup>rd</sup> home on 51<sup>st</sup> street. Chairman Immenschuh reminded the residents in attendance that the form requesting signatures from neighbors was simply an acknowledgement of receiving notice, not an indication of approval of the plans.

Some discussion occurred on whether any signs are permitted within residentially zoned areas of the City. The City Attorney indicated that if the plans were approved by the ARB, the church would also need to obtain approval from the BZA for a special use permit or a variance in order to construct the sign, based on the restrictions in the City's ordinances. Ms. Hunkeler indicated her dissatisfaction with the church's effort to make permanent what she believes is a disallowed temporary sign.

Mr. Bowden moved to approve the plans for the new sign. Ms. Ahsmuhs seconded the motion. Mr. Watkins clarified that there is no plan for illumination of the new sign and that the existing sign that bears the name of the church is also not illuminated presently.

Upon vote of the Board, 3 members voted in favor and one member abstained. The motion carried.

## **2. Lighting**

As background information, Mr. Watkins explained that the existing two lighting structures on the property, one on the North side and one on the South side, were in place prior to the Church purchasing the property. The issue before the ARB is the Church's request for a permit for the addition of a third lighting structure, which would be located to the East of the lighting structure currently located on the North side of the property. This request was brought before the Board in September 2014 but tabled in order to allow the church to gather more information.

Mr. Watkins introduced Mark Hershman from Impact Illuminations, which is a division of Henderson Engineers. Mr. Hershman was asked to analyze the current level of light in the parking lot and indicated that while the lighting is basically adequate, it does create some security issues in places. Next, Mr. Hershman took readings on 51<sup>st</sup> Street to determine the impact of the parking lot lights as compared to the street lights. Readings were taken when the parking lot lights were illuminated and taken again when the parking lot lights were

extinguished. Mr. Hershman reported that the readings he took indicate the lighting that exists on 51<sup>st</sup> Street is caused by the street lights, not the parking lot lights.

Mr. Mohsen, who lives at 2114 51<sup>st</sup> Street, noted that while this may be true, the light from the parking lot illuminates his bedroom and became substantially more noticeable after the fixtures were replaced. He also reported that Mr. Watkins and Mr. Hershman were invited into his home to view the manner in which the parking lot lights illuminated his home at night on one of the evenings they were out taking readings. He understands and respects the need for security in the parking lot but also hopes the church and the neighbors can reach a compromise.

Mr. Kneirim also reported that he continues to experience issues with the parking lot lights since the fixture was changed in October 2013.

Mr. Watkins reported that the church continues to work with KCP&L to shield the light that illuminates the playground fence.

Mr. Bowden moved to deny the church's request to add a third light at this time, with the understanding that the church is free to renew their request if further progress is made on the problems with the existing lighting and additional information about how KCP&L's efforts to shield or redirect some of the existing light is obtained. Ms. Hunkeler seconded the motion. The ARB voted and the motion to deny the permit carried unanimously.

Chairman Immenschuh encouraged the church to continue its efforts in experimenting with ways to reduce or redirect the existing lighting. All agreed that the lighting issues are exacerbated in the winter months, when leaves from the surrounding trees no longer provide some buffer. Mr. Watkins reiterated that the parking lot has always been illuminated; therefore the parking lot lights are not a new issues.

Meeting adjourned at 5:31 p.m.