

# KENSINGTON MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

## MINUTES June 30, 2009

1. Roll Call: Kay Reed (Acting Chair), Pamela Brown, Christopher Brydon, Gordon Becker, and Vanessa Cordova were present.
2. The minutes of the May 26, 2009 meeting were approved with no changes.
3. Citizens' Comments

Joseph Holmes (14 Highland) provided written comments on how the KMAC ordinance could be more effective. He found it difficult to initially find the ordinance and then he was unable to open one of the links in Safari (i.e., through the Mac web application). He thought it would be easier if the applicant would be asked to print and distribute copies of the ordinance to their neighbors when sharing information on their construction plan. Kay said that the council would take up his suggestions at another meeting.

Joan Gallegos (239 Cambridge) asked if KMAC was going to address the LAFCO issue, item five, this evening. Kay indicated it would be tabled until next month because the KMAC members who would have information on this issue were not present at this meeting.

Kay provided an overview of KMAC and the review and recommendation process at the start of the meeting.

**16 Highland (DP09-3011)** Request for a development plan to construct a two story addition to an existing single family residence

Casey Bowden (the applicant at 16 Highland) provided an overview of the project. They have been in the house 2 ½ years and currently have a 1,000 square foot house on an over 6,000 square foot lot. They are planning to build under the FAR that is set at 2,800 feet and they are proposing 2,423 square feet for this proposal. They decided to not go straight up to limit impact on the neighbors across the street. Instead, they are planning a two story addition that will go out and down, not up. The applicant presented two options they considered – the first would alter the existing ridgeline to run east and west along the house. The applicant described this original construction plan was comparable to their northern next door neighbor's addition. The second plan was to flatten out the ridge line and bring back the extension in the back yard to have less impact on the southern side and western side neighbors. They described that in pulling the second option together, they tried to minimize the space to just allow room for the primary appliances and furniture (e.g., sink, toilet, tub, and bed). The plan also includes a deck which is smaller than the existing deck. Lastly, they are going from a two bedroom, one bath home to a four bedroom, three bath home.

They reached agreement with their uphill and southern neighbors and he described to the west, they are 45 feet from the back yard property line where there is a 15 foot setback. With the

northern neighbors, there is an issue with a driveway easement which then required a variance. Because of that and because their current plan created a bedroom that would be too small, the applicant requested a revision to the submitted plan that would move out the house a foot and a half on the north side of the house.

As for community comments:

Martin Reed (17 Highland Blvd) is in support of the project. He also said it might be possible to have a lower profile ridgeline by either digging down and/or cutting down the number of steps to the addition.

Catherine Ortiz (18 Highland Blvd) is somewhat opposed to the project and lives just south to the project. They have enjoyed the views, including the northern views, and is concerned the proposed construction would eliminate her northern sunsets for the majority of the year. She is really opposed to the first plan and more supportive of the second plan. She also said that by cutting down the loft area, it would have less of an impact on her view.

Bob Westby (13 Highland Blvd) is supportive of the plan and not affected by this project.

Joseph Holmes (14 Highland Blvd) is opposed to the plan. They agreed the second proposal was a much better construction plan as related to impact on their houses. Their concerns are the overall height, presence of a loft and that the roof is not hipped down. But, he believes it would be excessively onerous to dig down to reduce the impact. So they think hipping the roof and eliminating the loft will address their concerns.

Ken Mirk (19 Highland Blvd) is supportive of the plan and lives across the street. He and his wife are both believe it has no impact on their view.

Thea Black (11 Kenilworth) lives at the back of the neighbor's house. She is concerned about the cathedral roof and the loft and how from that vantage point, they can look into her bedroom. She expressed concern about the impact on her privacy.

Douglas Frazier (15 Highland) and his wife support the project. From their point of view, they had a minor concern that has been eliminated with the second proposal. They had looked at the plans but still recommended a continuance to examine some of the issues, including alternate roof forms that are more compatible of the other houses in the neighborhood.

When the applicant was asked about the loft, he said it in effect had been cut back so significantly that it can no longer function in that way. It is now more of a storage or a "cave" space. They need it to provide ventilation for their bedroom.

Vanessa applauded the applicants considering alternatives and approaching the neighbors about the project. Pamela also acknowledged the neighbors consideration on the impact their recommendations would have on the applicants and ways to work together on this project. Chris said he was really close but would like to see a finalized plan in front of him to vote on. Gordon

has also stated that he thought it would be good see the house. Kay acknowledged the neighbors and applicant working together. She had concerns about the hipping of the roof and how that will look on the back side of the house. Addressing the concerns on the neighbor's privacy concerns, she thought that obscured glass could be required to provide light and allow privacy.

Kay made a motion to recommend approval of the plan date stamped June 3<sup>rd</sup> with the following conditions. First, the northern wall of the addition be moved 18 inches north. Second, the two windows in the attic storage space, the high facing west and south, be required to have non-clear glass. Third, the ridgeline will be no higher than the existing ridgeline. In addition, the motion included an approval of the variance it would not be a special privilege, the special circumstances pertaining to the easements on the lot, and it is consistent with the zoning district. Vanessa seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

4. Discussion with KPOA and County Supervisor/ By Laws was tabled until next meeting.

5. Council Terms

Kay briefly mentioned that some of the existing council members, Ray and herself, we not intending to reapply to be on the Council and that we should seek other members who might be interested in serving.

6. Adjournment – the meeting adjourned at 8:40pm.