

DRAFT: Subject to revision and adoption at next KMAC meeting

Kensington Municipal Advisory Council Minutes

Meeting of January 25, 2005

Council Members present:

Chair: Reyes Barraza

Secretary: Richard Karlsson

Council Member: Kay Reed

Council Member: Patrick Tahara

Council Member: Pam Brown

The meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m.

1. The Council approved the minutes of January 4, 2005, without change.
2. There were no citizen comments.
3. Procedural Matters
 - a. Review of Council Roster Information: Discussion was held among the Council regarding updates to contact numbers of Council members.
 - b. County Fundraising Ordinance. The date of February 1, 2005 was set for the planned discussion of the proposed County Fundraising Ordinance and public input regarding same. The meeting would begin at the usual time of 7:00pm and efforts to notify the *Outlook* and to otherwise notify the Kensington Community of the meeting would be undertaken by the Council.
 - c. Kensington Overlay Ordinance. The date of March 3, 2005 at 7:00pm was set for a KMAC retreat to discuss the application of the Kensington Overlay Zoning Ordinance with County CDD staff. The retreat would be open to the public but the purpose will be for County CDD to inform KMAC about the nuances of the ordinances.
4. **23 Cowper Ave. (VR 041143).** Request for Small Lot Review and Variance for a front setback of 14' 8" (20' required) for residence addition. Continued Hearing on Small Lot Review. Appearing in support of the application was Robert Wolf, the architect, and the homeowners, Mary Olivella and Bill Wright. The architect began the presentation by stating that his original calculations regarding the height of the roof were in error and that the actual increased height to the roof was 7", not 22" as stated in the meeting on January 4, 2005. In response to the suggestion at the meeting on January 4, story poles had been constructed. There had been no change in the floor plan, only to the design of the roof, and he

expressed his opinion that there would be no impact upon the view of the affected homeowners toward the Golden Gate Bridge.

Member Reed asked whether the ridges in the roof were now higher than previously indicated and was advised by the architect that the error in the prior design was due to the 5/12 pitch, so that the roof appeared to be higher than it actually would be after the remodel. Member Reed then inquired as to the height at the existing highest point, and was advised that it would be 28'10" taken from the lowest point on the property, which was the datum point of 10' (as indicated on page A-1 at the front entrance to the subject property), and therefore the actual high point was 18' 10". The height at the highest point of the house after the remodel would then be 19' 5", or an overall increase for the remodeled family room of 7".

Member Brown then inquired about the height of the interior ceiling in the new addition and was advised that it would be 10' 1". She asked about the ceiling height in the remainder of the home and was advised that it was 8'. She then inquired as to the need for the increase and was informed that because the property was below grade and the need for light to reach the skylights, there was a need for higher ceilings in the proposed addition. Member Reed then noted that the height of the ceiling as indicated in the drawings was 10' 3" and asked whether that could not be reduced, so as to minimize the impact upon the neighbors. She was advised by the architect that this was possible.

Hilary Goldstine the owner of the home at 41 Cowper then commented that she remains upset with the house located at 32 Highland Blvd and her prior experience with that remodel tended to color her attitude regarding this remodel. She thanked the owners of the subject property for addressing her concerns, but remained cautiously optimistic that the remodel of this home would not further deteriorate her views of the Bay.

Discussion then shifted as to whether by limiting the "plate height" of the ceiling to 10' the architect could further minimize the impact. After considering the issue, the architect indicated that he believed he could do so without negatively impacting the intended design of 23 Cowper. Discussion was further held that though it was expected that the overall height of the roof could then be reduced, as a result of the plate height limit of 10', that the overall maximum height of 7", to 19'5" would remain in the event that the contractor needed a 'fudge factor.' It was Member Tahara's opinion that a contractor could be reasonably held to this standard.

Based upon that assurance, the following motion for a recommendation was considered by KMAC. *To recommend approval of the proposed plans, date stamped as of 1/18/05, on page A-4 of the plans, and the remainder of the plans dated 12/17/04 (pages A-1, 2 and 3) with the changed exception of a limitation of height in the family room addition of no more than 10' at the interior plate line and the exterior roof extending to no greater than 19' 5" measured from the 10' datum point, shown on site plan 2, drawing A-1, or a total of 29'5" from the 0 (zero)*

datum point as shown on the same page. Member Tahara also added to the motion that the roof materials used on the additions match the existing roof materials. The motion passed 5-0. After adoption of the motion, Ms. Olivella and Ms. Goldstine thanked the KMAC for its efforts.

Informational Reports:

a. **Enforcement Report:** No enforcement report had been received by Chair Barraza and therefore there was nothing to report

b. **Progress on ByLaws:** Chair Barraza indicated that he had received several samples of bylaws and would be presenting a proposal regarding KMAC revised bylaws at a future meeting.

c. **Update on Amateur Radio Transmission Tower:** Chair Barraza indicated that there would be a follow-up at the next regularly scheduled meeting in February.

d. **Update on 300 Coventry and 500 Coventry:** The Community Development Department upheld the recommendation of KMAC in regard to the improvements to 300 Coventry and in regard to the concerts at 500 Coventry, the Zoning Administrator has upheld fines in the amount of \$800 for failure to have a use permit for the concerts.

e. **Note from County Staff regarding setbacks on corner lots:** Properties located on a corner lot are required to have a 20' front setback and a 15' secondary frontage setback facing the streets and the two remaining setbacks are both considered sideyards and are subject to the minimum and aggregate setback requirements for sideyards.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Secretary Karlsson