

DRAFT

KENSINGTON MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Venue: Conference Room, Kensington Community Center

Meeting Date: June 24 2003, 7.00 pm

- 1. Present:** J. Carman (Chair), R. Barraza, E. Detmer, S. Farneth (Alternate), D.Jenkins and K. Reed (partial attendance).

- 2. Announcement**

Chair Carman announced that Marianne Loring passed away on June 15 2003. The following resolution was passed by acclamation

“It is with great regret that KMAC has learned of the death of Ms. Marianne Loring on June 15 2003. She was a long-time member of KMAC and KIC and a pillar of volunteerism in the Community. KMAC expresses its appreciation for her extensive and devoted public service”.

- 3. Minutes** of the May 27, 2003 Meeting were approved unanimously.
- 4. 600 Plateau Dr. (VR031051).** Requests for a secondary sideyard setback of 6 ft. 7 in. (15 ft. required) to build an addition to an existing dwelling and conversion of an existing garage into living space.

This project was presented by R. Giddings (Architect) and A. Pastor and M. Pastor (Owners). The project is an expansion of an approximately 1500 ft² residence into an approximately 2200 ft² residence by connecting it to an existing garage through an existing breezeway. The breezeway and garage will be converted into 2 bedrooms, a family room and a bathroom. A. Giddings indicated that the project was being presented as a concept for KMAC’s input rather than for formal action by KMAC.

KMAC noted that two variances would be required – for the backyard rear setback (15 ft. required) and for a secondary sideyard setback (15 ft. required). KMAC will require completed plans for review, showing interior detail, dimensions and the location of all exterior doors and windows. The application form should be corrected to read “one unit” instead of “addition” as the answer to the question “Number of Units?”

- 5. 34. 40 and 44 Lenox Rd.** Consideration of a potential petition to install sidewalks in

front of subject residences.

KMAC's recommendations on this matter is being sought by the County Public Works

Director. The issue of retrofitting sidewalks is addressed by Sections 5875 and 5876 of the County Streets and Highways Code. Retrofitting sidewalks requires one of the following:

- affirmation by the owners of more than 50% of the parcels on the affected side of the street
- affirmation by the owners of more than 60% of the linear footage of parcel frontage on the affected side of the street
- an affirmative action by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) on their own motion. This will not occur in Contra Costa County because the BOS will not make such a motion without the approval of Supervisor Gioia who in turn will not approve the action without one of the previous two conditions being met.

The block in question includes 22-62 Lenox.

The following members of the public were present to discuss this topic: K. Sprague and B. Sprague (40 Lenox), M. Roth (34 Lenox), C. Nation and S. Nation (44 Lenox), J. Osborn (27 Lenox) and D. Hendrix (23 Lenox).

The key issue in this case was safety. The absence of a sidewalk *per se* did not cause this hazard. The safety problem exists because there is an interruption of the sidewalk in front of 24, 40 and 44 Lenox Rd and because these properties encroach on the area reserved for a sidewalk, making it impossible to pass without crossing to the sidewalk on the other side of the road, or stepping out into the road to get around the encroachments.

B. Sprague presented the following statement that he had circulated in the affected Lenox Rd area:

"I believe the property owners of 34, 40 and 44 Lenox, should not be forced to put in a sidewalk against their will".

This statement was supported by B. Sprague (40 Lenox Rd), C. and S. Nations, (44 Lenox Rd), T. Whitmore, (58 Lenox Rd), M. Roth (34 Lenox Rd), J. Harris (55 Lenox Rd), J. Ward, (54 Stratford), S. Amati ?????(53 Lenox Rd), E. Cheit (50 Lenox Rd), L. Johnson, (49 Lenox Rd), J. Ohr????? (27 Lenox Rd), F. Mueller (30 Lenox Rd), G.Thomson (41 Lenox Rd), G. Thorpe (33 Lenox Rd) and T. Dawson, 61 Lenox Rd).

B. Sprague also presented a map of the area around Lenox Rd showing that there were many streets without sidewalks and some places with “interrupted” sidewalks. Further discussion noted that there was a continuous sidewalk on the other side of Lenox, and that because the street had good unobstructed sight lines, approaching traffic could be seen easily.

KMAC noted that it was obvious that neither 50% of the parcel owners nor 60% of the owners of parcel frontage approved of retrofitting the sidewalk. Chair Carman will notify Supervisor Gioia and the County Public Works Director of this.

6 Citizens’ Comments

a. PUD for Colusa Circle Development

This project has been reactivated and D. Trachtenberg (Architect) and R. Nishimori (Architect) were present to bring KMAC up to date. Their discussion was illustrated by conceptual drawings and a model.

This 4 phases development was approved 22 years ago. Phase I has been completed but none of the other Phases (II, III and IV) had been started. The site on which Phase II was to be implemented has been sold by the owner (Hammond). The proposed activity is for Phases III and IV. The size of these phases has been reduced from 11,700 ft² to 8000 ft² and they will provide their own parking.

KMAC had generally favorable comments on the project design and architectural treatment. They suggested that an attempt be made to incorporate some outside “public” space and to keep the El Cerrito Planning department and El Cerrito residents on Santa Fe informed about the project. KMAC suggested that attention be paid to the appearance of the project from the rear (facing on Santa Fe) since this is the only side of the building facing residences. Attention should be also given to effects of the project on traffic patterns especially as they impact the adjacent pre-school. KMAC was interested in having the applicant confirm whether the original PUD was applicable given the changed nature and scope of the development.

b. 117 Lawson Rd. (VR031012). The County has determined that the front portion of this project would be 3 stories and is requiring a front set-back of the addition to avoid this.

R. Conception (Owner) and M. Kelly (Contractor) discussed with KMAC what changes would be required to gain County Planning approval of this project. KMAC recommended the following:

- show that pine tree will be removed
- show placement of structural members in the crawl space
- reduce the size of the side door to the crawl space to approximately 3' wide x 5' high
- remove the window from the crawl space
- clearly indicate that the crawl space is 6 ft. 11 in. high

7. Information Reports

(a) Enforcement Reports

- a. 4 cases are active
- b. New residential second unit ordinance to replace Code Chapter 82-24

J. Carman noted (with great personal satisfaction!) that his changes concerning the inconsistencies in parking requirements had been incorporated in the final version.

- c. Small lot review for a 1,110 sq. ft. addition at 685 Oberlin Ave.

This was not sent to KMAC due to an administrative oversight. Everything is in order with this project.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9.40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

David Jenkins
Secretary KMAC

Mydocuments\KMACJune..doc