

# KENSINGTON MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

**DRAFT**

## SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, July 15, 2015

7:00 PM

1. Roll Call of Members Present: Tahara, Brydon, Snyder, Engberg, Gilfillan
2. Citizens' Comments: None
3. **30 Ardmore (DP14-3044) – CONTINUED TO ALLOW FOR RESUBMITTAL OF MODIFIED PLANS**

Applicant requests Development Plan and Kensington Design Review to construct a 828 SF two story addition to the existing 1,538 SF single family residence and 450 split level deck.

Applicant's architect Gary Parsons presented the redesigned project. He explained the changes that are proposed since the project came before KMAC in November 2014. The modifications were proposed to mitigate impacts to 26 Ardmore. In general, the second story shifted forward 6 feet with an increase to the size of the second story laundry/utility room. Mr. Parsons mentioned that there are possible additional modifications to the pitch of the first story roof that could reduce the height by 17 in.

Gregory Kuhn, 30 Ardmore, spoke in support of the project. He described conversations with the neighbors and attempts at compromise.

Gillian Thackray, 30 Ardmore, spoke in support of the project. She described attempts to compromise with the neighbors and explained her design goals of maintaining the bungalow design and views of the garden from the second story.

Rena Rickles, land use attorney, spoke in favor of the project and explained that she has represented the applicant since March 2015. She described the procedure before the County Zoning Administrator and the attempts at mediation. She stated that in her opinion the findings could be made that the project minimized impacts. She stated that the applicant was amendable to reducing the pitch of the roof by approximately 18 in.

Anna-Maria Hertzler, 35 Ardmore, opposes the project based on view impacts. She posed questions to the applicant. She stated that her house is a legal duplex.

Peter Kohn, 22 Ardmore, opposes the project based on view impacts, incompatibility with the neighborhood, and inadequate parking. He submitted photos of the story poles taken from his deck, porch and bedroom.

Philip Moss, architect representing owners of 26 Ardmore, opposes the project as proposed. He stated that he was brought in to attempt to reach a compromise. He stated that the house is bigger than the original design. He described the attempts at mediation and his clients request to move the second story back 8' 3".

David Hertzler, 35 Ardmore, opposes the project on grounds of view impacts from his second floor office. He stated that the revised plans do not mitigate impacts to his view impacts. He stated that impacts from the existing oak tree should be ignored.

Neil Henry, 29 Ardmore, opposes plan based on views and bulk. He stated that he will lose views of the Bay Bridge tower and twinkling lights and night. He commented on the process.

Ondi Lingenfelter, 29 Ardmore, opposes project based on views. She stated that she will lose views of the sunset. She commented on the process and the timing of the applicant's outreach.

Krishen Laetsch, 34 Ardmore, supports the project. He commented on the prior statements of neighbors and the architectural character of Kensington.

Vickie Hopper, 216 Oak Manor, supports the project and read a letter from resident of Kingston who supports the project.

Don Bonato, 26 Ardmore, opposes the project based on view, light and air impacts from the living room, kitchen and dining area. He submitted photos of the views of the story poles from these living spaces. He is not opposed to the second story but asks that the fireplace be the break point. He noted that the project is larger than previously proposed.

Jane Kaplan, 26 Ardmore, opposes the project on the same grounds as Don. She asked that the project preserve her kitchen views of the redwood and palm trees. She commented on the impacts from the pitch of the 1st floor roof.

Robert Diener, attorney for Jane and Don at 26 Ardmore, commented on the process and the attempts at mediation. He stated that the chimney should be the break point and that they had asked in compromise that the project be moved back 8' 3".

Rena Rickles and Gary Parsons responded to some of the points raised in the public comment. They described movement by the applicant to reach a compromise.

The Council discussed the impacts of the project and the process to date. Councilmember Gilfillan asked whether mediation is still possible. Councilmember Engberg commented on the possible lowering of the roof line by the applicant. Councilmember Snyder asked for clarity on the existing and new square footage numbers. Councilmembers Tahara and Snyder stated that they had attended the June 2, 2015 ZA hearing, and that no changes to the plans had been made since that time. Councilmember Tahara asked the applicant whether she would be willing to consider further modifications to the plans based on public comments received at the KMAC meeting. Applicant said yes so long as she could maintain the August 17 continued ZA hearing date. Recommended continuance to date that would allow the County to maintain the August 17 ZA hearing - 5-0 (Tahara, Brydon, Snyder, Engberg, Gilfillan).

Follow up discussion of possible special meeting on July 24 to discuss any resubmitted plans, with a possible back up option of July 29 if the July 24 date is not achievable.

4. Consensus to adjourn at 9:10 pm.