

KENSINGTON MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

REGULAR MEETING NOTES - DRAFT

CONFERENCE ROOM, COMMUNITY CENTER

59 ARLINGTON AVE., KENSINGTON, CALIFORNIA

Tuesday, February 23, 2016 – 7:00 PM

1. Roll Call: Tahara, Brydon, Snyder, Engberg, Gilfillan (quorum)

2. Citizens' Comments

Catherine Engberg reported on her research regarding the applicability of state conflict of interest rules to KMAC. She explained that she would recuse from the discussion and vote on 202 Kenyon because it is located less than 500 feet from her home.

Patrick Tahara commented on procedures for room set up and take down.

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

None

4. **254 Trinity (DP15- 3041) Continued** Application for Kensington Development Plan for a 239 sq. ft. addition, a 133 sq.ft. deck extension to this first floor of the existing single family residence and an improved off street parking pad.

Robert Wolf (architect) explained the changes to the plans from the last meeting to address neighbor's concerns regarding light access to kitchen window.

Jess and Julie McCarter (owner) spoke in support of the project. Julie thanked KMAC members for their visit over the weekend.

Herve Attard (250 Trinity) stated that he found the revised plans acceptable in terms of the light and privacy impacts that he raised at the last meeting. He does not oppose the revised project.

KMAC members commented that this project provides a positive example of neighbors working together to find design solutions and minimize impacts.

Motion to approve (5-0) (Tahara, Brydon, Snyder, Engberg, Gilfillan – aye)

5. **202 Kenyon (VR16-1003)** Applicant requests approval of a variance to allow a 3.8 foot side yard (minimum 5 feet is required) for a deck. The project also includes a request for approval of a Kensington design review to determine compatibility of the proposed deck with the surrounding neighborhood.

Madeline Kingsley, owner of the property, explained that she started the process with the County, and understood that the County stamped its approval of her plans, with the condition that she needed to have survey done. She did the construction, then had the survey done, not realizing it would show that she now needed a variance, as her construction was in her setback. She was coming to KMAC, with much apology.

In discussing this, KMAC members each addressed the residents, noting that asking for a variance after work is done is never appropriate. KMAC has been compelled to deny a recommendation based upon this before. In this case, there is a special circumstance because of the odd-shape of the lot, making it a non-standard lot.

Motion to approve: (4-0) (Tahara, Brydon, Snyder, Gillfillan-aye. Enberg recused herself)

6. Adjournment: 8:02