

TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH
SAN MATEO COUNTY

Planning Office
(650) 375-7411
Fax (650) 375-7415



1600 Floribunda Avenue
Hillsborough
California 94010

**Architecture and Design Review Board
Minutes**

January 5, 2004

Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 p.m.

Boardmembers Present – Heyman, Jewett, Luebkehan, Reisman, Werbe and Alternate Boardmember Benoit

Staff Present – Morton, O'Connell, Milke, and Kirchgessner

Others Present – Commissioner Fannon

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – A motion (Werbe/Heyman) to approve the minutes of December 10, 2003 passed 5-0. (Boardmember Luebkehan abstained as he was absent on December 10, 2003, Alternate Boardmember Benoit voted.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Consent Calendar

2. **535 El Arroyo Road**—Jefferson St. Corps (Callan)
Fencing, gates, columns, and related landscaping

Approval, subject to re-establishment of hedge along the left side property line as addressed in letter from Michael Callan, ASLA, and dated December 28, 2003.

3. **1485 Crystal Drive**—Lindstrom/Green (Callan)
Landscape Plan

Approved.

5. **250 Bridge Road**—Doyle (Ostoya) 27% FAR; 4,689 sq. ft. total
Addition and remodel, including using a new roofing material

Approved.

A motion (Heyman/Werbe) to approve the consent calendar passed 5-0.

Discussion Items:

New Houses

1. **1350 Marlborough Road**— Ambos (Medan) 17.6% FAR; 3,823 sq. ft.
Substantial teardown and construction of a new house (foundation to remain)

The Board was concerned that the proposed paint color for the body of the house was too bright. A motion (Jewett/Werbe) to approve the project subject to the final body paint color being approved by the staff (prior to application of the paint on the home) and submittal of a final site plan and arborist report/tree protection plan to ensure the health of existing trees within 15 feet of the proposed driveway which would also be subject to the review and approval by staff, passed 5-0.

Remodels/Additions/Revisions

4. **1055 Vista Road**—Zimits (Gumbinger Avram Architects) 24.9% FAR; 4,516 sq. ft. total
Second-story addition of 554 square feet

Boardmember Luebkehan pointed out that this project was approaching the maximum allowable FAR. He said that the site reflected a very nice job with landscaping, but he was concerned that the new addition seemed to “turn its back” on some of the existing architectural details of the present home.

A motion (Luebkehan/Heyman) to approve the project subject to redesigning the first-floor bathroom to better integrate the permanent removal of the shower into a full redesign and to increasing the level of detail on the addition to better reflect that of the existing house, subject to the review and approval by staff, passed 5-0.

6. **320 West Santa Inez**—Grimes (Stewart Associates) 19.9% FAR; 9,298 sq. ft.
Substantial teardown and construction of a new house (foundation to remain) includes landscape plan and gates/fencing

Chairman Reisman indicated that he wanted to applaud the applicant for using the design review process so effectively and working so hard to address the concerns and comments of the neighbors and Design Review Board. He said that this site was beautiful, and the applicants had done a wonderful job.

A motion (Werbe/Luebkehan) to recommend that the City Council approve the project passed 5-0.

7. **2335 Oakdale Road**—Thorenfeldt (Stewart Associates) 24.2 % FAR; 7,344 sq. ft. total
Revision to previously approved plans for a new house, including moving a portion of the front of the house 6 feet closer to the street

The project architect explained that the proposal was adding 236 square feet of floor area.

A neighbor at 902 Baileyana Road (Krolik) spoke indicating that landscaping was his main concern. He said that there had been a meeting with six (6) neighbors, and that the applicant promised to revise the landscaping plans.

A neighbor at 2318 Oakdale Road (Ferro) referred to the letter that she had written and pointed out that this house was larger than other homes in the neighborhood, and that the visual effect

was personified because it was sitting on a knoll. She stressed her concern that it seemed unusual that this change was needed at this point in the project, saying that she believed that the process was being manipulated. She believed that this was a neighborhood of smaller homes on smaller substandard lots, and that this large sized house was not consistent. She believed that if someone alters a neighborhood, and it is their dream house, it is less problematic than someone who does so and then sells the house and leaves the area.

Boardmember Jewett said that he believed that the original stairway design was practical, where this revision was not. He thought that the additional six-foot protrusion may be evident from the street. Boardmember Werbe said that she agreed and expressed concern about the fact that such a seasoned architect and developer identified this problem so late in the construction process. She was not supportive of the process.

Boardmember Leubkeman agreed saying that he did not think that the proposed revision did the project any good and resulted in no benefit. He would rather have the project stay the way it was approved. Boardmember Heyman agreed. He clarified for the audience exactly what the proposal was and the limited scope of the proposed change.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit agreed saying that she thought the original design had a great deal of grace which is lost with the proposed revision.

Chairman Reisman said that he did not believe that the proposed revision materially changes the profile of the house, but agreed that the first design was probably better.

The project landscape architect, Mike Callan, discussed some possible changes to the landscape plan to address some of the neighbor's concerns.

A motion (Heyman/Reisman) to approve the project subject to revising the landscape plan to address the neighbor's concerns failed 2-3 (Jewett, Werbe and Luebkeman dissented).

The Chairman suggested that this item be adjourned to allow the applicants to discuss possible changes with the concerned neighbors, and that the item would be reconvened later in the agenda.

8. 10 Scott Court—Gomez (T. Peter Lam) 10,699 sq. ft. total

Revisions to previously approved plans for a new house, including an addition of 2,980 sq. ft. for an enclosed pool and second unit

A neighbor at 20 Live Oak Lane (Buckwald) spoke saying that the applicant had been a very good neighbor during the construction. He said that he had no objections to the change in the project.

A neighbor at 6105 Skyline Boulevard (Graham) also indicated that the applicant had been fine neighbor and that as long as the footprint of the house was not increasing he supported the project.

Boardmember Werbe commended the applicant with the way in which he had been working with the neighbors.

Boardmember Luebkeman said that he believed that utilizing the space under the garage and the proposed addition actually benefited the design of the project with the slope of the site. He also commended the applicant's positive relationship with the neighbors.

Boardmember Heyman said that he has always thought that this was an exciting project, and that the applicant had done a good job to manage a difficult site. He said that the proposed second unit is a natural.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit agreed saying that the proposal actually softens the way that the house fills the sloping site. Boardmember Jewett also commended the applicant.

A motion (Luebkehan/Werbe) to recommend that the City Council approve the project passed 5-0.

9. 905 La Senda Road—Breen (Skyline Design) 11.2% FAR; 4,196 sq. ft. total
Additions totaling 1,008 square feet, new roof structures, remodel, and landscape plan

Boardmember Luebkehan pointed out that this house was at the end of the street, and that the proposal resulted in a dramatic change in the style of architecture. His concern, however, was that the new style was unidentifiable since the project included several different pieces which did not appear to effectively represent an architectural style. He also pointed out some discrepancies in the plans and the actual elevations, which he said resulted in a concern in the overall project. He believed that the project needed additional work.

Boardmember Heyman indicated that he thought that the overall bulk and massing of the addition was fine. However, he believed that there was a missed opportunity in that the project lacked continuity and style. He pointed to the proposed wrought iron, saying that he believed that it degraded the look of the entry.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit said that she shared the concern of the other Boardmembers. She agreed that, compared to the current house, the project is initially pleasing but said the details were not consistent or representative of a specific style. She liked the use of natural stone and suggested that it might be used more consistently. She expressed concern about the articulation around the windows and asked for additional information on the way in which the windows were to be trimmed. She supported the use of slate and the color scheme.

Boardmember Jewett commented that the roof change and the overall feel were very positive. He did agree with the comments of the other Boardmembers and pointed to the fact that the windows in the front elevation were "kissing the molding". He discussed the use of the quoins on one corner of the building.

Boardmember Werbe agreed that her initial impression of the project were positive. She really liked the entry façade saying how successful the scale of that was. She agreed that the iron and the windows needed work and, overall, the level of detail needed to be improved.

Chairman Reisman agreed that the project needed additional work. He pointed out that the current house had a consistency in window styles. He also agreed that the entry piece was very well done. However, he believed that the quoins on one corner was not a successful solution, and that the windows were out-of-scale and proportion. He commended the use of slate and stone and suggested that the designer work to develop a more consistent style and level of detailing.

A motion (Heyman/Jewett) to continue the application to the meeting of March 1 passed 5-0.

7. 2335 Oakdale Road—Item #7 was reconvened.

The landscape architect Mike Callan indicated that the property owner had agreed to upsize the trees in the front to 48-inch box specimens and work with the neighbors on an agreeable species.

Mr. Krolik indicated that this addressed his concerns, although, Ms. Ferro said that it did not address hers.

A motion (Jewett/Heyman) to approve the project, subject to revising the landscape plan to increase the trees to 48-inch box specimens and to specify a species to which the neighbors agree, subject to the review and approval by staff passed 3-2 (Werbe and Luebckemen dissented).

New Houses

10. 1915 Parkside Avenue—Hawayek (Stewart Architects/Callan) 24.7% FAR; 5,443 sq. ft.
New house, including teardown, landscape plan, and gates/fencing

The project architect said that he planned to move the downspouts to the corner of the building and put the lights where the downspouts are currently shown.

Boardmember Heyman believed that this was a very nice traditional design which fits well into the neighborhood. He would like to see a sample of the cement siding. He pointed out, however, that the roofing material, asphalt shingles, was a very low-end product. He also pointed out that there were some comments in the Town's Landscaping Architect's report.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit agreed that this was an appropriate style for the neighborhood. She pointed out that the window details would be very important. She agreed that the roof material required some enhancement.

Boardmember Jewett agreed that the house, overall, was very nice. He shared the concern about the siding, and the architect offered to show the Board a sample. The architect said that the product carried a 50 year warranty and was fireproof. Boardmember Jewett pointed out what he believed to be a discrepancy on Sheet A8.

Boardmember Werbe said that she believed that this was a nice house. However, she pointed out that there was simplicity in the plans that was better addressed in the rendering, which she thought was lovely. She agreed that the detailing on the windows was important and pointed out how the windows were better detailed on the rendering than on the plans. She also agreed that the roof was a very prominent feature and needed to be upgraded.

Boardmember Luebckeman asked about the fireplaces, pointing out that there were no chimneys. The architect responded that the fireplaces were gas and did not require chimneys. Boardmember Luebckeman said that this was a very traditional style of architecture with which chimneys are normally associated. He was concerned that the project would appear too large and boxy and plain without careful attention to detail. He asked about the skylights in the storage room and about a corner of the roof on Sheet A-5.

Chairman Reisman agreed that he had thought the details were minimal. He believed that the window detailing as shown on the rendering was much more successful than that which was on the plans. He also agreed that this simple style of a house, which has two full story volumes

facing the street, needed a better roofing material. He also asked the architect to take a look at the dormers which seemed a little bit under-thought. He believed that some additional detail was needed. He complimented the entry design saying that it was lovely and very authentic. For the benefit of the homeowner, he pointed out that the floor plan needed some additional refinement. He specifically mentioned that the attic was open to the internal stairway.

A motion (Heyman/Werbe) to approve the project subject to changing the roof material to something other than asphalt shingles, adding additional detail such as molding at the eave, and addressing the comments in the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect's report, all subject to the review and approval by staff, passed 5-0. (The Board strongly suggested that the applicant consider adding chimneys and suggested that he look at the house at 901 Hillsborough Boulevard.)

OTHER ITEMS

Preliminary Review

Remodels/Additions

385 Robinwood Lane, 611 Fairway Circle, 1 Camaho Place, 350 Moseley Road

New Houses

3 Mountain Wood Lane

ADJOURNMENT

Maureen Morton, AICP
City Planner