

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**

February 2, 2004

Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

**CALL TO ORDER** – 4:00 p.m.

**Boardmembers Present** – Jewett, Luebkehan, Reisman and Werbe

**Boardmembers Absent** – Benoit, Heyman

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - A motion (Jewett/Luebkehan) to approve the minutes of January 5, 2004 passed 4-0.

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**Consent Calendar:**

1. **25 Panorama Court**— Fallan (Schuette)  
Revisions to previously approved (by the ADRB) landscape plan  
*Action: Staff recommends approval subject to addressing the comments in the report from the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect*
3. **370 Robinwood Lane**— Hsu/Yu (John Matthews Architects)  
Remodel and addition includes gates/fencing and a second unit  
*Action: A continuance to the March 15 meeting has been requested to allow for a revised design by new design team and to continue to work with neighbors*
4. **844 Eucalyptus**—Yu (RBJ, Inc)  
Landscape plan including tree removal  
*Action: A continuance to the March 1 meeting is recommended*

A motion (Werbe/Jewett) to approve the consent calendar passed 4-0.

**Discussion Items:**

2. **15 Cottonwood Court**—Goldstein (Architecture TM) 16% FAR; 3, 316 sq. ft. total  
New exterior siding and addition of 391 square feet

Chairman Reisman pointed out how difficult the plans for this project were to read. He said that he hopes he doesn't see plans of this quality again. Chairman Reisman said that the only reason he was willing to approve the project is because the project is not very significant, but if the project had been more significant and the plans were this poorly prepared, he would not support the project.

A motion (Luebke/Kem/Jewett) to approve the project passed 4-0.

*Remodels/Additions/Revisions*

5. **808 Irwin Court**—Marquardt (Robert Frear Architects) 9.1% FAR; 8,739 sq. ft. total  
Landscape plan, including tennis court and two accessory structures

The project landscape architect, Lisa Keyston, stated in response to the comment from the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect that the proposed hedge screening the tennis court will be 9 -10 feet tall.

All of the Boardmembers believed that the project was a beautiful design, the plans were extremely well-presented, and the architecture was simple and beautifully done.

A motion (Jewett/Werbe) to approve the project passed 4-0.

6. **25 Santa Felicia Court**—Pahl (Morrison) 12.6% FAR; 6,462 sq. ft. total  
First and second-story addition of 2,076 sq. ft.

Boardmember Luebke/Kem pointed out that the house is very close to the street which is a cul-de-sac. He said that the existing house tends to be "nestled into" the cul-de-sac where the project, including the addition, appeared overbearing. He was concerned about the added mass and how it was handled. He was also concerned that some of the design elements were not consistent with the Colonial style.

Boardmember Jewett shared the same concerns, pointing out that the design of the entry was not consistent with the intended architectural style. Boardmember Jewett also felt that the proposed arched windows appeared out-of-place. He also expressed concern about the massive addition over the garage, saying that it was an exceedingly large space for a recreation room and it contributed to the appearance of bulk from the street.

Boardmember Werbe agreed with the other Boardmembers. She also questioned elements of the style, saying that the roof appears almost commercial in nature. She suggested that the designer might want to try a pitched roof over the entry. Boardmember Werbe also believed that the oversized recreation room is going to appear very massive at the street. She questioned some of the elements specifically the railings and brick at the base of the columns. She stressed the importance of having all the elements consistent with the overall architectural style.

Chairman Reisman agreed with the others and summarized that many of the elements appeared to be "catalog pieces". He felt that this project appeared to be a missed opportunity. He stressed how important it was to pick a style and keep with it and maintain it with a high level of detail. Chairman Reisman also echoed the concern about reducing the appearance of bulk. Although he believed that this project was not extremely offensive, he also believed that it was not excellent or inspired.

The project architect responded saying that he had researched historical books and believed that there was a precedent for combining these architectural elements.

In conclusion, the Board believed that this architectural style needed appropriate and finely-crafted details to support the style and that the appearance, from the street, of the bulk needed to be reduced.

A motion (Jewett/Werbe) to continue this item to March 15, 2004 passed 4-0. (Chairman Reisman also pointed out that, although the color board represented some beautiful colors, his fear was that the color selected for the body of the house would fade to a very light color upon application.)

**7. 25 Trophy Court**—O'Connor (Jack McCarthy) 23% FAR; 5,877 sq. ft. total  
Remodel and addition of 2,186 sq. ft., including landscape plan

The project designer introduced the project.

Boardmember Jewett stated that his main concern was at the rear elevation, that the window of the great room appeared overpowering and out-of-place.

Boardmember Werbe stated that she believed that overall this was a nice design, but that the drawing set was not well articulated. She thought that the window details would be very important. She complimented the material palette and agreed with Boardmember Jewett on the rear elevation issue. She also pointed out that the garage doors needed to better relate to the overall style of the house.

Boardmember Luebke said that he believed that this project would fit well into the neighborhood context. He agreed with the concern about the garage doors. He also pointed out that the "keystone" feature appeared to be used rather randomly.

Chairman Reisman agreed that the design was nice and the material palette was also very positive. He agreed with the concerns about the out-of-scale window in the rear elevation and also believed that the window at the front, on the left side of the entry, was also out-of-place. He said that it was important that the use of the keystones have some consistency or hierarchy, and that overall there was a skillful refinement of the architectural details. He believed, however, that the necessary refinement and the window changes could be subject to the review and approval by staff.

Boardmember Luebke added, with regard to the detailing, that the corbels and the horizontal banding appeared to be used rather randomly. He asked what material the corbels would be, to which the response was they would be a concrete stone product.

A motion (Werbe/Jewett) to approve the project subject to addressing the Board's concerns about the two windows, one at the rear at the great room and the other at the front to the left of the entry, to further refine the architectural detailing including the keystones, corbels and horizontal banding, and to revise the landscape plan to address the comments of the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect, all of which can be subject to the review and approval by the staff, passed 4-0.

*New Houses*

**8. 8 Mountain Wood Lane**—Stonebridge Partners, LLC (Hunt Hale Jones) 21.5% FAR; 7,155.5 sq. ft. New house, including landscape plan and gates/fencing

Boardmember Jewett said that she believed that the applicant had done a good job of addressing the Board's comments from the preliminary review meeting.

Boardmember Luebkean agreed, saying that he believed the house would be an asset to the community and an example of a positive architectural style.

Boardmember Jewett agreed, saying that the project was very well represented and mentioned that it would be important to address comments from the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect.

Chairman Reisman concluded by saying that the house was large and that it was certainly not offensive; however, he believed that for its size, the design could go further. He believed that it was very nice and certainly approvable.

A motion (Luebkean/Werbe) to approve the project subject to revising the landscape plan to address the comments of the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect, subject to review and approval by staff, passed 4-0.

**9. 625 Barbara Way**—Chen (Hsu) 20.20% FAR; 4,992 sq. ft.  
New house, including teardown and landscape plan

A neighbor at 650 Darrell Road, Mr. Ome, spoke with concern about the project. He said that when he observed story poles he had a great deal of concern because the homes in this area are generally one-story. However with the story poles, one could see the roof from every room of his home and also from his swimming pool area. He had concerns about the view of the house and the associated effect on the value of his home.

Boardmember Luebkean stated that, although the Board considered and appreciated the neighbor's concerns, that issues of views and privacy are not something over which the Board has a great deal of control. The Board takes these issues in consideration; however Hillsborough's codes and ordinances do not provide view or privacy protection. Boardmember Luebkean added that the roof on this project seems to be overly complicated, and the forms are very large.

Boardmember Jewett said that he actually liked the roof and the way in which the angles and the elements helped to minimize the mass. He pointed out that the second floor consists of two small bedrooms located over the center of the house which appears to be the correct direction for a home which is in a neighborhood that has a preponderance of one-story homes. He pointed out that the materials were very nice and asked for a clarification on the roofing material. He thought that the details were very nicely done.

Boardmember Werbe agreed pointing out that often times the appearance of the story poles are very jarring, but that when the house, with its nice materials, is actually constructed the affect is not nearly as disturbing as the orange story poles. She pointed out that with this project there is a significant setback of the second story, and that the siting is such that it should not be problematic to the adjoining property owner. She also commented that it appeared that the proposed stucco color might be a bit too pink. She voiced a strong opinion for the use of real slate on the roof, rather than a manufactured product, since the roof structure is so predominate in the architecture.

There was a general discussion with the applicant and a clarification that real slate roofing would be used on this project.

Chairman Reisman said that he thought that the design of the house was fine. However, he believed that there could be some further refinements such as increasing the size of the chimney and reevaluating the proportions of some of the windows. He felt that the minimal second story, which is located at the center of the house under dormers, did not appreciably add to the height of the house and was very consistent with the City Council's direction for houses which are transitioning into areas of predominately single-story homes. He urged the property owner to work with the architect on refining some aspects of the floor plan. He stated that there was a comment from the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect on the landscape plan.

A motion (Luebke/Kemman/Jewett) to approve the project subject to the use of real slate roofing, reevaluating the proposed color possibly after the house is constructed, evaluating a swatch of color on the house, and revising the landscape plan to address the comment of the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect, all subject to the review and approval by staff passed 4-0.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

### **Preliminary Review**

New houses: 870 Vista Road, 15 Mountain Wood Court

The City Planner reminded the ADRB that Assistant City Attorney Penny Greenberg would be attending the March 15, 2004 meeting to provide the annual legal update. She stated that if the Board had any specific issues or questions to which they would like the Assistant City Attorney to be prepared to respond, they should provide them to the City Planner. Generally the review includes the Ralph M. Brown Act and conflicts of interest, but other issues can be reviewed as well.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Maureen Morton, AICP  
City Planner