

TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH
SAN MATEO COUNTY

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



1600 Floribunda Avenue
Hillsborough
California 94010

DRAFT
**Architecture and Design Review Board
Minutes**

March 1, 2004

Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 p.m.

Boardmembers Present – Heyman, Jewett, Luebkehan, Reisman and Benoit (Benoit served as a full voting Boardmember.)

Boardmembers Absent – Werbe

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - A motion (Luebkehan/Jewett) to approve the minutes of February 2, 2004 passed 3-0. (Benoit and Heyman abstained, as they were absent.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Consent Calendar:

1. **25 Mountain Wood Court** – Stonebridge Partners, LLC (Hunt Hale Jones Architects)
Reinstatement of approval for new house and landscape plan

Action: Staff recommends approval

- 2b. **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

Action: Applicant has requested a continuance to the April 19th ADRB Meeting

A motion (Luebkehan/Benoit) to approve the consent calendar passed 5-0.

Discussion Items:

- 2a. **45 Sheldon Way** – Bhargana (Borrego Solar System)
Roof-mounted solar panels

There was a question about which alternative was being proposed for the solar panels. The

applicant responded that the plan reflected on page 1 of the plan was what was being proposed (this plan showed the panels on the backside of the roof).

A neighbor at 70 Fagen Drive spoke saying that he would be looking at the back of the house, and he was concerned about the reflectivity of the products. The applicant responded that the product was anti-reflective.

Chairman Reisman pointed out that looking from the side, which this neighbor would be doing, he would not be looking directly at the panels. He also stated that the applicant had represented that they were anti-reflective.

Boardmember Heyman pointed out that these are photovoltaic panels which have more reflectivity than a flat black solar panel.

Boardmember Jewett stated that he believed that the slope of the roof was not such that these panels would reflect a great deal of light. Chairman Reisman added that the sun's impact is minimal, if any, which would also reduce the level of reflectivity.

Boardmember Benoit stated that she had seen other solar installations with big bulky pipes, and that this application seemed to have a much tighter, neater design.

A motion (Jewett/Luebkeman) to approve the project subject to installing the panels on the backside of the roof as per page 1 of the plan (Chairman Reisman reiterated that, although Boardmember Heyman indicates that this product may be more reflective than a solar panel, the neighbor most affected has signed off on the plans, and the neighbor who spoke at 70 Fagen Drive will not have a direct view of the panels, and their location will minimize the amount of sun available to reflect from the product) passed 5-0.

Landscape Plans

3. **844 Eucalyptus Avenue** – Yu (RBJ, Inc.)
Landscape plan including tree removal

The project landscape architect explained that there were two (2) large Cypress trees and one (1) Pine tree located on this property. She stated that they were proposing to remove the Pine tree and one Cypress tree, but the Cypress tree located on the common property line with the neighbor would remain.

A motion (Benoit/Jewett) to approve the project as per the plan passed 5-0.

Remodels/Additions/Revisions

4. **385 Robinwood Lane** – Young (Gumbinger Avram Architects) 21.2% FAR; 4,805 sq. fit total
First and second-story addition of 2,143 square feet

The applicants indicated that they had contacted their adjacent neighbors and none had registered any concerns regarding the project.

Boardmember Benoit said that the house represented a nice woodsy look, but she believed that there was an opportunity for additional articulation, especially with the trim, the chimney caps and the attic vents.

Boardmember Luebkehan said that he had had some concerns about this house. He felt that some of the elevations, particularly the westerly elevation, seemed "weak". He was also concerned about the use of the cultured stone and the roof forms.

Boardmember Heyman stated that he thought that the house missed a degree of refinement and was somewhat utilitarian. He pointed to the low-budget roof and said that the entryway was not very exciting.

Boardmember Jewett agreed, discussing the cultured stone and the composite roof saying that the choices of materials for this project were not extremely elegant and didn't represent a very high upgrade. He said that real stone would be preferred and that quality roofing would enhance the project. He believed that the house needed to be brought up a level on architectural detailing. He suggested that the architect add interest and not just copy what is already on the existing house. He pointed out that the project more than doubled the size of the house.

Chairman Reisman said that he had heard four (4) Boardmembers say that the house was plain and did not have a custom look. He agreed that the design was fairly basic. He pointed to the cost-conscious roof material. He pointed out that it appeared this was a five-bedroom house with a two-car garage. He asked if the project was egregious and said that he did not believe it was. He further stated that the ADRB encourages a care of craft and attention to detail. He complimented the architect for eliminating the angle gables, resulting in an updated look.

The project architect pointed out that the "flying" roof had been eliminated as well as the heavy trim. She said that they had simplified the design as per the ADRB's direction. She added that the stair in the family room was a feature to add light. She further explained that the west elevation is up against a high retaining wall, and it was felt that it was better to keep that elevation simple and reflective of the wall. She clarified that the color of the roof is brownstone.

Chairman Reisman pointed out that the rendering had a degree of romance including tones of purple and gray, however, the color sample board showed a basic beige color.

A motion (Jewett/Heyman) to continue this application to April 19, 2004 to allow for additional study, refinements and additional detailing, reconsideration of the roof material and the stone, passed 5-0. (Chairman Reisman summarized that there were no massing or bulk issues with this house, and that there were no neighbor issues. He stated that the issues really related only to the detailing and materials.)

5. **20 Pear Court** – Collins (Ben Behraves) 14.5% FAR; 6,324 sq. ft. total
Addition of 2,118 square feet and landscape plan

A neighbor at 739 Jacaranda Circle (Mr. Chu) spoke with concern about the landscape screening. He indicated that he had no objection to the house design, believing it was very nice; however, the landscape plan included several trees at a height of 80 feet. He asked that trees be selected with a reduced height in the 25 - 30 foot range in order to preserve his view.

Boardmember Luebkehan said that this project was a challenge to maintain the existing and integrate the new. He said that detailing would be very important. He didn't believe that height

was really an issue, but his major concern centered on the old and the new. He believed that currently there is an amalgam of styles. He was also concerned about the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect's comments.

Boardmember Heyman had no problem with the house design saying that there were other two-story homes in the area. He did believe, however, that the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect's comments were serious, and that screening from the street and on both sides would be very important.

Boardmember Jewett said that the project had somewhat of an eclectic collection of elements. He felt that the elements were nice individually, but that they were somewhat disjointed. He asked the architect if he believed the chimneys were high enough.

Boardmember Benoit said that in general she believed that this was a nice transition from a one to a two-story house. She pointed out that the garage doors detract from the stateliness of the design. She said that the corbel at the bay could be greater. She also discussed the siding application, reinforcing the fact that it was the stateliness of the overall design that was most appealing.

Chairman Reisman asked about the roof tiles, to which the architect responded that the existing roof tiles would be recovered and reused for the project. Chairman Reisman said that he liked the project, although he believed some additional detailing could be worked out. He made some suggestions, but indicated that he was generally supportive of the project.

Boardmember Luebkehan confirmed that he believed that the issue with this design was in the details, and the massing was certainly acceptable.

Chairman Reisman asked the applicant if he could work with the neighbor on the tree issue, to which the applicant responded affirmatively.

A motion (Heyman/Luebkehan) to approve the project acknowledging the applicant's willingness to work with the neighbor on the tree concerns and subject to revising the landscape plan to address the comments of the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect and providing sufficient screening from the street and the sides subject to approval by staff, passed 5-0.

New Houses

6. **1490 Crystal Drive** – Spano (Robert Allen Williams) 20% FAR; 4,289.6 sq. fit
New house, including teardown and landscape plan

The project architect presented the revisions that had been made to the project.

Boardmember Heyman pointed out that this design was certainly compatible with the street and the neighborhood. He had difficulty, however, as he searched for some ingenuity and excitement in the design. He believed that this was truly a missed opportunity, and that the new house looked very dated. He was concerned about the roofing material. He also had a problem with the landscape plan as evidenced by the strong comments from the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect.

Boardmember Jewett pointed out that this was a nice ranch house, but it did not look like a house that would be built today. He pointed out that it lacked interest.

Boardmember Benoit agreed, saying that this looks like a remodeled ranch house which needs updating rather than a new home. She thought it might be important to use additional stone. She believed that the black roof might visually depress the house. She asked for more information about the way in which the stone was going to be applied, saying that she thought that a more rustic stone and a lighter roofing material would be positive steps.

Boardmember Luebkehan said that this looks like a 1950's ranch house. There are not a lot of areas in which one can embellish this style of architecture, but it results in a project that is uninspired and not rich.

Chairman Reisman pointed out that his preliminary comments had been to find a new direction not recreate the 1960's ranch house. He agreed that the massing is compatible with the neighborhood. He pointed out problems with the floor plan, echoing a very dated design. He explained that the ADRB tries to inspire good design saying that it would be important for this house to be more up-to-date. Chairman Reisman said that the ranch style is not a favorite theme.

Boardmember Benoit said that new ranch-style homes have different ceiling heights that add value and living quality. She also agreed with the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect's report. She told the applicants that there was a house on the south side of Sierra Drive where a Tudor front had been integrated quite successfully into a ranch style home.

The property owner indicated that he was not planning to use a bulldozer in the project and intended to save the existing landscaping.

Chairman Reisman suggested that other houses be reviewed, such as the one at 20 Fagan Drive which is a 1970's version of a ranch. He reiterated his concern that the floor plan needed to be reexamined, and that the entire project needed additional inspiration. He pointed out that the Craftsman windows, the rock and the detailing of the entry were areas of inconsistency.

A motion (Heyman/Luebkehan) to continue this application to the April 19, 2004 meeting to allow for greater personality, a less dated image and a landscape plan passed 5-0.

7. **3 Mountain Wood Lane** – Stonebridge Partners, LLC (Stewart Associates) 17.9% FAR; 6,696 sq. ft. New house and landscape plan

The architect provided a sample of the stone and showed pictures from a book about architect stern.

Boardmember Jewett said that he thought the house looked great.

Boardmember Benoit talked about the brown stone and the gray shutters, saying that she did not care for that combination.

Boardmember Luebkehan said that he was supportive of the project. He said that the applicant was using the kind of materials and quality, which was reflective of "old" Hillsborough.

Boardmember Heyman said that he believed that the house was approvable. He thought the rendering was beautiful, but he did not think that the architectural elevations were exceptional. He referenced the vision that had been stated about the development at Stonebridge. He believed that this house was not up to that standard.

Chairman Reisman pointed out that there had not been that much change in this house from the preliminary review meeting. He said that a house of this size, 6,700 square feet, needs a great deal of detail. He believed that the house was approvable, but that the richness of detail was missing. He suggested to staff that perhaps the standard for Stonebridge, and the vision that had been promoted by the developer, might be the topic for a future study session. He recognized that the development strategies may have changed with the economy, but he believed that it was important that this subdivision represent the quality houses of Hillsborough.

A motion (Luebke/Benoit) to approve the project passed 5-0.

OTHER ITEMS

Preliminary Review

New house: 1540 Lakeview Drive
Addition: 70 Rowan Tree Lane

The City Planner reminded the Board that Assistant City Attorney Penny Greenberg would be present on March 15, 2004 for a brief legal update.

ADJOURNMENT

Maureen Morton, AICP
City Planner