

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**

March 15, 2004  
4:00 p.m.

Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

**CALL TO ORDER** – 4:00 p.m.

**Boardmembers Present** – Heyman, Jewett, Luebkehan, Reisman, Werbe and Benoit (Alternate)

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – A motion (Heyman/Luebkehan) to approve the minutes of March 1, 2004 with some minor corrections passed 4-0-1. (Boardmember Werbe abstained because she was absent.)

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**Discussion Items:**

**1. 535 El Arroyo Road**—Marquez (Jack McCarthy Designers, Inc.)

Changes to previously approved plans for a new house and landscaping, including an increase in overall height, changes to the garage doors, and changes to the landscape plan which include additional retaining walls, increased hardscape, and revised planting materials.

The City Planner reviewed some possible findings and approval. The project designer explained that he had met with the representative of an adjoining property owner, Mr. Fitzgerald, and he was now fine with the project.

A neighbor at 531 El Arroyo Road (Gustafson) spoke with concern about the project. He indicated that the bay window had been raised and it now significantly blocked his Bay view. He asked that the project be completed; saying that the people had worked six days of week. He asked about the height limit, and from what point the height of the building was measured. He indicated that he had a landscaping agreement with the applicant, and that throughout the process no one had contacted him.

A representative of property owners at 210 Eucalyptus Avenue (Mr. Fitzgerald) spoke saying that he was fine with the proposed changes.

Boardmember Jewett said that he thought the changes were acceptable as long as the Building Department applied the appropriate penalties for doing work that was inconsistent with the approved plans.

Boardmember Werbe agreed, saying that he was very disappointed that after the lengthy approval process that the project would be built other than according to the approved plans. She thought that the house was beautiful.

Boardmember Luebkean agreed with the concern that had been expressed. He did not believe that the applicant should be coming into the Board for approval of changes after they had been made. He said that when the framing was done would be the appropriate time. He did not want this action to become precedent-setting.

Boardmember Heyman said that he had no problem with the proposal to change the garage doors or to change the landscaping. He appreciated the screening that had been provided. In regard to the proposal to increase the height, he believed that, had the project originally come with the additional eleven (11) inches in height, the Board would have approved the project. He felt that there would be sufficient screening of the bay window so as the change should not result on a significant impact.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit said that according to the photo that the neighbor had provided, the bay window appears to impact the neighbor's Bay view. She pointed out that throughout the approval process things on this project had been carefully negotiated and now they had been changed. She agreed, however, that the home was beautiful.

Chairman Reisman asked the designer about the bay window and why it was raised, to which the designer responded that it was necessary to address rain water drainage. Chairman Reisman agreed that this was a nice house, but he did not appreciate the fact that it had been built in a manner that had deviated from the approved plans. He pointed out that the altered roof ridge was not in the neighbor's photo but agreed that the bay window did appear to partially impact the neighbor's view.

Boardmember Jewett asked what would happen if the Board approves the changes, and what would happen if the Board doesn't approve the changes. Chairman Reisman reviewed for the board that if the changes were not approved, he assumed that the Town would require the applicant to conform to the approved plan. Building Official John Milke explained to the Board the penalty structure for doing work without the required permit. There was also discussion about the purview of the Board and whether or not such a violation may be a matter for either the City Attorney or the Nuisance Abatement Board.

Chairman Reisman said that he would like to have the applicants, staff and the appropriate parties take a look at the bay window. He said that this neighbor has participated fully in the public process, and it appears that changes to the project may have jeopardized a portion of his Bay view. Boardmember Werbe agreed. Boardmember Luebkean added that had the ADRB seen the two (2) bay windows at different heights, the Board would probably have not approved that. He agreed, however, that the house was good-looking.

Boardmember Heyman agreed that if these changes had been brought forward to the Board, they would have more than likely been approved. The general consensus of the Board was that was the case, however, the issue of the bay window still needed to be addressed.

Chairman Reisman summed up that the design of the house is nice, and that the Board had no problems supporting the change in the overall height, garage doors and the landscape plan. However, it appears that a change to the bay windows may have a significant negative affect on the adjoining neighbor who had participated fully in the public process. The Board recommends that this issue is addressed by the appropriate Board or Town staff.

A motion (Luebkeman/Jewett) to approve the proposed changes relating to the height, the garage doors and the landscaping, but to ask the staff to investigate the appropriate way to handle the apparent discrepancy with the bay window design passed 5-0.

### *Landscape plans*

#### **2. 105 Bella Vista Drive—Carey (Landsystems)**

Tennis court and landscape plan

A neighbor at 30 Fawn Court (Michael) spoke with concern about the fact that the proposed tennis court would be about seventeen (17) feet above his swimming pool. He was concerned about the 135 foot long retaining wall on his property which was holding up the slope above the tennis court. He also requested that some faster growing screening hedge be added at the property line to be planted in advance of the construction to help screen the new tennis court. He also asked that ground cover be added between the tennis court and the property line to help with erosion control.

The property owner indicated her agreement to the suggestions.

It was the consensus of the Board that the project was acceptable, as long as the applicant addressed the comments in the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect's report and was willing to work with the adjoining neighbor on some substitute screening and groundcover.

Chairman Reisman explained, however, that the issue about the retaining wall was a technical issue which would need to be resolved with the Building Department during the permitting process.

A motion (Werbe/Heyman) to approve the project subject to addressing the comments of the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect's report and working with the neighbor for substitute screening and ground cover passed 5-0.

### *Remodels/Additions/Revisions*

#### **3. 1 Camaho Place—Andrighetto (Frederick Strathdee) 15.8% FAR; 5,321 sq. ft. total Addition of 1,383 square feet and new roofing material**

Boardmember Jewett stepped down due to the proximity of the project to his home.

An attorney, Mr. Pierce, spoke on behalf of his clients at 625 West Santa Inez. He indicated that the applicant had removed a fence and shrubs, constructed a construction fence and altered a natural creek on his client's property and that this action was currently in litigation. He asked the ADRB to impose conditions requiring the replacement of and reconstruction of these items.

A neighbor at 645 West Santa Inez (Jewett) spoke saying that he agreed that the site did not look good, and he would like to see the job completed. He explained that there had been a culvert along the old right-of-way that drained into a drainage ditch. He believed that removing the culvert, which provided flood protection, was not a good idea. He further indicated that he believed that this project was an improvement to the property and said that he had an agreement with the applicant about planting some Redwood trees.

Boardmember Heyman said that the ADRB's comments would be limited to the aesthetics of the proposal. He believed the project fit well into the neighborhood and used a nice choice of materials. He believed that it was important that a landscape plan was submitted and further believed that the legal issue between the neighbors should be resolved in a form other than at the ADRB.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit pointed out that the aesthetics of the site at the front property line needed to be improved. She said that the public could not see the house from the street, but that the view from the street definitely needed some attention. She believed that these issues could best be addressed in the landscape plan.

Boardmember Werbe said that the asymmetrical dormers were not acceptable to her; however, one cannot see the house from the street.

Boardmember Luebkeman pointed out that the quality of the plans was so poor that it was difficult to read and to make a determination on the project. He said that the grading plan was very confusing as well. He believed that the landscaping at the property line, the fence and plantings would be very important to this project.

Chairman Reisman said that it appeared to him that the Board believed that the project was acceptable; however, he said that he did not want the ADRB to review plans of this quality again. He said that the project was not well represented and the plans were such a poor quality that it was difficult for the Boardmembers to make any determinations on the project. He pointed out that there were some opportunities missed; that there were some details above the doors and the dormers which could definitely be improved.

A motion (Heyman/Werbe) to approve the project, clarifying that the approval is limited to the aesthetics of the project and to the ADRB's purview, and subject to the condition that a landscape plan is submitted to the ADRB and permitted and installed before calling for a final inspection on the house, passed 3-1-1. (Chairman Reisman dissented and Boardmember Jewett abstained.) There was further clarification that due to the litigation, the applicant's landscape plan could be done with alternatives or could be done to reflect the appropriate screening and fencing on the smaller of the possible two lot sizes in order that the Town will insure the property is properly fenced and landscaped.

**4. 710 Sharon Avenue**—Cellini (JD and Associates) 19.84% FAR; 3,694 sq. ft. total  
Addition of 1,620 square feet and landscape plan

A neighbor at 1805 Elmwood Road (Hampton) spoke saying that he lived across the street from the project and gave it his unqualified support.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit said that she believed that this was a wonderful project. She asked the homeowner about the finish on the gate saying that if it was painted white it would probably better relate to the design of the home.

Boardmembers Jewett and Werbe agreed that it was a very nice project, and the site would really benefit from the landscape plan.

Boardmember Luebkehan verified with the applicant that the proper approvals had been granted to build over the culvert. He asked about the roofing, to which the response was that the new roof would match the existing composition roof.

Boardmember Luebkehan believed that the landscape plan would mitigate any minor design issues with the house. He pointed out, however, that the garage design was a little weak or plain from the street in a very nice area of Town and suggested that the garage doors could be enhanced. Boardmember Heyman agreed that changing the garage doors would make the overall project much more attractive.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit also agreed, adding that it might be possible to incorporate the trellis design that is used at the front of the house and on the gate to enhance the garage.

Chairman Reisman concluded that this was a crisp and sweet project and that the landscape plan was very well done.

A motion (Heyman/Werbe) to approve the project with suggestions that the garage be enhanced with doors and a trellis passed 5-0.

#### *Continued Items*

#### **5. 370 Robinwood Lane—Hsu/Yu (John Matthews Architects)** Remodel and addition includes gates/fencing and a second unit

Chairman Reisman announced that, at the request of staff, he had attended a meeting with the architects, the property owners and staff to help facilitate a positive conclusion to this project.

Boardmember Heyman indicated that he had missed the February 2, 2004 meeting but had reviewed the file. He asked if it was appropriate for him to participate. Chairman Reisman said that it was acceptable, since this was virtually an entirely new project from what had been considered before.

Boardmember Jewett said that he thought this was an interesting use of materials to integrate the new with the existing. He wasn't overly supportive of the stepped windows but believed that the project was approvable.

Boardmember Werbe believed that this application represented huge improvements over what the Board had previously seen. She talked about the possibility of using additional stone to warm up the project and selecting a higher quality light fixture. She also asked if it might not be possible to increase the size of the support columns.

Boardmember Luebkehan agreed that this project had improved a great deal; although, he believed it still lacked some excitement. He pointed out that at 24% FAR it is large and, therefore, a high level of attention to detail is required. He said that the two-car garage still disturbed him, although he believed that overall the house fit into the neighborhood concept. He just wished that it had a little more pizzazz and was a little less flat and ordinary.

Boardmember Heyman said that he liked what the applicants had done. He asked if the siding on the piece to the left of the entry could possibly be increased in width. He pointed out that the trellis above the entry appears to visually slice the windows behind it. He was also somewhat troubled by the three (3) small windows on the west elevation.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit agreed that this was a vast improvement over the previous submittal and said that it fit well into the neighborhood. She agreed that the lighting fixtures needed some additional study. She pointed out that in the rendering, the front door and the garage doors were not visible. She suggested that those two features be reevaluated.

Chairman Reisman summed up the Board's suggestion including looking at the location of the trellis at the entry, working further with the end of the house which is existing to remain and reconsidering the front door and the garage doors.

A motion (Werbe/Jewett) to approve the project with encouragement to look further at the suggestions given by the Board passed 5-0.

**6. 25 Santa Felicia Court**—Pahl (Morrison) 12% FAR; 6,163 sq. ft. total  
First and second-story addition of 1,777 sq. ft.

The project architect indicated that he had taken the Board's previous comments to "heart", and that although he recognized that this was not the purest of designs, he believed that it was a cost-effective approach to a modest addition.

Boardmember Werbe said that she still had problems with the massing and the scale. She pointed to the proportion of the pediment over the entry saying that it was still very weak. She said that she had the same comments as she had before – that the massing was too heavy and that the design was not consistent with the Colonial style.

Boardmember Luebke believed that the project had improved, but that there were significant pieces that needed additional work. He discussed the color palette and what he had called a "catalog of window types". He believed that, although reduced, the recreation room was still very large, and that the overall appearance of the house was a poor integration of too many styles. While he acknowledged that the architect had indicated that there was a limit to the budget, the proposed Palladium windows were very expensive and not true to the Colonial style. He believed that the column design needed additional attention.

Boardmember Heyman believed that the main issue was the lack of continuity of styling and design features. He referred to the fluted columns of four (4) different sizes. He asked about the proposed cement siding and the proposed roofing tiles.

Alternate Boardmember Benoit agreed that the pediment design seemed out-of-proportion and suggested that possibly a color treatment might solve the problem.

Boardmember Jewett pointed out that the recreation room had been stepped back improving the massing. He believed, however, that the windows still needed additional attention and especially the pieces above the garage. He agreed that the entry columns needed additional work and possibly overall the project needed to be toned down and not be so heavy handed.

Chairman Reisman said that he probably was more supportive than the others on the design of this house. He recognized that it was a large house at 6,000 square feet and, therefore, required

a level of care in the detailing. He believed that the detail such as the columns, the shutters and the elements over the garage are details that could be resolved in a fairly easy fix. He talked about the issues of proportion and consistency of style that the Boardmembers still needed to be addressed.

A motion (Jewett/Werbe) to continue this application to the April 19, 2004 meeting to allow the applicant to address the issues of proportion, consistency and detailing, including the columns, the pediments, the windows in the areas above the garage passed 4-0-1. (Heyman abstained.) The Board also asked the applicant to provide a sample of the siding and the roof materials.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Maureen Morton, AICP  
City Planner