


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 3, 2005**

Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 p.m.

Boardmembers Present – Chairman Richard Reisman, Walter Heyman, George Jewett, Jennifer Werbe and Kathleen Benoit

Staff Present – Maureen Morton, Gina Tynan, and John Milke

Others Present – Assistant City Attorney Penny Greenberg

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – A motion (Heyman/Benoit) to approve the minutes of December 6, 2004 with minor changes proposed by Chairman Reisman passed 5-0.

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

1. **2778 Ralston Avenue** – White (Hunt Hale Jones Architects/Michael Callan, Landscape Architect) Findings for denial of the application for a new house and landscape plan including tree removal, fencing and gates along the street, and a new driveway (12% FAR)

Boardmember Werbe read the finding into the record:

Although the project complies with all Hillsborough zoning standards, it does not conform to the Residential Design Guidelines in that the proposed new home is incompatible with the neighborhood context. Specifically, the building bulk and massing do not generally conform to the buildings in the surrounding vicinity (p. 28). Relative to site planning on hillsides, the project does not adequately minimize the visual impact of the building massing on the slope (p. 21).

A motion (Benoit/Heyman) to adopt the Finding of Denial passed 3-0-2. (Reisman and Jewett abstained.)

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Additions

2. 730 Bowhill Road – Rossi (Stewart Associates)

Partial second story addition of approximately 1,100 sf and ground floor addition of approximately 150 sf (11% FAR)

Chairman Reisman acknowledged the letters which the Board had received by neighbors in support of the project. The applicant, Mr. Rossi, reviewed the process that he had used to notify neighbors and solicit their input.

The architect, John Stewart, talked about the constraints of the site which did not provide for additional floor area at the ground floor level.

A neighbor, Mr. Yee, at 718 El Cerrito (directly across the street), stated that he currently sees the roof and two chimneys of this house. With the addition he believes that the applicants will see into his yard. He is a 25-year resident and does not believe that this is a small addition. He pointed out that he believed this is a one-level neighborhood, and that this project will invade his privacy.

The public hearing was then closed. Boardmember Heyman said that he believed that this was an attractive two-story addition. He pointed out that the ADRB had received letters of support from all neighbors, except for the one at 718 El Cerrito which is down the hill from the property. Boardmember Heyman said that he has no objection to this design; however, he would like the applicants to consider an upgraded roofing material, saying that the asphalt shingles that are proposed are at the low end of the spectrum, and a more quality product would enhance the project.

Boardmember Benoit said that she believed that the addition is consistent with the current house and is well integrated. She supported Boardmember Heyman's comment about the roofing material. She also mentioned that the color board showed a different color green than on the rendering. She acknowledged that the majority of the neighbors appear to support the project. She felt that the grade difference between this house and the one at 718 El Cerrito should minimize any potential visual impact.

Boardmember Jewett stated that he agreed with the previous comments. He had no problem with the door and agreed that the color on the color board appeared to be a better green than on the rendering. He also stated his agreement with the comments about the roofing material. He further stated that he has looked at the photos which were submitted by the property owner at 718 El Cerrito, and while this house may be visible in certain spots where the trees are not as dense as in other places, it should not represent an invasion of privacy. He believes that this is a reasonable addition.

Boardmember Werbe explained that very often when story poles are erected the bright color orange tends to be more "jarring" than what the house, with nice materials and colors, will eventually be. She agreed with the comments about the roofing, saying that there are so many other possibilities besides the asphalt shingles. She also urged a revisitation of the colors to be sure that they appear as the homeowners hope they do with different lighting.

Chairman Reisman said that he had nothing further to add. He pointed out that there is substantial mature landscaping on this property to mitigate any potential visual impact. He stated that this house

has greater than the minimum required setbacks. He further said that this addition did not change in any substantive way any views. He pointed out that, at 4,500 square feet in total size, this house (including the addition) was not in the large range of houses. He reiterated the architect's comment about the options for ground floor additions being limited. He also pointed out that this house is not "at the limits" for any of the Town's standards, and that there was substantial neighborhood support for the project.

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

3. 380 Uplands Drive – Adibi (Stewart Associates)

Addition of approximately 1,135 sf including one additional garage parking space (19% FAR)

Boardmember Benoit stated that she believed that this project was nicely done, and that the addition had been well integrated. She believed that the garage doors were positive, and that the yard is beautiful with the mature/dense landscaping to remain. She asked about the existing solar panels on the front of the house, saying that the ADRB would prefer to have them moved.

The property owner responded that he would prefer to leave them, but that he was willing to reconsider and study options.

Boardmember Jewett agreed that this was a nice improvement and supported the consideration of removing the solar panels from the front of the house. Boardmember Werbe agreed with the support of the design and the encouragement of resiting the solar panels.

Boardmember Heyman also agreed that the design is very positive. He pointed out on the front elevation that there is stucco on one side of the garage and asked if wood siding could be carried to that side to better integrate the design, similar to the left side of the front elevation. Boardmember Heyman also referenced the letter of concern from the neighbor at 210 Rockridge Road asking for additional screening. Boardmember Heyman asked the applicant if he would be willing to provide additional screening.

The applicant explained that he had talked to the neighboring property owner, and it appeared that the concern was over the potential removal of some of the existing mature landscaping. The applicant indicated that he did not intend to remove any of the existing landscaping in the rear yard.

Chairman Reisman stated that he agreed with the Board's comments, including looking at the material on the side of the garage, giving strong consideration to relocating the solar panels, and improving the roofing materials. Overall, he complimented the designer on the nice job.

A motion (Jewett/Werbe) to approve the project subject to the applicant's strong consideration to relocate the solar panels from the front of the house, to reconsider the use of stucco on the side of the garage, and with the affirmation from the applicant that he would not be removing any of the mature landscape screening from the rear yard passed 5-0.

4. 310 Ranelagh Road – Lazarus (Coast to Coast Development/Bruce Chan, Landscape Architect)

Ground floor addition/remodel including removal of an existing carport and construction of an attached garage and office; associated landscape plan including a new pool equipment enclosure, tree removal, and new driveway (22% FAR)

The property owner indicated that this was a great old house with a “tired” yard, and that this was an attempt at upgrading both.

Boardmember Jewett stated that he was generally supportive of the project. He believed that the greatest improvements were those related to the site planning. He stated that he believed that the elevation is almost plain, but that it represented the style of the architecture. He believed that the landscaping would balance that plainness.

Boardmember Werbe agreed, saying that she would like the applicant to consider adding the dimensional bay windows to the addition that are currently on the existing house.

Boardmember Heyman pointed out that he believed that the front façade appeared to be off-balanced with the new addition. He stated that he had looked at other properties in Hillsborough for a possible solution. He passed out photos of the home at 620 El Cerrito, showing how the homeowners had raised the garage roof to provide a better transition between it and the home. Boardmember Heyman also commented that there were numerous issues in the report from the Town’s Consulting Landscape Architect and the Town’s requirement for an improved parking strip, both of which would need to be addressed in a revised landscape plan.

Boardmember Benoit stated that she thought that the plans looked fine. She supported the massing, but she thought raising the garage roof was worth considering. She believed that the floor plan was awkward at the kitchen and family room and suggested the homeowner might want to try to improve the function at that location. She indicated that she could support the project as submitted.

Chairman Reisman commented that he knew this house very well. He believed that this homeowner was going to correct many of the problems that it had. He said that he wished that a more charming garage door, commensurate with the charm of the house, could be used. He further believed that this application was probably approvable as submitted, but that there had been comments from the Boardmembers sufficient to have the property owner consider an improvement to the project. Those suggestions include: restudying the mass at the front elevation and possibly incorporating the suggestion for raising the roof of the garage, and improving the garage door to add more richness.

A motion (Heyman/Werbe) to approve the project subject to the applicant revising the landscape plan to address the comments of the Town’s Consulting Landscape Architect and to include the standard Town parking strip passed 5-0. In addition, the ADRB suggests that the applicant continue to study the massing and possibly consider raising the roof of the garage and strongly consider upgrading the garage door; both changes may be subject to approval by the staff.

OTHER ITEMS

Preliminary Review:

New Houses: 630 Pullman Road
 725 Jacaranda Circle

Second Story Addition: 350 Moseley Road (3rd Preliminary Review; first on 1/5/04, second on 11/01/04)

Study Session - Assistant City Attorney reviewed general legal matters with the ADRB

ADRB Discussion – The ADRB discussed possibly of requesting that the City Council have the ADRB review subdivisions. Boardmember Benoit reviewed the reasons why she believed it would be a good idea for the ADRB to preview subdivision applications. It was the consensus of the ADRB that Chairman Reisman would discuss with Mayor Kasten the Board's interest in reviewing subdivision maps.

Boardmember Heyman suggested that staff add a line to the General Data sheets of the ADRB application asking the applicant to state the architectural style of the project. The other members of the ADRB agreed with this request, and staff agreed to incorporate the change.

Maureen Morton, AICP
City Planner

adrbjanuary03.05