


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 5, 2007 at 4:00 p.m.
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 p.m.

Boardmembers Present – Jennifer Werbe, Chair; Walter Heyman, Charlie Barnett, Mark Heine and George Jewett

Staff Present – Maureen Morton, Liz Cullinan, Gina Tynan and John Mullins

Others Present – Councilman/Commissioner John Fannon, Mayor Mullolly

APPROVAL OF MINUTES — January 22, 2007

A motion (Jewett/Barnett) to approve the January 22, 2007 minutes, with an amendment indicating that Boardmember Heyman voted against the proposal at 16 Oak Tree Place, passed 5-0.

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - None

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Consent Items:

Landscape Plan

1. 10 Fawn Court – Lazarow (Ransohoff, Blanchfield, Jones, Inc.)

Rear yard landscape plan including renovation of an existing accessory structure and tree removal

Recommendation: Approve subject to Standard Conditions

A motion (Jewett/Heine) to approve the consent calendar passed 5-0.

Discussion Items:

Landscape Plan

2. 1190 Hayne Road – Rubashevsky (Marina Sherbinina)

ADRB-required modifications to a landscape plan associated with an approved new house

Vladimir Rubashevsky, applicant, summarized the project and outlined how the project now responded to previous ADRB comments.

There was no public comment on the project.

In response to Boardmember Heine's concerns with varying retaining wall components and their exposure and the style of the mail box and mail box numbers, the landscape designer confirmed the height of the mail box, that the mail box numbers were proposed as bronze and that the proposed retaining walls would be substantially screened through a diverse assortment of evergreen trees/landscaping.

Boardmember Jewett acknowledged the improvements to the project since the last ADRB review and expressed support for maintenance of as much existing landscaping as possible.

In response to an inquiry from Boardmember Heyman, the landscape architect stated that recommendations of the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect would be specifically addressed within the final project plans.

Boardmember Barnett noted significant improvements to the project since the last ADRB review and expressed support for the changes in the retaining wall colors and respective landscaping. Boardmember Barnett expressed concern with the incompatibility between the architecture and the mailbox and street numbers and requested that they be revised to be compatible.

Chair Werbe also expressed concern with the mailbox and house numbers and requested that respective required revisions be a condition of approval.

A motion (Barnett/Heyman) to approve the project passed 5-0 on the condition that the landscape plans are revised to address the Town Consulting Landscape Architect's comments and revisions to the colors/materials for the house and mailbox numbers to something more compatible with the architecture of the project are addressed via Administrative Review by staff.

Additions/Remodels

3. 415 El Arroyo Road – Beyer (Winges Architects Inc.)

Partial demolition, new garage and living area of approximately 1,462 sq. ft., and new fencing and gates along the street (24% FAR)

Jerry Winges, project architect, summarized the project emphasizing the complementary nature of the proposed style and construction materials with the existing residence.

There was no public comment on the project.

Boardmember Barnett complimented the project, and expressed interest in driveway paver samples and details of the shutters/windows to insure accuracy and consistency.

Boardmember Heyman complimented the style of the project, and stated that he did not believe additional parking would be required even though the ADRB has a policy requiring a 3-car garage for a

5-bedroom house because the project would not increase the existing number of bedrooms in the house and meets the minimum parking requirements per the Municipal Code.

Boardmember Heine complemented the project and also stated that he did not believe additional parking would be required because the project would not increase the existing number of bedrooms in the house. Boardmember Heine expressed concern with the style of the top of the proposed gate.

Boardmember Jewett expressed support for the project and specifically for the gate and gate posts.

Chair Werbe expressed support for the project and also stated that she did not believe additional parking would be required because the project would not increase the existing number of bedrooms in the house. She also expressed concern that the style of the top of the proposed gate was not consistent with the style of the residence.

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

New Houses

- 4. 560 Pullman Road** – Taheri/Naderi (Thompson Studio Architects/Ransohoff Blanchfield Jones, Inc.)
Teardown and new house of approximately 6,788 sq. ft. and landscape plan including tree removal, new driveway location, retaining walls and new fencing/gates along the street (20.8% FAR)

David Thompson, project architect, presented the project emphasizing the project's modern style and efforts to maximize view opportunities and outdoor living areas. Mr. Thompson noted that the second floor deck should not have a substantial privacy impact to neighbors, but that the applicant would consider eliminating or relocating the deck to respect neighbor concerns, that drainage issues would be resolved through final working drawings, and that removal of the oak tree at the front/center of the property was integral to the proposed design.

Public Comment:

Susan David, 515 Laurent Road expressed concern with view impacts, preservation of the neighborhood character, and the proposed removal of the oak tree.

Dr. James Yan, 570 Pullman Road expressed support for the projecting, noting the responsiveness of the applicant and the need for significant improvements to the existing home. He expressed concern with a flyer that he received in his mailbox.

Boardmember Jewett emphasized the responsiveness of the proposal to previous ADRB comments, the appropriateness of the construction materials, siting, and architectural massing in reducing bulk, and noted that removal of the oak tree at the front/center of the property was integral to the proposed design. He also confirmed that drainage could be addressed through working drawings.

Boardmember Heyman acknowledged the proposal as a striking modern design well suited for the site. He further complemented the detailing and quality of plans, but noted that the landscape plans were not ready for approval. He concluded that he supported the Town Consulting Landscape Architect's recommendation on the Oak tree issue, but supported preservation of the Pine trees and Olive tree number 4.

Boardmember Barnett complemented the project design while expressing sympathy for neighbors' concerns. He noted that the proposed landscape plan is not ready for approval, that he would rather not see replacement of the front/center oak tree with three oak trees in a row, and recommended that the applicant work with the neighbors on the final landscape plan with particular attention to the view of the project from the street.

Boardmember Heine noted that the model was very helpful in assessing the front elevation, but that the model did not represent a realistic visual image of the proposed landscaping. He noted that the landscape plans were not ready for approval, expressed support for the Town Landscape Architect's recommendations, preferred not to see the replacement oaks in a row, and expressed interest in establishing significant replacement trees in a naturalistic pattern as part of the landscape plan.

Chair Werbe complemented the plans, design and details of the project, but agreed that the landscape plan was not ready for consideration. She noted that she does enjoy the Oak tree but was supportive of the project, expressed support for the maintenance of the Pine trees, and acknowledged that the Town of Hillsborough can not legislate view protection.

A motion (Heine/Barnett) to approve the project passed 5-0 on the condition that the landscape plans are subject to review and approval by the ADRB at a future meeting.

5. 600 Pullman Road – Kazarian (JC Engineering/ Ransohoff Blanchfield Jones, Inc.)

Teardown and new house of approximately 6,111 sq. ft. and landscape plan including tree removal and fencing/walls along the street (24.5% FAR)

Javier Chavarria of JC Engineering presented a summary of the project, noting that the neighborhood is in transition, that the project involves deep setbacks, that the garage would no longer face the street, that the project includes legalization of existing structures encroaching onto adjacent property, minimizes mass, has nominal view impacts and provides substantial landscaping.

There was no public comment on the project.

Boardmember Heine expressed support for the project, details and landscaping. He further expressed interest in having a condition of approval requiring the represented arched mahogany windows and expressed concern with the discrepancy between the drawings and the color/material board in relation to the cast versus natural stone (with a preference to natural stone).

Boardmember Jewett complemented the presentation and design. He expressed some concern with the massing of the project and noted that the stone material should blend with the project rather than appear applied.

Boardmember Heyman complemented the design, but acknowledged that design standards are greater when a project is close to the 25% maximum floor area permitted. He additionally noted that the site is above street level which exacerbates massing impacts. He concluded that he could not support the project because the design does not appear to be sensitive to the location and the street side landscaping appears to be inadequate.

Boardmember Barnett noted that the project incorporates “honest” materials and represents an improvement from the prior plans reviewed by the ADRB. However, he did express concern that the project is not consistent with the Town of Hillsborough Design Guidelines as the proposed style is duplicative of a number of other projects within the Town.

Chair Werbe expressed concern that the project is not consistent with the Town of Hillsborough’s Design Guidelines as the proposed style is duplicative of a number of other projects within the Town, and noted that she could not support the project due to its mass and inappropriate neighborhood context.

A motion (Jewett/Heine) to approve the project passed 3-2 (with Boardmembers Werbe and Heyman voting against the proposal) on the condition that the landscape plans are revised to address the Town Consulting Landscape Architect’s comments and to include landscape screening enhancements for the front façade, and that final details of the stone material be submitted to the Planning Department for Administrative Review by Staff.

OTHER ITEMS

Preliminary Review:

Additions: 2465 Butternut Drive

New House: 1300 Lakeview Drive

ADRB Discussion:

Design Guidelines Checklist

The ADRB reviewed proposed revisions to the Residential Design Guidelines Checklist and provided direction to Associate Planner Gina Tynan to simplify and consolidate the questions where appropriate, emphasize the ADRB’s interest in architectural diversity, note that the document summarizes key issues rather than is exhaustive, and utilize the revised Residential Design Guidelines Checklist for a six month pilot period. The ADRB agreed that Staff could work with two ADRB members rather than bringing the final revised Residential Design Guidelines Checklist back to the ADRB prior to City Council review.

ADJOURNMENT

Elizabeth S.R. Cullinan, AICP
Acting City Planner