

TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH

San Mateo County

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

1600 Floribunda Avenue
Hillsborough, CA 94010



Architecture and Design Review Board Approved Minutes

Monday, August 03, 2009 at 4:00 pm
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

Applicants: Your extra plans will not be returned at the meeting; they will be available in the Planning Office for one week after the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER – 4:01 PM

Boardmembers Present: Mark Heine, Chair; Jennifer Werbe; George Jewett; Carl Goldstone; Lin Ho; Eric Nyhus, Alternate

Boardmembers Absent: None

Staff Present: Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning; Serena Ponzio, Associate Planner

Others: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 4, 2009 & July 6, 2009

A motion (Jewett / Ho) to approve the May 4, 2009 Meeting Minutes passed 5:0.

A motion (Jewett / Werbe) to approve the July 6, 2009 Meeting Minutes passed 4:0.

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - None

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Consent Items

Additions/Remodels

1. **1630 Marlborough Road – Ponterio (TRG Architects / Callan)**
Request for a one-year extension of ADRB approval for a teardown and new two story single family residence of approximately 5,448 square feet (24.9% Floor Area Ratio) with associated landscape plan, including new driveway materials and fencing. Previously approved on July 07, 2008. (Effective date of approval: July 22, 2008)

Recommendation: Extend ADRB Approval to July 22, 2010, as requested by the applicant.

A motion (Werbe / Jewett) to pass the consent calendar and approve this extension to the requested date of July 22, 2010 passed 5:0.

Regular Items:

Landscape Plans

2. **1388 Hayne Road - Chan (Landscape Reflections)**

New landscape plan including new plantings, trees, gravel pathways, mailbox and landscape terracing associated with the ADRB approval granted on August 20, 2007 for a remodel/first and second floor addition (21.2% Floor Area Ratio).

Stephanie O'Rourke, landscape designer, made a brief presentation on the landscape improvements and explained the goals of planting plan with respect to the existing Oak trees on the property.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing. As no members of the public were present to speak, the public hearing was closed.

The ADRB collectively supported and complimented the landscape plan, efforts of the landscape designer and homeowner and property improvements presented.

A motion (Goldstone / Jewett) to approve the proposed landscape plan passed 5:0.

Additions/Remodels

3. **15 Glenbrook Drive - United Genstar (Winges Architects / Louis Marano Landscape Architect)**

Request for a first floor addition of approximately 260 square feet and a second floor addition of approximately 380 square feet to an existing two story residence (24.9% Floor Area Ratio) and associated front yard landscape plan including terrace expansion, new plantings, new lawn area and new retaining wall.

Boardmember Werbe recused herself from the public hearing due to close proximity to the project.

Chair Heine recused himself from the public hearing due to close proximity to the project and appointed Boardmember Jewett as acting Chair of the ADRB.

Jerry Wings, project architect, provided an overview of the improvements proposed, including the addition and reasons for the octagonal design as well as the landscape improvements to enhance screening from the street.

Acting Chair Jewett opened the public hearing.

Mark Heine, 41 Glenbrook Court, explained his reaction to the proposal, understanding of the roofline design and stressed the importance of the level of detail. He added that his main concern was related to the lack of screening and proceeded to request clarification on the landscape plan, specifically on the tree height, recommending taller Olive trees, which could soften the appearance of the residence.

Boardmember Ho noted the stunning views available to the property; however, he commented that the existing residence is very prominent on the street and due to the Floor Area Ratio proposed, the level of detail needs to be on point. He stated his preference for the windows to match and requested clarification if the basement is a finished living area.

Jerry Wings, project architect, confirmed that the basement level is not finished and strictly used for storage.

Boardmember Goldstone requested clarification on how the basement would be addressed so as not to contribute to the Floor Area calculation. He questioned if the ceiling in the basement would be lowered.

Jerry Wings, project architect, confirmed that the basement ceiling would be physically lowered.

Boardmember Goldstone stated the project is near the maximum floor area ratio permitted; therefore, the windows should be consistent in design with the existing. He added that his main concern was regarding the proposed six foot tall retaining walls in the front yard area, which would amount to twelve feet of retaining wall/potential massing viewed from the street. He then expressed his support for the addition but remained concerned with the retaining walls.

Jennifer Werbe, 39 Glenbrook Court, expressed her concern with the Palm trees proposed and their inconsistency with the architecture and area.

Boardmember Nyhus noted the two tiers of issues present with the proposal: landscaping and the residence. He expressed his concerns with the retaining walls in the front yard, consistent with Boardmember Goldstone and noted inconsistencies in the landscape labeling, specifically with the Pine trees and Palms. He stated his preference for a landscape design with enhanced sensitivity to the front of the property, reduction in lawn area, softened terracing and increased screening of the residence. He added that although the interior reconfiguration makes sense, the exterior detailing needs to be refined and treated as an integral part of the residence.

Boardmember Goldstone expressed his concern with the basement issue.

Acting Chair Jewett stated the benefits to the community the landscape would bring and noted the right to build to twenty-five percent Floor Area Ratio.

Liz Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, explained the requirement for a document recorded against the property informing subsequent property owners of the maximum Floor Area for the property.

Jerry Wings, project architect, stated his efforts to work with Planning Staff and the City Attorney on clarifying requirements for the basement. He added the struggle with the window design and presented three options to the Board:

- Option 1 = with the grids to match the existing;
- Option 2 = Eliminate the grids to maximize the view;
- Option 3 = A combination design with clear glass and grids.

He stated that alternatives to the landscape plan had been explored, as the cost for the retaining walls was high and offered the alternative of less grass and one retaining wall with additional landscaping.

Louis Morano, landscape architect, stated that larger, more mature Olive trees could be utilized as well as three foot retaining walls and a reduction in the lawn area.

Jerry Wings, project architect, requested a conditional approval for the project with revisions to be reviewed by Planning Staff.

Acting Chair Jewett stated his preference for the landscaping to be reviewed by ADRB, noting the character and feel of the landscaping as the issue.

Boardmember Nyhus recommended window revisions and landscape alternatives to the applicants.

Boardmember Goldstone noted his preference for landscape and architectural revisions to be reviewed by ADRB.

Boardmember Ho expressed his preference for revisions to be reviewed by ADRB, specifically noting his preference for consistency in the window design.

A motion (Ho / Goldstone) to continue the proposal for a first and second floor addition and associated landscape plan to the September 8, 2009 ADRB meeting passed 5:0.

4. **366 Alberta Way - Zornes (TRG Architects)**

Request for first floor additions of approximately 609 square feet (17.4% Floor Area Ratio) and associated facade enhancements including a new foyer entrance and exterior modifications to the architectural style.

Randy Grange, project architect, explained the goals of the proposed improvements as an effort to achieve a refreshed façade without tearing down the residence. He added that the purpose of the entry feature was to provide more light as well as a new appearance.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing. As no members of the public were present to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Jewett noted the improvements as logical; however, he expressed his concerns with the tapered portions at the front elevation.

Boardmember Ho expressed his support for the proposal, commenting that the location of the solar panels could impact the neighbors.

Boardmember Nyhus complimented the improvements proposed, noting the proposal as organic and expressed his preference for the banding all around the residence. He added that refinement was needed and the entry was large.

Boardmember Werbe stated the project could benefit from a more expansive landscape plan and expressed her concern with the shingle quality proposed as well as the color palette proposed. She noted her support for the applicant to work with Staff to refine the details. Boardmember Goldstone concurred with Boardmember Werbe, noting his struggle with the composition shingle and low Floor Area Ratio proposed. He added that a front yard landscape plan is needed as the driveway is in disrepair.

Chair Heine noted the difference in the color of the windows on the projected screen image versus the color and materials board. He requested clarification on the color discrepancies.

Randy Grange, project architect, confirmed that the color proposed is a dark slate grey.

Chair Heine stated his preference for the colors depicted on the screen presentation, his support for the battered walls, and his preference for the band to be expanded all the way around the residence. He added that the proposal would benefit from a higher quality roof material.

A motion (Werbe / Ho) to approve the ground floor additions and façade enhancements with the condition that a landscape plan and alternative color selection be subject to the Administrative review procedures passed 5:0.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

Additions/Remodels

5. **2990 Summit Drive** - Preliminary review of first and second floor additions and major facade improvements to an existing two story residence.

Boardmember Goldstone expressed his support for the direction of the project, noting the need for a wider entrance.

Boardmember Nyhus expressed his appreciation for the project direction; however, he expressed concern with the roofline clashes and commented that technical issues such as visibility of vents and traps needed to be addressed.

Boardmember Ho expressed his support for the proposal and noted his own experiences with sod roofs, which could be of concern to the owners.

Boardmember Jewett expressed his support for the project, noting the interesting integration of the proposal. He added that execution would be a key component.

Boardmember Werbe stressed the importance of early public outreach for the proposal.

Chair Heine concurred with Boardmember Jewett in terms of execution of the design, specifically noting that the siding installation must be right on. He expressed his concern with the garage section, its height and that the guest house needed to be integrated architecturally with the main residence. He expressed his support for the direction and idea.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S) – None

ADJOURNMENT – 5:10 PM

ADRB Minutes Prepared by:



Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner