

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 Draft Minutes

Monday, May 03, 2010 at 4:00 pm
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 PM

Boardmembers Present: Mark Heine, Chair; Carl Goldstone; George Jewett

Boardmembers Absent: Lin Ho (Excused); Eric Nyhus (Excused)

Staff Present: Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning; John Mullins, Building Official; Mark O'Connor, Police Captain; Cyrus Kianpour, City Engineer; Joan Cassman, Special Counsel (arrived at 4:30pm)

Others: Mayor Christine Krolik

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Jewett/Goldstone) to approve the April 05, 2010 Meeting Minutes passed 3:0.

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

New Houses

1. **889 Sharon Drive – Kong/Florence (Otto Miller / Michael Kaindl)**
Request for preliminary review of a new two story French style residence of approximately 6,480 square feet (24.79% Floor Area Ratio) on a vacant lot. *(Received preliminary review as 851 Sharon Drive at the April 05, 2010 ADRB Meeting as a Colonial style residence)*

Boardmember Jewett stated the proposal was a good starting point with good siting of the proposed residence and keeping the garage entrance away from the street. He added that the package needed improvement, stressing the importance of a comprehensive submittal package and requested confirmation that the proposed roof material is a natural slate.

Boardmember Goldstone stated that the story poles would be a critical element of the review.

Chair Heine complimented the rendering and noted the importance of exterior finishes, authenticity of the proposed architectural style and the need for a slate sample. He added that the siting was appropriate, story poles would be critical, cautioned with the massing and noted that the detail would be critical. He added that the package submitted was rough and would need to be complete for formal review.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Regular Items:

Landscape Plans

2. **2186 Parkside Avenue - 2186 Parkside, LLC (Michael Callan Landscape)**

Request for installation of new tennis court and associated landscaping including new plantings, new screening trees, new turf and granite fines pathways at the rear of the property.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, made a presentation on the proposal to the ADRB, explained the perimeter screening incorporated into the plan to address neighbor comments and concerns received during the public outreach process and made himself available to answer questions.

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

Boardmember Goldstone asked the applicant to revisit the cypress tree located near the creek area, specifically to insure it was not a hazard to the oak tree.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, noted the cypress tree as tree number eleven and confirmed that the tree would be revisited.

Boardmember Jewett expressed his appreciation for the public outreach conducted, the neighbor sign offs provided as a part of the submittal package and for engaging the neighbors in the process.

Chair Heine stated he had nothing to add.

A motion (Goldstone / Jewett) to approve the request for the installation of a new tennis court and associated landscaping including new plantings, screening trees, turf and granite fines pathways, subject to the following conditions, 1) The final lot line adjustment map shall be recorded at the San Mateo County Recorder's Office and 2) changes to the landscape plan presented at the ADRB meeting to address neighbor comments shall be subject to the administrative review process, passed 3:0.

Additions/Remodels

3. **250 Darrell Road - Collins (CONima Constructed Image)**

Request for a first floor addition of approximately 405 square feet (15.5% Floor Area Ratio), roof change from flat to pitched and associated facade improvements including a new entry.

Craig Collins, owner/applicant, made a presentation to the ADRB and highlighted two issues relevant to the proposal. He stated that the proposed design is a substantial improvement to the existing conditions and expressed his concern with changing the roof pitched to a 4:12, as it would throw off the proportion and scale of the design. He added that the intent of the proposal was to keep a low profile roof and stated he was amenable to a natural roof material such as slate.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing.

Robert Lillo, 275 Darrell Road, stated he was representing other neighbors who were unable to attend the meeting. He described the neighborhood as a comfortable, cozy ranch area and expressed his concern with the height increase of eight to nine feet above the existing house and garage to accommodate the new roof pitch. He added that based on information received from local contractors, a 4:12 roof pitch is typical to the ranch style and expressed his concerns with neighborhood compatibility as it related to the proposed 5:12 roof pitch.

Chair Heine closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Jewett expressed his understanding and appreciation for the proposed improvements as well as the slate roof alternative. He stated that two of the roof portions extending to the front were both gable ends and incorporation of hip roofs at this end would assist in softening the façade. He commented on the proposed tower at the front, its height and noted that the tower would reduce visibility of the rear roofline. He added that the slate roof should be a natural slate roof.

Boardmember Goldstone expressed his preference for the proposal to be reviewed at a later ADRB meeting and revised to a 4:12 roofline.

Chair Heine noted the large hedge which blocked the view at 275 Darrell Road and clarified that view protection was not within the purview of the ADRB. He expressed his struggle with the gable ends proposed to match the entry and noted the lack of windows at the front. He noted the importance of incorporating architectural interest to the façade of the residence, specifically due to the amount of improvements proposed. He recommended exploring incorporation of landscape improvements, a 4:12 roof pitch, hips at the front, additional fenestration to the front to avoid blank walls, window trim refinements and additional chimney detail. He added that the proposed vinyl windows were a concern, the slate roof was a nice alternative and the stone was a nice element included in the proposal.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, stated the next available ADRB agenda was for the June 7th meeting.

Craig Collins, owner/applicant, accepted continuation to the June 7th ADRB meeting to address ADRB comments.

A motion (Jewett / Goldstone) to continue the request for a first floor addition of approximately

405 square feet (15.5% Floor Area Ratio), roof change from flat to pitched and associated facade improvements including a new entry to the June 7, 2010 ADRB meeting passed 3:0.

4. **262 West Santa Inez Avenue - Magnuson (Essalat Architects)**

Request for addition of new detached garage of approximately 604 square feet and addition of new detached loggia of approximately 163 square feet (15.7% Floor Area Ratio) and landscape improvements limited to a new driveway at the east end of the property, swimming pool and new tennis court at rear of property.

Farro Essalat, architect, made a brief presentation to the ADRB and made himself available to answer any questions.

Boardmember Jewett asked if the loggia structure would have doors.

Farro Essalat, architect, confirmed that the loggia would not have doors.

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

Boardmember Jewett expressed his support for the proposal and noted that landscaping would be appropriate to the design improvements.

Boardmember Goldstone noted his preference to see a landscape plan and expressed his support for the proposal.

Farro Essalat, architect, confirmed that additional landscaping was currently being designed for the property.

Chair Heine made note of the landscaping and asked what was being proposed at the front.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, stated that the additional landscaping could be reviewed at a staff level or brought back to the ADRB for review.

A motion (Goldstone / Jewett) to approve the request for addition of new detached garage of approximately 604 square feet and addition of new detached loggia of approximately 163 square feet (15.7% Floor Area Ratio) and landscape improvements limited to a new driveway at the east end of the property, swimming pool and new tennis court at rear of property, with the condition that landscape improvements be subject to the administrative review procedures passed 3:0.

5. **307 Ranelagh - Donald / Curti (TRG Architects / Michael Callan Landscape)**

Request for revisions to a previously approved plan for proposed improvements to an existing legal non-conforming two story residence (existing 46.2% Floor Area Ratio) including removal of existing basement and first floor area of approximately 315 square feet and relocation of approximately 248 square feet to the first and second floor. The proposal continues to include a full landscape plan, continuation of an existing legal non-conforming setback and roof ridge height and a total floor area reduction of approximately 67 square feet. Revisions include changes to the left side ground level windows, changes to the design of the right side second floor dormer and a revised demolition plan.

Warren Donald, owner/applicant, made a presentation to the ADRB, explained the time lost, costs incurred on the project and financial hardship due to the six weeks of inactivity. He added

that he worked with the neighbor to address concerns, which were included as revisions to the design and stated that he did not remove the walls and asked the ADRB for approval so the project could continue.

Randy Grange, project architect, provided an overview of the architectural changes made to the proposal including a revision to the right side dormer and window revisions at the left side to address neighbor concerns.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing.

Bogden Klopaki, 104 El Cerrito Road, expressed his ongoing concerns with the parking situation and stated that blaming the framing contractor for removal of the walls was not good as the owner is responsible for all activity.

Chair Heine closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Goldstone noted this as an opportunity to fix the poor driveway situation and increase the width of the driveway. He stated his preference for the proposal to be brought back for ADRB review with a driveway width increase and noted the lack of landscaping on the left side while still retaining the benefit of the non-conformities.

Boardmember Jewett noted the only concession presented as the windows and expressed his struggle with widening of the driveway. He noted the disregard for the previous approval as upsetting, understood the walls were removed by a subcontractor and specifically noted the efforts made by the ADRB to approve a reasonable project. He stated that moving the wall to increase the driveway width would be substantial.

Chair Heine stated the situation was difficult and noted his understanding from a developer's standpoint; however, all activity on the job site is ultimately the applicant's responsibility. He added that the favorable aspect is that the non-conforming status remains. He expressed his support for the house design, but specifically noted the difficult situation from an aesthetic view. He stated his opposition to widening the driveway and was not clear as to what would be gained from the widening.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building and Planning, stated that the ADRB could determine which changes would be suitable for the project and provided an overview of the recommendations made by staff, including widening of the driveway and reduction in floor area and other non-conformities of the proposal.

Becka Hidorn, 120 El Cerrito Road, explained the shared property line at the rear of the subject property and expressed her concerns with the massing and visual impacts of the new carport at the rear of the property.

Warren Donald, owner/applicant, stated that the pitch on the carport could be lowered.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, provided the ADRB with options for review of revisions to the carport, which could include a reduction in height and roof pitch.

A motion (Jewett / Goldstone) to approve the request for revisions to a previously approved plan for proposed improvements to an existing legal non-conforming two story residence (existing 46.2% Floor Area Ratio) with the condition that the carport issues be resolved with sign off from

adjacent neighbors and revisions subject to the administrative review procedures passed 3:0.

New Houses

6. **150 Bridge Road - Langmack (Stewart Associates / Michael Callan Landscape)**

Request for demolition of an existing one story residence and construction of a new two story French style residence of approximately 7,923 square feet (19.13% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including new front yard fencing, gates, plantings, swimming pool and tree removal. (*Preliminary Review: April 05, 2010*)

Scott Langmack, owner/applicant, made a presentation to the ADRB, thanked the ADRB and staff for the preliminary review and explained the public outreach conducted.

John Stewart, project architect, provided an overview of the revisions incorporated into the design since the preliminary review, which included a revised dormer shape and removal of two dormers in addition to a reduction in the overall floor area and increased setbacks.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, provided an overview of the landscape improvements, noting the positive comments from the Town's Consulting Landscape Architect (TCLA).

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

Boardmember Jewett stated that the changes incorporated into the design went a long way. He expressed his support for the proposal, noted the siting as good and expressed his concern with the new breakfast nook area.

Boardmember Goldstone stated the proposal was near perfect and complimented the dormer changes, outreach and tree retention.

Chair Heine complimented the submittal package and revisions. He stated that the style fits in the neighborhood; however, the lanterns appeared underscaled and appeared better in the rendering.

A motion (Jewett / Goldstone) to approve the request for demolition of an existing one story residence and construction of a new two story French style residence of approximately 7,923 square feet (19.13% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including new front yard fencing, gates, plantings, swimming pool and tree removal subject to the TCLA comments and landscape substitutes to be reviewed administratively passed 3:0.

7. **3115 Ralston - Brewer Development LLC (Habitat Architecture / Michael Callan Landscape)**

Demolition of an existing residence and construction of a new two story Mediterranean style residence of approximately 12,717 square feet in floor area (16.82% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including new plantings, tree removal, new tennis court, swimming pool and terraces. The project also includes on site grading of approximately 3595 cubic yards of cut and 2660 cubic yard of fill earth material with approximately 935 cubic yards of exported earth materials. The application also includes consideration of Adoption of Mitigated Negative

Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Design Review. *(Preliminary Review: March 01, 2010)*

Chair Heine provided an overview of the process due to the level of interest on the proposal. He noted that the ADRB would depart from the regular procedures for this portion of the agenda to ensure that all points of view are heard. He added that Staff would make a brief presentation on the components and parameters of the project and the applicant would make the second presentation. The public hearing would be opened and John and Leslie Wilson of 3080 Ralston Avenue and their agents would be allowed a total of fifteen minutes to make a presentation of their position on the project. Thereafter, other interested members of the public would be invited to speak on the project with a time limit of three minutes each. He reminded the audience that the primary purpose of the hearing was to hear all comments related to the environmental documents and potential impacts so that final responses could be prepared for the next ADRB meeting. He stated that this was the final opportunity for testimony on the Mitigated Negative Declaration that was issued for comment. He stated that after all the members of the public had spoken, the applicant would be allowed to respond to any of the comments or to provide any additional information on the project and since much of the public comment and information had been received very recently, the Town would not attempt to address all comments at the meeting. He concluded that although the ADRB would not be making a determination on the project this evening, the Board would thereafter discuss and provide direction to Staff on the project and its components. He asked all speakers to complete public speaking cards and that similar comment not be repeated. He thanked the members of the public for their respect and participation in the public hearing process.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building and Planning, made a presentation on the proposal which included the following:

- An overview of the project description which included the proposed architectural style, 12,717 square feet of floor area proposed, landscaping details and grading details;
- An overview of key project points, which included the actual square footage proposed of 14,436 square feet, 3,232 square feet of below grade improvements (basement) and setbacks which exceed the minimum required, highlighting the proposed setbacks of 55-feet from Ralston Avenue, 153-feet from Pinehill Road, 22-feet at the right side and 36-feet at the rear.
- An overview of key project landscape points, which included details on the thirty-six (36) trees proposed to be removed, eighteen (18) of which are greater than twelve inches in diameter at breast height and majority of which were eucalyptus trees in fair condition and ranged from 12-inches in diameter to 26-inches in diameter with one 24-inch box proposed to be removed. She added that 106 new trees ranging from 15-gallon to 48-inch box sizes were proposed to be planted and a series of retaining walls at four and one half feet were proposed to terrace down the hill with one six foot retaining wall proposed at the back of the tennis court. She confirmed the dimensions of the tennis court as 111-feet by 58-feet.
- An overview of the development standards compliance and highlighted that the proposal was below the permitted floor area, exceeded the required setbacks and retained design and construction materials of high quality. (Chart was displayed on screen)
- An overview of the timeline for the project process. Public notice dates were highlighted and noted as January 15, 2010 (preliminary outreach conducted by the applicant), March 08, 2010, April 1, 2010 and April 19, 2010 (notices sent by the Town).
- An overview of the scope of tree removal presented to the Town in an arborist report prepared by Timberline Tree Service.

- An overview and summary of public outreach completed by the applicant and Town to the twenty six properties included in the 500-foot notification radius. She added that four public notices had been sent since January 15, 2010, a neighborhood meeting was held by the applicant on January 28, 2010, story poles were erected on February 8, 2010 and public notices were posted at three Town bulletins beginning March 08, 2010. She presented the public notification list and affidavit of mailing.
- An overview of the site inspections conducted by ADRB members to the property.
- An overview of the environmental review conducted for the proposal, due to the proposed grading on a slope greater than ten percent and potential impacts resulting from tree removal. She highlighted that the environmental documents concluded that potential environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, biological resources, hazards and dangerous materials, utilities/services systems, cultural resources, hydrology/water quality, noise, air quality, geology/soils and transportation/traffic could be mitigated to a level of insignificance. She added that since the original publication of the IS (Initial Study) and MND (Mitigated Negative Declaration), additional mitigation measures addressing construction traffic and tree protection have been added to the MND.
- An overview of the project components which included an Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Design Review, which was recommended to be continued to the following meeting on June 7, 2010.
- An overview of the public comment received, all of which was provided to the ADRB members in their packets and additional comments received after packet distribution were placed at each desk. She stated that the primary public comments relating to environmental issues included aesthetic, construction, geologic, biological, and geology/soils impacts.
- She highlighted an error in the draft resolution which did not include all new additional mitigation measures and noted this as a housekeeping item.
- She explained that in order to approve the project, the ADRB first needed to adopt the MND and MMP on the finding that on the basis of the whole record there is no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant effect on the environment and the MND reflected the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.
- She concluded with the recommendation that the meeting and hearing remain dedicated to receiving final comments on the environmental impacts of the proposal and that the ADRB open the public hearing and receive final comments on the environmental documents and continue consideration of the MND, MMP and Design to the June 7, 2010 ADRB meeting.

Mark Sinclair, owner/applicant, made a power point presentation to the ADRB and public present which addressed the following:

- Visual impact of the proposal in relation to the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and noted the reasons for the FAR design and purpose of the FAR to preserve diversity and to insure homes did not overwhelm the land. He highlighted that the proposal included a 3,200 square foot basement area which brought the FAR to 16.8% and the visible FAR was 15%. He added that 79% of the homes approved by the ADRB in 2009 were equal to or exceeded an FAR of 16.8%.
- He provided a comparison of the proposal to the home under construction at 2755 Ralston and noted the 30-foot setback of 2755 Ralston with a FAR of 15%.
- He provided an overview of the minimum required setbacks of the Town, the existing setbacks at 3115 Ralston and the proposed setbacks, which exceed the minimum required.
- He provided an overview of the existing setbacks seen throughout the neighborhood and

highlighted that 40% of the homes had setbacks of 55-feet or less and 56% of the homes had 70-foot setbacks or less.

- He stated that based on the information provided by Town Staff, at least ten of the homes in the immediate area had setbacks of 55-feet or less and at least fourteen homes had setbacks of 70-feet or less which established a precedence.
- He provided a comparison of the height proposed at 29 1/2 feet, the maximum 32-feet height permitted and the adjacent residence at 3080 Ralston which retains an existing height of 41-feet. He added that the adjacent residence at 3080 Ralston Avenue retained a height of 41-feet with a 73-foot setback distance from Ralston Avenue.
- He provided an aerial photograph of the existing tennis courts in the area and their compatibility to residential living.
- He provided an overview of the landscape screening proposed along Pinhehill Road to mitigate potential impacts relative to the proposed tennis court and noted the 230 foot distance of the tennis court to the easterly neighbor and the 153 foot distance to the neighbor at 3080 Ralston Avenue.
- He provided an overview of the visual impacts in relation to the topography of the site and the landscaping proposed.
- He explained the existing screening seen around the perimeter of the property at 3115 Ralston Avenue and provided a comparison with displayed photos of screening seen throughout the Ralston Avenue area.

He concluded that the proposal posed minimal impacts to the neighborhood and environment as the proposed height is two and a half feet below the maximum, proposed FAR remains well below the Town's guidelines, setbacks have been increased from the existing conditions and the proposal includes an extensive landscape plan that screened the house from sight.

Bart Hechtman, attorney for Mark Sinclair, stated that in his experience with CEQA, the proposed residence met the categorical exemption; however, he understood Staff's conservative approach. He noted that aesthetic impacts associated with CEQA do not relate to size or setbacks and that CEQA addressed adverse visual impacts and those that were offensive to public view. He noted that there was no evidence of an adverse impact associated with the proposal because the existing views and conditions include views of homes. He stated that there was no unusual air quality impacts associated with the proposal and that there was no evidence of noise impacts or inconsistency with the Town's noise ordinance. He added that mitigation measures were not supposed to protect one neighbor but to protect the general public. He acknowledged receipt of the letter from J. Yang Associates at 3pm that day and noted that the letter which identified the driveway as not meeting Caltrans site distances did not mean the proposal posed an environmental impact. He added that the applicants were agreeable to a condition to use the upper driveway for construction vehicles, not for passenger vehicles, with flaggers at the bottom driveway as well as retaining all construction related vehicles on site during construction to avoid parking impacts. He stated that the neighbors were misinformed and expressed his hope that the focus would remain on environmental impacts. He asked that the ADRB consider holding a special meeting for the project review on May 17th and made himself available to answer any questions.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing.

Steve Mattas, attorney for John Wilson, introduced himself and team representing John Wilson, 3080 Ralston Avenue, and proceeded to introduce John Wilson as the next speaker in the fifteen minute series.

John Wilson, 3080 Ralston Avenue, introduced himself to the ADRB and stated that he was not opposed to the development, but did want it to be consistent. He mentioned and provided the history of the project at 3000 Ralston Avenue and 601 Provident which is currently under construction and noted the area of Ralston as unique as it consisted of two acre minimum lots. He mentioned the FAR limitations of 25% for the first acre and 15% for area in excess of one acre and stated that the home proposed at 3115 Ralston would be the fifth largest home in Hillsborough with a net lot size less than two acres. He expressed his concerns with the setbacks proposed based on the eighty-four setbacks analyzed and the average FAR which appeared to be 6% based on the data received from Town Staff. He added that a petition had been developed, which would be presented at the next meeting, which indicated that 60% of the neighbors agreed to the proposal incorporating an 80-foot setback, closer to the norm, a maximum 12% FAR, enhanced screening, as the neighborhood is characterized by winding streets with landscaping and larger trees and a revised location for the tennis court. He added that the proposed tennis court location is unprecedented above the grade and near the street. He concluded that the overall massing was a concern as well.

Steve Mattas, attorney for John Wilson, expressed concerns with the Mitigated Negative Declaration as it relates to aesthetics, air quality and noise. He stated that the primary concerns with aesthetics were the inconsistencies with the General Plan policies and Residential Design Guidelines as it relates to the proposed 16.82% floor area ratio and noted that this changes the neighborhood. He added that the policies and guidelines are intended to prevent overwhelming the site and neighborhood and the proposal would be one of the largest homes in Hillsborough and FAR comparisons to support this would be presented at the next ADRB meeting. He added that the other ADRB approvals presented were in other parts of the Town. He noted that the average setback in the neighborhood ranges from 97-feet to 113-feet and stated that the proposal needed an increase in landscaping. He stated that the preferred setback for the proposal is 80-feet off of Ralston and a maximum FAR of 12%. He stated that the landscaping should be increased on Ralston and Pinehill and 60-inch boxes should be considered for installation. He expressed concerns with truck traffic relative to air quality impacts and stated that the total volume of traffic should be considered to evaluate potential impacts. He continued to identify the preference for the primary access point to be the flag pole area as the lower driveway was determined to be a dangerous area according to their engineers. As for noise, he expressed concerns with the placement of the tennis court, noting it was elevated on the site and the noise would carry down. He recommended incorporation of a sound wall and appropriate screening.

Harold Bexton, architect representing John Wilson, delivered responses to comments on the mitigated negative declaration and quoted the Town's Residential Design Guidelines specifically relating to the winding roads and trees. He added that the rendering presented was inaccurate and siting of the proposed residence precludes additional landscape plantings. He expressed his concerns with the proposed landscape plan, specifically the proposed tennis court and associated noise impacts, which would travel down the hill. He made himself available to answer any questions of the ADRB.

Christine Zanello, 2050 Forest View Avenue and representing real estate agent for prospective buyers of 3115 Ralston, stated the design was exquisite and reminiscent of the 1920's Santa Barbara homes. She added that the design continued the old world home style and expressed her support for the proposal, specifically noting that a low 12% Floor Area Ratio was not suitable for a family of six.

Arthur Zanello, 15 Hidden Terrace, stated he lived in Hillsborough for forty-nine years and expressed his support for the proposal, specifically noting the lack of visual impacts to the environment or neighbors.

Terry Garnett, 3085 Ralston Avenue, stated he did not receive any public notice regarding the proposal and found out about the project because of tree removals. He added that the proposal was a large project for a tight street and would be harmful for the lifestyle. He stated it was troublesome to know of six additional upcoming projects for homes twenty thousand square feet and greater and expressed his concerns with the precedence which would be set. He expressed his concerns with potential property value decline, trees removed, smaller trees installed and concluded with concerns of the negative impacts the proposal would have to homes in the area.

David Chung, 415 Pinehill Road, expressed his concerns with the setting of precedent as it relates to floor area ratio and setbacks. He added that the desire was not to keep the new neighbors from building but questioned if the property could accommodate a house of this size. He expanded on diversity in the community in terms of development in different areas of Hillsborough and noted that development could occur without pushing the limits.

Katrina Garnett, 3085 Ralston Avenue, expressed her concerns with the proposed twenty two foot distance of the proposed tennis court to the street line, fire access to the property and surrounding homes, construction impacts associated with the proposal and day to day impacts associated with the construction inclusive of traffic delays. She concluded with her concerns regarding runoff and erosion during the rainy season and how the dirt of the site would be held in place.

Avner Nagggar, 3205 Ralston Avenue, introduced himself to the ADRB, noted he was a retired architect who worked on very large shopping mall developments. He stated his experience with CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) and expressed that in his opinion, single family residential development should be exempt. He stated he was saddened to see the NIMBY reactions taking place and noted he was the most impacted property, as he shares a property line with the subject property. He explained that the neighborhood has been changed and he had been through two developments, noting the home across the street which was developed eight years ago. He stated his preference for time limits for construction and stated he had no problems with the proposal and expressed his support for the design. He added he would have problems with trees planted which would block his view.

Scheherezade Sharabianlou, 2915 Ralston Avenue, expressed her concerns with the size of the proposal, privacy and noise impacts as well as potential devaluation of neighboring properties. She stated that she was not mislead by anyone and specifically noted that privacy should matter in the review process. She expressed the need for enhanced police presence due to the traffic speeds in the neighborhood and concluded that the proposal was too large for the area.

Cynthia Chen, 46 Baywood Avenue, stated she has been a resident of Hillsborough for fifteen years and expressed her concerns with the trees removed and the need to protect the trees, due to the fragile microclimate they provide. She expressed her concerns with the information she received regarding a row of Oak trees removed by the developer, which was apparently completed without permission. She explained that the Oak trees are dropping acorns which indicates stress and paraphrased from John F. Kennedy, stating "do not ask what your neighborhood can do for you but what you can do for your neighborhood." She concluded that she had previously lived in a seventeen thousand square foot home and a home does not make a life, it can make matters worse.

Leslie Wilson, 3080 Ralston Road, explained her passion for the Town of Hillsborough and for retaining neighborhood compatibility. She asked that the ADRB please take a close look at this proposal when considering the plans and thanked them for their time.

Dick Peterson, 260 Robin Road, expressed his concerns with the size of the proposed residence relative to the lot and the upcoming project at 425 Pinehill Road. He stressed the importance of native planting and ambience and noted that the neighborhood was on the cusp of quantum change. He concluded that the FAR's (floor area ratios) were originally designed for half acre lots and the need to preserve neighborhood compatibility.

Bart Hechtman, attorney for Mark Sinclair, stated that the precedence is not a CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) issue, it is a policy issue. He added that there is no evidence of property devaluation directly associated with proposal and that property values are not a CEQA issue.

Chair Heine thanked all the members of the public for attending the proceeding and for participating in the hearing process. He believed that everyone who sought the opportunity to be heard was recognized. As he previously stated, the main focus of the hearing was to receive all comments on the environmental record for this project. He added that Staff would take the next few weeks to carefully review all of the comments and testimony that had been received, determine what new facts or evidence had been presented relevant to the environmental issues, prepare responses to comments where appropriate and consider alterations to and finalize the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Plan in light of the record. He concluded and asked Staff to bring this matter back to the Board for the next meeting in which the Board plans to address the environmental findings and turn the attention to the application of the Town's Residential Design Guidelines for this project.

A motion (Jewett / Goldstone) to continue consideration of the MND, MMP and Design associated with the request for demolition of an existing residence and construction of a new two story Mediterranean style residence of approximately 12,717 square feet in floor area (16.82% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including new plantings, tree removal, new tennis court, swimming pool and terraces to the June 7, 2010 ADRB meeting passed 3:0.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S) – None

ADJOURNMENT – 6:40pm

Draft Minutes Prepared by:
Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner

