

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

Thursday, September 16, 2010 at 4:00 pm
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 pm

Boardmembers Present: George Jewett, Acting Chair; Carl Goldstone, Lin Ho, Eric Nyhus, Christian Huebner (Alternate)

Boardmembers Absent: Mark Heine, Chair (excused)

Staff Present: Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning; John Mullins, Building Official; Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner

Others: Marie Chuang, Councilmember Elect; Julie Tenenbaum, recently appointed ADRB Alternate

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Nyhus / Ho) to approve the August 02, 2010 ADRB Meeting Minutes passed 4:0.

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – none.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Regular Items:

Additions/Remodels

1. 10 Annescourt Place - Bobba (Kaindl + Partners)

Request for a second floor addition of approximately 467 square feet (24.9% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story residence.

Michael Kaindl, project architect, introduced himself, gave a brief explanation on the project and made himself available to answer questions of the ADRB.

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

Boardmember Goldstone noted the proposal was nearing the maximum permitted floor area ratio of 25%. He added that almost all roofs in the area were composition shingle and the windows on the existing residence appeared to be a mix of vinyl windows and aluminum, none of them appearing to be very old. He expressed his concern with requiring a full window change out due to the scope of work proposed.

Boardmember Ho stated that the house was well screened and his preference for the entire roof to be consistent and the patch and match proposal to be removed from the plan. He suggested that all windows at the front elevation be the same material and design.

Boardmember Nyhus stated that it was difficult to get an overall feel of the existing residence due to the large amount of screening. He added that it would be nice to have all the windows match and complimented the Juliet balconies on the existing residence. He commented on the eave that wraps around the lower end of the residence at the first level and impacts the front door.

Michael Kaindl, project architect, stated that the door is recessed with a two and a half foot return from the front elevation. He continued to explain the existing and proposed windows.

Boardmember Nyhus noted the two roof forms on the residence and stated he had no objection to the proposal; however, he recommended a fifty year roof composition shingle as opposed to a twenty year composition shingle as they are a thicker shingle that provides more depth.

Boardmember Jewett stated his similar observations with the window types and mentioned the good neighbor outreach conducted. He expressed his support for the project.

Boardmember Goldstone stated his preference for not requiring new windows due to the minimal scope of work proposed.

A motion (Goldstone / Ho) to approve the request for a second floor addition of approximately 467 square feet (24.9% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story residence at 10 Annescourt Place with the condition that the entire roof be replaced subject to the administrative review procedures passed 4:0.

2. **940 West Santa Inez Avenue - Davis (Ronald A. Perner, Architect)**

Request for a ground floor addition of approximately 968 square feet (9.35% Floor Area Ratio), new roof and revised front entry to an existing two story residence.

Ron Perner, project architect, made a brief presentation on the proposed Owens-Corning composition shingle proposed, stated the reasons for choosing a composition shingle as opposed to a wood shake or shingle, explained the design and scope of work proposed.

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

Boardmember Nyhus stated his support for the color and material board, noting that he preferred the kitchen elevation better in the rendering provided on the color & material board than in the actual plan set.

Ron Perner, project architect, explained the change was due to the structural engineer's recommendations so they proceeded with the current plan.

Boardmember Nyhus stated he liked the shutters and the project posed no obstructions to views. He added that there were less architectural features on the back side of the residence, such as the shutters and hoped that they would be added to the rear elevation as well. He mentioned that the crickets at the front roofline were complex and would like to see them revised, if possible.

Boardmember Ho stated his understanding for the emphasis on the roof as it is very visible from the street. He concluded that he had no further concerns.

Boardmember Goldstone noted the house was beautiful and his concern was the roof material proposed. He stated that there were no other composition shingle roofs on the street and the predominant view of the house from the street is the roof. He added that the existing shake roof looked great and asked why it was being changed to composition shingle. He added that a shake roof would work better with the architectural style of the home.

Acting Chair Jewett stated that a shake roof fit the character of the home better than a composition shingle and noted that the massing was improved with the proposal. He added that one substantial hip to match the left side would be better and if the hip at the left could be refined it would improve maintenance. He added that if the applicants wanted to revise the roofline, he was comfortable with revisions being processed at a staff level. He noted the low floor area ratio proposed.

A motion (Goldstone / Ho) to approve the request for a ground floor addition of approximately 968 square feet (9.35% Floor Area Ratio), new roof and revised front entry to an existing two story residence at 940 West Santa Inez Avenue with the conditions that 1) the new roof be wood shake or wood shingle and 2) the applicants work with Planning Staff to explore the opportunity for an improved roofline and revision to the crickets passed 3:1 (Jewett dissenting).

3. **35 Buckingham Court - Tian (Stewart Associates)**

Request for a second story addition of approximately 1,420 square feet (18.6% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing one story residence.

John Stewart, project architect, made himself available to answer questions of the ADRB.

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

Boardmember Ho stated the addition looked large and recommended a complete re-roof with a natural material. He expressed his concerns with the two dormers at the front of the residence and asked if they could be revised.

John Stewart, project architect, stated that one dormer would be too large and they were attempting to break up the massing with the utilization of two dormers. He explained the process they had went through, working with Planning Staff, to simplify the rooflines, which were initially complex.

Boardmember Ho noted that he was familiar with John Stewart's work and talent and felt the design could be improved.

Boardmember Goldstone noted he was glad a shed dormer was not part of the proposal and stated that he was unsure if there was a better solution than what was proposed. He agreed that the roof material should be natural and recommended sign off from the adjacent neighbor at 30 Buckingham Court, as this neighbor would be the most impacted by the addition.

John Stewart, project architect, stated that the wood shake roof cost twice as much and elaborated on the maintenance and life of a wood shake versus the proposed composition shingle.

Boardmember Nyhus stated he hoped quality of composition shingles would improve, noting that the ADRB would not be accepting composition shingle in all cases but understood why composition shingle was being proposed. He was glad to see the larger garage doors in the proposal, that the brick banding was being improved but expressed his preference for smaller dormers. He added that he had no objections to the proposal and was not as critical with concerns regarding the front door as Staff, as mentioned in the staff memorandum.

Acting Chair Jewett stated his initial reaction was questioning why the addition was not placed at the back of the residence and towards the back of the property. He added that the proposal was a nice solution, but close to the right side setback. He added that the roof was consistent with the neighborhood and he remained supportive of the proposal.

Boardmember Nyhus questioned the use of the moldings on the right side.

John Stewart, project architect, stated they intended to keep those as optional and would like to proceed that way.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building and Planning, informed the ADRB that neighbor notification had been completed with no neighbor comments submitted from 30 Buckingham and recommended against the requirement for neighbor sign off.

A motion (Nyhus / Ho) to approve the request for a second story addition of approximately 1,420 square feet (18.6% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing one story residence at 35 Buckingham Court with the condition that changes to the windows be subject to the administrative review procedures passed 3:1 (Goldstone dissenting).

4. **1480 Oak Rim Drive - Choi (Eiki Tanaka)**

Request for a ground floor addition of approximately 701 square feet (16.6% Floor Area Ratio) and associated front yard fence and gate.

Robert Choi, applicant and property owner, introduced himself to the ADRB and explained the project objectives. He made himself available to answer questions of the ADRB.

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

Boardmember Goldstone stated the proposal was not a substantial addition. He added that he was supportive of the proposed composition shingle in this case because it was consistent and

compatible with neighborhood. He assumed the new front yard fence would be located behind the existing hedges. He remained supportive of the proposal.

Boardmember Ho agreed with Boardmember Goldstone and added that the landscape screening in front of the fence should be reviewed by Planning Staff.

Boardmember Nyhus mentioned the long expanse of fence between pillars and was concerned with the removal of the shutters and mullions. He asked if there was a specific reason for their removal.

Robert Choi, applicant and property owner, responded that the purpose was to update the home to a more modern ranch style.

Acting Chair Jewett agreed with Boardmember Nyhus, was pleased to see the hexagonal window removed from the front elevation and glad to see the spacing between the fence columns. He stated his preference for a screening plan for the fence otherwise he remained supportive of the proposal.

A motion (Ho / Nyhus) to approve the request for a ground floor addition of approximately 701 square feet (16.6% Floor Area Ratio) and associated front yard fence and gate at 1480 Oak Rim Drive with the condition that the fence detail and landscape improvements to screen the fence be subject to the administrative review procedures passed 4:0.

New Houses

5. **2135 Parkside Avenue - Pang (Chu Design & Engineering / Michael Callan Landscape)**
Request for demolition of an existing single story residence and construction of a new two story Mediterranean style residence of approximately 6,543 square feet (24.99% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including tree removal, new front yard fencing & gates, new driveway cut, new plantings, hardscape and restoration of existing swimming pool.

James Chu, project architect, made a brief presentation to the ADRB, noting the public outreach conducted to the neighbors and that the revised landscape design at the front and left side took the ADRB comments from the preliminary review into consideration.

Boardmember Nyhus stated that a large amount of square footage, about twice the amount of the actual square footage, was dedicated to the central foyer. He added that the new home would fit well in the neighborhood.

Boardmember Ho stated that the design was terrific and would be a tremendous improvement to the property. He expressed his appreciation for the reduction in hardscape and the box sizes for the trees in the landscape plan.

Boardmember Goldstone expressed his appreciation for the improvements but questioned why the columns were off center.

Boardmember Nyhus commented that the columns were centered on the plans.

Boardmember Goldstone noted that the double corbels were not his first preference and the beautiful oak tree on the neighbor's property would need to be carefully trimmed back.

Acting Chair Jewett stated the proposal would be a substantial improvement to the property, noting it was well set back from the street. He noted that the reduction in the hardscape is inadequate and that the front terrace was large. He added that the three hundred square foot reduction in hardscape was a mechanism of reduction and could have been reduced further. He noted that the screening proposed along the street was open and perhaps too open for the neighborhood context.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, explained the proposed pittosporum hedge proposed, noting that the intention was to match the neighbor's hedge. He added that they would be installed in 15-gallon containers.

Acting Chair Jewett noted that the existing magnolia tree, which was marked to remain, appeared to be suffering.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, stated that the tree could be maintained with deep root fertilization and tree protection measures.

Acting Chair Jewett stated there was a fair amount of exterior lighting proposed with forty watt bulbs. He expressed his concern with over-lighting the neighborhood.

Acting Chair Jewett opened the public hearing.

Jim Trevor, 2125 Parkside, stated that he had lived next door to the property for almost fifty years and have grown up in the existing residence at 2135 Parkside Avenue, noting that he was looking forward to seeing it torn down. He added that from the front it appears flat, but if the property is viewed from the Barroilhet side, up from Hillsborough Blvd., the upslope is apparent, which has caused huge water drainage problems. He asked if the lot were to be re-graded, what the final elevation would be. He added that he had not seen the proposed site plan for the property and noted that the existing residence sits lop sided on the lot. He added that the driveway sits a great deal to the west side of the property and expressed his concerns with the proposed chimney locations and the smoke that would blow into his second story bedroom window. He wanted to insure the chimney was high enough to meet code requirements and was looking forward to having the Pang's as neighbors. He questioned what the construction noise restrictions are as Parkside Avenue has undergone quite a bit of construction from residential remodels. He noted his experience with construction trucks arriving early and inquired on the type of construction fencing that would be used.

Acting Chair Jewett responded that a number of Mr. Trevor's concerns would be addressed at the building permitting stages for the project.

John Mullins, Building Official, explained that wood burning chimneys have a 2-ft/10-ft rule which dictates height and location of chimneys; however, this rule does not apply to gas appliances, which is proposed. He added that construction hours permitted in Town are Monday through Friday from 8am to 5pm and Saturdays from 10am to 5pm with no work permitted on Sundays or Holidays. He added that because a pool is located on the property, fencing would be required at all times.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, confirmed that the proposal included a solid wood "good neighbor" fence, which is board on board and finished on both sides.

A motion (Goldstone / Ho) to approve the request for demolition of an existing single story residence and construction of a new two story Mediterranean style residence of approximately 6,543 square feet (24.99% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including tree removal, new front yard fencing & gates, new driveway cut, new plantings, hardscape and restoration of existing swimming pool at 2135 Parkside Avenue with the conditions that 1) a lighting plan be submitted subject to the administrative review procedures, 2) the magnolia and oak tree maintenance be performed early in the construction process and 3) sign off shall be obtained from the adjacent neighbors at 2155 Parkside and 983 Barroilhet for the location of the fire pit in the setback area, passed 4:0.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

New Houses

6. **35 Willard Lane - Wong/Lin (John Chan, Architect / Wendy Mok, Landscape Architect)**
Preliminary review of demolition of existing one story residence and construction of new two story contemporary style residence of approximately 5,453 square feet (24.0% Floor Area Ratio).

Boardmember Nyhus stated the proposal was tough and the butterfly roof included relentless heights and was long. He added that the scale was not overly large and acknowledged the efforts made, but noted that additional effort could be done. He added that there was no question the design was different than the other homes along the street and noted that if the butterfly roof was retained in the design, it would be different from all the other houses. He continued to note that the proposal included very tall spaces and at the rear elevation he could see where a 3-D model and color rendering would be beneficial. He commented on the existing split level condition and added that a smaller roof form could reduce the height by four or five feet. He acknowledged that the proposal was a departure from the existing neighborhood context as well as a challenge. He recommended compromise be incorporated into the design and perhaps the second story be compromised for a modern street façade. He added that the elevations did not provide enough information and there was one home at 55 Willard that had a taller entry. He concluded by noting that change happens and with compromise it can be done.

Boardmember Ho stated his difficulty with the proposal, noting he is an advocate for modern design; however, he stated the proposal did not fit in the existing neighborhood context architecturally or with the height proposed. He recommended the applicant revisit the entire proposal.

Boardmember Goldstone stated that staff had attempted to steer the applicant in the right direction based on detail included in the staff memorandum and the proposal was completely incompatible with the neighborhood. He noted that the applicant would have huge issues with such a departure and staff had outlined the reasons for this and the inconsistencies with the Town's Residential Design Guidelines. He added that the landscape plan was difficult to read and stated that the proposal was too extreme a departure architecturally and from the guidelines.

Acting Chair Jewett noted that proposing a floor area increase from 13% to 25% on site required excellence in design and compatibility with the design guidelines and neighborhood. He added that nothing included in the proposal corresponds with the residential design guidelines and the outreach completed had been exceptionally casual with no concrete basis for understanding how

the neighbors are feeling. He stated that if the neighbors are not supportive the proposal would be truly problematic. He added that the plan sheets were not legible and the font was too small. He concluded that the proposal was above and beyond making a statement and the applicant should have sensitivity to the neighbors. He recommended revisiting the design to a more subtle, gentle approach, which would make for a better process.

7. **2225 Oakdale Road (APN: 027-351-050) - Hoffman Trust (Kaindl + Partners)**

Request for preliminary review for construction of a new two story Spanish Mediterranean style residence of approximately 4,000 square feet (24.4% Floor Area Ratio) on a vacant lot.

Boardmember Ho stated the new home was proposed in a quiet neighborhood, noted it was a large home for the lot and concerns mentioned regarding privacy with the neighbors. He recommended that the design be revisited to mitigate the mass, shield the home from the street, address privacy issues and protect the “feeling” the lot currently has.

Boardmember Goldstone noted the neighborhood outreach was ok and that the proposed 4,000 square feet seemed big for the lot although he liked the design of the house, but scaled down. He stated the design seemed doable although it was a large scale and recommended that the applicant have all neighbors in line to support the design before moving forward based on the concerns received in the public comment letters.

Boardmember Nyhus acknowledged the home was large and nearing the maximum floor area permitted. He noted that the front elevation presented the opportunity for improvement and that landscaping would help. He added that the proposed driveway location was good and the best location for it based on the lot configuration. He asked if the opportunity to incorporate a side entry garage had been explored, noting it appeared that there was room to do it. He concluded that due to high floor area ratio proposed, the materials proposed would need to be of the highest quality.

Acting Chair Jewett stated his comments would be less charitable and because the code allows for a twenty five percent floor area ratio did not mean twenty five percent was appropriate for all lots in Hillsborough. He added that all corners of the proposed residence were touching the setback, noting that seven parts were bumping into the setback. He stated that it seemed that too much square footage was being squeezed onto the lot adding that the style appeared to be homogeneous in the neighborhood. He recommended that the applicants rethink the style for the site, rework the design accordingly and work with the neighbors.

Additions/Remodels

8. **1545 Bellevue Avenue - Thorenfeldt (Michael Callan Landscape)**

Request for preliminary review of a new landscape bridge proposed to span Ralston Creek in the rear yard at the above address. The bridge would connect the residential area with an expanse of the rear yard located across the creek channel and is proposed to consist of an engineered steel bridge 36 feet long to span the channel and 30 feet wide.

Boardmember Nyhus commented that due to the location of the opening at the center of the bridge, the grass area as proposed would be eight to nine feet in width, which would limit the use of the area, noting that it resulted in a large amount of build for a bridge to the other side.

Boardmember Goldstone concurred with Boardmember Nyhus regarding the opening in the middle of the bridge.

Boardmember Ho acknowledged the difficulty and uniqueness of the proposal as well as his concerns regarding maintenance and engineering of the proposal. Additionally, he expressed his concerns with the aesthetics of the proposal, noting that he had not seen anything like this before and his preference to see examples of a finished project which incorporated the same elements. He concluded that at this juncture, he could not support the proposal.

Acting Chair Jewett expressed his concerns with the precedence a project like this would set. He noted that the access aspect of the proposal made tremendous sense; however, it seemed that the thirty foot wide proposal was an attempt to create more property. He recommended the proposal be revisited for a more sensitive approach such as a regular bridge without the hole in the middle. He asked how the light well would perform.

Ralph Osterling, consultant to the applicant, explained that the hole was incorporated into the design based on staff comments and the biologist recommendations. He added that he had worked with staff on a variety of solutions for the proposal and allowing light to filter through to the existing vegetation below the proposed bridge.

Acting Chair Jewett posed the question of what precedence would be established with a proposal such as this.

Boardmember Nyhus stated that a bridge would be more appropriate and are typically fifteen feet wide and incorporate materials already seen on the main residence for architectural consistency.

Boardmember Ho stated that the lot is very transparent, as the backyard could be seen from the front yard.

Boardmember Goldstone agreed with Acting Chair Jewett's concerns regarding the precedent a project like this would be setting for bridges.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S)

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner, provided the ADRB with an overview of upcoming items to be reviewed at the October 4, 2010 ADRB meeting.

John Mullins, Building Official, explained roof materials and roof systems, specifically addressing the difference between Class A and Class C roofing pertaining to wood shake and wood shingle roofing. He noted that wood shingle and wood shake roofs are chemically treated to meet Class A requirements and explained the difference in types of composition shingles relating to 30yr, 40yr and 50yr versus lifetime shingles.

ADJOURNMENT – 5:36 pm

Minutes Prepared By:

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner

