

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, October 04, 2010 at 4:00 pm
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 pm

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

Boardmembers Absent: None

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

Others: Mayor Christine Krolik; Councilmember John Fannon; Julie Tenenbaum (recently appointed ADRB alternate)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Jewett / Goldstone) to approve the September 16, 2010 ADRB Meeting Minutes passed 5:0.

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Regular Items:

Landscape Plans

1. **1545 Bellevue Avenue - Thorenfeldt (Michael Callan Landscape)**
Request for installation of a new landscape bridge to span Ralston Creek in the rear yard to connect the residential area with an expanse of the rear yard located across the creek channel. The bridge is proposed to consist of an engineered steel bridge 36 feet long to span the channel

and 30 feet wide. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project due to the potential impacts on the riparian corridor. (*Revised plans for a 25-foot wide bridge received on September 27, 2010*)

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, made a brief presentation to the ADRB on the proposal and recommended the ADRB continue the proposal to the November 01, 2010 ADRB meeting in order allow sufficient opportunity for review of the revised proposal by the public, Staff and the TCLA, and noted that a substantial further reduction in width of the proposal could address both the Board's comments on limiting the landscape bridge area for access purposes and the outstanding environmental issues.

Ralph Osterling, Osterling Consultants, noted that the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) had reviewed the proposal and had no outstanding issues. He distributed a letter from the DFG to the ADRB members. He provided an overview of the discussions and communications held with Staff and noted the changes that had been made to address previous comments. He stated that the owner would like to move forward with construction of the project, noting that the landscape bridge would require one week of construction and monitoring. He expressed his concern with timing for the proposal and introduced Michael Callan, landscape architect.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, stated the project did not include a lot of hardscape and noted his research on the width of different bridges along Ralston Avenue. He stated that the bridge would have minimal impacts and would allow access to the other side of the property. He added that the original design included a few bridges and had been reduced to one twenty-five foot bridge.

Boardmember Goldstone stated his preference to follow staff's recommendation for a continuation to the November 01, 2010 meeting. He added that the landscape bridge would provide more than 600 square feet of additional yard area and while he was familiar with access bridges at the front of properties, this was a unique proposal. He inquired if City Council review would be required and if more bridges such as this would be reviewed in the near future. He expressed his concern about setting precedent.

Boardmember Ho stated he had tremendous concerns with the proposal, including the legal parameters and expanse of the proposal. He continued with concerns regarding liability, setting precedence and maintenance. He noted the need for aesthetic examples of projects such as this due to its unique nature and noted the concept of placing lawn over a creek as odd.

Boardmember Jewett noted the proposal as interesting and expressed his understanding of the reasons for the bridge as the existing site was small and a substantial amount of usable area remained across the creek. He stated the changes made to the plans were less subtle than the original concept and going in the wrong direction in terms of aesthetics. He added that due to the potential visual impacts, concerns with setting precedent and purpose for the bridge, he was less enthusiastic about the proposal.

Boardmember Nyhus noted the proposal as a unique method to achieve a larger backyard area. He added that with the proportion of land divided by the creek he understood the reason to want access to the other side, noting that he appreciated the approach and concept. He added that the DFG are notoriously strict regarding proposals which may impact creeks. He inquired if faux grass had been explored to avoid issues with maintenance, fertilizer, etc.

Ralph Osterling, Osterling Associates, expressed his concern for timing of project completion

with respect to the grading moratorium.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, confirmed that the project would not be subject to the grading moratorium.

Chair Heine stated that the width of the proposal was becoming the precedent setting factor as it was not solely for access. He added that the proposal is clearly for achieving more square footage and enlarging the usable area of the backyard space. He indicated his concerns related more towards the size of the proposal and setting precedent. He stated that time would be needed to review the proposal and hear from staff before making a final decision. He apologized for any inconvenience and again noted the unique nature of the proposal. He added that November 01, 2010 would be the next available meeting.

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

Ralph Osterling, Osterling Consultants, stated he had heard valuable comments regarding the square footage and width of the proposal and acknowledged that the lot was unusual due to the location of the creek.

Chair Heine stated continuation of the project to the November 01, 2010 ADRB meeting would be beneficial to the applicants.

Boardmember Jewett inquired on the timing of the project and start of work.

Chair Heine stated that the proposal would not be subject to the grading moratorium.

Ralph Osterling, Osterling Consultants, asked for guidance on the width of the bridge.

Boardmember Nyhus commented that precedence was difficult to define.

Chair Heine expressed to the applicant that the ADRB members were aware of what the project was intended to accomplish and it would be beneficial to have an additional thirty days to make a determination on the proposal.

A motion (Goldstone / Ho) to continue the proposal for installation of a new landscape bridge 36-feet long and 30-feet wide to span Ralston Creek in the rear yard to connect the residential area with an expanse of the rear yard located across the creek channel to the November 01, 2010 ADRB meeting passed 5-0.

Additions/Remodels

2. **2077 Forest View Avenue - Miller (Michael Kaindl + Partners)**

Request for a first and second floor addition of approximately 1,243 square feet (11.98% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story residence.

Michael Kaindl, project designer, made a brief presentation to the ADRB and explained the collaboration that occurred with staff for the review of the proposal, which included review by an historical consultant. He explained the reasons for the flat roof, square footage and front entry restoration.

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

Boardmember Nyhus asked for clarification on the flat roof element, noting that some sheets needed to be revised to correctly reflect a flat roof. He commented on the details of the fascia and chimney at the kitchen, specifically noting how it was set on brackets and his concerns with the trueness of the element in terms of architecture. He expressed his appreciation for the rear elevation, opening up the enclosed porch and overall scope of work. He added that the house is large and the proposed scale is appropriate. He stated his preference for the pitched roof, but understood the reasons due to the historical aspects of the property and expressed his support for the front entry restoration.

Boardmember Jewett agreed with Boardmember Nyhus and expressed his appreciation for the front door restoration, noting the prior alterations done were unfortunate. He stated that the changes at the kitchen made sense and noted the hanging fireplace as disingenuous. He inquired about the third window change.

Michael Kaindl, project designer, explained that the proposal included removal of the third upper level window.

Boardmember Jewett expressed his support for the project and complimented the rear elevation.

Boardmember Ho stated the proposal was a good attempt with the historical aspects and restrictions. He encouraged the applicants to revisit the chimney detail and concurred with Boardmember Nyhus.

Boardmember Goldstone stated the applicants had done a good job working within the historic guidelines and the chimney was not a huge concern. He asked if a landscape plan would be included with the proposed improvements.

Michael Kaindl, project designer, explained that the intent was to maintain the existing landscape on the property.

Boardmember Goldstone stated that the existing driveway was in poor condition and added that he was comfortable with a staff level review for the proposed entry restoration and landscape clean up. He expressed his support for the project.

Chair Heine questioned whether the applicants rely on the historic consultant or staff.

Boardmember Goldstone expressed his interest to insure the historic comments and requirements are met.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, confirmed that staff would work directly with the applicants and historic consultant to insure all comments and guidelines relating to the historic aspects of the property were met.

Chair Heine asked if the chimney could be eliminated from the design and a vent incorporated into the details, noting that this element of the proposal would need to be changed. He complimented the front door restoration. He added that he appreciated the comments from the historic consultant and would rely on her recommendations. He expressed his appreciation that the home was being kept and restored.

A motion (Nyhus / Goldstone) to approve the request for a first and second floor addition of approximately 1,243 square feet (11.98% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story residence with the conditions that 1) the chimney be revisited and/or brought down to the ground; 2) the front door restoration and rear doors follow staff and the historic consultants recommendations (restoration of the front entry subject to review by the historic consultant) and 3) the driveway be repaired and landscape cleaned up, passed 5-0.

3. **65 Country Club Drive - Smith (Talon Design Group)**

Request for a first floor addition of approximately 1,072 square feet (20.5% Floor Area Ratio) and associated façade improvements including a new roof, new siding and new windows to an existing one story residence.

Alan Paige, project architect, provided an overview of the proposal inclusive of the reasons and methods for the additions. He added that the project objective was to update, clean up and modernize the existing house. He presented a color rendering to the ADRB with a revised color scheme with two lighter colors for the body of the residence, noting the preference for the lighter colors depicted in the rendering.

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

Chair Heine made a disclosure that he had previously viewed the plans. He added that he was able to make a clear and impartial decision on the proposal, for the record.

Boardmember Ho expressed his support for the proposal, noting his preference to see a better integration of the vertical and horizontal siding elements.

Boardmember Jewett expressed his support for the proposal, noted that the two-tone color scheme was ok and liked the interplay of the vertical and horizontal siding proposed.

Boardmember Nyhus stated his support for the proposal as well and expressed his preference for the lighter beige color throughout. He noted his appreciation for the attempt at the two tone color scheme and his preference for the lighter color.

Chair Heine complimented the submittal package, noting the proposal was true to form and could carry the colors. He noted his preference for the lighter color or the two-tone as opposed to the darker colors initially proposed. He expressed his support for the proposal.

Boardmember Goldstone inquired about using the trim color in the original color board for the body of the residence, noting his preference for the dark color to be eliminated from the design.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, explained that a condition of approval could be included for a staff level review of the color change.

A motion (Jewett / Ho) to approve the request for a first floor addition of approximately 1,072 square feet (20.5% Floor Area Ratio) and associated façade improvements including a new roof, new siding and new windows to an existing one story residence with the condition that final review of the colors in the general direction of the colors presented in the color rendering at the public hearing be subject to a staff level review passed 5-0.

4. **711 Bromfield Road - Gladden (Flury Bryant Design Group / Michael Callan Landscape)**
Request for a ground floor addition of approximately 564 square feet (18.4% Floor Area Ratio) at the rear of an existing two story residence and associated landscape plan including new plantings, outdoor fireplace, flagstone patio, stucco fencing and relocation of the existing propane tank.

Bob Flury, project architect, stated staff had done a great job summarizing the proposal in the staff memorandum and informed the ADRB that the general contractor was also present to address any questions regarding public comment related to the construction and construction parking.

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

Boardmember Nyhus stated that the proposal was straight forward architecturally and aesthetically; however, he was struggling with the existing condition of the roof and roof material (simulated slate), noting the existing roof was in poor condition. He commented on the integration of the addition from the main residence and the angle which was incorporated into the design, which resulted in a small flat roof portion off of the family room. He asked if there was a better way to connect the form from the bay window at the family room, noting that the proposal had great form.

Bob Flury, project architect, stated that he did not want to feather in the new roof tiles for aesthetic reasons and wanted to create visual access from that same space.

Boardmember Nyhus noted that the new tiles were scattered along the existing roof and that integrity of the homes needed to be maintained.

Boardmember Goldstone stated that he was supportive of the proposal as it was not visible. He agreed with Boardmember Nyhus regarding the roof and expressed his concern with the original roof material, noting his preference to see the entire roof replaced. He added that the neighbor comments received were issues enforced by the Building Division. He acknowledged the proposed parking plan, noting it indicated construction vehicles to park down the street and around the corner, which would leave open spots on Bromfield. He encouraged the applicants to utilize the on-site parking available.

Boardmember Ho commented that the proposal was a nice use of space and noted he was not as concerned with the roofline integration. He concurred that the existing roof was in poor condition.

Boardmember Jewett expressed his support for the proposal, although he understood Boardmember Nyhus' comments regarding the roofline integration; however, he also understands the visibility concerns, noting the scope of work is small and at the rear of the residence. He commented that the recently remodeled bedroom would look out onto the new roof of the addition. He remained supportive of the project.

Chair Heine complimented the applicants on the submittal package, noting it was very complete. He noted he did not have concerns with the roof at the back and acknowledged the comments received from the neighbor, confirming that the concerns would be enforced by the Building Division. He stated the attic space would not be able to be used as habitable space as constructed and due to the small scope of work proposed, a re-roof would not be required, but is

recommended. He encouraged the applicants to explore the opportunity to replace the roof on the entire residence.

A motion (Goldstone / Jewett) to approve the request for a ground floor addition of approximately 564 square feet (18.4% Floor Area Ratio) at the rear of an existing two story residence and associated landscape plan including new plantings, outdoor fireplace, flagstone patio, stucco fencing and relocation of the existing propane tank passed 4:1 (Nyhus dissenting)

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

Chair Heine took a moment to thank Boardmember Goldstone for his time dedicated to the ADRB and announced that this would be Boardmember Goldstone's final meeting.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, expressed her appreciation on behalf of staff for Boardmember Goldstone's time and dedication to the ADRB.

New Houses

5. 1475 Crystal Drive - Der Abrahamian (Michael Carilli - Design Group)

Request for preliminary review of a proposed teardown and construction of a new two story French Eclectic style residence of approximately 5,449 square feet (24.9% Floor Area Ratio) and conceptual landscape plan.

Boardmember Jewett stated that the shutters on the first floor did not appear to complement the arched windows. He encouraged the applicants to add more thought into the rear elevation, not referring to embellishment.

Boardmember Nyhus expressed his appreciation for the slate roof and high quality materials included in the proposal and encouraged the applicants show a higher level of detail, inclusive of chimneys. He noted the variations in the window details and styles from elevation to elevation, specifically with the left side half arch windows and right side horizontal and vertical mullions. He added that there was inconsistency with the front door detail and commented that the front retained all the symmetry and the rear elevation needed attention to detail in terms of symmetry. He noted that the design was a give and take from the inside out and the goal was to achieve the inside and outside working together. He commented on the proposed stucco detail as simple and needing more detail. He stated his preference to see more detail on the house than spent on the roof material. He cautioned on making the entry too large, as it could out-scale the house.

Boardmember Ho stated the proposal had a nice start for the layout but he had reservations with the window treatments, which were inconsistent throughout. He encouraged the applicants to include consistency with the window treatments. He noted that the roof pitch at the rear was different and the free standing chimney looked odd. He encouraged the applicants to revisit the proposal with more thought.

Boardmember Goldstone stated the project had a good start; however, he expressed his concern with the massing at the right side. He concurred with Boardmember Ho regarding the freestanding chimney and commented on the conceptual landscape plan as follows:

- 1) the front fencing should be low profile as noted by staff;
- 2) the hardscape at the rear yard should be reduced and lawn configuration revisited as it

appears to be detailed up to the pool.

Chair Heine stated he was less enthusiastic about the proposal. He expressed his concern with the consistency of the proposal to the French eclectic style noted and specifically noting that the rear covered porch appeared to be ranch style and did not fit with the proposal at all. He stressed the importance of the details including windows, doors, eaves and lighting. He encouraged the applicant to be true to the architectural style proposed and stated that the current design appears to be a newer traditional home with a lack of detail. He encouraged the applicants to be aware of the importance of architectural details relative to the style, including quoins and at this point, he was not supportive of the direction. He closed by stressing the importance of being true to the architectural style.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S) – None.

ADJOURNMENT – 5:33 pm

Minutes Prepared By:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'S Ponzo', is written over a light blue rectangular background.

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner