

# 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, December 06, 2010 at 4:00 pm  
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

### CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 PM

Boardmembers Present: Ho (Acting Chair), Nyhus, Huebner, Tenenbaum, Ryan (Alternate)

Boardmembers Absent: Heine (excused)

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

Others: John Fannon, Councilmember

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Nyhus / Huebner) to approve the November 01, 2010 ADRB Meeting Minutes passed 4:0.

### WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - None

### PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

New Houses

1. **35 Willard - Wong (John Chan, Architect / Wendy Mok, Landscape Architect)**  
Request for third preliminary review of a new two story modern ranch style single family residence of approximately 5,453 square feet (24.0% Floor Area Ratio) and associated conceptual landscape plan. *(2nd Preliminary review held at the November 01, 2010 ADRB Meeting)*

Boardmember Nyhus commented that the plan needed additional thought, specifically with the roof plan and the connection of the 3:12 roof section with the remainder of the residence. As drawn, the connection did not seem physically possible and was not depicted accurately. He

added that the proposal is continuously going in the right direction. He noted that the 6-inch band projection will be placed where birds can nest, which may be an issue and the front window is approximately 1-foot above the finished floor where the kitchen sink is proposed and the interior stairs need to be revisited. Additionally, there is a drop from the living room to the family room which bumps into windows and clarification on the feasibility of the floor plan needs to be provided. He added that the wall of the second floor is an uninterrupted solid wall for the entire exterior length of the right side and landscape is not a permanent solution to massing issues. He commented on the high amount of hardscape proposed in the landscape plan, specifically in the front yard and asked for clarification on the material on the north edge of the property. He added that the rendering was muted and not representative of the colors, which made it difficult to get a feel for the project. He encouraged the applicant to continue outreach efforts to the neighbors and stated the changes made were a great improvement and preferred to see the central portion higher for differentiation in the elevation.

Boardmember Huebner commented that there needed to be consistency with the exterior and interior as well as fine tuning in the details. He noted that the horizontal planks are not visible in the plans and perhaps the copies were not done correctly. He commented on the side yard elevations, specifically noting that windows could be incorporated in the design to break up wall space. He stressed the importance of consistency and noted that the current plans seem disjointed. He added that the proposal was going in a better direction and encouraged the applicant to work on the details.

Boardmember Tenenbaum agreed with the other Boardmembers and encouraged the applicant to tighten up the details for a crisp proposal. She added that details in the landscape, hardscape, hardware and lighting would be important in the project's review.

Acting Chair Ho expressed appreciation for the applicant's efforts and noted that with the 25% Floor Area Ratio proposed, the design needed to be right on. He added that the elevations did not match as the horizontal siding at the rear elevation was broader than the front and all elevations should be consistent with materials. He reiterated the importance of consistency in the design details.

2. **610 Brewer Drive - Brewer Development, LLC (Habitat Architecture / Michael Callan Landscape)**

Request for preliminary review of demolition of an existing one story residence and construction of a new two story Shingle style residence of approximately 7,517 square feet (24.6% Floor Area Ratio) and associated conceptual landscape plan including a new secondary driveway, new plantings, new swimming pool and tree removal.

Boardmember Huebner recused himself from review of the proposal due to his family relationship with the applicant and left the room.

Boardmember Nyhus stated that the architecture was beautiful and done in a classic way, noting that the details and quality of materials were great. He expressed his concerns with the space above the garage and if the space could later be utilized as floor area. He mentioned the committee that reviewed the floor area ratio limitations for Hillsborough a while back and noted that the garage was setback from the street but 20-feet tall and could pose a visual impact from the street due to its size and height. He commented on the 7:12 peaks with an 8:12 roof and noted that the right dormer at the front elevation would be higher than the main roofline. He added that there were a couple of narrow brackets on the garage but the overall concept and design was beautiful.

Boardmember Tenenbaum commented on the proposed simulated divided light windows and recommended the use of true divided light windows with the proposal. She also recommended using a natural stone veneer and complimented the design and retention of existing mature trees on the property.

Acting Chair Ho stated the proposal would be a tremendous addition to the neighborhood. He agreed with Boardmember Nyhus regarding the potential imposition the garage could have from the street and although he is a fan of Robert Stern, his projects were typically on forty acre lots. He added that the support received from the adjacent neighbors was great and encouraged the early installation of story poles. He asked for clarification on the use of the space above the garage, noting it was of concern to him as well.

## **DISCUSSION ITEM(S)**

### **1650 Wedgewood Drive - Murphy (Yorkshire Roofing)**

Discussion of request to re-roof an existing one story residence with Gerard Metal Roofing, Barrel Vault style, in a custom timber color blend. The proposal will receive ADRB guidance/feedback on the request.

Acting Chair Ho recused himself from review of the proposal due to a business relationship with the applicant, appointed Eric Nyhus as Acting Chair for remainder of the meeting and left the room.

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner, presented background information regarding the re-roofing process and comments received from Chair Heine, who was unable to attend the meeting. She stated that although the proposed roofing material is not on the "pre-approved" list, Staff can sometimes process similar roofing materials administratively. Since the proposed roofing material did not appear similar in nature to those pre-approved by the Board, Staff consulted with ADRB Chair Mark Heine who concurred that the ADRB should provide guidance on the application and also provided the following commentary:

Chair Heine's initial questions related to:

- The visual impact of the material as it appeared to be easily bendable, which triggered concerns regarding dents; and
- Installation and the amount of fascia board that would be visible.

He further noted that while the metal roof appears to have the same visual impact as composition roofing in terms of color, the photos provided depict a very uniform roof style and color with lack of depth which led to concerns of lack of compatibility with homes in Town. After further photo and installation documentation, Chair Heine indicated that he did not support the proposed roofing materials due to the uniform appearance and thus visual impact but that the proposal would benefit from a broader review by the Board. She added that the applicant, Dr. Murphy and his roofing representative, Dan Nelson, were also available to present and answer questions of the ADRB.

Dan Nelson, Yorkshire Roofing, presented photos of the fascia board and gutter and explained how walking on the roof would be accomplished without damage to the material. He explained how the roof would be repaired if dented.

Acting Chair Nyhus asked if the roof color would fade.

Dan Nelson, Yorkshire Roofing, stated that the roofing had a twenty year color warranty and based on his experience with the product, the material would hold its color very well. He added that composition shingle roofing and metal tile roofing materials were the only two that had not had class action lawsuits.

Boardmember Tenenbaum stated she had researched the product online and it appeared very engineered, which she was not an aesthetic quality she preferred. She added that she did come across tiles that looked more like traditional roof tiles and informed the applicant that she found more than a few complaints online regarding leaks associated with the metal tile roofing. She stated that the website she viewed was dedicated to complaints regarding this material, specific to leaks.

Dan Nelson, Yorkshire Roofing, stated that if installed incorrectly, leaks could occur. He explained the experience his company had with installation of the roofing material and the technical details of the roof installation.

Acting Chair Nyhus clarified the role of the ADRB for this application and that it would be for aesthetic purposes only.

Boardmember Huebner asked for clarification on portions of the installation.

Dan Nelson, Yorkshire Roofing, provided clarification on the types of nails used and spacing.

Boardmember Huebner acknowledged that there was no similar preapproved roofing product and based on the presentation made by Dan Nelson, it sounded like the company had ample experience with installation of the product.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, clarified that staff was seeking guidance on the proposal, specifically for aesthetic purposes as well as direction on how to process the application.

Boardmember Huebner stated that the roof could be attractive as it appeared to be better than asphalt shingles.

Acting Chair Nyhus commented that the aesthetics of the metal roof were not superior; however, the residence was setback far enough off the street. He added that he did like the shake metal roof tiles on the website.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, asked the ADRB if they had a preference for any other options.

Dan Nelson, Yorkshire Roofing, stated that he was unaware of the re-roofing process and the preapproved material list. He added that a deposit had been made by the homeowner for a custom color blend and was not refundable.

Acting Chair Nyhus stated he preferred that the materials had not already been purchased and asked for clarification on the vote which would be made for the proposal.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, clarified that the ADRB could vote to make a recommendation to Staff on how to proceed with the review of the application.

Acting Chair Nyhus stated the proposed roofing material was close enough to certain forms surrounding the property and could probably be acceptable in the neighborhood. He added that this could be a good test case for the material from an aesthetic standpoint.

The ADRB collectively recommended that Staff continue with approval of the Gerard Metal Roofing material in a custom timber blend.

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner, announced that the January ADRB meeting would be held on Monday, January 24, 2011.

**ADJOURNMENT** – 5:10pm

Minutes prepared by:  
Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Sponzo', is located below the text identifying the minutes preparer.