

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 03, 2011 at 4:00 pm
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 PM

Boardmembers Present: Mark Heine, Chair; Eric Nyhus; Christian Huebner; Jerry Wings; Nan Ryan, Alternate

Boardmembers Absent: Julie Tenenbaum (excused)

Staff Present: Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning; Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner; Ray Yniguez, Acting Chief Building Official

Others Present: Councilmember Larry May (arrived at 5:06 pm)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Huebner/Winges) to approve the ADRB minutes of September 06, 2011 passed 4:0:1 (Heine recused).

WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Chair Heine informed the audience of the appeal process, in which any decision of the ADRB may be appealed to the City Council within fifteen (15) days of the decision by written application to the City Clerk's Office. He added that instructions for filing an appeal were available in the Town's Planning Office.

Consent Items

Boardmember Nyhus recused himself from acting on the consent calendar due to his residence proximity to 2105 Geri Lane, personal relationship with the owners of 10 Wickham Place and as architect of the project at 25 Bridge Road. Boardmember Nyhus left the chambers.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan disclosed her acquaintance with the owners of 2200 Ralston Avenue and stated that despite the acquaintance, she was able to review and vote on the project in a fair and impartial manner.

Landscape Plans

1. **2200 Ralston Avenue - Podell (The Wiseman Group)**

Request for design review of new 8-ft tall iron driveway gates to replace existing gates at the main entrance of the property along Ralston Avenue.

Additions/Remodels

2. **2105 Geri Lane - Morrison / Minton (Stewart Associates)**

Request for a second floor addition (enclosure of an existing second level balcony) of approximately 96 square feet (24.5% Floor Area Ratio) at the rear of an existing two story residence.

3. **10 Wickham Place - Sheehan (TRG Architects)**

Request to re-roof an existing one story traditional ranch style residence with a new standing seam metal roof (MS Metal Sales Manufacturing Corporation) in a dark gray-brown color. The roof material change is also a request for a revision to the administrative approval for a ground floor addition and remodel issued on March 11, 2011.

4. **820 Lombardi Lane - Goldstein (TRG Architects)**

Request for a first and second floor addition of approximately 798 square feet (17.9% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story residence.

5. **25 Bridge Road - Lang (Nyhus Design Group)**

Request for a ground floor addition of approximately 1,180 square feet (18.2% Floor Area Ratio) to the left side and rear of an existing one story ranch style residence. Facade improvements include new windows and a new entry.

A motion (Huebner/Ryan) to approve consent calendar items #1-5 passed 4:0.

Boardmember Nyhus returned to the chambers.

Regular Items:

Additions/Remodels

6. **249 Bridge Road - Green (Charlie Barnett Associates)**

Request for a ground floor addition of approximately 762 square feet (17.8% Floor Area Ratio) to the rear of an existing one story ranch style residence and associated facade improvements including new wood windows and doors.

Charlie Barnett, project architect, made a presentation on the proposal and explained the upgrades to the existing residence including new mahogany windows to replace the existing vinyl, replacement of the horizontal wood siding, retention of the existing wood shake and copper gutters. He noted that the goal was to preserve and work with the existing materials and neighborhood context.

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

Boardmember Nyhus expressed support for the materials proposed and the overall approach with textures. He inquired if the architectural style and goal for the rear elevation would be reflected in the front façade if there were no constraints maintaining the front of the residence.

Charlie Barnett, project architect, indicated that the purpose of the two styles and preservation of the front of the residence was to preserve the existing neighborhood context while being respectful of the project budget.

Boardmember Nyhus noted that the connections at the side elevations appeared to be difficult in their transition with the varying architectural facades. He complimented the material choices and expressed his preference for a comprehensive façade update, but noted he remained supportive and the upgrades would be a great enhancement to the site.

Boardmember Winges expressed his concerns with the two different roof styles from front to rear. He added that either approach, ranch or modern, would be fine; however, it would be best if they were not combined from an architectural perspective. He added that a comprehensive update to modern would not negatively impact the street character and his preference for an upgrade to modern. He noted that the detailing was very nice although he remained concerned with the roof shape and two different styles.

Charlie Barnett, project architect, added that the side elevations were not visible and stressed the importance of the budget to the owners. He added that with this approach they would be able to maintain the existing foundation and framing.

Boardmember Huebner stated his support for the house design from the street elevation and questioned if the landscaping would be improved as well, as it would play a role in balancing the project. He complimented the front door, mahogany trim and raised roof at the rear elevation to take advantage of the view of the redwoods in rear yard.

Charlie Barnett, project architect, confirmed that a landscape plan would be developed and requested an administrative review of the landscape improvements.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan commented on the stunning backyard of the property. She added that all materials, colors and finishes were of high quality and would benefit the site and neighborhood. She noted that the residence would be a light filled home with the new large

windows and expressed her support for the project, noting the side elevations are difficult to see.

Chair Heine thanked the applicants for submitting a complete package. He concurred with Boardmember Wings regarding the two architectural styles, noting the high cost of mahogany windows. He stated that the interior reconfiguration and space would be spectacular. He expressed concern with the different rooflines; however, the rear yard improvements would not be highly visible. He concluded by stating his preference for enhanced interconnection between gables; however, he understood the project goals and remained supportive of the improvements.

Boardmember Nyhus commented before the motion that the project was analogous to changing the entire skin of a house and while he understood the cost conscious approach, he noted the scope of work as significant, with his preference for a unified exterior.

A motion (Huebner / Ryan) to approve the request for a ground floor addition of approximately 762 square feet (17.8% Floor Area Ratio) to the rear of an existing one story ranch style residence and associated facade improvements including new wood windows and doors subject to the condition that landscaping be processed administratively by Planning staff passed 4:1 (Winges dissenting).

7. **950 Baileyana Road - Veit (Suarez-Kuehne Architecture)**

Request for additions of approximately 863 square feet (24.7% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing three level residence and associated facade improvements including entry refinements, new deck at the rear elevation and new windows.

Boardmember Wings recused himself from review of the project due to a business relationship with the applicants and left the chambers.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan recused herself from review of the project due to proximity of her residence to the project site and left the chambers.

Scott Kuehne, project architect, made a presentation to the ADRB and members of the public. He explained the project objectives in creating a larger family area around the kitchen and provided detail on the comprehensive façade improvements for enhanced consistency with the French Manor architectural style, inclusive of the addition of quoins. He stated that he had worked closely with Planning Staff, who had informed them of concerns with “patch and match” proposals and had encouraged a comprehensive roof update. He added that they opted to move forward with the patch and match due to the newer age of the roof and minimal visual impacts to the street. He acknowledged the public comment received from adjacent neighbor on Baileyana and stated they planned to respond to the neighbor’s concerns with a construction parking plan.

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

Boardmember Huebner thanked the applicants for submitting a very complete package and complimented the proposal, noting the details as great improvements which add architectural interest and dimension to the home. He stated that the design of the rear elevation was excellent and will relate well to the front of the house. He concluded that the home retains a nice presence on the street and the front façade could handle additional quoins at the outer edges of the building.

Boardmember Nyhus thanked the applicants, noting that the Town of Hillsborough needed more applications of this nature. He added that the improvements would be a great benefit to the site and the rear elevation was well executed. He complimented the triple window system on the upper floors, noted that the windows were well aligned and the pseudo dormers were appropriate for the architectural style as well as chimney caps. He expressed full support for the proposal.

Chair Heine stated he had no additional comments and was supportive of the improvements, making specific mention of the improvements to the rear elevation and details of the railings and copper chimney caps. He noted he was not supportive of the patch and match roof proposal and felt a different roof color would be more consistent with the improvements proposed. He added his preference for a condition requiring any damaged landscaping to be replaced.

A motion (Nyhus / Huebner) to approve the request for additions of approximately 863 square feet (24.7% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing three level residence and associated facade improvements including entry refinements, new deck at the rear elevation and new windows with the condition that any landscaping damaged during construction be replaced passed 3:0.

After the motion was completed, Boardmember Wings and Alternate Boardmember Ryan returned to the chambers.

8. **85 Southdown Court - Rashid/Panjwani (Leitzinger & Company)**

Request for an upper and lower level addition of approximately 1,627 square feet (20.5% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two level Mediterranean style residence and associated rear yard deck expansion.

Richard Letzinger, project architect, made a brief presentation to the ADRB on the project details and objectives and made himself available to answer any questions.

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

Alternate Boardmember Ryan expressed her support for the proposal, noting the details would be an enhancement to the existing residence and the improvements remained nominally visible. She noted that on the left hand side of the property, there did not appear to be a hand rail at the stairs leading down to the back of the property, which presented a dangerous situation.

Richard Letzinger, project architect, stated that the railing was connected to the building, but would look into it to insure a safe condition on the property.

Boardmember Huebner expressed his support for the proposal, noting the integration was executed nicely.

Boardmember Wings expressed his support for the improvements, noting it was a nice approach to the addition with minimal impacts to the neighbors.

Boardmember Nyhus acknowledged that although the improvements would not impact the neighbors, the existing home retain two significant roof forms and it was unfortunate to include a

flat roof in the design as opposed to other opportunities for a well-integrated design.

Chair Heine expressed his support for the improvements, noting it blended with the existing home well and has minimal visual impacts. He added that the railings were a nice addition.

A motion (Winges / Nyhus) to approve the request for an upper and lower level addition of approximately 1,627 square feet (20.5% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two level Mediterranean style residence and associated rear yard deck expansion passed 5:0.

New Houses

9. **515 Craig Road - Thorenfeldt (TRG Architects / Michael Callan Landscape)**

Continued review of the request for demolition of an existing split level residence and construction of a new two story French Country style residence of approximately 5,349 square feet (23.6% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including a new driveway entrance and surfacing, new plantings, tree removal, new retaining walls and pathways. *(Continued at the September 06, 2011 ADRB meeting)*

Randy Grange, project architect, made a presentation to the ADRB. He explained how the plans were revised to respond to prior ADRB comments through enhanced modulation and burying the second story to give it more of a one and a half story appearance. He added that all sides of the house were brought down to one story in appearance and the two story portions involved the rear bedrooms. He clarified that the reason the proposal was continued at the last meeting was due to a surveyor error in measuring the streetline setbacks. As a result, the story poles were installed twenty feet further back than they needed to be. He explained that according to their civil engineer, the lot was once level and that some lots were built up over time. He added that the proposed grading is intended to reduce the berm in front of the residence, a concept of which, is supported by an adjacent neighbor directly across the street from the project site. He explained the outreach conducted to adjacent neighbors on both Barbara Way and on Craig Road, which included a view study to determine the appropriate height of landscaping in order to preserve privacy, understanding it is a neighborhood in transition.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, explained that several really good and productive neighbor meetings had been held to discuss neighbor concerns and how screening could address issues with privacy. He explained the changes made to the landscape plan, which included additional evergreen trees to address concerns of the neighbor directly to the right and that he continued to work with the other neighbors regarding front yard landscaping options, one which included a new stone retaining wall to elevate the tree canopy and to provide additional screening.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing.

Joe Haines, 512 Craig Road, expressed his respect for the ADRB process and made reference to the public comment letter he had submitted. He stated that all of his concerns outlined in the letter were magnified with corrected story pole location and expressed his preference for a one story project, consistent with the existing neighborhood context. However, he added, if a one story project was not feasible, he felt the proposal should be scaled down and the front tower feature eliminated. He made reference to the two recent renovations on Barbara Way which retained one story projects out of respect for the existing neighborhood context and asked if the ADRB was inclined to approve the project that they include a condition of approval requiring the

landscape architect to work with the neighbors on landscape screening.

Michael Champeau, 530 Barbara Way, made reference to his letter of August 28, 2011, which was forwarded to the ADRB for their consideration. He explained that the area between Barbara Way, Ralston Avenue and Pullman Road consists exclusively of one story homes. He expressed his concerns with the mass of the second story, specifically at the rear elevation. He stated that the revised/corrected story poles did indicate a reduced impact than the original as the second story mass had been shifted back. He added that there is a flat wall at the rear elevation that lacks architectural relief and the balcony on the second level is the sole point of relief, which posed an invasion of privacy. He noted that the view of the new project from his property would appear as a sea of shingles; however, with appropriate landscape screening, he would be less concerned.

Kevin Gee, 518 Craig Road, introduced himself to the ADRB, explained that he was a builder by trade and moved to Hillsborough for the schools and for this neighborhood specifically. He added that he had attempted a second story proposal, which was not supported by the neighborhood, so he renovated his house within the ranch style. He stated that the proposed new home was huge with views directly into his pool, which posed a concern. He acknowledged the nice details of the house; however, he remained concerned with the roof pitch and two story elements, which impacted his privacy. He concluded that the home, as proposed, was large and tall and expressed his preference to see the home proposal toned down and significant screening incorporated into the landscape design.

Randy Grange, project architect, noted that the wood shingle roof would age and blend over time. He added that when the original public outreach meetings were held, the neighbors who attended expressed support for proposal, although it was lightly attended.

Boardmember Winges expressed his appreciation for the details of the house and architectural style; however he remained concern with the proposal on this site due to concerns with neighborhood compatibility, which neighborhood comment demonstrated. He noted he was supportive of diversity; however, it should complement the existing neighborhood. He noted that the design would benefit from architectural changes, making specific note of the front tower, which appeared massive compared to the neighborhood. He stated his preference for a one story element and for large portions of the house being one story with dormers popping through. He stated that the rear elevation was still an issue and although the rear impact was reduced through story pole location correction, he remained concerned with bulk and mass. He recommended exploring opportunities to reduce massing by reducing the tower and addressing the rear elevation. He complimented the applicant's public outreach efforts but also took the neighbors testimony into account. He concluded that one should not build a problem and then screen it, it should be built right first.

Boardmember Nyhus questioned the elevation/berm.

Randy Grange, project architect, clarified that the berm would be removed by grading four feet down.

Boardmember Nyhus stated for the record that he did view the story poles from the interior of Mr. Haines residence at 512 Craig Road. He added that mass is an issue with the proposal and although the rear elevation may not appear as massive as one may think, it sunlights away at 45 degrees from the rear. He added that the design of the house was nicely done, but pending

concerns of surrounding property owners as they relate to neighborhood context and privacy are legitimate. He stated that the rendering did not appear accurate in terms of grade elevation and the proposed distance from road. He noted that the half-timber piece that is presented as off center at the right/front elevation appears awkward and some of the roof forms are questionably integrated.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan concurred with Boardmember Winges' comments, noting that the story poles appear correct and look better; however, she acknowledged the enhanced impacts at the front. She noted that the home design was beautiful and expressed appreciation for the lot leveling; however, massing remained an issue even though there have been some improvements integrated into the design. She concluded that the proposal could benefit from additional improvements.

Boardmember Huebner thanked the applicants for the complete package submitted. He was supportive of the grading proposed and inquired if more could be done, noting that the proposal remained massive. He complimented the quality of the design and materials and stated that the neighborhood was in transition and the proposal should not be held to one height standard. He remained supportive of the two story proposal.

Chair Heine stated that the proposal does fit within the design guidelines as it provides diversity within the neighborhood and there is some precedence for two story homes in the immediate neighborhood. He expressed support for the design and stated that the entry feature was too large and could be reduced, but liked the transition to one story elements at the perimeter portions of the house. He concluded that the style was appropriate and expressed his support for the proposal.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, clarified that the Town does not have a privacy ordinance but that one of the intents of the zoning code is to preserve privacy. She then offered options for approving landscaping subject to staff review if the ADRB was inclined to approve the proposal.

Boardmember Huebner questioned Randy Grange as to whether he had explored design options to reduce massing.

Randy Grange explained the requirement for the bedroom windows by law at the second level and that the entry feature necessary part of architecture; however, a reduction in the second floor could be explored.

Boardmember Winges recommended lowering the front tower element, reducing the height of the windows by 1/3, reducing the height of the stucco wall, reducing the plate heights and lowering the top of the parapet height. He concluded that it was an appropriate house for different site.

A motion (Winges / Nyhus) to continue the proposal to the November 07, 2011 ADRB Meeting passed 5:0.

10. **366 Hillsborough Blvd. - Laugesen (TDG - The Design Group / Michael Callan Landscape)**
Request for demolition of an existing split level residence and construction of a new two story

modern craftsman residence of approximately 4,083 square feet (24.8% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including tree removal, new driveway paving, new plantings, new retaining walls and new patio areas. *(Received preliminary review at the September 06, 2011 ADRB meeting)*

Boardmember Huebner recused himself from review of the item due to proximity of his residence to the project site.

De Nguyen, project designer, made a brief presentation to the ADRB and described the architectural changes made to the design in response to ADRB comments, described the topography of the site and referred to the color board for an accurate representation of the materials and colors versus the rendering.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, presented to the ADRB, providing them an outline of the changes made as a response to the project's preliminary review.

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

Alternate Boardmember Ryan expressed her support for the changes, specifically the wood shingle extension, use of natural stone, quality windows and architectural details. She expressed her appreciation for the increase in backup space behind the garage and the widened driveway which allowed for greater visibility when entering and exiting the property.

Boardmember Winges expressed his support for the proposal, noting his appreciation for the detailing. He questioned if all of the eucalyptus trees would be removed, which he remained supportive of and acknowledged the lack of parking strip along the frontage. He questioned if the frontage was in Hillsborough or Burlingame and questioned where guests would park with a recommendation for a pedestrian path from Glendale.

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner, noted that a parking strip is not being recommended due to safety in this area and added that access would be best for guests from Glendale Road.

Boardmember Nyhus expressed his support for the proposal, specifically for the reduced number of materials in the design. He noted that the fence design may not match the architectural style of the residence and expressed concern with the front elevation and proportion of the windows. He stated the proposal retained an excellent architectural style.

Chair Heine thanked the applicant for submitting a complete package and noted the proposal was a good transition for the lot. He acknowledged the potential construction challenges and complimented the good lighting, windows and detail details. He concluded that the landscaping proposed was appropriate for the site and remained supportive.

A motion (Nyhus / Ryan) to approve the request for demolition of an existing split level residence and construction of a new two story modern craftsman residence of approximately 4,083 square feet (24.8% Floor Area Ratio) and associated landscape plan including tree removal, new driveway paving, new plantings, new retaining walls and new patio areas passed 4:0.

After the motion was completed, Boardmember Huebner returned to the chambers.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

New Houses

11. **39 Glenbrook Drive - Knuff (Toby Long Design)**

Request for preliminary review of the demolition of an existing residence and construction of a new two level French Provincial style home of approximately 10,049 square feet (14% Floor Area Ratio) with an associated basement area.

Chair Heine recused himself from review of the project due to its proximity to his residence.

Boardmember Winges indicated his interest in visual impacts from across the canyon. He noted that the design was harmonious and liked the tower feature expressed in stone. He stated the preference for real stone trim to precast and expressed support for the recessed windows and thick walls. He added that palm trees may not relate to architectural style proposed, remained supportive of green efforts and noted that the flat roof was not preferred.

Boardmember Huebner expressed concern with massing and the siting and noted that the site plan and rendering did not appear to be consistent. He stated that the home appeared closer to street. He added that the proposed front elevation was attractive, supported the stone element in the center and remained concerned with the flat and plain appearance of the rear elevation, noting it would benefit from additional architectural articulation.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan stated the importance of the siting of the residence. She complimented the submittal materials included in the packet, supported the recessing details included in the design and recommended the siting of the residence be more clearly represented.

Boardmember Nyhus noted the significant difference between the rendering and elevations. He stated that the windows on the front elevation could benefit from more recession and framing to give prominence; attention to garage doors was needed and they should be consistent with architectural style of residence. He added that the front bay could perhaps be three instead of two and stated that the house is working well. He complimented the use of the banding with the recommendation that it be better integrated and noted the design retained good symmetry and was a classic design. He concluded that an adequate foundation drainage system should be considered.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S)

12. ADRB discussion of review process for minor second floor additions

Liz Cullinan, Director of Building and Planning informed the ADRB that Staff experiences fairly frequent situations where a property owner proposes a second story addition under 500 square

feet which has little to no visual impact on surrounding properties or from the public right-of-way. Currently, all second story additions are required to be reviewed by the ADRB no matter their size. These types of second story additions are generally reviewed and approved on the ADRB's consent calendar; however the ADRB process is more time and cost consuming than the Administrative Review process. Ms. Cullinan requested ADRB direction as to whether they would support having second story additions under 500 square feet be processed at an Administrative Review level. In all cases, the Director of Building and Planning has the authority to refer any sized addition to the ADRB if there are design and compatibility issues.

The ADRB indicated that they would support an ordinance amendment allowing second story additions less than 500 square feet in size that were nominally visible to be processed at an Administrative Review level, with the option for the Director of Building and Planning to refer the item to the ADRB for projects with any potential for conflicts with the town's Design Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT - 5:57 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:
Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'S Ponzo', is located below the typed name.