

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, November 07, 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; Julie Tenenbaum; Jerry Wings; Nan Ryan, Alternate

Boardmembers Absent: Christian Huebner (excused)

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

Others: Councilmember Larry May

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Nyhus / Wings) to approved the October 03, 2011 ADRB Meeting Minutes passed 4:0:1 (Tenenbaum Abstained)

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 personal relationship with the owners of 20 Ralston Court and as architect of the project at 531 W. Santa Inez Avenue. Boardmember Nyhus left the chambers.

Landscape Plans

1. **20 Ralston Court - Stamos (Charlie Barnett Associates)**

Request for the installation of a new 97 lineal foot metal roof structure over the existing lower level pool and the installation of a new metal roof structure between the two existing garage buildings at the garage/auto court area.

Additions/Remodels

2. **531 W. Santa Inez Avenue - Tynan (Nyhus Design Group)**

Request for a first and second floor addition of approximately 340 square feet (23.04% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story Southern Colonial style residence. Improvements include a new second floor balcony at the rear of the residence, alterations to an existing legal non-conforming portion of a covered porch at the rear elevation, alterations to an existing legal non-conforming carport at the right side of the property, façade improvements and a new secondary driveway entrance.

New Houses

3. **935 Chiltern Road - Miller (TRG Architects / Michael Callan Landscape)**

Request for revisions to a previously approved new two story English Arts & Crafts style residence of approximately 6,358 square feet (24.9% Floor Area Ratio). Revisions include a new gable dormer on the second floor at the front elevation, revised dormer design at the right side of the front elevation and floor area adjustments made to accommodate the new second floor gable dormer including a reduction on the first floor and the addition of approximately 81 square feet on the second level. The landscape plan revisions include enhanced screening at the left side property line and adjustments as a result of the floor area revisions. *(Previously approved at the September 06, 2011 ADRB meeting)*

A motion (Winges / Tenenbaum) to approve consent calendar items #1-3 passed 4:0. After the motion was made, Boardmember Nyhus returned to the chambers.

Regular Items:

Additions/Remodels

4. **550 Pullman Road - Mock (Ronald A. Perner)**

Request for main floor addition of approximately 675 square feet (21.7% Floor Area Ratio) and basement level addition of approximately 480 square feet to an existing one story ranch style residence. The residence has an existing basement area of approximately 297 square feet.

Ron Perner, project architect, made a presentation on the proposal and made himself available to answer questions of the ADRB.

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

Boardmember Wings indicated he had trouble following the drawings but acknowledged the beautiful site and noted that the improvements made sense. He specifically mentioned sheet #4 of the plan set, and his concerns with the lack of clarity in the integration of the new addition to the existing garage at the proposed north side elevation. He stated that the proposed roof plan on sheet #3 indicated the use of a cricket over the closet area and that the elevation was

inconsistent with the roof plan. He added that the floor plan on the upper deck area included a floating column which was not included in the elevations. He expressed his support for the project with minor revisions to address the discrepancies and awkward roofline integration at the master bedroom and garage area.

Boardmember Nyhus acknowledged that the master bedroom addition to the existing residence was the greatest struggle for integration while preserving the view. He noted that the sketch provided in the plans appeared to be inconsistent with the plan elevations and commented that the gutter appeared to be below the ridgeline of the garage. He inquired on how the structural coverage would be reduced and expressed his support for the proposed improvements.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan stated that the existing backyard was wonderful and she acknowledged the peculiar integration of the roofline at the master bedroom addition. She noted the structural coverage revision as minor and expressed her support for the proposal.

Boardmember Tenenbaum stated the lot was beautiful, expressed her support for the proposal, noting it would balance the house out nicely.

Chair Heine acknowledged that the addition would be taller than the existing residence; however, no neighbor comments had been received regarding the height increase. He added that the gutter detail looked different in the sketch versus the plan elevations and commented that the proposed improvements would not change the existing style of the home. He expressed his support for the proposal.

A motion (Winges / Nyhus) to approve the request for a for main floor addition of approximately 675 square feet (21.7% Floor Area Ratio) and basement level addition of approximately 480 square feet to an existing one story ranch style residence, with the condition that the plans be revised at the left side elevation where the garage intersects the closet of the master bedroom addition, subject to the administrative review procedures, passed 5:0.

5. **249 Bridge Road - Green (Charlie Barnett Associates)**

Request for revisions to previous ADRB approval 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. Revisions include a revised front elevation and incorporation of modern elements including a new flat roof and adjustments to windows. *(Previously approved at the October 03, 2011 ADRB meeting)*

Charlie Barnett, project architect, made a brief presentation to the ADRB, explaining the revisions which had been incorporated into the design to address previous ADRB comments at the October 03, 2011 ADRB meeting. He added that the foundation and portions of the front walls would be retained but the remainder of the existing residence would be demolished to accommodate the improvements, which would unify the architectural elements and style of the residence.

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 and the change to a

modern façade. She made specific note of the lights, siding and other architectural details.

Boardmember Tenenbaum stated that although she was not at the October ADRB meeting, she had reviewed the minutes and commended the applicants for the changes proposed in response to ADRB comments and expressed her support for the improvements. She expressed her preference for landscape improvements to complement the architectural improvements.

Boardmember Nyhus expressed his respect for the responsiveness to the previous ADRB comments and appreciation for the architects and owners' efforts of working towards an improved, well-rounded project.

Boardmember Winges expressed his appreciation for the revisions. He complimented the use of the stepping roof planes and horizontal elements of the design. He added that he was supportive of a staff level review of future landscape improvements. He noted his concerns with roof leaks and recommended the incorporation of enough of an eave fascia in height to address roof slope without visibility.

Chair Heine expressed his appreciation for the responsiveness to ADRB comments and his support for the proposal. He inquired about landscape plans for the property.

Charlie Barnett, project architect, informed the ADRB that a landscape architect had been hired and was currently working on a plan. He requested a staff level review for the upcoming landscape improvements.

A motion (Nyhus / Tenenbaum) to approve the request for revisions to a previous ADRB approval 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 with the condition that landscape improvements for the property be subject to the administrative review procedures, passed 5:0.

New Houses

6. **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 October 03, 2011 ADRB meeting)*

Randy Grange, project architect, made a presentation to the ADRB and outlined the changes made to the design to address ADRB comments as well as concerns of the neighbors. He added that discussions had been held with adjacent neighbors for tree placement to provide screening, per the neighbor's request.

Michael Callan, landscape architect, explained the additional trees incorporated into the front yard landscape plan and the efforts made to meet and work with the neighbors to address their concerns.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing.

Michael Champeau, 530 Barbara Way, expressed his appreciation for the efforts of the

applicants. He stated that in a perfect world, he would prefer to see a one story residence built on the lot. He added that the home design was beautiful, particularly at the front. He noted that his concerns had increased and subsided with the story pole installations. He mentioned that Barbara Way is exclusively one story homes and acknowledged that Craig Road is not. He expressed his concern with future modifications to the approved landscaping as the property transitioned ownership.

Chair Heine acknowledged the concern and his question regarding maintenance of the landscape screening or changes to the approved landscape plan.

Joe Haines, 512 Craig Road, stated that at the previous ADRB meeting in October, his concerns were focused on the height and footprint of the residence with respect to the topography of the site. He continued that he was in attendance to thank the ADRB, specifically Boardmember Winges, for his comments to the applicants regarding lowering the height of the residence and to thank the applicant design team for their significant efforts on landscaping. He stated that the changes incorporated into the plan to lower the residence were significant and he closed by thanking the ADRB again.

Chair Heine closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Nyhus stated that the project was a great example of the ADRB process working and that the proposal had come a long way with time and patience. He mentioned the number of hipped roofs and was glad to see additional half timbering incorporated into the design.

Boardmember Tenenbaum thanked the applicant team for their neighborhood outreach. She stated that previously the proposal appeared large from Barbara Way and with the revisions it appeared more compatible. She noted the design was beautiful and that the landscaping at maturity will complement the house.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan concurred with Boardmember Tenenbaum, noted that the revised hipped roof on the right side was consistent with the style and that the height reductions resulted in an improvement to the massing. She added that the proposed landscaping complemented the architecture of the house and was responsive to the neighbors' concerns.

Boardmember Winges expressed his appreciation for the changes and for taking the ADRB comments into account. He stated that previously the home was massive and with the revisions was more appropriate to the neighborhood; however, the front façade and rear balcony still pose impacts to the neighbors, but they seemed to be supportive. He added that the change to the hip on the right side and two foot height reduction were substantial benefits to the design. He asked the applicant to insure the lighting used in the front entry hall was low wattage.

Chair Heine agreed with the Boardmembers and noted his support of the appearance although he did not feel the design had changed drastically. He expressed his appreciation to the applicants for their continued efforts with the neighbors and agreed with Boardmember Winges' comments regarding the lighting in the front entry hall.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, noted that minor changes to landscaping could be approved at a staff level, landscaping could be required to be maintained for the life of the project, and lighting for entry could be reviewed at a Staff level if issues arose and the lighting would need to be consistent with design guidelines.

A motion (Nyhus / Ryan) to approve 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, with the conditions that: 1) The final landscape plan be approved by Planning Staff and maintained for the life of the project unless otherwise approved by the Town; and 2) the front entry lighting issues be reviewed by Planning Staff and lighting be consistent with the Town's Residential Design Guidelines, passed 5:0.

7. **165 Woodridge Road - Chu (Richard Tapp & Associates / Bruce MacDonald Landscape)**
Request for review of the construction of a new multi-level residence of approximately 14,400 square feet and associated landscape plan including new plantings, retaining walls and driveway surfacing on a vacant lot, and grading of approximately 4,655 cubic yards of soil to be balanced on-site with no off-haul.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building and Planning, announced that no decision would be made on the project at the meeting and that the public were welcome to comment on the project including the draft environmental review documents up to and until November 16, 2011. She added that the proposal would be reviewed again at the December 5, 2011 ADRB meeting at which time the ADRB could make a decision on the project.

Richard Tapp, project architect, outlined the project objectives, design details, public outreach conducted and noted that he had met with three neighbors to answer questions regarding the view study, none of which had objections to the proposal. He provided a brief outline of the landscape plan and summarized the outcome of the view study, which determined there were no significant impacts. He noted the mitigation measures included in the environmental document and stated that compliance would be maintained with all mitigation measures listed and noted the enhancement measures included in the environmental document as well. He presented a rendering of the proposal at night and noted that majority of the lights would be concealed and that the exterior lights would be compact fluorescents and would be shielded by landscaping.

Bruce Macdonald, landscape architect, explained that the landscape plan would fully restore landscaping on site and provide a visual buffer as well as control erosion. He noted that the landscape plan included California natives planted in natural patterns, all of which are low maintenance and drought tolerant. He added that the plan incorporated measures to meet defensible space requirements and included fire resistant plants. He added that the entry gate was proposed approximately 106 feet up the driveway and noted that the driveway would be interlocking pavers in natural colors. The retaining walls would be stone clad with landscaping trailing over the walls to soften the appearance. He added that mature olive trees would be used for screening of the house and driveway and the plan included removal of eight smaller oak trees. He closed by noting the landscaping would be an immediate improvement to the neighborhood.

Chair Heine opened the public hearing.

Vergel Galura, project engineer, explained the drainage and grading quantities associated with the new driveway and home construction.

Chair Heine inquired if, in the drainage plan, the water in the pipe would be directed into the stormdrain or if some would be dissipated into the ground. He also inquired on the cut and fill

quantities, and specifically inquired if those quantities had included the excavated materials associated with the piers. He asked if the excavated materials would be treated onsite or if the off-haul quantity needed to be revised.

Vergel Galura, project engineer, responded that there may be some off-haul but not a great amount and the plan was to pulverize the excavated materials onsite.

Chair Heine stated that any change to the off-haul amount is information the Town would want to know about, specifically due to the environmental review being conducted.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, explained that any change to the off-haul amount would result in recirculation and re-notification of the mitigated negative declaration.

Vergel Galura, project engineer, confirmed that the numbers would be checked to insure they were correct.

Boardmember Winges stated that the project was very ambitious and exciting. He applauded the applicants' responsiveness to Board comments and noted that the home was well sited. He added that the packet included an excellent presentation of materials, well integrated design, natural materials and colors and he expressed his support for the curved form in the front living room area which became more horizontal. He added that the project was creative, although the driveway retaining walls could be lower. He commented that the night light rendering was interesting and inquired if there was any private recourse with neighbors across the canyon. He stated that the proposal was a successful contemporary design and that the reflective surfaces are not a great concern, solar energy elements were welcome and the gate design remained understated and well sited. He expressed his support for the proposal.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan stated that the proposal would be a great addition to Hillsborough, and the design was unique. She expressed her enthusiasm for the proposal and commended the applicant team for their work and the quality of the presentation to help ADRB envision the proposal. She commended the landscape plan which included the addition of 1,000 shrubs and 89 new trees.

Boardmember Tenenbaum stated that the proposal was beautiful and that it fit into the hillside. She complimented the curved roofline, the random, natural planting and the meandering driveway design.

Boardmember Nyhus stated that he had missed the last meeting where this was reviewed at a preliminary level but felt the house was well sited and the landscape plan hid the driveway fairly well. He stated that the house was large but broken into smaller segments thereby reducing mass and that the model helped quite a bit. He commented on the central piece over the garages and that the stone work directly below appeared to be floating over nothing, which resulted in an awkward aesthetic appearance. He recommended breaking up the garage doors as they seemed to stand out and he commented on the chimney placement above the garage, which was not axial. He complimented the aesthetic design of the house and stated the plan was well done.

Chair Heine stated that he originally had concerns with the proposal; however, it seemed to have evolved nicely. He liked the side elevations and curved roof elements, but remained concerned with night lighting.

Boardmember Nyhus reiterated his concerns regarding lighting as well.

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, stated that night lighting concerns were one of the key reasons environmental analysis was conducted along with geology. She noted that dark sky policies were referred to the applicant and they seemed responsive and policies seemed feasible.

Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner, provided the ADRB with a summary of the TCLA comments, distributed them to the ADRB members and made copies available to the public.

Boardmember Nyhus noted a correction which needed to be made on page 9 of the draft mitigated negative declaration, enhancement measures, which should have referenced A-1 and A-2 versus B-1.

A motion (Nyhus / Tenenbaum) to continue the item to the December 5, 2011 ADRB meeting passed 5:0.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW

(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)

New Houses

8. **130 New Place Road - Hao (Walker & Moody Architects / Thomas Klope Associates Landscape Architect)**

Request for preliminary review of demolition of an existing one story residence and construction of a new two story residence of approximately 9,350 square feet (12.6% Floor Area Ratio) with a basement and conceptual landscape plan including tree removal, new plantings and new swimming pool.

Boardmember Nyhus expressed support for the siting of the new residence; however, he expressed concern with the simplicity and singularity of the materials, specifically if the landscape plan was not sufficient.

Boardmember Tenenbaum stated that the proposal was simple and elegant but she needed to see an enhanced landscape plan. She added that the residence was sited well and the proposed roof material was of good quality; however, he expressed her preference for more texture in the design.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan stated that the proposal was simple and elegant. She noted that the design was not as residential in appearance and could benefit from a more detailed landscape plan. She expressed appreciation for the siting of the new residence and looked forward to reviewing a more refined design for a better understanding of the details.

Boardmember Winges stated the design of the house was interesting and could be extremely successful or appear as a series of stucco boxes. He added that the design details were important at a close-up scale but could be an issue from a distance. He stated that the site had amazing features and complimented the turned entrance to the garage so it is not visible. He added that the home design appeared to be very livable and respected views; however, it would remain nominally visible due to the site configuration. He commented that the story poles and

neighbor outreach would be important as well as landscaping and complimented the inspiration photos.

Chair Heine stated that the property was very private, a wonderful site and proposed home was sited well. He noted he was a proponent of modern living proposals and felt the proposal fit well into the diversity component of the residential design guidelines. He noted that the inspirational photos were helpful, the project was headed in a great direction and his support for the proposal.

Additions/Remodels

9. **527 Craig Road - Beames (John Malick & Associates)**

Request for preliminary review of a first and second floor addition of approximately 738 square feet (24% Floor Area Ratio) and change in architectural style from a single story traditional ranch style home to a two story English Arts & Crafts style.

Boardmember Nyhus recused himself from review of the project due to a personal and business relationship with project architect and left the chambers.

Boardmember Tenenbaum commented that the proposal was a charming refacing of an existing house which would be complimentary to neighborhood. She added that the proposal was well sited for mutual privacy and expressed her preference for the lightweight slate material. She noted that landscaping would be important as well as lighting fixtures and exterior materials.

Boardmember Winges expressed his support for the play on historical elements and noted that the roof was a large volume. He encouraged the applicants to continue neighbor outreach and inquired if the dormer at the rear elevation could be lower and slightly smaller. He inquired on the future use of the attic space and stated his preference for a non-front facing garage. He complimented the choice for vertical boards on the garage doors.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan complimented the linear emphasis of the design and the raised plaster framing of windows and noted that the transformation from existing to proposed was well handled. She agreed on the preference for a side facing garage if feasible, noted the improved livability of the home with the proposed improvements and supported the use of vertical board garage doors.

Chair Heine struggled with the proposal for asphalt shingle and expressed his preference for a natural material due to the large amount of roof in the design. He expressed concern with the use of brick and noted that to be consistent with the style, the garage doors should be broken up into single doors. He added that integration of the design would be important and with the improvements proposed it seemed like a new residence. He stated that the details of the chimney, stucco, windows, garage doors and fences would be very important and should be as true to the tradition of the architectural style proposed. He recommended the applicants consider integral color stucco for the exterior and that the home should not look added on to.

After comments were completed, Boardmember Nyhus returned to the Chambers for review of the following item, 330 West Santa Inez.

10. **330 W. Santa Inez Avenue - Cho (Maura Fernandez Abernethy Design / Blasen Landscape Architecture)**

Request for preliminary review of a first and second floor addition of approximately 2,768 square feet (16.34% Floor Area Ratio), which includes a detached second unit of approximately 1,200 square feet and a conceptual landscape plan with tree removal, new plantings, new half tennis court, new paving materials/hardscape and relocation of the existing front entry gate.

Alternate Boardmember Ryan stated that she had visited the site on Friday but was unable to access the site. She expressed her preference to hold her comments until she is able to access the site. She complimented the renderings included in the packet.

Boardmember Tenenbaum complimented the plan packet, noting it was fabulous. She added that she was unable to access the site as well; however, she appreciated how the home was reconfigured, was supportive of project and the use of the green roof deck. She added that the proposal would result in a nice family home and appreciated the design of the second unit. She expressed her support of the proposal.

Boardmember Nyhus stated he was not a proponent of homes with two distinct architectural styles and both existing and proposed designs presented architectural segments beautiful individually; however, the design did not present a comprehensive/unified façade. He stated that the design of the guest house was terrific and an opposing architectural style worked when it was separated from the main residence. He expressed his concern that the proposal separated the front and rear elevations more than existing.

Boardmember Winges stated that the applicants had an excellent presentation package and the graphics displayed and conveyed the design quality. He expressed concern with the two separate architectural styles. He added that the ADRB's purpose was to serve town and uphold the Residential Design Guidelines, which are specific in denoting consistency with design and style of residences. He stated that the existing residence is only four years old so the concept of applying the Secretary of Interior standards for historic buildings, which requires differentiation in architectural styles and features would not apply to this proposal. He recommended that traditional elements (materials or design) be incorporated into the modern rear elevation. He added that the massing of the addition may shade the pool and creates an overbearing façade. He expressed his preference for either modern or traditional, but not a mix of both. He acknowledged that the home has minimal visibility; however, consistency in style remained an important issue. He added that three styles on one property did not seem to work.

Chair Heine stated the submittal package and project explanation was great and he complimented the design of the second unit. He mentioned that perhaps some elements could be interchanged; but could support. He stated his understanding of the reasons for the proposal and that in the past the ADRB had approved home with different styles, examples of which were reviewed at this meeting earlier in the agenda. He expressed his preference for more consistency between the front and rear elevations and noted that the design felt more disconnected than connected. He encouraged the applicants to explore opportunity for a more cohesive design.

Boardmember Nyhus noted that currently, the existing slate roof ties the two distinct styles together and recommended revising the plan to use roof material, window sizes and design and stucco finishes to integrate the rear with the front or vice versa.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S)

11. **2012 DRAFT ADRB Meeting Schedule**

The ADRB provided staff with comments on the proposed 2012 Draft ADRB meeting schedule and specifically noted potential issues with the draft July 2, 2012 meeting date and recommended an alternate date be explored. The ADRB was supportive of the proposed January 23rd meeting date.

ADJOURNMENT – 5:55 PM

Minutes prepared by:



Serena Ponzo, Associate Planner