

# 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, July 16, 2012 at 4:00 pm  
Town Hall, 1600 Floribunda Avenue – Community Room

### CALL TO ORDER – 4:00 PM

Boardmembers Present: Eric Nyhus, Chair; Julie Tenenbaum; Jerry Wings

Boardmembers Absent: Christian Huebner (excused); Nan Ryan, Alternate (excused)

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

Others: Councilmember Larry May (Council Commissioner)

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Tenenbaum / Wings) to approve the June 04, 2012 ADRB meeting minutes passed 3:0.

### WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None.

### PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Chair Nyhus announced and explained the appeals process to members of the public, which allows any decision of the ADRB to be appealed to the City Council within fifteen days of the ADRB decision. He added that all appeals must be filed with the City Clerk and provided a brief explanation of the purpose of the consent calendar.

### **Regular Items:**

Additions/Remodels

1. **245 Sierra Drive - Petersdorf (Grocott Design)**  
Request for a first and second floor addition of approximately 1,238 square feet of floor area (24.2% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story Georgian Colonial style residence and associated facade improvements including a new composition shingle roof and window replacement.

Matt Grocott, project designer, made a brief presentation to the ADRB and highlighted the key components of the project, which included consistency for the front and rear elevations with upgrades in exterior materials, roofing material consistency and the future installation of solar panels at the rear elevation.

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

Boardmember Tenenbaum complimented the packet content as well as the details which addressed the balance issue with the exterior materials. She added that the new bay window at the front elevation provided a break in the massing and that the scale was appropriate. She noted that landscape improvements were needed; however, she expressed support for the project.

Boardmember Winges complimented the packet and details and expressed his support for the proposal. He strongly encouraged the applicants to explore using a roof material of higher quality and one with more depth and shadowing and to reduce or hide the roof vents.

Chair Nyhus expressed support for the proposal and stated that the new front bay window provided a beneficial off-set to the front elevation in addition to the continuation of exterior materials to the rear elevation for consistency.

A motion (Winges / Tenenbaum) to approve the first and second floor addition of approximately 1,238 square feet of floor area (24.2% Floor Area Ratio) to an existing two story Georgian Colonial style residence and associated facade improvements including a new composition shingle roof and window replacement passed 3:0 with the following conditions:

1. The ADRB encouraged the applicant to revise the proposed composition shingle roof material to a higher quality composition shingle;
2. A parking strip at the front of the property shall be required, based on the location of the residence and the amount of remodeling proposed, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Any landscape improvements resulting from the incorporation of the parking strip into the project plans shall be subject to the administrative review procedures of the Planning Division.

## **PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

**(Not public hearing items; Board comments only.)**

New Houses

2. **777 Chateau - Chammas (Debbas Architecture)**  
Request for preliminary review of demolition of an existing ranch style residence and construction of a new two story Contemporary style residence of approximately 5,700 square feet of floor area (24.9% Floor Area Ratio).

Boardmember Winges stated the proposal emulated a piece of art, was self-contained on the site and not part of any other style. He expressed support for the approach; however, he noted the plans were difficult to navigate. He recommended incorporation of more detail, such as detail of the roof edges and stated that the front elevation would benefit from enhanced fenestration. He

complimented the two volumes of the glass bridge and partee and expressed support for the one story portion on the site and massing proposed. He requested detail on the attachment of the rain screen element, building sections to clarify the detail of the upper level and stated that a conceptual landscape plan would have been helpful to review as a means of evaluating the relationship between the landscaping and the new home.

Boardmember Tenenbaum noted that the project was an exciting endeavor for the owners and while she expressed support for the concept and modern design, she stated that the plans were difficult to navigate and did not convey the layout of the proposal clearly. She requested additional detail in the plans and labeling.

Chair Nyhus agreed with the Boardmembers on the necessity for additional detail to demonstrate constructability of the concepts and acknowledged that the property is isolated and would be an appropriate site for the proposal. He added that due to the modern design proposed and as stated in the Design Guidelines, the expectations for high quality materials and accuracy in architectural design would be higher. He stated that landscaping is not a permanent solution to screen the front of the residence and without landscaping, the front elevation will retain a strong façade and would benefit from softening. He recommended the applicants submit the required data for the proposal to Staff for an appropriate assessment of floor area, structural coverage and the amount of off street parking proposed relative to the number of bedrooms in the residence. He stated that the massing and scale of the proposal were appropriate for the site and the concept brought diversity to the neighborhood.

### **DISCUSSION ITEM(S)**

#### **3. Story Pole Policy**

Elizabeth Cullinan, Director of Building & Planning, provided the ADRB with background information on the development of the existing story pole policy, which was adopted by the ADRB in 2002. She provided the ADRB with an outline of options to refine the story pole plan policy which included requiring story poles with proposals twenty-two feet or higher (despite the number of stories) and waiving the story pole requirement for all second story additions which would be reviewed administratively.

The ADRB discussed the existing requirements for story pole installation and concluded that the requirement for story poles associated with administrative reviews should be waived unless Planning Staff feels they are necessary and story poles should be required for all ADRB projects that are twenty-two feet in height or more, regardless of the number of stories. The ADRB provided Staff with direction to revise the existing story pole policy for review by the Board at the August 6, 2012 ADRB meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT** – 4:40 PM

Minutes Prepared By:



Serena Nevarez, Associate Planner