



TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH
California

Special Meeting
Architecture and Design Review Board (ADRB)
Approved Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 1, 2021 at 4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: – The ADRB Meeting of February 1, 2021 was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

Chair Foster announced that the meeting of the Hillsborough Architecture and Design Review Board is now called to order.

We will be conducting today's meeting in a virtual setting using Zoom. Board members and staff are participating from remote locations and everyone is practicing appropriate social distancing. Members of the public may view and listen to the meeting this evening as noted on the agenda.

Prior to opening the public hearing items, the members of the public should know that the ADRB is a Board created by and members appointed by the City Council. This five-member board is comprised of Hillsborough residents who volunteer their time to serve the community and ensure projects are consistent with the Town's Residential Design Guidelines. Members of the Board have experience in design or construction and include two community members at large. Their purpose is to promote good design to maintain and enhance the environmental qualities, historic character, and the high quality of aesthetic values that make the Town unique and a desirable place to live.

ROLL CALL:

Board Members Present: Benoit Delaveau; Kathleen Egan; April Filer; Yuvi Gill; Kaarin Hardy; and Lionel Foster, Chair.

Staff Present: Sarah Fleming, Director of Building and Planning; Tim Anderson, Building Official; Liz Ruess, Planning Manager; Martin de los Angeles, City Attorney's Office

WRITTEN/ORAL PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chair Foster stated that anyone who wishes to submit written communication or make public comment to the Board about any item not on the agenda may do so at this time. The Board may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed, however, the Board's general policy is to refer items to staff for attention, or have a matter placed on a future ADRB agenda for a more comprehensive action or report. Written communication may be submitted to the staff for the record. (Residents wishing to speak regarding non-agenda items are kindly asked to limit their time to three minutes.)

Chair Foster asked if there are any written or oral communications regarding items not on the agenda?

There being no public comments he moved on to the public hearing portion of the agenda.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

No items.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Preliminary Review

1. APN 028-520-010 New Place Road — Jaen/Galeana (Beausoleil Architects)

Request for preliminary design review of a new two-story Spanish style home with a total proposed floor area of approximately 7,440 square feet (9.4% FAR) on an 79,010 net square foot vacant lot. The proposal will include a full landscape plan to be submitted with at the Formal Review stage.

Bob Boles, project architect, provided a brief overview of the project.

Board member Delaveau expressed support for the sustainable design and encouraged the applicants to seek LEED Certification.

Board member Egan requested additional information about the roof tiles. She noted that the interior does not connect well to the exterior spaces. She added that the angle of the garage does not enhance the design and encouraged the applicants to work with the existing contours of the lot and maintain the existing, healthy vegetation.

Board member Gill expressed support for the preliminary design, adding that 3D renderings will help to convey the design and massing.

Board member Filer questioned how the small rooms will translate to the livability of the home long-term.

Board member Hardy clarified that the applicants have been able to connect with interested neighbors, given that the neighborhood meeting occurred between Christmas and New Years Day. She commended the applicants on the inclusion of an ADU and contributing to the Town's supply of potential affordable rental units. She complimented the courtyard, alcoves, and privacy of the home, but noted that the angle of the garage doesn't seem cohesive with the design.

Chair Foster stated that 3D renderings will be necessary to convey the whole design and proposed materials. He reminded the applicants that the roof tile should be two-piece not "S" tile. He expressed support for the overall concept, but stated that the garage angle seems out of place. He suggested light wells for the lower level may help to add light.

Board member Egan noted a preference for the thicker style columns shown in the lower image of their inspiration images, as the narrower style seems under-scaled for the design.

2. 255 Pinehill Road – Lo (Chu Design Associates, Inc.)

Request for preliminary design review of a new two-story Modern style home with a total proposed floor area of approximately 9,403 square feet (10.8% FAR) on an 87,120 net square foot lot. The proposal will include a complete landscape plan.

James Chu, project architect, provided a brief overview of the project.

Mike Callan, project landscape architect, addressed previous tree removals on site, noting that there was a case of sudden oak death, but most plant material removed were shrubs and under-sized trees to preserve the existing larger oaks. He also noted that the proposed landscape plan includes the planting of an oak woodland.

Board member Hardy stated that the lot is interesting and unique. She requested more information about the proposed grading and terracing. She noted that the proposed home appears too blocky and does not work with the natural slope of the lot. She added that the rear elevation needs to be softened.

Board member Egan stated that the design guidelines speak specifically to massing stepping down the hillside and that grading within setback areas is discouraged – she pointed out that the proposed home does not step with the topography of the lot and a significant amount of grading is proposed within setback areas. She noted that the building envelope profile is not complete and does not appear to comply and added that the colors and materials are stark in contrast to the natural elements of the site and not very consistent with the neighborhood context. She encouraged them to preserve existing healthy oak trees, even the small ones, and treat the sudden oak death.

Board member Delaveau stated that he does not believe the proposed windows will meet California energy code requirements, adding that the ratio of windows to wall seems unrealistic. He requested that the applicants consult with an energy auditor to ensure that their design is even feasible. He expressed support for the modern style.

Board member Gill expressed support for the architectural style and complimented the site and views, however, he stated that the massing is not considerate of the site and the colors and materials are stark. He suggested they add natural elements, adding that the full glass foyer and stair detract from the entrance.

Board member Filer agreed with board member Hardy, noting that the massing is blocky and does not respond to the topography of the lot. She complimented the views of the lot, but noted the challenging driveway – encouraged them to explore ways to improve the safety of the driveway. She added that some of the drop-off edges of the retaining walls along play areas seem dangerous.

Chair Foster stated that A6 demonstrates how massive the proposed building is and that it appears to be cantilevered. He noted that the design needs to integrate better with the lot and is not currently consistent with the design guidelines. He encouraged them to break-up the mass into smaller volumes that modulate the building mass, respect the topography, and stay within the height limitations.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- **Board Member Updates** - none
- **Staff Updates** - none

ADJOURNMENT: The ADRB Meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

