

TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH

San Mateo County

Planning Office
(650) 375-7422
Fax (650) 375-7415

1600 Floribunda Avenue
Hillsborough, CA 94010



Architecture and Design Review Board Draft Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 1, 2020 at 4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER – The ADRB Meeting of June 1, 2020 was called to order at 4:04 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 insure 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 in order 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: Patrick Donnelly; Kathleen Egan; Leonard Mezhvinsky; Jerry Wings; and Dr. Lionel Foster, Chair

Board Members Absent: None

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; Consulting planner, Cynthia Richardson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - A motion (Donnelly/Winges) to approve the Meeting Minutes for May 04, 2020, passed 5:0 unanimous on roll call vote.

PRESENTATIONS:

1. Presentation on Tesla Solar Glass Roof Tiles - AJ Molina, Tesla

AJ Molina, Project Manager with Tesla provided a brief overview of the Tesla Solar Glass Roof Tile.

Board member Wingses stated that he would be interested to know more about the potential glare effect and size options for the tiles.

Board member Egan expressed interest in a list of installed roofs, to see the final product.

Mr. Molina responded to Board member Donnelly that yes, Tesla is planning for additional styles, such as Spanish clay tiles, slate, etc.

Mr. Molina responded to Chair Foster that there is no indication that the color will change overtime, but the longest installed roof has only been complete for approximately 5 years.

Chair Foster thanked Mr. Molina for the presentation and requested that he provide a list to staff of addresses where the roof is installed and can be viewed.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

Appeal

2. 20 Panorama Court – Cooper (Kikuchi & Kankel Design Group)

Appeal of the April 21, 2020 Administrative Design Review approval of a six foot tall open wire fence proposed to the right of the existing driveway along the front and a portion of the side property line within the front 30-foot setback. Also a seven-foot tall solid wood fence located to the left of the existing driveway within the front 30-foot setback at 20 Panorama Court.

Board member Wingses recused himself due to a prior business relationship.

Consulting planner, Cynthia Richardson, provided a brief overview of the project history.

Marc Bender, appellant's attorney, provided an overview of their objections

Tom Conroy, applicant's landscape architect, provided an overview of the fence proposal

Chair Foster opened the public hearing, no public comment was requested, so he closed the public hearing.

Chair Foster stated that the visuals of the fence are very clear, noting that it is unfortunate that the neighbors could not reach a mutual solution.

Board member Egan stated that this is a very unfortunate situation. She noted that they clearly installed a solid fence for a reason, probably additional privacy since there was already a fence there.

Board member Mezhvinsky stated that the situation is very clear; if the fence can be built on a legal basis, there is no reason the fence would have to be removed. The fence is built to legal standards and follows Hillsborough design guidelines. He noted that he is inclined to reject the appeal on the basis that the fence is below 7 feet. If it exceeds 7-feet, then it must be reduced.

Board member Donnelly stated that he is inclined to reject the appeal and uphold the administrative review approval.

A motion (Donnelly/Mezhvinsky) to reject the appeal and approve the resolution, upholding the Administrative Approval of April 21, 2020, based on the project's consistency with the Residential Design Guidelines, as discussed, and subject to the Standard Conditions of Approval and conditions of approval listed in the Staff Memorandum, passed 3:1 on roll call vote, Board member Egan dissenting.

Board member Winges rejoined the meeting.

New Houses

3. 2111 Forest View Avenue – Stein (Eric Nyhus / Michael Callan Landscape)

Request for design review approval of a new two-story with a basement, English Cottage style residence with a total proposed floor area of approximately 7,130 square feet (24.9% FAR) on a 28,588 square foot lot. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing house and a full landscape plan.

(Project received preliminary review by the ADRB at the March 2, 2020 Meeting)

Eric Nyhus, project architect, provided a brief presentation. He noted improvements to the driveway grade and the brick along the front has been updated to be stucco to match the house.

Board member Winges noted that it appears that the deck overhang behind the garage projects too far into the setback area.

Liz Ruess, Planning Manager, Stated that the roof overhang can project 24” into the setback area, but anything exceeding that must be reduced.

Mike Callan, project landscape architect, responded to Board member Donnelly that they met with the rear neighbors to discuss the stone wall along hidden terrace and assured them that no modifications to the wall will be made.

Chair Foster opened the public hearing

Christine Zanello, daughter of owners of 15 and 20 Hidden Terrace, stated that they are very concerned about the 5 windows that will face their property, especially the two master bedroom windows. She noted that landscape screening that would address their concerns would block the desired view from that room, so not sure what the compromise can be.

Eric Nyhus noted that those windows are more than 125 feet from the front of the Hidden Terrace property.

Kieran Muldowney, 235 Victoria Road in Burlingame, stated that he has been the Zanello’s contractor for a long time. He notes that story poles really help convey the impacts of a project in a way the plans cannot. He continues that the Zanellos are in support of the project as a whole, but have major concerns about those windows. Showed photo from the proposed window looking back at the Hidden Terrace property.

Chair Foster closed the public hearing

Board member Donnelly stated that he is supportive of the project, noting that the privacy issue seems to be from quite a significant distance. He continued that the best way to handle this is through landscape screening, adding that 2111 Forest View likely doesn’t have any desire to look at the Hidden Terrace roof either, but have the right to their views. He stated that he would be comfortable with a condition of approval to address sufficient screening.

Board member Egan stated that she agrees with the approach of additional screening. She noted that additional screening in the yard of Hidden Terrace would be more effective than at 2111 Forest View. She noted that the large pad at the rear is not consistent with Residential Design Guidelines (RDGs), and that as noted in the staff memo, the landscape plan has unaddressed issues with retaining wall height, which will need to be modified to stay under the maximum allowable heights. She added that more stone along the front of the building would be nice.

Board member Mezhvinsky expressed support for the project. He noted that Staff needs to ensure that the retaining walls comply. He noted that he is conflicted about the privacy issues, but given the distance from the house on Hidden Terrace, he thinks additional screening can address the concern.

Board member Winges complimented the nicely designed house. He noted that the color and material palette and window and door details are consistent and appropriate; however a stone accents or cap on the wall would be nice. He stated that the massing is a bit boxy, but the chimneys and stone base along the first level is successful. He stated that the lower level connects house to the rear yard. He noted that the driveway slope is unfortunate, but he understands the existing conditions. He stated that he is in favor of the project, as long as the windows are screened with tall trees and the retaining walls should be terraced and or reduced in height to comply.

Chair Foster stated that the design has improved from the preliminary review and expressed support for the proposal. He continued that the screening between master bedroom windows and hidden terrace is key.

A motion (Donnelly/Winges) to approve the project based on the project's consistency with the Residential Design Guidelines, as discussed, and subject to the Standard Conditions of Approval; conditions of approval listed in the Staff Memorandum; and added condition that the applicant shall work with staff to provide sufficient screening between master bedroom and hidden terrace, passed 5:0 unanimous on roll call vote.

PRELIMINARY REVIEW ITEMS:

4. 2536 Butternut Drive – Bramhe (SSSantos Designs)

Request for preliminary design review of a first and second story addition of approximately 1,971 square feet to an existing two story residence for a total proposed floor area of approximately 6,881 square feet (16.6% FAR) on a 41,387 square foot lot. The proposal includes two new decks at the rear, expansion of the existing driveway, and removal of four trees within the front yard.

Board member Winges expressed support for removing one of the three visible doors and relocating it, however enough screening must be provided to block the two new doors. He noted that if this was a new house, it doesn't meet the RDGs; use of ballusters too heavy, too many, not consistent with style. He suggested they eliminate some or make the runs of ballusters more consistent. He noted that the roof eave detail is consistent with ranch style, not with the Mediterranean style of the rest of the house. He continued that the design does not appear to be of the standard for Hillsborough designs, not architecturally consistent with a true Mediterranean style. He requested that they select an architectural style and research it to apply consistently. He stated that he is not in favor of current design.

Board member Egan agreed, noting that it looks like a modern Spanish style. She noted that it is hard to determine how much can be improved when it is an addition, not a new house, but all windows are being replaced, so they could be recessed to be more Spanish. She noted that the room at the back seems too long and skinny to be usable. She suggested they could rotate one garage to the side. She noted that there is a lot of hardscape and that the deck at rear could step down. She stated that the 4 redwood trees at front are in bad shape, new screening along the front is really needed. She added that the large redwoods on left side should be preserved and let the smaller oaks grow.

Board member Donnelly agreed with his fellow board members. He noted that landscaping along the front will be very important to block the new garage doors and that color is important along with the quality of the proposed materials. He stated that he is not sure the proposed architectural style is working and that he is not supportive of current design. He added that the applicant should

remember no s-tile for the roof, must be 2 piece.

Board member Mezhvinsky agreed with Board member Wings, adding that it seems like a confused architectural style, could be improved. He requested that they please try to retain large trees and enhance front yard landscaping.

Chair Foster noted that this is a large remodel and the exterior modifications are resulting in lots of work, so there is an opportunity to improve the architectural style. He noted that inspirational photos would be helpful, adding that the style does not appear to be well defined or consistent, so it is a challenge to support the current design. He requested that the applicants please incorporate some of these comments to help the design moving forward.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS - None

6. ADJOURNMENT

The ADRB Meeting was adjourned at 6:19 p.m.