

**THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes
November 7, 2016

CALL TO ORDER The meeting of the Woodside Architectural and Site Review Board was called to order on November 7, 2016, at 4:30 P.M. in Independence Hall.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Lubin; Members Carlsmith, Mah, and Reyering

Members Absent: Vice Chair Larson

Staff Present: Jackie Young, Planning Director
 Kai Ruess, Town Attorney
 Sean Mullin, Associate Planner
 Jennifer Li, Deputy Town Clerk

CALL FOR CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

Director Young noted one desk item which is the Director's Report for October 2016.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

None.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Michael and Anne-Renee Feldman	ASRB2016-0035
175 Josselyn Lane	Planner: Sean Mullin, Associate Planner

Presentation and consideration of a proposal, requiring Conceptual Design Review, to demolish an existing residence, guest house, garage, two accessory structures, and a swimming pool; and construct a new main residence, a detached garage with an activity room, an accessory living quarters (music room), an accessory structure (gym/office), swimming pool, and other site and landscape improvements.

DISCUSSION

Sean Mullin, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Lubin asked if the small accessory structure downhill in the garden is to remain.

Planner Mullin said all buildings are proposed for removal.

Chair Lubin asked about the pool.

Planner Mullin said it's in a very similar location.

Chair Lubin asked if the driveway will remain where it is now.

Planner Mullin said yes. The proposed driveway is very similar to the existing.

Member Carlsmith asked if Cal Water is historically accommodating to relocating easements.

Chair Lubin said she has found Cal Water amenable. They're easier to work with than PG&E.

Planner Mullin said the Town works with Cal Water on a variety of projects (e.g., water lines and water tanks). The Town has a good relationship with them.

Chair Lubin invited anyone to speak.

Ken George, Josselyn Lane, said there are 14 properties on the private lane. His property happens to be impacted by earthquake faults and development restrictions. He asked if there are restrictions on building in the same footprint.

Planner Mullin said he would have to look more closely at the fault trace impact on this project site.

Chair Lubin asked if they have done any trenching.

Planner Mullin said he's not sure.

Mr. George said there was trenching on nearby lots. He doesn't think the project site is impacted.

Chair Lubin invited anyone else to speak.

Michael Kao, project architect, presented images, conceptual sketches, and renderings that he felt would be more helpful than the abstract elevations. He said:

- They mainly wanted to be sensitive to the amount of proposed excavation. The clients originally came to him with a very large basement program, and he was able to convince them to do otherwise. Sustainability has an attitude that is about simplicity and modesty. It's a different building strategy.
- He presented an image of what the building will look like when one approaches Josselyn Lane. They originally designed wood-clad boxes.
- Planner Mullin is great to work with and is proactive with the process.
- The second-story volume over the existing garage is a noisy room for the clients' daughters to play in. That has been set far back.
- The proposed structure is introverted. It is turning itself inward into a series of courtyards.
- As seen in the South Elevation, it opens up into the vistas of the hills.
- There is a music studio within the house for the two daughters.
- They did not try to relocate the existing pool. They are simply modernizing the existing.
- He explained the flow of the structure through various sketches and renderings.
- A green roof connects to the natural topography.
- Regarding materials, they propose board formed concrete, cedar left to turn gray, a muted understated palette, stone cobble that has been bush hammered, and a bronze fascia that will weather with time.
- The slats are patterned to limit light emission while still allowing light to come in. The earlier schemes had

more glazing, which is the property owners' preference; however, it has been reduced with Planner Mullin's guidance. They need the openness and connection to the outdoors.

Member Carlsmith and Chair Lubin thanked him for the great presentation.

Chair Lubin asked how deep the overhangs are.

Mr. Kao said eight feet. It cantilevers over the balcony.

Member Reyring commended Mr. Kao for the nice presentation. The ASRB has never been invited into a house in this way before.

Member Mah said it was helpful to understand how the house will be occupied on the site. The sketches and renderings were really helpful.

Chair Lubin asked about the existing house. Was there no practical way to do an adaptive reuse?

Mr. Kao said it was very difficult to achieve their goal with the existing house. The majority would be reconfigured.

Chair Lubin said it already seems like a beautiful house.

Mr. Kao said yes. There are a few lucky Stanford students renting the house right now.

Director Young asked him to expand on his answer. It's a specific question from one of our Planning Commissioners, i.e., why applicants are choosing to demolish and rebuild as opposed to an adaptive reuse. She asked him to speak specifically about the decision to demolish and build new, and how that fits his clients' program.

Mr. Kao said it opens up the possibilities of relationships within the plan. Reconfiguring an existing house was not possible. His clients were attracted to some of his work in the Town of Atherton. There is a relationship in the way sight lines connect that is very controlled and very specific. We do our best when remodeling; however, it is not achievable when given a new site to do this. Because they wanted such a house, we explained the limitations of reconfiguring versus what's possible when building brand new. In the end, they chose this route for them. He's glad the renderings helped the ASRB.

Member Mah said it was also helpful to understand where the project started and how the design has adapted.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Member Carlsmith said his first reaction is very favorable considering he is not a fan of modern architecture. The Residential Design Guidelines call for rural designs; however, the ASRB has approved many modern designs. This particular design does follow Residential Design Guidelines by stepping back a significant degree. The only objection would be the front, two-story fascia, although there is great relief offered in the design. It mitigates what otherwise might be an intruding design. In other discussions, the ASRB has asked applicants to provide relief of various kinds to break up the mass, and Mr. Kao has already achieved that. He doesn't see a reason to amplify that point. The outside finishes are good. The gray color may be dreary. He would prefer a woodsier look; however, that is personal preference. In summary, it's an extraordinary project. Mr. Kao has captured what he had intended to do, which is to provide privacy, surprise, drama, and separation. He is positively inclined at this point.

Member Mah asked if they are proposing to use the slatted screen (as shown on the east view) elsewhere where

there is a lot of glazing.

Mr. Kao said yes, it's a detail they will be introducing throughout.

Member Mah asked if the slats move.

Mr. Kao said they do not.

Chair Lubin asked if they are fixed louvers.

Mr. Kao said yes.

Member Mah asked where they would be used elsewhere.

Mr. Kao said it's a design detail they hope to use throughout the house, and at times becoming an interior detail. They were discussing having the slats become the rail for the main staircase of the house; however, their concern is the maintenance. The individual wooden slats require more care. They're trying to be mindful of how to balance beauty versus maintenance and longevity. They're using it to filter light, and being mindful of the southern exposure.

Chair Lubin asked about the southern elevation. It's a harsh exposure during the summer.

Mr. Kao said they were considering a movable screen along the balcony level so that they can bring a row of slats across the façade. The clients have not yet committed fully to the idea. The louvers introduce the concept of playing with the light.

Chair Lubin said the northwestern end seems to jut out above and below on both floors. Were you considering the louvers?

Mr. Kao said yes. That's one place where they think it would be beautiful to think of that as a two-story vertical element, and have the entire volume clad in the slate. They're very open to the design.

Member Mah asked if he is familiar with turtle glass, and if that might be an option there.

Mr. Kao said yes. They're already considering it.

Member Reyerling said she appreciates the sensitivity and concern about sustainability. Reusing the existing building pad, minimal excavation, and concerns about light emission are things the ASRB often looks at. The proposed materials look good. The fact that the structure is sited into the hill reduces the apparent massing. The elements of modern design that comply with rural sensitivity are a tendency towards a low profile. The material palette is often very earthy, and has a lightness of mass. Modern design has to do with glass, which is challenging sometimes because the ASRB looks to reduce light emission and glare; however, one can look through the building to landscape. There's an open quality about that. Modern design often sits lightly on the land, and that is the case here.

Member Mah said the simple lines are part of what helps a modern house fit into a rural context because it's not overly done. The proposed structure sits lightly and is simple, whether it has a flat roof or not.

Chair Lubin said that when she first reviewed the project, it seemed corporate and boxy. The renderings convinced her of the design being simple. The windows lend to the lightness, and reduce massiveness somewhat. It's a tough

dilemma between having views and limiting light emission at night. The proposal shows a good balance for breaking up glazing. The overhangs help.

Member Reyerling said she has been on the ASRB for six years. When she first started, there were seven Members, and five Members didn't like modern design. Even after the Residential Design Guidelines was published, there was a lot of discussion about how to reconcile it. She noticed there aren't plans for fencing yet. There is some split-rail open fencing on the property. She urged Mr. Kao to work closely with staff when they reach that point in their design. She also suggested looking at the Backyard Habitat program from the Open Space Committee, and consider what part of the land can remain open for wildlife passage.

Member Mah said commended Mr. Kao for his design statement. What he said about minimal disturbance and bringing in all of the activities (i.e., gathering them versus spreading them out), really preserves the natural landscape. It's very much appreciated. She feels everything has been said as far as overall design. The proposed materials are very appropriate, nice, and will be lovely as it ages. It will acquire a weathered look. Her only concern is the amount of fenestration and light emission. It could get hot inside with the southern exposure. It's a nice project and complies well with the Residential Design Guidelines.

Chair Lubin commended them for leaving so much in Natural State, not digging a large basement, and reusing the existing pad and pool. That's probably the best place on that site for the house. Modern design can be rural if done properly with materials. She doesn't agree with Member Carlsmith about the gray color because gray will help fade into the landscape. She shared Member Mah's concern about light emission. She's interested in what is visible offsite at night. She could see how light emission and heat gain might be concerns. Mr. Kao has addressed that somewhat with the overhangs. She likes the simplicity of forms. She was taken aback with how linear it is. The design fits the Residential Design Guidelines by being tucked into the hill and subordinate to the land.

Member Carlsmith said modern windows reflect about 80% of the UV rays, which may mitigate heat gain concerns.

Chair Lubin suggested Mr. Kao pay attention to proposed interior lighting to avoid light emission.

Director Young summarized: the ASRB commended the applicant for explaining the project history and sustainability considerations, a well-prepared design statement, and the following project traits:

- I. Community Character:
 - a. The use of existing developed portions of the property, which minimizes disruption on neighbors (e.g., reduced off haul and length of construction).
- II. Site Planning:
 - a. Utilization of the existing driveway, building pad and pool locations; and elimination of a basement to minimize site disturbance and grading; and,
 - b. Clustering the development to preserve landscape and Natural State.
- III. Building Design:
 - a. A building design that steps with the hill; and includes privacy, separation of uses, drama and surprise;
 - b. Slatted screening to introduce light play and control light emission;
 - c. Eight foot deep eaves on the second story, south elevation to control light emission;
 - d. Specification of rural building materials; and,
 - e. Lightening of mass through the interplay of glass and landscaping.

The ASRB recommended that the applicant address the following issues:

- I. Building Design:
 - a. With respect to controlling light emissions, consider: glazing specifications, interior lighting design and off-site visibility.

- II. Landscape Elements:
 - a. The fence design should be reflective of the Residential Design Guidelines; and,
 - b. If interested, see staff for the details of the Backyard Habitat Award.

Chair Lubin asked if Member Mah and Member Reyering were concerned about the proposed color of the cedar since Member Carlsmith had expressed considering a warmer color.

Member Mah said no. Allowing it to weather naturally is fine.

Member Reyering said they will have material board for the Formal Design Review, so they will be able to discuss it further.

Member Carlsmith said that's fine. It was just a suggestion.

Chair Lubin asked if they're anticipating proposing colored concrete.

Mr. Kao said no.

Member Mah said regarding his philosophy of minimal disturbance, the Josselyn Lane neighbors are going to be appreciative because there will be much less disturbance than if there was off-haul coming off the site.

Chair Lubin said also, it means a shorter construction period.

ACTION

The ASRB recommended that the applicant address the following issues:

- I. Building Design:
 - a. With respect to controlling light emissions, consider: glazing specifications, interior lighting design and off-site visibility.
- II. Landscape Elements:
 - a. The fence design should be reflective of the Residential Design Guidelines; and,
 - b. If interested, see staff for the details of the Backyard Habitat Award.

The ASRB recommended that the project continue to Formal Design Review before the ASRB.

Motion: Member Reyering/ Second: Member Mah
Ayes: Chair Lubin; Members Carlsmith, Mah, and Reyering
Noes: None
Absent: Vice Chair Larson
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

2. Minutes of October 3, 2016

ACTION

The ASRB approved the Minutes of October 3, 2016.

Motion: Member Reyering/ Second: Member Carlsmith
Ayes: Chair Lubin; Members Carlsmith, Mah, and Reyering
Noes: None
Absent: Vice Chair Larson
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

REPORTS

Director Young discussed the Director's Report for October 2016.

Chair Lubin said she's glad to see an increase in Solar Permits.

ASRB MEMBERS' COMMUNICATIONS

Member Reyering discussed the article regarding eucalyptus trees. In the San Francisco Presidio, they're removing sections of older eucalyptus trees, and replanting different native species instead of clear cutting all of the eucalyptus trees. They're also doing it in wedges, not squares, so it's going to have a mix of species for a long time to come.

Chair Lubin said they're making sculptures out of them. The article is timely because right on the corner of Laning Drive, they're removing all the eucalyptus trees.

Member Reyering said that was where there was a big fire. There are still wires along there. That's a safety issue. There are different reasons for cutting eucalyptus trees down, and sometimes reasons for not being in a rush to remove all of them.

Chair Lubin adjourned the ASRB meeting at 5:25 P.M.