



THE CITY OF
NOVATO
CALIFORNIA

75 Rowland Way, #200
Novato, CA 94945-3232
415/899-8900
FAX 415/899-8213
www.cityofnovato.org

Mayor
Pat Eklund
Mayor Pro Tem
Eric Lucan
Councilmembers
Denise Athas
Madeline Kellner
Jeanne MacLeamy

City Manager
Michael S. Frank

Design Review Commission Meeting

Location: Novato City Hall, 901 Sherman Avenue

August 7, 2013

REVISED MINUTES

Present: Patrick MacLeamy, Chair
Michael Barber, Vice Chair
Jon Strickling
Tom Telfer

Absent: Joseph Farrell

Staff: Elizabeth Dunn, Planning Manager
Alan Lazure, Principal Planner
Louise Patterson, Planner II

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL:

The meeting was called to order.

APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA:

The final agenda was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Two people spoke.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2013 (PM, JF, TT)

The March 6, 2013 meeting minutes were continued.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 2013 (MB, JS, TT)

M/s Barber/Telfer (passed 3-0-1)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 2013 (PM, MB, JF, BR)

The June 19, 2013 meeting minutes were continued.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CONTINUED ITEMS:

- 1. SHELL GAS STATION RENOVATION (ED)
P2013-017: DESIGN REVIEW
APN 132-183-12; 2085 NOVATO BLVD.**

Conduct a Design Review hearing on the site plan, building architecture, colors and materials and landscape plan for a remodeled Shell gas station, and convenience store with a second floor office area.

Applicant attendees – Muthana Ibrahim, Architect; Nick Goyal, Owner

Planner Dunn gave a staff presentation stating this was a Design Review hearing, as the Commission previously saw this proposal in a workshop setting in June 2013. The Commission is being asked to provide a recommendation, as the applicant has also submitted a request to amend an existing Use Permit at 2085 Novato Blvd. That request will be heard by the Zoning Administrator, and the recommendation of the DRC will be incorporated into the action taken by the Zoning Administrator.

Applicants presented the project site plan, landscape plan, lighting plan, building architecture and colors and materials.

Two members of the public stated that the design of the proposed project had improved. They had reservations about the Use Permit. While not the appropriate venue, as the Design Review Commission does not address land use, the residents requested against approving it.

Comments from the Design Review Commission:

Telfer: likes the composition of the building; likes the varied height of the building, and the height of the trees; it's a fresh composition and fresh colors; there's more variety in the architecture and interesting colors; enhanced landscape concept; commendable and interesting

Strickling: landscaping makes sense and is appropriate; building colors make sense with the area; lights on the LOOP signage is questionable

Barber: LOOP sign is internally illuminated; he would be ok with this area surrounding the LOOP; simple, but landscape plan, but wants to see something other than privet; wants to better understand what's happening at the alleyway; this is a more residential scale project, and the office is adopted better to the area; like the push and pull of the architecture; there's more refinement to the windows, but they could still benefit from lining up the location of the second floor windows with the first floor windows; the office looks stuck on; made a strong recommendation to have the colors on one elevation, as he's concerned there's too much going on at the site, and needs to see all the colors and materials represented in a comprehensive

fashion; for example, the yellow of the LOOP and the Shell yellow appear to be different (this needs to be verified); believes the roof tiles are out of proportion to the size of the building.

MacLeamy: believes the project is much improved, but he's not prepared to approve the project as submitted; the project architect is correct to push the building to the property line and make the site work better; landscaping is a good edge along the western property line look at an on-site building for the office and have all uses fit on the site and keep the propane tank; a lot is going on with the colors and materials; the convenience store looks like a sign and sticks out more as a lot is going on at this location; the roof tiles are out of scale and this tile pattern may not survive; the stone product (or brick if the material were to change) should touch the ground so that it can work with moisture that accumulates at the base of the columns; a full width ramp can be created at the end of the convenience market if the planter is removed; get more planting at the east end of the convenience market by shifting the parking spaces; calm down the building through colors and materials.

RECOMMENDATION: Vice Chair Barber recommended approval of the site plan and elevations, and the landscaping plan as submitted, except the following needs to be resubmitted for final Design Review approval:

1. A colored elevation rendering that depicts the colors and materials for the gas station canopy and the convenience store
2. An alternate to privet must be shown on a final landscape plan.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Strickling.

Chair MacLeamy indicated he would not support the motion, as he feels the proposal needs to be simplified.

M/s Barber, Strickling (passed 3-1-1) MacLeamy voting no.

NEW ITEMS: None

PROJECT DESIGN WORKSHOP:

2. **SHELL GAS STATION REMODEL(LP)
P2013-019: DESIGN REVIEW/USE PERMIT
APN 152-102-04; 1390 S. NOVATO BLVD.**

Conduct a Design Review Workshop on the site plan, building architecture, colors and materials and landscape plan for a remodeled Shell gas station, convenience store and car wash.

Applicant attendees – Muthana Ibrahim, Architect; Nick Goyal, Owner

Planner Patterson gave a staff presentation stating that this was a Design Review Workshop; the Commission has not reviewed this project previously.

Applicants presented the project site plan, landscape plan, lighting plan, building architecture and colors and materials.

One member of the public spoke in favor of the proposed project.

The DRC provided the following comments/direction:

- All commissioners agreed that the site plan, lighting plan and landscape plan were good
- The scale of the building was good
- Circulation and parking layout of the site was good
- One Commissioner stated that the building was lacking architecture, there was no form or order for the materials, the design appears like a billboard.
- Other comments included: the building was an interesting, unique design; the building looks fine; and, the building needs to be simplified, too many different materials were being proposed.

GENERAL BUSINESS: None

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned by the Vice Chair at 10:20 p.m.