

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE APRIL 9, 2025, DRB MEETING

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
March 26, 2025
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Bahar Biazar
Ben Kellman, Vice Chair
Vita Rey, Chair

Brian Carter
Karlyn Neel

Chair Vita Rey called the regular meeting to order at 6:02 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Vita Rey, Vice Chair Ben Kellman, and Boardmembers Brian Carter and Karlyn Neel

Absent: Boardmember Bahar Biazar

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Hector Lopez and Pete Srivarom, and Christopher Dykzeul from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: None

MEETING PROCEDURES: None

PUBLIC FORUM

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

CC 2.	PLN25-034	SWINFORD ADDITION AND DECK
	Description	REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AND A DECK IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
	Location	951 YUBA STREET
	APN	523-093-006
	Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
	Owner	SEAN SWINFORD
	Applicant	JOHN NGUYEN (DESIGNER)
	Staff Contact	PETE SRIVAROM Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE APRIL 9, 2025, DRB MEETING

Members of the DRB expressed their support for the staff recommendation to approve Item PLN25-034.

JOHN NGUYEN, the designer, was present to respond to questions. There were none.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Kellman/Carter) to approve PLN25-034, Swinford Addition and Deck, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended nine Conditions of Approval; Approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Carter, Kellman and Rey; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Biazar and Neel).

APPEAL DATE

The appeal date for actions taken by the Board at this meeting will be no later than 5:00 P.M. on Monday, April 7, 2025.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. PLN24-288 | BRICKYARD MARINA MASTER SIGN PROGRAM |
| Description | REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A NEW MASTER SIGN PROGRAM FOR A MULTI-TENANT COMMERCIAL CENTER. |
| Location | 1120 BRICKYARD COVE ROAD |
| APN | 560-430-003, 560-430-004, 560-440-001 |
| Zoning | CM-2 (COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, NEIGHBORHOOD); RM-1 (MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL) DISTRICTS |
| Owner | BOARDWALK PORT, LLC |
| Applicant | JULIE BOGOSIAN (DESIGNER) |
| Staff Contact | PETE SRIVAROM Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Pete Srivarom presented the staff report dated March 26, 2025, and explained that Brickyard Marina was a multi-tenant commercial center that required a Master Sign Program because there were more than six tenants. The site spanned multiple lots, some in the CM-2 Commercial Mixed-Use, Neighborhood District and some in the RM-1 Multifamily Residential District. The abutting uses were primarily single-family residences. He identified the existing sign for the Brickyard Marina and explained that the owner proposed a new Master Sign Program to create a coherent design standard for all tenants. He added that for the commercial center, a Master Sign Program could exceed the standards in the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC), subject to DRB approval.

Mr. Srivarom stated the Master Sign Program proposed three new free-standing signs identified as Sign Type A, the main identification sign/tenant sign; Sign Type B, the property identification sign at the corner of Sandpiper Spit and Brickyard Cove Road; and Sign Type C, a directional sign, along with four potential wall signs and 23 proposed tenant under-canopy signs.

Mr. Srivarom reported that the RMC allowed Type A free-standing signs at a maximum size of 20 square feet and the applicant proposed a total of 130 square feet, and the Type B signs had been proposed at 70 square feet. Both the Type A and B signs required DRB approval for the deviation from the standard in the RMC. Type C signs had been proposed at 5 square feet and met the RMC requirements. One sign had been proposed for a wall sign for Building C at 27 square feet (the maximum allowed) and three signs had been proposed for Building D at 15

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE APRIL 9, 2025, DRB MEETING

square feet (minimum size each), and 3 square feet was the maximum for the under-canopy signs; all complied with the RMC. He provided the details and displayed the picture of each proposed sign in the Master Sign Program and described the white and orange color theme and font for each. He also explained why the proposed sizes were needed for visibility purposes.

Mr. Srivarom explained that tenants were allowed to use their own color and logo as long as they conformed to the size requirements in the Master Sign Program. There were three types of illumination for the commercial center only subject to the requirements of the RMC. He provided examples of each and noted that all other signs would be non-illuminated. There were also three proposed locations for tenant cabinet signage. For under-canopy signs, there were 13 existing tenant signs on the Boardwalk facing the water that would have to be adapted to the new Master Sign Program.

Mr. Srivarom stated there had been no public comments submitted for the application. The proposed signage would not affect the surrounding area, and staff recommended that the DRB conditionally approve the project. He clarified that no landscaping had been proposed as part of the Master Sign Program.

Chair Rey opened the public hearing.

JULIE BOGOSIAN, the designer, clarified that Type A and B signs would be illuminated. She pointed out the areas that would be illuminated to call out the names, addresses and the tenant names for wayfinding and clarified there would be no overwhelming illumination.

Ms. Bogosian described the sign and pointed out the location of the Type A sign that would replace the prior sign that was old, did not adequately represent the complex, did not offer tenant information, and was not very helpful to anyone driving by. Because the entire property followed a very large area and curved all the way around, the Type B identification sign had been proposed so that the property could still be identified coming from the other direction. She pointed out an exit in the area where the Type C directional signs were intended to redirect traffic so that people did not go in the wrong entrance.

Ms. Bogosian stated the building signage was intended to bring a cohesive look to the complex since there was no current standard. She pointed out Building D as the closest to the edge of the property that people would notice when they drove by, and the channel letters for Building C that had no current major tenant but could in the future. She stated that the Boardwalk signs would be refreshed to join the new aesthetic and provide direction to the complex.

Boardmember Carter asked about landscaping and Ms. Bogosian pointed out the area where Sign A would be placed in the existing area of dirt and rocky gravel. While landscaping could be considered, she stated the sign had been designed to be installed as is. Sign B would be situated in a grassy area and no additional landscaping had been proposed.

Boardmember Carter suggested that the applicant discuss with the client how to complement the new sign package to avoid an unkempt appearance and to create something that might be more easily maintained.

Vice Chair, Kellman noted that while he did not necessarily support overlarge signs, he was familiar with the property that was poorly signed and confusing. He liked the proposed tasteful design that was appropriate in terms of scale. He supported the staff recommendation and verified with Ms. Bogosian that Signs A and B were internally illuminated aluminum cabinets with LED.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE APRIL 9, 2025, DRB MEETING

Boardmember Neel verified that the sign construction would be aluminum painted with a faux wood look. She supported the look of wood that tied into the feeling of the community.

Chair Rey was also familiar with the site and stated the design made sense. She asked if the applicant had worked with the community to come up with the design, and Ms. Bogosian explained that the owner had been interested in improving the signage for the complex and they had worked together to come up with a final design and had developed all the signs.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Boardmember Neel referred to the exhibits in the staff report, expressed a concern for readability and usability, and found the legibility for the top of Sign Type C difficult to read. As such, she recommended a modification to that sign to improve the legibility and she offered a sketch to show what she intended. She sought verification from staff that her recommended modification would not create a sign too large to meet RMC requirements.

Mr. Srivarom clarified that the directional sign was 5 square feet in size and was allowed up to 20 square feet so her proposal would be possible.

Vice Chair, Kellman suggested that the proposed top of the sign was consistent with the other signs and appeared to be the logo of the sign program. He could accept the original proposal.

On the discussion, Ms. Bogosian suggested making the sign larger and keeping the logo orientation the same.

Chair Rey closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Neel/Carter) to approve PLN24-288, Brickyard Marina Master Sign Program, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended nine Conditions of Approval; along with the following DRB condition: 10) Make Sign C larger to make the “Brickyard Richmond Marina” portion of the sign more readable; Approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Carter, Kellman, Neel and Rey; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Biazar).

3. PLN25-066	HUANG SECOND-STORY ADDITION
Description	REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 100 SQUARE-FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION AND A 200 SQUARE-FOOT GROUND FLOOR ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
Location	1830 BURBECK AVENUE
APN	529-271-004
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	HUANG QING JUAN
Applicant	ROBERT AVELLAR
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONTINUE TO APRIL 9, 2025

Given that staff had requested additional time for the applicant to submit revised plans, it was recommended that the item be continued to the April 9, 2025 meeting.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE APRIL 9, 2025, DRB MEETING

PUBLIC FORUM

GRAHAM LEGGETT, a Western Drive resident in Port Richmond, noted that various people had built on the shoreline side over the past 15 years and many other residents planned to build in the next 15 years, and people were talking about the Shoreline Overlay District Ordinance regarding visibility of the Bay from public rights of way. He sought information about that ordinance. Hector Lopez reported that several projects had been considered along Western Drive; one in particular about two to three years ago, and there was a requirement to provide view corridors along the side. There was also a set of requirements and a special permit from the San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission (BCDC) if within 300 square feet of the shoreline.

Mr. Leggett asked about consistency and clarity with respect to the Shoreline Overlay District Ordinance and stated he would speak to Mr. Lopez off-line to learn about the process.

Boardmember Carter clarified that the DRB was not a legislative body and he recommended that Mr. Leggett also talk to his City Council representative.

Board Business

A. Staff Reports, Requests, or Announcements

Christopher Dykzeul offered a brief update to the status of the DRB's Bylaws.

B. Board Member Reports, Requests, or Announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:43 P.M. to the regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, April 9, 2025.