

Historic Yorktown Design Committee

Minutes

February 21, 2024
East Room
York Hall
301 Main Street
Yorktown, Virginia

Members Attending: Thomas E. Tragle
Carol Tyrer, Alternate – Voting

Staff Attending: Earl W. Anderson, AICP and Jeanne Sgroi

Mr. Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the October 18, 2023 and January 17, 2024 meeting were approved unanimously.

New Business

None

Old Business

None

Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

Application No. HYDC-247-24; York County Board of Supervisors, 425 Water Street

Mr. Earl W. Anderson submitted the staff report, which stated that this application, submitted by the York County Board of Supervisors, requests approval of the design and architectural features of a new building proposed to replace the existing Dockmaster Building and Public Restrooms at the intersection of Water Street and Ballard Street. The County previously submitted a two-story structure that was denied by the HYDC and the Board of Supervisors. After that decision, a public input process was completed to gain feedback on a new structure. Two designs, one with a cupola and one without a cupola, are proposed for the HYDC to decide which they prefer. The proposed one-story structure would support the existing activities of County operations and provide ADA-accessible

public restrooms. The submitted memo outlines the proposed uses for the new building. The proposed construction would be brick with roof materials of synthetic slate shingles. The project also proposes signs for the Dockmaster's office and the restrooms. Four double-sided signs would hang from wrought iron brackets and are approximately twenty-one inches by nine inches. Two other signs would be mounted in the alcove for the restrooms and are approximately sixteen inches by six inches. The sign design would be black and white with decorative lettering.

The subject property is located in the Waterfront sub-district, as defined by the Yorktown Historic District and Design Guidelines, and should be evaluated for conformance with the Waterfront standards (see standards on page 29 of the Design Guidelines).

Mr. Anderson stated that in the staff's opinion, the proposed construction is consistent, subject to certain conditions, with the Design Guidelines and with the character of surrounding structures and the Waterfront sub-district. Staff believes that the proposal is well conceived and will represent a significant improvement to this segment of Water Street. Accordingly, staff recommends that the Committee find it consistent with the Yorktown Design Guidelines, subject to the following conditions:

1. The architectural design and features shall be consistent with the conceptual renderings submitted.
2. A composite wood siding shall be used and trim applications shall be per the dimensional and specifications set forth in the Design Guidelines.
3. The brick-and-mortar colors shall match the brick-and-mortar colors used within the Riverwalk development.
4. All doors, siding, trim, fencing, and shutters shall match a color from the Yorktown Color Palette and be compatible with the wall and trim colors used on the building.
5. Color samples for the shingles shall be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator before installation.
6. If any vents are installed in the roof they shall be painted to blend with the roof shingle color.
7. Fencing around the outside mechanical equipment shall be made from composite wood, painted white, and screened with evergreen landscaping.
8. The sign brackets shall be black or some other matching color.

Mr. Tom Tragle asked if there were any other questions for staff and hearing none he asked if the applicant had any comments.

Ms. Carol Tyrer asked if the Committee was being asked to choose between the building having a cupola or not.

Mr. Anderson stated that was correct.

Mr. Darren Williams, the applicant's representative opined that the thought behind the cupola was to bring more continuity with some of the other buildings within Riverwalk. Many of the adjacent structures have cupolas and they wanted to match the look.

Mr. Tragle said that he looked around Riverwalk and he saw four buildings with cupolas. He felt the proposed building with the cupola fit within the character of the surrounding area and the cupola could house antennas and cameras. The gazebo leading to the piers, which is fifty yards away, has a cupola. He noted that it provided uniformity to the area. He addressed the email the HYDC received from the Chischiak Watch property owner on the end lot. He went and stood on that side of Buckner Street and since the building would not be higher than the current, he felt it would not have any adverse effects.

Ms. Tyrer stated that she liked the cupola. She felt it tied in well with the dormers and she liked the nice pyramidal point it created.

Since there were no other questions, Ms. Tyrer moved approval of the application to find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and that the application be approved, subject to the specification and details submitted with the application with the following conditions:

1. The architectural design and features shall be consistent with the conceptual renderings submitted.
2. A composite wood siding shall be used and trim applications shall be per the dimensional and specifications set forth in the Design Guidelines.
3. The brick-and-mortar colors shall match the brick-and-mortar colors used within the Riverwalk development.
4. All doors, siding, trim, fencing, and shutters shall match a color from the Yorktown Color Palette and be compatible with the wall and trim colors used on the building.
5. Color samples for the shingles shall be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator before installation.

6. If any vents are installed in the roof they shall be painted to blend with the roof shingle color.
7. Fencing around the outside mechanical equipment shall be made from composite wood, painted white, and screened with evergreen landscaping.
8. The sign brackets shall be black or some other matching color.

By voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Application No. HYDC-247-24; York County Board of Supervisors, 425 Water Street

Mr. Earl W. Anderson submitted the staff report, which stated that this application, submitted by the York County Board of Supervisors, seeks approval for the design of a proposed new building to be constructed at 104 Buckner Street. The applicant will utilize the structure as outlined in the narrative memo submitted with the application.

The proposed one-story structure will be located on the western side of Buckner Street between the existing parking garage and the bluff. The proposed construction will require a Yorktown Village Activity permit and is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission at their March 2024 meeting with a subsequent hearing by the Board of Supervisors.

The subject structure is located in the Historic Core, as defined by the Yorktown Historic District and Design Guidelines. It should be evaluated for conformance with the standards for Site Planning and Landscape Alterations and New Construction – Commercial, Civic and Institutional Construction (see standards beginning on pages 28 and 45, respectively of the Design Guidelines).

In staff's opinion, the proposed structure is generally consistent with the Design Guidelines. Staff believes that the proposed new Waterfront Operations Staff building will be visually appealing and that it merits approval. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Committee find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and that the application be approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The building shall be constructed in accordance with the exterior features depicted on the architectural renderings and with the supplementary information presented with the application.

Ms. Tyrer asked how the building would affect the slope.

Mr. Anderson stated that the proposed building would go into the slope and pointed out the retaining walls around the building, which would be approximately five to six feet high.

Mr. Tragle questioned how the proposal would handle ADA access.

Mr. Anderson stated that had not been designed, yet; however, the most likely access would come from Buckner Street.

Mr. Williams confirmed that was their intention and that the engineering department would be updating that as the project moved forward.

Mr. Tragle asked how many people would be working in the building.

Mr. Williams stated that it would have three to four full-time staff members, which would consist of waterfront operations staff. These would include: the Event Planner; the Waterfront Operations Coordinator, who oversees the trolleys, parking ambassadors, and the Freight Shed; and the Waterfront Operations Assistant. The Dockmaster may also have office space at the Waterfront Operations Staff building but an assistant Dockmaster would be housed at the Dockmaster Building. There would also be a work-as-required workroom that would serve up to 30 work-as-required employees during the height of the season, which runs approximately from April to mid-December. The building would have space for these employees to have lunch, complete required training, check emails, and respond to voicemails. In addition, an event logistics command space will be available for event staff and public safety employees, like the Sheriff's deputies and Fire and Life Safety personnel, to manage events and respond to incidents effectively. Lastly, there will be storage space for items that need to be close to the waterfront. They are hoping to have flexibility within this space for the many operations that happen at the waterfront.

Mr. Tragle asked how many parking spaces employees would use on the parking deck.

Mr. Williams stated that currently, workers are required to park either at the County Administration building, at the Tourism Office's lower parking lot, or at York Hall. That would not change with the construction of this new building. Some of the full-time employees, like the Dockmaster, have two reserved spots underneath the Coleman Bridge. The County emphasizes that parking at the waterfront is a premium for visitors and employees are to park in only designated areas.

Ms. Tyrer added that the Watermans Museum is considering opening its parking lot on a full-time basis and reviewing a pay-to-park app. She asked if the County utilizes a parking app.

Mr. Williams said that the County does not charge for parking; however, we do have the ETA app, which is used for tracking the trolley in real time. The app also shows public parking. The County is currently considering wayfinding options, which will address parking and could have an associated app.

Ms. Tyrer opined that it would be helpful if all localities and organizations used the same app utilized by Colonial Williamsburg.

Mr. Williams agreed, stating it would be more intuitive for visitors of Williamsburg and Yorktown.

Mr. Tragle asked if the overgrowth along Buckner Street would be cleared out.

Mr. Anderson said that they would clear along the building frontage, but was unsure about the area further south on Buckner Street.

Mr. Tragle stated that he would appreciate if it were cleared further south because he believes it is unsightly.

Ms. Tyrer noted that there is the cemetery for prisoners of the Revolutionary War above the bluff. The cemetery was previously believed to be located down near the parking garage but an archeological study did not produce any evidence of one there. Archeologists did find some burial sites, but they were not from the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Williams remarked that the County purposefully placed the building into the bluff to not block any viewsheds and the building would not be higher than the bluff.

Ms. Tyrer stated that she liked the design and that it will be tucked into the hill. The County is trying to make use of land that probably isn't culturally sensitive.

Mr. Williams also noted that, because the property is currently owned by York County, this proposal would not remove taxable land from the tax rolls.

Since there were no other questions, Mr. Tragle moved approval of the application to find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and that the application be approved, subject to the specification and details submitted with the application with the following conditions:

1. The building shall be constructed in accordance with the exterior features depicted on the architectural renderings and with the supplementary information presented with the application.

By voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Williams thanked everyone for their time. He appreciated their consideration.

Committee Requests

None

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Earl W. Anderson, Secretary

Approved by HYDC: EW. Anderson