

Historic Yorktown Design Committee

Minutes

February 20, 2019
East Room
York Hall
301 Main Street
Yorktown, Virginia

Members Attending: Carolyn Weekley, Chair
Robert Andrade, Vice Chair
Belinda Willis, alternate – voting member
Jose Longoria, alternate

Staff Attending: Earl W. Anderson, AICP

Ms. Weekley called the meeting to order at 6:53 PM.

Minutes

The minutes of the January 16, 2019 meeting were approved unanimously.

Old Business

The committee discussed the coordination with the Chischiak Watch Architectural Control Committee. Mr. Anderson presented the new application that added the clarification that if the property is located in the Chischiak Watch area it may need to be reviewed by the Chischiak Watch Architectural Control Committee.

Mr. Longoria asked about the memorandum and the County Attorney's opinion.

Mr. Anderson stated that the County cannot enforce private covenants between private property owners and the County Attorney thought the best route would be to address it within the initial application submittal.

The Committee was satisfied with the adjustment to the application.

New Business

Application No. HYDC-159-19, Scott and Julie Reichle, 234 Nelson Street

Mr. Anderson stated that this application submitted by Scott and Julie Reichle, the applicant, seeks approval for the design of the proposed renovations to an existing single-family detached home on property located at 234 Nelson Street. The proposed renovations would consist of replacing the existing windows with new divided light windows; relocating and expand the existing side windows along the driveway; removing existing shutters; removing the aluminum siding and replace with smooth Hardiplank siding; painting the structure with CW 807 Market Square Tavern Gray, SW 2923 Rock Clay, or SW 2841 Weathered Shingle; replacing the front door and sidelights with new design; installing new door knob and associated hardware; installing a car pull off Nelson Street; and replacing the existing walkway with pavers or exposed aggregate.

Mr. Anderson stated that it is staff's opinion that the proposed renovations to the structure are fully consistent with the Design Guidelines and with the character of surrounding structures and the Historic Core. Staff believes that the proposed construction 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:

The renovation shall be constructed in accordance with the narrative descriptions and submitted materials and pictures and with the supplementary information presented with the application and received January 30, 2019.

Mr. Andrade asked about the material for the car pull off and the sidewalk.

Mrs. Reichle said they wanted to do brick pavers to match the foundation and extend the exposed aggregate sidewalk to the pull off.

Mr. Andrade asked if there were any other homes with brick paver pull offs.

Ms. Weekley said yes, there is a two-car pull off at the house on the corner of Bacon and Main Streets, Mrs. O'Hare's house.

Mr. Andrade said he was happy with the brick pavers, as long as they have been used somewhere else in the village.

Mr. Reichle said they are happy to answer any questions.

Mrs. Reichle stated that they have been working to keep it Colonial and they have been working with an architect to maintain and improve the property.

Ms. Weekley opined that the proposed improvements are going to make the house very attractive.

Mr. Andrade stated that he very much liked the louvre/screen door that is proposed.

Mrs. Reichle stated that the door hardware and the lights would be a matching material.

Ms. Weekley asked if the trim would be same color as the house.

Mrs. Reichle said the trim would be painted white.

Mr. Andrade asked if the shutters would be put back on.

Mrs. Reichle stated that they are going to take them off and not put them back on the house.

Mr. Reichle said they are currently ornamental and if they were going to put them back on, then they would put real shutters on the house.

Mrs. Reichle said they were going to remove the ornamental molding above the windows and make it match all around the house.

Mr. Longoria asked about the Hardiplank and if they planned to use the smooth with no bead, so there will not be an outline of the planking at all.

Mrs. Reichle stated that Mr. Longoria was correct. It would not have the little bevel.

The Committee discussed other places where there was bead and no bead so the Reichles could see what it looked like.

Mr. Reichle asked if the Committee would approve allowing either once they look.

Ms. Weekley said it would not be a problem to allow the flexibility.

Mr. Longoria wanted to clarify that there were no gutters on the house.

Mrs. Reichle said they are only on the back.

Ms. Weekley asked if there were French drains.

Mr. Reichle said there were not.

Mrs. Willis said she felt that the proposal was going to make a great improvement to the property.

Ms. Weekley asked if there were any other comments.

There being no further discussion Mr. Andrade moved approval of the application to find the proposal consistent with the Guidelines and that the application be approved, subject to the following conditions:

The renovation shall be constructed in accordance with the narrative descriptions and submitted materials and pictures and with the supplementary information presented with the application and received January 30, 2019.

By voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Staff Reports

Mr. Anderson stated there were several administrative approvals over the last month and he reviewed them with the Committee. Approvals included the painting the pump house on Water Street, the second story addition to the rear of the Hornsby House Inn, the sidewalk and railing from the new parking area next to the old Red Coats Antiques building, and fencing for the Moss property.

The Kings have submitted a request to add gutters to the house and deck; however, Mr. Anderson said he asked them to wait until they have gotten approval from the Chischiak Watch Architectural Control Committee. It has been paused until the approvals from this group has been completed.

Mr. Longoria gave an update to the current approvals the Chischiak Watch Architectural Control Committee.

Committee Requests

None

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:24 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Earl W. Anderson, Secretary

Approved by HYDC: Earl W. Anderson

Historic Yorktown Design Committee

Minutes

October 17, 2018
East Room
York Hall
301 Main Street
Yorktown, Virginia

Members Attending: Carolyn Weekley, Chair
Robert Andrade, Vice Chair
Robert Hodson, Member
Belinda Willis, Alternate

Staff Attending: Earl W. Anderson, AICP, Senior Planner

Chairwoman Weekley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes of the August 15, 2018 meeting were approved unanimously.

Old Business

None

Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

Application No. HYDC-151-18, Grace Episcopal Church, 109 Church Street

Mr. Anderson stated that this application seeks approval to replace the existing driveway lighting, to place a facing on the interior retaining wall along driveway, and to add a mirror to the upper driveway at 109 Church Street. He presented the staff memorandum.

In staff's opinion, the proposed changes to the existing driveway lighting and adding the safety mirror to the upper driveway on the property are consistent with the Design Guidelines. The proposed lighting on the fencing and wall will not be significantly visible from the adjacent property and the lighting will be directed downward and installed on the inward facing portion of the post to avoid light

pollution to the adjacent properties. The proposed changes to the retaining walls interior face along driveway seem to be appropriate, as it is proposed to match the color of the existing brick; however, without an example of the proposed material it is difficult to provide a complete recommendation. The applicants have brought materials to the meeting, so the HYDC can discuss the appropriateness of the material.

The proposed changes are consistent with the historic design guidelines and merit 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 condition:

1. The proposed changes shall be installed in accordance with the features as depicted on the “Detailed Description Attachment” presented with the application and received on September 21, 2018.

Chairwoman Weekley asked if the applicant had any comments.

Ms. Elizabeth Wash, the applicant’s representative, and Ms. Pam Mason, the Church’s senior ward, were in attendance in support of the application. Ms. Wash stated that the application was submitted primarily for safety reasons which explains the requested location of the lighting along the lower side of the rail, as well as the installation of a convex mirror near the top of the driveway.

Mr. Hodson expressed concern relative to the requested location of the handrail lights as it was suggested that a lower location may be more aesthetically pleasing, while providing a needed safety feature.

For clarification purposes, Mr. Anderson explained that the following requests will require the Committee’s consideration and approval:

- Reconcile the interior facing of the wall where the holes are located with a material that will either complement or match the existing material;
- Installation of lighting along the handrail; and
- Installation of a convex mirror at the top of the driveway.

Mr. Anderson pointed out that the lights on the interior facing side of the driveway on the block wall were approved at the last meeting so they do not require consideration/action by the Committee this evening. Although the proposed landscaping does not require the Committee’s approval, the applicant brought landscape drawings to enhance the Committee’s understanding of the application.

He stated that staff is recommending approval of the retaining wall; however, the material to be used in this portion of the project should be specified in the approval motion.

Mr. Anderson stated that the applicants have requested the Committee's opinion on their preference for the window configuration with the previously approved door and window styles of the Mansard style home. They would like to be able to use either design for the first floor windows and doors for either of the two styles they submitted for the August meeting. The HYDC approved Option B, which was the cottage style and had a double door and two large windows. The Mansard style has the double doors, but four double hung sash windows. This change would not be a substantive change and would not need approval from the HYDC.

Mr. Andrade asked for some clarification on which window style the applicants were asking for and if the dormers would change.

Ms. Wash stated that the second story windows would not change and they were only asking about the first floor windows. They like both options, but since the Committee suggested the larger windows, they wanted to see how the HYDC felt.

Mr. Andrade stated that he liked the Mansard style home windows.

Ms. Wash then went on to explain the sample material that she brought for the Committee's consideration is proposed to cover the foam used to fill the gaps in the retaining wall. She stated that an exterior grade Styrofoam will fill the gap and a deck coating material, colored to match the existing wall, will be applied on top of the foam. She stated that the contractor could, if the Committee preferred, use wood to fill the gap and coat it with the same exterior material to make it more durable. This technique, she explained has been used by their contractor at Busch Gardens and Colonial Williamsburg. Lastly, she stated that their contractor had also provided an additional option, i.e. to fill and cover the wall gaps with larger stones which would incorporate another color into the project.

Mr. Andrade asked about how the fill material stayed within the gaps.

Ms. Wash said they could use glue or some other material to keep it in place. She further opined that the existing wall adjacent to the driveway is crucial as it holds the driveway in place. She stated that the Church, subsequent to re-grading the driveway to provide a gentler slope, will determine if the wall can be lowered. However, she emphasized that safety is the chief factor in all of the considerations.

Ms. Wash stated that it would not be feasible to cut matching brick to fill the holes and to do so would require that the entire surface be covered which would be cost prohibitive and would make the wall material inconsistent with its other side.

Mr. Hodson expressed concern with using a material that would not last and would end up looking inappropriate for the site. The freeze cycle could make the material fall out. He wondered about putting a brick façade along that side of the wall.

Ms. Wash stated that they wanted to be consistent with both sides of the wall so it matches. The Styrofoam referred to earlier in the meeting is called foam core and is made for exterior use, so the concern regarding possible deterioration is unfounded. However, should the Committee prefer wood plugs covered with the exterior material, the Church would be pleased to use this material instead. She stated that the foam/wood core and texturizing material would be applied post construction to ensure it is not damaged during the project.

Mr. Andrade asked if you could cut matching bricks to fit in the holes.

Ms. Wash said that the brick was special ordered and she was unsure if more can be ordered again.

Mr. Hodson said that if the entire interior wall was resurfaced either with brick or pressure treated wood, you could not be able to see the holes.

Mr. Wash stated that the re-grading should limit what you see and the holes might not be visible and this might be a moot point.

Mr. Hodson said that he would like to see it first, because he is concerned that the material will not weather well.

Ms. Wash said that she would contact the contractor to inquire how well other project(s), which were completed using similar materials, aged/weathered.

Mr. Anderson stated that if the Committee is not prepared to vote specifically on the filling/covering of the holes, this portion of the application can be tabled and considered at a future meeting when the applicant has samples of the product for the Committee's consideration.

Mr. Hodson stated that he does not feel comfortable approving something without seeing it tonight. In the future, once the surface of the driveway has been done, then the applicant could do a few examples that the Committee could walk over and see

the variety of types. He is worried about putting too many different styles on the property.

The Committee and applicants discussed a variety of textures that could match the existing brick that would be cost effective for the church and still look aesthetically pleasing.

Chairwoman Weekley asked the Committee how they wished to proceed with the application, to which it was suggested they vote on it in sections. As such, she asked for a motion on the requested lighting.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Andrade moved to approve the proposed lighting to be installed along the handrail in accordance with the features as depicted on the "Detailed Description Attachment" presented with the application and received on September 21, 2018.

Ms. Weekley asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Hodson said that he thought the lighting would be lighting the foot path and not be so high on the rail.

Ms. Wash stated that for safety reasons, they want to light the hand rail and the foot path which is why they placed them above the rail.

Discussion occurred around the height of the lights and where they would be located on the railing. There was also discussion about which light style to use and the color that should be used to blend them into the railing and the wall.

By voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Weekley said the next item would be the mirror.

Mr. Hodson asked why there was a need for the mirror.

Ms. Wash explained that re-grading the driveway is a top priority in the project as the current grade is so steep it is a safety hazard to pedestrians and motorists. She stated that although the requested convex mirror is not aesthetically pleasing, it will serve an important purpose by enabling motorists and pedestrians to see one another in time to avoid conflicts. She cannot predict whether the re-grading will eliminate the need for the mirror. She continued by stating that subsequent to the re-grading,

if possible they plan to lower the existing wall, making it the same height as the first section of the fence at the base.

Although several Committee members expressed an aversion to the proposed mirror, they agreed that it was a needed safety feature. As such, the Committee suggested that this portion of the request be tabled until it is determined whether it is needed.

Ms. Wash stated that the re-grading should commence shortly; however, the driveway will not be paved until the entire project is completed. She pointed out that the Church is concerned about maintaining the integrity of the existing wall; however, the contractor that initially constructed the wall is performing the re-grading so they will know how to maintain its stability. Once the re-grading is complete, the wall can be scrutinized to determine if the top section can be removed for aesthetic purposes without compromising safety.

Subsequent to a brief discussion, the Committee's consensus was to temporarily approve the requested mirror until the re-grading is completed and it is determined whether or not it should be made permanent for safety reasons.

Mr. Andrade moved to approve the requested mirror, in accordance with the features as depicted on the "Detailed Description Attachment" presented with the application and received on September 21, 2018.

By voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

The HYDC's consensus was to table the request to fill and cover the holes until the applicant provides the requested samples.

Although the Committee's approval was not required, Mr. Anderson stated that the applicant would like the HYDC's input as to whether cottage style or Mansard style windows should be installed on the lower, front windows of the house. In response, the Committee expressed no preference for either option.

In closing, Ms. Wash informed the Committee that the Church had incorporated its suggestions regarding the back of house as they had added a window in the study and a portico over the back door.

The Committee thanked Ms. Wash and the Church for their hard work to implement all of the improvements.

Ms. Wash stated that the contractor is now recommending a metal rail on the back deck railing rather than the picket style that was approved.

Mr. Anderson added that the minutes from the June meeting state that the approved picket fence railing for the deck is to be similar to other fences in the neighborhood. He reminded the Committee that any variance from that which was approved would require the submission of a new application.

Ms. Wash stated that since the Church is currently addressing numerous construction issues that this decision will be delayed until a future date.

During the Committee's discussion, concern was again expressed over the previously approved picket fence railing for the deck.

Ms. Wash suggested that perhaps a traditional deck railing should be constructed as opposed to the approved picket fence railing. She recommended that should the deck appear too obtrusive with the installation of a picket fence, lattice or landscaping below it would minimize the visual impact of the deck's height.

Although the former Committee had approved the picket style fence railing, the current Committee appeared to support a traditional deck railing with a picket fence being erected along the ridge at the front of the property.

Ms. Wash stated that this matter could be resolved at a future meeting unless the Committee wished to address it this evening.

Mr. Anderson stated that the Committee could not make a decision at this meeting, as the letters to adjacent owners did not mention that this would be an item of discussion.

In addition, several Committee Members stated that they wished to first visit the property to better understand the request before voting on the request. As such and at the Committee's request, Ms. Wash agreed to place a pole in the ground so that the members would have a better idea of where the deck will be located and its approximate height.

New Business

Mr. Anderson asked if the Committee would like to consider adopting Rules of Procedure that will specify, among other things, how long public speakers may address the Committee similar to how the Planning Commission allows speakers.

He also inquired if the Committee would like to extend the application deadline in order to provide additional time for adjacent property owners to craft their opinions/comments on applications, as well as, to provide staff additional time in which to prepare staff memos and to properly notify adjacent property owners.

Mr. Hodson said that when he filed his application he missed it by a day and he had to wait two months before he could have his case heard. He would prefer not to make applicants wait.

Mr. Andrade said that he has not experienced a concern about speakers taking too long and the last meeting was a bit of an exception. He would prefer to allow speakers to take the time they need to address their concerns.

The HYDC decided to leave the speaker time open and to keep the deadline date as is for now.

Reports/Member Concerns

Ms. Weekley asked about the delayed completion of the ramp at the Drane's house at 232 Bacon Street.

Mr. Anderson stated that the delay had been noticed by the staff and a zoning violation has been issued to the property.

Mr. Hodson said he was pleased to see the screening of the dumpster at the Pub. Has there been any progress on the Duke of York Hotel dumpster.

Mr. Anderson explained that the area was previously was a roadway, so he is in the process of contacting the Virginia Department of Transportation in order to obtain their permission to install screening at this location. He is unsure if it can be done, but he is investigating.

Mr. Hodson asked about vending machines at the Duke of York Hotel that can be seen from Water Street. Is there any guidance on these machines not being seen by the public?

Mr. Anderson stated that the placement of these vending machines, like several others in this area, were likely grandfathered, though the guidelines do say they need to be hidden.

Adjourn

October 17, 2018
Minutes
Historic Yorktown Design Committee
Page 9

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:48 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Earl W. Anderson, Secretary

Approved by HYDC: Earl W. Anderson

YORK COUNTY WETLANDS BOARD

Minutes of August 8, 2019

6:00 PM

At a meeting of the York County Wetlands Board held on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. in the Multi-Purpose Room of the Public Works Administration Building located at 105 Service Drive, Yorktown, Virginia, those present were:

Board Members: Eric Ancarrow, Chair
Jeff Frye, Vice Chair
Noel West
Diane Short
Timothy Smith

Staff: Anna Drake, Stormwater Engineer II
Allison Norris-Lay, VMRC
Jennifer Wilson, Administrative Assistant II

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Eric Ancarrow, Chair.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The July 2019 Wetlands Board minutes were approved by consensus

WETLANDS APPLICATIONS

- **Application 19-36, VMRC 19-1076 for Riverworks, Inc. (Agent) and Chan S. Park, (Property Owner):** Request to install rip rap revetment along the shoreline of Boathouse Creek at 132 Wynne Road

Anna Drake presented the application, property maps, photographs, revised drawings, and SEAS report.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jordan Clifford, of 5140 Old Roosevelt Lane, Gloucester, VA, for Riverworks, Inc. (Agent and Contractor) came forward to answer questions from the Board. It was determined that the 50-feet of failing bulkhead would be removed and 50- feet of rip rap revetment put in its place. Regular fill with 4-inches of top soil behind the revetment is permitted because of the amount of mitigation to be completed. A 420- foot marsh toe sill with 1,400 CY of sand and wetlands plants will be constructed. The marsh toe sill portion of the project will create 6300 square feet of vegetated wetlands which would compensate for the estimated 500 square feet of vegetated wetlands fill. The project will result in a net increase of vegetated wetlands of 5800 square feet.

The Board closed the Public Hearing and opened deliberations.

The Board noted that it was a large living shoreline project and Mr. Frye motioned to approve this project with revised drawings.

The application was approved on the following roll call:

Noel West	Yes
Diane Short	Yes
Timothy Smith	Yes
Jeff Frye	Yes
Eric Ancarrow	Yes

The Chair stated the application could be picked up after the required 10-day appeal period.

EXTENSIONS AND FINALS

- **Permit 17-27, VMRC 17-1133 for Charles Duke (Agent) Gary Stergin (Property Owner)** Construction of 242-feet of replacement bulkhead in front of an existing deteriorated bulkhead along the shoreline of the Poquoson River at 104 Key Circle.

Anna Drake presented before and after photos of the completed project.
Board agreed by consensus to approve final.

OLD BUSINESS

Site Visit violation letter was provided to board for informational purposes, no further problems are expected.

NEW BUSINESS

There will be a September meeting, an alternate will be needed for Diane's seat.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.



Eric Ancarrow, Chair

9-12-19

Date