

**EMAILS FOR THE RECORD - PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 15, 2015**

**From:** tom priscilla <tommasopacelli@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 30, 2021 8:19 AM  
**To:** Hays, Diana; Hankins, Sally; Stinnette, Murrell; Grewe, Joel  
**Subject:** Proposed Historic Overlay Zone

Please accept this email as my request to NOT be included in the expanded Historic Corridor Overlay Zone. I remain OPPOSED to my property's inclusion. Thank you.

Tom Priscilla

=====

**From:** Kecia Brown <keciabrown@me.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 4:21:44 PM  
**To:** Brandon Gibson  
**Cc:** Fraser, Kwasi; Nedim Ogelman - Personal; Milan, Stanley; Ogelman, Nedim  
**Subject:** Re: historical home plaque for 330 S. 20th St

That's wonderful, Brandon!! What wonderful discoveries. I would only tell you to make sure you have archival materials in your frame so as not to decompose your artifacts. It sounds like Purcellville's Architectural Review Board has offered the plaque! Maybe someone in this email will be able to steer you to the correct person (I'm used to our organization having to buy historical plaques, so hence the two companies). I'm also unaware what the "HCOD" is that is referred to in this article. I'll look forward to hearing from Mr. Ogelman or Mr. Milan.  
Kecia

**From:** Brandon Gibson <[brandonmgibson@gmail.com](mailto:brandonmgibson@gmail.com)>  
**To:** Kecia Brown <keciabrown@me.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021

I got a letter today saying my house is supposed to be included in the Purcellville HCOD. I'm at 330 S 20th St.

I saw in the Blue Ridge Leader that I would qualify for a free plaque (is that true?).  
<https://blueridgeleader.com/expanding-purcellvilles-historic-district-public-hearing-july-15/>

I actually had been wanting to get one for a few years now because I've seen them all over town and I think my home is one of the older ones in Purcellville. Additionally, I have some historic artifacts that were discovered when my house was renovated in 2013. I had them framed and would be willing to share with the Town if there is some sort of history display. I also found some childrens' writing that included their names on the underside of my floorboards dated 1920.

=====

**From:** DEUK YEON  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 5:19 PM  
**To:** ddooley@purcellvilleva.gov  
**Cc:** Deuk Yeon  
**Subject:** Absolutely Oppose Zone Change Proposal: Two Parcels at 140 S. 20th Street, Purcellville

How are you?

Thank you for answering my questions this afternoon.

Due to my need to sell my bldg and two parcels at the address above and a current contract signed by sellers and buyers, I worry about all negative impacts on this sales contract, buyers' concerns and in the worst scenario, if buyers cancel their purchase agreement, I absolutely oppose this burdensome proposal to change the zone and new restrictions associated with this Town's Corridor Overlay District proposal.

I cannot afford to pass this proposal in any means. If so, my family will suffer financially, mentally, and spend more time managing and changing my own bldg and obtaining permission or approval from Purcellville Town.

Please wipe out this burdensome, unnecessary, and anti-business proposal immediately so that I do not even need to attend Hearings to oppose this proposal.

Thank you for counting my opposition into your decision making process.

Kyong Yeon  
on behalf of Rainbow Realty & Investment, Inc.  
703-909-2161 or 909-8404 Deuk Yeon

=====  
**From:** David Yeon <[rainbowyeon@hotmail.com](mailto:rainbowyeon@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 2, 2021 5:22 PM  
**To:** DEUK YEON <[deukyeon@comcast.net](mailto:deukyeon@comcast.net)>; Dooley, Don <[ddooley@purcellvilleva.gov](mailto:ddooley@purcellvilleva.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Absolutely Oppose Zone Change Proposal: Two Parcels at 140 S. 20th Street, Purcellville

I absolutely oppose this zone change that negatively affects my business and income. Please count my opposition as well.

Thank you.

David Yeon

=====  
**From:** Beverly Macdonald <[bevmacdonald99@aol.com](mailto:bevmacdonald99@aol.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 6, 2021 11:17 AM

**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Beverly Chiasson; Only Town Council; Mekarski, David  
**Subject:** July 15th Planning Commission Public Hearing Comments -Historical Overlay District

Purcellville Planning Commission,

I love Purcellville.....I'm sure because Mom instilled in all of us her love of our Town as did the 4 family generations before her.

Therefore, I thank you for your interest in preserving Purcellville's history however I have concerns.

I have a vacant lot that is on the corner of 28th Street and Main Street that appears to be in the current corridor although I don't remember receiving an initial notice. Maybe that is because single family residential structures were exempt, from the ordinance, for building and improvements.

Although my current home is not part of this expanded corridor it is my understanding that it is the intent of the Planning Commission for the Town to review and include structures as they become qualified. ***With this I do not want to be included in any future historic corridors.***

I have listened to all of the Planning Commission discussions on this topic since last year. Conversations have gone from including BAR review on some home improvements, to no.....just demolition requires approval....to maybe some things require approval. As of the last meeting I'm not sure there was a good understanding among all PC members (and therefore staff) as to what approvals are needed for what actions AND what qualifies a home to be a "contributing" structure.

Planning Commissioners have been very much aware of the vast concern from property owners when this was last attempted. ( in 2008 I believe).

These actions will not impact most Town Council and Planning Commissioners as they live in newer homes. However, I know there is an appreciation from at least one Planning Commissioners as to the cost for requiring original or like replacement of home buildings materials A commissioner acknowledged she did not replace her home's roof with like materials( tin ) due to costs.

Purcellville has chosen to let the historical barns at Valley Springs fall into disrepair due to cost of rehabilitation of these structures. We know the cost of rehabilitating the Aberdeen Home. The Mayor has noted the Pullen house could be demolished and replaced with a new home bringing with it new Purcellville residents and an increase in tax revenue. Sometimes very difficult decisions are made for the benefit of all.

=====

**From:** Mitch Pilchuk, 140 N. Hatcher Ave  
**Email:** [mpilchuk@pilchuk.com](mailto:mpilchuk@pilchuk.com)  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 10, 2021 12:50 PM

I am concerned about the zoning change affecting my property. I don't find that having another layer of government above me is beneficial. You already have enough control over my assets without adding me to the historical district.

=====  
July 12, 2021

By Regular Mail and Email Mr. Don Dooley, MPA, MHP Senior Planner &  
Planning Commission 221 S. Nursery Avenue  
Purcellville, Virginia 20132

Re: PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE TO REAL PROPERTY OF ERIC S. LYLES AND LYLES FUNERAL SERVICE  
PARCELS 489484785000, 489483383000, 489482494000

Dear Mr. Don Dooley, **MPA, MHP**, Senior Planner :

This letter is in response to your letter dated July 1, 2021 informing me about a proposed change to the the Zoning Ordinance for the Town of Purcellville that would down zone my business and property located at 630 South 20th Street by including it in the Town's Historic Corridor Overlay District. And furthermore may result in jeopardizing all investments and cause or threaten irreparable damages to the interest in the real property and business. The thrust of this letter is to suggest that the Town of Purcellville take no action with respect to the suggestion made by the Planning Commission to down zone this property by placing it in the Town's Historic Corridor Overlay District based upon the following legal reasons.

Research by this office indicates that this property which the Planning Commission proposes to change falls under Court Ordered Zoning in the Circuit Court of Loudoun County in the case of Eric Sheldon Lyles v. Ronald M. Masters, Mayor, et al., At Law No. 12273.

The Defendants refused to list the Plaintiffs property on the Zoning Map from the date of its rezoning in 1985 to 1992 and caused subsequent rehearing on assertions that his zoning was erroneous namely in April 1989 and again in 1991 causing rise to this action.

The failure or disclaimer by the Town Council of Purcellville to include or properly identify the Real Property of Eric S. Lyles and Lyles Funeral Service in accordance with the 1992 Court Ordered Zoning in the Circuit Court of Loudoun County in the case of Eric Sheldon Lyles v. Ronald M. Masters, Mayor, et al., At Law No. 12273. in the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map will be action tantamount to the downgrading of this property and may cause rise to new action.

It is apparent that you were not aware of our Zoning being under Court Order. The proper research will preclude the possibility of any litigation.

Yours very truly

Eric S. Lyles

=====  
**From:** Dawn Bowman <db1122@me.com>

**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 8:59 AM

**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Only Town Council  
**Subject:** No to Historic District Overlay

Planning Commission

I am not in favor of expanding the Historic District Overlay. Having watched many of the Planning Commission meetings, it is obvious that the Committee is not clear on the guidelines and what this exactly means to the citizens you are impacting. The citizens do not need a Government imposed HOA and you are only doing this as an attempt to “stop” something and not to better the town.

This is my notice that should this pass, in the future I do NOT want my house included in the Historic District overlay.

Dawn Bowman  
211 N 28th Street

=====

**From:** Margaret Vaughan <mvmath42@aol.com>  
**Date:** July 13, 2021 at 9:38:40 AM EDT  
**To:** Only Town Council <purcellvilletc@purcellvilleva.gov>  
**Subject:** Proposed changes in historical districts  
**Reply-To:** Margaret Vaughan <mvmath42@aol.com>

Good morning..

I am Margaret W Vaughan and I have lived at 181 W K Street for more than 40 years. In the past, I have had the pleasure to serve on the Town's Planning Commission, Council and Zoning Appeals.

After reading the details of the proposed changes in the historical district, I am very strongly opposed. Most of the homes on my street are older and very well kept . A few have been remodeled beautifully and what an asset to the Town. One home, which was in poor condition, was torn down as it needed total upgrades for everything. The replacement is a lovely new home for a growing family. I feel homeowners should have options what to do their property and I feel my street is a typical one for the older sections of the Town.

I strongly feel it is an overreach by the Town to control adding porches, colors of home and shutters, etc. People take great pride in their homes. They do not need nor want the Town limiting their options and having to pay fees for hearings to improve their properties.

Thank you so much for your time and your serving on the Council. Take GREAT care.

=====

**From:** Brenda dowdy <tw\_200@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 10:33 AM

**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** W F street historical proposition

Good Morning,

I am writing to ask that you reconsider Including W F street in the historic district. These homes were only built in the 50's and do not hold significant historical properties. Many of the owners on F street have signed a petition asking to take F street off of the proposed historic plan. I am begging you as an owner of a home on F street and an educator in our community that would love to stay in this community please take us off of the proposed historical district map!

Sincerely,  
Brenda

=====

**From:** Kathryn Ruckman <[ruckmanfamily@yahoo.com](mailto:ruckmanfamily@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 14, 2021, 10:36 PM  
**To:** [clemarr@purcellvilleva.gov](mailto:clemarr@purcellvilleva.gov)  
**Subject:** Regarding changes to the HCOD

Hi Connie,

Could you please forward this email to the person who is in charge of receiving comments for the public hearing regarding changes to the HCOD on July 15?

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to have my questions read at the public hearing on the evening of July 15, 2021 regarding the proposed changes to the current HCOD. I live in one of those homes (221 S 12th St) that is currently in the HCOD, and I am a Purcellville native, a child of Western Loudoun natives. Over the years I have welcomed the growth that Purcellville has seen, which has allowed us opportunities for local jobs and shopping options, as well as meeting new and wonderful people. I live three streets down from where I grew up, and I have noticed the changes as people move into Purcellville. We used to be a very rural, agrarian town, and Purcellville has changed quite a bit from that time of long ago. The issue I currently see is defining what Purcellville heritage is, and it doesn't always align with what I remember.

With that said, here are my questions:

- I understand that my home used to be a farm house for a pig farm when it was first built in 1910. Under the proposed changes to the HCOD, if I were to make exterior changes, by what standard would I be held to? Would I be asked to make my house more of its original construct, or to be in sync with one of the homes on Main Street, running counter to the actual heritage of my home?
- The house my parents used to live in on 9th Street was in a state of decay, mostly because for my parents' life they never had the money to fix it up. What would happen to people such as they under the proposed changes? Would they be notified that they need to fix it up at some point? Would there be a plan to help them with finances? Would they need to incur debt in

order to be in compliance and continue to live in the home? What would be the progressive process for people such as they?

We have all heard stories of overly aggressive HOAs and oppressive expenses to keep a home in a historic district accurate to an exacting degree. Although I truly love history, and love the history of my town, I wouldn't want this to devolve into a situation where I or any other home owner in the proposed HCOZ would have to incur distressive debt in order to appeal to another's viewing pleasure.

Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Kathy Ruckman

=====

**From:** Dallas Linkous <dalinkous5@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 15, 2021 5:44 PM  
**To:** Hays, Diana  
**Cc:** Only Town Council  
**Subject:** Historic Overlay

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Hays -

I am writing in opposition to the proposed historic overlay to include residences 50 years and older. I'm a lifelong resident of Purcellville and love the historic structures of Purcellville. My mom as well as my family have not been included in this wave of proposed residences over 50 years old which I am grateful even though we both live in older residences. Asking such demands of homeowners is not right. One of the nicest things of living in houses such as ours is having no homeowners association. Now we would be included in the hardest homeowners association possible to get things completed for an older home. How exactly is this going to help my older home? It's not being shown for tours or as historical place. It's my home, where I have chosen to raise my family. Is my family along with my mother going to get historical tax breaks or bonds issued to us to upkeep this historical site? What a deterrent for young homeowners to try and keep up a beautiful older house in my hometown.

How about we focus on more important issues in our town such as the ridiculous water and sewer rates we have?

This proposal needs to be voted no.

Thank you for your time,  
Bessie Linkous  
Along with my mother, Maria Kakouras

=====

---

**From:** Nate Cook <nate.cook8@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 13, 2021 9:46 PM  
**To:** commission@purcellvilleva.com; Only Town Council  
**Subject:** 231 W K Street & Historic Zone Expansion

Good evening,

I'm unable to attend Thursday's meeting regarding expanding the historic district, but would like to share my opinion. Please include my message as part of the minutes at the meeting if possible.

My name is Nathan Cook, and I live at 231 West K Street. I grew up in Purcellville, work in Purcellville, and my family and I love the town and community.

My house was originally built in 1950. When we bought it, it was an eyesore. I would encourage you to search the address to see the photos of the original structure in place. However, it was torn down and completely renovated in 2020. The only remaining original feature is the foundation, which cannot be seen. My home is not a historic property, "feature," or structure.

Somehow my home would be included in the expansion of the historic zone, while my immediate neighbor's house (original structure that was built in the 1940s) is not. My house cannot be seen easily from Main Street. There is virtually no through traffic on K Street. The proposed expansion of the zone appears to be completely arbitrary.

Expanding the historic zone is not something the people that live here want, or have asked for. It would provide no benefit to the community. It would instantly create more hurdles for people who wish to do what we did with our house. I suspect that is the likely intent, but the consequences would be harmful to Purcellville as a whole as well as the people who live in the zones proposed to be added.

We've had multiple neighbors thank us for building a home like ours, because they know what it brings to the neighborhood and their property values. Had the proposed regulations been in place, we would have never purchased this property. It would still be a dilapidated structure and an eye sore. As a contractor and a lifelong Purcellville resident, I can tell you with confidence that the proposed zone changes will only result in more and more eye sores. There is little to no historic or beautiful architecture, structures, or "features" to maintain on K Street or the surrounding streets.

Please listen to the people that will be affected, and do what is right by your constituents. The suggested change is an clear overreach that will hurt almost everyone and benefit almost no one.

Thank you,  
Nathan Cook

=====

Doreen C. Hope  
711 Sonata Way  
Silver Spring, MD 20901  
(301) 642-6131

July 15, 2021

Town of Purcellville Planning Commission  
c/o Office of the Town Clerk  
221 South Nursey Avenue  
Purcellville, VA 20132

RE: Public Comment on Zoning Change Affecting 521 S. 11<sup>th</sup> Street, Purcellville, VA 20132

Dear Commissioners:

I am one of the owners of the above-referenced residential property. My siblings and I recently inherited the property which has been in our family for nearly 100 years. We have enjoyed many short and long stays in Purcellville growing up, spending all of our holidays and summers here. The home was built by our grandfather, J. Leslie Cook, and was the birthplace for many of our aunts and our father. So needless to say, we are vested truly in the well-being of our property.

Moreover, our entire family has been vested in Purcellville. Our aunt and uncle Samuel and Josie Murray integrated the Purcellville Public Library in 1950s and owned a very successful upholstery and drapery business in town; and most importantly, our uncle, Basham Simms, was a public servant of Purcellville serving on the Town Council for a number of years, and ultimately as the Vice Mayor.

We thoroughly understand the need to preserve and protect the history of Purcellville and its significant lands but we feel some of the proposed changes to the regulations governing certain properties are, among other things, overreaching, overburdensome and could constitute an interference with the right to own land. Based upon my preliminary review and understanding of the proposed changes, specifically Article 14(A), Section 2.7, the proposed requirement to offer the historic resource subject to demolition should be stricken or revised based on the following reasons, the provision:

- 1) Requires a forced sale of private property which substantially interferes with landowner's rights to quietly enjoy his property;
- 2) It's not clear whether the initial determination of which properties contribute to the historical significance of the Town on which this provision requirement is based upon (the 2006 Historic Resource Survey), was consistently applied to all impacted parcels,
- 3) It's not clear whether the proposed new historic corridor boundary determination is most appropriate boundary or the most accurate;
- 4) Could negatively impact property owners of color disproportionately;
- 5) Does not guarantee new owners of structure will make repairs timely;
- 6) Does not allow landowners to make his property safe or free of unsightly structures or pest infestation or to improve his property in the most economical manner or manner of his choice;
- 7) Does not prescribe how the purchaser of a historical structure would even access the structure after the sale if the structure is surrounded completely by private property thus, "opening the

door” for additional forced use or sale of property owner’s remaining land or adjacent property owner’s land.

In sum, we feel you can attain your goal of “protecting the town’s unique historical resources and architectural character and ensuring that new development is in keeping with the small-town character of Purcellville”, as stated in your hearing notice, by managing the time, place and manner of demolition, to be specific, as opposed to including the forced sale of privately-owned and essentially sub-dividing it without adequate recourse or opportunity to refuse simply because the owner seeks to improve aesthetics of her property or even more importantly, to eliminate safety hazards and pest invasion upon her property.

Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that (1) this Commission review how the parcels it seeks to include in the Historic Corridor and Overlay Zone were initially identified as contributors to historical significance, (2) to substantially revise the provisions in the proposed regulation that governs demolition of historical resources located within the Zone so that it does not include the forced sale of private property just to protect it, and finally; (3) the Town, through this Commission should identify adequate financial resources to help land owners, when appropriate, to repair, improve or make safe those resources and structures owners would seek to demolish.

I have had only a short time to review these documents. So if I have mischaracterized or misinterpreted the implications of the proposed changes before this Commission on this matter, please excuse.

Thank you for this opportunity to present and submit comments on this very important matter. Please include this statement and this letter into the public record on this hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Doreen C. Hope on behalf of myself and  
Darryl A. Cook, Deboarh C. Moten, and  
Martin L. Cook, Jr.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS - PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 15, 2015**

James Tipton: In opposition to proposed expansion of the town's historic corridor overlay district. The proposed changes would impose restrictions on the use of our property which were not present when we decided to buy. When shopping for our home, we intentionally avoided properties that were subject to the town's existing historic corridor as well as home owners associations to avoid unwanted intrusions by outside parties attempting to exert influence over how we could use our private property.

The actual language in the ordinance in combination with an expansion of the historic corridor opens the door to significant negative impacts on the personal enjoyment of our property which we would have to incur significant personal expense and hardships to rectify.

The criteria you are using to determine which properties are and are not proposed for inclusion in the expanded historic district are also unclear as well as the purpose for this particular expansion.

There's no historic resource on my property that's apparent to me, and you've not produced any documentation establishing your assertion that there is one. There's no discernable aesthetic or overarching style linking the homes up and down my street that would be preserved by limiting their owners' abilities to make changes to their properties appearance.

The contributing properties indicated in the proposed historic corridor overlay zone map provided with the letter we received do not appear to correspond with the map of the historic features in the town's 2030 comprehensive plan. It's unclear why some properties are included and others are omitted from the proposed expansion. Based on the presentations tonight, I've seen nothing to demonstrate how these changes provide any actual benefit to the preservation of historic resources in town; rather I suggest it would visit hardship upon many residents.

=====

Marc Rossi: I'm in complete agreement with Jim Tipton's comments. I think it's important for a town to retain its charm and character. I searched all over Virginia for a place to live. I love this town. I made a concerted decision to be in this town because of the quality of life and what I thought the benefits would be. I'm all for being ultra-conscientious about properties that have value, have historical significance - but what are those? A famous architect, a particular period. If there are changes that are made, will there be an impact to me. I happen to own multiple parcels, that's another issue - it's a legacy for my daughter. I don't plan on building town houses or commercial structures but would like to have the ability to make decisions that would be in my best interest.

With things like Amazon headquarters moving to Washington DC, there will be fifty to a hundred executives that would want to look for a town like this. A lot of people will be attracted to the charm of this town who won't want to destroy it. They are very interested in gentrification and enhancements to a town like this, so it's not something we need to be scared of. If those people don't wish to come here because of the impact, it doesn't help us in the long run. And all of the things you talked about, the façades, colors, shutters, etc. - statements were made in the emails that were read about potential impact. Overreach doesn't help any of us but obviously being conscientious about our town does, so it's figuring out how we're going to do that. If there is anything that's hidden in this that comes back to negatively impact us, that's not going to be good for anyone.

It's just being very clear about the short- mid- and long-term goals are of this. If we are trying to stop big developers from doing something, that's one thing. If we're trying to stop people from destroying properties and building things that are architectural eyesores to the town, I understand that, but who is going to determine that. If we deem something to be historic, street lights, sidewalk plaqueing, all those things, do we care about that, do we not care about that, is it in name only? What does that mean?

This isn't an unbelievably historic town from an architectural perspective, there are some all over the United States that have greater architectural significance, but I think it's significant. I love the Victorians on Main Street; I love so many different things. Many of the homes in my neighborhood were built by persons who lived there; do we know all this, have we evaluated this? Those are things that are important to acknowledge but not to be regulated.

I don't want to say opposed or not opposed, but if you hinder my ability to enhance our town, or impact me negatively, from an economic standpoint, then I absolutely oppose it. If there is an economic impact, there needs to be some compensation for it.

=====

Doreen Hope: I'm one of the owners of 521 South 11th Street and that property has been owned by our family for almost a hundred years. The home was built by our grandfather J. Leslie Cook and his father Joe Cook and it was the birthplace of many of my aunts and my father, so needless to say, we are truly vested in the well-being of our property. Moreover, our entire family has been vested in Purcellville. Our aunt and uncle, Samuel and Josie Murray, integrated the Purcellville Public Library in the 1950s, and they also owned a very successful upholstery and drapery business on South 11th Street. But most importantly, our uncle, Basham Simms, was a public servant, serving on the town council for a number of years and ultimately as its Vice Mayor.

We thoroughly understand the need to preserve and protect the history of Purcellville and significant lands that make up this town, but we feel that some of the proposed regulations governing some of the properties are among other things, overreaching, overburdensome, and could constitute an interference with the right to own our land and to quietly enjoy living upon our land. Based on my preliminary review and understanding of the proposed changes, specifically Article 14A, Section 2.7, the proposed requirements to offer the historic structures subject to demolition should be stricken or revised based on the following reasons.

First and foremost, the proposed permitting process requires properties or structures to be demolished to go through a permitting process which includes putting the property up for sale or offering it for sale, This substantially interferes with the landowner's right to quietly enjoy his or her property. It's not clear whether the initial determination of this properties contributes to the historical significance of the town, and as we've heard from some comments beforehand, it's not clear how that process was actually done or those decisions made. It's also not clear how the new historic corridor boundary was made and whether or not it's the most appropriate boundary or the most accurate.

The proposed provisions could impact property owners of color as well as property owners who are more senior and are looking to leave behind their legacy. The proposed provision changes to not guarantee that new owners of the structure will make the repairs timely. Also, it does not allow landowners to make his or per property free of unsightly structures or pest infestation, or to improve

the property in the most economical manner of their choice. Nor does it prescribe how the purchaser of the historical structure could access the structure after the sale if the structure is surrounded completely by private property. Thus this could open the door for additional forced sales of the property owner's remaining land or adjacent property owners' land. So in other words, if the structure to be demolished is in my back yard, and it's surrounded by my yard and my adjacent neighbor's yard, if the sale of the structure is forced upon us and sold, how will the new owner get access to the structure once it's been purchased.

So in sum, we feel that you can attain your goal of protecting the town's unique historical resources and architectural character and ensuring that new development is in keeping with Purcellville's smalltown character as stated in our hearing notice about managing the time, place and manner of any demolition. To be specific, as opposed to include a forced sale of privately owned property and essentially subdividing it without the opportunity to refuse that process. More importantly, it will also not eliminate the safety hazards or pest invasion of the structure if it's in bad decay as is the case of some structures on our property that we inherited. It's already in bad decay and falling in, etc.

So based on the forgoing, we respectfully request that this Commission oppose this action or, in the alternative, that this Commission review how the parcels it seeks to include in the overlay zone were initially identified as contributors of historical significance and to substantially revise the provisions in the proposed regulations that govern the demolition of historical resources within the zone.

I've only had a short time to review all of the documents, so if I have mischaracterized or misinterpreted the implications of the proposed changes before this Commission, please excuse that error. I would also like to ask the Commission for an extension of the comment period to allow myself and others who may not have had the opportunity yet to review all of the documents that have not only been presented for public review but also the other historical documents that have led us to this point.

=====

Chris Levy: I want to address something you said initially where you were talking about color and texture of the houses, according to Section 2.6.b., the certificate of design approval is required as follows any historic corridor overlay zone: "in making such determination as to consistency with design guidelines, the Board of Architectural Review may specify any architectural feature as to appearance, such as, but not limited to, motif and style, color, texture and materials together with configuration", so maybe somebody can address that.

I'm against the proposal as written as it enacts strict and expensive policy on many homes that are less expensive than their neighbors', punishing lower income households for purchasing homes they can afford inside our great town. It seems that most of the newly listed only qualify based on being over 50 years old based on the eligibility in the National Register of Historic Places. Giving a blanket historic classification to homes over 50 years old with no other reason is just plain lazy. Requiring lower value homes to the historic preservation professional, who I'm sure comes at a premium, begs the question who's in y'all's pocket. Not only will it cost to modify our homes, but my insurance agent says the additional cost to repair could require additional coverage. I completely understand wanting to preserve our history along our main roadways, but if you follow Google maps to get to any known historic treasure in our area, you'll never make it down any of these roads including mine and other dead end roads. I ask this board not punish those families of lower income, I ask this board not to be lazy in their [garbled] to policy, and I ask this board to their proposed modifications to the historic zoning ordinance.

=====  
John Yacek: I'm going to be pretty quick because everyone has pretty much said what I want to say to you guys. This gentleman basically told you the exact same story as me and my wife: we moved to this town because of the good schools, because it was a good area to live, and we bought our house with the sole intention of adding on to it later when we were building a family because we wanted to raise a family here. We have no intention of leaving this area, most of the family we have left is close to the area.

I oppose this. In addition to that, I would like some clarification because, as it's been pointed out, my understanding of the map, the blue designates areas of historical significance [i.e., the existing historical corridor overlay district], and the striped area is the existing corridor area and the blue is the actual property resources. Can any of you explain to me how you get to any of those historic resources by traveling down West F Street? You can't; it's a dead end road that runs from Nursery Avenue. It doesn't even meet the definition that you have sent us which is arterial streets and highways. Under Section 2. Applicability, an arterial roadway is defined by Virginia Code; it's determined by the town council to be either a significant route of tourist access to the town, West F Street does not give you access to the town, or a significant route access to the town's designated resources. It doesn't do that either.

The only way I'm seeing that you're getting West F Street included in this is further down in Applicability the next paragraph gives, in my opinion, the committee the ability to do whatever they want, because it says regardless of whether the streets or highways are otherwise within the zoning district classifications. So that just negates everything that was said before that. [Chair: Just because it's come up several times, the criteria for inclusion on that map is that the nation and the state, in their historic registries, have identified those resources as historically contributing resources.] I understand, so I'll again second what other people said, I don't believe that any of those house have any actual historical significance other than the definition of being other than 50 years old. There are also other properties that are on that map that are older than 50 years old that are not included. I just think that it's not a fair application of what you guys are doing and I oppose it.

=====  
Brenda Dowdy: There are many questions. So many people before me have expressed every single feeling. I have lived all over Loudoun County for over 20 years, I've been a teacher in the County and Purcellville is where I landed to raise my family. I specifically did not want to live in a townhouse, the only houses that I could find were these houses on F Street. F Street has become a family. Many of us are here tonight; we have 13 of the 21 residents on F Street that have signed a petition saying that they would like to be taken off of this expanded historical area. I know that some of you have said you do not have the intention of being an HOA, but that's this Commission. What happens when it changes? We've [garbled] been clarified and somebody else might have a different intention.

The pictures in the binders that are on the table in the back are from 2006. Is this the structure that has to be maintained; is that what they're considering as the underlying example of what that home should be? - because that picture in 2006 already has a addition of a large section of the home that I purchased that was added in the 1990s so it is not at all a representation of the original home from the 1950s. And many of the homes on F Street have been changed. Part of the reason that I chose the home that I live in is because, as families on F Street (we are a family altogether) is to do improvements that would fit

our family and not living in an HOA. I have the space we have our yard, we want to be able to maintain that and I'm afraid that if get considered historic just because of the age of my home, that we will not be able to do that and I'll be forced out of living in the community. I drive 5 minutes to get to work, my kids go to school in Purcellville and I want us to be able to maintain that. So please take F Street off of the historic district.

=====  
Kaylene Blaylock: We've been residents on South 12th Street for 21 years. My home is not one that is on the proposed historic corridor. Of 23 residents with homes on that street, there are 2 of us who do not meet the criteria; our homes are newer. My home is still 25 years old. One of my concerns is what will happen. What will happen in 25 years when my home is 50 years old? What about the proposed sidewalk that is be built on 12th Street? We heard earlier concerns about those new structures, are the going to be new street lamps, are there going to be new sidewalks that will meet the historical code? Are we going to get our sidewalk? Its going to change what the street looks like. When moved here, there was so little traffic we could actually allow our children play in the driveway; now so much traffic because of the new developments that have been build around us. Our street was not designed for two cars to pass; it's really a one way street. I'm concerned about how that will affect the historic process. Finally, truly how does this benefit the town. What do we stand to gain as a town from having this historic corridor built? [garbled] up and down my street but they're going to be sorely disappointed about the historic view that they're not going to see. Just bringing additional traffic to a street that cannot support that traffic, with newer homes structures have already been changed. There is no historic value there other than once upon a time it was.

=====  
Don Nichols: I grew up in town but I do not live in town. I live north of Hillsboro but I'm going to inherit the family house in town. The house needs some work, it's going t0 need some repainting so I think I heard if I want to paint it fluorescent pink I can do that, right? I'm not going to do that, but I could. The original house was built in 1953, it was just a rectangular brick home. It's had two additions put on, one in 1961, one in 1969. What if I want to demolish one of the additions? Is that going to be allowed? There's a shed on the property that was built in the 1970s. If the property gets designated historic, can I tear that shed down? [Director of Planning Dooley: If the addition was built to one of the structures that was listed as a contributor to the historic district, then that addition would have to go through the Board of Architectural Review. If the addition was non-contributing, then I don't see why there would be any problem with the demolition. If the shed is not a contributor to the property, because it was built prior to 1957, it would not be a problem to demolish that.]

I'm here neutral; I'm not for against, I'm here to find facts out.

=====  
Brian Ducharme: No. Just no. I oppose this wholeheartedly. I ask when you go up to the Council with this, you shoot it down. And think about the lawsuits that could be coming down the pike because of this.

=====

Paul Biggers: I pretty much second the comments you just heard. My house was built in 1939 or 1940. It is in no way significant; historically it was just a house that somebody built that they needed to live in before World War II. My neighbor's house on one side would need to be demolished; nobody would every buy it. It's suitable only for one person or two people at the most. My next door neighbor Nancy Love asked me to speak for her to say she's opposed to it although her house is older; it dates from 1920 but it's just a single family house.

How did anybody decide that these houses were in any way historic? Nobody famous lived in them, there was no founding father that lived in my house.

I heard that the town is coming up with doing away with these 25' x 150' lots. My house was on four of them. We consolidated all four of them because we couldn't build on them. We were going to subdivide and made a duplex out of it but they cut that out. Then we weren't able to build a mother-in-law apartment on it because the addition on our house had to be at least 500 sq.ft. and at least 25% as large as the existing house. Our house is only 1,600 sq.ft. so we couldn't match either one of those things so we couldn't do that either. So this looks just like another way to us for the planning commission and town council to take more control over our property and what we can do with it, so I'm also against it.

=====

Richard Miller: I'm actually supportive of the goals of what you 'all doing; I just think there could be other means that could be explored in order to achieve what you are looking for. Can we put together some resources, can we put together some special financing opportunities to help homeowners achieve these goals? Can we have contests, craziest color door or whatever, that other towns have done to promote the residential properties. As I understand it, and I was one of the ones who actually read the document, and deciphered the fact that I don't think this is really going to hurt me.

Basically I can't tear down my house but when we bought our property 12 years ago, and I have what I'd call a contributing home; it's John Case's home and its the structure that remained from the Case farm that now most of the property is Village Case. So it's the crazy reddish-orange house, I did try to challenge to color palette when moved here.

When we moved here 12 years ago it was at the bottom of the market; we thought we were going to have to move out to Cumberland or Culpeper or somewhere out a lot further in order to purchase a home. One of the things we identified early on was we wanted to put an addition on and that when the home inspection was done, they said your porch is not that structurally sound. It's still there holding on. But that's going to have to be removed or fortified in some fashion. The theory was we'd take that off and build an addition on and then build some sort of other porch off the back of it. That will require, because there would be some demolition taking down part of that porch, that's going to require approval of the board. Hopefully we'll have good enough plans, It's not that you can't say that you can demolish something, you have to figure out if it's worthwhile. That would be my biggest concern.

I also want to know what are the current fees, and is there a different fee structure for these reviews for residential vs. commercial properties that are being assessed because I think for the homeowners, it should be as modest as possible. And now there's a 90-day period that's permitted to get back to us, or it's like a pocket veto, or it could go through by default. How long is the process currently taking?

I have concerns, quite frankly - no disrespect to any of the individual members of the commission, but the town's got a pretty bad history of managing itself. Whether it's the water system, taxes on restaurants, personnel, and so forth, and to give more power is not something that I'm particularly thrilled about, and there could be a movement to unincorporate this town at some point because of the kinds of history that we have.

I'm generally supportive of what you want to do, but maybe we need to look for different means. We talked about the comprehensive plan recommended doing this - why did they come to that conclusion? Why were the properties not included when this was set up originally?

=====

Rebecca Visma: I came not in favor nor opposed to the proposition. Some of the comments that people have made tonight about the arbitrary lines and what qualifies a house as historic is something that really should be taken into consideration. I don't think I have a leg to stand on with that because we live in the Dillon house that was built in 1796 with an addition in 1910. However this falls, if there's any additions I fully see us being on that - I'm surprised that we weren't when we moved in.

We bought the house 8 years ago. My husband and I are both teachers, so when it comes to trying to repair the property, it's one where we might have actually benefitted from some of the historical regulations because people have done things to that house over the years that were band aids and have created problems, and over the past 8 years we kind of pick and choose what is our priority project of the year because of finances. We intend to be here for the long haul; we have a four and seven year-old and we plan to stay here at least until they graduate.

We love our home but some of the questions that start to come up - any structure on the property, if it starts to have deterioration - the springhouse that's on the property is not necessarily in good standing and it potentially does need some repairs that we never intended to do because it's not something that influences the property. Our backyard has some water issues that we've brought to the town's attention before - at least twice - but we were told that there's no easement, there's nothing that could be done, but it continues. We've done our own band aid of digging a trench that we put tadpoles and other things into to entertain our kids but the runoff from K Street affects the water table and I don't know if the water table potentially affects the springhouse. If the springhouse does start to deteriorate, that's not something I'm confident with our teacher salaries we'll financially be able to restore historic property, so is there something in this so that if there is something we need to do to preserve the historic context of our property we could apply for? Because we've been doing our very best in our past 8 years to improve the house or continue to make it the oldest living residence in town, but some of these things do bring concerns of how is this going to put a financial burden on us when we've been doing our best as we live here. We're certainly not opposed or in favor of - I think some people here bring up some very good points.

=====

Carter Warley: I don't have a lot to add to what the people before me have said. We bought our house four years ago. It sat on the market 18 months vacant before we bought it. The house has small bathrooms and no walk-in closets and all the modern day amenities most people want in a house - that house does not have it. What it does have is a Civil War era barn which is wonderful and the termites

have had just a field day with it; it's got a springhouse that sounds very similar to the woman who spoke before me that has seen better days, there's a shop that was built in the 1960s, and I can go on.

These structures are wonderful and completely understand the town's desire to preserve them. The problem is there's only one person here who is actually paying to keep these things up, and it's very expensive. The only reason we bought the house was because there were no restrictions like this on the property. We were looking at a three-acre property that was ours to do what we want with full property rights; we are not members of the HOA which was already in place. But to put this in place, I have to look at I have kids going off to college in a few years, it's a lot of property and a lot of house for two people - we may want to sell the house - with a restriction in place that says if you want to tear down the old barn that's costing a fortune to keep up or the springhouse or the shop, any of these structures have to go through some sort of approval, and you can give me the details of what that is and say well, it doesn't matter.

Prospective home buyers are going to take one look at that and say no. The main house is one thing but keeping the other structures up - we are doing our part: se just put standing metal seam roofs on every structure on that property; it was not cheap. We probably be able to do another thing for five years after doing this. But this will absolutely hinder our ability to sell the house one day because people will take one look at it, they will see there is some of historic overlay restriction and no one is going to want to read through all of that. They're just going to say that barn has seen better days, that springhouse is going to be a lot to fix and maintain and I don't want permits if I want to get rid of it, so I would ask if you look at us geographically, we're not in any district, we isolated in a 20 year-old neighborhood - I would ask to be left off of this for the simple fact that we want to keep what we bought for yours ago in the same condition that it's in.

=====

Kim Collins: I am relatively new to Purcellville, unlike other people who have been year for years and years, but what I can tell you is that I have moved away from three towns that were overtaken by wholesale development, so I know exactly what that will do and what it looks like. I like on K Street in a quirky little house that was built by a barn builder and I am certain it can take incoming rounds. It's perfect for me; I live alone, I take care of it by myself and it's just on the edge of what I can do. So when discovered I'm basically living on a stream that's feeding springhouses and everything else and its causing my porch to sag and problems like this, these are things I'm intending to try to fix but I'm waiting for the day for somebody to knock on the door and say you must fix this and you must fix it my standard and you must do it within this amount of time. What am I supposed to do about that? What are the penalties and how am I going to be assessed because I've now become historic?

When I live in a little dollhouse that was built in the 1950s, the quirky charm that everybody likes, the superman-sized shower and no closet space is perfect for me but it is a tough sell. I have a shared driveway, that's an unusual thing for people who didn't grow up with one. I live on a street with ditches that'll kill you if you don't know that they're there; it should probably be a one way street. SO if we become historic, how does that affect the infrastructure - the ditches, the roads, the guttering and all that other stuff. Basically we all kind of live and let live right now, but if the town is expecting things of me to maintain a historic property, what is the town going to do for that area?

I would respectfully ask for an updated survey because I was befuddled to find that in K Street my house and my two neighbors were considered to be contributing structures but all of the other houses on K

Street aren't. And yet we're all on the same road that leads to the actual historic area, so I don't understand the criteria of how this house was picked other than perhaps it's old. All of the houses are cute, but they're not historic.

I am opposed to this expansion of the historic overlay district and until there's more clarification on the criteria of the 300 houses that were designated. I know that two doors down from me that is now on that proposed map was cut to the ground, dug out the foundation was redone and rebuilt last year so it's not even close to historic but yet it's still on that map, so there're things that need to be updated when we look at that as well.

=====

Susan Eidelheit: I'm a long-time resident of Loudoun County; I moved here about 17 or 18 years ago. Were the proposed new guidelines sent to the entire town or just to the people that would be affected in the new potential historic district? [Chair: Just to the people who would be affected.] Ultimately, and I don't know how other people would feel, think sets up an interesting dynamic. Everyone here has a vested interest in what might be impacted. Someone said when her house is 25 years older, it will be interesting to see what happens, I think all of the townspeople have a right to know because they might be the next ones on the chopping block. I didn't even see it in the local paper. I think it's to select and insulated to have given it to all of us. For example, I even called Loudoun County to find out the potential property tax implication; they hadn't even heard about it. I said no one from Purcellville has called to ask you about this - she said no. I don't actually think she knew about it. And with all of the inconsequential things that are in our local papers, why hasn't this been in the paper? [Director of Planning Dooley: Traditionally when you notice, you notice the people that are affected by a proposed change to an ordinance. It is published in a paper of general circulation and on the town's website for greater access to it. But typically notices are not sent directly to unaffected property owners who a change in the ordinance doesn't directly affect.] I think there is merit in considering giving it to the entire town.

There are pluses and minuses. I wouldn't say I'm on the fence about this because most people here to chose to come to Purcellville or have been here for generations because some of those areas might have historic value, but for other people that wasn't part of the deal in a sense in choosing to come here. I would equate it to condo or coop associations in New York. It definitely has some pluses; they claim that your property value goes up a little but your appraisal goes up and your taxes go up. What research did you do, can you give us the articles or the economic analysis that you assessed before making the decision to even contemplate this major initiative?

If we become a historic district and it's on the National Register of Historic Places - our house is not. The only significance of our house is the people who lived there before were probably local drug dealers. That house was gutted. Before I moved here it took them a year to get rid of all the broken glass and beer cans. I looked at this thing and said its preposterous. Yes, it's over 50 years old, Is it cute now - sure. But I also speak on behalf of my neighbors, two single women, on pensions and social security who are both opposed to this. If the district is deemed national historic, is every particular house that is affected by it also given that designation? [Chair: No, there are contributing structures within a district, but in this instance what we're talking about is we took the National Register of Historic Places and Virginia Department of Historic Resources every property that they identified as contributing historically. We used that data to identify these properties.]

So Virginia being one of the states that has a historic rehabilitation tax credit program, certain renovations could qualify for rehabilitation expenses in two ways. One: you may potentially qualify for a Federal rebate, however there's lots of stipulations - right now it's mainly for places like B&Bs - it has to be generating income. For most of us, that's not the case. [Brief discussion about rebates for renovation work.] Would we qualify for a property tax reduction based on the increases in property tax that accrue from the very nature of being deemed historic? [Director of Planning Dooley: There has been research done that demonstrates that having a historic resource on contributor being within a historic district is somewhat recession proof in that when the economy drops historic resources within a district will usually hold their own or if they drop it'll be less than everything else around it. When properties appreciate, the district will usually appreciate at a greater rate than anything around it.]

=====

Steve Hansort: Regarding the mailing that was sent out, the map printed in black and white on 8 1/2" x 11" is super small; 11" x 17" would have been better. Second, sending out a draft mark-up version of the ordinance made it very confusing to read; a final draft without marked changes would have been better.

I love the old town charm of Purcellville and moved here two months ago. I tis an older house and I want to keep that old house charm. However, receiving this letter raised some concerns. There are things I want to do with the house. I'm a first time home buyer and I want to know what I can do. Do I have the option to opt out? I kind of lean towards opposing, noting has shown be that I can be thumbs up about it. [Chair: This has come up quite a bit and my understanding is that the idea that we just wouldn't do it is much more reasonable than the idea that people would have to option to opt out.][A discussion with the Town Attorney Hankins about opting out followed.]

=====

Casey Chapman: I am opposed to the historic corridor overlay district. I own 141, 151 and 161 North Hatcher Avenue. If there is an option to opt out, I'd love to take that option. I don't want to be in this district. The point of why weren't these contributing buildings or assets or properties put into place at the same time as round one, I'll call it, when the other contributing structures were added. You sometimes go into the Comprehensive Plan but that's changed over the years. Was this map that's behind you in the Comprehensive Plan in 2006? [Chair: There was a different Comprehensive Plan in 2006.] So in the new Comprehensive Plan, was this map in it with these contributing structures? [Chair: The map was not in there; the desire that we read to include all historically contributing structures to help preserve the character and feel of the town, that's what was in there.]

The general consensus of the idea of contributing structures or the character and feel of the town. I heard a lot of people talk about charm and uniqueness and all those great things, all those things occurred without having a historic corridor overlay district imposed on them. They occurred naturally, organically by creativity, by individuals, by business owners. That is what made Purcellville what it is, it wasn't a board, it wasn't a commission, it wasn't a committee, it was individuals using their personal property rights and their imaginations to do what they dreamed and build what is the American dream in a great place like the town of Purcellville. To try to control something like that or impose regulations that there are clearly are large number of people opposed to, I would say why keep going? Why do it? What is the benefit, what are you gaining out of this? What is the town gaining out of this? [Chair: The Comprehensive Plan is the document that encapsulates the values of the town. We have a new

Comprehensive Plan. This is a value that is described in it, and the duty and the job of the planning commission is to try to realize the values in the Comprehensive Plan through zoning and regulation.]

Understood. And has any third party come in to assist you in the creation of this map and in forming this district? I haven't heard or seen any consultants being referred to so far that put any significant input into how this may affect the tax on someone's personal residence, or how this is going to affect the inheritance of a property when it's handed down to someone's daughter. The things that this impacts go much further than just shutters and paint; these are huge economical impacts that you are taking the liberties which I don't believe are yours to take or impose on the residents or businesses of this town.

I agree with the majority of the statements made tonight by the residents in this beloved town and I again say that I am not for this district.

=====

Carol Luke: I come from a different point of view. I used to work in the Tysons area, in Arlington and I saw many areas that were charming and lovely that had gotten into the shadow of pother buildings because there was limitation on what could be built in those neighborhoods. I don't think we need to have regulations of everything that's dome, but I think we have something special in Purcellville. It is a funny little town and that's Purcellville. It has a personality of its own. It isn't Waterford, it isn't Middleburg; it's like a cow town. This was a trade center and I think its wonderful. Once we start changing and just allowing random things to happen, it's gone. It will change it. It won't change one; it'll end up changing all of them. I've seen buildings built that put the whole surrounding in shadows - the sun never shined. Because there were no restrictions on this.

I don't think we need to do that. I like old houses. I bought my old house because it was more charming than the new house I bought; when I had the opportunity, I moved. I had a house in Aldie that was an 1803, I had a house in Alexandria that was an old Sears Roebuck 1920. They have a personality that I think is worth preserving. Is it worth isolating - and it can be isolated in a sea of modern - then it loses all of its attraction. There are things that are here that are of value and that we have an opportunity to preserve, and if we don't preserve it now, it won't be there.

If I do something in town that totally changes my building, and I have two, don't think that it doesn't affect my neighbors, because it does. Whether or not it complies with the regulations it will change my neighbors' houses. I don't think that's particularly fair to them. My little house is made of the last stone taken from a quarry that was in Hamilton - it's the same stone as the library. It's just these unique things that make Purcellville. Personally, I think it's worth working on, I think there are things here that should be preserved. If there are not, why don't we just go live in Ashburn? Why did we move here? We moved here because we liked this little funky town. I moved here to raise my last child; I like the schools here. There are things of real value that we have, even if saving some old buildings is part of it, I think its part of our heritage here and I think we owe it to the town.

=====

Susan Eidelheit: She said before we go thinking about a historic district, with the laws that hopefully are in place - we have a turkey a few houses away, chickens that are running at a house that's a little on the derelict side - nobody's regulating that. We have bamboo growing and Nancy said people to follow the ordinances that are there now as opposed to neighbors having to call to push the town to act, and that

would add to the historic nature of the region as well. That certain things are not being followed now - that would help.

=====

Leo Belvis: The house that we purchased has a massive garden that used to be owned by a botanist, and my wife and I moved here in 2017 with the hopes of raising a family. We have three kids under five and its a handful, but we choose to maintain the house and beautify it and update it to match existing decor. It's a house built in 1950. We're doing that in spite of any kind of outside influence. My wife is a better kind of police accountability person than any council law would ever make. I don't see any incentive for me to follow through with accepting this proposal. I'm doing this already out of my own volition with my own money. Prices of building materials are not getting any cheaper and in spite of that I'm still hosing to update my house, beautify it, make sure that my neighbors aren't likely to lose their minds over my massive gardens, and so there's really no incentive for me to be part of this district if I'm already doing it to begin with and I personally don't need any prompt to take care of my house.

I don't support or opt in to this district. Like Casey said, this is the American dream - I came to Purcellville because it was like a frontier. If left alone, I can maintain my house, take care of my family and that's what we came here for. I'd hate to leave because of any kind of outside intrusion because property values right now are insanely high and we don't need any more help to increase the property values and so I would hate to have to leave because I can't maintain a standard that is outside of my means, and so it doesn't really help me if I'm trying to work inside a budget.

=====

Larry Simms: I totally support what Mrs. Duke had to say a few minutes ago. I lived at my address since 1970. And I really, really dislike people that have lived here a minute to come in and tell Purcellville residents how we should live. I've raised two kids, gone on to college, come back, left again, but I totally support what you guys are trying to do to keep this small town atmosphere. And I do not like the fact that things are changing as quickly as they are, and it is because you have outside people coming in and trying to change this small town.

=====

Elizabeth Dyer: My husband and I bought out house a little over three years ago. It was built in 1904. We are not in the historic district which was a great disappointment to us when we bought our house. We believe that our house is special and we believe our street is special and that the town is special, and it is something to preserve. I think the biggest things that are being missed here are not necessarily whether you should be told to take care of your property, because obviously you should take care of your house - where you live and where you should take great pride, but I don't want my neighbors to maybe not take care of that house and maybe someone buys that house and is able to demolish it and build townhouses or something that's not fitting for my street.

Behind us some parcels of land were sold, we have two parcels of land we have no intention of selling out back yard, but we could. Someone behind us sold their parcels of land and fit three monstrosities on it, as I recall. It does not fit in with the neighborhood, they are very close together, the noise from the families is terrible and we're just scared that this is just going to keep happening and it's going to push out the rest of us who want the small town character and wanted that feel. I dream of my kids walking

to school in every direction, that's special, but when you demolish the houses around you and have way more population coming in, they may not feel safe doing that. Already since we've lived here, the traffic has gone up exponentially. We're not trying to discourage people from moving here, that's not the point. The point is just preserving what we have, making sure the houses that are special but maybe not of historical value ... may to those points some people have said my house has no historical value, maybe they just don't know, but I don't want my neighbor's house to be demolished and have three houses put on it. That's my point and my biggest concern, so I do support the historical overlay.

**COMMISSIONER COMMENTS - PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 15, 2015**

[Commissioner Bennett:] I think at this time I just want to make a couple of comments. Thank you, really, all for coming because you are the town. This is the character that we want to preserve - people showing up - because I know from what you've said that you didn't move to Tysons, you didn't move to Herndon, you didn't even move to Leesburg - you moved here. And you take care of your homes - you're homeowners just like us. There are two commissioners on this dais tonight that are already in the overlay, and should this ordinance pass, two more will be. We're just like you. We care about our homes and we care about this town. That's the character, and I love it. I can't remember who - a barn guy built our house; we just had someone else call it a cow town. So yes, it's not Old Town Alexandria but we're who we are and that's pretty darn special.

It's a travesty that there was so much misunderstanding due to this letter. It was difficult to read. But there are no restrictions for homeowners except if you want to implode your home -and then you would be asked to come and have a public hearing like this so your neighbors, because we don't live in isolation, we live in a community, so your neighbors can come and say gee, that kind of smarts.

=====

[Commissioner Forbes:] I live on West Main Street so I have been in an historic corridor for a long, long time. Frankly, this proposed ordinance which toyed expand that district would not make any difference unless I wanted to tear my house down and frankly, you'd have to bind and gag me and knock me over the head with a big stick before that's going to happen. I live in my grandmother's house and I've got my children coming up and my mother and her brothers grew up there and my grandmother gardened it for years. I love my house. I know how you all feel about your houses. And I think that's one of the themes that I've observed as I listened to everybody who talked here, whether you're neutral or I don't want this or yes please let's do this. The theme that I'm hearing is that people are here because they really like Purcellville, they like the way it looks, they like the way it feels, it's small town, and I'm not hearing anybody say they don't want that.

And so to start with, it seems like we've all got a lot in common, the question is how do we get to that end result and are we doing it the right way? You know, what's the best way to accomplish that? How do we keep the smalltown that we have?

One of the concerns that I think the Town Council had when they passed the comprehensive plan that we are attempting to address with this proposed with this change in the ordinance is how do we keep smalltown Purcellville small town? The biggest concern is that there's absolutely nothing at this point to prevent somebody from tearing a house down. That if you have a house and you decide you want to put up a McMansion or a bigger house, that you could just tear it down - you have to get a demolition permit but you can tear it down. When it has become known that there are some folks that plan to tear down property in town, and I think we all know that there are some properties that are on the line and can go down in a month or two, people are outraged; How can you do this? How can you let this happen? Why is that permitted? Well, because there isn't anything to prevent it.

So the point of this is to try to figure out whether or not to create at least a hurdle. Doesn't meant that it cant be done but is there a way to create a hurdle to create a procedure that would require that there

would be some sort of review before somebody could knock down your house. That's it. That's what this proposal essential is.

Another piece of it is demolition by neglect. I am reminded about a case that I observed going through the courts in Loudoun County ten years ago, it was a property in Waterford - and I'm not comparing Purcellville to Waterford -they have all kinds of rules and regulations. But the issue in Waterford was that someone wanted to tear down a historic building and they weren't permitted to do it and basically they just let it fall apart. The roof fell apart, the rain came in and after a number of years it was absolutely a trash heap and it ended up being torn down.

So to the extent that there is something in the proposed ordinance that suggests somebody must maintain their property, the idea is let's not have someone be able to do an end run against the concept of just tearing it down, but to maintain some minimal level of maintenance so it does not become a hazard and you can't just get your teardown because you ignore it completely.

The ordinance is written, as I understand it, does not control in any way what you can do with your house - inside, outside, additions, paint colors, roofs, you name it, you can do what you want to with it. That's why when somebody said he wanted to paint his house hot pink, he can paint it hot pink he can paint it hot pink, put purple polka dots on it, put glitter all over it, fly flags from it - nobody cares. That's not what this ordinance says; there's absolutely nothing in it that says you can't do that.

So when I've listened to people speak I've been picking up the threads - where is the concern. I've heard some folks say just don't tell me what to do about anything - just don't tell me what to do, it's mine I want to do what I want period. End of discussion. I've heard other people say I'm worried because I may want to remodel or I may want to pull down an addition or I may want to put on an addition, I want you to tell me what to do. But this isn't doing that. Other people expressed concerns about maintenance; to what extent or what are the criteria with regard to maintenance. I think that is a very good question; I think that's something I would like to explore a little bit more and figure out if there's some criteria - what is minimal maintenance so that it doesn't fall into a trash heap.

I haven't heard anybody talk about how they want this town to explode into bigger buildings or McMansions or townhouses. All of you who have spoken really like where you live, you like your neighborhoods, it sounds like you like your friends and your neighbors, that's why we're here and that's what the effort is - to try to maintain. And another piece of this is to the extent that there is an intent to create a desire to try to create a hurdle to a teardown - actually the way this ordinance is written, it doesn't prevent a teardown - it creates a process by which folks have to come in and have a review to determine if a teardown is the best approach and to try to figure out if there is another way to go about it before you are permitted to tear it down. At the end of the day, it doesn't say you will not be ultimately be granted permission to tear it down, but it does require that other steps be taken so that the teardown is not the first thing that somebody can do. And that's all this is about, it's a let's really slow down and look at demolition before we demolish. It doesn't have anything to do with paint colors or additions or roofs or interior changes or anything else you want to do.

=====

[Commissioner Kowalski:] I think Nan summed up pretty well our reasons for doing this. There are lots of questions that we will look into and I'm sure there will be a lot of rewriting. You've given us a lot to think about and other possible solutions, and we're going to go back and look at those. This is not going to be

a rammed through process; it's going to be a month or more while we review this and research it and staff looks at it and we start restructuring, because our job here is to be responsive to you. One thing I would add is most of you came here and you didn't like what you read and maybe now that you've gotten our intent behind it, maybe you understand more why we're doing it even if you don't like the process.

Our emails are all on the town website, the planning commission, the town council. I'm ex-military and was always told don't brag unless you come up with a solution, so I'm challenging you: Send us a solution for this, what you said was a very good one, but take a look at the intent of why we are doing this, take a look at what we're trying to preserve, take a look at in spite of us not communicating it well I guess was not to which was to be an HOA, and tell us how to make it better. We're open to that. As you've seen every email gets read into the record, we all listen to we all get them into our town email boxes and read them before the meetings - it's our homework that we are required to do, so help us be part of the solution. And I'm not promising you we're going to come up with a solution that everyone likes, but we'll do our best to be responsive for what we think is the good of the town and the good of the town is based on what's communicated to us by you as well as us living here too.

=====

[Council Member Milan:] I want to echo what Nan said. I listened to everyone speak and the reason I asked Mr. Tipton why he moved here was I wanted to hear the real reason, and I have heard it through everyone who spoke: small town character and the freedom to do what I want to do. And you may not be aware that we are rewriting the ordinances to reflect what the comprehensive plan stated. For years, prior to my being on the council and planning commission, a lot of development in the town was haphazard. As you mentioned, the street you live on should be a one way street but it's not. Tearing down a house and then building three houses small houses on the property. Through the ordinances were trying to control that and manage that to where it's more livable. There are a lot of streets in town that were haphazardly developed, you can't go down there with two cars, the drainage is terrible, there's no plumbing for the older homes to alleviate the drainage issues they have - we're trying to correct that through the ordinances. It can't be done overnight. There are a couple of people on the town council who are opposed to everything that the planning commission does. They approved the comprehensive plan but yet they try to negate what we're trying to accomplish in the comprehensive plan so I don't understand that. It's like the left hand cutting off the right hand. You approve it but you try to slow it down and deny it. We're forging through systematically and methodically to get it in line with the comprehensive plan and with what the citizens want. We are not trying to shove anything down your throat, do anything subversively to sneak some policies in.

I understand that many people want to transfer their property to their children down the line; your house is 25 years old, what's going to happen to your house 25 years from now? I don't know. Every five years we review the comprehensive plan, so things may change depending on the nature of the town the makeup of the people, and the majority of the people I heard today have lived in town less than five years; there are some who have been here longer, and some who are brand new. So the atmosphere and attitude you had with you when you came here, you don't want to see that here. The issues with people trying to build a four-story apartment building on Hatcher Avenue, and you're thinking Hatcher is a two way street. Forty apartments dumping cars onto Hatcher. There's two cars at least for each apartment, that's 80 cars coming onto Hatcher and at 4 o'clock traffic is backed up all the way to the veterinary hospital. It doesn't fit, it deters from the smalltown character that we have here. We're trying to manage that to make it livable. Traffic is a problem. There's a rush hour in Purcellville - can you

believe that? From Main Street all the way to Giant traffic is backed up from 4 o'clock there and I'm thinking when I came here 11 years ago, there was just a yellow oscillating light at Hatcher and Main. Now we have a traffic light there and we have a traffic jam. Firetrucks can't get to Main Street off of Hatcher, they have to come down Maple. There are a lot of considerations we have to think about for the health, safety and welfare of the town and we try to preserve the historical value of it which will impact the economic development in town and we're all thinking about that. It's like a puzzle; as you're building your jinka, your structure, if you move one thing off it may stay there, if you move another thing off it may fall. We're trying to build that do it's stable for everyone in town.

We have a lot to think about, a lot to rework and a lot to rewrite. So a lot of people want to opt out. Do you like paying your taxes? You can't opt out of that - it's the law. The same thing with an ordinance - it's a law. You may be able to opt out of the registry, which is done by a third party - the state and the Federal government, but the ordinance is the law. I don't like paying my taxes, but let me not pay them and I won't be up here talking to you. It won't happen. I don't like the speed limit on the toll road, I'm paying money to ride the toll road, but I can't go 100 mph like I'd like to. So that's what we're working with. Just give us time to work through these things. We have the whole ordinance to rewrite. That's a lot of things we have to consider. We have to consider what happened in the pandemic for businesses, they're allowed to have outdoor dining which is not in the ordinance so now we have to accommodate that just in case we have to go through this again. We don't want to reinvent the wheel. It's going to take time. I appreciate your comments. There are a lot of obstacles we have to go through. The freedom of doing what you want is paramount in America. I live under an HOA which I don't like but it keeps the housing values stable in my neighborhood. We're trying to keep the historical value of Purcellville stable. What happened with the Harris Teeter development? - there was the barn that was not supposed to be destroyed but they went and did it anyway, so there was a big stink about that. So they renovated that barn with a replica of it, but not the true structure of the barn with the silo. They were not supposed to tear that barn down; the developers didn't listen to what the council said, some citizens got wind of it and we came there and stopped it at two-thirds of destruction; they had to replicate it because it was in the contract to rebuild it. That's what we're trying to do - preserve the small town character and why people move here and why people want to stay here and maintain the stability of our economic development and your property values. I don't want to lose any more property value that I had when I first moved here. I don't want to go through 2006, 2007 and 2008 again.

=====

[Vice Chair Neham:] I am in agreement with what all the other commissioners have said so far, that we all really want small town Purcellville. And it's not really a small town but also relative quaint. And if you like and want to keep Purcellville the way it is we should act to do that and not act to get Reston. And if you don't want Reston, how do we prevent it? So one of the things we are trying to do is be Purcellville and not Reston and one of the things we're aiming for in the one ordinance change is just, and only just, to discourage demolition of older houses that make up Purcellville's quaintness, and there's nothing else in the ordinance about controlling anything. As somebody said earlier, if you're painting your house a shocking pink you'd be hearing from your neighbors probably before you hear it from the town.

=====

[Commissioner Paciulli:] During the talk this evening, I took notes on about 21 speakers. I'm going to re-read this, I've got to take all this in. I want to process what you've said and what the commissioners said.

On page 18 of 32 in the staff report, there's a section that I was a little bit, I was more of your thinking until I read this area under Historic Properties in Single-Family, Detached, Residential Use: "structures ... will continue to be exempted from obtaining a Certificate of Design Approval from the Board of Architectural Review for any interior or exterior construction or alternations (i.e., additions, repainting, new roof, windows, doors etc.) made to these buildings and structures. It would be just as if they continued to be located outside the Historic Corridor and Overlay District. This provision is provided under Section 2.5 (Exemptions) of Article 14A that regulates the overlay district. [This] ... will still require a building permit from the County and the issuance of an over-the-counter zoning permit to verify compliance with building setbacks and" different construction details that the town monitors.

Those kinds of words made me feel like the process was going to be more normal than what I was hearing or concerned with when this was proposed. I haven't processed everything you all have said and these details and what other folks on the commission have to say about this, but I am less concerned now about being able to have this be more productively effective for everybody than no. But the jury is out on that detail until we go through some really lengthy discussions.

=====  
[Chair Ogleman:] I agree with what all of the other planning commissioners have said and I just want to touch a couple of the questions. The way this ordinance - this is just a modification of the ordinance that already exists. I live under this historic corridor overlay district and I very much like living under it. I consider the historic corridor overlay district to have saved my house from the impact of demolition that was done across the street because the developer was not allowed to blast at a level that would have been most efficient for them but would have damaged my house. Being in this district protected my house from that. We just put a brand new roof on it so I can attest that nobody asked me - was I supposed to ask someone before I did that, but I didn't, I just put the roof on. I see benefit to this.

I like living in the town and I get great pleasure walking around the town and seeing your houses and being in this quaint town.

The way the ordinance is written now, there are all of these restrictions and then there's an exemption. That exemption says basically for single family dwellings, other than for demolition and some of those maintenance things, none of what's in the rest of that ordinance applies to you. That's under Section 2.5 Exemptions, and specifically I'm speaking to "a." which has a couple of different parts because it's been adjusted but that's where it says all of these things we've put in here - they do not apply to your single family dwelling other than for demolition. Page 18 of 32 in the staff report and in the red-line text it's on page 21 of 32 on the bottom right-hand portion. That's how it's trying to protect this. For commercial properties in fact for all properties other than residential and agricultural, I think, the architectural control overlay district already regulates what can - a commercial property has to go before the board of architectural review to do even minimal design changes, but that's not we're proposing, that's in the ordinance as it exists.

So for the folks living on F Street, the reason it got registered is because as a whole, as an entire development, it represented a specific era in architecture that the people who went around deemed to historically contributing. Once again, in that context, because of this exemption, there is nothing as far as extending, building out, doing all of those things other than tearing it down that you would have to interface with the town government on. You might go to get permits from the county or something like that, but if you're going to change your roof, paint your house, put an extension on it, remodel the

inside, any of these things under what we're talking about. I've been looking at this for a long time so I can pick these things out of it, but it is a complicated hard to read document and I respect all of the anguish that has called and we apologize for that, but we are just trying to have this conversation that we are having right now based on this idea.

Going back to Maple Avenue, I very much appreciate what was said about, and this is always the case with government, it is a balance between overreach and conscientiousness. If everybody was just conscientious all the time, there would be no need for regulations, laws and rules, but we seem to need and feel - we live in a community so we don't get to do everything; we are not entirely free, we try to balance out and have the person freedoms we have with the value we get from being neighbors and friends in a community. That's why we're talking about these rules.

I really like the idea about talking about solutions, and we're eager to hear solutions. We've articulated what the comprehensive plan which is also based on citizen input, what that says we want to do as a town and we are just trying to operationalize that in ordinances. So if you have ideas and thoughts about this, keep engaged, keep in touch with us and help us find a solution. We are not trying to present additional problems for you in your lives. And I think all of the information about the cost and financial burdens from all this, I have not thought about that more than just as a homeowner in my own context. That's place where if people have solutions I'd love to hear about it because I don't have any right off the top of my head, but we certainly are trying to look for ways not to burden citizens with this. We're trying to do whatever we can to have a time out before having structures demolished with the lightest possible touch.

## OPEN DISCUSSION - PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 15, 2015

John Yacek: I want to thank you because the way you [i.e., Commissioner Forbes] put it was how the intent should have been written. This intent on her is not what you said, but what you said is very understandable and you think you guys already have a solution. She [gesture to audience] provided you with a perfect solution that accomplished what the intent is. This was extremely confusing to read through; there are portions where you get to where, I know you just brought up Section 2.5 on exemptions and then you're halfway through 2.5 and it tells you unless you're in 2.1, then you have to go back to 2.1 and then that falls into the corridor, so I'm part of the corridor. It goes back and forth and it's extremely confusing and I think that's why you're getting this many people showing up here saying we don't want this because we can't understand it, we don't think you guys understand it. I think by the way most of you are reacting, the first time you read it you probably had the same reaction we did. It's extremely confusing, it's extremely wordy, and there are other portions of it where 2.3 says if the appearance of the house is altered - well putting an addition on a house would alter its appearance - I think if you brought that into a court of law, any judge will tell you if you're putting an addition, that alters the appearance.

Council Member Milan: The confusion comes with the altered that's not in compliance with the original structure. That's where the BAR comes into play. If you make an addition to your home it should mirror or fit in with the current façade. That's not implied in that statement so we have to clarify it.

John Yacek: When I read this initially, I'm planning on putting an addition on my house in the near future, and then to read this and be confuse about whether or not I'm allowed to do that, if I have to go get a special architect that I have to pay extra money for is extremely frustrating. Especially you're trying to figure out the finances between I can move into an area and pay \$500,000 or \$600,00 for a house, or I can put a \$200,000 addition on my house - which is the most cost effective for me and my family. This doesn't seem like the town has our best interest by the way this is written. The way you [Commissioner Forbes] said it I think does speak to what the actual intent is and I don't think this accomplished what the actual intent was. And I think she [gestures to audience] gave you a perfect solution to accomplish what you want to accomplish and I know that's absolutely possible.

Chair Ogelman: The idea that we have a sort of blanket you may not demolish a structure without this cooling-off situation or without this deliberative process, do you feel that the community as a whole would be accepting of that?

John Yacek: My understanding is if that's what the purpose and intent of you're doing right now, what's the difference?

Chair Ogelman: The only difference is - there's not a huge difference.

John Yacek: There should be no difference because that's what you said. That's the intent, right? The intent is to not tear down structures that ... Vienna VA is very unique. It's consistent with Purcellville in a lot of ways. However, I think Vienna has become what you're trying to prevent. In Vienna you can drive down the streets and you have a modular home right next to someone who tore down a house and built a home on the entire property. There's no yard but you have a 5,000 sq.ft. house on the property. I think that's what you are trying to accomplish, but by doing this is creates a lot of confusion, it creates a lot of skepticism, whereas if you just create the single ordinance that says of you want to tear down an

existing structure in the town of Purcellville, you have to go before this board and you have to get prior approval for what you're going to do with that property when you tear it down. For example, on West F Street I've gotten estimates on what it would cost to put a second floor on my house just to double the square footage. That doesn't change the footprint of my house. It would be cheaper for me to tear my house down and build a new house because it's a modular home with 2" x 3" studs. The amount of work that would have to be done to it is ridiculous. So tearing that down is something I'm assuming you would approve as long as I come to you and say this is my intention, this is my plan and this is what I have drawn up to do. It seems to me like the board or the town is trying to go after contractors who are purchasing properties, tearing them down, building mega-mansions on a small parcel of land and changing the footprint of the town.

Chair Ogelman: Just to be fair, we're not trying to go after anybody, we're just trying to fulfill what the comprehensive plan says.

John Yacek: To go back to spot zoning, to me [pointing to map] that's the definition of spot zoning. You have a property right behind me that can be split up into four parcels - this was actually talked about when they sold it - but that's not listed on there but my property is because my property can be purchased for a much cheaper price, torn down and then a new structure be built on it. So there is an advantage for someone to purchase my property over a two acre property that sits right behind it which is not listed on there. Four homes can go right behind my property but I would have to go a special approval. They don't have to do that for their property but I do on a property that I'm going to live in; why do I have to pay extra money when someone else can go right behind me and do the same thing.

Chair Ogelman: The only reason is this was our effort to preserve our smalltown character. I've many people don't agree with it, but these are properties we didn't arbitrarily pick, that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the National Park Service said were contributing and we said we aren't going to be arbitrary. If they'd been arbitrary I think a lot of what people had to do with that. We had a uniform rule that says if they consider these properties to be contributing, then that is going to be the means by which we try to do this part of the comprehensive plan. That's how we're going to try to expand the ordinance to preserve the character and small town feel of the town.

John Yacek: I also think if you're going to make an overlay district, that's not a district. When you go into a district, you're in the district. You can't say I'm in the district and my neighbor's not and the guy next to him is. That doesn't make any sense for a district. If you go into a downtown district, the guy who lives next to the other guy - it just doesn't make any sense to do it that way. If you're going to blanket it across a whole area that makes more sense, but I would still 100% disagree with it unless you're going to do what you said of just giving a blanket ordinance saying anything within the town of Purcellville needs special approval. And I think that will solve all the problems you want to solve.

Chair Ogelman: Would you support something like that?

John Yacek: I would support something like that - over this, Yes, I absolutely would.

=====

James Tipton: Just to pursue that line of thought a little bit, my wife and I were talking about is right along those lines. If the goal is preserve small town charm, then the way to implement that is to preserve the charm of the whole town, not subsets of the town.

I want to go back to the assertion you're making that these provisions in the ordinances as written shouldn't apply to residential properties. I'm not a lawyer, but the way I read that exemption that we had up on the screen and I have in front of me now says: "no certificate of design approval shall be required for the following: a. Lots within the Historic Corridor and Overlay Zone that do not contain a historic resource on them" Well all of the properties highlighted in yellow there are highlighted because they contain a historic resource on them. So I fail to see how that exempts any of the people who're concerned about this.

Chair Ogelman: The second of part of that starts: "for historic and non-historic resources" that's the part that exempts all of these things. It reads: "For historic and non-historic resources, construction or alterations to main and accessory buildings or structures in single-family detached residential use or in an agricultural and forestal district where no site plan is required for the work." OK. That's what exempt, single family detached homes and it says: "demolition or removal a historic resource from a lot is not exempted by this section. I've looked at this so much ... what we're talking about here is part of our existing ordinance, so I live under the existing version of this, and it sort of pops you into something and pulls something back out of it and then puts something back in and pulls something out, but definitely this is that part that is exempting single family homes from homes anything related to this ordinance except for demolition.

James Tipton: Like I said, I'm not a lawyer, that's not how it sounds to me. I understand that's the intent, I would suggest that this portion be revised to make that much clearer, but the bigger point I would make is in the spirit of offering a solution to the problem, if the intent is to prevent the demolition of structures for whatever reason, whether it's to avoid building a high-rise next to my single family home or whatever other purpose, then the ordinance should be that properties that are being proposed for demolition should be subject to the review process and nobody else should be mentioned in the ordinance and we're free to do with our properties as we see fit under the existing law.

Chair Ogelman: Would you support that?

James Tipton: I would support an ordinance written that way. I would not support one written this way, even with the intent that you're describing because I think it's confusing enough as to potentially lead somebody to rule not in my favor on a decision like this in the future because the misunderstand a confusingly written ordinance.

Chair Ogelman: But a single blanket requirement to go before the board of architectural review before demolishing any property in town - that would be acceptable?

James Tipton: Yes, I would support that if there was a requirement to go before the board of architectural review for demolition of a property and for no other reason for a residential property.

=====

Susan Eidelheit: In line with what she [gestures to audience] was saying there's another potential part to add on to the solution, and I don't remember if it's in cities that have historic areas or it's towns I've been to, but I know in some smaller cities they also have ordinances of just how high buildings can go, and that's something else you could consider to help discourage or stop the possibility of McMansions.

I totally agree what to me it's like spot zoning as well for the two houses right near us - they can do whatever they want to it within the current ordinances. Our house lost like \$100,000 value when you changed it for four homeowners. We're still here, this is a great town, but there are rules. It's not there's nothing in place to control people, but I think her idea is a great one, and also the idea of square footage, height, things of that nature.

Commissioner Kowalski: The height of buildings in the area is something we've been talking about a lot and spending a lot of time between defining stories, how high in feet, do we go to the peak of the roof or the eaves and how steep is the roof, does that make it another story, what about buildings on sloping ground? We are considering everything you just said. We are trying to work through the logistics and the legalities and the definitions of it.

Susan Eidelheit: What happened on 21st Street? I've never seen a town meeting as full, out the door at least twice when they were trying to build a four-plex, six-plex on an old historic street. And that shows you how important it is to us as a community, and there will be a voice. People who say we want to retain the flavor. There are other ways to do it without such a voluminous potentially restrictive thing, particularly if you're letting other houses right in our district do what they please.

Chair Ogelman: This idea of a blanket cooling off or requirement to go before the board of architectural review for any demolition of a residential property - would you support something like that?

Susan Eidelheit: Town-wide? Yes, and because I think this could have implications down the road for other sections of town, I think it might be nice to consider a referendum on this on not just the council. I don't see how this could be accomplished in just one or two months.

Chair Ogelman: We're not allowed to have referenda otherwise we would have some.

=====

Doreen Hope: I wanted to clarify some of my remarks earlier and I may have misread what was here but it's my understanding in reading, I want to draw your attention to Section 2.7 which the demolition permit review and approval process. In reading this again, would the properties that are outlined in yellow on the map behind you of which one is my property, is I wanted to demolish two sheds that are dilapidated and falling inward and causing a safety hazard on my property and a haven for pests because they are getting in through the holes in the building I inherited. If I wanted to demolish those sheds only, I'd have to get a permit, correct, and then I'd also have to put those sheds and the property that they're on up for sale?

Chair Ogelman: What I think is theirs thing is the sheds on your property might not even be contributing structures, but let's just assume that they are, like the house is. So if they were, you'd go before the board of architectural review and that board could very well turn to you and say these are a threat to health, safety and welfare so you should tear them down. They could also say they are in very, very good shape and they are contributing and here's the evidence they're contributing, so you cant tear them down. But even if they say you can't tear them down, that is not an enforceable rule in the long term. You as a property owner will always at some point have he right to tear down your property, no matter how historic it is. What happens is, and this is where that sale idea comes in, if the property was deemed to be in good shape and the BAR already said you don't need to tear it down for health, safety and welfare reasons, you just want to. And you said you still want to tear it down, they would say: for one

year you need to give people the opportunity to purchase it for fair market value if somebody is going to purchase it and now tear it down. After that year, if nobody says they want to purchase it for fair market value, and this is only if it's in good shape and the BAR said it needs to stay. Then you could tear it down. After that year if nobody was willing to buy and preserve it, you could tear it down and there's no further recourse for the town.

Doreen Hope: So that seems like that's an additional way for someone to purchase property at the downside of someone else's issues. With that result, I think I would continue to stand opposed to the plan.

Chair Ogelman: OK. And I don't know that we thought that through. The way we came to this is we were trying to discourage the razing of properties that were sound and in good shape and historically contributing. My hope is the board of architectural review at that point would say this is a safety hazard that needs to be torn down. I assume that's how they would react as a board. One other safety stop is the town council could probably override the board of architectural review's decision if the BAR said something needed to be preserved but the town council said it didn't.

Town Attorney Hankins: That's correct, the appeal from the BAR goes to the town council and the town council decision would be final, however it could also be appealed to the circuit court.

Chair Ogelman: So there is this process. It's designed to not let people willy-nilly demolish historic structures, but there are all of these positions in the process that say this doesn't make sense, if it's a health, safety and welfare risk then these boards would have the opportunity to say you should tear it down.

Town Attorney Hankins: I think the speaker makes a very good point. The requirement to offer your property for sale, which the state code says includes the land under the historic resource, it's kind of surprising that the state would say you have to sell your property or live with the building. We may want to think about how we can narrow the scope of that so that, for example, it would not include accessory structures; it would really only include principal structures like the actual house and not a garage, not a shed.

Commissioner Kowalski: Or you could say its for uninhabited structures because a garage could have an apartment over it or something.

Town Attorney Hankins: Right, because you couldn't sell the land under a shed anyway because it's not really feasible because you wouldn't have a subdividable parcel for that tiny amount of area.

Doreen Hope: And that was the point I was trying to make in my comments early. I have two sheds in the back and if they were sold under this process, the new owner who buys it and says I'm going to preserve this; because those she sheds are on my property and my and my neighbor's property that surrounds the sheds, there's no way for the new owners to get to it unless they force me to them an easement so now I've given away half of my property.

Chair Ogelman: This is really helpful. I think that no matter how this goes forward, this is valuable input for how this would be discussed.

Commissioner Kowalski: On the sale, you've definitely given us some things to think about. For the process part, the BAR is not malicious. If you go the BAR and say you have these falling down sheds, they're not going to not to tear them down. Maybe if George Washington lived in one, they might say you to preserve it.

Doreen Hope: But I don't want to hang my hat on it.

Town Attorney Hankins: We do need to think through what happens if the outcome is you can't tear it down.

Doreen Hope: And I worry as an African-American resident owning property, I worry if that another way for us to easily lose our property.

Chair Ogelman: Not is definitely not the intention of anybody here.

Doreen Hope: But that could be one of those unforeseeable impacts.

Commissioner Kowalski: To Devil's advocate that, and what you brought up too, what if someone has a perfectly nice house they want to, or two next to each other and they bought both lots and they want to tear it down and put up something that doesn't fit in, and we say you can't demolish it. I can foresee possibilities where we want to make sure someone can't demolish it and do that too. So we have to find something that works both ways.

Chair Ogelman: Ultimately what we learned is if somebody owns a property and want to demolish it, the best you can have is this cooling off period.

Susan Eidelheit: What happens if there are a couple of teenagers hanging out drinking and she knows and could have hired someone and in a day they could have razed the structures but her hands have been tied until the review decision saying yes we're giving you our blessing to get rid of it. But she could have done hiring someone to do it, but in the interim the town said you need a cooling off period, who's liable if the kids injure themselves: her or the town?

Doreen Hope: My position would be the town.

=====

Marc Rossi: On declaring something historic, we might feel that there are things important to us in the town but that doesn't mean they're historical. There are national standards, state standards and maybe local standards that we establish, but I think that probably what's most important here is that the whole town - it encompasses everything. Historic is probably not the way I would approach it, but there are precedents. I came from a town out West that was burned to the ground in a great fire in the early 1900s, and they made a concerted decision to create standards that are basically still in place today over a hundred years later, and it's done well for the town. I'm also of the belief that the way we can achieve maintaining our town is not creating some restrictions that aren't too restrictive but meet the expectation. Also we have to be open to outsiders. I'm an outsider but I'm a townie now and I love this place, and I think that a lot of people who are here are they haven't spend their whole lives here, they weren't born here, but we truly care about it and I think that should all matter.

So want to attract more people who care and people who bring money and revenue and can support the goals that we all have. I'm in favor of saying that it doesn't have to be historic and I think what we're trying to say here, and the sheds and everything that's all important to ensure the details are accounted for. But what we don't want is something torn to the ground and a McMansion or things that are not in keeping with our town. And so I think it's more important on the back end the legalities of our expectation. You can't build something with a footprint that's greater than the lot can accept. That would just be a parameter to say OK nothing that's 20 feet from a fence. It would regulate whether it could be a 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 foot structure. In the town I came from, every commercial structure could only be a certain height and they factored in all the things you're talking about, the pitch, that angles, all of that. There are precedents out there that we could leverage for our town.

I'm in agreement with taking away the historic component. I think every historic property should be identified individually and accounted for, but I think the town should set just one standard, and if anything is going to be demolished, is it historic yes or no, and if it's deemed not historic, then a developer or an individual can't build something that exceeds defined parameters based on lot size.

It appears that everybody does have a concern and hopefully we get to the desired result here.

=====

Richard Miller: So we brought up this idea of let's just have an across the entire town - if you want to demolish something you'll have to go to the board of architectural review. That's the idea that's being considered, and that should be whether it's commercial, which is already the case, or not but you could have the one thing.

But what about that one about destruction by neglect? If I don't maintain my property, where is that going to go in to this whole thing. My neighbors have 25 year old homes; they're all falling apart, everything is crappy. That's the thing I like about an old house, it actually tries to stay together. They're not going to want to tear their house down, but there's a certain amount of neglect that many homeowners have. Now you're talking about imposing that on every structure in the town. That could be a challenge.

Chair Ogelman: What comes to my mind with this is there's only a part of town, this core middle part that is not in any homeowners association. So homeowners associations I think enforce these rules. It's not that light of a touch there about things like neglect and how tall fences can be and what colors houses can be and all of those things.

Richard Miller: It could really be just my neighbors. Basically what happened was when the Case farm was silt up, the nephew got the property with the house and the land immediately around it, and the niece got what became Village Case. So my yard got subdivided. Talk about setbacks, my lot line to where the house is built is about 2 feet long, all these crazy angles that were approved, but the point is there are five other houses that are there. They're not in a homeowners association so they would be affected. But most of the newer homes, as you said, are probably under a homeowners association, Just an aside, the document mentions, for commercial structures, if there is an addition or change, the same materials must be used. For additions, that's actually contrary to the national historical preservation guidelines which clearly state that additions must look enough different that they do not appear to be part of the original structure.

Commissioner Kowalski: When you're talking about your neighbor's house tending towards neglect, the town has ordinances that prevent that now but they don't have high grass police to go around but if someone files a complaint with the town, don't we have code enforcement or something?

Richard Miller: I'm not suggesting that I'm calling out anybody. My previous neighbors had to do a lot of repair to their home in order to sell it.

Commissioner Kowalski: I'm just saying that as the house started to fall into neglect someone would notice and the town would take action to notify the people before it collapsed in on itself.

Town Attorney Hankins: That is a shortcoming of the town. We don't have a building maintenance code that requires - we have the authority at the very extreme case where its a threat to health and safety but we don't have something prior to that.

Richard Miller: It's always been hard to find contractors to work in this area, and it's only worse right now, but any resources that the town could develop so that when I do need something fixed I can actually find somebody to do the work - that would be very helpful.

Town Attorney Hankins: I do want to add just because it's been spoken about a lot tonight that this idea a town-wide prohibition on demolition without BAR approval - I don't think it's authorized under state code. I think the state code limits that authority to a review and prevent demolition to historic buildings and structures.

=====

Chris Levy: I want to thank everybody for this work in this job. I've worked in public service and it's a thankless job and the intent is not always understood by the public. I was one of those people - when I read it Section 2.5.a is not crystal clear. You asked everybody if they would support something like that, but maybe if you read it as you have to have permission to demolish it. You have to demolish it if its in Virginia's historic ...

Town Attorney Hankins: We can certainly reword the exemptions to be more clear. I just want to be clear that I didn't write this ordinance. I inherited it and we were trying to amend it as little as possible.

[Chair Ogelman:] We didn't write it either.

Town Attorney Hankins: They didn't write it either. It long predates us all. We probably should have scrapped the whole thing and started over. But we didn't so here we are trying to piece things together.

[Director of Planning Dooley:] This is called cutting and pasting; in trying to make it better, sometimes it may not come off the way its intended as you've all been testifying to.

Chris Levy: My only hesitation with adding the rest of the district is if it's not made to be written crystal clear the next person that comes to buy my house or an upgrade or whatever, is going to see that and say no, I'm not going to touch that.

[Chair Ogelman:] A big takeaway for me is that language has to be very clear and everybody has to be comfortable with it, and actually this is the process working properly. I've lived under this. I feel like I've looked at it too many times and I think we need input so we really appreciate it.

[Commissioner Paculli:] And your continued input will be very important because we may hear something this evening and the intent is there but it doesn't come out just right. Don't just let it go after tonight.

=====

Benda Dowdy: I know you're looking for input as to whether we would agree or disagree with an overall no demolition without approval. I would agree with that more than my home being put in a historic district and being classified as historic. My home is 1,100 sq.ft. which is much smaller than many of the townhouses that are in town. We have one bathroom and three small bedrooms and we make it work for a family of four. But as an educator, I can't get lawyers to be able to get approvals to get architects. I want to put in a half bath. I want to get y laundry out of my kitchen where I'm literally doing my laundry and prepping in my kitchen at the same time. I don't want to have to go through big hoops to modify or close in a car port so that I can have a master bedroom with a bathroom in it like many other homes. I know I could choose to live someplace else, but I don't want to live where there's an HOA; I want have property so that I can do things that our wonderful area - I want to have tings we do around here.

How many of you have taken the map of the historic district that's being proposed and driven around to each of the homes and said oh yes, this makes Purcellville Purcellville. Not jus a small town, but I'm thing of the stone structures when I'm driving around oh my gosh they hand-dug all those stones, the sone walls around some of the homes. But then I drive around Purcellville or I walk, which I do mostly, and I look at some of the homes. Our homes on F Street were from a Sears catalog that somebody pointed out. My neighbor whops 90 years old has told be so much history of the town of Purcellville, he remembers the grain station and when he and his family used to take the pigs and go and get the grain and trade. He said I've seen the growth. He said they came in and literally hand-dug out the basements. We don't have full basements. So for my home to be considered specially historic I would like to suggest that you take your own map of Purcellville without the historic district or anything on it and look at the houses and mark the ones that make Purcellville Purcellville, not in the sense of a smalltown but in the sense of this is the character that we want to keep. Those old Victorians on Main Street, the stone houses on Maple Avenue and then put it over the overlay that has been proposed and is the historic district and say OK this makes sense. If that is what goes forward, I ask that you look at this. I Know that you're going in a broad statement of this is what somebody else has identified and we're going with it because it creates no discussion of good or bad, but please look at these homes that they have identified and say if you're really keeping Purcellville is this really historic to us. Even Fireman's Field has been completely revamped, curbs put in there. Now from F Street we drive up and down in front of this building and when there's a baseball game two cars can't pass. We have a camper - part of the reason I have a camper is I don't have to pay to keep it somewhere and we leave on Fridays and if there's a baseball game, with our pickup truck we can't pass if there's another car coming, and we can't back up on that street so the other car is going to have to go the other way. With the change of these curbs and these things those aren't even in keeping with what Purcellville was.

I ask that you look at some of those things and then consider the economic impact of if my taxes go up I'm not going to be able to support it, if I have to go and get all of these other approvals and I have to get all of these architectural things - because I want to do it right, I want to keep my home but I'll have

to move out of the County. I've had this conversation with myself many times because as teachers, our salaries are not going up with the salaries of the other areas -Amazon is going to come in, they're going to bring in executives, all these people. I can't stay and I want to stay. I want to finish out my career in Loudoun. I've taught in local schools for 18 years now; I've been in Sterling for three and this is where our family is. But please consider the economic impact of whatever the decisions are that you'll make.

[Council Member Milan:] A comment on your requesting us to go out and drive around, we did that. For a lot of the houses that were added we went around had to visually see if they were there. I saw a lot of stone homes that were built and I'm thinking how did they get them to fit. I can't get my planter to level out on my yard and those are whole houses and everything looks neat and measured.

[Chair Ogelman:] I think at our Planning Director's request, we tried to look at all of them because part of the due diligence for this was to physically observe whatever these reports or surveys said existed there actually exist there. There's some degree of arbitrariness that happens with the surveys themselves, people are interpreting things and they're deciding on structures, there have been changes and we wouldn't necessarily notice if the change was enough to have changed the status of something, but we certainly tried to do our best - and we're also all just volunteers doing this.

Benda Dowdy: But when you say that we've gone out to see if the structure is still there, that's not looking at something with the thought of this is what makes my home my home.

[Chair Ogelman:] We were trying to follow the criteria we were given about it being historical so I agree with what you're saying in that we and the comprehensive plan that we're using equates or says the character of the town, its quaintness and its charm or more over it is even more than architecturally is tied in to these structures that were built in the past.

[Council Member Milan:] Some of the houses I saw didn't look historical to me. On F Street a lot of smaller module houses, three houses going East were in the registry and the other houses weren't. They looked the same to me but I don't know the criteria they used to determine if they were historical or not.

Benda Dowdy: If I lived in a very nice old home I would agree that somebody should look at my home because it was built in the 1800s and it's not available. John was here speaking earlier and he's done a lot of constructing to the inside of his home, and they also own another property on F Street where his in-laws are living and there's no wall structure because they're just square rectangles built. They're so small, the rafters just go from wall to wall. It's basically just a cardboard box inside of it. To be told that I can't do simple modifications, because I want to put a porch on the front because we all sit outside and we all talk in the evening.

[Commissioner Forbes:] Nobody's saying that.

Benda Dowdy: That's what we're reading.

[Commissioner Forbes:] That's what we're here to clarify. You're absolutely not in any way being told by anybody that you can't put a porch, an addition, convert your garage, anything you want as long as it meets the setbacks and other conditions that already exist. But this has absolutely nothing to do with making those sorts of changes. If you wanted to tear it down, that's what we were worried about and noting else.

Benda Dowdy: Thank you for clarifying and hopefully the upcoming copies that we'll see with information has been clarified so we don't all have that very scary feeling of wait this is my house and now you're telling me I can't, so thank you for all of that.

[Chair Ogelman:] We are part of you all. This is our community and its your community and want this to be what everybody wants. We take all of the touch point we can to try to do that. We know that we're not going to be able to please everybody no matter what we do, but we certainly don't want to do anything that most of the people in the town don't want.

=====

Leo Belvis: Part of my apprehension after seeing the letter is HOA. Being told what are you going to do, what color I'm going to; paint my house, when and how often I need to maintain it. It's like I'm already doing that and its really expensive and I don't want someone to tell me to do that already. That's why I moved to Purcellville to be left alone and to raise my family. I'd live to live here for a thousand years and have my family here for a thousand years or however long the town will be here. I can't go into this thinking that you have nefarious plans or just want to control everything - I want to give you the benefit of the doubt that you have the town's best interest in mind. Like the homes on 32nd Street, when they were blasting everything. The first thing I thought was I miss the rolling hills, the misty fog in the morning when I drive to work. I think that's no longer there but that's the person who sold the property. There's not much I can do about that; however, to say that we're going to do our best to prevent McMansions from popping up in the middle of you neighborhood when everything else is like a bungalow or everything else is a ranch or a colonial house. Ours is colonial, our neighbor's is exactly the same footprint, the same layout - identical but it's not on the overlay which doesn't make sense to me. It didn't seem like you were the ones who were picking and choosing, it may have been a different board that did that.

[Chair Ogelman:] There was actually a set of surveyors that went out and they evaluated things and I too don't understand the rhyme and reason sometimes, but I know are packets that go in and if something has been altered enough - Mr. Dooley is a professional in historic preservation and he understands the integrity of these resources very well. They get off of the list or they're not included as contributing when their integrity goes last a certain cut point, even if they're nice looking houses. I've been surprised. Right off your street there's a house I know is from the late 1800s and its been worked on in different ways and I've been shocked that it's not on the list. I don't always understand the reasons, but for us not to be arbitrary, it was important that we're not the people choosing what goes in there.

Leo Belvis: I found that really interesting that our houses are almost identical and theirs is actually, in my opinion, is better looking, but theirs isn't on there and of the two, that should be on these.

If I had gotten a letter prior to this very technical letter saying what are your intensions for this house, I would have told you right off the bat to live here as long as possible, not move, raise my kids, give my kids the property, no McMansions erected because that's what we planned on doing. The reason we bought the house is there's a 20' x 20' professional greenhouse in the back that I intend on redoing. I would hate to be put in the historic districted when I'm already doing these things only to limit my future. Forename, when you sell your house, how would that limit the purchaser and how they'd feel about there's certain stipulations. So if that was fleshed out a little bit better, that would be helpful. But that intent, like coming up to me and going to my property and saying what do you guys want to do, do

you plan on selling this to Blackstone or Blackrock and having them develop it and build a McMansion - we don't plan on doing that. We'll sell it to a family when the time comes. Getting that more personal what is Purcellville, like talking to me would have been like that is Purcellville. What is the intent of the homeowner? That, to me, gives you a picture like he wants to stay here as long as possible.

I think that there's a lot of clarification that will take place from now until whatever decision is made. I think a lot of the folks here don't intend to build high rises or four story buildings and if their voices were heard prior the letter being sent to, I think that would have avoided a lot of the apprehension.

[Chair Ogelman:] We did try to - there was an insert that Vice Chair Neham has written and we had agreed to and that staff looked at that was in the one of the water bills because we know that that goes to everybody. Point taken, and we certainly are trying to do outreach and we're trapped by the amount of time we have.

=====

Richard Miller: You were looking for solutions and I've got something that I thought might help - that is most of the objections seem to be from those who feel their home's not historical, its not significant, they're modest homes. Well the modest homes are part of Purcellville and that's part of what makes Purcellville what it is. They should be preserved in some fashion but let's be realistic. Folks who live in modest homes and have plans to expand them in some fashion or they've been there for a real long time, or they've just never had the ability to move up something. So could we do some things to ease some of the burden of putting them into this, such as an expedited approval price or application, or a lowered fee or a waived fee.

[Commissioner Paciulli:] Isn't that in the proposal, that it's a normal permit process.

[Chair Ogelman:] My understanding is we have a permit process. The main thing we were trying to do with respect to that is what Commissioner Forbes was going back to. We are just trying to not have people have to turn to the government for anything other than this demolition process.

Richard Miller: But if they think this is something that's affecting them, it would be a benefit that you may never have to pay out, but you have some sort of concession to the more modest homeowner who's being included into this because I think their sense is its a burden on them that the taxes may go up because the value of their home. Well if you don't plan on selling your home until you die, I don't really care that the value went up. Just things to consider.

=====

Susan Eidelheit: I think it sounds like everyone needs to do a little more homework before such a significant proposal gets put forth to the people affected. It just sounds like some more research is needed on everyone's part. On the economic level, two of you live in historic homes ...

[Chair Ogelman:] We live in the historic corridor overlay district in that hatched red part of town.

Susan Eidelheit: But it was historic when you moved in or afterwards?

[Chair Ogelman:] Our property was historic.

[Commissioner Forbes:] It depends on how you count. I lived there when I was 2, that was 67 years ago. Then my husband and I moved in in 1983.

Susan Eidelheit: I have a call out to my insurance agent. Whatever I have read in articles, two of them do point out that some insurance companies require to you have historic homeowner owner insurance and the rates are quite different. So do we still have to report this to our insurance companies? In terms of those people who have a mortgage fer the implications and what is the impact on them?

[Commissioner Forbes:] I'm not aware that it makes any difference at all; they're interested in whether or not you're in a floodplain.

[Chair Ogelman:] I moved in to the historic corridor when I moved to Purcellville and I did not anything about ayu of these things. The people who lived there before me put a garage in there. I've never lived outside of these rules: painted different things, repaved the driveway, chopped down trees, planted trees.

Susan Eidelheit: I guess its different when its of your own volition.

Richard Miller: Our houses were not singled out as being historic, the area was and our houses are contributing structures. You may not have been aware of it because you went with a modest home. It wasn't sold that way to you or any of that whereas some of the stone houses or ones with unique architectural features, we kind of figured that might be part of that and we've been aware. None of the things that are being done by the architectural are any different than what is actually required nationally. So I can't put a crazy addition on my house, there are certain guidelines that I have to follow. By bringing this in, they're kind of protecting us from doing something that might be wrong' like tearing off a part of my house or something and getting sued.

=====

No Name: You had mentioned that the timeline you are looking at was approximately a month from this point, is it possible that whatever timeline on which you're working that we can reconvene and this process could in some way be revisited with everyone who received a letter so that this isn't just a one-off opportunity to go ahead and then things are amended an then sent back out? There's a lot of confusion in terms of trying to understand the original historic corridor, versus the historic overlay, versus the proposed addition to the historic zone area, and I think a lot of what's gone wrong is a lot of clarification. So my request is that once the language has been clarified and everything has been revisited, that the letters go back out and we have an opportunity as a community to come back and discuss again.

=====

[Chair Ogelman:] There will definitely be revisions to this and there will be another public hearing that would happen depending on how much change there is for this.

[Town Attorney Hankins]: The short answer is we can send out another letter announcing a new meeting date whenever the meeting might be. The public hearing is a particular legal term; I don't know if would be another public hearing r not but it would certainly be a public meeting.

[Chair Ogelman:] But even if we did nothing else but submit what we had, there will be a public hearing because the town council would have to have a public hearing before they vote anyway.

[Town Attorney Hankins]: That is true but I thought she meant before this body.

[Chair Ogelman:] I think we can do that to, but keep in mind there's the recess in August. It would have to be in September but that's good.

=====

[Commissioner Neham:] Mr. Chair, please answer the two bulleted questions in Kathryn Ruckman's email.

[Chair Ogelman:] Question 1a: I understand that my home used to be a farmhouse for a pig farm that was first built in 1910. Under the proposed changes to historic corridor overlay district, if I were to make exterior changes, by what standard would I be held to?

Answer: She would be exempted by Section 2.5 of any standard for exterior changes as long as it's a single family detached use.

Question 1b: Would I be asked to make my house more of its original construct or be in sync with one of the homes on Main Street?

Answer: No.

Question 2a: The house my parents used to live in on 9th Street was in a state of decay mostly because during my parents life they never had the money to fix it up. What would happen to people such as they under the proposed changes?

Answer: We had some discussion about this and I think we need more time to talk about the financial impacts of this legislative burden would be on people.

Question 2b: Would they be notified that they need to fix it up at some point?

Answer: The whole notion of maintenance is something we need to talk about.

Question 2.c: Would there be a plan to help them with finances. Would they need to incur debt in order to be in compliance and continue to live in the home? What would be the progressive process for people such as they?

Answer: I think those three questions are related to this financial responsibility and I think we need to do some thinking about that.

**FOLLOW-UP EMAILS - PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JULY 15, 2015**

**From:** Doreen Hope <doreenhope@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 16, 2021 4:35 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Public Hearing on Zoning Code Text Amendment 221-05

Commissioners:

Thank you for your time, attention and demeanor last night. It made well for a productive hearing and town hall.

To be part of the solution, I will provide you some proposed language to help with some of the issues contained in my comments.

And again, many thanks to your helpful staff, particularly, Ms. Hays, Ms. Bandy, Mr. Dooley and Ms. Hankins.

Thank you,  
Doreen Cook Hope  
Co-Owner  
521 S. 11th Street  
Purcellville, VA

=====  
**From:** Beth Visna <bethvisna@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 17, 2021 9:34 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Follow up from Thursday's meeting

Hello Planning Commission-

This is Beth Visna, resident at 241 W. J St. I attended the meeting Thursday night and felt a need to follow up.

I very much respect the intentions of the planning commission. I believe if you shared some of your thoughts at the beginning of the meeting, you may have avoided some of the redundant public comments of people's concerns that "the government is going to tell us what to do". I think many of the individuals pushing hard against this ordinance are the same people who oppose the development of an apartment building in the place of three historical homes.

I applaud your composure as some of the public comments were frustrating and long winded. While I realize at times I spoke out of turn, I hope I never interrupted or spoke in a way that was offensive to the commission. I believe you conveyed compassion and made it clear that you heard residents' concerns and truly plan to take them into consideration.

I hope you will take my recommendation into consideration. I believe by creating an ordinance that applies to the whole town it will be more equitable and prevent many from becoming defensive. I also believe it can prevent some of the problems that were brought up for instance, an individual buying one property and building three houses or a high rise.

I assume you have some limitations in how ambiguous you need to make your remarks, but I am not sure some of my fellow town's people were aware that the very person they applauded for his statements is one of the individuals with intentions of altering the "small town charm". If there is a way to communicate to residents that the only way to prevent the Chapmans' plan from coming to fruition is an ordinance like the one being proposed.

I do still have some questions about what the inclusion of our home in the historic overlay may mean for us as property owners. For instance, we have concerns that in the next 20+ years our spring house has the potential to deteriorate due to age and high water table and water runoff from W. K St and a sump pump. I would appreciate the opportunity to speak to someone about what we may be held accountable for in maintaining a non-inhabitable structure. I plan to reach out to Mr. Dooley with some further questions.

I hope you heard that there is some support and more once people felt heard and at ease. I hope you're able to act quickly enough to prevent some irreversible changes that so many oppose.

Respectfully,

Beth Visna