

# Change Matrix (Version 2.3)

Town of Purcellville Draft Comprehensive Plan Update

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
1	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				List of Comments	Editorial	Does plan need to state "historic character" or historic so often?			5. Considered and noted for record.
2	E. Van Istendal	2/27/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				Markups in Doc	Editorial	<a href="#">Punctuation, grammar markups throughout. See E Van Istendal Version 2.3 Markups.</a>			1. Adopted
3	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				Email to E. Goodrich	Administrative	Some non-Purcellville photos could be replaced with pictures of structures in our town. Two photos that I find especially unattractive are on pages: 50 (fig. 120) and (fig. 122); another is pg. 66 (fig. 160).			1. Adopted
4	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				Written list of comments	Administrative			Standardize on the use of either "&" (ampersand) or "AND" throughout the document." [True administrative!]	1. Adopted
5	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				Written list of comments	Editorial	As has been noted in previous Planning Commission sessions, there are a fair number of photographs in the Comprehensive that are not of Purcellville properties.	See comment 3., 242, etc.		5. Considered and noted for record.
6	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				Written list of comments	Editorial	The maps that have a lot of content/detail are too difficult to comprehend when printed on 8 1/2" x 11" paper.		In the final copy of the Comprehensive Plan, print the following maps (or those that survive the review process) on 8 1/2" x 17" paper: The Town of Purcellville Street Map, Figure Ground Map, Existing Land Use Map 2017, Areas to Sustain Map, Parks and Protected Spaces Map, Townwide Future Land Use Map, The Land Use Focus Area Map, Facilities Map, Historic Features Map, and the Bike and Pedestrian Plan Map.  Consider splitting the Land Use Map into two maps at main street to enable enlargement.	2. Partially Adopted
7	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Throughout				Written list of comments	Editorial	In various places in the document, certain terms are in bold or italicized bold font. These fonts seem to want to call particular attention to these terms, but because their meaning is not given (perhaps in a Note or elsewhere?), and because they are not consistently applied, their significance, if any, is opaque to me.	EG - Ensure Bold Italic Fonts applied consistently...  Bold Italic = External Documents. Semi bold (non italic) = Sections or Maps within the document.	Either add a Note that explains the significance of these font styles and apply them consistently throughout, or change them to the document's regular font.	1. Adopted
8	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		I			Word Doc List	Editorial	Delete "Existing Development"			1. Adopted
9	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		I			Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Future Land Use" to "2018 Land Use Plan"			1. Adopted
10	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		II			Email to E. Goodrich	Editorial	Spell "diverse" correctly, shows as "divers".			1. Adopted
11	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		III			Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "Existing Land Use Map 2017"			1. Adopted
12	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		III			Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Townwide Future Land Use Map" to "Townwide 2018 Land Use Map"			1. Adopted
13	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		IV	Map		List of Comments	Administrative	Hard to Read. Fireman's field very hard to read. Woodgrove labeled Mountain View.			1. Adopted
14	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		IV			Word Doc List	Editorial	Add historic quote below image			1. Adopted
15	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		2			Email to E. Goodrich	Editorial	The 1st and 2nd lines of header are too close.			1. Adopted
16	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		2			Word Doc List	Editorial	Add appropriate quote/picture in white space below seal language			1. Adopted
17	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		3			Word Doc List	Editorial	Add appropriate quote/picture in white space below planning history language			1. Adopted
18	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Town History	3		The Town's Planning History	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "In 1995 an Urban Growth Management Plan was adopted between the county and the town. The purpose of the plan was to expand upon the town comprehensive plan by accommodating future development in the Urban Growth Area beyond the town boundaries. The plan grew out of a joint annexation agreement between the county and the town...This plan was dissolved by a legislative action by both bodies."  Shouldn't the town document it's position/policy regarding development outside the town boundaries (including our ability to provide infrastructure, services, etc.) and a position on annexation (and other methods of "controlling" land use in this area? Examples: Providing (or not) water for residences, mixed uses, low impact commercial, etc. What if new wells are drilled outside the town boundaries that end up drawing down on our aquifer supply and stressing the town's ability to provide water for its residents?	Change to: "In 1995 the Purcellville Urban Growth Area Management Plan (PUGAMP) was adopted between the county and the town. The purpose of the plan was to expand upon the town comprehensive plan by accommodating future development in the Urban Growth Area beyond the town boundaries. The plan grew out of a joint annexation agreement between the county and the town...In 2013, the PUGAMP was superseded by revisions adopted by the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors on March 6, 2013 and effective as of July 1, 2013."	2. Partially Adopted	

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
19	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3		4	Street Map		Directly Into Matrix	Administrative	Remove Purcellville Gateway, Catoctin Corner and the Shoppes labels from the map.			1. Adopted
20	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		5	1st para	4th line	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...as well as planning commission input"			1. Adopted
21	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction	5		Intent & Purpose	Written list of comments	Administrative			Use standard two-character state code. For example, District of Columbia is abbreviated as "DC" (i.e., without periods).	1. Adopted
22	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		6	Plan Content Box		Word Doc List	Editorial	Delete "Strategic Planning Areas"			1. Adopted
23	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		6	2nd para	lines 6 & 7	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "and the areas...or future enhancement" to read "...as well as focus areas based on community input. Each category of existing character or focus..."		Delete "areas best suited for enhancement".	1. Adopted
24	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction	6		Overview, and elsewhere	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "The public strongly expressed during the public input process that town officials are expected to uphold the policy direction of this plan and not take potential amendments lightly without thorough consideration of impacts. However, as time passes new information or opportunities may arise and amendments may be necessary. The recommended approach to this is provided in the Implementation Chapter."		Change to: "During the public input process, participants strongly expressed that town officials are expected to uphold the policy direction of this plan and not take potential amendments lightly without thorough consideration of impacts. It is recognized, however, that as time passes new information or opportunities may arise and amendments may be necessary. The recommended approach to maintaining the plan's currency is provided in the Implementation Chapter."	1. Adopted
25	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction	6		The Plan At A Glance	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Suggestions for implementing and maintaining the plan are given in the last chapter so that the plan may have meaningful, long-term impact."		Change to: "In the last chapter, suggestions for implementing and maintaining the plan are given so that the plan may have meaningful, long-term impact."	1. Adopted
26	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		7		Last	Email to E. Goodrich	Editorial	Last line, the word "from" is not needed.			1. Adopted
27	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction	7		The Challenge	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "However, the same homey characteristics that attract tourists also attract new residents, and population growth may challenge from Purcellville's ability to remain a small town."		Change to: "However, the same homey characteristics that attract tourists also attract new residents, and population growth may challenge Purcellville's ability to remain a small town, and furthermore its ability to manage increasing transportation demands."	1. Adopted
28	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Goals	8	Last Bullet		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Remove. This is so specific compared to the others.			1. Adopted
29	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		9	Phase 1	line 3	Email to E. Goodrich	Editorial	Not sure who the "stakeholders" are...Rewrite to "citizens"			1. Adopted
30	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction	9		The Planning Process - In Phase 1: Project Initiation	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "...the planning team gathered information and established the working relationship between the consultant team, planning staff, and the town's stakeholders. The first round of public input happened in Phase 1 and established the primary values for the plan and the general areas to focus on managing change or protecting existing assets."		Change to: "...the planning team gathered information and established the working relationship between the consultant team, planning staff, the town's Planning Commission, and the town's stakeholders. The initial round of public input occurred during this Phase 1 and helped to establish the primary values for the plan and the general focus areas to manage change and protecting existing assets."	1. Adopted
31	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction	9		The Planning Process - In Phase 2: Research & Analysis	Written list of comments	Administrative	The document states: "The Critical Findings Report was shared with the planning commission and public in the second round of engagement This information influenced a focus on what the town most needed to address moving forward."	OK as is.	Change to: "The Critical Findings Report was shared with the Planning Commission and the public in this second round of engagement. This information influenced a focus on what the town most needed to address in moving forward."	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
32	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		10	2nd para	line 2	Word Doc List	Editorial	Delete "...which is attached"			1. Adopted
33	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction: The Planning Process	10		In Phase 2: Research & Analysis	Written list of comments	Substantive	The document states: "Participants were supportive of mixed use development within existing commercial and industrial areas as well as in areas with adequate transportation infrastructure and access", but mixed use has not been defined up to this point in the document. It's not clear to me that the "participants" share a common view of what "mixed use" is, and the same would apply to the term "mix of uses" when it appears later within the Land Use Plan - Commerce Areas for example, and where it is better defined within "Mix of Uses" on page 33. Further, the participants' responses were not grouped according to whether they were Purcellville residents or not (see page 150 within the Compendium of Public Input Round 2); this might affect the importance that might be given to such a finding.	Meant to be mixed use in this case, so do not add second part.  Include glossary with definitions consistent with the industry standards.	Change to: "Participants were supportive of "mixed use" development within existing commercial and industrial areas as well as in areas with adequate transportation infrastructure and access, although it was not always clear whether they were considering "mixed use "or the somewhat different "mix of uses"."  I have included definitions of "mixed use" and "mix of uses" in the Glossary tab of this workbook.	2. Partially Adopted
34	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		11	1st para	line 2	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Future Land Use Map" to "2018 Land Use Map"			1. Adopted
35	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		14	Map		List of Comments	Administrative	How many maps do we need? In first 14 pages, 3 maps are similar detail.			5. Considered and Noted for the Record
36	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		17	Figure 28		List of Comments	Administrative	Figure 28 does fill a space but does nothing for me.			5. Considered and Noted for the Record
37	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		17	2nd para	line 2	Word Doc List	Substantive	Add after "...joint land use management area" the following "(the area immediately adjacent to the town boundary)"	Explain what area this is referencing? Within the County JLMA Zone? More general?		1. Adopted
38	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		17	1st para	line 4	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...continue experiencing..." to "...continue to be challenged by..."	Trying ton get away from the idea that growth is a thing that happens to.... an that pile has no say....		1. Adopted

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
39	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		17	1st para	line 6	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...were processed in early 2016 to estimate..." to "were processed in early 2016 and were used to..."	Unlikely that Weldon Cooper actually developed numbers for Purcellville.... Is this what they really did? How did we get these numbers? Please clarify.		1. Adopted
40	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction: Background And Key Findings	17		Regional Growth And Demand For Housing	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "As a highly desirable and <u>relatively affordable</u> (as compared to other parts of Loudoun County) family-friendly community in Loudoun County, Purcellville is anticipated to continue experiencing significant demand for new homes", but I don't believe it is relatively affordable any longer. Consider property values elsewhere in western Loudoun.		Change to: "As a highly desirable family-friendly community in Loudoun County, Purcellville is anticipated to continue experiencing significant demand for new homes."	1. Adopted
41	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction: Background And Key Findings	17		Regional Growth And Demand For Housing	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Based on these regional forecasts, McBride Dale Clarion (MDC) estimated that the Purcellville joint <u>land use management</u> area could see demand for as many as 1,780 new housing units by 2040." This is the only place in the document that the joint land use management area (JLMA) is mentioned and its significance is unclear.	Refer to comment 39.	Change to: "Based on these regional forecasts, McBride Dale Clarion (MDC) estimated that the Purcellville area could see ..."  Additional considerations: Include a reference to the JLMA in The Town's Planning History on page 3, and include citations to the JLMA/PUGAMP as a footnote, or include the documents as an appendix. (I have included definitions in the Glossary tab of this workbook.) <a href="https://www.loudoun.gov/index.aspx?NID=1242">https://www.loudoun.gov/index.aspx?NID=1242</a> <a href="https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/120004">https://www.loudoun.gov/DocumentCenter/View/120004</a>	5. Considered and noted for the record
42	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		18	Figure 30		List of Comments	Administrative	Figure 30 is a private street if that makes a difference.			5. Considered and Noted for the Record
43	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		18	Pull out Quote		Email to E. Goodrich	Editorial	The word "could" needs to be lower-case.		See comment 46.	2. Partially Adopted
44	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		18	Pull out Quote		Email to E. Goodrich	Editorial	This is the only citizen quote used as a pull-out, Councilman Ogelman has others he has culled from the many input sessions.		Add more quotes.	1. Adopted
45	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		18	last para	line 3	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...does not keep up with..." to "...lags..."			1. Adopted
46	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		18	quote		Word Doc List	Substantive	Replace			1. Adopted
47	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction: Background And Key Findings	18		Regional Growth And Demand For Housing	Written list of comments	Substantive	The document states: "The external pressures of housing demand and affordability is a core challenge to be addressed in order to preserve and protect the unique, thriving, and diverse small town character." Purcellville doesn't have to bend to this pressure; i.e., we do not have to look for ways to increase our housing by out-of-scale infilling or annexation. New housing developments/subdivisions have produced larger (more costly) houses. The rest of Purcellville (especially the older parts) has lots of smaller and more unique houses; these are more affordable and are probably in the \$350K and lower range rather than the \$650K and higher range.	Do not adopt.	Change to: "The external pressures of housing demand and affordability <u>are</u> significant challenges to be addressed in order to preserve and protect the unique, thriving, and diverse small town character. <u>Following the guidance provided during the citizen input sessions, Purcellville should endeavor to maximize infill development within the town's boundaries in scale with surrounding properties and neighborhoods, and to approach annexations with a great deal of caution.</u> "	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
48	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Introduction: Background And Key Findings	19		Regional Growth And Demand For Housing	Written list of comments	Substantive	The document states: "In this plan, the town clearly expresses a desire to ensure that any future growth of Purcellville coincides with the availability of adequate public utilities and does not create negative effects for the community. This will likely mean that planning decisions outside of the town limits will occur under Loudoun County planning and zoning recommendations..." Regardless of how successful Purcellville will be in working with the County to exercise some control over the growth outside the town limits, a real challenge will be for the town to be able to keep nearby county residents from overwhelming the town's ability to serve/satisfy everyone's needs.	Noted. Do not adopt.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
49	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3		19			Written list of comments	Substantive	The document states: "At present, citizens of Loudoun County—including Purcellville—expect the remaining farmland and green spaces surrounding the town to be developed with three or five acre single-family estate lots." Does the word "expect" mean that they believe that this is what's going to happen, or that this is what they want to have happen? In any case, I would not want the "expectation" of non-Purcellville citizens weigh too heavily on what the town itself needs to express within this Comprehensive Plan.	OK	Change to: "Although the citizens of Loudoun County have indicated that they expect the remaining farmland and green spaces surrounding the town to be developed with three or five acre single-family estate lots, <u>it is essential that the town fully engage with the county in an effort to jointly manage the areas adjacent to the town with the goal of minimizing larger scale development of these properties and maintaining the rural nature of Purcellville's setting to the maximum extent possible.</u> "	1. Adopted
50	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3		23	Last Para		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Move last two sentences to the end of page 41.	See comment 58.		5. Considered and Noted for the Record
51	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Land Use Plan	23	Last Para		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Revise to read, "Much of the land area in Purcellville has been identified as areas to sustain, <del>therefor the future land use map looks very much like the existing land use map, with greater detail and fidelity in the categorization of land uses.</del> (and should maintain a similar development pattern to what is on the ground today.)"			1. Adopted
52	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		24	Industrial para	4th line	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "enhancement" to "focus"			1. Adopted
53	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	1st para	line 1 & 2	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...and there are only a small handful of areas left without some type of committed development or preservation."			5. Considered and Noted for the Record
54	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	2nd para	line 2	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...future land use map..." to "...2018 land use map..."			1. Adopted

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
55	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	1st para	line 5 & 6	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...includes a snapshot of the existing development and character circa 2017..."			1. Adopted
56	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	1st para	line 8 & 9	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...whether that area was identified as an area to remain the same or as an area of potential change." And replace with "community input."			1. Adopted
57	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	Commercial para	lines 3 & 4	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...are considered to hold potential for change..." to "...are opportunity rich..." and change "enhancement" to "focus"			1. Adopted
58	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	2nd para	lines 3 to end	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete both sentences from "Annexation" to "Implementation Chapter"			1. Adopted
59	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	1st para	lines 7 & 8	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...future..." on both lines			1. Adopted
60	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		23	3 boxes at bottom of page		Word Doc List	Substantive	Relabel "Areas to Sustain," "Community Design" and "2018 Land Use Plan"			1. Adopted
61	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	23		Overview	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Much of the land area in Purcellville has been identified as areas to sustain, therefore, the future land use map looks very much like the existing land use map, with greater detail and fidelity in the categorization of land uses." The Planning Commission has already expressed its concerns about existing land use maps.	No change.	Change to: "Much of the land area in Purcellville has been identified as areas to sustain. Consequently, there is a high degree of correspondence between the future land use map presented later in this chapter and previous versions of Purcellville's land use that were presented in the 2006 Comprehensive Plan and modified since."	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
62	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	23		Overview	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Annexation of land not currently shown in the Future Land Use Map will be subject to a comprehensive plan amendment and an impact assessment."	See comment 58.	Change to: "Annexation of land not currently shown in the Future Land Use Map, if and when it should occur, will be subject to a comprehensive plan amendment and an impact assessment."	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
63	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3		24	2nd para		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Delete, replace with, "The <i>Areas to Sustain Map</i> shown on page XX highlights the areas of Purcellville that should maintain the character that currently exists into the future. These includes Civic/Institutional (blue), Parks & Protected Spaces (green), Residential areas (yellow), and select commerce areas (beige). The recommendations that follow the map aim to ensure these areas retain their existing character that residents have said they value so highly. The grey areas on the map represent areas that have been identified as areas of focus for the future, and are discussed in greater detail in the Land Use Focus areas on page XX"		In addition, "Future Land Use Map" must be changed to "2018 Land Use Map" in all locations in the document.	1. Adopted
64	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		24	1st para	line 3	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...allow for infill and some redevelopment in targeted areas." And replace with "...explore options for community focus areas."		Change to, "Allow for infill and explore options for community focus area"	1. Adopted
65	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		24	2nd para		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Existing Land Use Map on the following page..." to "2006 Land Use Map (with amendments)" and delete "This map is circa fall/winter 2017."		Attach 2006 Plan in back and make sure the document references it.	1. Adopted
66	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	24		Existing Development	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Residential Single-Family Detached, make up the majority of Purcellville's neighborhoods. They are unified subdivisions from various eras that contain the town's housing stock. These are considered a committed land use and are included in the residential neighborhood areas to sustain strategies."		They include: "Residential Single-Family Detached, make up the majority of Purcellville's neighborhoods. They include unified subdivisions from various eras that contain the town's housing stock. These are considered a committed land use and are included in the residential neighborhood areas to sustain strategies."	1. Adopted
67	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		25	Map		List of Comments	Administrative	Does this help? Grey area on 32nd, grey on Hirst, green on east side, darker yellow east side of orange area east 7.	This page will be removed. See comment 68		5. Considered and Noted for the Record
68	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		25	Existing Land Use Map 2017		Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete map			1. Adopted
69	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		26			List of Comments	Administrative	Can we add a stream and slopes along Hirst from green area to Hirst - see page 29.			1. Adopted
70	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	26		Existing Development	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Vacant/Permitted but Undeveloped, is the land that is not currently occupied by a building or permanent use. This includes residential lots which are approved but have not been platted and do not yet have homes on them, as well as a few commercially zoned properties which have not yet been redeveloped or developed." Is "plating" significant? If not, let's remove it.	Leave original language, just delete "but have not been platted"	Change to: "Vacant/Permitted but Undeveloped, is the land that is not currently occupied by a building or permanent use. This includes residential lots which are approved and do not yet have homes on them, as well as a few commercially zoned properties which have not yet been redeveloped or developed."	2. Partially Adopted
71	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		27	Areas to Sustain Map legend		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Managed Change Areas" to "Focus Areas"			1. Adopted
72	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	27		Areas to Sustain	Written list of comments	Substantive	The Areas To Sustain map colors are too muted.		Use the following colors from the Future Land Use map for these areas to sustain in the Areas To Sustain map: Civic/Institutional: same as Institutional & Government Commerce: same as Commercial Medium Scale Parks & Protected Space: Parks & Open Space Residential: Single Family Detached Traditional	1. Adopted

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
73	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	27		Areas to Sustain	Written list of comments	Substantive	This map also includes a "Managed Change Areas" which are only referred to in Implementation: Amendment Process on page 100: "Possible consideration of amendments include requested amendments to allow for uses not anticipated in the plan, changes from a Preservation Area to a <b>Managed Change Area</b> or vice-versa, ..." At the very least, the document should contain a definition/explanation of Managed Change Areas.	See comment 71.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
74	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3	Parks and Protected Space	28	4th Bullet		List of Comments	Critical	Add statement to protect streams. Words in this paragraph refer to the ability to develop.			1. Adopted
75	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		28	6th bullet		List of Comments	Critical	After rezoning add "or sale by Town" (the Town explored sale of Fireman's Field and did sell Makers Smith).			1. Adopted
76	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		28	Last section		List of Comments	Critical	Add statement to last section, "protect streams and adjacent slopes."			1. Adopted
77	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Parks and Protected Space	28	1st para		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Before first sentence add, "Parks and protected spaces are shown in green on the <i>Areas to Sustain Map</i> on the previous page, and are further detailed on the <i>Parks and Protected Spaces Map</i> on the following page. As shown on the map, the network..."			1. Adopted
78	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		28	5th bullet		Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete	No change.		5. Considered and Noted for the Record
79	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	28		Areas to Sustain, and elsewhere	Written list of comments	Administrative	First observed with "PARKS AND PROTECTED SPACE", some of the section headings are in a <b>MAROON</b> color and most of the others are BLACK. Is the maroon coloring significant?		Make all of the headings black.	1. Adopted
80	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	28		Areas to Sustain	Written list of comments	???	Under Parks and Protected Space, the document states: "Update the zoning ordinance to require the preservation of parks and green space." It may interesting to see how this will be accomplished in the zoning ordinance.	No change.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	5. Considered and Noted for the Record
81	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		29	Map		List of Comments	Critical	There are no streams through Woodgrove site - show them.	OK		1. Adopted
82	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		29	Text Box on lower right		List of Comments	Critical	Add, "streams and adjacent slopes"	OK		1. Adopted
83	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Parks and Protected Space	29	Map		Directly Into Matrix	Administrative	Change the well property located to the north of Village Case to Open Space (should also be changed on the Areas to Sustain Map and the Future Land Use Map if this comment is accepted).	OK		5. Considered and Noted for Record
84	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	30		Areas to Sustain	Written list of comments	Substantive	Under Residential Neighborhoods, the document states: "Infill in the residential neighborhoods should follow the guidelines for the appropriate future land use as designated on the Future Land Use Map." We should ensure that the specificity and colors used in the Townwide Future Land Use map (page 42) thoroughly supports this. Furthermore, I am concerned that this is setting up situations where more people will want to request zoning changes to take advantage of what the zonings for these newly defined districts may confer upon the property owners. In other words, the Future Land Use map appears to be more than a vision or guideline - that infill development in residential areas is governed or directed by the Future Land Use map; rather it may be informing/shaping the zoning ordinances.		4/26/2018 WS - (1) Ensure that the specificity and colors used in the Townwide Future Land Use map (page 42) thoroughly supports this. (2) I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern. <b>I withdraw my comment.</b>	5. Considered and Noted for Record
85	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3		31	Last para		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Delete last paragraph and replace with paragraph reading, "The Community Design section which follows provides general recommendations that should be considered for any land use and development decisions in Town."			1. Adopted
86	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	31		Civic And Institutional Areas	Written list of comments	Administrative	The document states: "The Future Land Use section which follows provides general and specific strategies that the town will use to steward context appropriate infill and redevelopment ..."		Change "will use" to: "may employ". Change "context appropriate" to: "context-appropriate" wherever it occurs in the document.	1. Adopted
87	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		32	bullets		List of Comments	Critical	Add 2 items to the bullet list, 1. Stream, slope and related vegetation, and 2. landscaping detail between uses.	No change.		5. Considered and Noted for the Record
88	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		32	2nd para	line 7	Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...future land use..." to "...2018 land use..."			1. Adopted
89	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	32		Community Design	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "The unique development form, architecture, and mix of land uses in Purcellville are the defining physical attributes of the small town charm and character."		Change to: "The unique development form, architecture, and mix of land uses in Purcellville are the defining physical attributes of its small town charm and character."	1. Adopted
90	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		33	2nd bullet		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "...Future Land Use Map..." to "...2018 Land Use Map..."			1. Adopted
91	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		34	6th bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	4 stories in rear.	reject! ERIN CHECK THIS TO THE ORDIANCNE!!!		5. Considered and Noted for the Record

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
92	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	34		Scale	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Individual blocks and neighborhoods should be of modest scale reflecting the traditional subdivision pattern in the older sections of Purcellville." I think this is a bit of mischaracterization in that I (and probably lots of others) don't consider older sections of Purcellville as looking like any kind of subdivision.		Change to: "Individual blocks and neighborhoods should be of modest scale reflecting the traditional patterns evident in the older sections of Purcellville."	1. Adopted
93	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		35	Last Bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Add "and ARB design guidelines" to the end.	Revise but it should be BAR not ARB.		2. Partially Adopted
94	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	35		Architectural Design	Written list of comments	Administrative	I'd like to have a "shout out" to the Purcellville Fire and Rescue Center.		Add a picture of the Purcellville Fire and Rescue Center such as this one I grabbed from Google:	1. Adopted
95	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		36	1st bullet		List of Comments	Critical	Delete, "within historic areas"			1. Adopted
96	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3	Site Design	37			List of Comments	Critical	The parking lot in front of La Petite Lou Lou or Belly Love center has dangerous aisle landscaping. We need landscaping but can't interfere with sight distance (in this _____ area in summer view is totally blocked).	No change.		5. Considered and Noted for the Record
97	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Site Design	37	5th bullet		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	at end of sentence add, "and the larger pedestrian network."			1. Adopted
98	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	37		Site Design	Written list of comments	Substantive	The first bulleted item states: "Allow for green infrastructure consistent with traditional town appearance and structure, and maintain consistent landscaped setbacks along existing roadways." The term "green infrastructure" appears at several places in the document and is not adequately defined or described. It appears in three bulleted items under Open Space & Landscaping; a prior definition would help to better understand this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seek out economic opportunities, grants, and funding compatible with green infrastructure projects.</li> <li>• Align environmental and economic boards and committees in search of strategic green infrastructure goals.</li> <li>• Review and amend zoning ordinance as necessary to implement desired landscaping and to maintain the Tree City USA designation.</li> <li>• Green infrastructure should be considered when planning open spaces.</li> </ul>	Remove "green infrastructure" say "landscaping" instead. Also "require" instead of "allow".  Additionally, delete "with curb" from second to last bullet regarding utility/dumpster.	At the least, add a definition of green infrastructure to the Glossary. Better yet would be a paragraph or bulleted item (the first one?) describing green infrastructure. I do not have suggested text for this.	2. Partially Adopted
99	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	37		Site Design	Written list of comments	Substantive	The document goes into a fair amount of detail that might be too great for a Comprehensive Plan. If it isn't, then I would argue that the document should have a section on Outdoor Lighting that discusses this topic to an equivalent level of detail. I think that we would like to say something about minimizing light intrusion and pollution, and that we do not wish to have areas of our town look more like an aircraft landing zone.  Similarly, the Comprehensive Plan doesn't say anything about noise and odors. Granted these are items that should/will be dealt with in the zoning ordinances, perhaps we should say something about how controlling noise and odors is part of maintaining Purcellville's small town atmosphere (now that the slaughterhouses and rendering plants are gone).	Add bullet reading, "Any outdoor lighting shall minimize light intrusion and buffering to minimize noise and odors."	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	1. Adopted
100	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		39	1st, 2nd, and 6th bullet		List of Comments	Critical	Sight distance cannot be compromised.	OK.		5. Considered and noted for the record.
101	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		39	7th bullet		List of Comments	Critical	No	OK, delete.		1. Adopted
102	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Open Space & Landscaping	39	1st bullet	last line	Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Delete, "Parking spaces should be large in size to accommodate larger family vehicles." This is not appropriate for this section.	OK, delete.		1. Adopted
103	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Open Space & Landscaping	39	7th bullet		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Delete, "Parking spaces that accommodate the large, roomy SUVs driven by the families in town." Not appropriate for this section. If it must be kept, move to "safety", see page 40, and modify "on-street parking" to "... parking spaces of sufficient size to accommodate safe entry and exist of larger family vehicles, ..."			1. Adopted
104	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	39		Open Space & Landscaping	Written list of comments	Editorial	The first bulleted item includes: "Parking spaces should be large in size to accommodate larger family vehicles", and the seventh bulleted item states: "Parking spaces that accommodate the large, roomy SUVs driven by the families in town."		Remove the seventh bulleted item; it is redundant.	1. Adopted



Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
105	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		40	Figure 79		List of Comments	Substantive	Not if not all new in Town townhouses are garage units plus 2 more stories. Walls are awkward (3 feet long each) or not installed on TH side.	Replace photo.		1. Adopted
106	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3		41	2nd para	1st line	Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	Move the first sentence to the end of this page and change "rezoning" to "annexation".	May be superseded by another comment??		1. Adopted
107	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		41	last para		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "The Townwide Future Land Use Map" to "The Townwide 2018 Land Use Map" and detail what has changed between the 2006 amended and 2018 land use plans	Accept text change and also needs to detail what has changed between the 2006 amended land use plan to the 2018 land use plan. Detail this on the end on that page even if it goes into a new page.		1. Adopted
108	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		41	Title		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Future Land Use Plan" to "2018 Land Use Plan"	Yes change.		1. Adopted
109	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	41		Future Land Use	Written list of comments	Administrative	The second paragraph includes: "These specific guidelines should be incorporated into updates to the town's Zoning Ordinance."	See comment 7.	Change he font style and case to: "These specific guidelines should be incorporated into updates to the town's zoning ordinance."	5. Considered and noted for record.
110	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	41		Future Land Use	Written list of comments	Critical	I am very concerned that there is no clear traceability showing how we progressed from 2006 land use maps to the 2017 land use map to the proposed future land use map. How did we get here? Perhaps there can be specific references to made to supporting documents. Item #237 of the Version 1 change matrix includes the comment: "Please provide documentation of any and all changes in land use between the "existing" and "future" land use map and reasons why each area has been changed. What has changed between the "existing" and "future" land use map and why?", and the recommendation: "Please provide documentation of any and all changes in land use between the "existing" and "future" land use map and reasons why each area has been changed."	See comment 107.	I don't see where that has been accomplished in Version 2.3 of the Comprehensive Plan. I would like to see specific references that are or should be incorporated into the Supporting Documents in the introduction to Future Land Use as well as for each of the focus areas. We need to follow up on this. I do not have a suggested specific "fix" for this concern.	5. Considered and noted for record
111	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	41		Future Land Use	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "After the future land use categories, seven focus area maps, public input, and detailed recommendations are provided to provide guidance on the specifics of development in these areas in a way that complements the existing character of Purcellville and completes the built environment for the town."		Change to: "After the future land use categories, seven focus area maps, each with public input and detailed recommendations, are detailed to provide guidance on the specifics of development in these areas in ways that complements the existing character of Purcellville and completes the built environment for the town."	1. Adopted
112	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42	Map		List of Comments	Critical	No streams in Woodgrove area?	Check if there's a stream. Add to map if so. Otherwise, change the label for water to "significant water" or something....Should represent as much water as possible.		1. Adopted
113	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42			List of Comments	Critical	How can this plan showing tan on Chapman Hirst cleared site work against existing zoning? Should we look at alternatives uses with benefits for Town and intensity for owner to think about?	No change.		5. Considered and noted for the record.
114	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42			List of Comments	Critical	Same binder with next spot.	Multi family from mixed use neighborhood scale colors too close. Update colors.		1. Adopted
115	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42			List of Comments	Critical	So brown area adequate as existing zoning?	No change needed.		5. Considered and noted for the record.
116	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42			List of Comments	Critical	Why is the area at end of 18th (east side) shown as multi-family?	It is correct, however the future land use map must be larger. See comment 6.		5. Considered and noted for record.
117	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42			List of Comments	Critical	This plan gets rid of R3A, ok with me. The PC tried a version of this and first term town council member had us change this detail. Should be gone. 18th Street 20th Street, and Nursery.	SKIPPED - who about removing the "detached" from traditional and suburban single family??		1. Adopted
118	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		42			List of Comments	Critical	Show stream and slopes/vegetation as green on south east town corner that crosses Druhan onto Sam's Orchard property.	OK - make change.		1. Adopted
119	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	42		Future Land Use Map	Written list of comments	Critical	Who determined how the Future Land Use Map would be arranged/colored? Based upon what inputs?		See Requested Change above for page 41 Future Land use above.	5. Considered and noted for record.
120	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	42		Future Land Use Map	Written list of comments	Critical	I don't know how common this is throughout the town, but our property is mischaracterized as Mixed Use Neighborhood Scale in the Townwide Future Land Use map. Our property should be characterized as Single Family Detached Traditional, which agrees with the rest of the residences in our neighborhood.	Make sure that Eds house located between Hoof & Paw and the Florist is still shown as Residential-Traditional in all the maps!!!	Identify and reconsider properties that were formerly characterized as residential and are now characterized as "more than" residential, such as Mixed Use Neighborhood Scale, etc.	1. Adopted
121	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		43			List of Comments	Critical	100% agree with dedicated public street cross section to all new decisions in this area.	Add bullet reading, "Public right of way should be consistent with Figure 81."		1. Adopted
122	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		43			List of Comments	Critical	Do NOT make the cross section onto existing streets, only starting at dedication line of existing street. That way, minimize the drag on existing streets / neighborhood looks.	OK, see comment 121.		5. Considered and noted for record.
123	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		43			List of Comments	Substantive	Ok on cross section with same note as prior section. I am not sure where to use but ok to have for unknown. I like to keep because of 6 foot tree areas.	OK. Leave the cross section.		5. Considered and noted for record.

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
124	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	43		Single Family Detached Traditional	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: • "Streets are narrow and straight with tree lawns being common on both sides of the street. Sidewalks should be installed on both sides of the street." • "Lots generally range between 0.2 acres and one acre."	OK	Change to: • "Streets are generally straight and many are narrow, with tree lawns being common on both sides of the street. Sidewalks should be installed on both sides of the street." • "Lot sizes generally range between 0.2 acre and one acre." N.B. The acreage of smaller than one acre properties should be expressed as singular (i.e., acre vs. acres). throughout the document.  Consider changing the photograph in Figure 84. Traditional home to a smaller house more typical of older Purcellville, perhaps in the southwest quadrant.	1. Adopted
125	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		45			List of Comments	Substantive	Need Town planning and DPW input on cross section. Townhouses with garage under, which is what is built these days.	No change, but double check this cross section would still be eligible for VDOT funding.		1. Adopted
126	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	45		Single Family Attached	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Streets are narrow and straight with tree lawns and sidewalks on both sides of the street." Trees are not always on both sides of the street. Here's a Google aerial view of some of the houses on McDaniel Drive:	OK	Because site and aesthetic design considerations do not always lend themselves to "should be's", change to: "Streets are usually narrow and straight with tree lawns and sidewalks often on both sides of the street."	1. Adopted
127	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		47			List of Comments	Substantive	Useful cross section? Possibly on Hirst mixed use area?	No change.		5. Considered and noted for record.
128	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	47		Mixed Use Neighborhood Scale	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Buildings can be set to the sidewalk edge without front lawns". But if we are not talking about North 21st Street as an example, then we should consider some setbacks may be more appropriate.	OK	Change to: "Buildings can be set to the sidewalk edge without front lawns, if compatible with the surrounding neighborhood scale."	1. Adopted
129	E. Goodrich	2/21/2018	Version 2.3	Mixed Use Med Scale	48	5th bullet		Directly Into Matrix	Editorial	change "four" story to "three" story.	See 130.		5. Considered and noted for record
130	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	48		Mixed Use Medium Scale	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Architecture tends to be traditional and of a medium scale with two to four story buildings being common." I think we will be limiting structural heights, generally to three stories.	Yes 2 to 3 story. Revise	Change to: "Architecture tends to be traditional and of a medium scale with two and three story buildings being common."	1. Adopted
131	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		50	6th bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Do we want this statement? Does it say anything?	No change.		5. Considered and noted for record.
132	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		50	8th bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	OK with ZO?	Check square footage against Zoning Ordinance.		1. Adopted
133	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	50		Commercial Medium Scale	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Residential use encouraged over first floor commercial buildings that are not more than three blocks."	OK	I do not understand: "that are not more than three blocks". I do not have a suggested specific "fix" for this concern.	1. Adopted
134	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	51		Industrial Business	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "This category represents the industrial areas in Purcellville and is appropriate for future development in the designated industrial parks or subdivision."	OK	Change to: "This category represents the industrial areas in Purcellville and is appropriate for future development in designated industrial parks or industrial subdivisions."	1. Adopted
135	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		52	Agriculture Commercial	current 3rd bullet	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...are typically situated away from road"	OK		1. Adopted
136	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		52	Agriculture Commercial section		Word Doc List	Substantive	Add second bullet "Also includes uses or facilities that increase the value of agricultural produce over the cost of raw produce such as canning, drying, freezing, or packaging agricultural produce for the ultimate sale to customers"	Add additional bullet as suggested.		1. Adopted
137	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		53	3rd Bullet	last line	List of Comments	Critical	Place "perceived" after "size" and delete, "from 10 to 100s of acres."	Change to "vary in size"		2. Partially Adopted
138	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		53	last para	last sentence	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete last sentence	Change this sentence to reference future pages, "...see recommendations contained in the environmental resources section under topical plan elements."		2. Partially Adopted
139	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	53		Parks & Open Space	Written list of comments	Editorial	The last paragraph on this page that begins: "Future land use in Purcellville should reflect the town's existing character" seems to be out of place.	OK. Move first 2 sentences to page 43 and drop last sentence its no longer pertinent.	Insert this paragraph into Future Land Use on page 41 just before the paragraph that begins: "The Townwide Future Land Use Map..."	1. Adopted
140	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		54	2nd para	1st line	Word Doc List	Editorial	Delete first "detailed" and correct second "detailed" to read "details"			1. Adopted
141	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		54	all 3 paras		Word Doc List	Substantive	Move to bottom of page 55	Move text on page 55 to page 54 and combine. Make map bigger.		1. Adopted



Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
142	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	54		The Land Use Focus Areas	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "The community identified areas of Purcellville where opportunities exist to expand or elevate development to a level more consistent with the town's vision." "Expand or elevate" may be too strong a term in this context; the feeling I get from reading it is the same as "supersize". I don't think that's what the majority of the participants had in mind.	OK	Change to: "The community identified areas of Purcellville where opportunities enhance and facilitate development to a level consistent with the town's vision."	1. Adopted
143	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	54		The Land Use Focus Areas	Written list of comments	???	The document states: "Any future development will comply with environmental regulations, and the town will adopt new and innovative environmental instruments to enhance this aspect." I'm not clear as to what this means.	change "instruments" to "innovative environmental enhancement to support this aspect."	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	1. Adopted
144	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	54		The Land Use Focus Areas	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "The detailed maps provided for each area show the details of the future land use recommendation for that part of Purcellville."	OK. See comment 140.	Change to: "The detailed maps provided for each area show the details of the future land use recommendation for that part of Purcellville."	5. Considered and noted for record.
145	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		55	The Land Use Focus Area Map legend		Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete colors, use 2018 Land Use Map, with outlines around focus areas	Use a dotted outline instead of the filled in colors...identify the names with a number instead of color in the legend.		1. Adopted
146	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3	Hirst West	56	Intro para	5th Line	List of Comments	Editorial	Sentence states "The County's" ... this sounds too singular. Possibly change to "A County"	OK.		1. Adopted
147	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		56	Community Input		List of Comments	Administrative	Does this make sense? Does 56% of the survey takers want something else? Possibly open fields?	See comment 148.		5. Considered and noted for record.
148	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		56	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Reword to read, "The majority of community input focused on maintaining the industrial designation in the business park and the parks and open space designation along the South Fork of the Catoctin Creek. Specific comments about land use in this area indicated that industrial and commercial zoning is appropriate, and a desire to maintain the creek in a natural state."	OK		1. Adopted
149	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		56	Community Input			Substantive	Can we reinforce community input in another statement that actually makes sense to a first time reader? 44% noted industrial - so that means 56% noted other uses? 48% along the creek wanted a park and open space. Did the majority want to clear and pave?	See comment 148.		5. Considered and noted for record.
150	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66 and 68		Hirst West, et al	Written list of comments	Substantive	The document states: "The participants in the second round of input identified two primary desired uses in this area. Industrial 44 percent in the business park, and parks and open space 48 percent along the South Fork of the Catoctin Creek." There is no clear traceability to the documents that support this and similar findings for any of the focus areas.	No change.	I would like to see specific references incorporated into the Community Inputs for each of the focus areas; e.g., see <section> on page <#> of <document name> in Supporting Documents. As a "nice to have", I'd like to see a distinction between Purcellville and non-Purcellville resident comments if it is available.	5. Considered and noted for record.
151	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		57	2nd bullet		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change to read "Allow up to three story buildings"	Ok		1. Adopted
152	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	57		Hirst West	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within the Guiding Statement, the document states: "The Hirst-West area is a light industrial business park on a well-traversed roadway, which should receive special design consideration."	Delete the phrase, it already received special design consideration.	I would like to know what "special design consideration" means. I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	1. Adopted
153	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	57		Hirst West	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "Increase landscaping and tree planting throughout the development by requiring additional greenspace in parking lots and open spaces in site design requirements."	No change.	How can the Town encourage/force this to happen on existing properties? I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	5. Considered and noted for record.
154	E. Van Istendal	2/27/2018	Version 2.3	Hirst West	57	1st and 5th bullet				Bullet 1 states, "encourage redevelopment of sites with a predominance of surface parking..." whereas bullet 5 states, "seek to reduce surface parking in this area." Could be interpreted as a contradiction. Make more clear.	Change "development ON sites with a predominance of surface parking..."		1. Adopted
155	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		58	Community Input		List of Comments	Administrative	Does the dot thing help, hurt, or confuse? So does the survey indicate approximately 38% of the dot placers want only park and open space and 42% of dot placers want mixed use on same site? Then does that note only apply so site should be open space or only mixed use or 38% open space and 42% mixed use total or is there another 20% to do something with?	See comment 158.		5. Considered and noted for record.
156	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		58	General Recommendations	3rd bullet	List of Comments	Administrative	Regarding the use of "suitable" ... if we ask each PC ember the definition of suitable, I wonder how many version there would me?	Deleted see below.		1. Adopted
157	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		58	14th bullet		List of Comments	Editorial	Better words are listed. Shouldn't 3rd and 14th bullet be worded together?	Get rid of bullet on right column that reads "Provide substantial..."		1. Adopted

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
158	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		58	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change to read, "The participants in the second round of input favored Mixed-Use development and Parks & Open Space in this area." Remaining language should be unchanged	Add "The majority of participants...." as well as what was suggested by comment.		1. Adopted
159	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	58		Hirst East	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "The eastern portion of the Hirst Road Corridor sits between Hirst Road and North Maple Avenue."	OK	Change to: "The eastern portion of the Hirst Road Corridor sits between North Hatcher Avenue and North Maple Avenue."	1. Adopted
160	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		58				Substantive	According to the Community Input stated on page 58, commercial, industrial, and residential grouped together were recorded at smaller frequencies. So IF 80% of uses were Parks, Open Space, and Mixed Use, does that indicate to me that 20% total of 7% each of commercial, industrial, and residential make up the remainder of the 100% total? If so, we are making a land use recommendation based on 7% of survey to be apartments?	See Tips comments. No additional change.		5. Considered and noted for record.
161	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59			List of Comments	Critical	Similar comment to that on page 61 (i.e. Is the perimeter to be developed mixed use medium scale and parking lots to be developed something else? (shading issues)).	This is a blow up of the future land use map and should use same coloring... The parking lots and buildings and features shouldn't be a new color, but instead should just be an outline.....Colors shouldn't change based on the underlying objects.		1. Adopted
162	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59	Map		List of Comments	Critical	Do the tree shading and parking lot colors confuse the intent of the map? (Yes to me).	See comment above.		5. Considered and noted for record.
163	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	59		Hirst East	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Recommendations, the document states: "Improve pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between Hirst Road and Maple Avenue."	OK	Change to: "Improve pedestrian and vehicular connectivity between North Hatcher Avenue and Maple Avenue."	1. Adopted
164	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	59		Hirst East	Written list of comments	???	Observation/Question: It probably isn't within the Planning Commission's purview, but has/should something be said about the somewhat unsightly area on the south side of Hirst Road east of North Hatcher Avenue and west of the South Fork of Catoctin Creek that has been "under construction" for the past several years?	Not in the comp plan.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	3. Referred to Other Board / Commission for Action
165	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59			List of Comments		The Chapman site is graded based on (I assume) Town but (I assume) for sure County approved plans. I believe (assume) the graded building area on site is larger than shown on this plan. This plan shows a flood area in an area I assume is built (or planned) to not flood.		4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
166	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59			List of Comments	Critical	In areas zoned higher than our plan, what do we do to get this to work?	No change.		5. Considered and noted for record.
167	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59			List of Comments	Critical	Fix the color variations of brown.	See comment 161.		5. Considered and noted for record.
168	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59			List of Comments	Critical	Flood Zone is wrong.	No it's not.		5. Considered and noted for record
169	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		59			List of Comments	Critical	Should we do a better job on this area plan to make it a more viable proposal considering the existing zoning? Yes.	No change		5. Considered and noted for record
170	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		60	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change to read, "The participants in the second round of input showed a significant preference for mixed-use development in this area with a few recommendations for commercial, residential, and industrial." Last sentence remains unchanged	OK		1. Adopted
171	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61			List of Comments	Critical	Is the perimeter to be developed as multi family and the parking lots as single family?	Fix the colors to be clearer. See comment 161.		5. Considered and noted for record.
172	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61			List of Comments	Critical	I think not, fix colors. Don't color parking green areas and buildings at different colors, just denote outline.	See comment 161.		5. Considered an noted for record.
173	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	3rd Bullet	3rd line	List of Comments	Substantive	Add or reword, "maintain the front lawns and trees established" to the east along Main Street.	OK add.		1. Adopted
174	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61			List of Comments	Substantive	Add bullet reading, "provide a row of single family residential lots with 100 foot depths along east and north boundary of Area 1 and the south line of Area 2."	A buffer is already required by zoning ordinance. Agree with intent. No change.		5. Considered and noted for record
175	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Area 1, 1st bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Substitute retail for office.	OK		1. Adopted
176	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Area 1, 3rd bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Reword but at least, "Maintain existing residential structures" drop rest of words.	OK		1. Adopted
177	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	61		West End	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "Bury power lines along Route 7." Does this mean only in the focus area or all along Main Street, or throughout the town? Whatever the case, this would be a fairly expensive undertaking.	No change.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	5. Considered and noted for record
178	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	7th bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Delete "west". Just leave "east".	Delete everything after "main street corridor" i.e. drop the east/west part.		1. Adopted

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
179	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Area 1 3rd bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Drop "when possible"	See comment 176.		5. Considered and noted for record.
180	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Area 1 4th bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Drop after Purcellville "so there is a clear transition from town to county." The existing church and homes thereafter provide that transition.	OK		1. Adopted
181	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Map		List of Comments	Substantive	Delete words south of 7-Eleven reading "Potential Residential Development". It is what it is.	OK		1. Adopted
182	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Map?		List of Comments	Substantive	In Area 2, add in correct terms, move 7-Eleven entrance to west per VDOT standards.	OK.		1. Adopted
183	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Map?		List of Comments	Substantive	Delete entrances onto 32nd Street.	Not a change of the map... See comment 185 below.		5. Considered and noted for record.
184	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Area 1		List of Comments	Critical	Add bullet reading, "Provide single family residential lots along east and north perimeter of focus area to provide like lot size transition between existing residential and new redevelopment area. "	No change.		5. Considered and noted for record.
185	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		61	Area 2		List of Comments	Critical	Add bullet reading, "Delete any vehicular access onto 32nd Street."	OK		1. Adopted
186	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		62	Figure 149		List of Comments	Editorial	Captioned wrong. It's termite place? Better photo from street level.	Fix.		1. Adopted
187	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		62	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change to read, "The participants in the second round of input showed a clear preference for Mixed-Use development in this area. A minority input indicated a desire for parks and open space in this area specifically in the tear drop, and parcels along N. 23rd Street. Input also indicated that one to three story buildings were highly preferred in this area with a mix of retail and entertainment uses that would be family friendly. There was also a strong preference for maintaining the character of buildings downtown."	OK		1. Adopted
188	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		63	1st bullet		List of Comments	Administrative	While I agree the store is important, aren't all along Main important? Name the "hardware store"(Nichols Hardware or correct name). If White Palace and Nichols important, than so is Catoclin Dis.	Remove references to actual businesses. Remove all after "architecture" "character" in Guiding Statement AND bullets.		1. Adopted
189	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		63	Focus Area Map		Word Doc List	Substantive	Redraw the outline to include tear drop	North of parking lot, south of church.		1. Adopted
190	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	63		Downtown South Focus Area Map	Written list of comments	Critical	Although, with recent changes, our property is no longer in the Downtown Focus Area, it is mischaracterized in the Downtown South Focus Area map as Mixed Use Neighborhood Scale.	See comment 120.	As in the comment about page 42, Future Land Use Map: "Our property should be characterized as Single Family Detached Traditional, which agrees with the rest of the residences in our neighborhood."	5. Considered and noted for the record.
191	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		63	3rd Bullet			Substantive	Need wider than "30 foot wide".	Change to read "Similar to the exiting...  Also add 21st Street to the north of the merge with 23rd street. Add label to map.		1. Adopted
192	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		63	4th Bullet			Substantive	Dash in whole area zoned - the no more than 3 stories should/could/does apply on main, Hatcher, etc.?	Fixed by other comment.		5. Considered and noted for record.
193	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		64	1st para	5th line	List of Comments	Editorial	Reads, "This area is more accessible by car...". OK, but I walk to there several times per week and not a walkability issue.	Delete this sentence.		1. Adopted
194	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		64	Figure 153 and 155		List of Comments	Administrative	Trying to show slope right to left and left to right. The area has front to rear, so why show the Southern States and gray building which are graded and mostly flat?	Swap out photos.		1. Adopted
195	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		64	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Reword to read, "The participants in the second round focused mostly on the properties with frontage on 21st Street indicating a strong preference for mixed-use on these sites. Several comments suggested that the charm of downtown should be extended north along 21st Street."	OK		1. Adopted
196	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	64		Downtown North	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Existing Area Features, the document states: "Addressing parking for the businesses." This is not a feature; I am not sure what was intended here.	Remove bullet.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	1. Adopted
197	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	64		Downtown North	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Community Input, the document states: "The participants in the second round focused mostly on the properties with frontage on 21st Street indicating a strong preference for mixed-use on these sites. Eighty six percent of the suggestions were for mixed-use." As stated in my comment about page 10, In Phase 2: Research & Analysis, I think it is not clear whether the participants were thinking about vertically-separated mixed use or horizontally-separated mix of uses.	No change. see above.	I would like to see a clarification or distinction between mixed use and mix of uses if there is one to be made here. Personally, I am having a little difficulty envisioning vertical residential/commercial mixed use here. I could see different shades of commercial/office/restaurant uses that are horizontally-separated.	5. Considered and noted for record
198	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		64	3rd Bullet		List of Comments	Substantive	Reads, "Addressing parking for the businesses.". I think it's a non issue in this area. If asking for another public parking area for south, then say that.	See comment 196.		5. Considered and noted for record
199	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		66	1st para	lines 4 & 5	Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "...but the auto-oriented design does not match the town's desired character"	No change.		5. Considered and noted for record

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
200	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		66	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change to read, "The participants in the second round of input indicated that mixed-use redevelopment would be ideal in this location. The comments indicated..." the rest remains unchanged	OK		1. Adopted
201	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		65	General Recs, 5th Bullet		List of Comments	Critical	Revise to read, "Manage change and preserve the Dillon House	OK but keep "and it's immediate environment".		1. Adopted
202	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		65	Area 1, 2nd bullet		List of Comments	Critical	What does this say? Possibly yes/ok, more information please.	Change to "Re-examine zoning to better reflect current use and development pattern"		1. Adopted
203	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		65	Area 2, 1st bullet		List of Comments	Critical	Revise to read, "Encourage infill opportunities...."	Ok		1. Adopted
204	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		65	Last 2 bullets		List of Comments	Critical	Revise to read, "Encourage storefronts or office building at a scale similar to and continue the character of downtown along 21st Street."	Ok		1. Adopted
205	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		66	Community Input		List of Comments	Editorial	Reads, "mixed use redevelopment would be ideal". With a 3% change to 49%, would this still be true?	See comment 200.		5. Considered and noted for record
206	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		66	Community Input		List of Comments	Administrative	I am still tripping on wording about community input. I believe it's super important but don't like to quote numbers based on half of 1% of population responded.	See comment 200 and 211.		5. Considered and noted for record.
207	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	66		East Main	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within the introduction to East Main, the document states: "This area includes the town's larger-format retail and office uses and has a predominantly auto-oriented design." Within existing Area Features, the document states: "Existing automobile oriented design." Within Recommendations, the document states: "Consider the feasibility or desirability of continued auto-oriented uses with drive-thrus in this area."	OK	Change to "automobile-oriented" throughout the document.	1. Adopted
208	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	66		East Main	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Community Input, the document states: "The participants in the second round of input indicated that mixed-use redevelopment would be ideal in this location with 52 percent of the input, the comments indicated a desire for some retail/apartment mixed use buildings, as well as improved green space within the development." I think it's missing a period.  And what did the remaining 48% suggest?	See comment 200.	Change to: "The participants in the second round of input indicated that mixed-use redevelopment would be ideal in this location. With 52 percent of the input, the comments indicated a desire for some retail/apartment mixed use buildings, as well as improved green space within the development."	5. Considered and noted or record.
209	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	67		East Main	Written list of comments	Administrative	The document states: "Use the size, design, and mix of uses of the commercial buildings on the south side of Main Street to the west of Maple Avenue ...". The font size of the red text is too large.	OK	Make the font all the same size.	1. Adopted
210	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		67	6th bullet			Substantive	Study Landscaping - services to lower zones adequate? Interior parking currently is dangerous in front parking lot at Shoppes at Main & Maple (Leaves off now so view is only reduced, in summer, totally blocked until pull car half way out into the travel lane).	Not really related... more of a maintenance issue.... No change. Defer to Version 3.	4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
211	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		68	Community Input		Word Doc List	Substantive	Reword to read, "The participants in the second round of input identified a cluster of use and scale inputs around the four quadrants of the roundabout. The input presents diverse opinion on what should be here, excluding the main part of the Crooked Run Orchard property, which is predominately identified for open space. In the East End area, the majority of responses were for open space followed by mixed-use and residential land use."	Add note to page 54 reiterating the actual number of respondents / participation in the activities. Reference the input attachment.		1. Adopted
212	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	The Land Use Plan	68, 69		East End	Written list of comments	Critical	Within Community Input, the document states: "In the East End area, 38 percent of the responses were for open space, 26 percent for mixed use, 12 percent for commercial, and 12 percent residential." Within the Recommendations for Area 3, the document states: "The size of available property in Area 3 at the southeast quadrant offers an opportunity for a compact two to three story mixed-use office or residential development with some support commercial uses."  And what did the remaining 12% suggest?	See Tip's comment. Say "small footprint agricultural opportunities" in the bullet in Area 3.	These two statements contradict each other in that the Plan seems to emphasize development over open space in Area 3 - contrary to much of the community's input. I don't take the community's input to mean that 38 percent of the entire East End area should be designated as open space. I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	2. Partially Adopted
213	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		69	Map	Area 2 and Area 3	List of Comments	Critical	Might need stronger words and specifics. I will work on words using Crooked Run as a starting point, but no where Catocin Corner is.		4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
214	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		69	6th bullet		List of Comments	Editorial	Regarding pedestrian and vehicular access.... Its a part of site plans I believe (different than SE, but done).		4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
215	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		69	8th bullet		List of Comments	Administrative	Regarding dumpsters, etc., Can the PC proposed a ZO amendment now, separate from this plan review?	Yes. No change to comp plan, however.		3. Referred to Other Board / Commission for Action
216	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		69	Map		List of Comments	Administrative	Does the flood zone demarcation go to the +/- correct point in Crooked Run?	Yes it aligns with 2017 FEMA map.		5. Considered and noted for record

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
217	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3	East End	69	Focus Area Map		Email to E. Goodrich	Critical	2nd bullet has the better description of what is meant by Agricultural Business. The word "rural" is not used in the bullet under "Area 2." <u>Suggestion:</u> Agricultural Commercial will temper development density and restrict large scale mix use commercial while still offering innovative plans for enterprise. With a little ingenuity, the town can enhance its businesses in these areas without sacrificing the traditional environment Purcellville residents want to sustain. Choices that could work and flourish with this land use include: all farm-use business (such as CSAs); small inns, breweries, wineries, equestrian facilities, product market, and fresh-and-local restaurant -- just to name a few.	Add this language to the definition on page 52.		1. Adopted
218	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		69	Area 2		Word Doc List	Substantive	Reword to read, "Consider small scale agriculture-commercial development..."	Ok		1. Adopted
219	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		69	Area 3		Word Doc List	Substantive	Reword to read, "The size of available property in Area 3 at the southeast quadrant offers an opportunity for diverse agriculture-commercial opportunities"	OK use the small footprint language from comment 212.		1. Adopted
220	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		69	Area 2 & 3			Critical	Need to be re-written.	See above, no additional changes.		5. Considered and noted for record
221	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		72	last para		Word Doc List	Editorial	Reword to stipulate "revenue tax base" and "tax revenue" throughout para	OK. Comment aims to clarify that its not the land area its the tax REVENUE.		1. Adopted
222	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	72		Economic Development	Written list of comments	Editorial	I do not disagree with the statement that the town's goal is: "to be closer to 70 percent residential and 30 percent commercial." I would like to point out that commercial development does not have to be something with a dedicated building and street-side presence. I operated a consulting business for 30 years from my house and because of the nature of the business (i.e., providing esoteric IT services to the Federal government), the business was generating over \$8M in revenue and having virtually no negative impact on the town (the majority of the work being done in the DC metro area). Its positive impact was the tax paid to Purcellville on the revenue.	See comment 221.	I don't know how to state or emphasize this in the Comprehensive Plan, but it would be nice to say that commercial development doesn't always mean a bricks-and-mortar presence. With the right idea, any of the single family and multi-family land uses could support "home-based" businesses that could generate significant income for their proprietors and substantial tax revenue for the town while presenting little or no demand for town services and having little or no negative impact on their neighbors.	5. Considered and noted for record
223	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	75		Services And Facilities	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "The local Purcellville community incurs most of the costs, as due to the demographics, they lack qualification for most federal grants and hardship."	OK	Change to: "However, Purcellville's demographics don't allow it to qualify for most federal grants or hardships, resulting in the Purcellville community having to incur most of the costs."	1. Adopted
224	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	76		Services And Facilities	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "7. Require all applicants for rezoning to a substantially more intensive use to analyze the capacity of the town's water system to meet peak demand flows and fire flows, so as to determine if adequate capacity exists to meet the increased demand on the distribution system." I think the burden is on the applicant to provide good engineering estimates of water consumption, and on the town to determine if there will be adequate water system capacity.  Is there a way to define "substantially more intensive use"?		Change to: "7. Require that all applicants requesting a rezoning to a substantially more intensive use provide technically adequate <a href="#">(may need more work on wording here)</a> estimates of their proposed use's water demands. This will enable the town to analyze the ability of the entire water system to meet peak demand flows and fire flows and thereby determine if adequate capacity exists to meet the proposed use's increased demands on the distribution system."  4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
225	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	76		Services And Facilities	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "8. Require all applicants for rezoning to a substantially more intensive use to conduct a capacity analysis of the town's wastewater system to demonstrate that the project can be adequately served by the wastewater collection system." As for Recommendation #7 (above), I think the burden is on the applicant to provide good engineering estimates of wastewater generation, and on the town to determine if there will be adequate wastewater system capacity.  As above, is there a way to define "substantially more intensive use"?		Change to: "8. Require that all applicants requesting a rezoning to a substantially more intensive use provide technically adequate <a href="#">(may need more work on wording here)</a> estimates of their proposed use's wastewater demands. This will enable the town to analyze the ability of the entire wastewater system and thereby determine if adequate capacity exists to meet the proposed use's increased demands on the wastewater system."  4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
226	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	76		Services And Facilities	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "9. Coordinate public improvement projects to bury existing utility lines underground when feasible, and require all utilities to be buried in new development and redevelopment." Can we really require all utilities to be buried in redevelopment, particularly when the redeveloped property is infill in nature?	No change.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.  4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
227	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	77		Services And Facilities	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "13. Study the feasibility and costs associated with the relocation of the police station, and determine if a new location needs to be acquired or an existing facility adapted." I have no argument with this, but this recommendation to relocate the police station seems to "come out of left field; I see no substantiation for this anywhere in the document.	No change	Substantiate this recommendation.  4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
228	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		78	Figure 176		List of Comments	Administrative	Do we need to show a 4 story portion/photo of apartments. Further back it's 3 story.	Swap this a photo with one showing the 3 story part of this development at the front, not the 4 story rear.		1. Adopted

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
229	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		78	4th para	1st line	Word Doc List	Substantive	Add at the beginning, "In accordance with Commonwealth requirements..."	Ok add this. Be sure to use consistent wording with the remainder of the document however ("state code" vs. "Commonwealth")		1. Adopted
230	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	78		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Purcellville's housing stock is a blend of historic residence and a significant supply of new family oriented housing."	Change "family-oriented" to "recently constructed"	Change to: "Purcellville's housing stock is a blend of historic residence and a significant supply of new family-oriented housing."	2. Partially Adopted
231	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	78		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "Larger lot sizes for residential single-family development in the neighboring areas of Loudoun County mean a decrease in density and walkability, ..."	This sentence is long and maybe could be reworked. Revise to: "...mean a decrease in density, and that may have otherwise remained.... Contributes to the loss of greenspace and rural character of the surrounding areas."	Change to: "Larger lot sizes for residential single-family development in the neighboring areas of Loudoun County mean an increase in density and a decrease in walkability, ..." I think this is what was meant?	2. Partially Adopted
232	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		79	6th rec		Email to E. Goodrich	Administrative	"Universal Design" is this a style manual? Proper - noun name of a book? Make more clear.	No change.	4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
233	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		79	item #2 and item # 5		Word Doc List	Substantive	Change "Enhancement Areas" in both items to "Focus Areas"	Yes - all instances.		1. Adopted
234	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	79		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Substantive	The term "enhancement area" appears in a few places in the document, most significantly in the Housing and Neighborhoods Recommendations, but it is not adequately defined or illustrated anywhere.	See comment 233.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern.	1. Adopted
235	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	79		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "4. Evaluate the town's Zoning Ordinance and permitting processes to determine if there are any obstacles that could be removed to make renovation and redevelopment of existing housing more affordable." I don't doubt that obstacles exist, but are we able to cite an example of such an obstacle?	No change.	I do not have a suggested "fix" for this concern. 4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered an Noted For Record
236	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	79		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Recommendations, the document states: "6. Encourage the use of Universal Design building techniques which utilize a broad-spectrum of ideas to produce buildings that are inherently accessible to everyone, regardless of their age or ability." This is the only place in the document where "Universal Design building techniques" appears.	See comment 232. No change.	Provide a citation (URL?) here and/or a more detailed description in an appendix. 4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
237	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	79		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "8. Evaluate the Zoning Ordinance's regulations for accessory dwelling units to determine whether the regulations should be changed to allow these units as options for extended family or rental units within neighborhoods." I have no argument with this, but this recommendation to evaluate accessory dwelling units seems to "come out of left field; I see no substantiation for this anywhere in the document.	No change.	Substantiate this recommendation. 4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
238	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	79		Housing and Neighborhoods	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Recommendations, the document states: "9. Collaborate with Loudoun County on the land use policies managing growth in and around the town."	Remove "in" should just be "around town" then include " to ensure planning priorities policies remain in alignment."	Change to: "9. Collaborate with Loudoun County on land use policies in the town and its surrounding area to ensure planning priorities and policies remain in alignment."	2. Partially Adopted
239	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	80		Historical Resources	Written list of comments	Administrative	The Aberdeen Property map and the Historic Features map seem to me to be in the wrong order.	OK	Interchange the two graphics.	1. Adopted
240	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		81	#8		List of Comments	Administrative	I assume this is adjacent to Village Case. If so, please state.	Ok add "adjacent to village case"		1. Adopted
241	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		82	Map		List of Comments	Administrative	I like map idea, but I can't tell the difference in pin markers (especially on the map).	Make this map bigger.... And clearer.		1. Adopted
242	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		84	Figure 185		List of Comments	Administrative	I like photo, but if not located in Town, can it be stated here possibly on other photos also).	Use photo of swale in over by tabernacle in place of this photo.  In other instances (example) is used to indicate out-of-town photos.		2. Partially Adopted
243	M. Bennett	2/20/2018	Version 2.3		87	Map		Email to E. Goodrich	Substantive	Norther Collector Road is no longer? Eliminate. O Street no longer? Eliminate.	Add (County) after "Proposed collector" in the legend since the County has not removed this from their list of projects. Remove the O street connection (the little black T in the map).		1. Adopted
244	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		88	#8			Critical	Add, "Review and update ZO as appropriate" after 12.	Already says to do this in item #16.	4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
245	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Topical Plan Elements	89		Roadway And Vehicular Recommendations	Written list of comments	Editorial	The document states: "14. Improve connectivity and safety for all users of town streets by adopting traffic calming options including the following : • Frequent marked pedestrian crossings, • Short block lengths, • Street trees, • On-street parking, • Roundabouts or traffic-circles, • Raised or textured crosswalks, • Bump-outs, or • Street jogs"	OK	Change to: "14. Improve connectivity and safety for all users of town streets by adopting traffic calming options including but not limited to the following : • Frequent marked pedestrian crossings • Short block lengths • Street trees • On-street parking • Roundabouts or traffic-circles • Raised or textured crosswalks • Bump-outs • Street jogs"	1. Adopted
246	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		89	#12		List of Comments	Critical	Revise ZO to define (reduce) ability to use private streets in R-3 and R-3A zones (this is specific to an area and should be said even though Item 16 is listed).	No change		1. Adopted



Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
247	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	93		Tools: Regulations, Handbooks and Guidelines	Written list of comments	Substantive	The document states: "While this plan is an adopted guide for the future, the recommendations rely on an update of the Zoning Ordinance for enforcement. The town's Zoning Ordinance is the most direct mechanism to implement the land use recommendations of the plan." Correspondence between new land use districts and existing zonings? Do we need new or amended districts? Zoning ordinance. Implementation recommendation.	No change. Don't need to talk zoning.	A table that shows the proposed land uses and the current zonings available to them should be included in this Comprehensive Plan. Recommended changes to these zonings, or indeed, changes or additions to the proposed land uses would be very helpful, if not in his document, then as one of the first things to be done after its approval.  4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and noted for record.
248	R. Trivedi, VDOT	1/29/2018	Version 1	Transportation & Mobility	95		General	Email to E. Goodrich	No Change	After reviewing the Transportation and Mobility portion of the 2018 Town Comprehensive Plan Draft, we find the Recommendations contained therein generally appropriate.	No change.		5. Considered and noted for record
249	R. Trivedi, VDOT	1/29/2018	Version 1	Transportation & Mobility	95		General	Email to E. Goodrich	Administrative	The current update doesn't include an update to the transportation plan. It identifies some of the needs for more bike / ped friendly facilities in the town and recommends to begin the update of the Transportation Plan within the next 18 months. The Town should coordinate with VDOT and conduct a scoping meeting prior to beginning the update of the transportation plan to ensure that the Chapter 870 requirements are addressed and VDOT can review to address the Homeland Security emergency evacuation and Chapter 536 requirements.	Update of the Transportation Plan is a priority of the Comprehensive Plan.		2. Partially Adopted
250	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	96		Collaboration And Community Building Efforts	Written list of comments	Substantive	Although it has been stated or alluded to elsewhere in the document, I would like to see this paragraph "beefed up", emphasizing that Purcellville <u>must</u> engage with the County to ensure that any future growth of Purcellville coincides with the availability of adequate public utilities and does not create negative effects for the town.	Ok add his sentence "Purcellville must..." but change to "future growth outside of Purcellville's boundaries coincides with..."	I do not have a suggested <u>specific</u> "fix" for this concern.	2. Partially Adopted
251	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	96		Funding And Revenue Sources	Written list of comments	Substantive	Under Other Local Taxes, the list includes "Town Business License". In my view, I think there is an opportunity for the town to increase its business license revenue. Perhaps some types of businesses can afford to pay higher rates. For example, my LLC (a Professional Service) just paid \$138 on \$81K gross receipts; I could easily pay more. If my rate was, say \$0.50/\$100, my tax would have been \$405; certainly wouldn't break the bank. Purcellville's coffers would be \$267 fuller (three times more!). Now multiply by, say 50 similar businesses, the Town gets \$13,350 more. ["Back-of-the-envelope" disclaimer goes here.] Here is the current Purcellville business tax rate table:	In first paragraph add, reviewed annually...." and then add business license/fee bullet. Or something....	Add a recommendation that the town undertake a study to determine whether changes can be made	1. Adopted
252	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	96		Funding And Revenue Sources	Written list of comments	Substantive	<u>Continued from above:</u> How are these rates determined? Can the rates be changed? If it's possible to adjust these rates, then maybe the Town could analyze the business license reports and come up with some new strawman rates (some of which could even be lower than they are now) and then socialize them with the business community and solicit their input. Some of these businesses may be able to pass some or all of these marginal increases on to their customers, as I could through a slightly and substantiably (new word!) increased overhead rate. Perhaps home-based businesses could have a lower rate than brick-and-mortar businesses that usually require more service.  What are other jurisdictions doing? We don't need to drive businesses away by increasing these taxes unreasonably, but we also don't need to be "giving it away". For example, Arlington County's tax rate for professional services is \$0.58/\$100 revenue, and Loudoun County's rate is \$0.33/\$100 revenue. On the one hand, Purcellville could advertise lower business tax rates and thereby hope to gain more revenue from businesses moving here, but on the other hand, we could raise our tax rats selectively (as suggested above) and increase our revenue in the short term.	see above.		5. considered and noted for record.

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
253	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	97		Initial Action Prioritization	Written list of comments	Editorial	Under Short Term Efforts, the document states that the timeframe for this effort would be: "Start in the next six months and complete within twenty-four months". Because of the near-term nature of this work and its importance, I would like to see prospective "soft" dates added to the individual items.	No change.	I do not have suggested <u>specific</u> dates for this concern. 4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
254	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	97		Initial Action Prioritization	Written list of comments	Critical	Under Continuation of Current Efforts, the document states: "Collaborate with Loudoun County to ensure planning priorities and policies are aligning", but under Short Term Efforts, Mid Term Efforts and Long-Range, nothing further is said about the town's ongoing engagement with the County. I believe constructive collaboration with the County will be critical to Purcellville being able to achieve its stated goals (see page 8 of the Comprehensive Plan), one of which is: "The town must work with Loudoun County and adjacent incorporated towns to preserve the scenic, natural and rural landscape surrounding the town that is as much a part of our identity as the town itself." In other words, keeping Purcellville Purcellville.  From the town's perspective, the 2017 Code of Virginia, Title 15.2 - Counties, Cities and Towns, Chapter 22 - Planning, Subdivision of Land and Zoning, §15.2-2211. Cooperation of local planning commissions and other agencies states: "The planning commission of any locality may cooperate with local planning commissions or legislative and administrative bodies and officials of other localities so as to coordinate planning and development among the localities."  From the County's perspective, the 2017 Code of Virginia, Title 15.2 - Counties, Cities and Towns, Chapter 22 - Planning, Subdivision of Land and Zoning, §15.2-2231. Inclusion of incorporated towns in county plan; inclusion of adjacent unincorporated territory in municipal plan states: "Any county plan may include planning of incorporated towns to the extent to which, in the county local planning commission's judgment, it is related to planning of the unincorporated territory of the county as a	Add bulletin under each short/mid/and long term efforts and put the last sentence there that was suggested reading "maintain engagement...."	Under Short Term Efforts, add: "Identify the specific geographic areas outside of the town limits that are of joint interest to the town and the County, and engage with the County on cooperatively planning uses in these areas and devising a mutual stewardship arrangement." Under both Mid Term Efforts and Long-Range, add: "Maintain engagement with the County to ensure planning priorities and policies are aligning."	2. Partially Adopted
255	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		98	3rd para	1st line	Word Doc List	Editorial	Delete "Predicting the future is impossible."	Ok		1. Adopted
256	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	98		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Document Maintenance, the document states: "The comprehensive plan is a document with a long-term vision that looks ten to twenty years into the future."	No change.	Change to: "The comprehensive plan is a document with a long-term vision that looks ten years or longer into the future."	1. Adopted
257	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	99		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Document Maintenance, the document states: "It is a long-term document and the official policy of the town in these matters."	OK	Change to: "It is a long-term "living" document and the official policy of the town in these matters."	1. Adopted
258	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	99		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Annual Review, the document states: "This annual review would be well timed with the annual budgeting cycle to coordinate capital improvements and other programs with the goals of the plan."	No - we cant tell mayor what to write.	Change to: "This annual review would be well timed with the annual budgeting cycle to coordinate capital improvements and other programs with the goals of the plan, and the results should be included in annual State of the Town presentations." 4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
259	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	99		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Editorial	Within Five-Year Review And Update, the document states: "For these reasons, Virginia requires local plans to be reviewed every five years."	No change.	Change to: "For these reasons, Virginia requires local plans to be <u>formally</u> reviewed every five years."	1. Adopted
260	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	101		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Acceptable Reasons To Amend The Plan, the document states: "2. An unforeseen county, state, or federal project which will impact the town. The town will initiate a comprehensive plan amendment to adjust for any unforeseen project(s) by another jurisdiction that may affect land use within the town or render any portion of the document inaccurate or incomplete."	OK, but "as required or by legal statute" no "superior jurisdiction"	Change to: "2. An unforeseen county, state, or federal project which will impact the town. The town will initiate a comprehensive plan amendment to adjust for any unforeseen project(s) by another jurisdiction that may affect land use within the town or render any portion of the document inaccurate or incomplete as required or legally directed by a superior jurisdiction." <a href="#">(Do not use about the proper wording here.)</a>	2. Partially Adopted
261	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		101	Acceptable Reasons to Amend the Plan		Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete "Acceptable" in title	OK		1. Adopted
262	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		101	last sentence on page		Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete line	OK		1. Adopted
263	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	101		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Acceptable Reasons To Amend The Plan, the document states: "4. A boundary line adjustment request. In the event that a property owner of land outside of the town's current jurisdiction would like to petition the Town for a boundary line adjustment for services, the town's future land use map will need to be amended to address the area, in conjunction with and before a zoning designation is made."	No change.	Change to: "4. A boundary line adjustment request. In the event that a property owner of land outside of the town's current jurisdiction petitions the Town for a boundary line adjustment for services, and the property owner's conceptual plan is approved, a comprehensive plan amendment may be required and the town's land use map may need to be amended to address the area, both before and in conjunction with a zoning designation is made." 4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
264	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	101		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Acceptable Reasons To Amend The Plan, the document states: "5. A Rezoning Request, if applicable. If a property owner of land within the town's jurisdiction would like to petition the town to rezone their property, a comprehensive plan amendment may be required in addition to the rezoning if the proposed zoning does not align with the future land use designation for the property."	No change.	Change to: "5. A Rezoning Request, if applicable. If a property owner of land within the town's jurisdiction petitions the town to rezone their property, and the property owner's conceptual plan is approved, a comprehensive plan amendment may be required in addition to the rezoning if the proposed zoning does not align with the land use designation for the property."  4/26 WS - Agreed no edit.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
265	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	101		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Substantive	Within Acceptable Reasons To Amend The Plan, the document states: "6. Annexation: the future land use of any annexation considered should remain consistent with the Loudoun County future land use designation applicable to the property when under county jurisdiction." I do not know why an annexation would need to be consistent with the County's land use designation, especially if Purcellville and the property owner(s) have agreed to a less impactful land use than the County's designation.	Add " If annexation appears to be prudent or necessary, the future land use..." but end at black "County". Exclude red text at end and exclude the red sentence about the Purcellville residents.	Change to: "6. Annexation. Purcellville's residents have expressed that further growth of population and geography would hinder its ability to continue being a small town. However, in any particular case should annexation appear to be prudent or necessary, the future land use of any annexation considered should remain consistent with the Loudoun County and/or the Purcellville land use designation(s) as agreed to by the County, Purcellville and the property owner(s)."	2. Partially Adopted
266	Ed Neham	2/10/2018	Version 2.3	Implementation	102		Maintaining The Plan	Written list of comments	Substantive	Preceded by the statement (on the bottom of page 101) "The process described on page 100 (note that this should have been page 102 in the current version) applies to a boundary line adjustment request process.", the document includes a separate page/figure (as an example?) titled: "How To Apply For A Comprehensive Plan Amendment For A Boundary Line Adjustment (Annexation)". I think this detailed example is not needed (and could possibly be misleading).	See comment 267.	Remove the figure titled "How To Apply For A Comprehensive Plan Amendment For A Boundary Line Adjustment (Annexation)". The existing figure titled "Amendment Process" is adequate.	5. Considered and Noted for Record
267	T. Stinnette	2/19/2018	Version 2.3		102 and 103			Word Doc List	Substantive	Delete both pages	Delete		1. Adopted
268	C. Paciulli	2/26/2018	Version 2.3		103			List of Comments	Administrative	Ouch! Really? I like the steps layered out but how does this fit with our statement to look inside existing borders. Is there a way to keep?	Delete. See comment 267.		5. Considered and Noted for Record
290.1	P. Crown on behalf of B. O'Toole	3/30/2018	Version 2.3	East End	24/69	General	General	Letter Via Email	Substantive	On behalf of Beverly F. O'Toole, owner of approximately 12.32 acres of land located at the southeast quadrant of Berlin Turnpike/Druhan Boulevard (Routes 287/16010) and West Colonial Highway (Business Route 7), identified in the Loudoun County Land Records as PIN#453-28-4755 and #453-28-2415 (the "O'Toole Property"), we hereby request that the land use designation for the Property be changed from the Low Density Residential designation in the current Purcellville Comprehensive plan to a medium commercial scale designation that provides for a mix of uses such as retail, office, service, lodging, restaurants, and senior housing.	Thank you for your comment. The suggested planned land use of Agricultural-Commercial remains an appropriate future land use for this area and aims to balance the citizenry's desire to maintain open space and the agricultural heritage of Purcellville, with the property owners desire for revenue generation.  The Planning Commission is continuing to define and refine the vision for this area and will provide the community additional opportunities to comment through the public hearing process. Please continue to follow the conversation.		5. Considered and Noted for Record
290.2	P. Crown (on behalf of B. O'Toole	3/30/2018	Version 2.3	East End	42/69	General	General	Letter Via Email	Substantive	Version 2.3 of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Draft, dated February 13, 2018, (the "Draft Plan") designates the Property for agricultural commercial uses. The Draft Plan describes this land use category appropriate for land within the Town that "reflects the character for agriculturally productive land within the town and allows for commercial enterprises on agriculturally used land." While this agriculture land use designation may be appropriate for larger parcels within the town that are currently in farm production, it is inappropriate for the 12.32 acre O'Toole property which is: (1) located along two major transportation corridors, (2) bisected by an environmental corridor, (3) within the East Main Street corridor, and (4) at the Gateway to the Town. The Gateway area of the Town has previously been identified appropriate for use that will provide opportunities for the town to continue to attract consumer spending to its Main Street corridor (Town Plan, page 60).	See Comment 290.1		5. Considered and Noted for Record
290.3	P. Crown (on behalf of B. O'Toole	3/30/2018	Version 2.3	Economic Development	72	General	General	Letter Via Email	Substantive	More importantly, the town has promoted land use policies that will provide for a balance of housing and commercial uses that will achieve a real estate tax revenue ratio of at least 30 percent from commercial uses and no more than 70 percent from residential uses. As indicated on page 72 of the Draft Plan, "currently the town is at about 79 percent residential and 21 percent commercial tax revenue. The goal is to be closer to 70 percent residential and 30 percent commercial to create a more sustainable tax base for the provision of town services." Designation of the O'Toole Property for low density agricultural commercial uses will remove an important economic development opportunity for the town, place further strain on town services and place a greater burden on residential tax payers in the town. We request that Planning Commission reevaluate the proposed land use designation for the O'Toole Property and recognize its strategic importance to the town to implement its goal to balance the residential and commercial revenue.	See Comment 290.1		5. Considered and Noted for Record

Overall Comment	Reviewer Name	Date Comment Made	Document Version (Date)	Location in Document (V2.3)	Page Number (V2.3)	Paragraph (V2.3)	Line Number (V2.3)	Medium	Change Type	Comment / Requested Change	Planning Commission Response to Comment	PC Recommendation (Specific Change/Language)	Agreed Upon Action
-----------------	---------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	------------------	-----------------------	--------	-------------	----------------------------	---	--	--------------------

*PC = Planning Commission  
PS = Patrick Sullivan  
EG = Erin Goodrich  
BAR=Board of Architectural Review  
PRAB=Parks and Recreation Advisory Board  
TESC=Tree and Environment Sustainability Committee  
TS = Tony Scheffler*