

HOLMES RUN ACRES POTENTIAL HOD POLL
OPEN ENDED COMMENTS RECEIVED
8/1/2022 – 9/9/2022

Comments: If you'd like, please share any additional thoughts about the potential Historic Overlay District for Holmes Run Acres.

My wife and I are strongly in favor of an HOD in HRA. Thanks for all your hard work on this study!

It is something that need to happen. Some things should be preserved for the future - especially as unique as HRA.

I feel it was not clear to many HRA residents when we voted for a study in 2019 how the entire process would unfold; that at the end of the study we would not be able to vote "Yes" or "No" on the HOD, but that the decision would be made by the FFX Board of Supervisors, not the residents of HRA. Now, that we've seen the guidelines and learned more about how it will affect a homeowner's ability to make changes to their own home, I would definitely vote against an HOD.

I initially voted yes on the study mistakenly believing we would have another opportunity to decide as a community whether the HOD would actually pass or not. It was sold as a way to prevent McMansions, and only that. After seeing the guidelines, there is a large amount of subjectively aesthetic and "nitpicky" regulations that are no longer in the spirit of this eclectic neighborhood. I am now strongly opposed to the HOD believe many more neighbors would be as well if they new the details.

I would like for the county to consider how to revise the guidelines to encourage architectural creativity within the context of midcentury architecture. I am concerned that the ARB has too much authority to enforce matters of taste and will therefore stifle the creative additions and renovations that the neighborhood currently features.

We specifically sought out this neighborhood and feel strongly that the houses and overall neighborhood should be preserved to retain the character while allowing for tasteful updates in the original architectural style. We feel the HOD is necessary and we support it.

I want fewer laws and rules. I want to have more power over my own property. I don't want others limiting my decisions.

I hope that the BOS does not vote in favor of this HOD. We have a nice community already and this HOD is turning neighbors against each other and breaking he "family" this neighborhood used to be.

I am very supportive of the Historic Overlay District for Holmes Run Acres. It is the best way to save the unique character of neighborhood from being destroyed by greedy developers. Please protect this historic neighborhood from tear downs replaced by McMansions, which are so commonplace in the rest of Northern Virginia!

After three years you generated 118 pages and countless pages stuck behind links. If you can't make it simple for the neighbors to inform themselves on this issue, how can we expect you to make the application process simple? You've overdone this thing, and I shudder to think it's our tax dollars that paid for it.

The notion of a historic overlay district was initially proposed to residents as a way to prevent encroachment of "mcmansions" in the neighborhood. I originally supported this goal, but the guidelines as currently drafted go well beyond what is necessary to achieve that goal. As a result, my wife and I no longer support the idea of an HOD in the acres.

<p>I was on the working group and departed due to the lack of ability to tailor an approach and guidelines for HRA. The guidelines are far reaching beyond what was intended and we were informed that the state and national standards drive the content. Inflexibility at a local level firmed a no vote for me.</p>
<p>The guidelines have gotten completely out of hand, and the community is largely unaware of what they are as well as how they are being applied in practice in Hollin Hills.</p>
<p>In viewing the list of non-contributing homes, I find that I visually appreciate the design choices in many. They reflect the quiriness of the neighborhood. As a one-year resident of HRA, I deliberately purchased in a MCM neighborhood with no HOA or HOD, and am starting construction shortly after working with a MCM-focused design firm. I hope to see HRA homes around me continue to push forward with innovative MCM homes without restriction. I do understand the cost - opening the door to non-MCM.</p>
<p>As a contributing property and an Architect that conforms to the vernacular of the original design via modern materials, i am dismayed by the arrogance of a few within the community to prescribe interpretive design aesthetics without due compensation to those who can't or won't afford such unsubsidized mandates.</p> <p>The neighborhood was deceived into believing the "survey" was FIO and not actionable. The county should not act on this deception.</p>
<p>I originally responded YES, but am resubmitting with a NO. Thank you.</p>
<p>Way Too prescriptive. A lot of areas still TBD. I'm opposed to Mc mansions or other over size houses that don't fit in. I don't want to restrict inspired, modernist expansion of these house</p>
<p>I don't want McMansions, but I don't want an overly burdensome, cumbersome, expensive entity like the ARB.</p>
<p>Too bureaucratic. Too cumbersome. Too limiting particularly concerning the materials allowed considering the need to introduce more modern materials and strategies to make these homes more energy efficient in the face of climate change. The whole thing is Kafkaesque.</p>
<p>We think this would be a positive step in keeping our neighborhood in its historical context, as opposed to losing it to developers building McMansions.</p>
<p>I was on the committee to get HRA on the register and am an architect. The guidelines are in almost all respects excellent. However on pg. 62 there is a "not recommended" statement discouraging "Building second-story or new two-story additions on sites that could appropriately accommodate a one story addition". I understand the intent but this limitation to one story could be unfairly restrictive. When bedrooms are on the 2nd sty it's an odd layout to add an extra BR at the 1st fl. Pls. re-eval</p>
<p>We're a young family that plans to renovate our home and we're not interested in the additional costs and loss of property rights involved with an HOD</p>
<p>I have lived in Holmes Run Acres for 33 years. I am adamantly opposed to the Historic Overlay District (HOD) for Holmes Run Acres. I see no value in the HOD which would relinquish a portion of my property rights to the County and the ARB.</p>
<p>I don't think the burden on both the county and the homeowners is worth the time and money. I was support restrictions on tear downs and new construction, but I think levying on existing properties should not occur.</p>
<p>The one level houses are the ones most vulnerable, and we don't need larger houses in HRA that would bring in more people because our neighborhood is crowded enough now with people, cars and pets.</p>

<p>Knowing the extra layers of bureaucracy required in this process--and the complexity of the guidelines themselves--we're not supportive. We didn't realize the vote to conduct a study meant that ultimately we were green-lighting the BoS to take a vote on establishing the HOD. Felt like a big gap there in expectations, and now a train that's steaming ahead through well-meaning but ultimately bureaucratic processes. We do not want the HOD.</p>
<p>I fully support this initiative and I appreciate all of the hard work that has gone into making it happen. Thank you.</p>
<p>I am strongly opposed to my home being included in a Historic Overlay District. This entire process has been undertaken with the false promise to the homeowners of HRA that we would be able to have a vote on its adoption and changes to our property rights. This is not true- we were led down a path that was very misleading. It is now up to the Board of Supervisors. Legal action may need to be taken if my property rights are limited without my direct permission through this proposed HOD.</p>
<p>I do not support the HOD. I fear the loss of our property rights under an HOD; I am concerned about confusing, arbitrary and conflicting guidelines; increased costs, such as fees and building and planning costs, increased taxes and other government fees needed to oversee the HOD; moving from a community with no covenants to one with large government oversight because of two tear downs in the last few years; the poll that has an unknown weight and the permanence of the change.</p>
<p>The majority of neighbors do not want this HOD to go into effect. I anticipate continued and considerable push back on the country, the staff and this voted into office if this moves forward. Several folks are already reaching out to the media I've heard, believing that elected officials are pressuring residents to abide by their new rules and building requirements, making it less affordable to live here and putting extra financial pressures on current residents.</p>
<p>We were initially in support of this, but the goal of maintaining the history of the neighborhood has morphed into a nightmare of a process that puts too much value on the arbitrary opinions of others and watching some of those plan review meetings has convinced us that our neighbors dreams for their properties would no longer be within reach, both because of cost and because we will all be at the mercy of the self righteous opinion of the review committee.</p>
<p>We are a strong no on the HOD. I feel the original survey impact was purposefully hidden leading to an environment where the HRA no longer has the control in deciding the fate. This poll represents a small portion of the larger decision, which is curious as the impact will only be felt by HRA homeowners. It's a shame the selfish nature of those driving will negatively impact my families financial future, esp. when many of those in favor have already positively benefited from their investment. NO</p>
<p>want to keep neighborhood in its original historical condition and tradition and reduce the potential for haphazard remodeling developments.</p>
<p>I strongly disagree with establishing an HOD. As a younger family in this neighborhood, I would like to retain the freedom to modify my home to accommodate my growing family and increase my property value.</p>
<p>We have no other comments.</p>
<p>I am not interested in any additional restrictions on my property</p>

<p>This is exclusionary zoning and does not align with One Fairfax. The county needs to find other mechanisms to limit McMansions and allow for multi-family housing while keeping with strong design principles.</p>
<p>What's been outlined here is to prescriptive, in my opinion. I'm unsure/uneasy about being included in the HOD.</p>
<p>Judging from neighbors' reactions and clips of ARB meetings regarding Hollin Hills proposals, HRA seems to fit imperfectly in the County's HOD practice. Our houses are historic, but were designed to be starter homes, easy to enlarge and modify. Adherence to the MCM ethos, but without slavish preservation of every feature, has served us well for 70 years. Given the ARB's occasional obtuseness, the guidelines should call more clearly for a gentler approach to proposed changes. Go slowly, please.</p>
<p>It is the county's way of controlling the amount they make on permit sales and denying the permit. The county says that they are just guidelines but they have already decided they are going to do it no matter what we think then they become rules.</p>
<p>As a former two-term president of the HRACA and Board Member for 8 years, I was active on the Board when the HOD study was initiated. While I appreciate the work of the Working Group, the Board, and Fairfax County Staff, I believe that an HOD for HRA would put an unnecessary burden, in terms of cost and time, on homeowners who seek to do work that would require ARB approval. The guidelines, as written, are too vague and open to interpretation at the opinions of the ARB to be fair to homeowners.</p>
<p>I am in favor of a height limitations of 1- and 2-story houses as were the original homes, the setback limitations proposed, low-sloping roofs, and vertical or flat panel siding, and car park area off of driveway for 2 cars max (don't want front yards that look like parking lots). I am not in favor of an ARB review and approval process.</p>
<p>Important to keep the mid century architectural design of Holmes Run Acres</p>
<p>I would support requirements around setbacks and height restrictions for our zoning to maintain some of the integrity of the neighborhood in terms of not getting houses that are too tall or large for their lot size.</p>
<p>I see no virtue whatever in an HOD and am opposed to any imposition on my property and related rights. To be clear, I am opposed even to an "advisory" body.</p>
<p>So far, even the discussion of the HOD has caused tremendous division in the community. I think that establishment of an HOD would be even worse. I worry about the impact on current and future homeowners in the Acres - including our son, who will inherit this property eventually. I also think that it would bring nothing but headaches to the County Board of Supervisors in the future. I urge the Board of Supervisors not to approve the HOD for Holmes Run Acres.</p>
<p>I commend the county on its work regarding the HOD as well as the handling of the community meetings. The virtual one (most recent) was well done and informative.</p>
<p>We like the idea of preventing teardown and preserving the architecture of HRA but the ARB seems overbearing without clear guidance on who is affected and the added cost, especially for non contributing homes.</p>
<p>the overlay process is going to impact property values and impose zoning limitations without out owner concurrence.</p>
<p>It would be helpful to receive minutes from the community meetings on the issue. (Though maybe they've been shared and I've just looked in the wrong place!)</p>

Adamantly against.
We moved to HRA to live in a MCM home that is part of a wooded MCM neighborhood. Our block contains some of the oldest and smallest homes, and is the most susceptible to pressures of development. The HOD comes with a cost, but we believe the collective benefit of preservation outweighs the personal cost. The past 70 years have shown that the tradition of modification of HRA homes can be successfully accomplished in a preservationist manor - one that we hope will continue under the HOD.
I've waffled on my response twice now; this third and final submission is made in conjunction with further reading and discussion with my husband. We are in favor of the HOD. Thank you.
Historic preservation is important to me, I support the need for an HOD.; However, I would like the county to revisit the guidelines and actively listen to community input in order to improve the current guidelines.
I want to stop additional tear-downs and rebuilds (like 7908 HRD and 7900 Sycamore) and extensive modifications that expand the building footprint to maximize setbacks and are inappropriate architecture and size for HRA. the lots are not all the same size so it is difficult to be restrictive by exact size, it is by proportion of the building to land and the positioning of the structure. it would be better for building 2nd story than expand footprint on the land.
We find it very unfortunate that a few members of our community were able to obtain a "study" put in motion a process that no one fully understood until now. We bought a home in an eclectic neighborhood where almost every home has already been tastefully modified in some fashion to suit its owner's needs. This process unfortunately has driven divergence & hostility in a neighborhood where everyone always got along before. I hope this process is at least shelved to allow our community to heal.
HOD sounds like a terrible addition to this neighborhood
NO HOD for HRA
I think the Guidelines are almost complete, but still require some work. The preference for single-story additions should be expressly removed. I think an option for a half-butterfly roof (like that on Joan Court) for additions should be included as recommended since that has allowed homeowners to bump out their homes while retaining the same, original ratios re: windows, etc.
Those opposed are loud and shrill, but their arguments are based on nothing substantial
I am co-owner of three (3) Holmes Run Acres properties - 7528 Friar Tuck Court; 7529 Friar Tuck Court; and 7707 Poplar Tree Lane - I cast all three of my votes in favor of the Historic Overlay District. Signed - Neil E. Nappo
After I review the HOD guideline and watch the video on how ARB work, and also see those nice houses being categorized as non-contributing, I realized the HOD can't limit the size and high but instead adds unnecessary restrictions; it will limit the homeowners' options, inflate the cost of even a small renovation, and make this community deteriorated. I also distrust ARB's narrow aesthetic judgment. How some of them treated the Hollin Hill applications show HOD will give them too much power.
The design guidelines are too extensive and require additional work to clarify what will be enforced and what is simply shared as best practice. Overall the messaging to date has lacked clarity on what the legal meaning of the design guidelines is.

<p>The addition of another level of government restriction on how a person updates the property they purchase is not necessary. The addition of HRA-HOD is unnecessary!! Current Fairfax building code are sufficient for Fairfax we do not need another level, after a structure is 100 yrs old there are law to protect and preserve them we do not need at 50. If this passes then what 25 years or maybe 10. I vote no</p>
<p>HRA is rare. The modest houses were intentionally designed and sited to take advantage of nature. They feel bigger than they are. HRA was cutting edge as a Modern American architectural style 70 years ago. Today, it resonates loudly for other reasons: countless studies have shown we need nature for our physical, emotional, mental, and social health. HRA teaches us how to live among it, and how restraint and intentional design foster community. Please protect us from ourselves and enact the HOD.</p>
<p>I feel it is extremely important to protect the integrity of our community. McMansions will ruin our neighborhood. However, In my opinion , all exterior additions should reflect the intent of the original architecture and blend into the natural park-like setting — they should be modern but not necessarily slavishly duplicate the 1951 design. Our house is “non conforming “ but uses materials , roof slope, roof materials, and windows of original HRA design. It is situated on lot for max privacy.</p>
<p>Would like to maintain the integrity of the architectural design - MCM, park like setting, preservation of natural habitats. If the Overlay is established certainly important that it is staffed well to avoid problems with reviews of plans etc. Also we have a “non conforming”house that we feel is sensitive to the community. I feel that the “non conforming”designation misses the point. Our Community has become divided over this, hopefully the County will continue to provide info and support!</p>
<p>Were these questions written and approved by the HRACA? Also, why is the poll being conducted when the relevant documents are still in draft form? Will there be another poll when the documents are in their final form?</p>
<p>The county preyed upon constituent fears of McMansions to garner enough interest to conduct an HOD study, and are now forcing that HOD on them with no official say in the matter. The county clearly doesn't value its constituency's voice and this survey being requested by HRACA exemplifies that.</p>
<p>I would like to help preserve the HRA community as the original intent; California contemporary, mid-century style neighborhood.</p>
<p>I have lived in the Acres for 54 years, first in a one-level and currently in a two-level house. I appreciate the style and beauty of the mid-century modern houses and would like to keep them looking like that style, rather than all the other styles that make up the vast majority of houses in this area.</p>
<p>I'm concerned about how pragmatically the ARB will apply the guidelines and whether the County will devote enough resources to supporting HODs to enable building permits to be handled expeditiously. If I continue to have these concerns when the proposal comes before the BOS, I will speak and advocate against it.</p>
<p>I request that the Board of Supervisors to vote NO on this HOD Overlay proposal. I would also like to request that the Board of Supervisors vote NO on any future HOD Overlay proposal. There are multiple reasons why I am asking the Board of Supervisors to do so, but would like to keep this message short. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

No further government oversight is needed . Fairfax County building codes are sufficient for fair and consistent oversight of our community .
I strongly do not support an HOD.
I think the guidelines should be simplified and written in anyway that will allow for unique & creative additions. One thing we love about this neighborhood is that each house has its own character and not all the houses look the same. I'm voting in favor of the HOD mainly to prevent tear downs and rebuilds that don't match the character of the neighborhood. Tear downs should be allowed and new builds shouldn't have too many restrictions as long as the design the "spirit" of the neighborhood
There are enough regulations to comply with already without adding more hoops to jump through. Plus, our houses are nice and simple but certainly not sufficient to meet everyone's needs, particularly those with growing families.
My wife and I support the HOD, but also value many of the "non-contributing" houses in the neighborhood. Therefore, we would favor a "light touch" from the ARB in its review of proposed changes. We would like to preserve the character of Holmes Run Acres, but allow for creative modern interpretation of the original HRA architecture.
I would like HRA to preserve the integrity of the original architectural style and minimize the macmansion effect.
Existing houses in HRA that meet original architectural intentions of builders should be grandfathered in: 2 level additions to 1level Lurias; 2nd level when zoning requirements, environmental, drainage, storm water control issues do not allow for 1 level expansion should be considered by ARB if the proposed design meets original architectural goals. New technologies that diminish environmental impacts & make each building more green should be supported by ARB
No thank you
There has been some inference that this HOD would impact two adjacent properties to ours, 7512 and 7510 Masonville Drive, which I would strongly oppose. These two properties abut a small portion of Holmes Run Acres but are in no way related to the architectural style or historical nature of Holmes Run Acres and should not be subject to a potential HOD.
Abything that prevents destruction and out of character replacement...NO "McMansions"!
If you have any questions for me feel free to call; I do not want builders to come in here and change the architectural look. The slant degree of the roofs are very important. We do not need the box looking trailer look., As many of the new condominiums that are being built. In order to save this neighborhood which I grew up and played in the creek walk to the pool and then moved back to bring my daughter up here the historical look and the trees that need to be Saved and saved in every New neighborhood. Developers must stop cutting down the tree; This neighborhood was built in the woods the trees were there as markers of property. The trees give us oxygen. If we can stop any other developer from chopping down trees just to make houses. The architecture of Hra is unique the slant of the roof. Everything was thought of when it was first built shading of the house with the trees. I grew up here I moved back here to bring up my Fourth grader. More communities like this need be saved. McMansion belongs on 50 acres. Modern is not Contempora
I am not sure how flexible the architectural review board is when, for example, the topography would result in a butterfly roof for an addition. And, I wish the guide book were clear what applies when a permit is required vs what is recommended for the neighborhood. It would

<p>make it clear which would need and be considered for an permit and what is nice to know if you're fixing up your house.</p>
<p>Are Non-contributing properties penalized?</p>
<p>I've owned my home in the Acres for 42 years and hope to live here for the rest of my life. I appreciate the huge amount of work contributed by my neighbors who served on the Work Group as well as County staff and current/future members of the ARB in developing the Design Guidelines, reviewing the status of existing homes and addressing the colossal number of questions and concerns generated in the process to date. I fully support the HOD.</p>
<p>I bought my home almost 20 years ago because there was no HOA and it was fee simple. I am very upset and do not agree with this at all. I do not want anyone having a say in how I have my home. I should make those decisions not others and be forced into something that I dont want. Very against this ; Very much opposed to any restrictions that would be imposed on me as a home owner. Against the Historic Overlay District for Holmes Run Acres.</p>
<p>I would support redrafting the design guidelines so that they are more descriptive instead of being prescriptive as they currently stand.</p>
<p>Should the HRA HOD be passed by the BOS, I would encourage staff to establish office hours devoted to answering questions from the HRA community, such as an HOD POD or Planner of the Week.</p>
<p>We are not in favor of this initiative. It has been poorly communicated, and as owners of a non-contributing property, we are concerned of additional hindrance or expense to our property should we require changes in the future. Thank you.</p>
<p>I am completely opposed to restrictions on how I manage maintenance and mostly having several layers of red tape and added expense to get anything done. I am a strong NO! it is tearing our community apart and it needs to stay as is!</p>
<p>I'm a retired single home owner. The proposed HOD would force me to sell my home. I moved into this neighborhood because there wasn't an HOD. How dare Fairfax county overreach like this. The neighborhood is torn apart over this. Just let us have our peaceful community back. ; I am a single retired homeowner. The proposed HOD would force me to use what little resources I have to fight the county government to get anything done to my house. It would force me to move. Moreover this HOD conversation is tearing our neighborhood apart. Fairfax county is engaging in a major overreach into our neighborhood and causing unnecessary chaos.</p>
<p>We strongly support the implementation of the HOD</p>
<p>I think that most neighbors want, and would agree to, guidelines that review the overall design and whether it fits with, and integrates into, the original architecture. This would be a simple review of whether the overall design framework fits within the existing original architecture, or whether it is based on some other architectural style such as colonial, rambler, 'big box' mcmansion, etc. The guidelines should not allow other architectural framework styles. But creativity within the origin; But creativity within the original architectural framework is a hallmark of HRA and most in HRA would agree that such implementations have complimented the original architectural style.</p>

<p>These homes are distinctive and deserve to be preserved. The original homes sold for under \$20,000 and it was said they required a special type of person because they were very unusual for this area and that they would never appreciate. We already have 3/4 of a dozen houses that have become jarring eyesores in the neighborhood, changing the flavor of these distinctive homes horribly. Why destroy the image of the most unusual neighborhood? Let those who want a different style buy elsewhere.</p>
<p>I am a contiguous property owner to the HRA HOD being studied. I do not support the HRA HOD as it will adversely impact my property with no direct benefit to me being outside of the HOD boundary. I don't appreciate being excluded from the notification of this neighborhood poll by Fairfax County in which I have lived, voted and paid taxes for 36 years!</p>
<p>This is the time to protect the scale of the neighborhood. If someone does something ugly but in a small scale that's fine by me.</p>
<p>1) Requiring disabled people to submit their accessibility designs to the ARB is discriminatory. Current guidelines asking for ramps to be on side or rear doors ignores the basic dignity of entering one's own front door.</p> <p>2) ARB members repeatedly cite the DOI Standards as the basis for their comments, this is incorrect. The Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance is the rule, not the DOI Standards. Where the DOI uses "shall" the County uses "should" – these have distinct and different legal meanings.</p>
<p>Historic overlay, plan community other similar makes improvement difficult and property values go DOWN. I do not want to live in such community that others interfere in my decision to change and improve my house after all is MY HOUSE; Hod lowers home value and lower improvements</p>
<p>I am strongly opposed to establishment of Historic Overlay District for Holmes Run Acres. I will submit detailed comments directly to the County, District Supervisor and Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. With respect to the inquiry on Height, my vote "No" here is solely *in context of this HOD initiative*. I do think there is a county role in R-3 for *modest* limit of combined bulk reg (prevailing height/setbacks/footprint) to address McMansion/McMods but NOT in context of the proposed HOD.</p>
<p>The HOD is a continuation of the NIMBY politics of HRA shown in the Historical Designation to limit effect of the tool road construction, shown by the addition of the 3 non-historic houses on Gallows to prevent demolition for an access ramp and the efforts to prevent development of housing opposite Woodburn school. HRA is evolving with sales to new owners who want to develop their property. The "historic" aspects here in HRA have been decreasing each year as new owners make the neighborhood the</p>
<p>There is nothing historic about these homes. ; I am opposed to any additional changes to the current zoning requirements. I am adamantly opposed to an additional layer of review that an HOD would impose. This effort should cease immediately.</p>

<p>Enacting a HOD soon is critical for the Acres. The intersection of Holmes Run Drive and Gallows was full of trees and beautiful houses two decades ago. Today, it is blighted.; It's important the study continues and a HOD is enacted. I regret the conduct of the "NO HOD" group, whose uncivil and unethical anti-HOD campaign is a disservice to the Acres.</p> <p>The "NO HOD" group's fear, discourtesy, and Libertarian views don't speak for us.</p> <p>Peer jurisdictions on the West Coast, and consultants Page & Turnbull, achieved superior design guidelines and outreach for "Eichler" homes in Orange/Palo Alto. Please extend the study and adopt peer jurisdiction's best practices.; Fairfax County staff have been extremely helpful and gracious despite difficult circumstances!</p>
<p>Following the discussion on the HRA listserve, my sense is the HOD (vs. no HOD) is the lesser of the two evils. I feel strongly that the historic nature of HRA should be preserved. I am concerned the HOD as written is somewhat too stringent. I feel that, as long as the square footage is not overly high and the character of the home is in accord with the mid-century Wright-style homes already here, that would be sufficient.</p>
<p>; No</p>
<p>The idea that any exterior improvement has to go through the ARB seems too severe. Existing design guidelines provide design approach without being fully restrictive. Impacts on insurance, time lines for permits, personal choice are too great. No considerations for green and energy efficient building techniques. I want to be in a visually progressive and contemporary community anchored in a visually progressive and contemporary environment.</p>
<p>Materials deficient in explaining the restrictions on improving my property. Houses similar to mine with in-character additions were rejected without useful explanations. One-level houses apparently have extreme restrictions. Unanswered questions. Polling flaws. Creates inequities, jeopardizes property value, and confiscates individual property rights. Original vote was to "explore" the HOD, but deceptively led to a near unstoppable implementation; leaves only last-stand appeal to Supervisor.</p>
<p>Desire something that would prevent tearing down original HRA MCM homes & replacing them with horrific McMansions NOT in the MCM design styles!!! Our "Historic Registration" has proven to be a bunch of baloney & worthless -</p>
<p>We're concerned about a few things within the draft language. We're also concerned we're being asked to make a decision when the guidelines are still a draft. The complexity of trying to balance the appropriate amount of leeway as well as clear guidance does not seem to be here, & it appears the ARB will have significant leeway/power to demand alterations when not specifically supported. There seems to be some overreach/in the weeds level of detail. Giving the ARB free control is concerning.</p>
<p>I am concerned about lack of ability to have community feedback after an HOD is put in place. Can HOD design guidelines be changed in the future?</p>
<p>The initial idea of an HOD was to help prevent McMansions from being built in our neighborhood and ruining the character of the homes. It appears that this is not the case; however I feel that using the ARB will help deter those who want to build houses that don't match the current Aesthetics.</p>
<p>I feel that this petition may be compromised or results contaminated by efforts of the anti HOD contingent. Please take that into consideration when weighting this poll in your decision.</p>

Not interested in adding more red tape to the process of obtaining a building permit
I value these homes and neighborhood, which is why I bought this house a few years back. I prefer to have the original character with an updated vision than tear downs that may not reflect the architectural heritage of this neighborhood. However, I hope this is not a way to limit the expansion possibilities within those architectural values for folks like myself who have one of the smaller 2bd/1ba Luria homes. This is where I envision having a family, so I hope that will be able to expand. Thx!
I would very much like Holmes Run Acres to retain the character it has and feel some sort of protection is necessary to maintain the unique character of the neighborhood. Otherwise the homes just become a house on a street. My wife opposes potential restrictions in case the houses need to be rebuilt for some reason, since we may no be able to build in the original way. That is why I voted No Opinion. I would be fine with taller houses if they maintained the character of the original houses.
We were originally supportive of exploring the HOD in order to avoid McMansions / teardowns/rebuilds of homes not within the midcentury modern style. However, the draft guidelines are overly complicated and go beyond what could and should have been straightforward guidelines. Also, without fully understanding what the ARB would and would not allow, we don't see a way for homeowners to make an informed decision. Unfortunately, there are too many unanswered questions for such a significant change.
We are generally supportive of the intent behind the HOD, protecting the historic character of HRA homes, stopping tear downs, and McMansions. However, as new parents considering a growing family, we purchased our home because of the potential we saw in the existing Luria, lot, and neighborhood to expand our home to fit our needs well within the Midcentury Modern style characterized in HRA. Reviewing the existing materials we are not confident the proposal will be flexible enough for us.
No McMansions!
I'm absolutely in favor of maintaining the Mid-Century Mod style of HRA. But inability to control massing combined w/guideline overreach, contradictory info & unanswered questions eroded my confidence in its value. What REALLY gave me pause is that (per last meet w/county) now that an HOD has been pursued, our poll votes will not dictate the outcome, they will only be "considered" & FFX County will determine whether or not we have an HOD. What?? Begs the question: an HOD done for us or to us?
It's just too restrictive. There's too much variety in MCM. I'd hate to try to write guidelines like this. We could do general things, but there's really hardly 2 houses alike here. They're all conforming, in my opinion.
The stated reason for an HISTORIC Overlay District by its HRA purveyors was to prevent future teardowns. Preserving historic elements of HRA houses, given their compromised sympathetic integrity, was always notional, I.e., it was a means to an end only. The county should put a hard stop to this end run on unencumbered property rights by activists within any neighborhood. I bought in an R-3 zoned, otherwise unrestricted neighborhood. Any attempts to reduce the building envelope is a Taking. Thx!
Thank you for the work for the community
We support an HOD but NOT as has been misrepresented by Fairfax County. We also do NOT support the draft Design Guidelines as proposed because they are inconsistent, subjective and unrealistic. Contributing/noncontributing designations further reinforce the arbitrary nature of this process, which has been opaque at best.

The Draft HOD and some of the decisions by the ARB in HH seem to be too open to subjective interpretation on too many items. A more limited scope related to prevention of tear downs and McMansions would likely be more well supported.