

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	ZOAM-2020-0002 Prime Agricultural Soils and Cluster Subdivision Amendments					
	Summary of Public Input Comments - Outreach Groups / Staff Responses (8/8/2022)					
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
3	Save Rural Loudoun (SRL)	Section 2-101	Purpose and Intent	Supports changes made in the draft text language to reflect Comp Plan with emphasis on preservation of prime soils and limiting residential development.	Addressed. See Sections 2-101 and 2-201	
4	Rural Economic Development Council (REDC)	Section 2-101(E)	Purpose and Intent	Add language to Sections 2-101(E) and 2-201(E) for mention of "Historical Attraction" as part of the tourism uses.	Not addressed. Sections 2-101(E) and 2-201(E)	
5	REDC	Section 2-101(E)	Purpose and Intent	Look into the meaning of "special event" uses. Does this mean those special event uses as contained in Section 5-500?	Not addressed. Sections 2-101(E) and 2-201(E)	
6	REDC	Section 2-102	Use Table	If the Preservation Farm Lot (PFL) remains, add the following uses to the Use Table in 2-102 and 2-202, as permitted: "Stable, Livery", and "Stable Private".	Partially addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202. "Stable, Livery" proposed as a Minor SPEX use and "Stable, Private" proposed as a Permitted use, on the PFL.	
7	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Supports general changes to the "Use Table" which clearly shows permitted uses for each type of rural lots.	Addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
8	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Supports the limited non-ag uses permitted on the PFL to include the B&Bs but not the "Inns" or "event centers". However, the use list should be slightly expanded to include direct market businesses, central farm distribution hubs, agricultural processing, and equestrian event facilities as permitted, by right uses (P) on PFLs.	Addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
9	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	"Portable dwelling/trailer construction" as a permitted use. Is this a reasonable use of a "farm lot?" Could it affect preservation of prime soils? If permitted, should it only be by special exception?	Not addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
10	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	If drainfields are permitted on OSLs, then OSLs should not be counted as part of the land intended for preservation.	Not addressed. See 2-103(C)(9) and 2-203(C)(9).	
11	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Allows stormwater management facilities "For the proposed development or for a larger area in compliance with a watershed stormwater management plan." Oppose. This is a potentially large reduction in the area reserved for PFLs, RELs and prime soils.	Not addressed. See 2-103(C)(5)(b) and 2-203(C)(5)(b).	
12	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Continued allowance of sewer and water pumping stations. This Ok, provided that such OSLs are not counted as part of the land intended for preservation.	Not addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
13	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	The addition of "Easements and improvements for drainage, access, sewer or water lines, or other public purposes." This is Ok, provided that such OSLs are not counted as part of the land intended for preservation. Add reference to multi-purpose trails?	Not addressed. See 2-103(C)(5)(b) and 2-203(C)(5)(b).	
14	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Supports not allowing non-ag commercial uses in OSLs.	Addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
15	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Supports maintain most of the permitted uses for this lot type designation. Also supports the elimination of some uses that are inappropriate for the Rural Policy Area (RPA) such as airport/landing strip, fairground, cemetery, fire/police stations, etc.	Addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
16	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Drops some permitted uses that may be worth keeping, e.g.: art gallery, craft shop, restaurants (if limited to size of wineries). Question. Do these businesses make important contributions to the rural economy?	Not addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
17	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	Limited Breweries continue to be listed in the category "Agriculture Support and Services Directly Related to On-going Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Husbandry Activity, On-Site." Question. Limited breweries are not required to be directly related to ongoing agriculture. Most existing operations do not use local inputs and some rely on off-site production. Unless standards for "Limited Brewery" are strengthened to require operations to be directly related to on-site agriculture, this use should be moved to the "Food and Beverage" category	Partially addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202. "Limited Brewery" and "Virginia Farm Winery" have been removed as permitted uses from the REL and RCL. These uses still remain under the "Agriculture Support and Services Directly Related to On-going Agriculture, Horticulture and Animal Husbandry Activity, On-Site".	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
18	SRL	Section 2-102	Use Table	<p>Sewer System, Communal, and Sewage Disposal System, Individual. Oppose. Only "Sewage Disposal System, Individual" (as currently defined in Ch. 8) should be permitted on RCLs, PFLs, and RELs. Locating septic systems outside the lots of the users increases health risks which could affect local water systems and farming on adjacent lots.</p> <p>The lack of consistency between the Uses Table (2-102), the cluster subdivision regulations (2-103), the Definitions chapter (Ch. 8), and the general Open Space Standards (Section 5.04) may create confusion and potential legal disputes about which types of sewage systems are permitted on which types of rural lots. We recommended that the terminology be harmonized across all these sections of the Ordinance.</p>	Not addressed.	
19	Conservation Easement Group	Section 2-102	Use Table	I don't believe, at this point, that the modifications to permitted uses will have an adverse effect on values. Further consideration would be required for a final determination.	Addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
20	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)	Cluster Subdivisions Option	<p>The word may is inappropriate if the intent of this ZOAM is as stated is truly to preserve prime agricultural soils. "It MUST contain" serves the purpose.</p> <p>Also the intent of this option is to allow for housing density giving the landowner value for his land, yes, but it is also intended to promote the preservation of prime agricultural soils as we have thus far failed to do. Why is this not clearly stated right here?</p> <p>Language should say: Must include one large lot containing 80% of the available prime soils and other soils allowing for one contiguous preserved property.</p>	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C) and 2-203(C), and Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
21	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(1)	General Req.	Maintaining minimum lot sizes for cluster development 20 Ac AR-1, and 40 Ac AR-2. Ok. If our recommendations are adopted, a 20-acre cluster subdivision would consist of one PFL and a cluster of three houses.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(a) and 2-203(C)(1)(a).	
22	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(1)	General Req.	<p>Maintaining density of 1 lot per 5 Acres. Oppose (recognizing the BOS decided not to address this issue in the current ZOAM).</p> <p>The maximum lot yield in all rural cluster subdivision should be one residence per 15 acres, as is the current standard in the ARS district and all of Loudoun's neighboring counties.</p>	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(b) and 2-203(C)(1)(b).	
23	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(1)	General Req.	This is the AR1 Base density, allowing subdivision below the base density for the entire subdivision, with no lots larger than 20 acres is counter to the goal of preservation.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(d) and 2-203(C)(1)(d). If required, PFLs within Originating Tracts that are greater than 30 acres, the minimum lot size is 20 acres in AR-1 and 40 acres in AR-2.	
24	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(1)(b)	General Req.	Subordinate to the preservation of 80% prime ag soils	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(a) and 2-203(C)(3)(a).	
25	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(2)(a)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	<p>The rural residential cluster lot groupings should be one total grouping, not multiple and may contain some non prime agricultural soils as well.</p> <p>Preservation Farm lots were intended to replace Rural Economy lots, as is appropriate, this idea first proposed by Farm Bureau, was never intended to add another optional development category.</p> <p>If there is no REQUIREMENT for preservation farm lot what is the point of all of this? How will this improve our current position? This must be a requirement.</p>	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(a) and 2-203(C)(2)(a). Also see Sections 2-103(C)(3),(4) and 2-203(C)(3),(4).	
26	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(2)(b)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	The (potential) lot yield following the protection of prime ag soils is better calculated with the rocky regions and steep slopes already removed as was originally proposed by farm bureau and several other stakeholders.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(d) and 2-203(C)(1)(d).	
27	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(2)(c)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	Lot creating or home being built?	Not addressed. 2-103(C)(1) and 2-203(C)(1).	
28	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(2)(d)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	The Preservation Farm Lot should be placed into permanent Ag easement at the time of its creation to assure no further subdivision regardless of changes in zoning policy.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(b) and 2-203(C)(3)(b).	
29	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(2)(d)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	Boundary Line Adjustments. SRL supports this change.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(c)(ii) and 2-203(C)(1)(c)(ii).	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
30	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(2)(h)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	Those areas where the drainfields are located off-site and are within open space areas, these areas should not be included in the overall 70% preservation total	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(g) and 2-203(C)(1)(g).	
31	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(2)(h)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	Making the 70% set aside req. optional. Replaces shall with may. Strongly Oppose. The fundamental rationale for the cluster subdivision option is that it requires development to be concentrated so as to preserve rural land. Making the percentage of land to be preserved optional would be a major step back for the County.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(d) and 2-203(C)(1)(d).	
32	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(2)(h)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	Retains the rule that 70% req. Oppose. The portion of land to be preserved should be increased to 80% of the gross acreage of the tract, and this portion should consist entirely of PFLs and RELs. OSLs containing residential infrastructure should be located on the remaining 20%. This section should establish a maximum proportion of the gross acreage that may be occupied by OSLs containing residential infrastructure. The draft rule would allow stormwater management and septic systems on OSLs to occupy an unlimited portion of the property outside the housing cluster, reducing the land available for farming and other rural economy uses below 70%. The division of the entire tract should be: 80% for PFLs and RELs, 15% for CSLs, and 5% for OSLs (see annexed model cluster subdivision dimension standards).	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(d) and 2-203(C)(1)(d). The 2019 General Plan envisioned, as part of the design characteristics of the clustered subdivision, Open Space being 70% of the cluster subdivision.	
33	Conservation Easement Group	Section 2-103(C)(2)(h)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	The required 70% open space, rural economy lots, Preservation lot, whatever, is fine.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(d) and 2-203(C)(1)(d).	
34	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(2)(h)	Characteristics of Cluster Subdivision Option	Any land used for septic or cluster lot wells shall not be counted towards the open space calculation unless the clustered lots are village style on minimal lots, then utilizing an open space parcel would be appropriate.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(1)(d) and 2-203(C)(1)(d).	
35	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(3)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Changing "Lot Standards" to "Lot Requirements". Support. Makes it clear that these are legal requirements and are different from the advisory standards in the LSDO.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2) and 2-203(C)(2).	
36	Conservation Easement Group	Section 2-103(C)(3)(a)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	A decrease in the maximum number of lots in a cluster is detrimental and does not serve a purpose in enhancing the subdivision. It drives costs up, so will have a negative impact on the value of conservation easement and create more impervious surfaces. I do not see any advantage or enhancement to this change.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(a) and 2-203(C)(2)(a).	
37	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(3)(a)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Why was a 25 lot minimum altered to now be 15? What is the justification for this? Why is there any limit at all? Setting a limit and create multiple cluster groupings only harms the stated goals of preserving farmland and maintaining the rural character of the RPA as the residents have indicated so many times they want maintained. If not enough land exists to create more than 5 cluster lots is it appropriate to allow the cluster option with the exception of a family subdivision of a single farm? We do not support a 15 house maximum for a cluster and prefer no limit as a larger single grouping of clustered homes is more likely to leave a larger portion of preserved land.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(a) and 2-203(C)(2)(a). The total number of RCLs within a cluster group has been changed back to 25 lots with a caveat that the grouping requirement can be adjusted when demonstrated that more connected areas of Prime Farmland Soils can be placed within PFLs or more environmentally sensitive areas (floodplain, steep slopes, etc. can be preserved.	
38	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(3)(a)(iii)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Supports allowing for fewer than 5 lots if that allows for more contiguous farmland or less disturbance of MDOD and FOD.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(a) and 2-203(C)(2)(a).	
39	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(3)(b)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Reduction of lots in cluster grouping from 25 to 15. Question. Larger clusters may have a greater impact, but a greater number of smaller clusters may contribute to fragmentation of farmland and wildlife habitat.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(a) and 2-203(C)(2)(a).	
40	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(3)(b)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	There should be no requirement to spread out the cluster if placing the cluster all in one area leads to more farmland preservation overall. The goal of the ZOAM is to preserve prime ag soils. Again if there is a break why was 15 lots decided instead of the original 25 and why are we placing a cap on this number?	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(a) and 2-203(C)(2)(a).	
41	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(3)(c)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Increases the minimum distance between clusters from 50 to 250 feet.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(b) and 2-203(C)(2)(b). The distance req. between clusters was never increased. The distance req. was reduced from 500' to 200'.	
42	Conservation Easement Group	Section 2-103(C)(3)(c)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	I see no reason to create separation between the clusters based on the number in the cluster.	Partially addressed. The setback has been reduced further to 200', although it may be reduce to 100' if demonstrated that more connected Prime Farm Land Soils can be preserved within the PFL or more environmentally sensitive areas (floodplain, steep slopes, etc.) can be preserved. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(b) and 2-203(C)(2)(b).	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
43	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(3)(c)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	If smaller distance between clusters leads to great preservation of farmland, there should be no arbitrary buffer that "uses up" land. A tight clustering of homes in a village setting is an attractive option which this would limit.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(b) and 2-203(C)(2)(b).	
44	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(3)(d)	Min. Lot Size	The minimum lot size of 40,000 SF seems to be too small for a lot with a well and drainfield.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(c) and 2-203(C)(2)(c).	
45	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(3)(d)	Min. Lot Size	Refers to on-site and off-site "water and wastewater," which also are not defined in Ch. 8. The lack of consistency between the Uses Table (2-102), the cluster subdivision regulations (2-103), the Definitions chapter (Ch. 8), and the general Open Space Standards (Section 5.04) may create confusion and potential legal disputes about which types of sewage systems are permitted on which types of rural lots. We recommended that the terminology be harmonized across all these sections of the Ordinance.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(c) and 2-203(C)(2) and 2-103(C)(9) and 2-203(C)(9).	
46	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(3)(d)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	I could see using common open space to allow for wastewater/water/drainfields if the lots were quite small, less than ½ acre and village style. If lots are 3 acres they must contain their own drainfields.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(9)(b) and 2-203(C)(9)(b).	
47	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(3)(e)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Reduce Max. Cluster Lot Size to 4 ac from 3 ac. Question. Is it necessary to specify the size of RCLs or restrict the proportion of RCLs that may be occupied by buildings?	Partially addressed. RCL size has been further reduced to a maximum of 2 acres. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(d) and 2-203(C)(2)(d).	
48	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(3)(e)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Is this for ANY lot within the subdivision or the cluster lots themselves? There should be no upper limit on the size of the Preservation Farm Lot. Also, why would there be a 34 acre cluster lot? Why would we put an upper limit on a preservation farm lot and whose benefit does this limit serve?	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(d) and 2-203(C)(2)(d). A 34 acres maximum lot size requirement for RCLs was never proposed. The maximum lot size has been reduced from 4 acres to 2 acres.	
49	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(3)(f)	Req. for Residential Cluster Lots	Again, why are we not allowing for smaller or tighter grouped housing within the clusters?	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2)(d) and 2-203(C)(2)(d).	
50	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(4)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Do away with the Preservation Farm Lot (PFL) and just rename the Rural Economy Lot (REL). Don't need another "lot" category. Combine the PFL and REL for one large lot(s).	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3),(4) and 2-203(C)(3),(4).	
51	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Oppose. The draft appears to be based on the premise that prime soils are the only type of land that is valuable for farming. Livestock can be raised on non-prime soils. Forestry and vineyards are also possible. PFLs should be required on all cluster subdivisions unless the developer can demonstrate that the land is useless for any kind of farming.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3), and 2-203(C)(3). Prime Farmland Soils are the primary focus of the ZOAM. PFLs are required when there are 5 or more acres of Prime Farmland Soils on the Originating Tract.	
52	Conservation Easement Group	Section 2-103(C)(4)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	I do not know (or yet understand) the effect of introducing the Preservation Farm Lot. Every parcel is unique, so I will withhold my opinion if the idea is further developed.	See Sections 2-103(C)(3), and 2-203(C)(3).	
53	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(4)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Any cluster subdivision that contains ANY prime farmland soils must contain a preservation farm lot, and we do not believe having a separate option for a rural economy lot is the right as the RPA is full of lots which can accommodate the proposed rural economy uses, lots located within a neighborhood setting are inappropriate for.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(a) and 2-203(C)(3)(a). PFLs are required when there are 5 or more acres of Prime Farmland Soils on the Originating Tract.	
54	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)(a)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Supports requiring developer to map prime soils. However, Section (a) should require developers to identify contiguous sections of prime soils. Contiguous sections are more valuable for farming than isolated pockets. This is necessary for the calculation required in subsection (d) – minimum lot size.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(c) and 2-203(C)(3)(c).	
55	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(4)(b)	Min. Amount of Prime Farmland Soils to be Preserved on Preservation Farm Lot	50% Preservation of Prime Farmland Soil is not enough. Needs to be at least 80%	Partially addressed. Required amount of Prime Farmland Soils within the PFL(s) is now 70%. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(a) and 2-203(C)(3)(a).	
56	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)(b)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Oppose. As we understand it, this formula preserves small pockets of prime soils while allowing for development on large, contiguous areas of prime soils when those soils exceed 50% of the entire tract. The latter are much more valuable for farm preservation. The actual impact depends on the characteristics of each tract. Rather, the regulations should require that all contiguous areas of prime soils of 5 acres or more must be located on a PFL.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(a) and 2-203(C)(3)(a).	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
57	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(4)(b)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	The Preservation Farm Lot should contain at least 80% of gross prime farmland soils on the originating parcel and there should only be ONE preservation lot, not multiple. Justification being that we already have plenty of 5-10-15 acre lots in AR-1, and we do not need to "create" more of them under the guise of "preserving" prime ag soils. We need to preserve the larger contiguous parcels with good quality soil. Farm bureau and other stakeholders have spoken at length on this issue. I have no idea where the 50% proposed has come from, which stakeholder group thought that number did anything to accomplish the purpose of this ZOAM, but this undermines the integrity of the work attempted here and allows for business as usual greenfield development in the RPA as the people living here have said over and over they no longer want.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(a) and 2-203(C)(3)(a). If more than 5 acres of Prime Farmland Soils, a PFL must contain at least 70% of the Prime Farmland Soils; minimum lot size 10 or 20 acres.	
58	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(4)(d)	Min. Lot Size	The lot(s) set aside for preservation of prime farmland soils or farming, need to be larger contiguous lots. The minimum 10-acre requirement should be removed from the draft text language.	Partially addressed. Minimum PFL size is dependent upon the Originating Tract size. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(d) and 2-203(C)(3)(d).	
59	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)(d)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Oppose. Effectively, this may mean that there is no minimum lot size for PFLs (if there are very small pockets of prime soils). The minimum lot size for a single PFL should be the base density (20 acres) and PFLs should occupy a minimum of 50% of the tract.	Partially addressed. Minimum PFL size is dependent upon the Originating Tract size. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(d) and 2-203(C)(3)(d).	
60	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(4)(d)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	The Preservation Farm Lot must be at least the base density of originating parcel (20 acres in AR-1, 40 acres in AR-2) unless the tract being subdivided is too small to accommodate this acreage, in which case the Preservation Farm Lot shall constitute whatever acreage amounts of 80 percent of the prime ag soils on the original tract.	Partially addressed. Minimum PFL size is dependent upon the Originating Tract size. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(d) and 2-203(C)(3)(d).	
61	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)(e)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Supports PFLs being required to be contiguous unless the prime farmland soils are not.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
62	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(4)(e)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	There should be one preservation farm lot consisting of the required acreage of preserved prime ag soils and some non prime ag soils in order to give priority to a single contiguous lot. This plot should not be smaller than the base density for the region.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
63	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(4)(f)	Max. Lot Coverage	Does the 15% include agricultural structures?	Not addressed. Agricultural structures are included as part maximum lot coverage requirement. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(e) and 2-203(C)(3)(e).	
64	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)(f)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Max. lot coverage. Question. Is this too much? It means that permanent structures could cover up to 3 acres on a 20-acre PFL. But does it matter if the permitted uses are limited to farming?	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(e) and 2-203(C)(3)(e). 15% maximum lot coverage proposed.	
65	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(4)(f)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	This eliminates any option for a village style development that would be very beneficial to the region.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(e) and 2-203(C)(3)(e).	
66	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(4)(g)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Why have this? This would preclude villages and close clustering of homes and flexibility for building the most amount of homes on the least amount of land. Why are we proceeding with business as usual when this has served the needs of the county poorly. We support flexibility in setbacks, lot width, and buffers.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3). The minimum lot width requirement has been removed.	
67	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(4)(h)(i)	Req. for Preservation Farm Lots	Supports language prohibiting HOAs from restricting uses on the PFLs.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3). The Private Agreements Limiting Permitted Uses Prohibited requirement has been removed as the County does not have the authority to restrict HOA covenants.	
68	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(5)(a)	Req. for Rural Economy Cluster Lots	The Rural Economy lot is not necessary and should not be part of this zoning amendment as there are many lots available outside of cluster subdivisions in the rural policy area that can better accommodate the proposed uses for this lot type. This is not something we support and many of the uses for a Rural Economy lot are inappropriate in intensity for a neighborhood setting. Our original input to rename the rural economy lot to the Farmland Conservation lot is still the most appropriate option for this ZOAMs and many of our members are frustrated at this twisting of our original proposal.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(4) and 2-203(C)(4). The REL is still part of the Cluster Subdivision Option, however, it is only required when the Originating Tract contains less than 5 acres of Prime Farmland Soils.	
69	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(5)(b)	Req. for Rural Economy Cluster Lots	Oppose. A minimum lot size of 10 acres would be reasonable and would create more flexibility to include both a PFL and one or more RELs.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(4)(b) and 2-203(C)(4)(b). Propose 10 acre minimum RECL on minimum Originating Tract size of 20-30 acres; 15 acre minimum on Originating Tract size greater than 30 acres.	
70	Conservation Easement Group	Section 2-103(C)(5)(b)	Req. for Rural Economy Cluster Lots	Not including steep slopes and floodplain in the 15 acres required for the rural economy lot will have a negative impact on value for conservation easements.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(4)(b) and 2-203(C)(4)(b). Steep slopes and FOD included in minimum lot size.	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
71	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(5)(c)	Req. for Rural Economy Cluster Lots	Max. lot coverage of 8%? Question. It's unclear why the County would allow much greater lot coverage on PFLs (see above) than on RELs. Since many more uses are permitted on RELs, perhaps there should be more flexibility on REL lot coverage.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(4)(c) and 2-203(C)(4)(c). 15% maximum lot coverage proposed.	
72	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(5)(f)	Req. for Rural Economy Cluster Lots	Supports language prohibiting HOAs from restricting uses on the RECLs.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(4) and 2-203(C)(4). The Private Agreements Limiting Permitted Uses Prohibited requirement has been removed as the County does not have the authority to restrict HOA covenants.	
73	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(6)	Req. for Open Space	The heading of the section refers to "Open Space" rather than "Open Space Lots." For clarity and consistency with the Permitted Uses Table, the heading should refer to OSLs. The following text refers to "building lots," a term that isn't used anywhere else in the draft. For clarity and consistency, this should be replaced with "cluster subdivision lot."	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(5) and 2-203(C)(5).	
74	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(6)	Req. for Open Space	Does not establish any maximum area for OSLs. Oppose. This means that stormwater retention, drainfields and other residential infrastructure could occupy an unlimited portion of the tract beyond the minimum lot sizes for PFLs and RELs. The Ordinance should establish a maximum lot size for OSLs that is reasonable and sufficient for the permitted uses. A maximum of 5 acres or 5% of the tract would be reasonable. The division of the entire tract should be: 70% for PFLs and RELs, 25% for CSLs, and 5% for OSLs.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(5)(a) and 2-203(C)(5)(a).	
75	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(6)	Req. for Open Space	Open space must have a maximum limit. This is not a work around for a place to put septic systems allowing for business as usual to continue to undermine the desires of the community living in the RPA. If the individual residential cluster lots are 3 acres or more it is not appropriate for septic systems and wastewater to be run communally and placed on common open space. If the cluster housing lots are village style or less than 3 acres this could be a viable option as long as the open space does not contain prime ag soils. The acreage allotted for open space used to accommodate wastewater and septic systems for residential cluster lots must come from the land allotted to residential clusters not the % needed for preservation farm lots.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(5)(a) and 2-203(C)(5)(a).	
76	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(6)(a)	Req. for Open Space	Supports moving the OS uses to the Use Table in 2-102.	Addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202.	
77	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(7)	Setbacks	The residential perimeter setback should be removed as well, to accommodate a more compact cluster.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(6) and 2-203(C)(6).	
78	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(7)(a)	Setbacks	Arbitrary setbacks will consume acreage that could be preserved for agriculture or conservation. Structure should be 35 feet from existing roads or 25 feet from an access easement.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(6) and 2-203(C)(6).	
79	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(7)(b)	Setbacks	Lot line setbacks should be 35 feet from neighboring lot lines, no need for 100 foot setbacks.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(6) and 2-203(C)(6).	
80	REDC	Section 2-103(C)(8)	Yards	The setbacks for the Residential Cluster Lots should be taken out to allow for more flexibility and preservation of Prime Farmland Soils. This could accommodate smaller lots in the cluster.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(7) and 2-203(C)(7).	
81	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(10)	Utility Req.	Allows individual septic systems to be located on OSLs, which contradicts the definition of individual septic systems in Ch. 8 (defined as being on the lot served). The lack of consistency between the Uses Table (2-102), the cluster subdivision regulations (2-103), the Definitions chapter (Ch. 8), and the general Open Space Standards (Section 5.04) may create confusion and potential legal disputes about which types of sewage systems are permitted on which types of rural lots. We recommended that the terminology be harmonized across all these sections of the Ordinance.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(9) and 2-203(C)(9).	
82	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(10)(a)	Utility Req.	Any land devoted to wells placed off the parcel utilizing the well shall not count towards the overall preserved acreage on the original tract (25 foot radius around well and 10 foot wide allowance for pipeline to the house)	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(9) and 2-203(C)(9). Per chapter 1040.9.e of the County Codified Ordinance, all new wells must be located on the lot the well is intended to serve, unless it is a communal well.	
83	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(10)(b)	Utility Req.	Septic systems shall be placed on the lot using the system unless there is no technological manner in which to perc the land, in which case it can be placed on a communal parcel that would not count towards the preserved "open space" on the originating tract.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(9)(b) and 2-203(C)(9)(b).	
84	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(10)(b)(i)	Utility Req.	Oppose. This section should be revised to require that sewage disposal systems serving individual RCLs (and residences on PFLs and RELs) must be located on the lots they serve. The draft retains an internal inconsistency in the Ordinance. Ch. 8 (definitions) defines a "Sewage Disposal System, Individual" as a system that is located on the lot it serves. That definition was adopted to ensure that private sewage disposal systems are properly monitored by their owners and do not become a health hazard. This section contradicts that approach by allowing individual systems to be located outside the lots served, creating room for confusion and legal dispute. It also creates a health hazard, since homeowners are less likely to carefully monitor septic systems located outside their own lots.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(9)(b) and 2-203(C)(9)(b). Up to 70% may have primary and/or reserve septic fields on Common Open Space Lot.	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
2	Name/Organization	Proposed Z.O. Section	Section Title	Comment (Initial Draft)	Staff Response (via 2nd Draft Text)	Notes
85	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(14)	Pre-Submission Meeting	Supports establishing a new requirement that developers have a pre-submission meeting with County staff before submitting a cluster subdivision application.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(13) and 2-203(C)(13). The Pre-Submission meeting is not required, although encouraged.	
86	SRL	Section 2-103(C)(15)	Advisory Cluster Sub. Siting and Design Guidelines	Support! This adopts the approach used in the Hamlet zoning regulations (have not yet done a direct comparison).	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(14) and 2-203(C)(14).	
87	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(15)	Advisory Cluster Sub. Siting and Design Guidelines	Many of the guidelines already included in this ZOAM are counter to the statement “every cluster subdivision design will be a custom response” and instead promote the same prescriptive subdivision that has eaten up our farmland up until now in the RPA. Gigantic houses dotting the landscape with very little consideration of their impact on the viewshed or the wishes of the existing residents. Today looking at a home search for non-pending houses in the Harmony School District valued at \$700,000 or less and 3 bed rooms or more produces only 2 total properties. There is zero question of “building to what people want to buy” people are buying whatever is available so it is time for the county to build to suit the character we wish to see maintained in this unique region.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(14) and 2-203(C)(14). Flexibility in Cluster subdivision design within parameters of Section 2-103(C) and 2-203(C).	
88	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(15)(a)	Advisory Cluster Sub. Siting and Design Guidelines	The highest goal should be to preserve the largest area of farmland and natural resources as possible, all other considerations such as “nestling into landscapes” or “blending” should be subordinate to this goal. B should take priority over A.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(14) and 2-203(C)(14). Also, see Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
89	Farm Bureau	Section 2-103(C)(15)(f)	Advisory Cluster Sub. Siting and Design Guidelines	Two of the tree species mentioned (ash and hemlock) are currently being decimated by pests. Until resistant cultivars are found, these should not be part of required plantings.	Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(14)(e) and 2-203(C)(14)(e).	
90	SRL	Section 2-104	Homeowners' Association Responsibilities	Supports prohibiting HOAs from restricting farm activities, however, this provision should apply to RELs as well.	Not addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(4) and 2-203(C)(4). The Private Agreements Limiting Permitted Uses Prohibited requirement has been removed as the County does not have the authority to restrict HOA covenants.	
91	Conservation Easement Group	General		The conservation easement program is making a significant impact on Western Loudoun County bolstered primarily by the zoning that is currently in place which makes easements economically viable. The prime soils initiative will be detrimental to conservation easements being recorded in Loudoun by adding additional unneeded restrictions and reducing land values. I ask that the staff and members of the board carefully consider this consequence before passing any changes to zoning that may reduce the appraised values of conservation easements.	Acknowledged.	
92	Conservation Easement Group	General		I would encourage the board to promote voluntary conservation easements and re-establish the Purchase of Development Rights Program in Loudoun. Permanent Conservation Easements are the best way to protect Western Loudoun.	Partially Addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3)(b) and 2-203(C)(3)(b). PFLs will be required to be placed within permanent open space easements. Addressed.	
93	REDC	General		The Hamlet requirements of Section 5-702, do a much better job of preserving natural and open areas. Staff should look to implementing these requirements.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C) and 2-203(C). Some components of the Hamlet Option have been applied to the Cluster Subdivision Option.	
94	REDC	General		The PFL doesn't have to contain all prime soils but should have a mix of soils that are not necessarily designated as Prime Farmland Soils.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
95	REDC	General		The REDC consensus is for larger contiguous farmable parcels.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
96	REDC	General		The addition of another lot type leads to more residential lots. No need for an additional lot type.	Not addressed. See Table 2-102 and Table 2-202. In order to address the preservation of Prime Farmland Soils and continue to support the rural economy, the PFL was introduced and the REL remained as part of the Cluster Subdivision Option. Overall density remains the same.	
97	REDC	General		The ordinance requirements need to allow for a flexible design of the cluster lots.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2),(3),(4),(6),(7) and 2-203(C)2-103(C)(2),(3),(4),(6),(7) .	
98	REDC	General		The hierarchy of the cluster subdivision needs to be changed. Right now, the most important aspect of the cluster is the number of residential lots. The top priority needs to be the lot(s) preserving the prime farmland soils and those farmable lots.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(3) and 2-203(C)(3).	
99	REDC	General		Don't give up vistas. There needs to be more spaces between the home situated on the RCLs.	Partially addressed. See Sections 2-103(C)(2),(6),(7) and 2-203(C)(2),(6),(7).	
100	Conservation Easement Group	General		Approximately 3,500 acres of conservation easements were recorded in Loudoun County in 2021. About 2,850 acres are in AR1. The average residential density for properties in an easement is one main house per 50 to 100 acres. How many acres were developed as subdivisions in the AR1 zone? I don't know, but for sure, not nearly that much.	As of February 2022 in AR-1 and AR-2 zoning districts: 39,191 acres in residential projects approved; total prime farmland soils of 13,673 acres; 2,178 acres in approved cluster subdivision.	