

Q. 2 Other answers

Note: ONLY those BOUND by covenants MUST complete the process.
Respondent circled 'all' and added ?!
Respondent underlined 'must' and added this: I am not sure about the 'must.' I do not believe this is in my deed? Respondent drew arrow to 'included in my deed' for #3.
Yes and it is unfortunate that houses cannot have vinyl siding. The wood siding goes so low to the ground it acts like a wick and absorbs water. The exterior is high maintenance.

Q. 3 Other answers

Included in the deed???
'No' also circled with note to 'see comments page.'
Note: the covenant give ??? to CAHH and any of its committees are only advisory
See #2 Other above.

Q. 4 Other answers

Don't believe these were approved by COMMUNITY -- pls check records. I think it was never submitted to COMMUNITY. CAHH is not the COMMUNITY.
I'm not sure how the community has approved them. I've never been asked how I feel about anything before now.
In what year? The original community -- 1950-60's?

Q. 5 Other answers

(We did so more informally by speaking to our neighbors.)
And I previously notified DRC that notif should include neighbor BEHIND property. This is a serious ????. DRC ignored this. (photocopy of answers attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
Aware of it, not the process.
but not the timing
How is 'contiguous' defined?
Not specifically, but I could call others in the newsletter.
Respondent underlined 'by postcard or letter to his.'
Yes, except never heard portion before (circled 'and the date...Committee's review' and have never been asked to do this notification including this date.

Q. 6 Other answers

?
Believe me, it was a marginal notification -- process did not work well 20 years ago.
but really can't remember 38 years
Not in the last 5 years. 7406 Recard Lane put in a carport but did not obtain our approval. We would have definitely supported the carport if we were asked.
Once, many years ago.
only once!
Yes, and I was very agreeable about what they wanted to do.

Q. 7 Other answers

and then script any exceptions
Drawings/plans should be available to neighbors on request, i.e., full disclosure of new construction should be available to neighbors! Design Review Guidelines, Section V, p 7 is inadequate. Architects drawings of exterior should be available to neighbors INCLUDING NEIGHBORS AT THE BACK OF THE HOUSE if the addition is on that side. Full disclosure to ALL enighbors is required. Neighbor input should be before final drawings as major window placement, for example, may need to be changed is neighbors' homes are overlooked unacceptably.
Good idea!
Have the option of using form OR writing their own note.
It would simplify the process.
Notification should be by DRC if it is to be effective. The idea is to let residents - not only neighbors - weigh in before its too late.
Own description is OK if the DRC looks at it and it appears description is clear and accurate.
Perhaps at least 'guidelines/expected topics' should be provided.
Respondent underlined 'as part of' and added this: Unless it amkes the whole process easier or more efficient for the homeowner. There is also a certain 'neighborliness' that is preserved by having the homeowner write their own description.
Should be standardized, but reasonably simple & accurate.
Standardization of proposed renovations will better assure all issues are covered.
Uncertain, based on wording of question.
Unless homeowners 'lie' or under-represent the scope of the project.
w/minimum requirements. Should also encourage/require professional plans for major renovations.
Why not both?

Q. 8 Other answers

Absolutely not -- and in fact I often haven't ??? about it until renovation under way. The system is broken.
Before final (expensive) drawings
But you should make it clear that INITIAL presentation is only step #1.
Depends on complexity or degree of change to architectural entity.
Guideline needs to be reworked to allow more than 3 days.
I just do not know.
Not sure
The time period needs to allow for the possibility that some neighbors might not be available (e.g., out of town).
There is no leeway if they disagree--no arbitration process--a mistake. I have a big problem with this. We wanted to screen our hot tub with an architect's proposal who took it to the committee and the neighbor said they wouldn't approve anything but taking the hot tub down. The design review committee was no help at all with this, so it's (the hot tub) been out in the open for 19 years. In our case, the design review committee didn't do a thing except give the neighbor carte blanche over our proposal--we submitted 3 designs by a Hollin Hills architect who has served on the committee--what difference do design review guidelines make if a neighbor has veto power. It's a farce.
We have no experience.
Which is it? Number 8 or Number 5?

Q. 9a Other answers

1 week
A: This should be optional, perhaps suggestion but not required. D: Presume this would allow for changes, suggestions by neighbors.
circled both B or C, 'either'
Comments--No definition of major vs minor. With none noted it could be said that a 'minor' for one neighbor may be a 'major' for another. Hence same dates.
F. If the neighbor is asking for some type of contingency to the construction that effects neighbors property.
Given that people are busy/travel -- I think 2 weeks prior to 1st presentation to the DRC to be preferable to 3 days.
homeowner checked all boxes but other.
homeowner checked all boxes but other.
I think this is a confusing question. I see NO need for neighbor notification for small changes -- only large. This should be done before the first meeting.
if plans obstruct view or light or intrudes on privacy of next door neighbors -- before submitting plans to DRC.
Immediately after receiving
Our preference is for one week's notification, rather than 3 days. In all cases, the clock should begin ticking--so to speak--when neighbors RECEIVE notification, not when it is dropped in a mailbox.
Respondent marked out 3 days in all cases and wrote in 'at least one week' then checked 2, 3 and 5. Regarding 4, resp wrote: This doesn't actually happen in most cases. And DRC must take the resp in the notif process. Again DRC should notify by public agenda at least 1 week in adv ?? emailing or mailing ALL ??? neighbors (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
This back and forth seems impractical. Who's on first? This is hard to fathom.
To B: 'official' meeting
To D: ENCOURAGE, but don't require, earlier notification.
unclear
What is the 'build out' plan. Don't fully understand this part of the questionnaire.

Q. 9b Other answers

1 week
A: This should be optional, perhaps suggestion but not required. D: Presume this would allow for changes, suggestions by neighbors.
Comments--No definition of major vs minor. With none noted it could be said that a 'minor' for one neighbor may be a 'major' for another. Hence same dates.
Don't care about minor
homeowner checked all boxes but other.
homeowner checked all boxes but other.
I don't think minor changes should require neighbor notification.
neighbor approval should not be required
Our preference is for one week's notification, rather than 3 days. In all cases, the clock should begin ticking--so to speak--when neighbors RECEIVE notification, not when it is dropped in a mailbox.
Respondent added this: G. NOT AT ALL FOR MINOR RENOVATION, SUCH AS WINDOW REPLACEMENT.
See answer to #23.
To D: ENCOURAGE, but don't require, earlier notification.
unclear
What is the 'build out' plan. Don't fully understand this part of the questionnaire.

Q 9a F (Other) (IF YES TO 'Other time(s) in the process' for MAJOR additions/renovations IN Q.10) <p> ALL OTHERS SKIP TO Q. 10a <p> At what <u>other</u> times in the process should neighbor notification be done for <i>MAJOR additions/renovations</i>?

A week before the first meeting with the DRC to discuss proposed changes. Neighbors should be given the opportunity to attend the meeting where changes will be discussed, and they should be invited early in the process. Three days is not always enough time to arrange a babysitter or reschedule classes.
Also as in B above but with a prior notification time of ONE WEEK before the FIRST meeting with the DRC.
as soon as owner has a plan before DRC approval [Neither Major nor Minor was selected by respondent.]
F: Neighbors should be permitted two full weeks to respond and propose changes, once they are notified and they have confirmed receipt of such notification.
For Line C - Three days is probably insufficient (people could be out of town); a week would be more appropriate.
'I consider the content and tone of this document threatening to my rights as a property owner. If my home is a common element of this community then please reimburse me for the costs of maintenance over the past 11 years.'
I hesitate to make a proposal since I have never been involved in the process, but the notification should be timed to be useful for the process as well being more than a pro forma nod to the neighbor; it should incorporate neighbor concerns without those concerns driving the process.
Immediate notification of the entire community as soon as the DRC or CAHH board becomes aware that a tear-down is being proposed.
Nobody knows the boundary between major & minor.
Seven days before meeting with DRC to present formal proposal plans.
start of constructions
The 3 day time period is inadequate--should be changed to at least 2 weeks.

there is always lots of traffic with workmaen coming and going. it would be nice to know in advance when the hassle will start.
Three day notice does not adequately address the busy schedules of Hollin Hills residents. To have a notice given followed by DRC meeting and approval within one week does not take into consideration vacations and business travel. I also understand that you may not want to give notice immediately. Perhaps a one or two week notice might work.
To F: A week's notice seems more reasonable than 3 days--people are busy. Also what if the neighbor is away for an extended time?
When new neighbors move in

Q. 9b F (Other) (IF YES TO 'Other time(s) in the process' for MINOR renovations IN Q.10) <p> ALL OTHERS SKIP TO Q. 10a <p> At what <u>other</u> times in the process should neighbor notification be done for <i>MINOR renovations</i>?

Also as in B above but with a prior notification time of ONE WEEK before the FIRST meeting with the DRC.
as soon as owner has a plan before DRC approval [Neither Major nor Minor was selected by respondent.]
Depends on how minor the renovation.
F: Neighbors should be permitted two full weeks to respond and propose changes, once they are notified and they have confirmed receipt of such notification.
I don't really expect to be notified if the ren [sic] [This is all respondent wrote.]
If the minor renovation(s) are merely replacement of existing items, such as window panes, roof covering, etc., no notification should be required.
Minor changes should not require neighbor approval.
minor modifications such as window replacement/repair, siding replacement, etc should not require neighbor notification at all. The DRC should have the authority to approve/reject minor issues.
Neighbor notification should not be needed for minor renovations, ex: windows & doors.
NEVER
Nobody knows the boundary between major & minor.
Not necessary to notify.
notification should be required whenever there is change which will affect the neighbor's use of their property - this would include a change in sight lines.
See above
Should not be required for minor additions/renovations.
Shouldn't be necessary if its minor.
The 3 day time period is inadequate--should be changed to at least 2 weeks.
the problem is in identifying 'minor' are they cosmetic concerns that would significantly impact the visual environment the neighbor woul dhave to view? Is a fluorescent blue/purple paint job minor?
Three day notice does not adequately address the busy schedules of Hollin Hills residents. To have a notice given followed by DRC meeting and approval within one week does not take into consideration vacations and business travel. I also understand that you may not want to give notice immediately. Perhaps a one or two week notice might work.
To D: or not at all

Q. 11 Other answers

A and B were circled together.
But should be willing to facilitate discussion on other points.
C: Respondent circled 'only issues that are within the scope of the Guidelines.'
Please define 'all issues'--can't reply without understood.
Respondent also selected C, with this notation: If guidelines were IMPROVED, then C is okay. C would be acceptable if guidelines were more comprehensive. It should be simple for DRC to deal with minor additions/renovations. MOST major renovations can probably also be dealt with by DRC. Leave room for flexibility in handling major issues. NEIGHBOR NOTIFICATION ISSUES ARE VERY IMPORTANT & CANNOT BE NEGLECTED OR DISCOUNTED.
Respondent checked both B and C, adding this: I do not have enough background to know what issues have arisen in the past to warrant the inclusion of this comment.
Respondent checked BOTH B and C.
Respondent underlined 'only issues that are within the scope of the Guidelines.'
The DRC should be empowered to resolve as many issues as possible. 'All' is too comprehensive a word. There are 'issues' that can't be resolved to everyone's satisfaction that would still allow the renovation to proceed.
The question not clear. DRC must assume resp (and liability) for its decisions if the process is to work. (if someone continues to object, and DRC has considered the objections it should so state in writing and prepare to defend its decisions -- there will be some issues where not everyone will be happy, but DRC must act fairly and responsibly and without conflict of interest or favoritism.
What's the alternative if issues are not resolved before approval?

Please provide any additional thoughts you have on the neighbor notification process.

A major renovation within sight of my house took place with no notification: It just loomed up one day. To be honest, I just decided not to worry about it.
Again, leave minor renovations out of the process.
as for problem resolution; it would seem to me that if neighbors have problems that result in a design change, the DRC would have to review. They (the DRC) should also serve as an appeal vehicle if a neighbor disagrees with the approval as at that point, it's not the homeowners sole decision.
By 'resolve', I mean the DRC should acknowledge and discuss all issues brought up by immediate ('viewing') neighbors. That does not mean the DRC should waste time addressing matters of little or no import or relevance.
DRC should attempt to resolve all issues (major or minor projects). But it may not be possible to actually come to a resolution.
For major renovations, the DRC should notify the entire community via email or the Bulletin. Really, I think the DRC should be making the notifications to the appropriate neighbors - the homeowner should provide the description of the work and pre-addressed, pre-stamped envelopes to the DRC - this way the DRC can ensure that the description is correct and that the notices are mailed without too much effort on their part.
I believe that for major alterations to the exterior, additions, and tear downs there should be a community hearing held as is done by the BAR in Alexandria and many other Jurisdictions. This gives everyone in the community a chance to voice their opinion. The committee can then weigh those opinions to the extent it deems advisable, but the decision still rests solely with the committee. The hearing provides an opportunity for everyone to feel as though they have been heard, and precludes the possibility of allegations that the approval was secret or hidden from the community.
I strongly feel that any addition/renovation done to one's own property is not open for committee design which is what happens when all neighbor's thoughts/concerns as well as DRC members thoughts to 'improve' the designs have to be included. the Owner's needs/desires get lost. Obviously neighbor's concerns should be considered but not above and beyond what guidelines state. Building codes help to eliminate many neighbor problems (drainage)

I understand that giving neighbors the right to comment on plans makes it a more arduous task, but clearly anyone who can see the changes has a stake in making the outcome the best possible.

If done as it is intended, the process works. It is helpful if some form of plan is used to explain the renovation. The immediate neighbors are most effected in terms of property value and aesthetics. The whole community is too much.

If notification occurs at different times (e.g., before-after SRDC review), nature of the notification (level of detail) might vary. Before formal review, something very brief; after, considerably more detail.

I'm not convinced the neighbor notification process is particularly effective. In 27 years I've never received EVEN ONE!

it is nice to know what is going on in our area.

Minor renovations should not require so much procedure.

More accurately, the DRC does not and should not be required to resolve issues; rather it should assist the parties in finding a resolution.

Neighbor notification concerns should be considered during the Design Review process, but should not prohibit an addition/renovation if approved by DRC.

NEIGHBOR NOTIFICATION PACKAGE--TO INCLUDE NEIGHBOR COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT--SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO DRC AS PART OF ORIGINAL APPLICATION.

neighbor notification should be done after DCR approval and as a courtesy to neighbors that renovations are being done under DRC approval. Neighbors should take up personal issues with the homeowners first, then thru DRC.

Neighbors should not have veto power over something within the guidelines which the design review committee approves--that is putting the neighbor before the owner of the property.

Neighbors should send their replies directly to the DRC chair.

Neighbors who are visually impacted should be notified, and have a formal process and time period established to address their concerns before final approval is granted. This time period must be long enough to allow for real comment and discussion. The process must also allow for approval without 100% neighbor satisfaction, as some neighbors may use the process in a vindictive manner rather than true concern related to design issues.

Notification is important, but mostly so neighbors are aware that construction will soon commence. Neighbors' objections may or may not be within the scope of the guidelines. They should not be able to unreasonably delay renovations if they are within the scope of the covenants and meet the guidelines. The Design Review Committee should be trusted to do its job. Once neighbors are notified, I believe responsibility rests with them to voice their opinions and keep track of progress through the DRC, website and newsletter.

Only that all Hollin Hills residents should be notified regarding major renovations--including additions, tear downs or major design changes to current architecture.

Questions relating to the details and qualifications of the statements by the neighbors are not addressed.

re. 13.C.: How about the website AND email?

Reference 10c. All Hollin Hills: the monthly bulletin should be adequate.

Reference 10c: All Hollin Hills: the monthly bulletin should be adequate.

The DRC has had problems in the past due to 1.) length of time in committee, 2.) perceived inconsistencies, 3.) when person(s) involved sit, chair or head the committee making an 'unbiased' decision, 4.) neighbor notification is secondary to above issues.

the DRC has no authority on its own. The HHCA Board has the power and had passed on the work to the Committee. It is the habit of the DRC, particularly after a Board member sits in on meetings, to pass the buck back up to the HHCA Board on difficult cases.

The DRC should not become involved in engineering issues - for example, will there be an adverse affect on the flow of water because of neighbor's addition -this is beyond their scope of their charter and their expertise. More importantly, it could open the DRC and CAHH up to liability.

The DRC should resolve all issues that arise within the allotted timeframe, although it need not rely upon the issues raised (i.e., it can decide that an issue is meritless). The distinction between major and minor modifications is very subjective and should not be introduced into the Guidelines.

The important thing for me is to maintain the integrity of this neighborhood. This means the houses should look as close to as they did originally. Currently, changes are drastic and DRC mandates are ignored or the DRC fails to address major changes.

The neighbor notification process currently in place seems to work. If it becomes to onerous to obtain approval of additions etc., people will not comply with the design review process.

The present system is OK.
We believe the guidelines are sufficient and we trust those elected to DRC (or we as a community elect them).
We received a notification of major renovations that was merely an invitation to 'come over' and view the drawings, etc. The DRC should never accept this example as proper notification.

12. 'It Depends' responses: (IF YES TO 'It Depends' IN Q.12) Please explain your answer.<p> ALL OTHERS SKIP TO Q. 13 <p>

--
1) In-Kind replacements, do not require approval. 2) If the roof lines are to be changed, approval is required. If roof lines and materials are to be replaced In-Kind, no approval is necessary. 3) In-Kind Replacements do not require approval.
any exterior alteration: if noticeable
Any exterior alteration: ok if immaterial Replace deck: ok if identical Replacing windows: ok if identical
At present it is our understanding the DRC can't prohibit a tear down: it can control the replacement's design. This conforms to county regs.
Can the shed be seen from the street? If not, what's the fuss?
D. excluding in-kind replacement/repair F. not required for in-kind replacement/repair N. not required for in-kind replacement/repair
D. No if in kind, yes if shape or material change. F. No if in kind, yes if shape or material change. N. No if matching existing, yes if changed.
depends on kind of roof and window -- if same type, no DRC approval is required
Depends on the type of alteration proposed. Replacing a doorknob or an outdoor water faucet would presumably not require approval (nor should it).
depends upon change in original Hollin Hill window shape
emergency repairs
Exterior alterations, including windows that simply replace existing structure w/identical replacements don't require approval. Changes that alter existing appearances of the house would require approval.
F. If changing materials. Should use built-up roof not shingles. N. If modifying look of the window or changing size.
F. Yes if structural, no if same structure. N. No if not structural change.
G: If attached to second story or overlooking adjacent house.
H. Has nothing to do with architecture. Note: this goes to one of key DRC failures. ??????? of design harmony in various areas. That is key. (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
I believe that in-kind replacement does not require approval, nor do minor alterations such as landscaping, changing/adapting exterior lighting, painting, etc.
I read the materials sent out earlier and I thought if a house were replaced, that wasn't a modification and didn't need approval, but if the foundation was reused (although the rest of the house was rebuilt), it did not - so I don't know
if a change in type of window
if different from existing
If installing only double-pane windows and not changing the nature of the windows, no DRC approval needed. Otherwise, DRC should be involved.
If the roof is a standard HH roof, it does not need approval.
If the roof or window replacement is in-kind the owner need not go to the DRC. Any new, external design feature should go to the DRC.
In-kind replacements for roofs and windows do not need approval.
It is my understanding that DRC approval is needed for changes that detract from the Hollin Hills look of the house. For example, a new roof that is of the same materials and look as the existing roof would be fine, but a new roof with a different pitch or that changes the shape of the house would require DRC approval (although hopefully the DRC would not allow such a thing).
It should not matter if alteration can not be seen.
Need for approval for roof and/or window replacement depend on whether the new construction is in kind with the same material or look, or whether there is a substantive and discernable change in the look of the item. Duh. Also depends on who you know on the DRC committee.

no review required if replacement is done with the existing system.
Not all exterior alterations require approval. For example, a paint color or replacing windows 'In Kind.' DRC approval is not required for 'In Kind' replacement of windows. If the window proportions and type are proposed to change, DRC approval is required.
Only if exterior appearance changes.
Only if the replacement roof is substantially different in structure and/or shape (flat to butterfly).
only if visible from the street.
re replacing windows - i assume that is replacing the windows with similar windows. the same with the roof - same for same does not require approval.
Really, replacing windows SHOULD require approval but I don't know if it does. Some people think that Anderson windows are an appropriate replacement for original windows and they should not be.
Replace roof: IF ALTERING Replacing windows: IF NON-HH STANDARD then YES
Replace roof: If style altered Windows: If appearance appreciably altered.
Replacement windows have to conform to guidelines.
Replacement--NO.
Replacing roof and windows only if they are materially different from those existing
Replacing windows -- if just replacing the glass in existing frames I wouldn't think so. Changing style would seem yes.
Replacing windows: replacing same w/double pane=2
Roof - depends on whether or not it is a 1 for 1 replacement. Windows - depends on whether or not it is a 1 for 1 replacement.
Roof - technically does not require approval but DRC may be interested in materials
Roof is replacing with different material than stone and tar does require approval.
Roof replacement should require approval if the the proposed replacement roofing material or edge details are different than the existing roof. Window replacement should not require approval if one is replacing in kind and keeping the same details and materials as the original house.
Sheds are discouraged.
Should not require approval if replacement matches existing conditions
The design review process is governed by the covenants and guidelines. However, in our opinion, people often submit projects for approval even when not required.
To Adding a deck, Adding a pool, and Adding a shed or detached structure: IF VISIBLE.
To Adding a fence: Extent of fence To Replacing windows: Existing windows
To Any interior alteration and Kitchen renovations: Expansion of footprint of house?
To both G and N: if replacing same size & style
To D: If it's structural, it needs approval. To E: Unless it affects exterior appearance, it DOESN'T need approval.
To D: Like kind ok. To G: If material change. To J: Like kind ok. To N: Like kind ok.
To D: minor window change To N: no comment included
To D: paint no, garage yes
To F: If replaced in-kind.
To I: exterior? To N and D: repair existing does not To K: requires Fairfax permit
To J: I believe that any form of fencing is not acceptable.
To Replace roof AND Replacing windows: If new type.
To Replace roof: If changed. Maintenance ok. To Replacing windows: If replaced same is ok.
To Replace roof: If more than resurfacing To Replacing windows: If more than just replacing glass
To Replace roof: If pitch & gravel To Replacing windows: In kind only
To Replace roof: Needs approval if not identical type.
To Replace roof: new material. To Replacing windows: new appearance.
To Replace roof: no approval if same as before To Replacing windows: no approval if exterior appearance is same as before
To Replace roof: unless there is a change To Replacing windows: if the appearance would be altered

Q. 12 Other answers

F. replace roof: if of same type does not require approval. I. Kitchen: if only effects interior does not require approval. N. replacing windows: if windows are different type require approval, if same or very similar NO approval needed.
NO FENCES!
Not knowing any SPECIFIC approval requirements, I answer a blanket Don't Know.
Pools need fences--county code. To Kitchen renovations: (inside house) as in J.
Respondent circled 'Replace' in Replace roof and added IF ANY CHANGE? To N (Replacing windows) respondent added IF DIFFERENT.
TO C: INTERIOR TO N: TYPE STYLE
TO F: UNLESS IN KIND
To H, Adding a pool: Who does this?
To N, Replacing windows: ?--same kind/size
To Replacing windows: 2 as long as same Goodman design, otherwise 1.
TOO MANY are covered!

Q. 13 Other answers

*Especially if we are pursuing historic community recognition.
Get rid of passive voice. Who is to consider this? But, then the interpretation will always be subjective & depend on who serves on the DRC. Doesn't 'conformity & harmony' have something to do with size & siting also? I think these terms should be defined further in terms of what to consider.
Given recent DRC decisions, It appears that DRC doesn't understand some pretty important and basic principles.
GOAL IS TO ALLOW SUFFICIENT CONSIDERATION/APPROVAL LEEWAY.
helpful
I am more concerned with phrase 'take account of' than I am with the harmony and conformity. Take account of does not provide a strong mandate. Harmony and conformity must be the primary criteria, not just taken into account.
I have not been able to find out what 'harmony & conformity' actually means. A person could build a very large house, with long windows & wood siding & look very, very different from original houses. What does neighborhood want?
If neighborhood notification should have standard form, harmony and conformity should have similar criteria. As is, they are aesthetic sensibilities, which is all well and good. But for community acceptance, criteria would be more objective.
Needs to be emphasized. Very important. Harmony & conformity is very important. MOST IMPORTANT is Goodman criterion of not imparting negatively on one's neighbor's property, i.e., preserving views, additions (particularly 2-storey additions) not to look over or into neighbor's property.
One must trust that the DRC cares about the integrity of the community. NOT to the rules of 1949 or 1972. There are some building improvements not included in original specs ie windows.
Possibly
Respondent underlined 'above guidance.'
Respondent underlined 'from the beginning' and adds this to answer: With emphasis on passage 'from the BEGINNING' to avoid issue of later anomalies becoming the norm or root of objections.
Should be LESS specific
Strike the last sentence or principle 'widespread design....' invites violation of the basic Hollin Hills design characteristics.
Truthbe told one can find an example of almost anything in HH. 'Harmony and conformity' is about as good a phrase as any for DRGs.'
unless there have been problems

Q. 14 Other answers

(Poor choices) These choices are too limiting and are the result of a very low trust, proscriptive attitude toward the process. Goodman's designs are the foundation, not the recipe for the future.
[B and C were both checked.]
B and C were both checked.
But it depends on what features we're talking about.
Combination of A and C is best.
I would be happy with either C or D.
Materials have changed. Example: You can no longer get square gutter material. Storm doors have improved that actually look better than the original ones.
Relative to neighbors and harmony with styles in the block. this is key. C. Only if DRC shows understanding of harmony.
Respondent added, after '...reasons of': and availability of building materials.
Respondent circled D and E, adding this: I don't know how to differentiate D and E. Goodman design should not be relevant to 'harmony and conformity.'
Respondent underlined 'harmony and conformity standards.'
Respondent underlined 'to the amiximum extent possible' and added this in margin: The other choices here are too vague and open to interpretation inviting lawsuits and quarrels.
See Comments.
This already no longer occurs. I personally don't think 2 levels should have been allowed on flat land.
To A: Respondent crossed out 'to the maximum extent possible.' To C, D, and E: See the current violation at 2304 Glasgow Rd.
To B: Key here is major. There are some houses currently in Hollin Hills that are quite gorgeous. But having them next to you could greatly lower your house's value as they are so much bigger and/or different.
To E: or even, ?
Two aspects of design/construction shd. be considered: that to be preserved & that to be built.
Within reason--deference to Goodmanesque design.

Q. 15 Other answers

!!
Absolutely!
DRC should stand behind its decisions if process is to work.
If design changes approved by the DRC are NOT met, mediation or legal recourse should be sought. may avoid later legal controversy
NO--but OFFER, and indicate ramifications if they don't comply. (If no ramifications, then REQUIRE.) PENALTY FOR NON-COMPLIANCE? PAINT THE HOUSE ORANGE?
Provided the DRC then had recourse to do something if there were deviations. Not sure if need 'requirement' for all renovations although the DRC might be given the right to visit a site if reasons for concern arose.
Respondent adds: 'During construction' is too late. At that point the homeowner would never consent to any changes requested of him.
Respondent circled 'in accord with the approved plans.'
There should be a grievance process if the designs aren't followed.
This should be available at owner's or neighbor's request.
Volunteers, and not construction experts.

Q. 16 Other answers

?
addition of ground-level deck

Please provide any additional thoughts you have on the <i>design review process</i>.

9 years ago we went to the DRC regarding the renovation of an existing shed. The process was painful because of the attitude and behavior of the then DRC chair. We were quite turned off by the process only because of the personality of the person involved. The personality of the DRC members is critical to the success of the review process.
A member of the DRC should be allowed to visit a homeowner's premises during construction upon notification that significant changes to the approved plans and specification are being made without the DRC approval.
Although the DRC should be required to make site visits for all approved projects, spot checks (pursuant to the Guidelines) to ensure that additions/renovations are made in accord with the approved plans might be a good idea.
'Any contemporary or modern design features should be allowed consistent with harmony and conformity standards' The above statement will work beautifully if the Harmony and Conformity standards are more architecturally stated. Cues can be taken from our own Hollin Hills/Goodman Book. The main point being that the modern designs need to be sympathetic in both design and construction language (materials, proportion, light, airy repetition, heavy/thin contrasts, siting, and etc...
Don't fix what already works!
Guidelines should allow changes consistent with key design elements of openness with environment, glass exterior and minimal disruption to park-like atmosphere. Should not be excessively restrictive in vain attempt to preserve museum like status - this is and should continue to be a living community.
how that hollin hills mc mansion on glasgow could have passed the drc review!?! it is certainly the worst color also! i lost any respect for this system when i saw that house!
I am not aware that there have been any problems that would necessitate the DRC to visit - they have enough to do. It is important to remember that Virginia law will not allow the DRC to ignore the design 'dissimilarities' that have occurred during the last 50 years. For example, some houses have gravel roofs, other shingle - both have been allowed and the community look has not suffered as a result.
i find that the approval process changes with the people on the DRC. I find that there are MANY discrepancies with current design/review policy that have been done by MANY Holling Hills homes in the past. example: 3 years ago i was told by the DRC that no carport was allowed at my home, but on Marthas Rd almost 1/2 the homes have carports and many were built within the last 10-15 years. example: we have strict standards for design, windows and the all important t111 siding, but very few guidelines about the color of our homes. This is really ridiculous! We must conform to a design code but I can paint my house neon pink if I want? If the whole idea is conformity and harmony we need to look at this dichotomy and balance each out. One is too strict the other is too lax. I also feel that 'who you are' in hollin hills has an impact on DRC regulations as well. A very prominent member of HH has constructed a brick walled room addition in the front of his home (no windows). Simply a brick wall that faces toward the road. I dont believe that anyone else in HH could have had this done to their home because it in no way promotes conformity and harmony. It truely detracts from the home and looks horrible. I cant imagine anyone on the DRC allowing this to happen, unless you take into consideration who this person is in the community.

I think it's an excellent process. It is very important to all current and future residents of HH that we maintain a harmonious architectural and landscaping feel to the community. I commend the DRC on its great work. If the DRC believes the rules need to be clearer or better enforced, I can certainly go along with that but don't wish to overly burden the members.

I think the 'harmony and conformity' language should be more specific to the original design of the neighborhood. I don't think we should allow certain elements (i.e. shingle roof) just because they came into prominence during a time when the DRC was not as strong as it is now.

In regard to question 21, I think that a member of the DRC should be allowed access to the project site if they have received notification that a project varies from the approved design.

In the four years I've lived in Hollin Hills, I've seen all manner of strange and ugly things happen - gothic stone walls, colonial doors, chicken wire fences, teardowns with high design re-dos, all manner of cheesy poor-taste gewgaws and plantings and of course plain old disrepair. These simple houses / this simple neighborhood requires a lot of restraint and few are willing or capable of living within that structure. Yet, that is exclusively where the beauty of the neighborhood lies. That is the neighborhood. Without that we have nothing.

Just that it be open to all--e.g., so if one of my neighbors decides to change a house I can know about it.

KEEP W/IN THE SPIRIT OF THE ORIGINAL

My 'no' answer to #21 takes into consideration the time necessary to do this (volunteers only have limited time) and also the fact we should have trust among neighbors.

Note that the current DRC guidelines recommend that the ideal of harmony and conformity stands even if unfelicitous changes have been made. For example, that there are shingle roofs on some houses doesn't mean it's okay for everyone to put a shingle roof on their house. Past mistakes should not be used as current precedents. The guidelines are pretty good the way they are -- but they could be more explicit and they do need to be enforced. If such enforcement can't be had without being more specific in the guidelines, then maybe the guidelines should be changed accordingly.

On #8, neighbor-notification form: I think notification should be as simple as possible but I said 'yes,' there should be a form. However I think the form would be useful only if there is a feeling that there are standard points that should not be missed.

Question 20 is problematic for me. #2 should leave off the words 'for reason....taste.' Someone's taste may include columns or peaked roofs. #3 'contemporary or modern design' would include corrugated metal siding, and those words are just too vague. Question #21 sound like a good idea but would place too much burden on the time for the review committee

re. 19.: My 'Yes' assumes equitable application of the standards. The Glasgow tear-down does not seem to me to conform to the above criteria.

Section IV, item 7 of the DRC guild lines states that neighbors shall be notified 3 days before the project is reviewed. Currently the notification letters go out after the project is reviewed. I submit that if the DRC wishes to have any credibility at all, it must follow its own written guidelines.

The current process works. Not everyone is happy everytime but the process is good. Please don't let a few unhappy people change our vibrant neighborhood.

The objective should be to retain and preserve the Goodman design of HH homes, but some reasonable accommodation should be allowed for new elements and improvements on the Goodman design.

These houses were built 60 years ago and some flexibility is warranted to match today's housing expectations. I bought here because of the style of the homes and certainly want to preserve the appearance of the neighborhood. However, within the spirit if the Goodman tradition, there should be modernization considerations. Gutters are a good example. My house has its original gutters and they do not match the Goodman style. When they are replaced, they will cost more to fix since the retrictions now apply. Go figure!

This is very important to our neighborhood. Thank you for all your efforts. I feel strongly that maintaining original home and landscape elements is critical to the unique value of Hollin Hills.

Tough, thankless job. I've heard stories where the DRC input was appreciated, and accounts in whichit seemed DRC members oerstepped the bounds of review and exercised their own design biases.

We are unhappy with the last sentence in the box under item 18 which is an editorial and should not be there. This questionnaire smells of bias. The Guidelines themselves have no authority. The DRC has to be a subjective body to function at all, therefore the Guidelines are exactly that - advisory. The HHCA Board has the police power to check on actual conformance, not the DRC.

Q. 17 Other answers

BUT A LONG TIME AGO

but largely forgotten

not in a while, now I have

not recently

some time ago

Q. 18 Other answers

A. see answer to Q. 20a

a. unclear on how DRC should be approached at concept stage. c. questions on allowed vs preferred roofing material. e. forget

ALL alterations implies that interior changes need approval too. The emphasis in the guidelines is on exteriors. I would prefer the wording: ALL EXTERNAL OR EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS and let people do what they like with interiors.

B. The problem is that there are holes in the procedure. C. this has been ignored by DRC for too long. D. (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548) E. this is central weakness. there is none.

D. I forget E. I forget

Haven't read recently enough to comment--6 years ago.

It's been awhile since I read the guidelines--but I believe it covers these areas.

Next to C/NO: Just a little tweaking needed or a little elaboration of specifics.

SEE PG. 10 [COMMENTS].

To B: Too vague--'Encouraged to present.... should be changed to 'required...!'

Q. 19 and 19a Other answers

19: I don't know what they are so I cannot mark in most of these. 19A: These should be relaxed to permit vinyl siding.

Because some people are not abstract thinkers, cite MORE concrete examples [to A-I].

D. again this not enforce???
(photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548) F. Not being enforced G. not being enforced H. not being enforced I. Not being enforced L. and prop VALUES
D. gutters are a problem. F. what's instead of T1-11? M. must be considered.
F. exterior siding: update with modern materials H. construction materials: update with modern materials.
Haven't read (see Q 19) so I don't know except about paint color.
HIRE AN ARCHITECT!
ignore 19a answers
I'm not familiar with current guidelines but based on past experience generally think they're ok.
Not sure, haven't read
respondent appeared confused...checked j - m as 'okay' but also checked j and m as the 2 most important CHANGES.
Respondent circled 'okay' under In your opinion...
Respondent indicated A-M 'should be LESS specific.'
Respondent underlined 'okay and they are now.' Perhaps made LOOSER, instead?!
See comments below.
The DRC should resolve this issue.
To B, Roof line designs: Height?
To E: Saw nothing on chimney. On K: Underlined 'lighting.'
To Exterior paint colors: Paint colors are getting out of hand. USE EARTH TONES. Respondent indicated that L and M are 'a single issue.'
To G: doors especially
To I, Exterior paint colors: Shouldn't be under design review
To I: WE DON'T LIVE IN SOUTH BEACH
To J: TWO checkmarks.
To L: Respondent included three checkmarks and 'very important.'
TOO MANY QUESTIONS. ENOUGH ALREADY.
We relied on architect to be responsible for understanding guidelines.
Window walls are oriented HORIZONTALLY not vertically as guidelines state (interior frame divisions are vertical).

Q. 20 Other answers

A. This is hairsplitting. all will be subject unless any design duplicates exactly. D-F. These relate to harmony
B. Why allowed?
How can specific/prescriptive guidelines happen with so many site conditions in this neighborhood? Fairfax County Zoning ordinances already set these limits (arrow to D through G)
However if they are addressed they should be directional.
I. other: siting and impact on adjoining neighbors
I. Other: Nothing more is needed.
I: adding carport or garage
I: Are there any shed designs available that meet guidelines? Any of them available at stores?
I: PAVING a new driveway that covers most of the front yard!
Mostly issues of harmony & conformity.
Next to A: NO
NO
No palladium style moon at top of exterior door. window exterior frame 2' not 3' or 4' Box gutters basic to original house design.
None needed! This is an incredibly LEADING QUESTION! The chart needs a 'no improvement' column.

Q. 20 is confusing. Does it state that the DRC can question changing windows -- but DOESN'T address te complete replacement of a house?? Or an addition that changes the look of the house?

RECONFIGURING THE TOPOGRAPHY.

respondent 'guidelines needed' for a-e, did not check for f-h. but selected types of guidelines needed for f-h and not for a-e.

Respondent included '?' for C, D, E, F, G, and H.

To A: Should not be permitted except post-fire or similar situation.

Q. 20a Other answers

A and G [also important].

A. size

C-H: Legal issues with doing any of these.

I: PAVING a new driveway that covers most of the front yard. Two checkmarks.

I'm not clear on what 'general direction and standards' means

20b. IF YES TO 'OTHER' IN Q. 20 OR Q. 20a: In what other areas are guidelines needed?<p> ALL OTHERS SKIP TO Q. 21.

Additions or new houses should not over power the neighbors' houses. Consideration should be made if all the houses in an area are one story houses, how the addition of a two story will affect the appearance of the section.

Due to the poor chimney construction and detailing, leaky chimneys are endemic in Hollin Hills. Many people have remediated this flaw with unsightly, ugly, nasty tin caps over the chimney. As one of our own talented, imaginative local builders has developed an esthetic and functional fix for this problem, the tin caps should be outlawed, and DRC members who have these abominations on their own chimneys should be drummed off the committee.

I: MAINTENANCE OF YARD/LANDSCAPING & REMOVAL OF DEBRIS, CLUTTER, TRASH

I: Specific features, designs, etc. that would NOT be acceptable

I: View from neighbor's house

in general the existing guidelines are too prescriptive

Looking around the community I believe that the Guidelines have served us well. Not only do they meet the physical needs of the community, but they also allow the community to function well. If we become more restrictive the willingness of the community members to work with the DRC may be severely limited. Please do not give in to the demands of few loud voices who want their own design preferences to dominate the rest of us!!!!

materials

None of this is needed. Were the thrust of this questionnaire followed. nobody would serve on such a bureaucratically-constrained body save those folk who would turn HH into Disneyland. KISS! Keep it simple, keep it subjective.

NUMBER OF CARS IN YARD + OR STREET

please no more hollin hills mc mansions!

To I, Other: Maximum square footage of any deck and/or patio

To I, Other: Privacy of neighbors, sight lines of neighbors.

To I: Color

Tried to but could not un-check two entries in Q.27

Please provide any additional thoughts you have on the <i>Design Review Guidelines</i>.

Whether the guidelines are specific enough is not really the issue. The issue is when and how the guidelines will be enforced. Again and again I see the DRC accurately describe a proposed project as outside of the guidelines, but it is allowed to pass anyway. The DRC needs to stand tall and say, for example, 'No, a shingle roof is NOT ok. Anderson windows are NOT ok.' even if there is precedent in the neighborhood to the contrary.

as above
Be sure non-architects can understand and comply with guidelines especially for minor renovations that do not normally require an architect - don't be too technical so compliance is easily accomplished
I am horrified and angry at the slanted nature of this questionnaire. The issue is McMansions and tear-downs. The DRC and Guidelines are such that tear-downs are OK. It's what one replaces a tear-down that's the issue and the DRC has the control now, without all this palaver. Think: how can HH prevent an Owner from demolishing his house? We can't but we can control its replacement. Some folk are all upset by the Bell-Clark house. I can point to previous Goodman work that parallels the Connecticut Modern that project displays. It's supposed to turn gray over time. It doesn't display raspberry trim or shingles, nor does it thumb its nose at the DRC, which approved it. The choice of members of the DRC is perhaps more important than wrapping the DRC in pages of red tape detail. I went on the DRC the last time to protest the then tendency of the DRC to insist on making the 3-foot mullioned window-wall of models 2 and 3 the only system for all new additions. Goodman didn't stop there. he provided house detail that evolved over 25 years. The philosophy that should control is, does the work spring from reason and use, rather than hewing to a 'style' concocted by lay persons. It should be understood that the Covenants are the Holy Writ, not the Guidelines which are advisory. Use of the word 'governed' in question 5 is too strong a concept.
I feel that the guidelines should be restricted to the exterior appearance only. For example, in reviewing a new home design, the interior should not be subject to review. Proportion, stories, etc., should be addressed if possible. These are tough questions and difficult ones to give definitive, rigid guidelines.
I love Hollin Hills. I am an architect who was drawn to this neighborhood primarily for its park like setting and glass filled mid-century modern architecture. I always feel a certain level of pride when I tell someone where I live. I do think design guidelines and a design review process are necessary components to preserve unique spirit and character of our community. That being said I am very concerned about certain people's interpretation of what constitutes architectural 'harmony and conformity' in HH. I very strongly believe that additions and modifications (or new homes for that matter) should NOT be required match the details and materials of the original Goodman designs such as roof shapes, wall types, window shapes, construction details, etc. So long as a proposed design is true to the spirit of modernism that Goodman embraced- clean simple lines, honest materials, lack of ornament, etc- additions should be allowed to deviate more from the conventional HH aesthetic. HH was founded as rather cutting edge of-the-times place to live. Constructing additions today that look like they were designed in 1955 is not an honest modern way of preserving the true spirit of our neighborhood. Goodman would not have wanted it that way.
I read them 14 years ago when we bought our house. Have not read them since. However, it seems they are working pretty much just fine as is, as I drive around our beautiful neighborhood I don't see any egregious design issues.
I think if a person is on the DRC and wants to tear down her house and rebuild it, she should resign from the committee. In any case, she should be very aware of the guidelines, design a chimney that looks like the HH chimney, not have her new house loom over neighboring houses like an apartment building. I almost had a similar situation and the DRC forced a change.
Items listed in Q. 28 would all seem to be covered by any reasonable interpretation of the guidelines.
My deed does not have any reference to covenants and therefore I am not bound by any covenants or design review requirements.
Q 27 Exterior colors: Guidelines should prohibit loud or highly contrasting colors. Gutters: Guidelines should nor be so stringent as to insist on box gutters that cannot easily be cleaned. Q 28 Guidelines should prohibit additional stories that do not conform to land contours.
re. 29.A. & 29.B: These 2 areas should be a primary focus. This, in light of the stated goals of the process and the plain fact that these two categories will have the most significant impact on everyone, particularly neighbors within view. (29.C. is equally important, but seems amply covered by 29.B.)
Thank you for your hard work and clarity.
The colors of the houses should be earth tones. There are plenty to choose from. Get rid of the garish colors, now and for evermore. Amen
The Guidelines seem adequate to me, but I am not conversant with recent issues that may have arisen regarding inappropriate additions or teardowns. I am in favor of doing what's needed to preserve the HH design atmosphere - but also think the DRC has done very well with the current Guidelines. Thanks for the great work!

They are too restricting--the prettiest houses in Hollin Hills are the ones NOT designed by Goodman. His house siteings are great but why conform to guidelines that are ugly and perpetuate that.

This all began because people were concerned about 'McMansions' - but the DRC Guidelines address this concern - the Guidelines require that buildings 'not be heavy or imposing,' vistas are to be shared, all building must flow with the topography. We have had no McMansions and I suggest that we save our firepower for the time when one may be proposed. Let us not waste or jeopardize our community on small issues of import to only a very few who want to make this into a Goodman museum. I am further concerned by those who wish to impose their life style on me - who wonder why people need large kitchens, or master baths - 'they have never needed them.' This social engineering is inappropriate.

We disagree with the premise of question #28, which states that the areas addressed therein are not covered by the existing Guidelines. To the contrary, any structure 'erected, placed or altered' is covered by both the Guidelines and the Covenant, which clearly encompass replacement of an existing house, an addition that significantly changes the external appearance, and adding an additional story. Addressing specific maximum requirements (e.g., height, footprint, etc.) is more precise than the Guidelines currently are or should be.

We have to become better stewards. Design review must view Hollin Hills with the respect it deserves. This is hard given the wide range of perspectives on what the neighborhood means. In my opinion the neighborhood means what it looks like. If it is allowed to change, slowly or by grand teardown attrition it is no longer the unique place it was.

time prior to meeting

5 days

at least seven days.

depends -- email notification would work

NA

posted on the website 2 days prior

they can be posted on the web site 3 days before

Q. 21a Other answers

3 days to 7 days (both numbers circled)

As soon as possible/reasonable

as long as the date of the meeting is announced in advance

Both 3 days and 7 days were circled.

Depends on Design Review Committee's requirement also.

Q. 22 Other answers

!

All design review procedures and decisions should be open to any and all residents.

attend but not participate

But w/time limits

CAHH members only

Esp. to ask questions or simply get information! Not necessarily to voice opinions--to be informed!

However, shouldn't the meeting be OPEN to the community?--(as observers)

It would be wise to have this expressed 'in writing' so that meetings won't be disrupted or take unduly long [time].

LIMITED SPEAKING TIME in some cases may be required.

Notification of immediate neighbors might not be enough to bring up significant issues.

only those that are members

Respondent circled 'any.'
respondent underlined 'voice opinions: This should be done on a yearly basis to cover any problems that have accrued.
The idea is to protect the COMMUNITY. Limiting disc to immediate neighbors is unacceptable as are attempts to close ????? (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
This should be two questions. Yes they should be able to attend, No they should not be able to voice opinions. The 'Sophie's Choice' of the survey. The DRC couldn't possibly get through a meeting if everyone/anyone who attended (Not one seeking approval) also was free to comment.
We should give opinions to DRC either before or after posted decision.
Yes, Attend. No (also checked), voice opinions, unless neighbor.

Q. 23 Other answers

!
But not as a guarantee of approval. This can also occur with any memmber individually already.
informal interaction with individual DRC members?
Maybe residents should request a little protection from a Design Review Committee to avoid being unprepared. They should know if they need advice from architects or lawyers.
Only 1 private, preliminary meeting, though.
only for advice.
Submit PRELIMINARY sketches/plans & then discuss.
This might save \$ and time and have been understanding of guidelines to provide to architect.
TO CUT DOWN ON IN-MTG 'OOP'S'; THIS SHOULD LEAD TO BETTER PREP & FASTER MTGS
Why should they meet privately? Plans are matters of public record and the process must be open if it is to work. (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
Yes, would avoid A LOT of problems.

Q. 24 Other answers

As above -- only informal with available members. DRC is VOLUNTARY and meetings take TIME.
Homeowners can be truly frightened by formal hearings.
No and No Opinion were both circled.
Not in place of the DRC monthly mtg, only in addition to std. mtg.
'Privacy,' in any form should be ruled out.
provided an opportunity it provided for an objecting neighbor to meet with DRC
Respondent underlined 'allowed to request.'
see above

Q. 25 Other answers

BUT CANNOT BE ON A VOTING PANEL FOR THEIR OWN HOME
For a MAJOR addition/renovation, DRC member should RESIGN not recuse self. Then have new member and DRC still will have 5 members. If DRC member uses DRC member architect for major renovation & both are recused, DRC has 3 members. This is not enough. Please consider this issue and address it. Should BOTH resign and be replaced before project is considered?
Merely recusing oneself does not eliminate inherent conflict of interest. All human activities/decisions are influenced by relationships.
Respondent underlined 'if they recuse themselves from the decision.'
Respondent underlined 'if they recuse themselves.'

Respondent underlined 'major additions or renovations.'
Respondent underlined 'recuse' and added this: It would be wise to post notice on the website because of the potential untoward influence of the committee.
SHOULD RESIGN PRIOR TO REVIEW.
Some things can't wait.
Such recusal would be a sham.
There are plenty of people who can serve on DRC , so ???? is only way to protect the process. (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
They should resign once they submit their plans.
Underlined 'if they recuse themselves.'

Q. 26 Other answers

??
Family situations change.
It would be wise to post notice on the website because of the potential untoward influence of the committee.
SAA
see above. (??? if the process is truly indep, the a minor member -- ie not an OFFICER could do so. Certainly not the DRC liaison. (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548)
Too much influence.

Q. 27 Other answers

BUT more details should be available upon request.
On the Web
Or the CAHH rep to comm should provide a report indicating substance of disc esp if problems.
Same report, just additional distribution.

Q. 27a Other answers

c. especially to neighbors. regular mail only if community member didn't have email address.
Continue to put report in community's HH Bulletin.
HH Bulletin
if yes, through community email so everyone gets it.
most cost effective
No \$ should be spent on this.
Note: Everyone receives regular mail. We are not all on email or website access.
Plus
To Regular Mail: Too expensive To both Website and email: Coverage too uneven

When DRC Report

30 days
As soon as possible
As soon as possible, certainly within 1 week.
brief report, within 1 week
in the next bulletin
n/a
next Bulletin plus HH Comm email
reasonable for reporting in Bulletin

see other

See Other answers Q. 28.

Q. 28 Other answers

Don't know, haven't used process to know.

Other: It may have to vary depending upon nature & complexity of issues considered.

This is a volunteer organization -- this time burden should not be placed on them as well.

To Other: Members of the DRC should feel free to decide what may be the controversial with any member of Hollin Hills but not look for alliances for or against a proposal.

Within 2 weeks

Q. 29 Other answers

Do the DRC members think they need this? If so, yes.

I refuse to see dues raised for this

If it is needed I'd be willing to consider such funding.

if needed

If needed.

I'm not aware of the extent of the burden on the DRC members, or whether there is precedent for part-time assistance. I would be open-minded to a new hire.

It would depend on what work is required and whether the volume of business made it necessary.

Like the natural design for Voigt Park

More info needed in order to answer this one. With more info, the answer might be yes!

not at this time

Seems like a LOT OF WORK.

Too expensive

What do THEY [volunteers] think?

Please provide any additional thoughts you have on the <i>Design Review Committee meetings</i>.

#20 County requirements are adequate. #12-A A teardown should be allowed. The new structure should be approved if it is within 'harmony & conformity.'

*DRC should consider landscaping pool and water run off which may affect neighbors. *DRC should monitor neighbor notification. *DRC should ensure that parking will be on property and not on street. Number of cars per lot should be specified/limited. *DRC should ascertain that properties with home office/studio has obtained county license and parking restrictions before any approval.

1.) I am horrified by some of the projects approved by the DRC in the past few years--there are some really ugly additions--carports, etc. Isn't there any way to talk about what this community should look like without defensiveness and rancor? 2.) People who want to tear down build bigger houses & carports that look like they don't belong with the original structures do have options--they can sell & go elsewhere. I don't think this community should give up its original charm because some people want more space. Look at the monsters that are being built around us & see what could come here if we let it.

1.) Neighbor notice--should be mail notice to all who can see it, plus website notice. 2.) DRC resolution of all neighbor issues could include telling neighbors that an issue won't be resolved in the neighbor's favor (Q. 11). 3.) We don't think there is much need for specifics on design elements, but there should be easily findable resources showing examples that are okay and examples of what's not, say on the website (Q. 19). 4.) We believe the key issue is DRC's willingness to enforce the guidelines because the guidelines are pretty good as written. The DRC also should welcome community involvement because that helps build community support for the process. 5.) A note of major/minor changes: Windows aren't a minor change--they're integral to the Goodman aesthetic.

1.) To better cope with the interpretation of complicated plans, the explanation of the nature and function of materials, and the sheer amount of proposals, THE DRC NEEDS TO ADD AN ADDITIONAL NUMBER, NAMELY ANOTHER ARCHITECT. At present the burden of the committee's work seems to rest FAR too heavily on the shoulders of one or two individuals. Another architect on the committee would not only assist the committee in accomplishing its tasks, but help the NON-architect members stay up to speed and make better-informed decisions.

2.) The process of neighbor-notification needs attention. First, all houses in sight lines of a project include many more than immediate neighbors. One must consider, e.g., the visibility of the alteration esp. in WINTER when the trees are bare, when houses across the park or at another distance become the ones not nearest but MOST physically visible. Second, the procedure for assuring that neighbors ARE notified needs some mode of verification. How does the Committee know that the neighbors have indeed been notified? And/or that they have been notified of the full extent of the project?

3.) My gravest concern is that faced with the number of projects they are asked to consider and with the welter of detail involved in each of those, the DRC is thereby prevented from a given reason to avoid seeking what may be called the 'sufficient distance: or even 'aesthetic distance: necessary to really weigh and apply the notions of 'harmony and conformity.' The details the committee attends to are myriad, as I saw when attending a meeting, but the bigger questions regarding each structure (e.g., is it sufficiently and TRULY transparent; does it sit lightly on the land; is it simple and modest to the degree of not dominating its neighbors or the surrounding landscape; is its height and scale consistent with other houses in the neighborhood, in the particular section of the neighborhood, and on the particular side of the street, and consistent with the slope and features of the surrounding nature?) seemed not to be seriously addressed, got lost as I've already noted in the welter of demanding detail. The only solution to this is to insist that such questions get asked and answered aloud. and that the make up of the committee is such that it is responsive to and comfortable with not just the technical details, but also with matters of architectural history and aesthetics.

A project should not be reviewed by the DRC unless neighbor notification has been made - a wider area for a bigger project

About a decade ago there was a division amongst members regarding the rejection of a hip roof garage on Elba. I believe, rather than rejecting alternate suggestion not necessarily 'Goodman' design but with slight variation ought to be provided. DRC might have done so but was not discussed in public.

Additional meeting notes will require part time administrative assistant to maintain records/paperwork.

Additionally there are two areas I am concerned about: Roofs and Driveways.

1.) ROOFS. STANDARDS OF ORIGINAL DESIGN--Section II, pg. 47: 'The original built-up roofs were asphalt felt and slag/cinders with few penetrations such as skylight.' Section V, page 51 F: 'Roofing materials that retain the visual appearance of the original built-up are encouraged.' MY COMMENT AND CONCERN: I strongly disapprove of the allowed ? use of asphalt shingles. They detract from the Goodman design.

2.) DRIVEWAYS. STANDARDS OF ORIGINAL DESIGN--Section II, page 45: 'Driveways were gravel to reduce the visual impact.' Section V--Design Guidelines, page 49, Driveways and Parking Pads: 'Such car areas should be kept to a minimum size.' MY COMMENT AND CONCERN: The proliferation of asphalt and concrete driveways, even on flat areas, is disturbing--aesthetically and environmentally. Certainly they are a departure from the desired natural look of our wonderful community. Further, in 1985 we did a rather extensive remodeling of our home. The DRC, at that time, provided us with invaluable advice and help for which we are eternally grateful.

Anyone should be able to attend, and there should be a specific time that attendees are allowed to speak to the DRC members during the meeting. If attendees want to comment during the proposals, the DRC could allow it at the DRC's discretion.

As a HH new homeowner, we believe that the DRC function is very important. In looking for HH housing, we saw a wide variety of homes--in good condition, and in poor condition. Many had significant additions or changes--some in woeful taste. We were also concerned to learn about the lack of restrictions on teardown/replacement or expansion of multi-story, etc. We moved here because of the integrity of the neighborhood and all that it stands for. We cherish the opportunity to live here, and commend the DRC's work to preserve this community.

as for reporting, needs to be more detailed - link to more detail might be in order

Balance is needed - should a 1949 house be made to 1949 standards? No. Too many useful improvements in building. The integrity and external appearance of home should be maintained. Going from 1 floor to 2 floor house requires REAL careful consideration. The siting and type of house on each lot were Bob Davenport's best abilities. Changes in house heights and size can affect neighbors a lot, as well as the community perceptions as one passes the home on foot or car. I still feel that the DRC is a fair organization with community interest at heart in spite of that ugly orange house. It is tricky with changing building materials and changing needs. Remember when all landscape plans included a space to hang out one's wash in a tasteful manner?

Basically the DRC needs to realize that 'our neighborhood' needs renovations at this point -- '2007' and that we should encourage people to 'up grade' their homes. This will also make the value of our property go up. We can't make the process so difficult that it pushes positive change out! We are currently thinking of adding an addition and the process seems overwhelming in its self, let alone to have the DRC have so many more rules than are in place now. Hope things get streamlined!

By and large the DRC appears to be doing a great job. It is important that there be no lapses in its work as there were for a period in years long gone by, but the burden is also on each homeowner to want HH to retain its unique stature and appearance.

Can't we be adults & reason together? We're a community. We need to accept that our neighbors have a stake in our decisions on these things. [These notes follow #11, Neighborhood Notification Process.]

Consel gave advice that majority in attendance accepted about the Popkins tear down which has been demanding exercise of DRC action. That advice should be basis of any further changes or modifications of DRC rules and regs. This advice is legally defensible. Congrats on this outstanding questionnaire!

Currently the House in the Woods Club is turning private matters into neighborhood gossip. Your house is your private property and not open for committee design and neighborhood gossip or pressure. The guidelines state ideas of our houses which should remain but even as Goodman changed his style from one end of the neighborhood to the other, the guidelines should allow for individual interpretation. The committee should not be designing the projects -- or trying to install their views -- just approving if the uidelines are satisfied. I don't want to see a Reston neighborhood where every house has to match and only 3 colors can be used. That's one of the beautiful things of our neighborhood -- that our houses are all different but have an underlying theme. The DR Committee represents the community and thats the extent of community involvement. Neighbors (pr members of the community) not involved should NOT BE involved. There was such a fuss made over the house on Drury Lane which needed to be torn down due to foundation problems. The DRC needs to recognize that the houses are all aging and will be requiring significant upkeep work. With all the newer materials -- low maintenance materials and 'green' materials, the houses need to change to some degree. Limiting new materials is costly, demands more time and upkeep of homeowners -- which is likely to make people bypass the DRC approval process. The guidelines should state the ideas to be maintained and the committee should be tasked to protect those ideas. Ways to get there should be the homeowners task. As a homeowner I've submitted 3 projects. The 4th in February. As an architect, I've submitted 7 over the past 15 years. As a CAHH Board member, I was the DRC liaison for 2 years. Ive seen excellent committees and horrible committees. Any questions, feel free to call. Rebecca Bostick 703-768-2240. Also, as an architect, the building code is making several of our details -- especially windows -- more and more difficult to follow. This should be taken into account.

Design Review is doing a terrific job! We are far more concerned about HH houses that are falling apart than we are about those residents who want to improve their properties. Is there anything HH can do about these horrible shacks?

DRC should create & maintain a resource file (binder) with pictures that exemplify the prescriptive & performance outcomes they wish to maintain. Pictures are often easier to inform than words. A fact sheet for homeowners to give an architect should be drawn up so that standards are easily accessible and understandable. Internal alterations to a home that do not impact on external design elements should not require DRC approval.

General comment: The DRC is a fully-functioning, responsible body capable of rendering fair, thoughtful and appropriate responses. It needs neither additional rules nor external oversight not already in place. Our thanks to their efforts.

Good luck in getting adherence to DR principles/rules--however they may be modified.

I am in favor of allowing the committee to do its job without vox populi interference. If people want a say in these matters, they can run for/volunteer for the committee.

I commend the CAHH for putting out a survey to ascertain all manor of community views rather than just relying on open meetings. I found the survey useful but sometimes biased too, insofar as it never asked about loosening or weakening the Guidelines and the DRC process, but only about tightening and strengthening. FYI, I still do not accept that the DR covenants apply to my property. On the contrary, for 22+ years they were considered to have lapsed! I have acted accordingly. Design Review seems to be such an endless bone of community contention and source of petty power and aggravation that perhaps it should simply be abolished. At the least, it should not longer apply to minor matters such as fences, window 'rabbits' or sheds. Historic designation will only make matters worse! I do not wish to live in an outdoor museum, nor a 'cabin in the woods,' so to speak. Please make the process as fast, simple and cheap as you can; avoid tendencies to make it even more regulatory, bureaucratic and downright 'Baroque.'

I do not feel that if a homeowner is REPLACING windows, door, or deck WITH SAME that it should have to go thru DRC.

I do not think new houses or renovations should seriously interfere with 'we live in a park' concept or be seriously out of line w/architectural intents.

I found this survey most unhelpful & intrusive. What legal authority does the DRC have? to attach one's property? If one replaces leaking & broken windows with affordable stock or reduces exposure with T1-11 while minding consideration of HH design is that person vulnerable to action initiated by a nosy, nitpicking neighbor? Is maintenance renovation?

I measure the effectiveness of a design review body by the Reston Review Committee. This group, before which I have submitted work, is bound up in schedules, miniscule rules, staff work, and has been dominated by an ego-tripping architect for decades. I have had submitted brick samples haggled over and changed on whim. The Hollin Hills DRC is collegial, with limited terms, self-organized, the members don't generally inject themselves into a proposed design except where the direction is clearly in opposition to the Covenant wording. Let us keep it that way and continue a body that both serves the community and becomes a pleasant social activity. Too much constraint will ruin the idea of a citizen participant, producing instead neighbor police.

I think that given that this is a community of people, and not houses, that the Design Review Proces has and does work very well 99% of the time. I believe in the Eason Cross school of thought that recognizes that these houses were intended grow, change, adapt with the time, holding to the core of Goodman's philosophy that realized that's what would and should happen. We've even been told that under certain DRC regimes our 1976 addition would not have been approved. And yet we love our house as does nearly every person who sets foot in it! Its addition was inspired by Goodman--we believe it is in 'harmony and conformity:--a phrase that will always be debated as long as HH exists and it should be! I appreciate the work that the DRC volunteers do and I think it should stay the same. I'm very concerned about houses that have fallen into disrepair--sit vacant--have colors that a jarring to the landscape, or doors (front doors) that are not in keeping with a contemporary house. I hope this community remains progressive and expansive in its approach to the DRC guidelines, embracing contemporary architecture, and encouraging a liberal and inclusive interpretation of the guidelines.

I think what is a good intended process for the visual integrity of the neighborhood has gotten ridiculous--I think of the design review committee like the KGB--too much power--too restrictive--too much control--unless something is outrageous why not just leave homeowners alone. There are many good things about Hollin Hills that make it a desirable place to live. The design review process makes it less desirable. I am glad you are giving neighbors an opportunity to express their understanding of the guidelines and their opinions about the process. I wish the survey form had an area for creative dialogue about how the guidelines might be improved and less restrictive. We as purchasers find a home we love, are pressured to sign the covenant and are stuck with a process we had no input to for as long as we live in Hollin Hills. There is a lot more to the integrity of the neighborhood than what the houses look like--'the architectural integrity.' What if we were all still driving cars from the 50's? Wouldn't that be ridiculous? I think it's time for the design review committee to lighten up a bit. I don't want houses torn down and megahouses put in their place as is happening in most neighborhoods, but I think the process is too strict. I'm required by law to have a railing around my deck and have done nothing about it because I don't want to have to deal with the design review committee or beg my neighbors for approval--It just doesn't always work the way it is and the homeowner gets left out in the cold. Thanks for the opportunity of expressing my opinion. Is it possible for a purchaser to buy a home without signing the covenant?

I think wider variations in design should be allowed. I think minor renovations should not require neighbor approval as long as they are approved by the Design Review Committee. There should be a grievance process for homes that are in a major state of disrepair. There should be a process for work that needs to be done on an emergency basis, such as a tree taking our a major portion of the roof, walls or windows, same with major leaking, etc. These homes are NOT well-built, the process of updating them should NOT be an impediment to purchasing a property here. Allowing good and harmonious design would be a better thing for the neighborhood, rather than 'preserving Goodman,' in a specific sense. Keep it simple.

If the procedure and process is more time consuming.

In response to question 34, I believe anyone should be able to comment on major renovations, but not on minor ones.

INCREASE SIZE OF DRC TO SPREAD WORK AMONG MORE PARTICIPANTS

It has worked well in the past.

It is critical that we not alter the process in ways that will make it so onerous to the homeowner that they are willing to risk sidestepping the process. Nor should we make it so onerous on the committee that we can't find volunteers to serve.

It is important for the DRC to be knowledgeable about architecture and about Goodman architecture (both construction and theory). It is important for the DRC to have guidelines that enables the committee to properly review, (a knowledge base and ability to think freely). It is important for HH residents to be knowledgeable in order to properly submit. There are actually a shortage of additions that have in my estimation properly used Goodman's language. Certainly while the new house on Glasgow is very nice; it is not sympathetic to Goodman. (wood siding does not make Goodman)

It would be helpful to the community for the DRC to provide information as to the types of garden sheds that could be acceptable. It's understood that the siting of a shed would have to be presented for review, but the idea of hiring an architect for a garden shed makes keeping our old one repaired look preferable. Same goes for storm doors. We can replace a storm door--but the only evidence we have of what was there are the hinges. The standards as I read them say nothing about chimneys--yet the free-standing chimney is one of the major characteristics of a HH home and there should be clear standards regarding them. For neighbors with living spaces that face one another and are sited on a plane, it seems reasonable to allow a privacy fence between them if both neighbors agree.

It's important that the review process be completed in a timely manner and not become bogged down by complicating the process.

Most of the exterior fireplace & chimney construction is used brick. The use of concrete block for exterior fireplace & chimney should not be accepted.

My deed does not have any reference to covenants and therefore I and my property are not bound by them.

Our addition start to finish went along smoothly because we used an architect familiar w/HH and GC who have had experience in HH. Our addition was done (we're still completing the patio) in 3 parts. [Respondent listed specific parts, architects, and GC's for each. To include them here would be to identify respondent.]

Over a period of ten years we have experienced a variety of DRC interpretations of the covenants. The relative importance assigned to privacy plus the functioning of neighbor notification are the issues underlying our comments about consistency of treatment. When we bought a single story house we were told that the previous owner had attempted to get approval for a two-story addition. Following neighbor objections, construction was begun on a one-story addition but the house was put on the market before it was completed. We made our sales contract contingent on DRC approval to complete this addition. We hired a neighborhood architect to draw up the plans and shepherd them through the DRC. The plans were approved after we agreed to use tongue and groove siding rather than the siding proposed in the plans. The additional cost was several thousand dollars. We assume the DRC accepted the original neighbor notification process and we had no contact with our neighbors for this addition. We are in a constant struggle with bamboo planted by a neighbor along one side of our property. We conferred with DRC in 2002 when our neighbor on the other side proposed to plant bamboo as a privacy screen. We request information on what type of privacy fence would be permitted and were advised by the DRC representative to plant red-tip bushes along the property line. However, the amount of shade is problematic for this plant. We first tried cedars and then a beech hedge but none survived. We need to re-address this unresolved issue with the DRC in the context of current development of neighboring property. Also, there is a 6-foot woven redwood fence that belongs to the neighbor behind us on our rear property line so a prohibition against a fence on our side property line is confusing. What we'd like to see is guidance on how to harmonize a new fence with existing fences, especially as more additions are permitted, threatening our privacy and eliminating natural sight lines. In 2003, we contacted our neighbors when we planned to build a tool shed at the rear of our house. We sought siting advice from a neighborhood architect, provided neighbors with a drawing, and got their approval. We attended a DRC meeting where approval was granted, provided we use solid sheeting roofing instead of shingles. We built the shed. Our last experience with neighbor notification was the summer of 2005. On July 4, our next-door neighbor informed us that he would be making a one-story addition for a family room on the house that he rents. In late August, as we were traveling to the West Coast for a one-year assignment, we received an email from him with plans for a 2-story addition. We objected to a 2-story addition, 15 feet from the shared property line, as it overlooks our living areas and reduces our privacy. There has been no action on our objections by the neighbor or the DRC, and construction is underway. Therefore, it's unclear to us how a neighbor's concerns are addressed.

People moving into the community are likely to believe that the Design Review Committee is just advisory. Real estate agents aren't likely to tell new owners that the DRC can scuttle their plans. When I bought my house on Elba Road from a friend of a friend, I was determined to have a flagstone patio that was longer than the house. Although none of it is more than 2 feet above ground, I still have no idea if I should have asked the Design Review Committee. After 38 years, I still have no idea if the DRC would have had any interest. I had done similar work at my previous home in Arlington. I wouldn't have purchased the house if a substantial patio couldn't have been built. The work was done over 3 years. + I worry that the DRC may have the employment of architects as a motive for the review process. It's good to have architects on the committee, but they must show restraints. Architects with a 'Goodman' orientation may be either too sparse or too numerous. + Substituting a 4 foot tall divider for a hedge near the driveway is a minor item to us but may require DRC approval. I don't even have a good basis for discussing this with my wife.

Please feel free to follow up with us. As is perhaps obvious, Stuart and I have no major concerns about the DRC or its guidelines. The process needs vigilance, the Hollin Hills community continues to reinforce that. But overall, it continues to produce the desired results, just drive through the neighborhood, enjoy the architecture. --Wendy Clark

Protecting property rights is important, too. Some of the recent discussion have been too '1984' to suit me. I am thinking about an addition and am well aware of the process and would never propose something outside the best interests of the community. However, I don't like the thought of having CAHH and the DRC dictating every detail. There is usually more than one right answer to every question. There needs to be flexibility, too.

Questionnaire was difficult to answer. Some questions confusing & poorly worded. THANK YOU FOR DOING THIS JOB.

Re #14: Option A--Too restrictive due to restrictive nature of following, in perpetuity, one person's thoughts/ideas. Option B--How does DRC (& homeowners) define 'minor' (10%, 20% variations?) Option C--2 key words 'contemporary' & 'modern' will continue to change--as 'contemporary' often means 'of the times,' and as we all know--the times (and design ideas) are a changing. Too nebulous terms. Re #7: Does the DRC ever read what the applicant is telling neighbors? Are the neighbor notifications factual and truthful?

Re question 11 -- I don't know enough about what the question is based on -- i.e. whats happened in the past -- to answer properly.

re. 42.: This 'Yes' for the part-time position is on condition that this person assumes none of the approval/disapproval decision making responsibilities of the DRC volunteers. ***** My general comments are below: ***** Overall, I am not inclined to layer on more rules. However, given the DRC as a component of the good life in Hollin Hills, I urge equal and careful consideration of all proposals, particularly tear-downs. Which criteria exist to verify that a house is in such poor condition that it must be torn down? Why is Hollin Hills at once applying for historic status and the DRC simultaneously allowing the replacement of a tear-down on Glasgow Road that seems in many, many ways to not conform to the guidelines? Further, though I am a devoted reader of the Bulletin, it eluded me that this tear-down was approved until it was underway. I learned of it the day I saw the old house being loaded into dumpsters. It is very possible that I overlooked the notification, but considering the magnitude of the project, I was/am surprised that this event was not more fully reported and discussed beforehand --- especially in light of the homeowner's concurrent service on the DRC. *** Hollin Hills has survived numerous insults to its architecture. A lot of ugly work has come AND gone. Likely, the community would retain its essential character without covenants or a DRC at all. However, we do and will have these rules. Given that fact, those who volunteer should perform those duties with particular attention to the design details for which these houses are known. Every project should receive the same fair and attentive review, including large scale projects. There is no reasonable excuse for nitpicking detail on small projects on the one hand and then, on the other hand, giving a pass to a house so clearly non-conforming as the replacement on Glasgow Road. Thank you very much for your dedicated and careful efforts. Respectfully, #500

Re: Garden supply sheds (for lawn mowers, lawn chairs, garden tools). Are any of those sold by box stores allowed? Are there any plans which do meet standards available?

Records maintenance for institutional memory and sharing of history would be very helpful.

Regarding question 34, all meetings should be open to observers, but observers should not make comments during sessions with homeowners. The norm now seems to be that observers sit quietly and only ask questions or make comments in between applicants' presentations or at the end of the meeting. This seems to work fine.

Should keep 'park' atmosphere. New additions should be in keeping with original design. Some cutting is good--some bad; keep trees where possible.

Since the original designs and/or 'feel' of Goodman houses seem to be maintained I think the DRC is doing a good job. Members of the community at large who want to police every aspect of every house change - even tho it may not affect their view - should consider being on the DRC if they are so inclined.

Spend money creating an architectural scholarship for an Hoolin Hills student. Go positive, Not negative. [Signature]
The new house on my Glasgow Rd is a beauty.

Thanks for allowing input. Although new to HH, we fully support retaining those factors that appealed to us in the first place--architecural integrity; preservation where feasible--practical, possible; and respect for the history of the neighborhood. While attempting to preserve what is good, we also hope to make the process not overly burdensome.

Thanks for asking. I am a new resident and love this neighborhood. Understand need to update, customize & be current for re-sale value but keeping the 'look' of this community is what makes it so special & unique. Thanks.

The DRC and CAHH have not been open about the extent to which some members of the community are not subject to DRC. Certain viewpoints expressed by the CAHH attorney at the recent community meeting regarding DRC are, in my judgment, and based on previous legal findings, incorrect. Try to make the Design Review Process more friendly and more open.

The DRC could never write detailed guidelines that address every potential issue. The basic design features: roof shapes, window shapes, color palettes, and other such issues addressed in the 'Introduction - Philosophy and Overview' of the Design Review Guidelines provide solid guidelines to the DRC. We should not deviate from the basic guidance provided for these basic features. Who knows what building materials may be 'down the road.' New construction methods, new materials, ecological requirements may render current approved methods/materials obsolete. If we want to retain the Goodman design we must retain and adhere to the basic design features. However, each new DRC must be given the latitude to apply the Goodman philosophy to the requests it receives.
Barry Pearson

The DRC's purpose is to ensure visual harmony in the HH community. It should not be permitted to dictate lifestyle changes or restrict homeowners from meeting their needs, such as more space, ramps, fences, or size, or carports. The DRC needs to also take into consideration new technologies which may affect renovations--new types of windows, alternative heating or cooling sources or automatic surveillance, cleaning or other methods. The DRC should also consider expenses to homeowners who find it more economical to replace a defective structure than repair it.

The existing standards are generally satisfactory and not all worth all the extra effort involved in re-writing the rules & regulations. It is the problem of ENFORCEMENT which needs to be addressed: The problem involves MIXED notification. A: The homeowner who is very confident of approval will be happy to involve the neighbors to add allies in the sure-fire approval. But if the homeowner anticipates a problem with the DRC, the [notiatee (?)] is to 'forget' to notify the neighbors. To involve them would be to endanger approval and lose friends among the neighbors. Motivation to evade HIGH but MIXED. B. The neighbors. A neighbor may value the homeowner seeking DRC approval as a helpful caring friend and even if asked for approval it motivates to ignore the request not complain if no request was made. Instead for years there would be resentment when the homeowners proceeds tempered by pain at loss of a friend if complaint is made--MIXED MOTIVATION. One possible solution: On receipt of request for DRC approval, DRC sends neighbors forms to return registering their opinions. Homeowner is given the results not the replies of the specific neighbors. Also extend the definition of neighbor to include anyone who can see the project from his/her house or yard.

The present system is ok.

The question about going to the meetings and being able to voice opinions is confusing. I think we should be able to go to meetings, but not voice opinions while the homeowners are there. This is the current practice. People voice opinions or ask questions during the breaks between homeowners or post them on the website. By stating the question as you have, I think people would be concerned about onlookers disrupting the meeting.

The recent DRC reports in the Bulletin seem more specific than they have been at times in the past, and we think that the descriptive information that has been included recently is informative.

There are a number of houses in HH that are 'new' structures (several of them are located on Rebecca Dr.) which are not influenced by Goodman design but which blend in. The much discussed house on Glasgow does not 'offend' me with its design or size. It has a contemporary feel to it with clean lines and to me appears smaller than many houses in HH. It is the COLOR that sets it apart in a way that is jolting and unaesthetic. I would like to see more attention paid to the exterior color. In addition, originally landscaping plans were seen as an integral part of the HH community and the homes themselves. The 'interplay' between house and environment is especially important in houses with floor to ceiling windows.

There should be minutes of DRC meetings. (this could be function of CAHH DRC liaison). There should be stds for DRC members -- ??? now there is apparently little comprehension of resp to the community. The CAHH Board review and approve all DRC actions (as a committee, DRC members ????????) and CAHH Board resp for its committee's actions. Regular CAHH review could also solve most serious problem -- lack of appeal process. that would give RESIDENTS a forum to raise serious concern without going to court. Essential to give all community residents a say in the process ??? need for special membership class (Note: by law CAHH not a civic association but only a voluntary recreation assn -- if all community residents not allowed to partic, covenants will be unenforceable Review committee and DRC members should do a tour of good ????? decisions. Good decisions include: (photocopy of survey attached. handwriting could not be read. #548) also attached, 5 typed pages of additional response.

This is why we have an elected DRC. They are to enforce the rules and guidelines. To have anyone in the meeting that wants to be involved is crazy! nothing will ever get done...too many cooks and too many opinions. This policy of DRC approval followed by neighbor notification and working from there is a good blueprint to follow. I'm afraid that this is going to become too involved and doing anything to improve ones home is going to need an act of god to accomplish it in HH.

This survey is VERY poorly written and exhibits an obvious bias towards changing/expanding Design Review. DRC already has authority over 'design of a complete replacement of an existing house.' So #20 does not need to ask this question. This is just one example of bias. This committee is just trying to trick people into prohibiting teardowns which are not covered by DRC. Stupid survey.

NEIGHBOR NOTIFICATION INVOLVING SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL ALTERATION SHOULD BE GUIDED BY A STANDARD PRESENTATION PACKAGE (DRAWINGS) INCLUDING A 3-D MODEL AND THE SCALE MODELS SHOWING MASSING OF VOLUMES WITH CONTIGUOUS NEIGHBOR 3-D VOLUMES. EXTERIOR SURFACE MATERIALS AND FENSTRATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE CLEARLY PRESENTED. DESIGN REVIEW GUIDELINES NEED STATEMENT IN PROCEDURE FOR APPLYING FOR APPROVAL. 'PLANS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE NO LESS THAN ONE WEEK BEFORE A MEETING.' DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEES WORK EXTREMELY HARD AND ARE TO BE THANKED. THE WORKLOAD AND THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CURRENT SUBMISSIONS TO THEM HAS CHANGED THE PARADIGM. IT IS AN IMPORTANT EFFORT TO GIVE THE DRC TOOLS AND BACKING TO DO A DIFFICULT JOB WITH AS MUCH GUIDANCE AS CAN BE PROVIDED. THEIR REVIEW CANNOT BE PERSONAL SUBJECTIVE AESTHETICS BUT RATHER THE SYNTHESIS OF THE COMMUNITY ARCHITECTURAL LIFE HISTORY. --AND THANK YOU ALL.

Volunteers are required to spend much time to perform this function and although many of our opinions as denoted by this survey may may not take into account the practicalities of dealing with the homeowners needs or duties. Some latitude must be given to the expertise of the members of the committee to deal with personality difficulties and building codes, etc.

We are aware of the Hollin Hills Covenants by word of mouth only. Our deed includes only what might be considered 'boilerplate' text: 'If the property is a condominium or other property subject to Owner's Association covenants, regulations and by-laws, Borrower shall perform all obligations under such documents.' Our title insurance refers to: 'Restrictions appearing of record in Deed Book 820, page 230; amended in Deed Book 1455, page 267.'

We are governed by the covenants - the covenants provide for DRC review, not community review. If we make this the community debating society, decisions will become political rather than driven by the Guidelines. I also concerned that because of a very vocal minority in the community driven by their own goals I would be forced to bring with me to the meeting people who shared my views - a very ugly scene.

We believe that the design standards have become too rigid and too focused on the elements that comprised the initial Goodman design. 'Harmony and Conformity' are both ambiguous and conflicting. Many communities and public buildings are harmonious juxtaposition of different styles and materials. Conformity can connote rigid adherence to materials, colors and design. It can also mean adhering to a modern design that blends indoors and outdoors in a harmonious design. We bought in Hollin Hills and have loved living here, not because of the repetitions of Goodman design elements, but because the style of living showed an independence of thought and spirit that reflected a thoughtful, forward looking, educated, and tolerant population. We came to escape the kind of person who was bound to the traditional houses and traditional thinking of the people in those houses. Years ago there appeared in Life magazine a picture of a row of houses, each identical, each with a grass lawn and gas light by the side of a concrete walk. In the middle of the picture was one house in which the homeowner had planted a tree. The neighbors were trying to evict him for this design crime! We want to plant a tree, and we want to live in a community where planting a tree is not a crime but is celebrated. Goodman himself was not a slave to 'Goodman design.' Why should we be? We want to live in a community where the architecture remains edgy, where adventurous people try to expand the modern architectural idiom, where people do not feel bound to have a house just like their neighbor and do not feel diminished if it is not. It worries us that we have changed from a group that cast off the traditional orthodoxy of 1940 with its Colonial style, but are not attempting to voluntarily don the strait jacket of a new orthodoxy, the Goodman style. We want to live with people who are as passionate about modern architecture today as we were in 1945. The idea of design review is, in our opinion, off the track. In some communities it is against the rules to have a design that is similar to another within a three block radius, in others various degrees of conformity are required. This is 'The land of the free and the home of the brave.' Let's loosen the bonds of design review, let's create a community of people willing to move on, who think for themselves about how they want to live--and let their neighbors do the same! The design review committee should, in our opinion, be a group that helps the homeowners by providing advice and assistance. They can give educational talks, write up good practices, show how some architectural features are good and others bad and help the homeowner to do what he/she wants to do as any good

architect would do for a client. Celebrate Goodman, yes. He showed us a path--but he is not a dead end. We do not want Hollin Hills to become a museum, the graveyard, of modern design. That would be as bad as living in the community of traditional Colonial style houses that Goodman and the early Hollin Hiller's rejected.

We feel that the guidelines are quite clear as far as they go. There is a real need for direction of MAJOR renovations and RE-BUILDINGS. But above all, a better adherence on the part of the DRC to the guidelines.

We have been astonished by the furor over design review. But we are troubled, on reviewing the texts, at the term 'conformity,' which tends to invite different interpretations. We think that the term 'conformity' should be largely construed to mean conformity with the spirit of Goodman the architect. He surely would not have been a slave to the details of the original Hollin Hills houses. As residents since 1952, we have found many things we would do differently in a new house. Of course Hollin Hills should grow and change and not be regarded as a sacred museum piece. It is a place where people live, grow & change. The attempt to define every element that is or is not acceptable is, we think, misguided. The real standard should be the good taste of the moment of our time, not of 1950. We cannot define unacceptability but we almost all know it when we see it, e.g., McMansions and Colonial pillars. We have to accept the decisions of a [?] review board and realize that there are bound to be borderline cases.

We have followed the recent controversy regarding the design review process and have been very disturbed by the way some people have treated their neighbors. Some things to keep in mind: 1. The Design Review Committee has less authority than it seems to think it has. If the design review committee takes too hard a line, people may simply not voluntarily comply. As Mr. Diaz pointed out, Virginia is a property rights state. Further, restrictive covenants are construed narrowly. For instance, it is questionable whether DRC can really prohibit fences. Yet, DRC takes the position that it can. If DRC attempts to exert too much power, people may not comply. The process works mostly because people want to comply and want to cooperate with DRC. If you make the process into an adversarial process, that is what it will become. 2. The Civic Association and DRC are not government agencies. Therefore open meeting requirements are not applicable. 3. There are limits to how much the DRC guidelines can be changed. Again, the Civic Association and DRC are not government bodies. Further they cannot expand their own authority simply because they may want to. 4. In our opinion, this survey was slanted. The questions were drafted in a manner that encourages people to say 'yes' to more regulation and yes to expanding the powers of the DRC. 5. The process currently in place works. Do not try to change it, at least not significantly, unless you want to live in a neighborhood with constant friction and controversy. People seem happy to comply with the DRC process now. If you make things too difficult folks will not be so cooperative.

WE HAVE PRESENTED TO THE DRC THREE TIMES. 1. ADDITION TO EXISTING HOME WAS APPROVED BUT A DRC SITE VISIT CAUSED A STIR DUE TO DRC MEMBERS LACK OF GUIDELINE KNOWLEDGE--ALL ENDED WELL AFTER RESEARCH OF GUIDELINES AND ALEXANDRIA BUILDING CODE. NO CHANGES WERE REQUIRED AFTER LONG ANNOYING PROCESS. 2. NEW HOUSE ON REBECCA WAS APPROVED WITHOUT ANY OBJECTION OR REQUESTED CHANGES. DRC WAS VERY SLOW IN RESPONDING IN WRITING. CONSTRUCTION WAS STARTED IN SITE OF NO WRITTEN APPROVAL. VALUABLE GOOD WHETHER TIME WAS LOST. 3. CONVERSION OF REAR WOOD DECK INTO STONE PATIO WAS APPROVED. NEIGHBORS WERE INFORMED OF OUR INTENT. NO OBJECTIONS WERE VOICED AS FAR AS WE KNOW. DRC INTERPRETATION OF GUIDELINES ARE SUBJECT TO PERSONAL OPTIONS OF ITS MEMBERS. THIS IS FINE IF THE OPINIONS ARE FAIR AND MEET TODAY'S NEEDS, NOT 1950 BASED STANDARDS OF DESIGN & LIVING. GUIDELINES NEED TO REMAIN AS FLEXIBLE AND PROGRESSIVE AS CHARLES GOODMAN ONCE WAS.

We have submitted plans to the DRC on two occasions about 18 months apart. On both occasions we found the process to be efficient, friendly, reasonable and helpful. It is apparent how hard the DRC members (all volunteers) work. The most recent meeting I attended also had four observers. Their presence made me uncomfortable -- not because I have anything to hide, but because of the implication that the DRC couldn't be trusted to do its job without the presence of outside observers. In the future (if I ever need to appear again) I will plan to ask for a private meeting. I'm happy to be accountable to the community and I believe that accountability is being fulfilled by the work of the DRC members. The process that was designed many years ago is working. We've completed the neighbor notification process and found it to be very reasonable as well. As for Goodman's vision, one look around our community shows how much we have changed, as well as how we have remained in 'harmony and conformity.' I wouldn't want to legislate the DRC to act as a preservationist force. Our living, evolving community is much more appealing to me than an aesthetic time capsule could ever be. But don't get the impression that the recent inquiries into the DRC process have annoyed me. I think the discussion has helped us all appreciate how much we share and brought us closer, even without unanimity.

Why not pre-qualify architects who understand the 'style' of architecture & request all plans to be stamped by 'pre-qualified' architects. Might help review process. I am an architect who would be happy to speak with you further about any and all ideas. [Signature] Good luck.

You are brave and dedicated!