SPECIAL MESSAGE TO THE PUBLIC

WHILE WE HAVE A THREAT OF TRANSMISSION OF THE COVID-19 CORONAVIRUS AND IN RECOGNITION OF A GOVERNOR’S ORDER – NO IN PERSON ATTENDANCE WILL BE ALLOWED FOR THE FEBRUARY 1, 2021 MEETING. PLEASE UTILIZE OUR LIVESTREAM BY ACCESSING THE LINK BELOW

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82453182333

To make public comment please submit to: comment@strasburgva.com by 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 1st, 2021

Town Council
Work Session
Strasburg Town Hall
174 W King St
Strasburg, VA 22657

Monday, February 1st, 2021
7 p.m.

Town Council Members:  
Brandy Hawkins Boies, Mayor  
Ken Cherrix, Vice Mayor  
Dane Hooser  
John Massoud  
Christie Monahan

Taralyn Nicholson  
Doreen Ricard  
Emily Reynolds  
Paul Weaver

Staff Contact:  
Wyatt Pearson, Town Manager
Agenda

Please, silence all cellular devices. Thanks.
*Town Council Work Sessions are typically used for general discussion on matters pertaining to the Town. Formal actions are taken during Town Council Meetings unless otherwise notified.

Call to Order – Mayor Brandy Boies

Public Hearing:

- To receive public comment on the potential sale of the following real estate:
  Two (2) certain tracts containing 1,389 square feet, more or less and 4,020 square feet, more or less, identified as Portion of 25A3-A-56F located in the Town of Strasburg, Davis Magisterial District, Shenandoah County, Virginia.

Special Recognition:

- Recognition of Lt. Robert “Lonnie” Conner on his retirement after serving the community for more than 17 years.

Citizen Comments on non-agenda items:

Action Item:

1.) Approval of Minutes
   Description: Minutes of the January 19th, 2021 Town Council Work Session
   Staff Contact: Amy Keller, Clerk of Council

2.) Resolution Regarding Town Election Dates
   Description: A resolution in opposition of state legislation to change election dates from May to November.
   Contact: Council Member Massoud
   Support Materials: Resolution

Discussion Item:

1. Annual Utility and Tax Bill Write-offs
   Description: The Town annually reviews outstanding tax and utility payments. Utility fees and personal property tax payments can be collected for up to five years and real estate payments can be collected for up to twenty years.
   Staff Contact: Angela Fletcher, Director of Finance
   Support Materials: Staff Report

2. West Queen Street Property Sale
   Description: A Town owned parcel of land is proposed for sale to an adjacent property owner in the area of West Queen Street across from the old water treatment plant.
   Staff Contact: Wyatt Pearson, Town Manager
   Support Materials: Staff Report

3. SUP2021-01 – Pleasant View Apartments (Terminus of Pleasant View Drive)
   Description: SUP per UDO Section 6.6.2.B to request buildings containing more than 12 units, as required by UDO Section 6.6.4.A (Original application is for 2 buildings each containing 48 apartment units and 96 total units for rent. PC recommends 1 building of 48 units total).
   Staff Contact: Lee Pambid, Planning and Zoning Administrator
   Support Materials: Staff Report

If you require any type of reasonable accommodation as a result of physical, sensory, or mental disability in order to participate in this meeting, please contact Amy Keller, Clerk of Council, at 540-465-9197 or akeller@strasburgva.com. Three days notice is required.
4. **Surber Request for Revitalization Area Resolution**  
*Description:* Discussion on a resolution to establish a Revitalization Area as defined in Code of Virginia Section 36.55.30.2.A  
*Staff Contacts:* Lee Pambid, Planning and Zoning Administrator  
Michelle Bixler, Community Development Director  
*Support Materials:* Staff Reports

Old or unfinished business:  
New business:  

Closed Meeting:  
- Pursuant to Code of Virginia §2.2-3711(A).5 for the discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business’ or industry’s interest is locating or expanding its facilities in the community. The subject of the closed meeting is to discuss a prospective business in the Northern Shenandoah Business Park.

Adjournment
MINUTES OF THE STRASBURG TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION HELD ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH ZOOM ON MONDAY, JANUARY 19TH, 2021 AT 7 P.M.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT VIA ZOOM: Mayor Boies, Vice Mayor Cherrix, and Council Members Hooser, Monahan, Massoud, Monahan, Nicholson, Reynolds, Ricard, and Weaver.

Mayor Boies called the Work Session to order.

Citizen comments on non-agenda items:

Action Item:

1.) Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the January 4th, 2021 Work Session were approved as presented.

Discussion Items:
1.) FY2019-20 Audit Report
Description: James Kelley, auditor with Robinson, Farmer, and Cox, will review the findings of the last fiscal year audit.

Director of Finance Fletcher thanked Mr. Kelley and Marissa Helmick for joining the meeting and turned it over to Mr. Kelley. Mr. Kelley reviewed the audit, the auditor’s opinions, and financial highlights. The Town achieved the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting for the first time. It states that the town’s financial report is at the highest level it can be. He congratulated the town staff on this achievement.

Mr. Kelley reviewed the audit results and said they had issued an unmodified audit opinion which is the highest level of assurance available. The summary of net position was shown which is basically the balance sheet. The summary of changes in net position was shown.

The town is just a little below the fund balance policy of 30 percent, but Town Manager Pearson said the policy was amended and he will give this information to Mr. Kelley.

It was reported that more than 98 percent of the taxes billed were collected. Mr. Kelley spoke of the CARES Act and the spending of these funds. He cautioned to be sure to well document the spending of the funds.

Mayor Boies thanked Mr. Kelley for being with us and she thanked staff for their hard work.

Council Member Monahan said when Council looked back over the revenues for the past five years, 2020 was increased due to the Streetscape Project. In 2018, it was about at the same level and she asked why. Town Manager Pearson said he is not sure if there would have been another grant that would have made this higher and referenced the Façade Improvement Grant. Mr. Kelley said a lot of highway maintenance was spent during 2018 and these would have been recognized during that year.

Council Member Weaver said that the debt holding for the town has decreased from 2019 to 2020 and asked what specific debt came off. It was the Town Hall and the expansion of the Strasburg Fire Department building.

2.) Fort Hill Tank Re-painting
Description: Recommendation from the Infrastructure Committee to proceed with a project to
remove and replace the current Fort Hill Tank coating system.

**Director of Public Works McKinley** said we were working on bringing on a new carrier on the tank with a halo and it was thought, that while doing this, it would be a good idea to paint the exterior. It was discovered that the original primer is starting to come off. It was thought this coat could have been put on in the 1940’s or 1950’s or it might even be the original coating from 1930. When taking a sample, it was found the paint had a high level of lead, about 88,400 parts per million (ppm), which is the highest **Director of Public Works McKinley** has ever seen. The cost to renovate the exterior is $489,096, but the cost for the lead abatement is $165,534. The town would be responsible for the cost of the lead abatement, but not the other exterior renovation.

**Council Member Massoud** said he heard that this was the highest lead percentage and **Director of Public Works McKinley** said it was the highest for any town project that he has seen. **Council Member Massoud** asked what the limit would be that would be acceptable and **Director of Public Works McKinley** said none would be the best, but he believes it is 1000 ppm.

**Vice Mayor Cherrix** said he had suggested, because the amount is so low, paying this off at one time instead of doing it over five years. It makes sense to do this now. **Town Manager Pearson** said the Infrastructure Committee recommendation was to approve the project and for staff to come back with a funding proposal for the next fiscal year budget so this will be discussed later.

**Council Member Monahan** said when project starts in April or May, does staff have any plans to put out notification to citizens. She is sure there will be questions to make sure all will feel safe. **Director of Public Works McKinley** said there will be an educational component to this. The entire town will be notified and all will be told how they will be kept safe in the process.

**Council Member Ricard** said if we pay it off in the first five years, there is no interest and that is correct. She asked what will happen to the antennas when this is taking place and temporary poles will be set up for these while the work is being done; this would have to be done if only the halo was being installed.

3.) Pending and Potential Developments

*Description:* Presentation by staff on pending and potential developments in Town.

**Town Manager Pearson** reviewed terms and disclaimers he would be referencing during the presentation. He said a lot of what is being discussed is based on assumptions about the intent of private property owners.

*A slide was presented that showed the approved plans or plats within the town:*
- Village at Cedar Creek: 26 single family
- Signal Knolls: 12 single family attached
- Mineral Street Extended: 20 single family
- Stony Ridge: 10 single family
- Summit Crossing (Cedar Valley): 111 town houses, 140 single family
- Cedar Springs Estates: 58 Town Houses, 57 Single Family

*Areas that are Properly Zoned for development:*
- Dunmore/Bernstein: 364 single family proffered; no pacing requirement
- Mowery Family Properties: zoned multi-family residential, 118 units
- Hannum Property: Zoned Medium Density Residential, 207 units
- Derby Ridge: Low density residential; 132 Single Family, 40 units per year (anticipating a new
rezoning application)

All of these totals about 1,255 units; this could roughly add more than 3,000 residents.

**Town Manager Pearson** reviewed the Planning Considerations and Comments.
- Everything shown has been considered “expected” by staff since the original approval
- These developments factored into the construction of new Water and Wastewater treatment plants
- The developments will result in an expanded residential tax base which will in turn help fund increased levels of service
- Some of the larger developments have transportation improvements included as well as cash proffers
- The Comprehensive Plan guides land development decisions

**P&Z Administrator Pambid** said he and **Town Manager Pearson** consulted on this presentation, but **Town Manager Pearson** did most of the work on it. Whenever we talk about growth, the Comprehensive Plan is what we should be turning to. This has been revised/reviewed regularly. By state law, Comprehensive Plans have to be reviewed every five years. We should be starting this process very soon as the last review and revision was done in 2018. We should work towards the 2023 passage and not start the process then. This is a census year and we should have some good data as far as what our population is and how we are keeping pace with our previous estimates.

**Council Member Massoud** thanked Town Manager Pearson for the presentation as this is a conversation that the town has to have. He said we are looking at a probable 3,125 residents coming into the town if all the developments are built out. He asked when this will happen. **Town Manager Pearson** said it would be pure speculation to try to say when these might be built out, but he thinks Cedar Springs Estates, Summit Crossing, and the Village at Cedar Creek will be constructed.

**Council Member Hooser** asked about the proffers for transportation and what they mean. **Town Manager Pearson** explained the finishing of Colley Block Road and the joint agreement of a signal light between Summit Crossing and Dunmore. Derby Ridge has an escrowed amount for future improvements.

**Council Member Nicholson** said it had been noted that the developments factored into the construction of the new Water and Wastewater treatment plants. She said that DEQ said we had to do this and so these were not just done for development. **Town Manager Pearson** said she was absolutely correct with this and that while DEQ said the improvements had to be done, the development coming up played a part in the sizing of the plants.

**Council Member Monahan** said she drove by Derby Ridge and it is completely undeveloped. How long does it take for a subdivision such as this to build out? **Town Manager Pearson** said he isn’t sure, but we have a hot real estate market now and Cedar Springs Estates has gone through their permits quickly so he thinks they could move through this quickly.

**Council Member Monahan** said there is a road that is supposed to cut through Hupps Hill and **Town Manager Pearson** said it is a complicated plan. He explained the historic properties owned by the Bernstein Family and the connector road between Dunmore and the Crossing at Summit Point.

**Council Member Ricard** asked if there is any mention of green space in any of these larger developments. **Town Manager Pearson** said when there is already an approved plat, there might not be a chance to include any additional green space. In approved plans, they have to abide by the UDO and the requirement of green space. All properly zoned areas will have to have green space.
P&Z Administrator Pambid referred back to the Comprehensive Plan and also the approval of the Master Park Plan. Open space for individual developments were approved under previous zoning criteria so we cannot apply the UDO unless they come back for a new rezoning. The UDO requires 30 percent open space with 10 percent of this being usable. The Comprehensive Plan is the plan for the 10-to-40-year horizon. This is implemented by subdivision and zoning ordinances. Conversations are held with developers about open space. There is much that goes into open space development and pedestrian connectivity. This is always asked about.

Council Member Ricard said she would like to know if there are plans for bringing businesses into town. She is worried that people will not be vested in the town if we do not have the amenities they are looking for. P&Z Administrator Pambid said we often get questions of when are we getting certain businesses. National businesses do their own market analysis to make sure they are not overlapping with competitors or even themselves. Rooftops play a large part in this.

Community Development Director Bixler said her position has changed through the years to ensure that we do not just have large businesses or industries coming to the town, but to grow our own. We do have a lot of activity in terms of businesses wanting to come here. She is not sure if they are the type of businesses Council Member Ricard is asking about, but we always get inquiries. We look at what we have available for development and how we can position to get the businesses to come that we want.

Council Member Reynolds commented on some of her own experiences. When she first came on Council, we were trying to get Summit Crossing over some of the hurdles. It took her a long time to understand that what stage a development is in determines what Council can ask for. If you want to see something in a development, these things have to happen early on in the development. Even though she wanted to see traditional housing in Summit Crossing, she could not expect to influence what we would see in the development. Educate yourself on the process from start to finish.

Council Member Weaver said this was a very informative presentation. There is an interesting mix of information of numbers we can expect, but not a timeline of when they will be built. He urged Council to move with caution when considering the social and economic basis of newcomers. When he moved here, one of the first things he heard was that once he got a job in Pennsylvania, he will be gone. He is still here 20 years later. It is difficult to predict human behavior. Change is inevitable.

Council Member Nicholson said she remembers a report done by the Lord Fairfax Planning District level which showed that a lot of this development was already thought of and they knew it was going to happen in the 1970’s. This has been planned for a long time. As Northern Virginia property values increase, it pushes people our way. We have a Planning Commission and we need to entrust them to do more of the homework. We have a voice through Council Member Reynolds. If we need to know more, we should go to the Planning Commission meetings. We have to make the best decisions we can with what we have. This is the same thing that previous Councils had to do.

Council Member Monahan said on the Comprehensive Plan, how soon is he looking at revisiting it. P&Z Administrator Pambid said we just started 2021 and if we keep on a five-year schedule, he thinks in the second half of the next fiscal year we should start looking into it. The full 2022 should be devoted to this and maybe into 2023, and possibly, 2024.

Council Member Hooser said he is not seeing a lot of commercial development. He hears a lot talk about the types of businesses people they want. We only have one grocery store. With another 3,000 citizens, we will need another grocery store. He thinks the LSC property would be a great place for many businesses. Is it within Council’s purview to go to businesses and tell them we need
a certain type of business and have the property?

**Town Manager Pearson** said the town plays a role in this. Council can incentivize to get a certain type of business. It is not easy to do this. **CDD Bixler** said businesses are doing their own analysis and will come when they can make a profit, but we can create the right type of atmosphere to incentivize certain businesses

**Town Manager Pearson** said we are lacking large portions of commercial land. Planning for where we want to have the commercial developments to occur can be in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Council Member Nicholson** said she hopes we would have a meeting on commercial property. She continued by saying our town needs another doctor, too. We have a quick care clinic, but it only treats certain things; we do not have an Urgent Care. We need something more than Valley Health. This is part of our quality of life. We have several dentists, but only one doctors’ office. She would like to have another night to just talk commercial.

**Mayor Boies** said this discussion was just on the residential development. The decision last week on Cedar Springs Estates made her aware of what was on everyone’s minds. She sent an email to **Town Manager Pearson** asking for a presentation on how all of this works as far as economic development. We need to understand the need for affordable housing. She gave other ideas we might need to explore. She asked all to send to her recommendations on ideas for presentations.

**P&Z Administrator Pambid** said we are a 3.2 square mile town so are limited in our developable land. There are other considerations, too. Annexation is a possibility as well as rezonings. We have a one-mile buffer around the town. Looking internally, we need to encourage upper floor housing in the downtown area. This is desirable and energizes the businesses in the downtown area. We need to mix the residents with the businesses. What is the purpose of a town? It is a human settlement. This is where you expect the people to live. It is not desirable to have subdivisions to infiltrate out into the county land. We need to concentrate the development in the towns. This should be kept in the forefront of population growth.

**Council Member Massoud** said he thinks there are things the people of the town need to hear from Council. He will be making a public statement on this topic at the next meeting.

Citizens should email or call any Council Member so that Council is aware of what they want.

**Council Member Ricard** said she believes the key to a happy town is to find a way to be vested in the town. People have to have a reason to care.

**Old or unfinished business:**

**New Business:** **Council Member Ricard** said **George Rathore** is on the Outreach Committee and presented an idea. He was totally setback on the town’s decision to ask for an exemption that would allow the town to cutoff water. At last count, we had about 6,583 residents. Out of these, if there are 500 families in town that cannot pay their water bills, we need to help. He said we need to have a “Round-up Fund”. This fund would help pay the bills for those in need. If each person rounded up $1, that would be $6,000 a month that could help citizens that need help. This would give our citizens a vested interest with those around them. This would be an option and we could watch the fund grow.

**Mayor Boies** asked **Town Manager Pearson** if this would be a possibility and **Town Manager Pearson** said he thinks it would be difficult to do in the short term, but maybe it could be done in the long run. Dollar Energy has a program somewhat like this. He will have to work with the town’s software company to see if this would work.
Council Member Weaver thanked Mr. Rathore for the idea. As Mr. Rathore was talking about this, he thought of his gas bill. On that bill, you have the option to add a certain amount. This would be regional but contributing to people in our town would be good. He thanked him for bringing this idea to Council.

Mr. Rathore said he likes to give back and he wanted to come back with a solution. He was laid off for five-months and his wife was laid-off for four months. They made it through. We owe it to ourselves and to our fellow citizens to help each other. This is an anonymous way to help.

In other new business, Mayor Boies said the Mayfest Committee met and, with the reality of COVID, it was thought to potentially hold Mayfest in July. This would be in collaboration with the town’s celebration. If we do this in May, we would have to maintain social distancing and other things. A decision has not been made, but this is the thought.

Town Manager Pearson said we have been approached about selling a piece of property that the town no longer needs and we will be having a Public Hearing on this at the next Work Session. The public hearing will be advertised so he wanted Council to be aware of this before reading it in the newspaper.

Being no further business, the work session adjourned at 8:49 p.m.
RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF STRASBURG REGARDING TOWN ELECTION DATES

Whereas, the Town of Strasburg, originally known as Staufferstadt, was first founded, and charted in 1761; and

Whereas, the Town of Strasburg was first incorporated in 1922, and has held Town elections in the month of May for at least 60 years, and a significant number of locales in Virginia hold their Town/City elections in the month of May; and

Whereas, Town and City issues vary substantially from those at the state and federal levels; and

Whereas, the Council of the Town of Strasburg believes that the idea of having Town elections in the month of May, separate and apart from Virginia State and Federal elections, is a benefit to the residents of the Town, as having Town elections in the month of May ensures that Town issues receive a fair hearing away from partisan elections at both the State and Federal level; and

Whereas, locales in Virginia have had the choice of holding City and Town elections in either May or November for over 100 years; and

Whereas, the Virginia State Senate recently passed SB-1157, a law which if enacted would require each locale in Virginia that currently holds its Town elections in May to change those to November; and

Whereas, SB-1157 was introduced by a State Senator from Chesapeake Virginia who has little to no knowledge of the Town of Strasburg; and

Whereas, passing SB-1157 and its counterpart in the House of Delegates could further polarize and divide locales as future Councilors and Mayors attend to partisan politics more than to the local, practical, and apolitical needs of their constituents.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Council of Strasburg asks the Virginia House of Delegates to vote against the House counterpart to SB-1157 and direct the delegation from Shenandoah County to vote against the House counterpart to SB-157. The Town Council of Strasburg also asks that the Governor of Virginia veto any legislation which would require any City or Town election to change its election date against the will of the locale or the people of the locale.

RESOLVED by the Town Council of Strasburg this 1st day of February, 2021.

Mayor, Brandy H. Boies

Attest, Amy A. Keller, Clerk of Council
MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor and Town Council
From: Angela Fletcher, Director of Finance
Date: January 21, 2021
Re: Annual Write-off of Tax and Utility Bills

Personal Property Taxes
Attached is a list of the 2015 personal property taxes that need to be adjusted off the Town’s books. The amount to be written-off is $5,292.33. In 2015 we billed $346,231.96; the write-off represents 1.53% of the total amount billed, which reflects that for the 2015 tax year we have collected 98.47% of the personal property taxes billed.

Real Estate Property Taxes
There aren’t any real estate accounts to be written off for 2000.

According to State Code, the Town has five years to collect personal property taxes and twenty years to collect real estate taxes:

§ 58.1-3940. Limitation on collection of local taxes.

A. Except as otherwise specifically provided, collection of local taxes shall only be enforceable for five years following December 31 of the year for which such taxes were assessed.
B. Real Estate taxes shall be enforceable for 20 years after December 31 of the year for which such taxes were assessed.

Listed below are some of the collection procedures the Town uses to collect delinquent taxes:

1. Delinquent bills are mailed within 60 days of each deadline.
2. Once a personal property tax bill (vehicles only) is delinquent 60 days, we place a DMV stop on the account. This prohibits the individual from processing anything with the DMV until the stop is removed.
3. Set-off Debt – we can attach a lien to an individual’s Virginia State tax refund. Every November/December the Town processes delinquent personal property accounts and sends the information to the State. If the individual is due a refund, the Town receives the amount to pay their delinquent taxes.
4. If an individual owes a large amount of delinquent tax (over $500) the Town places a judgment against them in the General District Court. The Town must have a valid address for individual to do this.
5. The Town can garnish an individual’s wages in order to pay the delinquent taxes, if their place of employment is known.

Utility Bills
Attached is a list of the 2015 utility bills that need to be adjusted off the Town’s books. The amount to be written-off totals $14,079.03. In the 2014/15 budget we billed approximately $5,257,749; the write-off represents 0.27% of the total amount billed, which reflects that we collected 99.73% of the 2014/15 budget year. This is a bookkeeping procedure that the Town does each year to clean up accounts. The Town has used all available actions to collect on these accounts.

Listed below are some of the collection procedures the Town uses to collect delinquent utility bills:
1. Delinquent bills are mailed every month via postcard.
2. Delinquent final bills are mailed within 60-90 days after each deadline.
3. Set-off Debt – the Town can attach a lien to an individual’s Virginia State Tax refund. Every November/December the Town processes delinquent personal property accounts and sends the information to the State. If the individual is due a refund, the Town receives the amount to pay their delinquent taxes.
4. If an individual owes a large amount of delinquent utility bills (over $200, current lessee deposit amount) the Town places a judgment against them in the General District Court. The Town must have a valid address for individual to do this.
5. The Town can garnish an individual’s wages in order to pay the delinquent utility bills, if their place of employment is known.
6. The Town’s utility software will keep track of the social security number assigned to the written-off account which will allow staff to cross reference new accounts to written off accounts.

The Town has used all available resources to collect on these accounts. Staff continues to implement new collection strategies recommended by the Treasurers Association of Virginia and via networking with other localities. A variety of collection methods are necessary in order to promptly secure the revenues of the Town.

If you have any further questions on this matter, please contact me.

Recommendation
Staff is providing this information to the Council in advance of taking the necessary action to write-off the accounts, which is anticipated to take place at the February 9, 2021 council meeting.

Attachments
2015 Personal Property & 2000 Real Estate Tax Write-offs
2015 Utility Bill Write-offs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Customer Name</th>
<th>Base Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4438</td>
<td>Keith Alley</td>
<td>184.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6791</td>
<td>Anthony’s Pizza (previous owners)</td>
<td>559.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5364</td>
<td>Edward Arnold</td>
<td>46.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7418</td>
<td>Jason Barnett</td>
<td>17.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3024</td>
<td>Christopher Bell</td>
<td>22.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7338</td>
<td>Michael Beydler</td>
<td>42.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5336</td>
<td>Blue Ridge Transportation</td>
<td>20.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4468</td>
<td>Jonathan Bowers</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6479</td>
<td>David Boyce Jr.</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>928</td>
<td>Adam Brado</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4393</td>
<td>Kimberly Brill</td>
<td>35.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4527</td>
<td>Paul Brinson</td>
<td>14.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1433</td>
<td>Virginia Brinson</td>
<td>26.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1656/6064/8574/3737/6557</td>
<td>CarlIon Brooks</td>
<td>244.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Nancy Brooks</td>
<td>25.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6305</td>
<td>Ralph Byrd</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5736</td>
<td>C &amp; S Custom Building Inc</td>
<td>68.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1166</td>
<td>Allan Campbell</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4310/7492</td>
<td>Kirsten Campbell</td>
<td>28.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6860</td>
<td>Campbells Drywall</td>
<td>20.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chef Estaire Productions</td>
<td>33.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8284/8512</td>
<td>Bobby Cook</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5833</td>
<td>Evelyn Corum</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>657/2605</td>
<td>Donald Cox</td>
<td>392.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Lendia Davis</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817</td>
<td>Melissa Davis</td>
<td>28.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2108</td>
<td>Nouroulidine Diallo</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5189</td>
<td>Stacey Dorsey</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4235</td>
<td>Jose Duran</td>
<td>55.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5597</td>
<td>Elizabeth Edmonson</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6680</td>
<td>Ursula Ellis</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Roy England</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4181</td>
<td>Melissa Escalera</td>
<td>77.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Lawrence Fancher</td>
<td>35.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4255</td>
<td>Tamara Fraley</td>
<td>32.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538</td>
<td>Mark Garner</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6179</td>
<td>Jeffrey Garrard</td>
<td>19.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5854</td>
<td>Miriana Godzirov</td>
<td>29.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>Collazo Gonzalez</td>
<td>74.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3034</td>
<td>Belcher Grady</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6161</td>
<td>Nathan Grajeda</td>
<td>33.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5134/7347</td>
<td>Pablo Hammerly</td>
<td>22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8650</td>
<td>Rachel Hawkins</td>
<td>83.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>Virgil Henry</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>Henry's Paving &amp; Sealcoating</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>De La Cruz Hernandez</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1185</td>
<td>Sean Heyer</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6900/8686</td>
<td>Billy Hicks</td>
<td>262.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5405</td>
<td>Trevor Hill</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5169</td>
<td>Glenn Hines</td>
<td>23.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8755</td>
<td>Zachary Hoffman</td>
<td>20.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759/5179</td>
<td>Annamarie Hogan</td>
<td>109.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Holy Moly Donut</td>
<td>74.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2653</td>
<td>Joseph Howard</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7313</td>
<td>Jack's Drilling Inc.</td>
<td>163.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6534</td>
<td>Howard Jones</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7210</td>
<td>Charles Kenyon</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>Hershel Kirk</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824/8855</td>
<td>Alexandria Lohr</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1636</td>
<td>Katie Long</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Jacob Mallow</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Andrew Martynuik</td>
<td>17.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6278</td>
<td>Amaury Mavera</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5676</td>
<td>Karen May</td>
<td>23.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8481</td>
<td>Karissa Merica</td>
<td>68.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Connie Mitchell</td>
<td>25.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8839</td>
<td>Williams Monahan</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>Jeremy Monn</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>937/8294</td>
<td>Travis Morrison</td>
<td>295.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8991</td>
<td>Catherine Murphy</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Hernandez Nava</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8323</td>
<td>Robert Norton</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>Novitex Enterprise</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6016</td>
<td>Betty Lou Oneil</td>
<td>46.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>Kelly Otwell</td>
<td>10.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7133</td>
<td>Justin Payne</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>Perry’s Alignment/Service Center</td>
<td>249.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6166</td>
<td>Lavern Pitman</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422</td>
<td>Morales Portocarrero</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/4251/4585/5628/6276/6657</td>
<td>Jerome Racey</td>
<td>94.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2655</td>
<td>Richard Racey</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Leslie Raymond</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365/1200</td>
<td>Gary Reese</td>
<td>34.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6107</td>
<td>Jennifer Roberts</td>
<td>19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>Karl Rooney</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2554</td>
<td>Thomas Ruffalo</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>S &amp; S Handyman Service</td>
<td>27.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1083</td>
<td>Diane Shirley</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974</td>
<td>Larry Shuck</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>Claude Sine</td>
<td>23.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Candace Smith</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Billy Steel</td>
<td>94.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2598</td>
<td>Matthews Stevens</td>
<td>18.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>Richard Stickles</td>
<td>69.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6380</td>
<td>Bonnie Stickley</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671</td>
<td>Riobert Stonebreaker</td>
<td>23.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4547/6719</td>
<td>Gary Stout</td>
<td>128.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6004</td>
<td>Pamela Stout</td>
<td>23.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1283</td>
<td>Sweet Annie's Flour Shop</td>
<td>50.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700</td>
<td>Douglas Taylor</td>
<td>49.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6954</td>
<td>Margo Tetou</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8726</td>
<td>The Strasburg Emporium LLC (previous owners)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Valley Air Temp.</td>
<td>27.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5588</td>
<td>Susan Varner</td>
<td>51.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3741/5804</td>
<td>Robert Wald</td>
<td>29.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2614/2678</td>
<td>Roxanne Warner</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772</td>
<td>Michael Webb Jr.</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>Weemiko Maids</td>
<td>27.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5655</td>
<td>Jennifer Wickline</td>
<td>95.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756/6608</td>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>20.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL 2015 PP WRITE OFF AMOUNT**

$5,292.33

**2015 REAL PROPERTY WRITE OFF LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL RE WRITE OFF AMOUNT FROM 2000**

$0.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Account Num</th>
<th>Service Addr</th>
<th>Acct Balance</th>
<th>Acct Status</th>
<th>Landlord/Lessee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abutta, Cynthia</td>
<td>010-1081500-5</td>
<td>511 E Washington St.</td>
<td>$183.66</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athey, Gina</td>
<td>010-1075100-3</td>
<td>371 Crim Dr.</td>
<td>$24.93</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggett, Blake</td>
<td>040-4000807-4</td>
<td>807 Island Farm Rd</td>
<td>$53.54</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beisert, Cara</td>
<td>010-1056300-2</td>
<td>1038 Seldon Dr.</td>
<td>$55.18</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billhimer, Dakota</td>
<td>010-1069200-4</td>
<td>415 E Fairchild Dr.</td>
<td>$188.48</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Andrian</td>
<td>020-2015900-6</td>
<td>137 W King St. #6</td>
<td>$99.38</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumeyler, David</td>
<td>040-1032300-9</td>
<td>1026 Jackson St.</td>
<td>$115.55</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brado, Adam</td>
<td>040-1098100-11</td>
<td>479 N Mass St.</td>
<td>$92.71</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brill, Betty</td>
<td>040-1031900-9</td>
<td>1018 Jackson St.</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broy, Heather</td>
<td>010-1069200-5</td>
<td>415 E Fairchild Dr.</td>
<td>$87.09</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burham, Tammy</td>
<td>040-2049500-12</td>
<td>325 Mulberry St.</td>
<td>$34.27</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrow, Angela</td>
<td>040-2000352-4</td>
<td>352 W Queen St.</td>
<td>$48.09</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Clinton</td>
<td>010-1089000-16</td>
<td>431 Pleasant View</td>
<td>$43.13</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Tiffany</td>
<td>010-1073900-2</td>
<td>305 Crim Dr.</td>
<td>$62.86</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, Roy</td>
<td>040-2022700-3</td>
<td>136 Capon St.</td>
<td>$1,248.88</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flenner, Tatina</td>
<td>040-4003700-4</td>
<td>111 Frontier Fort Ln</td>
<td>$21.10</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foren, Jeremy</td>
<td>040-4012000-13</td>
<td>111 Cavalry Ct.</td>
<td>$334.00</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaush, Charles</td>
<td>040-2084700-3</td>
<td>158 Little Sorrel Dr.</td>
<td>$365.33</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Jeffrey</td>
<td>040-1060700-5</td>
<td>567 Bowman Mill Rd</td>
<td>$38.41</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Jordan</td>
<td>040-1060700-5</td>
<td>567 Bowman Mill Rd</td>
<td>$38.41</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady, Belcher</td>
<td>040-1028000-7</td>
<td>500 Pike St.</td>
<td>$302.74</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Carol</td>
<td>020-2023800-3</td>
<td>368 W King St.</td>
<td>$53.54</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Jessica</td>
<td>040-4037190-12</td>
<td>202 Cannon Ct.</td>
<td>$409.64</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpine, David</td>
<td>040-1028000-7</td>
<td>760 E King St.</td>
<td>$14.39</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry, Donna</td>
<td>040-1053600-2</td>
<td>476 E Fairchild Dr</td>
<td>$182.71</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockman, Tonya</td>
<td>040-1000136-3</td>
<td>136 N Funk St. #2</td>
<td>$80.53</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Kenneth</td>
<td>040-1039700-2</td>
<td>886 E Washington St.</td>
<td>$55.18</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd, Dale</td>
<td>020-2051000-10</td>
<td>660 Capon St.</td>
<td>$165.88</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewandowski, Mark</td>
<td>020-2016800-4</td>
<td>127 W King St. #4</td>
<td>$23.59</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe, Steven</td>
<td>040-1012300-6</td>
<td>528 E Queen St.</td>
<td>$14.75</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabe, Angela</td>
<td>010-1040100-14</td>
<td>141 N Loudoun St.</td>
<td>$299.87</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccue, Brittany</td>
<td>040-4037120-4</td>
<td>103 Cannon Ct.</td>
<td>$92.82</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel, Betty</td>
<td>040-4001180-3</td>
<td>118 Daniel Ct.</td>
<td>$124.57</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel, Noah</td>
<td>010-1016700-3</td>
<td>346 Zea St.</td>
<td>$65.53</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco, Allyson</td>
<td>040-4037122-8</td>
<td>204 Cannon Ct.</td>
<td>$236.29</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Chad</td>
<td>040-2041700-2</td>
<td>691 Jenkins Lane</td>
<td>$27.15</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Nathaniel</td>
<td>040-4000175-5</td>
<td>175 Oxbow Dr.</td>
<td>$93.45</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, Lani</td>
<td>040-1098000-11</td>
<td>273 Cool Springs Rd.</td>
<td>$15.97</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland, Heather</td>
<td>040-2000283-4</td>
<td>283 W Washington St.</td>
<td>$53.54</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newby, Sarah</td>
<td>040-4004300-7</td>
<td>307 Frontier Fort Ln.</td>
<td>$13.04</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olechnicki, Ronald</td>
<td>020-2036600-3</td>
<td>337 Capon St.</td>
<td>$22.60</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penley, Jason</td>
<td>010-1090400-10</td>
<td>460 Pleasant View Dr.</td>
<td>$101.14</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Fitness</td>
<td>030-3003200-3</td>
<td>35 Brandy Ct.</td>
<td>$809.53</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Fitness</td>
<td>040-1008390-3</td>
<td>35 Brandy Ct.</td>
<td>$827.17</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaughner, Kevin</td>
<td>020-2011200-15</td>
<td>214 S Fort St.</td>
<td>$99.67</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Sarah</td>
<td>040-1087100-7</td>
<td>318 Stonewall St.</td>
<td>$332.30</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roddy, Dean</td>
<td>010-1034500-11</td>
<td>105 Front Royal Rd</td>
<td>$79.27</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebrook, Hatcher</td>
<td>010-1018200-8</td>
<td>332 E Queen St.</td>
<td>$60.70</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryman, April</td>
<td>040-1081000-6</td>
<td>246 Walton St.</td>
<td>$49.20</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson, Robert</td>
<td>040-2058200-5</td>
<td>533 John Marshall Hwy</td>
<td>$58.89</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheidegger, Christopher</td>
<td>020-2088300-6</td>
<td>19 Company House Ln.</td>
<td>$512.40</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Bobby</td>
<td>040-4008900-9</td>
<td>403 Hupps Hill Ct.</td>
<td>$36.65</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shields, Anita</td>
<td>040-4000644-3</td>
<td>644 Dellinger Dr.</td>
<td>$53.13</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvius, Thomas</td>
<td>040-2034300-6</td>
<td>419 Ash St.</td>
<td>$201.56</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Angela</td>
<td>040-2014100-15</td>
<td>162 Sharpe St.</td>
<td>$245.19</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Brian</td>
<td>040-2045700-6</td>
<td>370 Sunset St.</td>
<td>$418.36</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparacino, Matthew</td>
<td>040-2077500-2</td>
<td>146 Breckenridge Ct.</td>
<td>$420.30</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spin Magic Laundry Mat</td>
<td>030-3004900-5</td>
<td>329 N Massanutten St.</td>
<td>$2,373.07</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stape, Joshua</td>
<td>040-2078400-3</td>
<td>129 Greenleaf Rd</td>
<td>$322.24</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stout, Jennifer</td>
<td>040-1077200-6</td>
<td>727 Laurie Dr.</td>
<td>$195.88</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Ferris</td>
<td>040-4037127-8</td>
<td>206 Cannon Ct.</td>
<td>$32.21</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainor, Brittany</td>
<td>040-2047100-4</td>
<td>490 Beacon St.</td>
<td>$18.91</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, Daniel</td>
<td>040-2021400-8</td>
<td>167 N Fort St. #2</td>
<td>$20.13</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan, Frances</td>
<td>040-1096900-10</td>
<td>424 N Mass St. #2</td>
<td>$18.63</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weatherholt, Wesley</td>
<td>010-1013400-3</td>
<td>247 Crawford St.</td>
<td>$185.01</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, Amy</td>
<td>040-4017400-5</td>
<td>174 Oxbow Dr.</td>
<td>$125.24</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, James</td>
<td>020-2061400-1</td>
<td>162 W. Maphis St.</td>
<td>$5.79</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wines, Carolyn</td>
<td>020-2044800-9</td>
<td>494 Sunset St.</td>
<td>$71.69</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilms, Levi</td>
<td>040-1083500-7</td>
<td>282 Borum St.</td>
<td>$615.17</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiser, Bethany</td>
<td>040-2063600-7</td>
<td>139 North St.</td>
<td>$241.62</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yowell, Ashley</td>
<td>010-1005000-8</td>
<td>991 Dutchess Circle</td>
<td>$41.20</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,079.03</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Town Council
From: Wyatt Pearson, Town Manager
Date: January 28th, 2021
Re: West Queen Street Property Sale

Staff has negotiated the sale of a parcel owned by the Town located on West Queen Street across from the Old Water Treatment Plant (388 West Queen Street). There are two distinct changes to ownership proposed, and they are delineated in the image below. The area shaded blue is to be sold to the individual who owns the property that surrounds the Town parcel. The area in green is going to be retained as an easement for a utility mainline in the area.

The property owner that staff is proposing the sale of this property to is Dennis M Morris. Mr. Morris owns the property that surrounds the oddly shaped parcel in question, and there really is not another viable buyer since the parcel is so oddly shaped and essentially unbuildable in its current condition. Mr. Morris has offered $5,000 for the sale of the property.
There is a ground mounted water tank located on the property that was part of the old water treatment plant operation and has since been discontinued. The Town plans to remove the tank from the property as part of the sale agreement (any foundations or underground utilities will be the responsibility of the buyer). There is not a current or future use for this parcel by the Town that we are aware of at this point.
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Memorandum

To: Strasburg Town Council
From: Leander N. “Lee” Pambid, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Date: Thursday, January 28, 2021
Re: Case SUP2021-01 Pleasant View Multi-Family Apartments (Town Council (Discussion only) 02/1/2021)

Identification and Location Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Jen Surber, agent for Pleasant View VA LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Mowery Family Properties LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tax Map # 025-01-001, Terminus of Pleasant View Drive, 100’ from the intersection of Pleasant View Drive and Stonewall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>~9.89 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlays</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Zoning</td>
<td>North: Multi-Family Residential MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East: Low Density LDR and Medium Density Residential MDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South: Medium Density Residential MDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West: Highway Commercial HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Uses</td>
<td>North: Crystall Hill Townhouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East: Single Family Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South: Duplexes and Single Family Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West: Single Family Dwelling (Hupp Mansion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request and Background

Jen Surber, representative of Pleasant View VA LLC, has filed an application for a Special Use Permit for permission to exceed the number of units in a single apartment building.

- The request is for two buildings containing 48 apartment units each (for a total of 96 units).
- UDO Section 6.6.4.A limits the number of apartment units in a single building to 12.
- UDO Section 6.6.2.B allows the Planning Commission and Town Council to consider a SUP to deviate from certain design standards.

The applicant has submitted example building elevations from a previous project and a conceptual layout for this site. The layout is general in nature, was revised per the Planning
Staff’s comments to show additional information, and is not intended as a final, fully designed and developed construction plan.

**Important Note:** Planning Staff emphasizes that a full site plan and another Planning Commission review is still required in the future. It is at that future time that the applicant must show full compliance with the UDO and other applicable regulations.

The Unified Development Ordinance contains design requirements for all multi-family structures, such as apartment buildings, townhouses, and condominiums. Staff has conducted an initial review of the plans pursuant to these requirements, and provided comments to the applicant as a courtesy and with the caveat that additional comments will be provided on subsequent reviews.

Because of the visual nature of the SUP request, the Planning Staff also identified several key issues that needed immediate attention and revision.

- Height of retaining walls requested (Between 4’ and 6’)
- Short distance between retaining walls and property lines (Distance increased)
- Some demonstration or illustration showing the overall height of the buildings in relation to the existing topography (provided)
- General locations of usable open space (provided)
- General locations of stormwater facilities (provided)
- Right-of-way for turnaround (shown and under consideration)
- Provision of stone that is compatible with traditional local building materials on certain elevations. (under consideration, see also recommended condition)

**Planning Commission Actions and Recommendations**

The Planning Commission acted as follows:

- At their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, January 26, 2021 at 7pm, the Planning Commission held an advertised public hearing remotely. It was broadcast via Zoom.
  - Present (6): Flanagan, Rhodes, Poling, Nicholson, Otis, Reynolds;
  - Absent (1): Dean
Applicant Jen Surber and multiple citizens spoke to the application during the hearing. Other citizens submitted written comments. (Attached)

Generally, their concerns are as follows:

- Traffic circulation, safety, visibility, street network capacity
- Location of primary access
- Elevation above existing townhouses
- Levels of public service, including school system capacity
- Wildlife, green space, and forest displacement
- Environmental impact (soils/karst topo, stormwater)
- Historic resources impact
- Lack of amenities/connectivity to town park
- Loss of community identity (small town)
- Inadequate retail (clothes, shoes, groceries)
- Increase in crime

- Two motions were made:
  
  o **First motion**: Recommend denial of the Special Use Permit. Moved by Otis, seconded by Flanagan. **Motion failed 2-4.** (Otis and Poling in favor of motion)

  o After the vote, Commissioner Poling asked Ms. Surber if an SUP for one building containing 48 units is acceptable. Ms. Surber indicated that would be acceptable.

  o **Second motion**: Recommend approval of the Special Use Permit but with 1 building containing 48 units and with the following conditions. Moved by Reynolds, seconded by Rhodes. **Motion passed 5-1.** (Otis dissenting)

**Recommended Conditions**

1. As much as practicably possible, a combination of large deciduous and evergreen trees at a ratio of 1:1 shall be replanted on slopes of 15% or greater. The amount of trees shall be shown on a landscape plan and reviewed by the Planning Commission at the time of the future site plan submittal.

2. No public address or speaker systems outside of any building shall be permitted.

3. Trash dumpsters shall not be serviced during the quiet hours specified in the Town Code.
4. A standard Town sidewalk shall be provided along the access aisle to the south property line and connect to existing sidewalk on the west line of Pleasant View Drive.

5. As much as practicably possible, a pedestrian connection to the Gateway Trail via Forest Glen shall be provided.

6. 4’ concrete walkways shall be provided around all buildings and parking areas and shall connect usable open space.

7. A 4’ faux wrought-iron fence shall be provided along the tops of major slopes adjacent to a pedestrian walkway.

**Land Use Considerations**

The conceptual layout proposes apartments for rent. This is consistent with the current zoning of MFR, Multi-Family Residential and the future land use plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Use</th>
<th>Vacant undeveloped</th>
<th>Map 3.1, page 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Recommendation</td>
<td>Future Residential</td>
<td>Map 3.3, page 67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-Family Residential use is therefore compatible with the surrounding uses and zoning classifications.

**Site and Building Considerations**

The site currently contains slopes of 15% or greater, and regrading of the site will necessitate the removal of trees, construction of one retaining wall.

Access will be provided through an existing right-of-way and street stub at the current terminus of Pleasant View Drive.

The existing vegetation consists primarily of cedar trees no taller than 25’ in height with thick scrub closer to ground level.

The buildings are generally 363’ long, 66’ wide, and 36’ in height, with articulated facades and the required architectural variations. They feature a substantial amount of brick with accents of cementitious cedar shake shingle siding and lap siding. Soldier courses provide a visual outside demarcation between floors. Colors are required to be subdued, with predominately natural tones and neutral colors.
Comprehensive Plan Considerations

The comprehensive plan makes multiple statements that apply directly to this case and speak to 3 main points (housing mix, viewshed, and density) that the Planning Commission and Town Council should consider when discussing the building design:

- Town Vision Statement (page 9)
- Viewshed (page 15)
- Medium Density Residential (Page 17)
- Comp Plan Goal 3: (Page 42)

The full text of these statements are provided as an attachment to this report.

Applicant Narrative

The applicant stated the following with her application:

“This application is for a Special Use Permit (SUP) pursuant to UDO Section 6.6.2 to modify development standards in Section 6.6 to allow for two buildings to be constructed containing 48 units per building.”

Citizen Comment

At the time of the staff report’s preparation, the Planning office had been contacted by four citizens regarding this case. To date, their inquiries consist primarily of requests for the plans and what will happen with the existing vegetation.

Staff Findings and Recommendations

Staff Findings

- The application is technically about a specific design requirement and about building “massing”. While the application is not directly about affordable or attainable housing, the design of the building is an immediate factor in the financial feasibility of the project. The project at its core is a development with a primary affordable and attainable housing element.
- The site is generally being graded down, reducing the profile of the proposed buildings against the backdrop (at the top of Route 11) of Signal Knob and Massanutten Mountain. The proposed structures will not significantly impact the scenic viewshed.
• The application is consistent with the 2018 comprehensive plan as it pertains to future land use, viewshed, housing mix, and density.

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit to allow for multi-family buildings that contain more than 12 units with the following recommended conditions:

1. As much as practicably possible, a combination of large deciduous and evergreen trees at a ratio of 1:1 shall be replanted on slopes of 15% or greater. The amount of trees shall be shown on a landscape plan and reviewed by the Planning Commission at the time of the future site plan submittal.
2. Facades shall feature a minimum of (X)% stone.
3. No public address or speaker systems outside of any building shall be permitted.
4. Trash dumpsters shall not be serviced during the quiet hours specified in the Town Code.
5. A standard Town sidewalk shall be provided along the east and south lines of the access aisle to the south property line.
6. A standard Town sidewalk shall be provided along and connect to existing sidewalk on both sides of Pleasant View Drive.
7. As much as practicably possible, a pedestrian connection to the Gateway Trail via Forest Glen shall be provided.
8. 4’ concrete walkways shall be provided around all buildings and parking areas and shall connect usable open space.
9. A 4’ faux wrought-iron fence shall be provided along the tops of major slopes adjacent to a pedestrian walkway.

Meeting Chronology

January 26, 2021- Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation
February 1, 2021 (anticipated)- Town Council Worksession- Discussion only.
February 9, 2021 (anticipated)- Town Council Public Hearing
February 16, 2021 (anticipated)- Town Council Vote
Attachments

1. **Staff Materials**: Staff report, aerial, staff plan with layout, grading, elevations, and image of Signal Knob

2. **Applicant’s Materials**: Image of recently completed and similar development

Staff Contact

**Lee Pambid**, Planning and Zoning Administrator  
**Phone**: 540-465-9197 x 127  
**Email**: [lpambid@strasburgva.com](mailto:lpambid@strasburgva.com)
Applicable UDO Sections for Planning Commission Review

2.20.5 Approval Criteria (for special use permit)

Where uses are permitted by special permit the location and beginning of such uses shall require, in addition to the Zoning Permit and Certificate of Occupancy, a special use permit. Such permit shall be subject to review and recommendation of the Planning Commission and approval of Town Council. These permits shall be subject to such conditions as required in this UDO, and those that the Town Council deems necessary to carry out the intent of this UDO. Application for such permit shall be made to the Zoning Administrator who shall issue such permit only after approval by Council. A public hearing in accordance with Code of Virginia, § 15.2-2204, as amended, shall be held for all uses permitted by special permit. Such permits shall be issued in accordance with the following regulations:

A. Such use shall be one which is specifically authorized as a special permit in the zoning district wherein the Applicant seeks such permit.

B. Such permit shall only be granted subject to any applicable condition and safeguard as required by this UDO.

C. Such permit may be granted subject to additional reasonable conditions and safeguards as may be deemed by the Town Council to be advisable, appropriate, or necessary in the public interest.

D. Such additional conditions may be recommended by the Planning Commission.

E. Such use shall be found by the Town Council to be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this UDO.

F. The proposed Special Use shall conform to the character of the neighborhood within the same zoning district in which it is located. The proposal as submitted or modified shall have no more adverse effects on health, safety, or comfort of persons living or working in the neighborhood, or shall be no more injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood than would any other use generally permitted in the same district. In making such a determination, consideration shall be given to:

1. The location, type, and height of buildings or structures;
2. The type and extent of landscaping and screening on the site; and
3. Whether the proposed use is consistent with any policy of the comprehensive plan that encourages mixed uses and/or densities.

G. Such use shall be of such size and so located and laid out in relation to access streets that vehicular and pedestrian traffic to and from such use will not create undue congestion or hazards prejudicial to the general neighborhood.
H. The proposed use shall not be noxious or offensive by reason of vibration, noise, odor, dust, smoke, or gas.

I. The proposed use shall not injure the use and enjoyment of the property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted nor substantially diminish or impair the property values within the neighborhood.

J. The proposed use shall not impede the orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted within the zoning district.

K. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the proposed use shall not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare. The public interest and welfare supporting the proposed use shall be sufficient to outweigh the individual interests that are adversely affected by the establishment of the proposed use.

L. Such use shall not conflict with development in accordance with any comprehensive plan or portion thereof which has been adopted by the Town Council.

M. A special use permit shall become null and void if the use is discontinued for two years.

N. If the use of the property substantially changes from the use presented in the application the special use permit shall become null and void.

O. No more than one special use permit shall be permitted per parcel.
Applicable 2018 Comprehensive Plan Sections

Town Vision Statement (page 9, excerpt)

“…We have intentionally retained the concept of a tightly interconnected community bequeathed by our forbearers. We will continue to modernize our infrastructure, transportation network, and government to encourage diverse housing, a strong sense of community, a culture based upon interpersonal relations, mutual support, and openness.”

Viewshed (page 15)

The Town should protect natural vistas from Route 11 looking east by enacting appropriate zoning restrictions and lighting regulations. Signal Knob and Massanutten Ridge are valuable natural resources to the citizens and visitors of this community. The viewshed to these areas should be protected by limiting high-rise development and the garish colors of new development. The Town is also concerned about the viewsheds looking from and into the Cedar Creek and Belle Grove National Historical Parks and will work with landowners to protect these vistas. See map 2.1, Appendix D.

Medium Density Residential (Page 17)

The Multi-Family Residential (M.F.R.) zoning district blends single-family detached dwellings, two-family dwellings (duplexes), townhomes, apartment buildings, and condominiums. This zoning district is best suited for individuals desirous of a diverse array of housing options and a walkable proximity to business districts.

Goal 3: Ensure the availability of safe, healthy, and attractive housing for present and future residents (page 42)

The existing and future housing stock of the Town must be safeguarded to promise its continued usefulness in the years to come. This can be achieved through the following strategies:

A. Establish residential areas that provide for varying densities and different housing types, in a form and pattern that is compatible with the traditional, small-town character of Strasburg. The availability of various types of housing units, such as townhouses, apartments, and condominiums, in addition to single-family detached
dwellings at different housing densities, should be developed to ensure homes for Town residents of all ages, income groups, and family sizes.

B. All new residential development shall be designed to reflect the human-scale and traditional, pedestrian-orientation of the Town. Neighborhoods shall be designed to balance the motor vehicle realm (streets, parking areas, and driveways) with the pedestrian realm (sidewalks, yards, and porches), to ensure that physical environments reinforce the traditional look and feel of the Town.

C. Use regulatory tools to ensure that all residential growth shall occur only when and where services and facilities, such as public water and sewer, storm water drainage, and transportation have available capacity. In addition, regulations should be modified to require coordinated, interconnected, and comprehensively-planned development of residential land to avoid piecemeal development.

D. Enhance land development regulations to ensure transition areas between incompatible uses such as commercial and industrial.

E. Allow higher densities for new residential development where it encourages infill development and revitalization, promotes cost-effective stormwater management and public service delivery, and protects surrounding farm and forest land.

F. Enact and enforce ordinances and programs that promote the maintenance of real property. Identify and secure sources of funding to assist property owners with the maintenance of their property.
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PLEASANT VIEW APARTMENTS
LAYOUT PLAN CONCEPT

TRAFFIC NOTES:
1. All parking space is one corner will be made
2. Municipal streets and reserve area will be made
3. Municipal streets will be made and are in accordance
4. All doors and elevators are made permanent

PARKING LOT NOTES:
1. All parking space is one corner will be made
2. Municipal streets and reserve area will be made
3. Municipal streets will be made and are in accordance
4. All doors and elevators are made permanent
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www.balzer.cc
Roanoke / Richmond
New River Valley / Staunton
Harrisonburg / Lynchburg

PRELIMINARY
1561 Commerce Road
Suite 401
Verona, VA 24482
540.248.3220

Full site plan submittal, review, and UDO compliance still required.
Full site plan submittal, review, and UDO compliance still required.

Existing vegetation does not include 50' trees. Mostly 25' cedars and thick scrub.
This Sheet For Informational Purposes Only. Not for Approval.
This sheet shows a similar design to the proposed buildings.
Massing, height, colors, and materials will be similar.
Staff will provide revised elevations for review and decision to the Planning Commission once received.

Colors and Materials
Provide colors and materials samples at time of site plan submission

Side Elevations Facing East and West
Hupp Mansion (west) and Single Family Dwellings (east)

Rear Elevations Facing North and South (2 bldgs)
Forest Glen Apartments, Crystal Hill Townhouses, and Route 11 (north)
Smithfield Subdivision duplexes (south)

Front Elevations Facing In-Board (2 bldgs)
Approximate location of site in relation to Signal Knob as observed from the community sign/ top of Route 11 hill
January 21, 2021

To whom it may concern;

This past week I received a letter from the Town of Strasburg about the Mowery Family Properties LLC that is adjacent to our property at 487 Walton Street. This letter advised us of the buyer wanting to build apartment complexes on the property. I have multiple concerns about this, one the entrance being off of Pleasant View Drive, Thompson Street, Stonewall Street and Walton Street have way too much traffic on them now. If you add at the minimum another 98 cars a day well you may as well forget that. Walton Street is actually a Dead End and we have a large amount of traffic on the extended part of that as well. Not to mention that Massanutten Street and Thompson is already a completely different issue, can you imagine what it will look like when there is an accident on the interstate? Not to mention there have been several times when I have had to contact Chief Sager about the amount of cars in the mentioned areas parked on the wrong side of the road causing an even greater traffic hazard already. Currently, every morning I have a car a pass between 6:20 a.m. and 6:35 a.m. parked on the wrong side of the road.

So you take that 98 units and maybe some have one person many may have more and children. Can our already overcrowded schools handle at the minimum 98 more kids just from this one development? We also then need to think in Fire/Rescue/Police? Has anyone considered the stress another development will bring to them?

Lastly, my husband was born and raised in Strasburg me from Front Royal, and we stayed here due to the small town feel. We wanted our kids to go to Strasburg schools and be proud to say that, a town where everyone knows your name or your parents type of town. But with this I would say that the small town of Strasburg is being lost one subdivision at a time. Not to mention these apartments will be built behind a historical house (Hupp’s Mansion) and will be an absolute eyesore.

In conclusion I hope the town is really truly looking at what will happen to the Thompson Street area before something big happens and not after.

Thank you for your time and for listening.

Scott and Robyn Smoot
487 Walton Street
Strasburg, VA
Amy Keller  
Clerk of Council/Office & HR Manager  
174 East King Street, Strasburg, VA 22657  
540.465.9197  
www.strasburgva.com

From: cathleen king  
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 1:02 PM  
To: Public Comment <comment@strasburgva.com>  
Subject: housing project

This message is regarding the proposed new housing project. I am opposed to it. From my understanding they will be extending the current dead end road on Stonewall into the new development. All the traffic will be traveling thru a residential area with narrow roads and hills that make traffic visibility hard and especially hard during bad weather in the winter. I know you can't stop progress, but if they are going to build they need to make entrance off main road!
Dear Ms. Erbach,

Thank you for your questions, which are answered in bold below.

If you have a statement you wish to have circulated to the Planning Commission (and Town Council), I am happy to send that out in advance of tomorrow’s meeting. Please send as soon as you can.

Sincerely,

Lee

Please visit our COVID-19 page and our Electronic Meetings page.

---

Leander N. "Lee" Pambid, CZA  
Planning and Zoning Administrator  
174 East King Street  
Strasburg, Virginia 22657  
540.465.9197 x127 phone | 540.465.3252 fax  
www.strasburgva.com

---

From: Lucinda Erbach  
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 1:06 PM  
To: Public Comment <comment@strasburgva.com>  
Subject: Public Comment

Good afternoon,

I would like to make a comment at Tuesday's (1/26/21) meeting on the "application for a Special Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of two 48-unit buildings. This exceeds the maximum number of 12 units contained in a single building. The 9.89 acre site is located at the northern terminus of Pleasant View Drive, approximately 100.00’ north of its intersection with Stonewall Street, on Tax Map #025-01-001. The site is zoned Multi-Family Residential (MFR)." I will be zooming in from home and would like to speak on the catastrophic implications of such a project to my neighborhood.

A couple of questions about building ...
1 - For how many units is the 9.89 acres currently zoned?
- Maximum number of units for this property is 12 units per acre, or 118 units. The development proposes 96 units.

2 - How is the ravine going to be addressed? It is a large part of that 9.89 acres.

- The property will be graded to provide flat pads for each of the structures and for the parking. Stormwater will be handled with a combination of underground and surface facilities.

3 - How many units are currently planned for the remainder of the construction on Stonewall? (High end: A duplex just finished and is up for sale, another duplex is nearly complete, ground is cleared for another construction. Low end: House is nearing completion, another began, and land cleared for at least one more.)

- 6 additional units (3 duplexes)

Questions about speaking Tuesday at the meeting...

1 - How long am I allowed to speak?

- 3 minutes

2 - Do you need to have my comments ahead of time, or just knowing that I’m EXTREMELY opposed to this enough?

- It is not necessary to have your comments ahead of time, but I recommend that so the Commission and Council can have a written record of your statement (and if it would take more than 3 minutes to state).

Thank you for your time.
Blessings,

Lucinda Erbach
392 Thompson Street
From: Melinda Wilson
Sent: Monday, January 25, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Public Comment <comment@strasburgva.com>
Subject: New housing

We definitely don’t need more houses in Strasburg until we have schools and shopping to support the influx of people. We have one grocery store, and not enough school space for what we have now. Sandy Hook is already using very rundown trailers for the overflow now. That’s not fair to the children. We have to go out of town for most of our shopping. You can’t buy clothes or shoes in this town. Please don’t approve more housing now.
Sent from my iPhone
From: Bradley Polk
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 12:27 PM
To: Public Comment <comment@strasburgva.com>
Subject: SUP for Multi-Family Development

Planning Commission/Town Council:

The approval of a special use permit for the 96 multi-family units in the proposed location would be irresponsible by the Town. Has a Traffic Impact Study been performed for the proposal? Considering only the transportation impacts of the proposed development there is no way the applicant could adequately mitigate the impacts of the amount of trips that would be generated by a 96 unit development being accessed by Pleasant View Drive/Stonewall Street.

The quickest access to Route 11 from the site would be at the intersection of Thompson Street and Massanutten Street. There is no way that the intersection could support this many additional trips per day.

How will this development mitigate impacts to our school system? Our elementary school is already overcrowded.

I would respectfully request that the Planning Commission and Town Council deny this special use permit request.

Bradley Polk
Good afternoon,

I have many questions / concerns about the proposed variance for the large number of apartments being discussed.

Environmental Impact:

The land in question contains caves. How will these caves be protected from the run off that will occur from a large paved area (likely containing fuel/trash/etc)? The topography of this area will cause runoff not only in the ravines that are already collecting trash when it rains heavily, but it will also into the cave system. Are their planned impact studies on this specific ecosystem?

The water from this area will run down into a historic protected residence -- will there be routing of this water away from the historic home downhill of it? We know that in Madison Heights many low lying homes have their basements flooded from runoff due to lack of proper water planning.

Safety:

Again, there are open cave entrances. Assuming there is a way to negate the run off impact, how will these entrances be secured so they do not pose a risk to children that might be exploring the property that live there? To prevent people from putting trash in them? But not
block them (bats and bears do live up on this hill - closing off an opening is not an option since we need to protect the ecosystem.)

Traffic - the only entrance is through one of the older neighborhoods in town. It has narrow streets and no side walks. People are already hesitant to walk on Washington St due to people speeding and ignoring speed limits. How will we make the streets safe for those that live in the area that could not have over 200 extra cars driving through their neighborhood several times each day?

Can our police force manage this? Can our fire trucks get into this area easily? Do we have the support services to support the needs of these families?

Schools --

Our elementary school is one of the TEN BIGGEST in the entire state. This is not good for children. There are grades in Sandyhook with over 200 kids in the grade. The trailers are over a decade old and are were meant to be temporary. They have classes in the hallways (sunken area), special ed teachers meeting with students LITERALLY in CLOSETS, and kids eating lunches between 10:30am and 1:00pm. We cannot add more students to this already crowded school. 100 new units could mean 100s (200? 300? more) students.

The traffic getting into all the schools is a nightmare. We have K12 buses where young students that live right here IN TOWN are on a bus almost an hour coming and going to school. This is not ok.

Borders a Historic District --

This proposed project shares a large border with the Hupp Historic district. This will be able to be seen from the historic Hupp Mansion property. What will the buffer be between these properties to ensure the visual line and security of the historic district is preserved?

Apartment Considerations -

While we recognize the need for affordable housing in the area, however, the quality of life in these apartments must also be considered. It looks like these units will not have any personal outdoor space (balcony or terrace). These look to have more of a 'hotel' set up where everyone will access their units from one main hall. This is not particularly 'community building' in planning.

With almost 100 units - I do not see a playground, a basketball court, a pavilion - or anything. And no safe way for the 100+ FAMILIES to access our own town park safely without a car.

Wouldn't it be better for our town, and future residents, to have few units that are pleasant to live in (balconies, terraces, etc.) in smaller buildings where people would be able to enjoy their neighbors?

For these (and other) reasons, a variance of this magnitude would be a huge mistake. Even 12 units with 6 buildings is a lot -- but 2 of 48 is not in our best interest, or those of future
tenants.

Shannon and Doug Bowen

Hupp Historic District
From: David Malbuff  
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 2:37 PM  
To: Public Comment <comment@strasburgva.com>  
Subject: RE: SUP2021-01 - Pleasant View Apartments

I strongly request the Planning Commission deny the Special Use Permit. This is a deeply flawed and recklessly designed proposal.

One glance at the map reveals the most immediate and alarming feature of this proposal: a provision for 96 units without any vehicular ingress or egress to and from a main road.

96 units means a minimum of 200 cars.

It is inconceivable that anyone could have recommended this plan for approval given the clear and obvious traffic nightmare that would inevitably result from 200 cars turned loose on these narrow residential streets day after day.

200 cars leaving the complex every morning, and 200 cars entering the
complex every evening. One way in, and one way out.

200 cars cutting through the neighborhoods of Thompson Drive, Stonewall and Walton Streets, turning a quiet residential neighborhood into a series of thoroughfares.

Imagine 200 cars attempting to turn left against traffic from North Massanutten Street onto Thompson Drive at 5 PM every day. Now imagine traffic backed up past Walgreen’s and on up the hill past Food Lion. Every day.

Imagine a dozen or so cars sliding down the hill on Thompson Drive onto North Massanutten Street on a rainy and road-slick morning.

Imagine two dozen cars backed up that hill while one car at the bottom is attempting to turn left onto Massanutten Street with traffic in both directions. Now imagine several more dozen cars racing through the narrow streets of this neighborhood in all directions, their drivers trying to make up for lost time.

Imagine the collisions. Lots of them.

The original plan for 12 units per building, and no more, takes these and many other factors into account.

I lived in California for 30 years. I have seen first-hand the devastating effect of rapid “urbanization pockets” such as these on small towns and neighborhoods. Long after the developers are gone, the snarled traffic, overcrowded living conditions, noise, litter, and ill feelings will remain.

Is that what we want for Strasburg?

Like the rest of us, I trust the members of this Commission intend to live here in Strasburg for years to come. I request you put us-- your neighbors, your friends, your fellow stakeholders in our pleasant little village-- ahead of all other considerations. Deny this permit. Send this plan back to the developer and ask them to come up with a livable proposal, within the plan limits, one that takes traffic mitigation, quality of life, and environmental stewardship into account. We are counting on you.
Thank you.

David Malbuff
Lee,

I am writing to express opposition to the proposed rezoning/ordinance change regarding SUP2021-01. While the local community may be unable to prevent development, that in itself will be detrimental to the area, most residents in the neighborhoods are completely opposed to the addition of multi-family, apartment housing that will cause traffic and safety problems, create even more problems with schools that are already over-capacity, destroy local wildlife habitat, and potentially lower the property values of the existing community.

Traffic and safety of pedestrians are major areas of concern. It appears that no ADT was taken for Stonewall Street. The traffic surge during morning and evening rush hours will also negatively impact safety for children. In general, the area traffic is continuing to increase, and heavy traffic is already common from Route 11, turning onto Thompson.

Overflow parking is an issue also.
Schools in the area are already reported at overcapacity, and the council should not approve additional apartments that creates or exacerbates a situation that will cause school concurrency to fail for this proposal and/or other approved plans.
Wildlife has been observed in the area, and any development will destroy their habitat. Any planned development of the property should consider the continuing impact to local wildlife habitat.

Property values are likely to go down in the area if multi-family apartments are built. Some studies say they do, and some say they don't.

I urge you to disapprove the proposed rezoning and/or ordinance change for additional apartments. I know my opinions are shared by others who can't watch the meeting or write letters and emails. I'm for growth in any way, but this appears to be too much. The 12 units could be acceptable, but I believe that's too much also. That's manageable though I reckon.
Thank you for your continued service and support of our communities.
Best regards,

Tony Knave

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

On Wed, Jan 20, 2021 at 1:24 PM, Lee Pambid <lpambid@strasburgva.com> wrote:

Mr. Knave,

Please see attached information plan, as requested. It is conceptual and NOT a final plan.

Lee

Please visit our COVID-19 page and our Electronic Meetings page.

Leander N. "Lee" Pambid, CZA
Planning and Zoning Administrator
174 East King Street
Strasburg, Virginia 22657
540.465.9197 x127 phone | 540.465.3252 fax
www.strasburgva.com

From: Tony Knave
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 1:21 PM
To: Lee Pambid <lpambid@strasburgva.com>
Cc: Dana Knave
Subject: Copy of proposed plan SUP2021-01

We own the house at 500 Stonewall Street, which is located within 500 feet of the subject property. I would like to see a copy of the proposed plan mentioned above.

If you can mail it to our address of 100 N. Franklin Street, Strasburg, VA 22657. If it's better to scan it to me, then that's fine also. I would want to take a look at it. Where the ingress/egress points are, CE, etc.?
Thanks

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Lucinda Erbach  
392 Thompson Street

Address to the Planning Commission on Tuesday, January 26th, 2021  
RE: Special Use Permit for “Pleasant View Apartments”, Tax Map #025 01 001,  
“Mowery Family Properties of 9.89 Acres.

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Lucinda Erbach and I reside at the intersection of Stonewall and Thompson Streets. I think that the request before you should be denied.

Much has changed about Strasburg, yet it maintained its charm and beauty, until the building boom in the early naughts. More recently, successful efforts have been made to revitalize and beautify the downtown area. I have been encouraged by this and pray regularly for the return of the lovely red buds that once flanked Rt. 11 and that whatever gets built across from the Food Lion shopping center doesn’t continue the monstrousness of Frontier Fort and Pendleton Lanes.

In the past 20 years, I’ve seen over 50 homes built within my neighborhood causing the loss of lots of green spaces. I do not begrudge landowners the right to sell their property, but I pray that those of us with lots left to sell - don’t. I want Strasburg to thrive, but not at the expense of it’s beauty and small town charm.

The argument given for needing more multi-family dwellings (MFDs) is that local businesses say the work-pool isn’t here because of a lack of affordable housing. I suspect census data would show that this did not improve with the construction of apartments behind the Rec Center nor with the building in the naughts. My suspicion is that these units are occupied by individuals who are retired or commute to Winchester or Northern Virginia for work. This will not change in the future as it has not changed in the past. Therefore, using industry is not a valid excuse for mass building. Also, this is not a Town of Strasburg problem to solve alone, but a concern for Shenandoah County as a whole.

I will let others speak to concerns I have about residential growth like schools, first responders, and public amenities. The factor that hits closest to my literal home is that of traffic. When I purchased my house there was more traffic than I expected, but it was still relatively quiet. (That extra traffic, I came to learn, is from the residents of Madison Heights who cut through my neighborhood rather than going to the light at King and Massanutten Streets.) Since moving in, the traffic past my house has increased drastically. According to the proposal there are 820 vehicles passing daily (VPD) by my house. Using the same formulas, I calculated that this number is double what it was when I moved in 20 years ago. The builders calculate that their proposal
will increase this VPD by another 522. Let that sink in. Another 522 vehicle trips turning off of and onto Rt. 11 at the Thompson Street intersection. Now, if your mind isn't already blown at this possibility, please consider that there is a potential for at least another 150 VPD because of incomplete construction and empty lots within the same neighborhood. Thompson Street was not built to withstand the traffic it already receives, let alone any additional. As much as I enjoy the occasional loud boom boom of music blaring from cars and screeching tires to add excitement in my life, I don't look forward to that increasing. Beyond my personal discomfort and fear for my life when I have to walk across the street for my mail, (The visibility for vehicles is very difficult due to the grade of Stonewall and Thompson,) every resident who travels along Rt. 11 should be concerned. The current backup of traffic when cars are trying to turn is significant – wait until at least 522 more vehicle trips are added. I don't think the sign posted on Pleasant View making the public aware of the proposal was adequate. There should have been one also posted at the intersection of Rt. 11 and Thompson, because this construction will directly impact most all residents.

It isn't my job to do the studies and numbers to protect the rights of the current 6,000ish residents of Strasburg. I would like to think those looking at development proposals would think of us as much, if not more, than the polished professionals, just trying to do their jobs. A proper traffic impact study should have been conducted.

The reasons I have mentioned in my address to you go against town established criteria as according to the 2.20.5 Approval Criteria section G which states: “...such use shall be of such size and so located and laid out in relation to access streets that vehicular and pedestrian traffic to and from such use will not create undue congestion or hazards prejudicial to the general neighborhood.” And multiple sections of town Goal #3: “Ensure the availability of safe, healthy, and attractive housing for present and future residents” (please don’t forget the present) Section B: “...reflect human-scale...balance the motor vehicle realm...”, Section C: “...occurs only when...transportation have available capacity...” and Section E: “...protects surrounding .... forest land.” (This proposal will strip away a whole small forest, supposedly leaving buffer trees for adjoining neighborhoods.)

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration. I know that you are trying to balance the needs of many – I just ask that you do not forget the current residents, particularly those in the neighborhoods that will be most impacted and do not approve the proposal before you.
Hi Mr Pambid,

Thank you for the information that you sent us via mail.

I am the owner of Lot 55, Townhouse 100 Hupps Hill Ct., Strasburg, VA.

I am opposed to the development that was proposed directly south of Crystal Subdivision due to:

1. the two buildings proposed are on significantly higher grade than the townhouses at Crystal Hill.

2. The fact that initially the developer contemplated a retaining wall 5 feet from the property line (bold line) that later was changed to be 25-30 feet from the property line, provides the mind set of the developer / owner that is looking to save money in detriment of the planning well being of the area.

3. The map that you sent us, shows that the majority of the area had been developed with housing and other properties. If the 9.8 acres (Mowery Family Properties) would be approved that would represent a higher congestion on the roads. The Old Valley Pike road it is only a two road to get in and out from the area.

Kind regards

Alejandro "Alex" Cabrera

www.bcfinancialservinc.com
keeps coming back as undeliverable

On Wed, 27 Jan, 2021 at 3:22 AM, me <wilyboyagain@shentel.net> wrote:

To: 1pambid@strasburgva.com

On Wed, 27 Jan, 2021 at 3:07 AM, me <wilyboyagain@shentel.net> wrote:

To: 1pambid@strasburg.com

Lee,

I was just able to get a look at the proposed site plan for the Mowery property. I would like to get my comments on record.

First, the size and placement of the buildings is totally incompatible with the surrounding residences. With the topography such as it is we would have huge buildings towering over our yards. 99% of the surrounding area is single family in one form or another. 96 apartments will heavily contribute to road congestion and vehicular pollution. Second, there is still the issue of drainage. It will not only bring increased volume of water run off but that water will be bringing pollution to our yards. Third, the retaining wall. I understand the location has been pulled back 25 feet from the property line but it will still require a good deal of blasting. As I pointed out to you some of that area looks unstable. I didn't see how high they propose but no matter what we should have a wooded buffer of some sort. Four, This will impact the historic district. From Massanutten St the building will look like high rises.

I know they have the right to build but the proposed density is out of character with the surrounding area and unnecessary.

James Novotny
402 Hupps Hill Ct.
540-327-7635
Michael Marx
286 West Washington Street

We oppose the proposed Special Use Permit (SUP) for this development of (2) 48 unit buildings for the following reasons:

Too much population projected for this development in too small a space will add more stress to Strasburg's infrastructure that will prove strained and perhaps unsustainable in the near as well as far future.

Police, Fire, Rescue services, as well as garbage services, water and sewage use, hazardous road conditions due to an unsustainable increase in traffic and overcrowded schools are just a few concerns we have.

It doesn't seem, based on past history of hodgepodge development, that the planning commission or the town council listens to what the citizenry has to say regarding the overdevelopment of Strasburg.

Maybe it's just wishful thinking that a small town should remain just that.
Michael Marx
286 West Washington Street

We oppose the proposed Special Use Permit (SUP) for this development of (2) 48 unit buildings for the following reasons:

Too much population projected for this development in too small a space will add more stress to Strasburg's infrastructure that will prove strained and perhaps unsustainable in the near as well as far future.

Police, Fire, Rescue services, as well as garbage services, water and sewage use, hazardous road conditions due to an unsustainable increase in traffic and overcrowded schools are just a few concerns we have.

It doesn't seem, based on past history of hodgepodge development, that the planning commission or the town council listens to what the citizenry has to say regarding the overdevelopment of Strasburg.

Maybe it's just wishful thinking that a small town should remain just that.
Michael and Elizabeth Marx
286 West Washington Street

We oppose the proposed Special Use Permit (SUP) for this development of (2) 48 unit buildings for the following reasons:

Too much population projected for this development in too small a space will add more stress to Strasburg's infrastructure that will prove strained and perhaps unsustainable in the near as well as far future.

Police, Fire, Rescue services, as well as garbage services, water and sewage use, hazardous road conditions due to an unsustainable increase in traffic and overcrowded schools are just a few concerns we have.

It doesn't seem, based on past history of hodgepodge development, that the planning commission or the town council listens to what the citizenry has to say regarding the overdevelopment of Strasburg.

Maybe it's just wishful thinking that a small town should remain just that.
Memorandum

To: Strasburg Planning Commission
From: Leander N. “Lee” Pambid, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2021
Re: Revitalization Area Resolution for Pleasant View Apartments (Planning Commission 01/26/2021)

Identification and Location Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Jen Surber, Pleasant View VA LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Mowery Family Properties LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tax Map # 025-01-001, Terminus of Pleasant View Drive, 100’ from the intersection of Pleasant View Drive and Stonewall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>~9.89 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential MFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlays</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Adjacent Zoning      | North: Multi-Family Residential MFR  
                       | East: Low Density LDR and Medium Density Residential MDR  
                       | South: Medium Density Residential MDR  
                       | West: Highway Commercial HC |
| Adjacent Uses        | North: Crystall Hill Townhouses  
                       | East: Single Family Dwellings     
                       | South: Duplexes and Single Family Dwellings  
                       | West: Single Family Dwelling (Hupp Mansion) |

*This is the same site as SUP2021-01.*

Request and Background

In conjunction with her land use application (SUP2021-01), Jen Surber has requested the establishment of a Revitalization Area for her site.

The purpose of the Revitalization Area Resolution essentially is to indicate the Town’s support of the Surber application to Virginia Housing for project funding. Inclusion of a local government resolution helps the developer’s application score.

Revitalization Areas are defined in Code of Virginia Section 36-55.30.2.A. This code section is extensive, but the applicable and necessary language has been condensed in the proposed language. The full text of the code section is attached.
Additional extensive background, data, and recommendations are provided by the Community Development Department.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

Several of the 2018 comprehensive plan considerations from the Special Use Permit also apply to the revitalization area. Encouraging a “diverse housing” stock (page 9) as well as “infill development and revitalization” (page 42) factor prominently in the comp plan.

**Staff Findings and Recommendations**

Staff findings:

- No deleterious effects will result against adjacent properties from the establishment of a Revitalization Area specifically for a multi-family residential development (with no other non-residential uses proposed) at this appropriately zoned site.
- The establishment of a Revitalization Area to enable infill development and affordable and attainable housing is supported by the comprehensive plan.
- There are no other incentives zones that apply or that exist in Town for this specific purpose.

Staff recommendation:

- Staff recommends approval of the Revitalization Area Resolution.

**Attachments**

1. **Staff Materials:** Staff reports from Planning and Zoning and Community Development; Draft resolution language; Text of applicable state law; SCC report on Pleasant View VA LLC.

**Staff Contacts**

Lee Pambid, Planning and Zoning Administrator  
Phone: 540-465-9197 x 127  
Email: lpambid@strasburgva.com

Michelle Bixler, Community Development Director  
Phone: 540-465-9197 x 132  
Email: mbixler@strasburgva.com
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission
From: Michelle Bixler, Director of Community Development
Date: January 26, 2021
Re: Revitalization Area Resolution

Recommendation

Staff proposes the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Revitalization Area Resolution (Attached) to the Strasburg Town Council.

Background

The proposed Revitalization Area Resolution enabled by Section 36-55.30:2.A of the Code of Virginia of 1950 notes that (in summary) while the economic development of the Town of Strasburg would benefit our community, our area lacks the housing needed to induce such development to locate here; and the construction or rehabilitation of decent, safe and sanitary housing and supporting facilities that will meet the needs of low and moderate income persons and families in Strasburg and the surrounding area is unlikely to occur without assistance.

Analysis

Each year, for the past three years, economic development staff from the town, county and state endeavor to connect with our larger employers to hear about how we can assist them with any difficulties they may be having. The four largest employers have continually noted that sufficient workforce remains an issue for their businesses. The two largest have struggled to fill positions created during recent expansions, and it remains a challenge for them even as unemployment increases. Anecdotally, many of our small businesses have also expressed difficulty in finding and keeping staff.

A review of the analysis of demographic and residential real estate data conducted by RKG Associates, Inc. for Shenandoah County for the Strategic Economic Development Plan Update provided further support those experiences. While Strasburg experienced the greatest absolute increase since 2010, Woodstock, Mt. Jackson and Basye are becoming the new growth centers for the county. “A possible factor that contributed to this new shift is the relative housing affordability…as SA1 (Strasburg area) …has comparably higher housing values due to its regional location advantages” (RKG, 2019).

Further, despite experiencing the most residential and nonresidential development since 2000, only a small percentage (16.9%) of the entire county’s most affordable residential properties are in the Strasburg area (RKG, 2019). And although according to a recent report, Strasburg residents have a higher median household income ($56,744) than Shenandoah County ($53,934), it experiences a 22% net out-commute with 43.9% of those earning in the
The VCU Center for Urban and Regional Analysis conducted a housing study that provided an analysis of data trends and projections for the Northern Shenandoah Valley Regional Commission. The study identified several needs in Shenandoah County regarding attainable housing, and specifically in terms of economic development it noted that “new housing production will need to target low and moderate income buyers and renters. Future growth in the county will not be driven by high-earners. Therefore, new homes (both for sale and for rent) should be accessible to modest wage workers” (Center for Urban and Regional Analysis, 2018).

**Conclusion**

A Revitalization Area Resolution provides an instrument for the Town of Strasburg to support attainable housing, a clearly demonstrated need. Staff supports Planning Commission recommend approval of the Revitalization Area Resolution.

**References**


A RESOLUTION BY THE TOWN OF STRASBURG COUNCIL
DESIGNATING A REVITALIZATION AREA FOR THE PURPOSES OF ENCOURAGING
MIXED INCOME HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 36-55.30:2.A of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended, the Strasburg Town Council wants to designate as a Revitalization Area the area known as Shenandoah County Tax Map Number 025-01-001, on which the multi-family apartment development known as Pleasant View proposes to locate.

WHEREAS, the industrial, commercial, or other economic development of such area will benefit the Town but such area lacks the housing needed to induce manufacturing, industrial, commercial, governmental, educational, entertainment, community development, healthcare or nonprofit enterprises or undertakings to locate or remain in such area; and

WHEREAS, private enterprise and investment are not reasonably expected, without assistance, to produce the construction or rehabilitation of decent, safe and sanitary housing and supporting facilities that will meet the needs of low and moderate income persons and families in such area and will induce other persons and families to live within such area and thereby create a desirable economic mix of residents in such area.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Council of the Town of Strasburg determines that the above-referenced development is located in a Revitalization Area in the Town of Strasburg, Virginia.

Wyatt Pearson
Town Manager

ATTEST:
Town Attorney
§ 36-55.30:2. Housing revitalization areas; economically mixed projects

A. For the sole purpose of empowering the HDA to provide financing in accordance with this chapter, the governing body of any city or county may by resolution designate an area within such city or county as a revitalization area if such governing body shall in such resolution make the following determinations with respect to such area: (i) either (a) the area is blighted, deteriorated, deteriorating or, if not rehabilitated, likely to deteriorate by reason that the buildings, improvements or other facilities in such area are subject to one or more of the following conditions: dilapidation; obsolescence; overcrowding; inadequate ventilation, light or sanitation; excessive land coverage; deleterious land use; or faulty or inadequate design, quality or condition; or (b) the industrial, commercial or other economic development of such area will benefit the city or county but such area lacks the housing needed to induce manufacturing, industrial, commercial, governmental, educational, entertainment, community development, healthcare or nonprofit enterprises or undertakings to locate or remain in such area; and (ii) private enterprise and investment are not reasonably expected, without assistance, to produce the construction or rehabilitation of decent, safe and sanitary housing and supporting facilities that will meet the needs of low and moderate income persons and families in such area and will induce other persons and families to live within such area and thereby create a desirable economic mix of residents in such area. Any redevelopment area, conservation area, or rehabilitation area created or designated by the city or county pursuant to Chapter 1 (§ 36-1 et seq.) of this title, any census tract in which 70 percent or more of the families have incomes which are 80 percent or less of the statewide median income as determined by the federal government pursuant to Section 143 of the United States Internal Revenue Code or any successor code provision on the basis of the most recent decennial census for which data are available, and any census tract which is designated by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and, for the most recent year for which census data are available on household income in such tract, either in which 50 percent or more of the households have an income which is less than 60 percent of the area median gross income for such year or which has a poverty rate of at least 25 percent shall be deemed to be designated as a revitalization area without adoption of the above described resolution of the city or county. In any revitalization area, the HDA may provide financing for one or more economically mixed projects and, in conjunction therewith, any nonhousing buildings that are incidental to such project or projects or are determined by the governing body of the city or county to be necessary or appropriate for the revitalization of such area or for the industrial, commercial or other economic development thereof.

B. The HDA may finance an economically mixed project that is not within a revitalization area if the governing body of the city or county in which such project is or will be located shall by resolution determine (i) either (a) that the ability to provide residential housing and supporting facilities that serve persons or families of lower or moderate income will be enhanced if a portion of the units therein are occupied or held available for occupancy by persons and families who are not of low and moderate income or (b) that the surrounding area of such project is, or is expected in the future to be, inhabited predominantly by lower income persons and families and will benefit from an economic mix of residents in such project and (ii) private enterprise and
investment are not reasonably expected, without assistance, to produce the construction or rehabilitation of decent, safe and sanitary housing and supporting facilities that will meet the needs of low and moderate income persons and families in such area and will induce other persons and families to live within such area and thereby create a desirable economic mix of residents in such area.

C. In any economically mixed project financed under this section, the percentage of units occupied or held available for occupancy by persons and families who are not of low and moderate income, as determined as of the date of their initial occupancy of such units, shall not exceed 80 percent.


The chapters of the acts of assembly referenced in the historical citation at the end of this section(s) may not constitute a comprehensive list of such chapters and may exclude chapters whose provisions have expired.
## Limited Liability Company - Articles of Organization

### Entity Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity Name</th>
<th>Pleasant View VA LLC</th>
<th>Entity Type</th>
<th>Limited Liability Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Business Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Code</th>
<th>0 - General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Perpetual(forever)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Registered Agent Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RA Type</th>
<th>Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA Qualification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localitly</td>
<td>RICHMOND CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The company’s initial registered office address, including the street and number, if any, which is identical to the business office of the initial registered agent, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Office Address</th>
<th>100 Shockoe Slip Fl 2, Richmond, VA, 23219 - 4100, USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Number</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Principal Office Address

| Address | Jen Surber, 38 Greentree Circle Rd, Bristol, VA, 24201 - 1558, USA |

### Principal Information

| Management Structure | Member-Managed |

### Signature Information

Date Signed: 12/11/2020

Executed in the name of the limited liability company by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer E. H. Surber</td>
<td>Jennifer E. H. Surber</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The State Corporation Commission has found the accompanying articles of organization submitted on behalf of

Pleasant View VA LLC

to comply with the requirements of law, and confirms payment of all required fees. Therefore, it is ORDERED that this

CERTIFICATE OF ORGANIZATION

be issued and admitted to record with the articles of organization in the Office of the Clerk of the Commission, effective December 11, 2020.

The limited liability company is granted the authority conferred on it by law in accordance with the articles of organization, subject to the conditions and restrictions imposed by law.

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

By

Jehmal T. Hudson
Commissioner