



**Board of Supervisors
County of Louisa
Monday, November 7, 2022
Louisa County Public Meeting Room
5:00 PM**

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS - 6:00 P.M.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Tommy J. Barlow	Mountain Road District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Fitzgerald A. Barnes	Patrick Henry District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Willie L. Gentry Jr.	Cuckoo District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Eric F. Purcell	Louisa County Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
R. T. Williams	Jackson District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Duane A. Adams	Mineral District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM
Rachel G. Jones	Green Springs District Supervisor	Present	5:00 PM

Others Present: Christian Goodwin, County Administrator; Helen Phillips, County Attorney; Alexandra Stanley, Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk; Wanda Colvin, Director of Finance; Griff Carmichael, Director of Human Resources; Andy Wade, Director of Economic Development; and Scott Raettig, Information Technology.

CALL TO ORDER - 5:00 P.M.

Chairman Adams called the November 7, 2022 regular meeting of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors to order at 5:00 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

On the motion of Mr. Barlow, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to enter Closed Session at 5:00 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the following:

1. In accordance with §2.2-3711 (A) (1) VA Code Ann., for a discussion of salaries of staff; and
2. In accordance with §2.2-3711 (A) (3) VA Code Ann., to discuss the consideration of disposal of publicly held real property when discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position of the County; and
3. In accordance with §2.2-3711 (A) (5) VA Code Ann., to discuss a prospective business in the Mountain Road District where no previous announcement has been made of the business's interest in locating in the County; and
4. In accordance with §2.2-3711 (A) (8) VA Code Ann., to consult with legal counsel about a multijurisdictional agreement requiring legal advice; and
5. In accordance with §2.2-3711 (A) (29) VA Code Ann., for discussion of a public contract involving the expenditure of public funds for architectural services, where discussion in an open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the County.

REGULAR SESSION

On the motion of Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0,

the Board voted to return to Regular Session at 6:00 p.m.

RESOLUTION - CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED SESSION

Voter	Role	Vote
Tommy J. Barlow	Voter	Yes/Aye
Fitzgerald A. Barnes	Seconder	Yes/Aye
R.T. Williams, Jr.	Mover	Yes/Aye
Willie L. Gentry Jr.	Voter	Yes/Aye
Duane A. Adams	Voter	Yes/Aye
Rachel G. Jones	Voter	Yes/Aye
Eric F. Purcell	Voter	Yes/Aye

On the motion of Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Louisa County Board of Supervisors has convened a Closed Meeting this 7th day of November 2022, pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, §2.2-3712 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Louisa County Board of Supervisors that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with the Virginia Law.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED on this 7th day of November 2022, that the Louisa County Board of Supervisors does hereby certify that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting was heard, discussed or considered by the Louisa County Board of Supervisors.

INVOCATION

Mr. Williams led the invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

On the motion of Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the November 7, 2022 agenda, as presented, with no changes.

MINUTES APPROVAL

Board of Supervisors (BOS) - Regular Meeting - Oct 17, 2022 5:00 PM

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve the minutes from the October 17, 2022 regular meeting.

BILLS APPROVAL

Resolution – To Approve the Bills for the Second Half of October 2022

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve the bills for the second half of October 2022.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the Consent Agenda items for November 7, 2022, as follows:

- Resolution – Posthumously Recognizing Melvin Burruss for His Service and Contributions to Louisa County
- Resolution – Right of Way Easement Agreement with Rappahannock Electric Cooperative for New Bridge Fire & Rescue
- Resolution – Approving FY2022 Budget Re-Appropriation for Louisa County Public School Bus Purchases

RECOGNITIONS**Presentation – Recognizing Lake Anna Elite Anglers on Their Success and Achievements in the 2021-2022 Season**

Mr. Goodwin read the resolution and Mr. Adams presented a framed copy to the members of the Lake Anna Elite Anglers recognizing them on their success and achievements in the 2021-2022 season.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Adams opened the public comment period.

Mr. Ryan Underwood, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Jake Underwood, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Wesley Underwood, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Ben Unruh, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development. He said he does not have an issue with commercial development but cannot support the development as proposed.

Mr. Dan Thomlinson, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Ms. Christine Unruh, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express her opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Ms. Candace Dowling, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express her opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. David Dowling, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Ms. Cathy Kern, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Bernard McDermott, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Phillip Winston, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Bruce Bauer, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Rob Lorenzen, Leesburg, VA, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Richard Hoopbur, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his concerns with the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Warren Linscott, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Ms. Nikki Linscott, Mineral District, appeared before the Board to express his opposition to the proposed Lake Anna Resort development.

Mr. Adams noted the Board received seventeen (17) written comments and requested those comments be made part of the official meeting record. See Appendix A.

With no one else wishing to speak, Mr. Adams closed the Public Comment Period.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

Presentation – Piedmont Virginia Community College

Dr. Jean Runyon, President of Piedmont Virginia Community College, appeared before the Board to provide an update on activities and enrollment at the College.

Presentation – Louisa County Agricultural Fair

Mr. Chris Gibson, Member of Louisa County Agricultural Fair, took a moment to thank the Board for their continued support and presented them with a Fair Honoree of 2022 plaque.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(None)

NEW BUSINESS/ACTION ITEMS

Resolution – To Consider the 2023 Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission Legislative Program

The Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) prepares and recommends the annual Legislative Program to serve as the basis of legislative positions and priorities of the member localities of the TJPDC for the 2023 Session of the Virginia General Assembly. The Board has reviewed the draft 2023 TJPDC Legislative Program.

On the motion of Mr. Purcell, seconded by Mr. Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to approve the 2023 TJPDC Legislative Program.

Resolution – Requesting State Funding for Near-Term Harmful Algal Bloom Mitigation

Lake Anna's 13,000 acres serve as a popular tourism destination and an economic engine supporting the Counties of Louisa, Orange and Spotsylvania as well as the Commonwealth as a whole.

Lake Anna has been materially affected by Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB) over the past few years, resulting in "No Swim" advisories and significant negative impact on those enjoying the lake as well as those relying on it from an economic standpoint.

The most recent state budget included significant funding for a study of HAB in Lake Anna, and while this study is a necessary it is also time consuming, additional funding support is need to mitigate immediate impacts of HAB in the coming tourism season.

On the motion of Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Barnes, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to request, in addition to the existing study funding, \$1,000,000 for mitigation of Harmful Algal Blooms at Lake Anna.

Resolution – Supporting the Development of Public Infrastructure for the Shannon Hill Regional Business Park

The Board of Supervisors has determined that Louisa County has a near-term need to construct water and wastewater infrastructure (the "Project") to serve the Shannon Hill Regional Business Park in order to enhance the Park's marketability and increase the County's chances of successfully competing for economic development projects.

Water and wastewater utility service to the Shannon Hill Growth Area is part of the County's Long Range Water Supply Plan. The County purchased the Park property in 2019 to facilitate economic development opportunities, create jobs for County citizens and further diversify the County's tax base, and the County is committed to responsible development of the Park.

In March 2021 the Board appropriated two million five hundred thousand (\$2,500,000) dollars to design, permit and acquire the easements necessary to construct the Project, and the County has received over \$1.98M in offsetting grants and has applied for additional grants to further offset the Project costs. The County has entertained several economic development prospects interested in locating within the Park; and

Collectively, the prospects' total potential impact would have included \$250,000,000 in capital investment and the creation of over 500 new jobs. A primary reason cited in past prospect

decision to locate elsewhere was the lack of water and sewer infrastructure at the Park.

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to hereby acknowledge that utility infrastructure is critical to the success of the Shannon Hill Regional Business Park and is committed to taking the necessary steps to complete the Project by the end of the third quarter in 2024.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee Reports

Mr. Gentry presented the Board with a preliminary concept for an affordable/workforce housing development in the County.

Back and forth discussion took place between the Board and Kim Hyland, Fluvanna/Louisa Housing Foundation Director.

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Purcell, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to move forward with the proposed affordable housing project.

Board Appointments

(None)

County Administrator's Report

Mr. Goodwin reported that there were several monthly reports and items of correspondence in the Board packet and reminded the Board of several upcoming events.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Resolution – Approving a Boundary Line Agreement Between Louisa County, Virginia and Goochland County, Virginia

In 2019, it was discovered that the taxing boundary recognized between the Counties did not coincide with the United States Census Bureau boundary used to establish election districts and precincts, thereby causing certain Goochland County residents to be assigned to vote in Louisa County, as well as certain Louisa County residents to be assigned to vote in Goochland County, which was of great concern because of the local elections in November 2019.

The Counties entered into a Boundary Line Agreement dated August 7, 2019, filed a Joint Petition in the Goochland County Circuit Court, and obtained a Final Order dated August 20, 2019, establishing a boundary between the Counties (the “2019 Boundary”) that corrected virtually all the misassigned parcels.

The Counties provided the 2019 Boundary to all local, state, and federal agencies which resolved the situation for the 2019 election, and the 2019 Boundary was thereafter adopted by the U. S. Census Bureau and used for the recent decennial redistricting.

At the time they submitted the 2019 Boundary, the Counties acknowledged that, based on jurisdictional information in individual surveys and/or deeds, there were approximately 10

parcels that were located on one side of the 2019 Boundary but being taxed by the other locality.

The Counties stated their intent, in 2019, to seek a future resolution of those approximately 10 parcels in coordination with the impacted residents and the Counties are now entering into this agreement to resolve those remaining parcels.

Virginia Code § 15.2-3106 et seq. authorizes Virginia localities to relocate, change, and establish the boundary line existing between them by agreement in accordance with the specific statutory procedures contained therein.

Virginia Code § 15.2-3108 allows localities to use a GIS map that meets certain criteria in the production of documentation to accompany the required petition to the Circuit Court to establish and identify the boundary line between the Counties.

The staffs of the two Counties have met with each other and the residents on the affected parcels and have agreed to an official boundary line map which is different from the 2019 Boundary only in that it resolves the situation for the approximately 10 misaligned parcels.

Mr. Adams opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak, Mr. Adams closed the public hearing and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

Mr. Williams motion to approve the boundary line agreement. Mr. Barnes seconded.

Mr. Barlow asked if the GIS map will be made part of the agreement.

Mr. Goodwin stated the GIS map will be an exhibit included in the documentation to accompany the required petition to the Circuit Court to establish and identify the boundary line between the Counties.

Mr. Barlow expressed his support with the boundary line adjustment but noted he cannot vote in favor of the agreement due to the use of the GIS map. He explained the intent has always been to follow parcel lines, however, the use of the GIS coordinates lends confusion to that.

On the motion of Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Barnes, which carried by a vote of 6-1, with Mr. Barlow voting against, the Board voted to approve the boundary line agreement between Louisa County, Virginia and Goochland County, Virginia.

Ordinance – Amend Chapter 86 Land Development Regulations to Add Section. 86-162 Roadside Buffers Not to be Enforced

At the September 19, 2022, regular meeting of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors, the Board directed staff to draft an amendment for consideration that would clarify their intentions not to enforce the former Agricultural (A-2) subdivision buffers.

The requirements, for roadside buffers in the Agricultural (A-2) Zoning District, were removed from the ordinance on February 16, 2021, with the adoption of the comprehensive ordinance amendments.

The proposed amendment is to no longer enforce the prior buffer requirements for maintenance and or replacement plantings; and to return any security being held by Louisa County for the roadside buffers to the respective party.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing on October 13, 2022, and voted that the public necessity, convenience, general welfare, or good zoning practice compels it to make a recommendation of approval to the Louisa County Board of Supervisors on the proposed amendment to Chapter 86. Land Development regulations, by adding the following language:

86-162. Roadside Buffers Not to Be Enforced

On February 21, 2021, the Louisa County Code was amended to remove roadside buffer requirements for Agricultural (A-2) subdivisions, which required roadside buffers to be provided along existing state roads. Any roadside buffer approved by the subdivision agent as of February 21, 2021, is no longer required and it shall not be enforced for maintenance and/or replacement of plantings. Any security posted with Louisa County and currently being held for subdivision buffers (plantings) required under the prior regulations, shall be returned to the developer by the Community Development Department.

Mr. Adams opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak, Mr. Adams closed the public hearing and brought it back to the Board for discussion.

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0, the Board voted to adopt the proposed amendments to Chapter 86. Land Development Regulations, to add Section 86-162. Roadside Buffers Not to be Enforced, as follows:

86-162. Roadside Buffers Not to Be Enforced

On February 21, 2021, the Louisa County Code was amended to remove roadside buffer requirements for Agricultural (A-2) subdivisions, which required roadside buffers to be provided along existing state roads. Any roadside buffer approved by the subdivision agent as of February 21, 2021, is no longer required and it shall not be enforced for maintenance and/or replacement of plantings. Any security posted with Louisa County and currently being held for subdivision buffers (plantings) required under the prior regulations, shall be returned to the developer by the Community Development Department.

ADJOURNMENT

On the motion of Mr. Barnes, seconded by Mr. Williams, which carried by a vote of 7-0 the Board voted to adjourn the November 7, 2022, regular meeting at 7:35 p.m.

BY ORDER OF:
DUANE A. ADAMS, CHAIRMAN
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
LOUISA COUNTY, VIRGINIA

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Brenda Johnston <bjj_johnston@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 22, 2022 2:16 PM
To: Info
Subject: Stop the Commercial development of Lake Anna.

CAUTION: External email

As a Virginia resident I'm tired of our beautiful areas being destroyed by commercial and housing developments.

When is enough, enough! All around our beautiful green spaces, greedy developers are absorbing the farm and beautiful areas to build shopping complexes, hotels, and storage facilities.

What ever happened to the "Green" movement or is that just a joke on the population.

NO WATERFRONT LAKE ANNA R



BOARD MEEETING NOV 7 & 8
EMAIL: INFO@LOUISA.C

Brenda Johnston.

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device
Get [Outlook for Android](#)

APPENDIX A

Confidentiality Notice: This information may be Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) exempt and protected as privileged under Va. Code Section 2.2-3705.7(2). The information contained in this message may be otherwise privileged, confidential, and/or protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or any employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Thank you.

From: Cathy Kern <cathydavidkern@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, October 28, 2022 4:03 PM

To: Info <info@louisa.org>

Cc: Duane Adams <lcbs_md@louisa.org>; Tommy Barlow <LCBS_MRD@louisa.org>; LSBS_GSD@louisa.org; Fitzgerald Barnes <LCBS_PHD@louisa.org>; Willie Gentry <LCBS_CD@louisa.org>; Eric Purcell <LCBS_LD@louisa.org>; Toni Williams <lcbs_jd@louisa.org>

Subject: Please Deny the PUD for Lake Anna Resort

CAUTION: External email

Board of Supervisor Members:

My name is Cathy Kern. My husband and I live at 2694 New Bridge Road in the Mineral voting district. We have owned a home at Lake Anna in Louisa County since 1991. When we purchased the lot for our current home on Rt. 208, we knew full well we were in the middle of a commercial growth area. We had many conversations about the dangers of buying in this area. In the end, we decided that we could live with the growth and have accepted the many changes to our little area over the last few decades. We've seen the addition of a grocery store and many restaurants and a variety of services. They are all small additions that have not overwhelmed the area and we are happy to have them. We are not against growth and change. We are however against Northern Virginia type development here in our rural hometown of Louisa. The proposed resort is simply too dense a development for this area.

We moved here for the Lake but specifically moved into Louisa County for its small-town feel. A development of this type does not fit with the culture of the community of Louisa County, and we do not have the infrastructure to support this level of development. Specifically,

1. Our roads, especially Rt. 208, in this specific area, are overcrowded and dangerous already. We have a road sign near our driveway for a young man who lost his life on this curvy, high-speed road. We have had several other major accidents on this stretch of road over the last few years, with a total of 4 deaths. Not to mention the weekly accidents at the intersection of 208 and 522. Speaking of 522, we cannot get from our house to Rt. 522 on a summer Friday, Saturday or Sunday without sitting in a long line of traffic. Adding 226 new residences in this small area, with no planned road improvements, will cripple the road and result in many more accidents and deaths.
2. Our Lake. While we all want growth, very few who have moved here are looking for an urban environment. We come here for the peace, quiet and beauty of the area and specifically the Lake. This monstrosity with its lights, noise, and large volume of transient people will severely impact the entire Lake but certainly the area around the 208 Bridge. It is already very congested with the hundreds of boat slips at the

APPENDIX A

Plaza. 200+ more boats entering and exiting this area on a summer weekend will result in more accidents and deaths.

3. Our Environment. The Resort relies on the poorly managed wastewater treatment plant across the road at the Plaza. The County is working to take this plant over – at a cost somewhere north of \$10 million. Where is the funding for this upgrade coming from? I imagine it will come from those of us who don't want this development, nor the greatly increased affluent dumped into our Lake. The developer has offered \$1 million towards this plant – not even a tenth of the cost to improve it, let alone maintain it. This is a horrible mistake – one that will cost us taxpayers tremendously and increase the risk of severe impacts to lake water quality.

There are those who see this Resort as **the** cash cow for revenue and those who see it as **the** key piece to bring more services – internet, medical, etc. – to the area. Us taxpayers see it as a huge, ugly burden.

Three years ago, at the beginning of the pandemic, people were flocking to this simple rural area to get away from the crowds in the big cities. These very people are now returning to work and no longer flocking to our Lake to work from home. Additionally, the market has cooled and will continue to cool with the increase in interest rates. What happens if the condos don't sell?

This project is a tremendous risk for the County due to its size and density. The infrastructure is not here to support it, the rural nature of this county will be ruined, the wastewater treatment plant is a huge financial burden for the county that will be passed on to the residents, and there is no guarantee that the Resort will be built as outlined - not that this level of development is needed nor supported. This developer has no experience in Louisa County and no experience in developing a project of this size and scope. We may need growth, but we don't need this dense development. I strongly encourage the Board to deny the request for this PUD – it is too much for our beautiful community to absorb and too financially risky. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Catherine Kern

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Claude Owen <claudio.owen2@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2022 12:43 AM
To: Info
Subject: Fwd: Statement in Opposition to the Rezoning Request for the Proposed New Lake Anna Resort

CAUTION: External email

CHAIRMAN ADAMS AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

MY NAME IS CLAUDE OWEN, AND I LIVE ON MITCHELL POINT ROAD IN THE MINERAL DISTRICT. LAST WEEK ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 10, I EMAILED EACH MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION A COPY OF MY WRITTEN STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED REZONING REQUEST BY LAKE ANNA RESORT. A COPY OF THAT STATEMENT IS FORWARDED TO YOU IN THIS EMAIL.

MY WRITTEN STATEMENT IS COMPREHENSIVE, COVERING SEVERAL OBJECTIONABLE ASPECTS OF THE PROPOSED NEW RESORT, INCLUDING THOSE CONTINUING SINCE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACCEPTED THE UNANIMOUS RECOMMENDATION OF THE THEN PLANNING COMMISSION TO REJECT A SIMILAR APPLICATION FOR REZONING IN 2016.

SINCE I WILL BE OUT OF THE COUNTRY AT THE TIME OF THE ANTICIPATED PUBLIC HEARING BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE REZONING REQUEST, I WISH TO HIGHLIGHT IN THIS MESSAGE THREE PARTICULAR CONCERNS. FIRST IS THE SITING OF A 550 FEET PLUS IN LENGTH, 80 FOOT HIGH, SIX STORY MONSTROSITY ALONG THE SHORELINE ON THAT FRAGILE 10 ACRE PLOT OF LAND ADJACENT TO THE 208 CAUSEWAY AND BRIDGE.

WITH APOLOGIES TO SUPERVISOR BARLOW WHO HEARD MY ORAL STATEMENT AT THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, IMAGINE FOR A MINUTE IF YOU WILL, THE PARKING OF THE SECOND LARGEST MEGAYACHT EVER BUILT ALONG THAT SHORELINE. THIS YACHT IS OWNED BY THE SULTAN OF OMAN, SOLE RULER OF THAT

APPENDIX A

FABULOUSLY RICH OIL AND GAS COUNTRY IN THE MIDDLE EAST. THE SULTAN'S MEGAYACHT IS SHORTER IN LENGTH BY SEVERAL FEET THAN THE PROPOSED CONDOMINIUM BUILDING AND DOESN'T HAVE 96 BALCONIES ON WHICH OWNERS AND RENTERS CAN HANG THEIR WET TOWELS AND LAUNDRY OR FIRE UP THEIR BARBECUE GRILLS. ONLY BY DYNAMITING THE DAM TO DRAIN THE LAKE OR CAUSING AN INTENTIONAL NUCLEAR ACCIDENT AT THE POWER PLANT COULD ONE DO MORE HARM TO LAKE ANNA, LOUISA COUNTY'S GOLDEN GOOSE, THAN BY APPROVING THE BUILDING OF THIS MONSTROSITY, INCLUDING ITS PROPOSED 60,000 SQUARE FEET PLUS OF OVERWATER BOATHOUSES AND DOCKS. TO THINK THIS IS ALL BEING CONSIDERED FOR A PROJECTED RETURN TO THE COUNTY OF A PALTRY, AND RISKY, \$206,000 PER YEAR WHILE POTENTIALLY DEVASTATING THE VALUES OF MANY HOMES ALONG MITCHELL CREEK AND CONTRARY CREEK COVES, EACH CURRENTLY PAYING PROPERTY TAXES IN THE RANGE OF \$10,000 OR MORE ANNUALLY. IT BRINGS INTO QUESTION WHOSE INTERESTS ARE BEING SERVED, THE TAX-PAYING RESIDENTS OF THE COUNTY OR THE DEVELOPERS?

AND TO TOP OFF THE INSULT, YOUR PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDS AGREEING TO AN EXCEPTION TO THE COUNTY'S ZONING CODE LIMITATION ON THE HEIGHT OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPER TO ADD A TOP LAYER OF 16 CONDOS OR PENTHOUSES, USING THE LOGIC THAT IF A HOTEL CAN BE 80 FEET HIGH, WHY NOT INCREASE THE HEIGHT OF THIS 550 FOOT PLUS MONSTROSITY BY ANOTHER 20 FEET AS WELL? IF THIS SORT OF THINKING WERE NOT POTENTIALLY SO TRAGIC, WE WOULD ALL HAVE TO LAUGH AT THE RIDICULOUSNESS OF IT. FORTUNATELY ENOUGH MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION SAW THIS PROPOSED EXCEPTION AS ILLOGICAL AND UNSUPPORTED BY FACT SO THE COMMISSION DENIED IT THEIR FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION. PRESUMABLY YOU WILL AGREE WITH THE WISDOM OF THEIR DECISION.

THE SECOND POINT I AM GOING TO MAKE CONCERNS BALD EAGLES AND THEIR WELL ESTABLISHED NEST ON THE PROPOSED SITE. I AM NOT AT THIS POINT GOING INTO ANY DETAIL ABOUT THE EXISTING FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS GOVERNING THE

APPENDIX A

PROTECTION OF BALD EAGLES, FOR IF YOU ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH THE PROHIBITIONS AGAINST THEIR DISTURBANCE, I FEEL CERTAIN AS SUPERVISORS YOU WILL BE MADE INTIMATELY AWARE OF THE ISSUE BEFORE TAKING A VOTE ON REZONING. DOMINION RESOURCES, THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES, THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE HAVE ALL BEEN PROVIDED PROOF OF THIS EAGLES' NEST, AND I AM INFORMED THAT THE DEVELOPER HAS ALSO BEEN MADE AWARE OF ITS PRESENCE.

I DO NOT EXPECT MANY OF YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO SERVE AS A PUBLIC SERVANT WITHOUT THE PROTECTION OFFERED AGAINST PERSONAL LOSS BY STATE LAW ON PUBLIC OFFICIALS IMMUNITY. I KNOW I WOULD NOT. BUT SUCH IMMUNITY IS NOT ABSOLUTE; INDEED, BY APPROVING THIS PROJECT THROUGH CONCURRENCE WITH THE DEVELOPER'S REZONING REQUEST, YOU WOULD BE EFFECTIVELY DISREGARDING FEDERAL LAWS THAT PROTECT THE BALD EAGLES. RESPECTFULLY, YOUR AUTHORITY DOES NOT EXTEND TO IGNORING FEDERAL STATUTES, AND IRRESPECTIVE OF YOUR PERCEIVED IMMUNITY, YOU POSSIBLY COULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE OR LIABLE FOR ANY ILLEGAL ACTIONS AGAINST THOSE PROTECTED BIRDS OR THEIR NESTS.

FINALLY, I WANT TO ADD A MATTER OF PROFOUND CONCERN WITH WHICH THE PLANNING COMMISSION UNANIMOUSLY AGREED AND THAT RELATES TO THE LACK OF ANY PERFORMANCE BONDING IN THE DEVELOPER'S PROFER OR TO THIS POINT, ANY RECOMMENDATION BY THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT THAT A SIGNIFICANT PERFORMANCE BOND BE MANDATED.

IN THE COUNTY'S ZONING REGULATIONS FOR A RESORT DEVELOPMENT, THERE ARE VERY SPECIFIC BONDING REQUIREMENTS FOR A RESORT OF 30 ACRES OR MORE. WITH THE LAKE ANNA RESORT DEVELOPER'S CONTENTION THAT THEIR PROJECT WOULD BE VALUED AT MORE THAN \$100 MILLION, THE COUNTY SHOULD NOT PROCEED ON THIS PROJECT OF 15 ACRES AS A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT REQUIRING BONDING. YOU WOULD BE NEGLIGENT NOT TO DO SO.

APPENDIX A

AT THE COMMUNITY INFORMATION MEETING ON AUGUST 31, THE DEVELOPERS ADMITTED THEY HAD NEVER BEEN INVOLVED IN RESORT OR HOTEL DEVELOPMENT NOR HAD THEY EVER DEVELOPED ANY PROPERTIES IN LOUISA COUNTY OR ON LAKE ANNA.

VIRGINIA JURISPRUDENCE HAS A STANDARD TO WHICH DECISION MAKERS ARE HELD CALLED THAT OF A “REASONABLE PERSON.” AS SUPERVISORS YOU DO NOT HAVE TO BE AN EXPERT IN BANKING AND FINANCE NOR IN HOTEL CONSTRUCTION AND FRANCHISING TO UNDERSTAND AND APPRECIATE THE HIGHLY SPECULATIVE NATURE OF THE REZONING PROPOSAL YOU ARE REVIEWING. IN THIS TIME OF RAPIDLY RISING INTEREST RATES, WITH MORE YET TO COME, AND WITH BANKS' LOAN TO VALUE RATIOS DECLINING, YOU ONLY HAVE TO BE A “REASONABLE PERSON” TO SEE THE FOLLY IN NOT EITHER REJECTING THIS REZONING REQUEST OUTRIGHT OR TO AT LEAST IN REQUIRING A PERFORMANCE BOND IN THE RANGE OF \$100 MILLION.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF THESE FACTS AND OPINIONS.

CLAUDE OWEN

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Claude Owen** <claudio.owen2@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Oct 10, 2022 at 2:03 PM

Subject: Statement in Opposition to the Rezoning Request for the Proposed New Lake Anna Resort

To: <gbrooks@louisia.org>, oaksby@gmail.com <oaksby@gmail.com>, <Equarles@louisia.org>, cyandjackie@yahoo.com <cyandjackie@yahoo.com>, <rivermarsh@firstva.com>, <gnuckols@louisiatown.org>, <mwoodward@woodward-insurance.com>, <james@virginiahomesfarmlands.com>

Cc: <tegeland@louisia.org>, <planningcommission@louisia.org>

October 10, 2022

To Members of the Louisa County Planning Commission:

My name is Claude Owen, and my wife and I reside in a lakefront home at 1065 Mitchell Point Road, Mineral, in the same cove as the proposed new Lake Anna Resort (“the proposed resort”). As with a previous attempt to

APPENDIX A

have this property rezoned to allow for the construction of residential housing units, we are vehemently opposed to the newly proposed plan.

The current property owners purchased the property knowing full well that it was zoned Commercial (C-2). Now they claim, after spending years attempting to devise a business model to develop the property for commercial purposes, they have determined that the only investment strategy which makes economic sense for them is to include high density residential housing.

These same property owners (“the developers”) represented themselves at the meeting with the community held on August 31, 2022, as sophisticated investors and experienced and successful developers. Yet they admit that they have never financed or built a condominium/hotel complex in any way similar to the proposed resort.

If in buying this property for commercial development, they bought a proverbial “pig in a poke,” unsuitable for the purpose it was purchased, one has to question their savvy as both investors and developers. If, on the other hand, it was always their intention to succeed in building high density housing where the previous developer failed, then their attempt to manipulate the county’s zoning ordinances to achieve their goal is obvious.

Now for the essence of my, as well the community’s, objections to building nearly 100 residential condominium units on that fragile piece of land adjacent to the 208 Bridge. We are concerned about:

- Boater safety from increased congestion at the mouth of Mitchell Creek Cove where there is already a bottleneck caused by the 208 Bridge and causeway through which all boat traffic going between uplake and downlake must pass. Adding tens of thousands of square feet of boat houses and boat docks extending 150 feet into the lake at the mouth of the cove, and the attendant additional boat traffic, as proposed by the developers, is itself unconscionable.

- Increased pollution, including noise and light pollution, from cramming several hundred additional residents, including likely short-term rentals, into acreage that, were it zoned Residential (R-2), would contain a maximum of fifteen homes and perhaps eight boat docks.

- Having what would be at 80 feet perhaps the tallest residential buildings in Louisa County on the shores of Lake Anna would be a monstrosity. Each of the housing units in those buildings would require decks or balconies facing the lake which would destroy the tranquility the existing homeowner/taxpayers have a right to expect as well as negatively affect tax valuations for those same homes. It also appears that the only way the proposed resort reaches the minimum standard for open green spaces is by including adjacent waterfront property owned by Dominion Resources.

- The removal of trees and the paving of most of the unimproved surfaces on the property will result in increased runoff into Lake Anna creating conditions for Harmful Algae Blooms (HABs) to become present downlake as well as adding pollutants to the Chesapeake Bay. With Lake Anna’s recently being added to the list of Virginia’s Impaired Waters, it is preposterous to implement development which can add significantly to both the area and intensity of the lake’s already considerable impairment.

- There is no cost effective way for the county to handle the increased sewage treatment load burden that the proposed resort would impose, plus the risk to the lake of pumping more wastewater, treated or not, into highly valued recreational waters would be a very unsound practice.

- The vehicular traffic from the 208 Bridge to the Rt. 522 intersection is already highly congested, particularly on weekends. The introduction of turning lanes into the proposed resort will likely be insufficient to mitigate the additional traffic due to the proposed resort.

- As you will read in comments from others, there is a pair of Bald Eagles in an established nest along the waterline on the property of the proposed resort. Dominion Resources, the Virginia Department of Wildlife

APPENDIX A

Resources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service have all been provided unassailable visual proof of these Bald Eagles and their nest which are protected at the federal level by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. There are also extensive regulations under Virginia law governing Bald Eagle protection as well. These Bald Eagles must not be removed, disturbed or interfered with in any way without the express written approval of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

It is clear to me that this proposed rezoning request amounts to a repackaging of the request made for the same property by its previous owner a few years ago with the addition of five additional acres along Mitchell Creek Cove to provide a second parcel to approximately double the number of boat house and docks on the new site plan from the original plan. As with the original plan, it also has massive contingencies as to its plans for wastewater treatment as well as its plans for the hotel and other commercial aspects of the proposed development.

Several years ago, due in part to objections from the community about the original plan, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend that the Board of Supervisors not grant the proposed rezoning request. The Supervisors at that time made its final decision in accordance with the Planning Commission's recommendation.

I trust after reading all the comments both written and oral that you receive on this matter, you will make the same wise recommendation against rezoning as did your predecessors.

In closing I would like to make one final point. At the community meeting on August 31, I asked in open session Mr. Egeland of the Community Development Department what type of performance bond the county would require of the developers if the property were rezoned and the site plan approved. If I understood his answer correctly, he said the county would require no bond, and only the state soil and water conservation authorities required a bond.

For a project that the developers claim will have a value of approximately \$100 million, if approved, it is essential that the county require a performance bond. The county zoning ordinance has very specific language on bonding for a Resort Development of 30 acres or more. The same standard should be applied should this project of 15 acres be seriously considered for approval as a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I have personal experience of more than 37 years in commercial, banking, and it is my considered opinion is that it will be very difficult for any developer operating outside his field of experience and expertise and outside of the geographical area where he has historically operated to get financing today for a project as speculative and with such significant contingencies as this proposal.

Further, their suggestion that they expect to get a hotel company such as Marriott or Hilton to build and operate a hotel on their property is contrary to my experience as to how these companies run their businesses today. They generally expect the developer to finance and build the hotel and then enter into management and marketing agreements where a percentage of the hotel's revenue is shared with the brand name hotel company. These obvious misconceptions on the part of the developers as to how this process normally works indicate their woeful lack of experience in hotel and resort development.

Due to the financial and operational difficulties the developers will likely face, it would be negligent for any public official to approve their proposed plan without a performance bond equal to the amount of their proposed investment.

Thank you for taking time to read my statement and for taking the facts and opinions I have presented here into consideration.

Sincerely,

Claude Owen
clauden2@gmail.com
434-489-9632

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: snoeyenbos@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 8:05 PM
To: Info
Subject: Vote NO on the request to rezone approximately 15.277 acres, comprised of tax map parcel 30-3A and a portion of 30-3, from General Commercial (C-2) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed mixed-use development on Lake Anna along the Route 208 cor

CAUTION: External email

Please vote NO on the request to rezone approximately 15.277 acres, comprised of tax map parcel 30-3A and a portion of 30-3, from General Commercial (C-2) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed mixed-use development on Lake Anna along the Route 208 corridor for the following reasons:

- Not appropriate or commensurate with the surrounding rural community.
- Increase in the risk of HAB (harmful algal bloom) in the lake due to increased runoff and increased discharge from the wastewater treatment facility.
- Increased traffic congestion and danger on the 208 corridor.
- Increased light pollution with hundreds of residential windows shining onto Lake Anna.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Carolyn and Bill Snoeyenbos

Valentine Woods Subdivision, Lake Anna

APPENDIX A

CAUTION: External email

To whom it may concern:

I sent the following text to all of the Louisa County Supervisors individually. One of my colleagues informed me that I need to send it to this address in order to get it included in the public record. Please insert the following into the public record. Please also note that I consent to permit individuals and organizations who intend to pass the information to the wider public to use all or any portion of it that they deem suitable to their needs.

Thank you,
Dan Tomlinson

Board of Supervisors:

I am writing to you to request a review of the Lake Anna Resort proposal to provide a condominium complex, hotel and restaurant/bar on 15.27 wooded acres located at the Southwestern end of the Hwy 208 bridge.

The proposal is addressed in a Louisa County Planning Commission document submitted to the Louisa County Board of Supervisors on October 6, 2022. I am using that document as the source of information for the list of comments and questions that I am providing below. I reference the relationship between the document and my comments/questions by identifying each "packet page number" that applies to the comment or question. I have enclosed the entire packet as an attachment to this email.

I request that you answer each question in writing and provide the citizens of Louisa County the opportunity to review the questions and answers for a reasonable period of time prior to approving the Developer's rezoning request.

Background:

A private developer Lake Anna Resorts, has submitted a request to the Board of Supervisors to rezone 15.277 acres of waterfront property to Planned Unit Development (PUD). The rezoning request would enable the developer to construct a six story five hundred foot wide luxury condominium complex adjacent to the gateway into Louisa County at the western end of the Hwy 208 bridge. The request is contained at packet page 10 of the Oct. 6 Memorandum.

A similar proposal was issued in 2014, which was subsequently denied.

Packet Page 12 of the Memorandum addresses the 2040 Louisa County Comprehensive Plan. It introduces the topic by identifying three main objectives of the Plan. I quote: **"The primary goal of the 2040 Plan is to preserve Louisa County's rural character, beautify its gateways and roadways, and accommodate future growth."**

Question: How does approval of the rezoning request align with the Comprehensive Plan? I request that you answer the question after reviewing this discussion of the three key points which are; preserve Louisa County's rural character, beautify its gateways and roadways, and accommodate future growth.

It is self evident that a six story 500 foot wide condominium complex is not consistent with preserving the rural character of Louisa County.

It is also self evident that it does not beautify the gateway to Louisa County. In fact it is an eyesore that spoils the entrance to Louisa County after crossing Lake Anna, the crown jewel of our county.

If there are any among you members of the Louisa County Board of Supervisors who disagree with the previous two statements please speak up now and explain the basis for your disagreement.

APPENDIX A

On the premise that none of you disagree that the developer's proposal fails to meet the first two components of the Plan's goal, I proceed to the last of the three components; "accommodate future growth."

At first blush this component appears to be at odds with the first two. Over time 'future growth' inevitably results in urbanization that transforms once rural landscapes into densely occupied cities. However it is not surprising that a long term comprehensive plan should account for a need to provide affordable housing to all the residents of the county including the "work force" wage earners near the bottom of the income range. High density housing may be a pragmatic means of fulfilling a portion of this need.

The planned unit development zoning enables the County to provide space to these necessarily high density projects. Setting aside for the moment the fact that there are other locations in Louisa County that could be zoned to meet the same need without creating an eyesore at the scenic eastern entrance to Louisa County, perhaps we should give the Developer's proposal a fair evaluation. The question becomes; does the Developer's proposal provide for affordable work force housing consistent with the need to accommodate future growth?

A hint at the answer can be found at the bottom of packet page 13 which says (T)here is no mention of affordable or work force housing proposed in this project.

A citizen question at the bottom of packet page 17 says; "what about the fire and emergency burden and the schools." The Developer's response was "our product is not conducive to families." The Developer goes on to declare that it's target customers are affluent residents of Northern Virginia (excluding children) and empty nesters who live near the lake and want to downsize.

Question: What is the justification for approving a proposed zoning change permitting a high density development that clearly conflicts with two of the three objectives in the Comprehensive Plan and effectively excludes families with children and individuals whose annual earnings are not substantially more than the median earnings in Louisa County?

I'll offer a speculative hypothetical response. The hypothetical response is 'because it provides a revenue stream that will enable the County to upgrade the waste water treatment facility on the Northern side of the bridge. (The condominium project will be located on the Southern side of the bridge.)

The Developer hired a consulting firm to evaluate the economics of the project. The economics include the estimated cost of the project \$103.8 million (packet page 109), a cost to upgrade the waste water treatment facility of \$10.8 million (packet page 110), a corporate proffer of \$1 million (pg. 16) and an expected annual revenue contribution to Louisa County of \$205,009 (pg.15).

After accounting for the Developer's \$1 million contribution, Louisa County can expect to contribute \$9.8 million to upgrade a waste water facility so that it is capable of the additional 100,000 gallons of waste water a day that will be generated by the development. At an expected income rate of \$205,009 per year it will take just under 48 years to pay for the \$9.8 million upgrade assuming an unrealistic interest rate of 0%.

Question: Why should Louisa County commit itself to a \$9.8 million expenditure on an initiative that almost exclusively benefits the Developer when the Developer has explicitly declared that it will only contribute \$1.0 million towards covering the cost?

Board Members; there are numerous other reasons to question the wisdom of approving the Developer's rezoning request. Among them are the fact that the fire and EMS folks have informed us that they do not have the staff to support a project of this size, a concern about encroaching upon wetlands and one or more bald eagle nesting sites and several others. I will leave it to my concerned citizen colleagues to express these concerns in their own way.

I plead with you to revisit the rationale behind your pending decision regarding the rezoning request. Please make sure that you put the interests of us citizens of Louisa County before the self interest of a Developer whose only motive appears to be profit.

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Janet Sheets <janshe@mail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2022 2:56 PM
To: Info
Subject: Opposition to proposed rezoning of property on Mitchell Cove on Lake Anna in Louisa County

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External email

Dear Board of Supervisors,

My name is Janet Sheets. I am a homeowner at 224 Bernie Circle which is directly across from the proposed LKA resort.

Needless to say this proposed resort would completely disrupt many aspects of life in this area. The boat slips at the 208 bridge already block the view of the water when heading east & already has so many vehicles filling the area that I can't even imagine what this proposed resort would look like with consideration to boat traffic & vehicles on the stretch of 208.

Furthermore, has an impact study been done on how a building of that size & population would effect the lake water in regards to sewage & how that would also potentially contribute to algae bloom that we are already studying & trying to mitigate?

What about how that building would block light & have effect on wildlife in the area? Noise to homeowners? I understand that the developers appear to have zero experience with this type of development. This highly concerns me. I want to see that study.

I am emphatically opposed to the proposed rezoning of property on Mitchell Cove on Lake Anna in Louisa County. I ask that you reject the request from LA Resorts & all future requests and preserve the land and shoreline as intended, protecting the health, safety, quality of life and the investment of the residents of Lake Anna.

Sincerely,

Janet Sheets
224 Bernie circle
Mineral, VA 23117
540-846-4926
janshe@mail.com

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Kristen DuVall <duvall.kristen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 6:17 PM
To: Info
Subject: Public Urban Development at Lake Anna

CAUTION: External email

Hello,

My name is Kristen and I am writing an email to express my disapproval with the proposed building on Lake Anna.

I moved to this area because it was away from the city and everyone is paced out. I moved here to get away from the city life.

This area already is way too crowded during the summer seasons, do not forget about the increased number of drunk drivers in the area too.

I do not agree with this development because it will ruin the lake with crowding it too much, increased risk of drivers under the influence, and too much congestion for certain roads to handle this large development.

Money is not worth ruining the quality of this area.

Best

Kristen DuVall

Is this Progress? Lake Anna Now



Email your thoughts
info@louisa.org or to
Supervisors **BEFORE**



Lake Anna with Progress



APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Karen Humphries <onecrazirn2@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 2:21 PM
To: Info
Subject: Lake Anna condos

CAUTION: External email

Please let me voice my concern over the pending approval of building Lake Anna Resort. It is not something that fits the surrounding area....the roads cannot handle the added traffic.....not to mention the environmental impacts on the environment with added waste to the lake? Are the members of the board willing to live and swim where the septic is being dumped?

Please do not approve this!! As someone who has lived near Lake Anna for over 22 years!! We need responsible and building suitable for the area!!

Karen Humphries
Concerned citizen

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Linda Twilley <lctwilley821@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2022 3:42 PM
To: Info
Subject: ROUTE 208 condo proposal

CAUTION: External email

Please veto this request. Vote NO to this possible construction.

Thank you

[Sent from the all new AOL app for Android](#)

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: KATIE STULLER <katie6476@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 10:02 PM
To: Info
Subject: NO to PUD

CAUTION: External email

Please do not enforce this undesired 'progress' of lake Anna

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: thecaldwells3@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2022 7:37 PM
To: Info
Subject: Lake Anna Resort

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External email

I'm not as articulate as a lot of the other people who have written to you. But I'm also against having this monstrosity built.

208 is a 2 lane curvy road in that area.

I've lived at the lake for 22 years and have seen the traffic increase. This Summer there were fatalities in that area of road.

That particular land is zoned commercial. Keep it that way. There's so much more that needs to be improved, infrastructure being number one. And yes the WWTF is completely separate. But that should still be put ahead of this white elephant

Nancy Caldwell
6518 Harbour Point Dr
Mineral, VA 23117
540-854-5124

[Sent from the all new AOL app for Android](#)

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Robert Cox <crazyman3520@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2022 7:52 PM
To: Info
Subject: LKA RESORT

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External email

I am totally against a ridiculous project like this at a rural lake. It would create even more road traffic and lake traffic which is already at capacity. It would ruin the atmosphere of the area and create numerous problems on and off the water. Let's not try to make another city where there is already a peaceful rural community. This project is all about money and has nothing to do with community.

Robert Cox
33 Bernie Circle 23117

Sent from my iPhone

APPENDIX A

Alexandra Stanley

From: Sarah Gabriel <sarahgabriel3715@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 10:37 PM
To: Info
Subject: Against Condo Development at Lake Anna

CAUTION: External email

I have been reading about the proposed development at Lake Anna near the 208 bridge. As a homeowner at the end of the Cove near this, I want to say that I'm very against this development.

It will bring way too much traffic both on and off the water. The lake, in that area, is rural and tranquil and I believe should stay that way.

I am very concerned this is this additional infrastructure will be a bad direction for we homeowners on the lake.

Please consider voting this down when the time comes.

Thank you,
Sarah Gabriel

Sarah Gabriel
703-868-6949
Sent from my iPhone