

Amanda G. Styne

Begin forwarded message:

From: Todd King <kingmt@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Date: July 14, 2026 at 7:37:21 AM EDT
To: "Justin D. Sanders" <sandersjd@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Tower in Pilot

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Erika Johnson <erikalynnj@gmail.com>
Date: July 13, 2026 at 6:21:42 PM EDT
To: Todd King <kingmt@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Tower in Pilot

This is an external email. Please exercise caution with any links or attachments.

I'm writing to express my opposition to the proposed tower construction in Pilot. This will Impact the view of many residents and subsequently diminish property value values for those residents and others in the vicinity. Please do not allow this to happen!

Sincerely,

Erika Johnson
Pilot resident

Sent from my iPhone. Forgive the brevity, the tpyos, and the lack of nuance.

Amanda G. Styne

From: Justin D. Sanders
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 8:00 AM
To: Amanda G. Styne; Brea G Hopkins; Jude A. Cochran
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] No tower. Our bucolic views with the blinking light will diminish our quality of life and affect our home values.

Please print for PC

Thank you,

Justin D. Sanders, AICP | CZA | CTM
Assistant Planning Director
Montgomery County, Virginia

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Todd King <kingmt@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Date: July 14, 2026 at 7:29:57 AM EDT
To: "Justin D. Sanders" <sandersjd@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] No tower. Our bucolic views with the blinking light will diminish our quality of life and affect our home values.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Pam McGraw <pwalkermcgraw@gmail.com>
Date: July 13, 2026 at 6:44:04 PM EDT
To: Todd King <kingmt@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] No tower. Our bucolic views with the blinking light will diminish our quality of life and affect our home values.

This is an external email. Please exercise caution with any links or attachments.

From: katanderson@swva.net
Date: July 13, 2026 at 3:35:12 PM EDT
To: Todd King <kingmt@montgomerycountyva.gov>
Cc: katanderson@swva.net
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed 199' Tower in Pilot, VA

This is an external email. Please exercise caution with any links or attachments.

Dear Todd,

This is Kathy Anderson in Pilot. My husband and I are adjacent property owners to the Wonderly's. Our address is 4670 Old Pike Rd.

We have lived here for 46 years and we love our home, property, and community. We are devastated to learn of this proposal to erect a 199' tower right in front of our house. The tower would be ever-present in our lives with no way to get away from it without leaving our property.

We're worried about what it will do to our property value. We own a beautiful 30 acre woodlot with a pond, nice outbuildings and a modest home that we built in 1982. We have worked hard to make this spot our own. One of the best things about it is the beautiful view we have. Do you think anyone looking to move to the area who would choose to purchase a home with a tower dominating their space?

Besides my sadness of how this could affect us directly, I think the tower will ruin the essence of "being in the country" and the character of Pilot, VA.

Is it proven that it is necessary to have a tower in this area?

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathy Anderson

Amanda G. Styne

From: JOAN W <rjcwolf@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2026 4:44 PM
To: mcplan
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Subject: Written Comments on SUP-2026-5 — Old Pike Telecommunications Tower

This is an external email. Please exercise caution with any links or attachments.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

I am submitting these written comments regarding SUP-2026-5, the proposed telecommunications tower at or near 4752 Old Pike Road.

After reviewing the application packet and listening to the prior meeting discussion, I understand that Virginia law may limit the County's ability to require certain proprietary RF materials, such as propagation maps or telecommunications traffic studies, and that the applicant submitted the project as a lattice tower while the County may have authority to require a monopole if necessary for consistency with County standards and the Comprehensive Plan.

My objection is not based on asking the County to second-guess Verizon's business judgment or compel proprietary coverage materials. My concern is that the application record remains materially incomplete and internally inconsistent on issues the County may still evaluate: tower type, height, visual compatibility, corrected federal documentation, site disturbance, generator impacts, stormwater, historic-resource review, and enforceable conditions.

The application packet itself states that the proposed structure is a **199-foot self-support lattice telecommunications tower**, with a 195-foot tower and 4-foot lightning rod. The engineering drawings also show a self-support tower. If the County believes a monopole is more consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, rural character, and visual-compatibility requirements, then the Planning Commission and Board should not approve the lattice tower as submitted. At minimum, the applicant should be required to submit corrected plans for the actual structure the County is considering.

There is also a serious problem with the federal review materials included in the packet. The project drawings identify the Old Pike site at approximately **37.0409119, -80.3490418**, with an overall structure height of **199 feet**. However, the FCC/TOWAIR and airspace exhibits appear to analyze different coordinates, a different project number, a different location, a **150-foot** structure, and a **monopole**. Those documents should not be relied upon as evidence of FAA/FCC compliance for this 199-foot Old Pike tower. Before any approval, the applicant should provide corrected federal documentation for the actual site, actual height, and actual tower type.

The application also remains inconsistent about the compound footprint. The narrative describes a **50-foot by 50-foot** fenced compound, while the engineering drawings show a **75-foot by 75-foot** fenced

gravel compound. That is not a minor drafting issue; it changes the amount of fenced and graveled area, land disturbance, screening, stormwater, and visual impact.

I also ask the Planning Commission and Board to focus on the visual and land-use impacts that remain squarely within the County's review authority. This is a proposed 199-foot industrial-scale structure in a rural A-1 agricultural area. The applicant asserts that the tower will blend into the surroundings and that existing trees will screen the facility, but the packet does not provide adequate objective visual evidence from nearby homes, Old Pike Road, Gold Rush Road, Mount Zion Road, Basham Road, or other affected rural viewpoints. A seven-foot fence may screen ground equipment, but it does not screen a 199-foot lattice tower.

The generator and fuel issues also need more detail. The application says the facility will not create significant noise or odor, but it also proposes a generator that may include a diesel fuel tank. The Planning Commission and Board should require the generator model, decibel rating, testing schedule, emergency-use limitations, fuel quantity, secondary containment, and spill-response measures before approval.

Finally, the application does not appear to include complete historic-resource, archaeological, SHPO/DHR, tribal, or Section 106 documentation for the actual proposed tower. Because the federal exhibits appear to analyze the wrong location and structure, any historic-resource review based on those materials would also be suspect. The County's SUP review includes consideration of scenic, archaeological, and historic features, and the Planning Commission should require corrected documentation before acting.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission and Board **deny or defer SUP-2026-5** unless and until the applicant provides a corrected and complete record. At minimum, the Planning Commission and Board should require:

1. Corrected FAA/FCC/TOWAIR/ASR documentation for the actual Old Pike coordinates, actual 199-foot height, and actual tower type;
2. Corrected plans showing whether the proposal is a lattice tower or monopole;
3. Resolution of the 50' x 50' versus 75' x 75' compound discrepancy;
4. A design consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and rural visual-compatibility standards, including consideration of a monopole if the County finds a lattice tower incompatible;
5. Objective visual-impact materials sufficient for SUP review;
6. Generator noise, fuel, containment, and testing details;
7. Stormwater, land-disturbance, drainage, and erosion-control details;
8. Historic-resource, DHR/SHPO, tribal, and archaeological review documentation for the actual proposed tower;
9. Enforceable conditions on lighting, future expansion, generator operation, abandonment, and transfer of ownership.

The Planning Commission and Board do not need proprietary RF maps to determine that the current application record is inconsistent and incomplete. This is a 199-foot tower, and Virginia law preserves the County's authority to apply nondiscriminatory zoning, SUP, compatibility, visual-impact, and Comprehensive Plan standards to a structure of this height.

Respectfully,

Randy and Joan Wolf