

Jennifer Rivera (Administration)

From: Beth Garmon (CDI: Planning)
Sent: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 11:09 AM
To: Jennifer Rivera (Administration)
Subject: FW: Opposition Email Regarding Proposed Development Off Of J M Turk Road
Attachments: Guth-Stanley Road Development BOC.docx

Jennifer,

Would you please add the email below and attached comments to the file for the JM Turk rezoning request?

Thank you,
Beth

Beth Garmon

Director of Planning and Zoning
Hall County Community Development and Infrastructure
(office) 770-531-6809
(direct) 770-297-2626
bgarmon@hallcounty.org

All **ZONING, PLAT**, and **BUILDING PERMIT** submittals may be submitted online through [Accela](#). Plat inquiries may be submitted to plats@hallcounty.org. Zoning and general inquiries may be submitted to planning@hallcounty.org.



From: Tommy Channell <tommy.channell@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 8, 2024 10:26 AM
To: Randi Doveton (CDI: Planning) <rdoveton@hallcounty.org>; Katie L. Greenway (CDI: Planning) <klgreenway@hallcounty.org>; Beth Garmon (CDI: Planning) <bgarmon@hallcounty.org>; Ellis Still (CDI: Planning) <estill@hallcounty.org>
Cc: Kathy Cooper (County Commissioner) <kcooper@hallcounty.org>; Richard Higgins (County Commissioner) <rhiggins@hallcounty.org>; Billy Powell (County Commission) <bpowell@hallcounty.org>; Gregg Poole (County Commissioner) <gpoole@hallcounty.org>; Jeff Stowe (County Commission) <jstowe@hallcounty.org>
Subject: Opposition Email Regarding Proposed Development Off Of J M Turk Road

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tommy.channell@outlook.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Hall County Employees and Esteemed Commissioners.

Please accept my email of Opposition to the Proposed subdivision off of J M Turk Road. I want to propose to you a few points of opposition to this development:

- The development will produce rainwater waste from the neighborhood yards and roads that will pour directly into the Mulberry River. With recent commercial development such as the community center and Ingles shopping center, the river easily floods when there is decent rainfall. With the completion of Quailwood and Grandview we saw this beginning. This has led to costly repairs of the roads and bridges in the Elah Valley development that the homeowners within Elah Valley are responsible for. More rainwater will easily exacerbate this problem. The current master site plan shows approximately 36 lots with space inside of the 75ft impervious setback off the Mulberry River and some of those have areas inside the 50' undisturbed buffer off the Mulberry. This is a major environmental concern.
-
- The developer is claiming a housing density of 2.24 units/acre; however, when the required setback/buffers and required stormwater ponds are taken out of the calculation, it gives a real density of approximately 3.6 units per usable acre. The PRD code states a density no greater than 2. Changes to the development plan should be made to bring the housing development more in line with the code.
-
- I have serious concerns about the septic system. A pumping station at the intersection of J M Turk and Cash Road has been discussed. The only open area is in a flood plain. A pumping station in a flood plain sounds like an environmental disaster waiting to happen. There is a pumping station in the development which is close to Mulberry River. Which I feel is risky. How is the sewage going to get from the development to the Cash Road pumping station? Is the plan to run sewage lines through private property? Will the developer compensate the property owners or will the government use eminent domain and take possession of the property that is needed? Every home between the development and Cash Road is on a well. Will the developer guarantee everyone homeowner their well will be kept protected from sewage contamination? This has never been explained to the local private land owners. I have brought this question up many times at the meeting at it never gets answered.
-
- I am not anti-development but this development does not fit the area. Many new homes have been built off of J M Turk which are large estate beautiful homes. A development such as Quailwood or Grandview should be proposed. Other developments of similar plans, starter homes and townhomes, are already being constructed on Union Church Road (3), Spouts Springs (4), and Highway 211 (1). We don't need another starter home development in the Cherokee Bluff / Flowery Branch school district. A starter home subdivision will not add to the ambience on J M Turk Road and should not share the same location as multi-million dollar estate homes. I am concerned about property values along J M Turk Road being negatively impacted.

I have attached a Word document detailing my other concerns on this proposal.

I beg you to deny this application for the project or at best table the application so that the developer can redo their plans and have the local property owner's questions answered. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Tommy Channell

Good afternoon and thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. I formally stand opposed to the J M Turk Road development for the following reasons:

- 1) The development will produce rainwater waste from the neighborhood yards and roads that will pour directly into the Mulberry River. With recent commercial development such as the community center and Ingles shopping center, the river easily floods when there is decent rainfall. With the completion of Quailwood and Grandview we saw this beginning. This has led to costly repairs of the roads and bridges in the Elah Valley development. More rainwater will easily exacerbate this problem.
- 2) The Planned Residential Development code calls out for a garage door that's no more than 40% of the overall front facade of a detached home and 50% of a townhome. This development is requesting 55% for both. Furthermore, the developer is claiming a housing density of 2.24 units/acre; however, when the required setback/buffers and required stormwater ponds are taken out of the calculation, it gives a real density of approximately 3.6 units per usable acre. The comprehensive plan states a density of 2.
- 3) The current master site plan shows approximately 36 lots with space inside of the 75ft impervious setback off the Mulberry Creek and some of those have areas inside the 50' undisturbed buffer off the Mulberry. This ties back to my first point.
- 4) How is the septic system going to be handled? A pumping station at the intersection of J M Turk and Cash Road has been discussed. The only open area is in a flood plain. A pumping station in a flood plain sounds like an environmental disaster waiting to happen. How is the sewage going to get from the development to the pumping station? Going to run sewage lines through private property? Will the developer compensate the property owners or will the government use eminent domain and take possession of the property that is needed? Every home between the development and Cash Road is on a well. Will the developer guarantee everyone homeowner their well will be kept protected

from sewage contamination? This has never been explained to the local private land owners.

- 5) This development does not fit the area. Many new homes have been built off of J M Turk which are large estate beautiful homes. A development such as Quailwood or Grandview should be proposed. Other developments of similar plans, starter homes and townhomes, are already being constructed on Union Church Road (3), Spouts Springs (4), and Highway 211 (1). We don't need another starter home development in the Cherokee Bluff / Flowery Branch school district. A starter home subdivision should not share the same location as multi-million estate homes.
- 6) The developers have requested 40' tall townhomes? The last townhome request (oddly enough, also with Steve Gilliam) was for 35' tall structures. Now we add another 5 feet in height to those? Really?? That is taller than many trees in the area.
- 7) Another variance is the developer wants a 22ft front yard set back. The PRD clearly calls for a minimum front yard setback of 25ft.
- 8) With the numerous new developments in the area (8 mentioned above and more in consideration), can Cherokee Bluffs / Flowery Branch truly handle the additional students? The South Hall school system is not capable of handling the influx of people coming in.

I want to encourage the planning commission to deny this development request. Thank you for your time and consideration.