

**HALL COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
RECOMMENDATION REPORT**

**Applicant** .....A&R Engineering, Inc.

**Request** ..... **Variance** of Section 8.4 for sidewalk standards

**Proposed Use** ..... 11-lot single-family subdivision

**Size** ..... 10.66± acres

**Zoning** ..... **Current:** Residential 1 (R-1) & Vacation Cottage (V-C) | **Proposed:** Vacation Cottage (V-C)

**Location** ..... **3219 Lake Drive** | Tax parcel 10146 000019

**Commission District** ..... Three

**Planning Commission Date** ..... January 21, 2025

**Staff Recommendation** ..... **Denial**, as no hardship exists pursuant to the criteria of 9.10.1.

**Record Number(s)** ..... HVAR24-0049

**Planning Commission Recommendation** ..... **Approval, with conditions**

**Vote: 4-0 (Sosebee absent)**

**Planning Commission Conditions:**

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the site plan dated February 14, 2025, and as described in the project narrative dated November 26, 2024, modified as necessary for compliance with conditions herein and development standards enforced at the time of site plan approval.
2. The property shall be subdivided into a maximum of eleven (11) single-family lots in accordance with the requirements of the Vacation Cottage (V-C) zoning district as detailed in Section 4.1 and Table 4.1.1.1 of the Unified Development Code of Hall County.
3. Residences shall be a minimum of 1,800 heated square feet and include a two-car garage. Vinyl siding is prohibited.

4. Access to the development shall be approved by the Hall County Engineering Department and all traffic engineering standards shall be met. The developer shall be responsible for all associated costs.
5. All lots shall be accessed only from the proposed new road within the development. No lot shall be accessed from Lake Drive or Lakeland Road.
6. A stormwater management report prepared by a professional engineer shall be required.
7. The following statement regarding the potential impacts of agricultural operations in the area shall be made a part of any plat recorded on the property:

“Owners, occupants, and users of property shown on this plat are hereby informed of the impacts associated with normal farming practices which may take place on adjacent and nearby property including, but not limited to, noise, odors, dust, the operation of machinery of any kind, the storage and disposal of manure, and the application of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. Therefore, owners, occupants, and users of the property shown on this plat should be prepared to expect the effects of such practices.”
8. No variances or development exceptions are granted as part of this request that are not explicitly granted by board approval. The development shall be compliant with the Official Code of Hall County, as well as any other agencies or reviewing departments, including, but not limited to Environmental Health, the Fire Marshal, and Hall County Engineering.
9. All conditions of zoning shall be made part of any plats created for the property.
10. There will be a sidewalk on a minimum of one (1) side of the internal street per the site plan submitted February 14, 2025.
11. Usage of the private dock is restricted to only residents of the proposed development.

---

**Excerpts from the minutes of the March 3, 2025 meeting**

**Applicant’s Presentation:**

**Katie Greenway, Planning and Zoning Administrator**, presented a summary of the request.

**Carla Walker, 340 Jesse Jewel Parkway Suite 650, Gainesville**, presented the request. The applicant has submitted four concurrent requests as part of a proposed residential development: to rezone a 10.66± acre tract from Residential 1 (R-1) & Vacation Cottage (V-C) to Vacation Cottage (V-C); a special use request to subdivide the tract into 11 lots; a variance request to reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 15 feet from property line; and a variance request to be exempt from including sidewalks within the development. The variance to reduce the front yard setback was previously denied at the January 21, 2025 meeting.

**Public Forum:**

*As the public hearing was held at the January 21, 2025 Planning Commission meeting, the public hearing was not reopened at this meeting.*

**D**

**Motion: A motion to approve, with conditions was made by Stan Hunt and seconded by Johnny Varner. Vote: 4-0 (Sosebee absent)**

Conditions (applied to requests A, B, & D):

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the site plan dated February 14, 2025, and as described in the project narrative dated November 26, 2024, modified as necessary for compliance with conditions herein and development standards enforced at the time of site plan approval.
2. The property shall be subdivided into a maximum of eleven (11) single-family lots in accordance with the requirements of the Vacation Cottage (V-C) zoning district as detailed in Section 4.1 and Table 4.1.1.1 of the Unified Development Code of Hall County.
3. Residences shall be a minimum of 1,800 heated square feet and include a two-car garage. Vinyl siding is prohibited.
4. Access to the development shall be approved by the Hall County Engineering Department and all traffic engineering standards shall be met. The developer shall be responsible for all associated costs.
5. All lots shall be accessed only from the proposed new road within the development. No lot shall be accessed from Lake Drive or Lakeland Road.
6. A stormwater management report prepared by a professional engineer shall be required.
7. The following statement regarding the potential impacts of agricultural operations in the area shall be made a part of any plat recorded on the property:

“Owners, occupants, and users of property shown on this plat are hereby informed of the impacts associated with normal farming practices which may take place on adjacent and nearby property including, but not limited to, noise, odors, dust, the operation of machinery of any kind, the storage and disposal of manure, and the application of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. Therefore, owners, occupants, and users of the property shown on this plat should be prepared to expect the effects of such practices.”
8. No variances or development exceptions are granted as part of this request that are not explicitly granted by board approval. The development shall be compliant with the Official Code of Hall County, as well as any other agencies or reviewing departments, including, but not limited to Environmental Health, the Fire Marshal, and Hall County Engineering.
9. All conditions of zoning shall be made part of any plats created for the property.
10. There will be a sidewalk on a minimum of one (1) side of the internal street per the site plan submitted February 14, 2025.
11. Usage of the private dock is restricted to only residents of the proposed development.

---

**Summary of Revisions for the March 3, 2025 Planning Commission meeting**

Dear Planning Commission,

At the January 21, 2025 Planning Commission meeting the board voted to table the request for the application of A&R Engineering, Inc. for an 11-lot single-family subdivision. The request was tabled so the applicant could provide an updated site plan which responds to the following: a sidewalk provided on one side of the proposed road; 30 foot front yard setback for all lots; reduction to 10 lots; 50 foot right-of-way for the proposed road; location of the cluster mailbox kiosk.

On Friday, February 14, 2025 an updated site plan was provided to Planning Staff with the following changes:

- 1. Addition of a 5 foot concrete sidewalk along the northeast side of the proposed roadway.
- 2. Addition of the proposed water quality treatment area at the southwest side of the property, south of lots 5 and 6.
- 3. Increase from a 15 foot front yard setback to a variety of a 20 foot and 30 foot front yard setbacks as detailed below:

Lot Number	Proposed Setback
1	30 ft
2	30 ft
3	30 ft
4	20 ft*
5	20 ft*
6	20 ft*
7	20 ft*
8	20 ft*
9	20 ft*
10	20 ft*
11	30 ft
Does not comply with UDC*	

**Excerpts from the minutes of the January 21, 2025 meeting**

**Applicant’s Presentation:**

**Katie Greenway, Planning and Zoning Administrator**, presented a summary of the request.

**Carla Walker, 340 Jesse Jewel Parkway, Suite 650, Gainesville**, presented the request. The applicant has submitted four concurrent requests as part of a proposed residential development: to rezone a 10.66± acre tract from Residential 1 (R-1) & Vacation Cottage (V-C) to Vacation Cottage (V-C); a special use request to subdivide the tract into 11 lots; a variance request to reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 15 feet from property line; and a variance request to be exempt from including sidewalks within the development.

**Otis Aleman, 2160 Kingston Court, Suite O, Marietta**, presented the request.

**Jaime McCutchen, 3620 Pellum Road, Greenville, South Carolina**, presented the request.

**Public Forum:**

**Johnathan Fields, 3222 Lakeland Road, Gainesville**, spoke in favor. Mr. Fields supported the request of no sidewalks to allow the homes to be closer to the center of the property creating more privacy from surrounding properties, preserving more of the wooded areas, and because the topography would deter people from walking in the proposed neighborhood.

**Jennifer and Alex Payne, 3380 Barry Lane, Gainesville**, spoke in opposition. Concerns raised were the number of lots being proposed, the dock being used by the public and causing too much lake traffic, and the topography being too challenging for homes.

**Lester Elliott, 3246 Lakeland Road, Gainesville**, spoke in opposition. Concerns raised were the number of lots being proposed, the proposed development not being in harmony with the surrounding area, and the lack of information on how the homes will look.

**Allison Fields, 3222 Lakeland Road, Gainesville**, spoke in opposition. Concerns raised were the amount of lots being proposed, privacy for surrounding properties, and the lack of information on how the homes will look.

**Rebuttal**

Ms. Walker explained that due to staff conditions prohibiting houses from having entrances off Lake Drive or Lakeland Road, they were unable to meet the required setbacks, which is why they are applying for the variance. She stated that the proposed homes would range in size from 1,800 to 2,500 square feet and would be limited to one- or two-story designs. Ms. Walker further clarified that they are requesting approval for a maximum of 11 lots. However, as the project progresses, they may decide to reduce the number of lots, but they want to retain the option to develop up to 11 lots

**Planning Commission Comments:**

Mr. Braswell asked if a Level 3 soil analysis had been completed which Ms. Walker confirmed that it had. Mr. Braswell asked for more detailed descriptions of the houses. Ms. Walker explained the lots would be purchased individually and the buyer would build their own homes but would follow all conditions the Commission listed, therefore, there were no floorplans that she could provide. Mr. Hunt asked if their assumption was that stormwater management would be needed. Mr. Aleman, the engineer, explained they have done a preliminary study and are prepared to do a hydrology study so they can determine what size retention pond and retaining walls would be needed. Mr. Aleman further stated the pond would most likely be located on Lots five and six. Mr. Hunt asked where the maintenance access to the pond would be because it is not shown on the site plan and Mr. Aleman explained they were planning on completing this during the land disturbance permit application process. Mr. Hunt asked for clarification due to Ms. Walker mentioning a 50 foot right-of-way but the site plan shows a 54 foot right-of-way. Mr. Aleman stated that this is an error and it should be 50 feet. Mr. Aleman went on to state how the lots are configured will affect what setbacks can be met and where the foundation walls are

needed. Mr. Hunt asked for clarification of the 10 foot path shown on the site plan. Ms. Walker stated it is a walking path to the private dock associated with one of the lots. Mr. Hunt further questioned if it would be HOA maintained. Ms. Walker answered that only the private property owner would be responsible for maintaining the path. She added that the dock has 4 slips and if the private owner rented a slip, the renter would need access to the dock. Mr. Braswell asked Ms. Garmon if renting out slips within this dock would be a zoning concern. Ms. Garmon explained she has seen cases that the private lot rents dock space to other parties. Mr. Braswell and Ms. Walker concluded it would be a private matter. Mr. Hunt asked if all the homes would have side garages. Ms. Walker stated it would be a case by case basis. Mr. Hunt brought to attention that the sidewalk would be located in the right-of-way. Mr. McCutchen explained that stormwater analysis will be water quality only. He stated that the developer plans to have a 20 foot parking space for front entry homes or slightly smaller; however, based upon whether sidewalks are required, this will impact how far back the house has to be located.

The Planning Commission members requested that this item be tabled so that the site plan can be updated to show the following: a total of 10 lots, sidewalks on one side of the street, a 30 foot front yard setback, a mail kiosk, and a 50 foot right-of-way for the proposed road.

### C

**Motion: A motion to deny was made by Stan Hunt and seconded by Johnny Varner. Vote: 4-0 (Sosebee absent)**

### D

**Motion: A motion to table to March 3, 2025 was made by Stan Hunt and seconded by Johnny Varner. Vote: 4-0 (Sosebee absent)**

---

**(A) & (B) Staff recommends APPROVAL of the applicant's requests with the following conditions:**

1. The property shall be developed in accordance with the site plan dated October 18, 2024, and as described in the project narrative dated November 26, 2024, modified as necessary for compliance with conditions herein and development standards enforced at the time of site plan approval.
2. The property shall be subdivided into a maximum of eleven (11) single-family lots in accordance with the requirements of the Vacation Cottage (V-C) zoning district as detailed in Section 4.1 and Table 4.1.1.1 of the Unified Development Code of Hall County.
3. Residences shall be a minimum of 1,800 heated square feet and include a two-car garage. Vinyl siding is prohibited.
4. Access to the development shall be approved by the Hall County Engineering Department and all traffic engineering standards shall be met. The developer shall be responsible for all associated costs.

5. All lots shall be accessed only from the proposed new road within the development. No lot shall be accessed from Lake Drive or Lakeland Road.
6. A stormwater management report prepared by a professional engineer shall be required.
7. The following statement regarding the potential impacts of agricultural operations in the area shall be made a part of any plat recorded on the property:  
"Owners, occupants, and users of property shown on this plat are hereby informed of the impacts associated with normal farming practices which may take place on adjacent and nearby property including, but not limited to, noise, odors, dust, the operation of machinery of any kind, the storage and disposal of manure, and the application of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides. Therefore, owners, occupants, and users of the property shown on this plat should be prepared to expect the effects of such practices."
8. No variances or development exceptions are granted as part of this request that are not explicitly granted by board approval. The development shall be compliant with the Official Code of Hall County, as well as any other agencies or reviewing departments, including, but not limited to Environmental Health, the Fire Marshal, and Hall County Engineering.
9. All conditions of zoning shall be made part of any plats created for the property.

---

**The following are variances requested by the applicant, and shall warrant determination by the Board should it choose to approve the submitted narrative and site plan:**

- C. Table 4.1.1.1 – Dimensional Standards for Single Family Residences** - Minimum front yard setback is 30 feet.
  - The applicant is requesting a front yard setback of 15 feet from the property line.
- D. Section 8.4 – Sidewalks** - Sidewalks are to be installed along all new public rights-of-way or private streets as indicated in Sec. 8.4.3.
  - a. The applicant has specified that the development will not include sidewalks.

---

The applicant has submitted four concurrent requests as part of a proposed residential development: to rezone a 10.66± acre tract from Residential 1 (R-1) & Vacation Cottage (V-C) to Vacation Cottage (V-C); a special use request to subdivide the tract into 11-lots; a variance request to reduce the front yard setback from 30 feet to 15 feet from property line; and a variance request to be exempt from including sidewalks within the development.

A preliminary plat to subdivide the property into 9 lots was submitted in 2005 (HDV2005-00081) and a land disturbance permit was issued by Hall County on May 16, 2005; however, no development occurred and the permit expired.

Surrounding properties are developed with single-family residences and are zoned Agricultural Residential 1 (AR-1) to the northwest and Residential 1 (R-1) & Vacation Cottage (V-C) to the northeast and southwest. The eastern and southern boundaries of the subject property abut Lake Lanier and land managed by the United States Army Corps of Engineer.

Per the submitted narrative, the applicant is requesting to rezone and subdivide the subject parcel into 11 lots to construct single-family residences. All proposed lots meet the minimum lot area and frontage requirements for Vacation Cottage (V-C). Per the narrative, the development will not include any common areas or amenity features. As depicted in the site plan and outlined in the narrative, the path to the dock from Lot 7 will be privately owned and is not intended to be used as shared or public access. No landscape buffers or entrance plantings are proposed for the development.

According to the submitted site plan, the proposed 11 lots will front a new internal road that intersects with Lakeland Road. No access will be permitted directly from Lake Drive. The new public road is proposed to have curb and gutter and does not include sidewalks. The applicant has requested a variance to the sidewalk standards; however, no statement of hardship has been provided by the applicant. Per the Hal County Unified Development Code Section 9.4.9.G., “Sidewalks may be constructed on one or both sides of the street.” The Public Works Department has recommended that sidewalks should be provided on at least one side of the road to allow access to the community mail kiosk.

The applicant is also requesting a variance to allow a reduced front yard setback from 30 feet to 15 feet from the property line.

While architectural standards are not required within the Vacation Cottage (V-C) zoning district, a sample elevation has been provided and the narrative details the following elements for future homes:

- Home sizes ranging from 1,800-2,500 square feet of heated floor area
- 3-4 bedrooms
- Two-car garage (per sample elevation)
- Architectural elements to include fiber cement siding with brick or stone water table (vinyl siding prohibited)

Water service will be provided by the City of Gainesville Department of Water Resources as confirmed in an email dated November 20, 2024. Sanitary sewer services will be provided by individual on-site septic systems.

The proposed site plan and narrative submitted reflects the desired layout of the development as follows:

Vacation Cottage (V-C) Standards	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	35,000 square feet (sf)	All lots meet this standard
Lot Frontage (Local Road)	50 feet	All lots meet this standard



<b>Lot Width at Building Line</b>	75 feet	All lots meet this standard
<b>Front Yard Setback</b>	30 feet from property line	15 feet from property line
<b>Side Yard Setback</b>	10 feet	Not specified
<b>Rear Yard Setback</b>	20 feet	20 feet

### **Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation**

**Based on the future land use plan, staff finds the requested rezoning and subdivision *is consistent* with the Hall County Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of Lakeside Residential which supports low density residential development in this North Hall character area.** Lakeside Residential is intended to preserve established lakefront neighborhoods and create opportunities for permanent and vacation residences along and adjacent to the lake. The Lakeside Residential designation envisions a density of 0.75 to 8 dwelling units per acre. This development has an overall proposed density of 1.04 units per acre.

### **(A) & (B) Zoning Analysis – Rezone and Special Use**

When considering a zoning amendment to the zoning maps, the Planning Commission must study the need and justification for the change based on a determination of the facts applicable to the particular case, and the following general lines of inquiry must be considered:

1. Whether the zoning proposal will permit a use that is suitable in view of the use, development and zoning of adjacent and nearby property; **The proposed Vacation Cottage zoning district and special use for an 11-lot residential subdivision is consistent with the use, development, and zoning of adjacent and nearby properties.**
2. Whether the zoning proposal will adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent or nearby property; **The proposed rezoning and special use of an 11-lot residential subdivision does not adversely affect the existing use or usability of adjacent residential properties.**
3. Whether the property to be affected by the zoning proposal has a reasonable economic use as currently zoned; **The property has reasonable economic use as currently zoned; however, the applicant cannot subdivide the property without approval by the Board of Commissioners.**
4. Whether the zoning proposal will result in a use which will or could cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, schools, police protection, fire protection, public health facilities or emergency medical service; **The proposed rezoning and special use is not expected to cause an excessive or burdensome use of existing streets, transportation facilities, utilities, schools, police protection, fire protection public facilities, or emergency medical service. The property will be served by an onsite septic system and a water availability letter was provided by the City of Gainesville.**
5. Whether the zoning proposal is in conformity with the policy and intent of the future land use plan for the physical development of the area; **The proposed use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Lakeside Residential land use designation. The Lakeside Residential designation envisions a density of 0.75 to 8 dwelling units per acre. This development has an overall proposed density of 1.04 units per acre.**

6. The extent to which property values are diminished by the existing zoning restrictions; **Staff is unable to determine the extent to which property values are diminished by the existing zoning restrictions.**
7. The extent to which the destruction of the subject property's value under the existing zoning promotes the health, safety, morals or general welfare of the public; **Staff is unable to comment on the impact of property values without a full market analysis. Multiple factors impact property value including construction types, proposed uses, and maintenance. Often it is difficult to determine the effect of a development on adjacent properties until the development is completed.**
8. The relative gain to the public as compared to the hardship imposed upon the individual property owner; **Staff has not identified a hardship imposed on the property owner as the property is currently zoned.**
9. The length of time the property has been vacant as zoned considered in the context of land development in the area in the vicinity of the property; **The property is undeveloped.**
10. Whether there are other existing or changing conditions affecting the use or development of the property which give supporting grounds for either approval or disapproval of the zoning proposal; **Staff is not aware of any changing conditions affecting the use or development of the property.**
11. Whether the change would create an isolated district unrelated to the surrounding districts; **As the property is already partially zoned Vacation Cottage (V-C), this would not create an isolated district unrelated to the surrounding districts.**
12. Whether the present zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions in the area; **There is no evidence that the present zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn.**
13. Whether the change requested is out of scale with the needs of the county as a whole or the immediate neighborhood; **No, the request is not out of scale with the needs of the county as a whole.**
14. Whether it is impossible to find adequate sites for the proposed use in districts permitting such use and already appropriately zoned; **The existing zoning of the subject site supports the proposed use; however, the proposal to subdivide the property requires approval by the Board of Commissioners.**
15. Whether the need for rezoning could be handled instead by a variance request to the Planning Commission; **The request for rezoning and a special use to subdivide the property into an 11-lot residential subdivision could not be handled alternatively as a variance.**

16. Whether there would be an ecological or pollution impact resulting from major modifications to the land if the request is granted; **Any land disturbance activities on the property shall be required to go through the land development permitting process, and as a result are subject to local, state, and federal regulations. As a result, there are no anticipated ecological or pollution impacts resulting from any modification to the land if the request is granted.**
17. Whether there is reasonable evidence based upon existing and anticipated land use that would indicate a mistake was made in the original zoning of the property; **There is no indication that a mistake was made in the original zoning.**

**(C) Zoning Analysis – Setback Variance Request**

The Planning Commission may grant variances in individual cases of unnecessary hardship upon a finding of the board that:

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular lot in question because of its size, shape, or topography (the hardship must relate to the physical character of the lot and not to a personal or economic hardship); **No, there are no extraordinary conditions pertaining to any of the proposed 11 lots that limit further improvements.**
2. The application of the requirements of this UDC to this particular piece of property would create an unusual hardship; **No evidence has been provided that an unusual hardship exists to prevent the development from complying with standard setbacks.**
3. Such conditions are peculiar to the property involved and are not common to other properties in the neighborhood; **The subject parcel has similar topography to surrounding properties.**
4. Such conditions are not the result of any actions of the property owner; **As the subject parcel has not been subdivided or developed, proposed lots can be configured to allow structures to comply with setbacks of the zoning district.**
5. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of this UDC; provided, however, that no variance may be granted for a use of land or building or structure that is prohibited by this UDC or for a Conditional Use Permit which has been denied by the Planning Commission. **Relief, if granted, may impair the purposes and intent of the Unified Development Code of Hall County as 15-foot front setbacks do not accommodate the distance required to comply with off-street parking requirements beyond utilizing a garage.**

**(D) Zoning Analysis – Modification of Sidewalk Standards**

Subject to Section 9.10, Modification of Standards, where the Board of Commissioners finds that extraordinary hardships or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with the regulations of Article 9 – Subdivisions or the purposes of the regulations may be served to a greater extent by an

alternative proposal, it may recommend modifications to these subdivision regulations so that substantial justice may be done and the public interest secured. The modification(s) will not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of these regulations. The Board of Commissioners may not recommend modifications unless based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case that:

- A. The granting of the modification will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare or injurious to other property; **The Public Works Department recommends a sidewalk on one side of the street to allow safe access to a community mail kiosk.**
- B. The conditions upon which the request for a modification is based are unique to the property for which the modification is sought and are not applicable generally to other property; **There are no conditions that are unique to the subject property and conditions are generally applicable to other properties within the county.**
- C. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations were carried out; **There is no evidence that the physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions present a hardship of providing sidewalks.**
- D. The modifications will not in any manner vary the provisions of the zoning regulations. **Allowing an exception to sidewalk requirements will vary the provisions of the zoning regulations.**

#### **11.2.6.E - Submission requirements**

- 1. Any person or persons requesting a change in the official zoning map or use subject to approval of the County Commission must file an application with a plat or map of the property attached thereto, together with payment of such fees set forth in this Sec 11.2. to cover administrative and advertising costs, in the Planning and Zoning Department office. Such person or persons or their authorized agent must appear in person at the public hearing held to consider the district change. **The proposal meets the requirement. The applicant has paid the appropriate fees and understands that someone must be present at both the Hall County Planning Commission meeting and the voting meeting of the Hall County Board of Commissioners.**
- 2. All applications for a change of zoning classification or use subject to approval of the County Commission must include:
  - a. A narrative statement identifying the existing and proposed use of the property and addressing each of the criteria set forth in this Sec. 11.2. **The proposal provides a narrative outlining the intent of the development; however, the applicant has not prepared a response to each of the criteria listed in 11.2.6.E.2.**
  - b. A site plan drawn to scale designating the area covered by the application and identifying existing and proposed buildings and uses, adjacent existing land uses, zoning on contiguous parcels, including those across an abutting public right-of-way, and any other significant site

improvements proposed to accommodate the proposed use or buffer adjacent uses, etc., or a plat of the subject property where no specific land use is proposed. In cases where only a plat or map is provided and no land use is proposed, the Planning Commission and County Commission may evaluate the application based on the most intense possible land use permitted in the proposed district. **The proposal meets the requirement.**

- c. For any application for a slow rate land treatment system as defined in 7.6.9.D.1, additional requirements apply. **This standard is not applicable to the applicant's request**
- d. For any application proposing the development of 100 or more residential dwelling units, a traffic impact study must be submitted prior to consideration of the application by the County Commission. At the applicant's expense, the traffic impact study must be prepared by a professional engineer in accordance with requirements established by the Hall County Engineering Department. The Engineering Department must review the traffic impact study and forward any comments to the County Commission **This standard is not applicable to the applicant's request.**

#### **Development Support and Constraints**

##### **Hall County Environmental Health**

In an email dated December 17, 2024, Emily McGahee stated, "All proposed lots must meet Hall County Board of Health Lot Size Resolution requirements. Please note that Zoning approval does not imply approval from other county departments. Further determination will be made during the plat review process."

##### **Hall County Fire Marshal**

In an email dated December 20, 2024, John Hornick, NPQ Fire Service Plans Examiner 1, provided the following comments:

1. If approved site plan will have to meet fire code for fire apparatus accessibility.
2. If approved fire hydrant(s) will be required.
3. The Hall County Fire Marshal's Office may have additional comments during the plan review process.

##### **Hall County Public Works and Utilities**

In a memo dated December 19, 2024, Bill Nash, Director of Public Works and Utilities, provided the following comments:

##### **Engineering:**

Recommend sidewalk on at least one side of the road to allow access to the lake/dock path. Please add mail kiosk per Hall County standards.

This site may require a stormwater management report should the site plan indicate the proposed development meets stormwater thresholds for impervious surfaces and/or disturbed acreage.

**Traffic:**

No comment.

**Utilities**

No comment.

**Georgia Department of Transportation**

In an email dated December 12, 2024, Henry Stevens, E.I.T., GDOT Civil Engineer 2, stated that GDOT coordination is not required.