



NARRATIVE REPORT
REQUEST FOR REZONING
HALL COUNTY, GEORGIA

RE: 0.90 acres located at 2630 Old Cornelia Hwy, Gainesville, GA 30507
Parcel ID 15021A000031A

Brayden, Carter, Brock, LLC (the “applicant”) respectfully submits this Narrative Report to the Hall County Board of Commissioners in support of an application for rezoning approval. This application and proposed use consists of 1 lot at 2630 Old Cornelia Hwy, Parcel 15021A000031A. The property is currently zoned S-S and the proposed zoning is I-1. The proposed use is a sign construction and printing shop.

The property currently has a 5,997 sf building which has been used as a contractor’s office since 1999. The property owner wishes to move this business to the adjacent property at 2614 Old Cornelia Hwy and allow this sign shop use the building. The attached plan to this application is a survey of the existing building and conditions. Please note that the adjacent home owners use this property for access.

There is an existing sign; however, any new signs will adhere to Hall County standards. The business operation hours will be from 8am to 5pm, Monday through Friday. Many properties along Old Cornelia Hwy are currently being used for industrial and/or business although not shown for this area in the current comprehensive plan. Please let us know if you have any questions or if any additional information is required.

Sincerely,

James Irvin, PE
Engineer for Applicant
Foothills Land Design, LLC

Statement of Hardship for 2630 Old Cornelia Hwy

1. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property 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).

The existing commercial building, which predates current zoning requirements, is situated in such a way that residential property owners must use a portion of the subject Light Industrial property for access to their homes. The physical configuration of the parcel and adjacent lots does not allow for alternative points of entry. Enforcing a 30' vegetative buffer would obstruct this shared access and make it physically impossible for adjacent residents to reach their properties, which demonstrates a hardship directly related to the physical layout and historic development of the site.

2. The application of the requirements of this resolution to this particular property would create an unusual hardship.

Applying the buffer requirement to this property would create an unusual hardship because it would effectively eliminate access for neighboring residential property owners. This requirement, if strictly enforced, would necessitate the installation of a physical barrier—vegetation—through an area that is actively and essentially used for ingress and egress. Such a condition is not only impractical but would result in functional and safety issues for both the applicant and nearby residents who have long depended on the existing access arrangement.

3. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved and not common to other properties in the neighborhood. That is, the application of the regulation would deprive the applicant of the rights commonly enjoyed by others in the neighborhood.

Unlike typical industrial-residential adjacencies where separation is feasible, the continued existence and practical function of this property relies on accommodating access for adjacent residences. Requiring a vegetative buffer in this case would remove that shared function and strip both the applicant and neighboring residents of the practical rights to use and access their land as they have historically done. Other properties in the area do not share this access-dependent relationship and would not face the same restrictive outcome.

4. Such conditions are not the result of any actions of the property owner.

The hardship is not the result of actions by the current property owner. The building has existed and been in use for commercial purposes for many years as well as the access arrangement for neighboring residents. The need for a variance arises solely due to the existing configuration of the land and the surrounding development pattern, not due to any recent modifications or decisions made by the owner.

5. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes and intent of this resolution provided; however, that no variance may be granted for a use of land or building or structure that is prohibited by this resolution.

Granting this variance would not be detrimental to the public good nor would it impair the intent of the zoning resolution. The planned use of the building will be a sign printing shop and represents a continuation of longstanding commercial activity on the property. Furthermore, denying the variance and enforcing the buffer would create logistical issues for neighboring residents. Allowing the variance preserves both access and safety, while also maintaining compatibility with the area's historical development pattern. It does not grant the applicant any special privileges not otherwise available to similar properties under similar conditions.