
August 4, 20225 HCPC meeting - Old Winder Hwy Rezoning Application

From Kaitlyn Elliott (Planning) <kelliott@hallcounty.org>

Date Thu 7/31/2025 9:25 AM

To Kaitlyn Elliott (Planning) <kelliott@hallcounty.org>

From: Katie L. Greenway (CDI: Planning) <klgreenway@hallcounty.org>

Sent: Thursday, July 31, 2025 9:18 AM

To: Chris Braswell (Personal) <[REDACTED]>; Chris Braswell (Planning) <cbraswell@hallcounty.org>; Frank (Personal) <[REDACTED]>; Frank Sosebee (Planning) <frsosebee@hallcounty.org>; Shannon Davidson <[REDACTED]>; Shannon Davidson (Planning) <sdavidson@hallcounty.org>; Stan <[REDACTED]> Stan Hunt <shunt@hallcounty.org>; Andre Castleberry <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Beth Garmon (CDI: Planning) <bgarmon@hallcounty.org>; Kaitlyn Elliott (Planning) <kelliott@hallcounty.org>

Subject: August 4, 20225 HCPC meeting - Old Winder Hwy Rezoning Application

Good morning, Planning Commissioners.

Chairman Braswell sent over an email back in June seeking some guidance from the county regarding the street design for 5401 Old Winder Highway. This morning, we received a follow up response from Brent Cook, County Engineer, to his original comments, and I wanted to share his additional thoughts with the board. Please see below: (Brent's original comments from June 2025 are in green and the follow up comment from this morning 7.31.2025 are in red.)

.....

In reviewing the Agenda for our 6/16/2025 PC meeting, I have a few concerns/questions regarding Items #8 and #9. My questions/concerns are specifically related to traffic issues that are internal to the proposed residential (Item #8) and industrial (Item #9) applications. While I realize that there are GDOT plans for future improvements to Hwy 211, the Traffic Impact Study, the site plan nor the applicant's narrative do not address internal traffic issues. Obviously, detailed engineering is not required at this point of the application process, but there doesn't appear to be any thoughts or ideas provided in the application that address this issue.

Can you inquire of Hall Co Traffic Engineering (HCTE) what they believe the most practical and safest type of street design that might be appropriate for this type of development? Including:

- Their design thoughts should include not only the number of vehicles per day but also the mixture of vehicles, e.g., several hundred passenger vehicles mixing with approximately 936 heavy trucks per day, within the development.

Yes, I would like to see:

- a vehicle distribution on the road network. This means an diagram at each intersection of the movement volumes.
- the vehicle classification at each intersection. This is the mixture of the vehicles making each movement.

- Because of this unusual vehicle mixture, I would like to see an access management plan that better incorporates driveway locations that accommodate expected peak hour turning movement queueing and ensure safe operations for all users.

None of these were included. They can be provided outside of the TIS with a simple Traffic Engineering (TE) report for each internal intersection with the main “parkway”. The access management plan can be shown in the TE with how the queueing is accommodated.

- What type of street is needed? i.e., a four-lane divided parkway with a median?
- If a 4-lane parkway is proposed, it needs to plan to carry this section to the last driveway.
 - The 4-lane roadway should include left and right turn lanes at each intersection as appropriate, that meet minimum storage and taper lengths.
- If they desire to stop it short of the last driveway, they need to provide a traffic engineering report justifying the transition to a 2-lane roadway.

In the last meeting, I understood the “parkway” was proposed to be a 3-lane section (2 thru lanes and a two-way-left-turn-lane). However, the updated site plan only shows a 2 lane roadway. Again, use the TE’s to verify this will result in an adequate level of service and sufficient queueing distance. At a minimum, left turn lane will be required on the roadway that would easily be accommodated if constructed as a 3-lane section.

- Should alternatives to the normal street construction standards need to be increased to handle heavier (by weight) truck traffic. Should bonding requirements be changed to reflect a change in the construction design? After all, if the applicants are approved (in some form), the internal roadway will become the responsibility of the County to maintain at some point in the future.
- I would expect a pavement typical section that is consistent with a GDOT commercial driveway permit, shown below:

REQUIRED PAVEMENT SPECIFICATIONS
 1 1/4"----- 9.5 mm SUPERPAVE
 2"-----19 mm SUPERPAVE
 8"-----25mm SUPERPAVE
 12"-----GRADED AGGREGATE BASE COURSE

This is for informational purposes to notify the applicant this is the pavement spec we will require on the LDP.

Beyond these questions, I am concerned about the proximity of the first driveway as you enter from SR 211. The site plan I’ve seen shows 2 lanes entering at SR 211 and then dropping a right turn lane at the first driveway which is very close to SR 211. Additionally, this location does not appear to show left turn lane which is extremely unsafe. Additionally, this short spacing does not allow for safe weaving movements. This access point needs to be relocated farther away from SR 211 or they need to consider treatments that offer a safer operational environment.

I understand the submitted traffic study recommends a single lane roundabout at the SR 211 intersection. I would like to see how the expansion to a multi-lane roundabout would impact the first internal access points.

I do believe a roundabout (both single lane and multi-lane) would only require a single departure from and single approach lane to SR 211. A roundabout can process a lot of traffic safely and wouldn’t necessitate multiple driveway lanes. But, as previously stated, the first internal driveway as shown is concerning no matter the SR 211 intersection treatment.

These concerns seem to have been resolved with the transition to a 3-lane section. Please make sure that the site plan submitted for permitting reflects the 3-lane section and the TE studies have adequately addressed the peak hour queueing.

.....