
Pine Circle Letter

From Sherry Dubose <[REDACTED]>
Date Mon 9/14/2026 10:53 PM
To Kaitlyn Elliott (Planning) <kelliott@hallcounty.org>

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.

Hi Kaitlyn,

Could you please help submit this letter for the Monday Meeting. I was unable to submit.. it could be too long.

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

My name is Sherry DuBose. I am a neighboring property owner, landlord, and owner of property directly below the proposed cell-tower site.

I am not opposed to reliable cellular service. I am opposed to placing this 175-foot commercial tower at this particular location. After reviewing the revised site plan, the engineer's letter, and the actual land, I respectfully ask the Board to deny this application.

The revised location does not correct the major problems with this site. It moves the tower approximately 75 feet west, but it does not resolve the steep terrain, erosion and drainage risks, access through an occupied residential community, or the required setbacks from surrounding residential property.

My principal reasons for requesting denial are:

1. The revised location shifts the setback problem

The applicant emphasizes that the tower is now approximately 175 feet from the eastern property line. However, the revised drawing appears to place it only approximately 101 feet from the western property line.

A 175-foot tower-height radius would therefore extend approximately 74 feet beyond the western property line. Moving the tower west may improve the distance

from one property, but it moves the tower closer to another property. It shifts the problem rather than solving it.

The original application stated that the tower was only 58 feet from a southern property line, compared with an 87.5-foot tower setback and a reported 350-foot separation requirement from R-1 property. The revised submission does not clearly explain which variances are still required.

Before any vote, the applicant should be required to provide the exact distance from the tower, foundation, and compound to every surrounding parcel and zoning boundary—not simply the boundary most favorable to the applicant.

Please require a setback table identifying:

- Every adjoining parcel and property owner;
- The zoning of each parcel;
- The distance from the tower to every property line;
- The distance from the compound and fencing to every property line;
- Which properties fall within the tower-height radius; and
- Every variance that remains necessary after the relocation.

2. I own the residential property directly below the tower site

Through SD Properties of Gainesville, GA LLC, I own Parcel 00116002023, identified as Property No. 10 on the revised plan. This R-1 property lies east of and directly downhill from the proposed tower site.

I also own residential lots affected by the access route through Kirwin DuBose Properties LLC.

The danger of erosion, concentrated runoff, slope movement, and construction damage is therefore a direct threat to property I own. Clearing trees, cutting into the hillside, adding compacted fill, and constructing a gravel compound and access road will change how water moves across this land.

The applicant has not provided a sealed drainage analysis demonstrating that additional water, mud, or sediment will not flow onto my property. There is also no complete plan showing retaining walls, fill slopes, drainage pipes, culverts, or discharge locations.

If this development damages or destroys my property through erosion, slope movement, or altered drainage, the damage may be difficult or impossible to reverse. The County should not approve the tower first and require neighboring owners to deal with the consequences later.

3. The video shows that this is not a level construction site

I have provided a video of the actual land. It shows steep, uneven, and heavily wooded terrain with substantial changes in grade.

A 60-by-60-foot tower compound cannot simply be placed on this hillside. The applicant will have to excavate into the upper slope, place fill on the downhill side, construct retaining walls, or use some combination of those methods.

The revised site plan does not show:

- Existing and proposed grades;
- Finished tower-pad elevation;
- Depth and extent of excavation;
- Cut-and-fill quantities;
- Retaining-wall locations and heights;
- Downhill fill slopes;
- Stormwater collection and discharge;
- Soil-boring locations; or
- A global slope-stability analysis.

This drawing shows where the applicant wants to put the tower. It does not demonstrate how the tower can be safely built there.

4. The engineer's letter does not establish that this slope is safe

The engineer's letter discusses the steel monopole and its resistance to wind. It does not provide a site-specific geotechnical report, foundation design, drainage plan, or slope-stability analysis.

The statement that monopole failure is rare and that the tower may theoretically have a "zero-foot fall radius" does not answer whether the soil, foundation, fill, or retaining walls could fail.

The Board should require answers to these questions:

- How deep and wide will the concrete foundation be?
- Has the soil and rock been tested at the relocated tower center?
- Could excavation, retaining-wall anchors, soil nails, utilities, or drainage structures extend under or onto my property?

- Has the entire downhill slope, including my property, been included in the stability analysis?
- Has the analysis considered saturated soil, severe rainfall, erosion, and construction vibration?
- Where would the pole and attached equipment go if a failure occurred?
- How many future carriers and antenna levels will the tower support?
- Could the tower ever be increased above 175 feet?
- Are the structural and foundation calculations based on the maximum possible height and maximum carrier loading?

A monopole can be safely constructed on some sites, but a tall monopole placed on a steep slope requires much more than a general letter about the steel pole. The safety of the pole cannot be separated from the safety of its foundation and the hillside supporting it.

5. The access road runs through an occupied residential community

Construction will require concrete trucks, drilling equipment, cranes, tractor-trailers, and vehicles carrying long, heavy monopole sections. The proposed access passes homes where families live and children and pedestrians may be present.

The documents have referred to three different access widths: a recorded 20-foot ingress-and-egress easement, a proposed 25-foot road, and an earlier 30-foot ingress, egress, and utility route.

The applicant has not demonstrated:

- The exact legal access and utility rights;
- Whether the easement permits commercial tower traffic and utilities;
- Where large trucks and cranes will turn, pass, stage, and unload;
- Whether the road can carry the weight of the equipment;
- How residents and emergency access will be protected; or
- Whether the road will have to be widened onto property that the applicant does not own.

I have not consented to using my property for road widening, utility installation, equipment staging, drainage improvements, or permanent commercial tower access beyond any rights legally established by the recorded documents.

Conclusion

This remains a 175-foot commercial facility proposed on steep land, surrounded by residential property, and reached through an occupied residential community.

The applicant's revision moves the tower, but it does not provide the engineering, setback, access, and property-protection information necessary to show that this location works. The engineer's letter addresses the steel pole but does not establish that the foundation and hillside are stable or that my downhill property will be protected.

Please follow the concerns already identified in this application and deny the rezoning, special use, and related variances.

A tower can be built somewhere else. Damage to my land, the residential community, and the future use of these properties may be permanent.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherry DuBose
SD Properties of Gainesville, GA LLC
Kirwin DuBose Properties LLC

[Click to Download](#)

Video.mov

0 bytes

Sent from my iPhone