
Re: Opposition to 175 Foot Cell Tower

From Kaitlyn Elliott (Planning) <kelliott@hallcounty.org>
Date Tue 9/22/2026 9:36 AM
To [REDACTED]
Cc Katie G. Ahmed (Planning) <kahmed@hallcounty.org>

Thank you for your comment. It will be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners.

Thank you,

Kaitlyn Elliott
Planning Commission Clerk
Planning and Zoning
(770) 531-6810
kelliott@hallcounty.org
www.hallcounty.org



Effective July 1, 2026, all open records requests should be submitted through Hall County's Next Request Portal (<https://hallcountyga.nextrequest.com>).

Hall County Planning and Zoning does NOT accept wire transfers.
All payments must be made through the Accela Portal or in person. If you receive any request for a wire transfer, please contact our office immediately—it may be fraudulent.

From: Tanya Mulka [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 8:50 PM
To: Katie G. Ahmed (Planning) <kahmed@hallcounty.org>; Kathy Cooper (County Commissioner) <kcooper@hallcounty.org>; Billy Powell (County Commission) <bpowell@hallcounty.org>; David Gibbs (County Commission) <dgibbs@hallcounty.org>; Jeff Stowe (County Commission) <jstowe@hallcounty.org>; Gregg Poole (County Commissioner) <gpoole@hallcounty.org>
Subject: Opposition to 175 Foot Cell Tower

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.

September 21, 2026

Hall County Board of Commissioners

Hall County, Georgia

Re: Opposition to Proposed 175-Foot Telecommunications Tower – Pine Circle Drive / Kelly Towers III, LLC

Dear Chairman and Members of the Hall County Board of Commissioners:

I am writing to respectfully request that the Board **deny the applications submitted by Kelly Towers III, LLC for the proposed 175-foot telecommunications tower on Pine Circle Drive.**

This proposal would place a substantial commercial telecommunications structure in an established residential area near Pine Circle Drive and Green Hill Circle. The applicant is seeking to rezone approximately 4.99 acres from Residential (R-1) to Suburban Shopping (S-S), obtain special-use approval for the tower, and receive variances from existing County telecommunications and road-frontage requirements.

I recognize the importance of reliable telecommunications service. My objection is not to telecommunications infrastructure generally, but to **this particular location and the impact a 175-foot tower could have on the surrounding residential community and nearby Lake Lanier.**

Residential Property Values and Marketability

One of my greatest concerns is the potential effect on the value and marketability of surrounding homes.

Hall County's own telecommunications ordinance specifically identifies both **the tower's effect on property values of adjacent and nearby residential properties** and **its effect upon potential purchasers of nearby residentially zoned property** as considerations in evaluating a tall-structure permit.

That is particularly important here.

People purchase homes in this area because of its residential character and its proximity to Lake Lanier. A 175-foot telecommunications tower would introduce a highly visible commercial structure into that environment.

Before approving this proposal, I respectfully ask the County to require credible, site-specific evidence addressing the potential effect of this tower on surrounding residential property values and marketability. General statements that towers do not affect property values should not substitute for an analysis of homes comparable to those surrounding this particular site.

Proximity to Existing Homes

The proximity of a structure this tall to existing homes is also troubling.

Hall County's telecommunications ordinance states that one of its goals is to **encourage the location of towers in nonresidential areas** and to locate telecommunications facilities where adverse effects on the community are minimized.

Yet this proposal requires property currently zoned residential to be rezoned to accommodate the tower.

The County should require the applicant to clearly identify the distance from the proposed tower to **every nearby residence**, not simply the property lines.

Residents and Commissioners should be provided with a map showing those distances before a decision is made.

The Board should also consider what a 175-foot structure would look like from neighboring homes and from the surrounding Lake Lanier community. A structure of that height is fundamentally different in scale from the homes around it.

Stormwater, Erosion and Runoff Toward Lake Lanier

I am also concerned about construction-related and long-term stormwater runoff.

Construction of the tower compound, access drive, equipment areas and associated improvements may require clearing vegetation, disturbing soil and creating additional impervious surfaces.

Given this property's proximity to **Lake Lanier and the watershed that ultimately drains into the lake**, I respectfully request that the County determine exactly where stormwater from the proposed development will flow and what measures will prevent sediment, erosion, pollutants and increased runoff from reaching neighboring properties, streams, drainage systems or Lake Lanier.

Before approval, the public should be provided with a site-specific stormwater and erosion-control analysis showing:

- Existing and proposed drainage patterns;
- The amount of land disturbance and impervious surface created by the project;
- The location of streams, drainage channels and other waters receiving runoff from the property;
- The ultimate destination of stormwater leaving the site;
- Erosion and sediment-control measures during construction; and
- Permanent stormwater controls after construction.

Lake Lanier is far too important a resource for these questions to be addressed only after construction begins.

Existing and Future Radiofrequency Exposure

Residents are also concerned about existing radiofrequency electromagnetic-field levels in this area and what the cumulative RF exposure would be after an additional telecommunications facility begins operating.

I understand that RF emissions from telecommunications facilities are regulated at the federal level and that facilities must comply with applicable FCC exposure requirements.

For that reason, rather than relying solely on assurances of compliance, I respectfully request **objective documentation**.

Before approval, the applicant should provide the County and residents with:

1. Existing baseline RF measurements taken at representative locations within the surrounding residential neighborhood;
2. Engineering calculations showing the anticipated RF exposure after the proposed tower and antennas become operational;
3. An analysis accounting for the cumulative RF contribution of existing nearby telecommunications sources together with the proposed facility; and
4. Certification by an appropriately qualified professional that the completed facility will comply with all applicable FCC RF exposure requirements.

If existing RF levels in this area are already elevated, residents deserve to understand how much additional RF exposure this facility is projected to contribute.

This is not a request for the County to establish its own RF exposure standard. It is a request for **transparency, measurement and verification of compliance with the applicable federal standard**.

Why This Location?

Perhaps the most important question remains unanswered:

Why must a 175-foot telecommunications tower be located here?

Hall County's telecommunications ordinance specifically encourages towers in nonresidential areas and encourages use of existing tower sites and structures.

The applicant should therefore demonstrate, with objective engineering evidence, why existing towers, collocation opportunities, commercial properties, industrial properties or other less intrusive locations cannot provide the required coverage.

The County's ordinance requires more than conclusory statements that an existing tower is unsuitable. If a telecommunications need exists, the appropriate response should be to identify the location that meets that need while imposing the least reasonable burden on surrounding residents—not to change the character of an established residential area simply because this particular parcel is available.

Multiple Exceptions Should Matter

Finally, I ask the Board to consider the proposal as a whole.

The applicant is requesting:

- Rezoning from **Residential (R-1) to Suburban Shopping (S-S)**;
- Special-use approval for a telecommunications tower;
- A variance from the County's telecommunications tower standards; and
- A variance reducing minimum road frontage.

When a proposed use requires a rezoning, special-use approval and multiple variances to make a particular site workable, the Board should seriously consider whether **the site itself is inappropriate for the proposed use.**

Hall County adopted telecommunications standards for a reason. Those standards should carry particular weight when the proposed tower would be located among existing residences and near one of Hall County's most important natural and economic resources, Lake Lanier.

I therefore respectfully request that the Hall County Board of Commissioners **deny the rezoning, special-use permit and associated variances requested by Kelly Towers III, LLC.**

At a minimum, no approval should occur until the applicant has provided the Board and surrounding residents with complete, independently verifiable information regarding residential setbacks and proximity, property-value impacts, stormwater and drainage impacts, alternative tower locations, and projected RF exposure and FCC compliance.

Once a 175-foot tower is constructed, its impact on this neighborhood cannot easily be reversed. This decision deserves the highest level of scrutiny before a permanent change is made to an established residential community.

Thank you for considering the concerns of the residents who will live with the consequences of this decision.

Respectfully,

Tanya Mulka

4415 T Mor Cove

Oakwood, Georgia