

Print**Board of Commissioners Voting Meeting Comments - September 22, 2026 - Submission #150117****Date Submitted: 9/21/2026**

Comments completed in the form below will be submitted into the record for the September 22, 2026 Voting Meeting of the Hall County Board of Commissioners.

First Name*

Lara

Last Name*

Morgan

Address1*

145 Meadow Oak Drive

Address2**City***

Talgo

State*

GA

Zip*

30575

Item for Comment*

Other Business



Select from the list below which item you would like to register a comment on. Items are listed in the order in which they appear on the agenda.

Your Comments*

Please deny:

- The rezoning
- The special-use request
- The requested variances

And require the applicant to find a more appropriate location.

- We are not asking you to stop telecommunications development.
- We are asking you to put telecommunications development in the right place.

Please write your comments in the box above.

File Upload

Pine Circle Opposition Letter.pdf

If you have files, such as photos, videos or text documents to include with your comments, upload them in the box above.

Follow-up Communication

Would you like a Hall County staff member to follow up with you? If so, please leave your email address or phone number in the box above. Otherwise, leave this box blank.

September 22, 2026

**Re: Formal Opposition to Proposed Telecommunications Tower at 2378 Pine Circle Drive
— Gainesville/Hall County, Georgia**

**To the Hall County Board of Commissioners and Members of the Planning and Zoning
Review Process:**

I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose the proposed telecommunications tower at **0, 0 & 2378 Pine Circle Drive**.

I am an **experienced Realtor who has worked in the North Georgia real estate market for many years**, and I understand firsthand what makes a residential property desirable—and what can make a property more difficult to market and sell.

I am not opposed to cell phone service or responsible expansion of telecommunications infrastructure.

I am opposed to placing this tower in this residential neighborhood.

According to Hall County's current agenda, this proposal involves a **4.99-acre tract currently zoned R-1 Residential** and requires the County to approve four separate requests: a rezoning from **R-1 Residential to Suburban Shopping (S-S)**, a **special use for a telecommunications tower**, a variance to the County's telecommunications-tower standards, and a variance to reduce minimum road frontage.

That is significant.

This is not simply a request to install equipment on an appropriately zoned commercial property. It requires changing the existing residential zoning and granting multiple exceptions to the County's development standards.

I respectfully ask the Board to deny all four requests and protect the existing residential character of Pine Circle.

The impact on surrounding homeowners is not theoretical

As a Realtor, one of the first things I consider when evaluating a property is **marketability**.

When I take a home to market, I have to consider what a prospective buyer sees when they arrive, what they see from the windows and yard, what surrounds the property, and what competing homes offer.

A large telecommunications tower can become a permanent and highly visible feature of the surrounding neighborhood.

And buyers have choices.

If a prospective buyer is comparing two otherwise similar homes—one with a large cell tower prominently visible nearby and one without it—that visual difference can become a factor in the buyer's decision.

It can affect the number of buyers willing to consider the property, the amount they are willing to offer, and the length of time the property may remain on the market.

That is not speculation about someone's health or motives. It is a basic reality of residential real estate: location, surroundings, views, aesthetics, and buyer perception affect marketability.

There is published research showing potential resale-value impacts

The concern about property values is also supported by published research.

A study published in the *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics* examined more than 23,000 residential sales and analyzed the relationship between home values, wireless-tower proximity, and tower visibility.

The researchers reported that properties within approximately **0.72 kilometers—about 2,362 feet—of the nearest tower experienced an average value decline of 2.46%**, with effects reaching **9.78% for homes within the tower's visibility range** compared with homes outside that visibility range.

Another study examined actual residential transactions in **Savannah, Georgia**, using sales from 2007 through 2016. That research reported that proximity to cellular towers could reduce selling prices by as much as **7.6%**.

I want to be fair and accurate: **the research is not unanimous**. Another market study found no measurable difference within a quarter-mile in the markets it examined.

But that disagreement does not make the concern irrelevant.

It means that the impact can depend upon factors such as **distance, visibility, tower design, neighborhood characteristics, and the local real estate market**.

And that is exactly why the County should not assume that surrounding homeowners will suffer no economic consequence.

I see this from the perspective of a Realtor—and a homeowner

A homeowner may live in a property for ten, twenty, or thirty years.

At some point, however, many homeowners need to sell.

When that day comes, they should not have to explain to prospective buyers why a major telecommunications structure was placed next to their neighborhood.

They should not have to wonder whether buyers will be concerned about the tower's appearance, proximity, or perceived impact.

And they should not have to accept a potentially reduced pool of buyers because a commercial telecommunications facility was approved next to their homes.

Once the tower is constructed, the homeowners cannot move it.

Children's health and residents' well-being

I also believe the concerns of families with children deserve serious consideration.

I recognize that current federal health agencies have not established that properly operating telecommunications facilities cause adverse health effects.

I am not asking the County to make a medical determination.

I am asking the County to recognize that residents have legitimate questions about long-term exposure and deserve complete, objective information before a permanent facility is placed near their homes and where children live and play.

Residents have reported **EMF readings above 80 in this area.**

Residents should not have to accept an unverified number, from either side, as proof of safety or danger.

We need the facts.

Why does this particular location need to be forced into compliance?

This is perhaps the most important question before the Board.

The property is currently residentially zoned.

The applicant wants a rezoning.

The applicant wants a special use.

The applicant wants a variance from telecommunications-tower standards.

The applicant wants another variance concerning road frontage.

Hall County's own agenda confirms these four separate requests.

Why should an established residential neighborhood bear the consequences of making this particular site work?

If there are other technically feasible locations—commercial property, industrial property, existing telecommunications sites, utility corridors, or other appropriate locations—those alternatives should be thoroughly investigated before this neighborhood is asked to accept a permanent structure that may affect its character and marketability.

Please consider the long-term consequences

This Board's decision will not simply affect the applicant.

It will affect the homeowners who already live here.

It will affect their views.

It may affect their ability to market their homes.

It may affect future buyers' perception of this neighborhood.

And it will affect the character of Pine Circle for years, potentially decades, to come.

The homeowners did not create this problem. They should not be required to absorb the consequences of solving it.

I respectfully ask the Board to look beyond the question of whether a tower can technically be constructed on this property.

Ask instead:

Is this the right location?

Is it compatible with the existing residential neighborhood?

Is changing the zoning necessary?

Are the requested variances justified?

Have reasonable alternative locations been fully investigated?

And has the applicant provided enough objective information for the County to confidently conclude that surrounding homeowners will not bear an unreasonable burden?

I respectfully believe the answer to those questions has not been adequately demonstrated.

Please deny the rezoning, deny the special-use request, deny the requested variances, and require the applicant to pursue a more appropriate location.

We are not asking Hall County to stop telecommunications development.

We are asking Hall County to put telecommunications development in an appropriate place.

As a Realtor, I understand the importance of protecting the long-term value and marketability of residential property.

As a resident and concerned member of this community, I understand the importance of protecting the character and quality of life of the people who live here.

And as homeowners, we deserve to know that our County government will carefully consider the consequences before permanently changing the character of our neighborhood.

Please protect Pine Circle.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lara Morgan