

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

DATE: Nov 14 2008 **ARC Review Code**: R810152

TO: Chairman Charles Bannister
ATTN TO: Jeff West, Planning Manager

FROM: Charles Krautler, Director (

NOTE: This is digital signature. Original on file.

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Below is the ARC finding. The Atlanta Regional Commission reviewed the DRI with regard to conflicts to regional plans, goals, and policies and impacts it might have on the activities, plans, goals, and policies of other local jurisdictions and state, federal, and other agencies. The finding does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

Submitting Local Government: Gwinnett County

Name of Proposal: Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact Date Opened: Oct 15 2008 Date Closed: Nov 14 2008

<u>FINDING</u>: After reviewing the information submitted for the review, and the comments received from affected agencies, the Atlanta Regional Commission finding is that the DRI is in the best interest of the Region, and therefore, of the State.

<u>Additional Comments:</u> The proposed development is located in an area that is primarily dominated by office as well as industrial and warehouse uses within Gwinnett County. It is important to consider compatible uses as the area continues to develop.

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CITY OF DULUTH
GWINNETT PLACE CID

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF LILBURN
GWINNETT VILLAGE CID

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF NORCROSS

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3309. This finding will be published to the ARC website.

The ARC review website is located at: http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse .

Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

FINAL REPORT SUMMARY

REVISED PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The proposed Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station is a 39,200 square foot waste handling facility on 9 acres in Gwinnett County. It is located on Shackleford Road, south of I-85 and east of Beaver Ruin Road.

PROJECT PHASING:

The project is being proposed in one phase with a project build out date 2010

GENERAL

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

Is the proposed project consistent with the host-local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

The project site is currently zoned M-1 industrial. The proposed zoning is M-2. The future land use plan for Gwinnett County designates the area as Office/Distribution/Technology.

Is the proposed project consistent with any potentially affected local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

Comments submitted by the City of Norcross, attached, indicate that the City's comprehensive plan calls for high intensity and high density mixed-use in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

Will the proposed project impact the implementation of any local government's short-term work program? If so, how?

No comments were received concerning impacts to the implementation of any local government's short term work program.

Will the proposed project generate population and/or employment increases in the Region? If yes, what would be the major infrastructure and facilities improvements needed to support the increase?

No, the proposed development would not increase the need for services in the area.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT <u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

What other major development projects are planned near the proposed project?

The ARC has reviewed other major development projects, known as Area Plan (1984 to 1991) or as a DRI (1991 to present), within a 2 mile radius of the proposed project.

YEAR NAME

2003 Goshen Springs Road Solid Waste Transfer Station

1998 Opus South

1989 Gwinnett Commerce Center

1988 Indian Brook Park

Will the proposed project displace housing units or community facilities? If yes, identify and give number of units, facilities, etc.

Based on information submitted for the review, the site is currently has a landfill and waste handling facilities that will not be demolished.

Will the development cause a loss in jobs? If yes, how many? No.

Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

The proposed development is located in an area that is primarily dominated by office as well as industrial and warehouse uses within Gwinnett County. It is important to consider compatible uses as the area continues to develop.

The ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) indicates that the proposed development is located within a Mega Corridor. Mega Corridors are defined as the most intensely developed radial corridors in the region. The proposed development is also located within a Freight Area, which are defined as concentrated areas of freight and industrial uses.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

FINAL REPORT

Regional Development Plan Policies

- 1. Provide sustainable economic growth in all areas of the region.
- 2. Encourage new homes and jobs within existing developed areas of the region, focusing on principal transportation corridors, the Central Business District, activity centers, and town centers.
- 3. Increase opportunities for mixed use development, transit-oriented development, infill, and redevelopment.
- 4. At strategic regional locations, plan and retail industrial and freight land uses.
- 5. Design transportation infrastructure to protect the context of adjoining development and provide a sense of place appropriate for our communities.
- 6. Promote the reclamation of Brownfield development sites.
- 7. Protect the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods, while also meeting the needs of communities to grow.
- 8. Encourage a variety of homes styles, densities, and price ranges in locations that are accessible to jobs and services to ensure housing for individuals and families of all incomes and age groups.
- 9. Promote new communities that feature greenspace and neighborhood parks, pedestrian scale, support transportation options, and provide an appropriate mix of uses and housing types.
- 10. Promote sustainable and energy efficient development.
- 11. Protect environmentally-sensitive areas including wetlands, floodplains, small water supply watersheds, rivers and stream corridors.
- 12. Increase the amount, quality, and connectivity, and accessibility of greenspace.
- 13. Provide strategies to preserve and enhance historic resources
- 14. Through regional infrastructure planning, limit growth in undeveloped areas of the region
- 15. Assist local governments to adopt growth management strategies that make more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
- 16. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local, and neighborhood levels.
- 17. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support Regional Policies
- 18. Encourage the development of state and regional growth management policy.

BEST LAND USE PRACTICES

Practice 1: Keep vehicle miles of travel (VMT) below the area average. Infill developments are the best at accomplishing this. The more remote a development the more self contained it must be to stay below the area average VMT.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

Practice 2: Contribute to the area's jobs-housing balance. Strive for a job-housing balance with a three to five mile area around a development site.

Practice 3: Mix land uses at the finest grain the market will bear and include civic uses in the mix.

Practice 4: Develop in clusters and keep the clusters small. This will result in more open space preservation.

Practice 5: Place higher-density housing near commercial centers, transit lines and parks. This will enable more walking, biking and transit use.

Practice 6: Phase convenience shopping and recreational opportunities to keep pace with housing. These are valued amenities and translate into less external travel by residents if located conveniently to housing.

Practice 7: Make subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges. This is traditional development.

Practice 8: Reserve school sites and donate them if necessary to attract new schools. This will result in neighborhood schools which provide a more supportive learning environment than larger ones.

Practice 9: Concentrate commercial development in compact centers or districts, rather than letting it spread out in strips.

Practice 10: Make shopping centers and business parks into all-purpose activity centers. Suburban shopping centers and their environs could be improved by mixing uses and designing them with the pedestrian amenities of downtowns.

Practice 11: Tame auto-oriented land uses, or at least separate them from pedestrian-oriented uses. Relegate "big box" stores to areas where they will do the least harm to the community fabric.

BEST TRANSPORTATION PRACTICES

Practice 1: Design the street network with multiple connections and relatively direct routes.

Practice 2: Space through-streets no more than a half-mile apart or the equivalent route density in a curvilinear network

Practice 3: Use traffic-calming measures liberally. Use short streets, sharp curves, center islands, traffic circles, textured pavements, speed bumps and raised crosswalks.

Practice 4: Keep speeds on local streets down to 20 mph.

Practice 5: Keep speeds on arterials and collectors down to 35 mph (at least inside communities).

Practice 6: Keep all streets as narrow as possible and never more than four traffic lanes wide. Florida suggests access streets 18 feet, subcollectors 26 feet, and collectors from 28 feet to 36 feet depending on lanes and parking. Practice 7: Align streets to give buildings energy-efficient orientations. Allow building sites to benefit from sun angles, natural shading and prevailing breezes.

Practice 8: Avoid using traffic signals wherever possible and always space them for good traffic progression.

Practice 9: Provide networks for pedestrians and bicyclists as good as the network for motorists.

Practice 10: Provide pedestrians and bicyclists with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets.

Practice 11: Incorporate transit-oriented design features.

Practice 12: Establish TDM programs for local employees. Ridesharing, modified work hours, telecommuting and others.

BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

Practice 1: Use a systems approach to environmental planning. Shift from development orientation to basins or ecosystems planning.

Practice 2: Channel development into areas that are already disturbed.

Practice 3: Preserve patches of high-quality habitat, as large and circular as possible, feathered at the edges and connected by wildlife corridors. Stream corridors offer great potential.

Practice 4: Design around significant wetlands.

Practice 5: Establish upland buffers around all retained wetlands and natural water bodies.

Practice 6: Preserve significant uplands, too.

Practice 7: Restore and enhance ecological functions damaged by prior site activities.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

Practice 8: Detain runoff with open, natural drainage systems. The more natural the system the more valuable it will be for wildlife and water quality.

Practice 9: Design man-made lakes and stormwater ponds for maximum environmental value. Recreation, stormwater management, wildlife habitat and others.

Practice 10: Use reclaimed water and integrated pest management on large landscaped areas. Integrated pest management involves controlling pests by introducing their natural enemies and cultivating disease and insect resistant grasses.

Practice 11: Use and require the use of XeriscapeTM landscaping. XeriscapingTM is water conserving landscape methods and materials.

BEST HOUSING PRACTICES

- Practice 1: Offer "life cycle" housing. Providing integrated housing for every part of the "life cycle."
- Practice 2: Achieve an average net residential density of six to seven units per acre without the appearance of crowding. Cluster housing to achieve open space.
- Practice 3: Use cost-effective site development and construction practices. Small frontages and setbacks; rolled curbs or no curbs; shared driveways.
- Practice 4: Design of energy-saving features. Natural shading and solar access.
- Practice 5: Supply affordable single-family homes for moderate-income households.
- Practice 6: Supply affordable multi-family and accessory housing for low-income households.
- Practice 7: Tap government housing programs to broaden and deepen the housing/income mix.
- Practice 8: Mix housing to the extent the market will bear.

LOCATION

Where is the proposed project located within the host-local government's boundaries?

The proposed development is located in southwest Gwinnett County, east of the Beaver Ruin Road and Shackleford Road intersection.

Will the proposed project be located close to the host-local government's boundary with another local government? If yes, identify the other local government.

The proposed development is entirely within Gwinnett County's jurisdiction. The proposed project is located within two miles of the City of Duluth, the City of Norcross and the City of Lilburn.

Will the proposed project be located close to land uses in other jurisdictions that would benefit, or be negatively impacted, by the project? Identify those land uses which would benefit and those which would be negatively affected and describe impacts.

None were determined during the review.

ECONOMY OF THE REGION

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT <u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

What new taxes will be generated by the proposed project?

Estimated value of the development is \$4,000,000 with an expected \$62,000 in annual local tax revenues.

How many short-term jobs will the development generate in the Region?

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?

Yes.

In what ways could the proposed development have a positive or negative impact on existing industry or business in the Region?

None were determined during the review.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Stream Buffers

The project is located in the South River Watershed, which is not a water supply watershed.

The project plans and the USGS coverage for the area show no streams on or near the property. Any unmapped streams on the property will be subject to the Gwinnett County Stream Buffer Ordinance. All waters of the state that may be on the property are subject to the State 25-foot erosion and sedimentation buffer.

Storm Water / Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants produced after the construction of the entire proposed development, based on the submitted site plans. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr). The loading factors are based on the results of regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. Actual pollutant loadings will vary based on actual use and the amount of impervious surface in the final project design. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report	November		Comments	October 29, 2008
Due:	14, 2008		Due By:	

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year

Land Use:	Land Area (Acres)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Heavy Industrial	9.04	13.11	173.93	1157.12	7186.80	15.01	1.90
TOTAL	9.04	13.11	173.93	1157.12	7186.80	15.01	1.90

Total Percentage Impervious: 80%

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located near a national register site? If yes, identify site.

None have been identified.

In what ways could the proposed project create impacts that would damage the resource?

Not applicable.

In what ways could the proposed project have a positive influence on efforts to preserve or promote the historic resource?

Not applicable.

INFRASTRUCTURE Transportation

Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Review Findings

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Expedited Review. The site is being proposed for a 39,200 square foot solid waste transfer station.

How much traffic (both average daily and peak am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?

GRTA and ARC review staff agreed with the methodology and assumptions used in the analysis. The net trip generation is based on the specific operational parameters being proposed by the developer.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT <u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

Based on information submitted for the review and the proposed use on the site, the vehicle trips generated by the proposed development will be approximately 100 per day.

What are the existing traffic patterns and volumes on the local, county, state, and interstate roads that serve the site?

Projected traffic volumes from the Regional Travel Demand Model are compared to the assigned capacity of facilities within the study network. This data is used to calculate a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The V/C ratio values that define the LOS thresholds vary depending on factors such as the type of terrain traversed and the percent of the road where passing is prohibited. As a V/C ratio reaches 0.8, congestion increases. Any facilities that have a V/C ratio of 1.00 or above are considered congested.

What transportation improvements are under construction or planned for the Region that would affect or be affected by the proposed project? What is the status of these improvements (long or short range or other)?

2008-2013 TIP* Not Applicable

Envision6 RTP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

^{*}The ARC Board adopted the Envision6 RTP and FY 2008-2013 TIP on September 26th, 2007.

Impacts of the solid waste transfer station: What are the recommended transportation improvements based on the traffic study done by the applicant?

No significant impacts have been estimated because of the development of this project.

What are the conclusions of this review? Is the transportation system (existing and planned) capable of accommodating these trips?

With only an estimated 80 truck trips accessing the site daily, this development is permissible under the Expedited Review criteria.

What transportation demand management strategies does the developer propose (carpool, flextime, transit subsidy, etc.)?

Given the type of development, none are necessary and the Air Quality Benchmark test will not be used.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT <u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Based on regional averages, wastewater is estimated at .0001 MGD.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

The Beaver Ruin facility will provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development.

What is the current permitted capacity and average annual flow to this facility?

The capacity of the Beaver Ruin facility is listed below:

PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD 1	DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD	2001 MMF, MGD	2008 MMF, MGD	2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD	PLANNED EXPANSION	REMARKS
4.5	4.5	4.46	4.5	0	None	

MMF: Maximum Monthly Flow. Mgd: million of gallons per day.

What other major developments will be served by the plant serving this project?

ARC has reviewed a number of major developments that will be served by this plant.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand is estimated at .0001 MGD based on regional averages.

How will the proposed project's demand for water impact the water supply or treatment facilities of the jurisdiction providing the service?

Information submitted with the review suggests that there is sufficient water supply capacity available for the proposed project.



₁ Source: Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District **SHORT-TERM WASTEWATER CAPACITY PLAN**, August 2002.

Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT <u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

INFRASTRUCTURE

Solid Waste

How much solid waste will be generated by the project? Where will this waste be disposed?

Information not submitted for the review.

Will the project create any unusual waste handling or disposal problems?

No.

Are there any provisions for recycling this project's solid waste?

None stated.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Other facilities

According to information gained in the review process, will there be any unusual intergovernmental impacts on:

- · Levels of governmental services?
- · Administrative facilities?
- · Schools?
- · Libraries or cultural facilities?
- Fire, police, or EMS?
- Other government facilities?
- Other community services/resources (day care, health care, low income, non-English speaking, elderly, etc.)?

None were determined during the review.

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

No.

Will the proposed project provide housing opportunities close to existing employment centers?

No.



Preliminary Report:	October 15, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station #1941
Final Report Due:	November 14, 2008		Comments Due By:	October 29, 2008

Is there housing accessible to the project in all price ranges demanded?

Given the minimal number of employees, no housing impact analysis is necessary.

Is it likely or unlikely that potential employees of the proposed project will be able to find affordable* housing?

N/A



^{*} Defined as 30 percent of the income of a family making 80 percent of the median income of the Region – FY 2000 median income of \$51,649 for family of 4 in Georgia.



MAYOR BUCKY JOHNSON • MAYOR PRO TEM JEFF ALLEN • COUNCILMAN DAVID MCLEROY COUNCILMAN CRAIG NEWTON • COUNCILMAN CHARLIE RIEHM • COUNCILMAN KEITH SHEWBERT CITY MANAGER WARREN HUTMACHER • CITY CLERK SUSAN B. WUERZNER

October 27, 2008

Atlanta Regional Commission Attention: Jon Tuley 40 Courtland Street NE Atlanta, GA 30303

RE:

DRI Review R810152

Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station

Dear Mr. Tuley,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed development so close the City of Norcross. The City of Norcross formally opposes this request.

The City's border extends to the intersection of Indian Trail Road at Interstate 85. The proposed waste transfer station is a little more than a mile outside of the city limits. This nearest point within Norcross has been designated with our 2030 Comprehensive Plan as a character area prime for redevelopment, high intensity, and density. Our long range plans call for mixed use developments, class A office space, transit opportunities, and a true live/work/play environment. The area is also a focal point of the Norcross Activity Center LCI study that is currently under way. The preliminary findings of the LCI study support the goals of the comprehensive plan and further detail the potential of this node for quality redevelopment and future transit potential.

The County has also invested significant time and resources into their Unified Plan. The County long range plans identify the I-85 corridor as a place of redevelopment potential and high intensity of future use.

To allow the establishment of a waste transfer station at such a critical location adjacent to one of the City's redevelopment nodes stymies our efforts in a significant way. To encourage and support redevelopment is to recognize the high cost of redevelopment and the challenges inherent to those efforts. A waster transfer station is not a use or investment that will encourage the redevelopment of this corridor. And redevelopment of this corridor is policy from the local level of the City to the regional levels of the ARC and State.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to voice our opposition to this project.

Sincerely,

Jennifer A. Peterson

Community Development Director

Cc: Chuck Warbington, Gwinnett Village CID



October 29, 2008

Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) Attention: Jon Tuley 40 Courtland Street NE Atlanta, GA 30303

Re: DRI Review R810152 - Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station

Mr. Tuley:

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns on the above mentioned project. The proposed project is located in a strategic revitalization area identified for redevelopment by the Gwinnett Revitalization Task Force created by the Board of Commissioners several years ago. Recommendations of this task force led to the creation of the Gwinnett Village CID whose boundaries extend from the DeKalb County line to Beaver Ruin Road and includes the subject property. The following are a brief listing of the concerns of the project.

- 1. The prime location of the property adjacent to I-85 offer many opportunities for future higher density mixed use at this site. The type of proposed use is simply not compatible with the vision and goals for the Gwinnett Village CID.
- 2. Gwinnett County has worked over the past 2 years on a new innovative 2030 plan including extensive public input that puts an emphasis on designating future employment areas along the I-85 corridor where the basic infrastructure is already in place for higher density projects. The subject property is labeled as a "preferred office" future use that includes higher densities with a major emphasis on office professional uses mixed with a combination of retail and residential uses. The 2030 plan specifically discourages large, free standing commercial/retail, all forms of new industrial, and residential except those that are apart of a higher density mixed use development. The proposed use certainly does not meet these requirements.
- 3. Existing zoning of the area east of Beaver Ruin road is M-1, Light Industrial which limits the intensity of industrial operations and processes. The only property zoned M-2 in the area is west of Beaver Ruin Road and is a 350 acre quarry operation that has been in existence for over 25 years at the site. A solid waste transfer facility requires a rezoning to an M-2 zoning including a special use permit. Precedence has been set based on current zoning of disallowing a more intense use of M-2 property on the east side of Beaver Ruin road.

1412 Oakbrook Dr., Suite 181 Norcross, GA 30093

Phone: 770.449.6515 Fax: 770.449.6561 Email: info@gwinnettvillage.com



- 4. Although not policy related, the following points concerning the area and its impact should be noted when considering this application.
 - a. The proposed project is located less than one mile from Louise Radloff Middle School which will be impacted by traffic and possibly health concerns from the proposed new use at the site.
 - b. Although the majority of the area is zoned M-1, Light Industrial, the majority of the actual uses in the area are more office/warehousing type use including the adjacent property owner to the east which is a medical respiratory equipment facility which will certainly be impacted by the proposed use at the site.
 - c. The entire property was recently cleared (6 to 12 months ago) for unspecified reasons at the time. Clearing the entire property of large trees and vegetation does not allow this site to provide proper buffering to adjacent properties if it is approved (i.e. a church to the west and a respiratory equipment facility to the east).
 - d. The proposed use, by their own admission, is for a "speculative" solid waste transfer station with no proposed end user identified for the project. This in itself raises many concerns around actual need, who it will be serving, what type of company will be ultimately operating at the site, etc. Too many unknowns for such an impact to the surrounding community.
 - e. Finally, Gwinnett Clean & Beautiful has currently received and is reviewing residential waste haulers in accordance with the approved County solid waste plan that consolidates solid waste curb pickup for Gwinnett residents. This selection process for waste haulers in the County is still under review and it is certainly premature to begin to develop waste transfer stations without the knowledge of who will be awarded contracts for the County.

In closing, since our formation in 2006, the CID Board has made a significant investment in the area to bring positive change to this economically challenged area. This includes an investment of over \$825,000 of landscaping at the I-85 interchanges within the CID including the Beaver Ruin Road at I-85 interchange directly adjacent to this proposed site. The CID also has made just under a \$1 million investment to maintain the state, county and city ROW within our boundaries. This includes mowing, trimming, edging and most importantly trash/litter cleanup along the streets. The proposed use for this site simply works in opposition of the positive changes that we are making in the southern part of Gwinnett County and limits maximum use of

1412 Oakbrook Dr., Suite 181 Norcross, GA 30093

Phone: 770.449.6515 Fax: 770.449.6561 Email: info@gwinnettvillage.com



prime redevelopment property along the I-85 corridor as outlined in the 2030 Unified Plan.

Thanks for the opportunity to voice our opposition to this project.

Sincerely,

Chuck Warbington, PE Executive Director

CC:

Senator Curt Thompson
Chairman Charles Bannister
Commissioner Bert Nasuti
Commissioner Elect Shirley Lasseter
County Manager Jock Connell
County Planning and Development Director Glenn Stephens
Gwinnett County School Board Member, Louise Radloff

1412 Oakbrook Dr., Suite 181 Norcross, GA 30093

Phone: 770.449.6515 Fax: 770.449.6561 Email: info@gwinnettvillage.com

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home DRI Rules Thresholds Tier Map FAQ Apply View Submissions Login

П	D	l #1	04	,
	•		94	

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Initial DRI Information				
This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Refer to both the Rules for the DRI Process and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds for more information.				
	Lo	cal Government Informat	on	
Submitting Local Government:	Gwinnett County			
Individual completing form:	Jeff West, P	lanning Manager		
Telephone:	678.518.6200			
E-mail:	jeffrey.west	@gwinnettcounty.com		
herein. If a project is to be loca	ited in more th	nan one jurisdiction and, in total, the pr	the accuracy of the information contained oject meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the insible for initiating the DRI review process.	
	Pi	oposed Project Informati	on	
Name of Proposed Project:	Shackleford	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station		
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):	4400 Shackleford Road, Norcross, GA 30093			
Brief Description of Project:	Solid Waste Transfer Station			
Development Type:				
(not selected)		Hotels	Wastewater Treatment Facilities	
Office		Mixed Use	Petroleum Storage Facilities	
Commercial		Airports	○ Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs	
Wholesale & Distribution	n	Attractions & Recreational Facilities	O Intermodal Terminals	
Hospitals and Health Ca	are	O Post-Secondary Schools	○ Truck Stops	
Housing Waste Handling Facilities Any other development		Any other development types		
Olndustrial		Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants		
If other development type, describe:				

Project Size (# of units, floor	39,200 sqaure feet
area, etc.):	39,200 sqaure reet
Developer:	JEM Development
Mailing Address:	c/o Mahaffey Pickens Tucker, LLP
Address 2:	1550 North Brown Road, Suite 125
	City:Lawrenceville State: GA Zip:30045
Telephone:	770-232-0000
Email:	ltucker@mptlawfirm.com
Is property owner different from developer/applicant?	○ (not selected) ● Yes ○ No
If yes, property owner:	Lancaster Enterprises, LLC
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	○ (not selected)
If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?	
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ◎ No
If yes, provide the following	Project Name:
information:	Project ID:
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	✓ Rezoning Variance Sewer Water Permit ✓ Other Special Use Permit
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ● No
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 2010 Overall project: 2010
Back to Top	

GRTA Home Page | ARC Home Page | RDC Links | DCA Home Page

Site Map | Statements | Contact

Copyright © 2007 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home DRI Rules Thresholds Tier Map FAQ Apply View Submissions Login

DRI #1941

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information		
This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the proposed DRI. Refer to both the Rules for the DRI Process and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds for more information.		
Local	Government Information	
Submitting Local Government:	Gwinnett County	
Individual completing form:	Jeff West, Planning Manager	
Telephone:	678.518.6200	
Email:	jeffrey.west@gwinnettcounty.com	
	Project Information	
Name of Proposed Project:	Shackleford Road Solid Waste Transfer Station	
DRI ID Number:	1941	
Developer/Applicant:	JEM Development	
Telephone:	770-232-0000	
Email(s):	Itucker@mptlawfirm.com	
Additio	nal Information Requested	
Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)	○ (not selected) ● Yes ○ No	
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?	○ (not selected) ◎ Yes ○ No	
If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.		
Economic Development		
Estimated Value at Build-Out:	\$4,000,000	
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$62,000 per developer	
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	○ (not selected) ● Yes ○ No	
Will this development displace		

any existing uses?	○ (not selected) ● Yes ○ No	
If yes, please describe (including number of units,	square feet, etc): One dilapidated industrial building.	
	Water Supply	
Name of water supply provider for this site:	Gwinnett County	
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.0001 mgd per developer	
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If no, describe any plans to expand the existing wa	ater supply capacity:	
Is a water line extension required to serve this project?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ● No	
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be	required?	
W	/astewater Disposal	
Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	Gwinnett County	
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.0001 mgd per developer	
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	○ (not selected)	
If no, describe any plans to expand existing waste	water treatment capacity:	
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be re	equired?	
L	and Transportation	
How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.)	25 pk/hr trips/day	
Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ◎ No	
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If yes, please describe below:		
S	olid Waste Disposal	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	n/a per developer	
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	○ (not selected) ● Yes ○ No	
If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfi	ill capacity:	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ● No	
If yes, please explain:		
Sto	ormwater Management	
What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	43%	
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffer project's impacts on stormwater management:det	rs, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the tention pond	
E	nvironmental Quality	
Is the development located within, or likely to affe	ct any of the following:	
1. Water supply watersheds?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ◎ No	
Significant groundwater recharge areas?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ● No	
3. Wetlands?	(not selected) Yes No	
4. Protected mountains?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ○ No	
5. Protected river corridors?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ● No	
6. Floodplains?	◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ◉ No	
7. Historic resources?	◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ◉ No	
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	○ (not selected) ○ Yes ● No	
If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:		
Back to Top		

GRTA Home Page | ARC Home Page | RDC Links | DCA Home Page

Site Map | Statements | Contact

Copyright © 2007 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.

