



REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

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

DATE: May 6 2010

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1004051

TO: Mayor Gary Pirckle
ATTN TO: Kaipo Awana, City of Sugar Hill
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: City of Sugar Hill

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Name of Proposal: North Point Community Church – Sugar Hill

Date Opened: Apr 6 2010

DRI Checklist Summary:

Regional Policies and Adopted Plans: 92%

Development Project Score: 40%

Open Space Preservation/Environmental Quality Score: 70%

Overall Score: 58.5%

Overall Weighted Score: 72%

FINDING: 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.

Comments: ARC's Unified Growth Policy Map identifies this area as suburban neighborhood which is defined as areas that are or will be developed at more of a suburban scale with appropriate commercial development and low intensity mixed use serving the local area.

ARC staff has concerns with the proposed driveways and median breaks. The proposed development is located along Peachtree Industrial Boulevard (SR 141). Currently, there is one median break along the frontage of the proposed development's property. The site plan shows two driveways on Peachtree Industrial Blvd with median breaks that are approximately 638 feet apart. ARC staff has concern over the spacing of these breaks and whether or not two median breaks are warranted. The developer should investigate having one driveway use the existing median break and the second driveway function as a right-in/right-out.

A third driveway is proposed to the north of the site onto Level Creek Rd. The developer and the City should work with the surrounding neighborhoods to ensure that traffic impacts are minimized.

ARC staff has concerns over the amount and placement of the parking. The City of Sugar Hill requires 1 parking space per 4 seats. In the case of the proposed development, that would equal 750 parking spaces. The site plan shows 2,435 parking spaces, well above what is required. The developer should reduce the amount of parking to avoid having large fields of unused, impervious surface parking, especially when the building is not fully occupied during the weekdays.

Considering the potential impacts to the surrounding community and critical environmental areas, the developer should consider utilizing permeable pavement, parking pavers, not paving portions of the parking lot or other strategy to reduce stormwater runoff.

The parking that remains should be screened from view and the building should be brought closer to the street. This can help reduce the visual impact of the large amounts of parking on both the surrounding neighborhoods as well as from Peachtree Industrial Blvd.

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING

ARC DATA RESEARCH

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

WINNETT COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

ARC AGING DIVISION

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CITY OF SUWANEE

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

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

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

General Project Information

Project name:	North Point Community Church		
DRI number:	2109		
Local jurisdiction:	Sugar Hill		
Local government action requested:	Concept Plan Approval		
Project description (include acreage):	North Point Community Church is proposed on the west side of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard just northwest the intersection of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard / W. Price Road / N. Price Road in Sugar Hill, Georgia. The development is proposed to consist of a 175,000 s.f. of church with 3,000 seats on a 50.6 acre site.		
Project phasing/buildout:	2012		
Project location:	LL 274 & 289 Sugar Hill, Georgia		
Current description of the site:	The existing site is currently undeveloped.		
Is any portion of the project built or under construction?	No		
If you answered the previous question with "Yes", please describe.	N/A		
Affected local governments (3 miles of project site):	Gwinnett County and City of Suwanee		
Adjacent/surrounding land uses and development:	Two neighborhoods zoned RS-100 (Medium Density Single Family Residential) are adjacent to the site to the north. East and west of the site is undeveloped land that is zoned HM-1 (Light Industrial). The area across from the site is undeveloped and zoned BG (General Business).		
New taxes generated by the project:	Church (tax exempt)		
Expected annual local tax revenues:	Church (tax exempt)		
Site access roads:	Peachtree Industrial Blvd, Level Creek Road		
Number of site driveways proposed:	3		
Total traffic volume to be generated by the proposed development:	SUNDAY PEAK: 876/876 Entering/Exiting 2,483 24-hour 2-way traffic		
Estimated water supply demand to be generated by project:	.002 MGD		
Sufficient water capacity available:	YES		
Estimated sewage flow to be generated by project:	.002 MGD		
Sufficient wastewater capacity available:	YES		
Estimated solid waste generated by the project annually:	23 tons		
Sufficient landfill capacity available:	YES		
Number of students expected to be generated by the project:	0		
Schools expected students to attend and capacity:			
School 1:	N/A	Capacity:	N/A
School 2:	N/A	Capacity:	N/A
School 3:	N/A	Capacity:	N/A

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
A. Regional Plans and Policies			
1. Unified Growth Policy Map			
A. Is the development consistent with the Unified Growth Policy Map and the Developments Type Matrix? • 3 points: Yes	X	3	The region place type for the site area is "Suburban Neighborhoods", according to the UGPM. Suburban Neighborhoods are defined as areas that are or will be developed at more of a suburban scale with appropriate commercial development and low intensity mixed use serving the local area. Other acceptable uses for this region include General Commercial, Residential Small Lot, Residential Med Lot, Residential Large Lot, Residential Very Low, Conservation 50% Open Space.
B. Is the development consistent with the Regional Development Plan Policies? • 3 points: Yes	X	3	
2. Metro North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) Plan Compliance			
A. Is there adequate water provisions available and accessible to the site? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	3	
B. Is there adequate sewer capacity available and accessible to the site? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	3	
C. Does the development incorporate stormwater best management practices from the State of Georgia Manual? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	3	
3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Goals & Objectives			
A. Is the development located on or within half a mile of a roadway designated on the Regional Strategic Transportation System (RSTS)? • 3 points: Located on the RSTS or within 1/2 mile and all access points align with existing or planned median breaks. If no median exists or is planned, all access points align with existing opposing access points.	X	0	The proposed development is located on Peachtree Industrial Blvd, which is designated an "Arterial Roadway" in the RSTS. The development is relocating an existing median break on Peachtree Industrial Blvd for a proposed full access driveway and is proposing an additional median break on Peachtree Industrial Blvd.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
A. Regional Plans and Policies			
4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)			
<p>A. Are the transportation impacts identified consistent with the TIP/RTP?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes 	X	3	<p>The projects located within 1 mile of the site include: GW-308C - SUGARLOAF PARKWAY EXTENSION: PHASE 3</p> <p>The projects located within 2 miles of the site include: GW-AR-243 - PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS AND RAILROAD UNDERPASS FROM MAIN STREET TO BUFORD HIGHWAY</p> <p>AR-941 - METRO ARTERIAL CONNECTOR (MAC) CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT STUDY</p> <p>GW-301 - SR 20 (NELSON BROGDON BOULEVARD/BUFORD DRIVE) ATMS FROM SR 13A (PEACHTREE INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD) TO I-985</p> <p>GW-341 - SOUTH HILL STREET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS FROM MAIN STREET TO SR 13 (BUFORD HIGHWAY)</p> <p>GW-349 - SR 20 (BUFORD DRIVE) FROM PEACHTREE INDUSTRIAL</p>
5. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)			
<p>A. Is the development located in an LCI Study area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The project is located in an LCI Study Area and meets the intent of the Study. 	X	N/A	<p>The development is not located within an LCI Study Area.</p>

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
A. Regional Plans and Policies			
6. Regionally Adopted Plans			
A. If the development is located within a transportation study area, indicate which study area.	N/A	N/A	N/A
B. Is the development consistent with the recommendations set forth in any sub-area or multi-modal corridor study? • 3 points: Yes	✗	N/A	N/A
C. Is the proposed development consistent with the Atlanta Regional Freight Mobility Plan? • 3 points: Yes	✗	3	
7. Locally Adopted Plans			
A. Is the development consistent with the host local government's Future Development Map or other comparable document? • 3 points: Yes	✗	3	The future land use map for the city of Sugar Hill shows the site's area to be "Mixed-Use Commercial/Office". Under Sugar Hill's Zoning Ordinance, Church is an allowable use for this zoning.
B. Is the development consistent with the local government's transportation plans? • 3 points: Yes	✗	3	The Gwinnett County Comprehensive Transportation Plan serves as the official document for transportation planning in the region and is adopted by Sugar Hill. There are no planned transportation projects fronting the North Point Community Church site, and the proposed development is not expected to greatly impact the road network in this area.
C. Is the development consistent with any local government sub area plans? • 3 points: Yes	✗	3	This project is located in Sub Area 7 of Gwinnett County's Comprehensive Plan, and does not appear to conflict with the improvements and plans listed there.
D. Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map? • 3 points: Yes	✗	3	
E. Do local regulations impact the ability of the project to meet GRTA's DRI Review Criteria?	✗	N/A	
F. Is the development consistent with other regional and/or local policies/adopted plans that have not been fully addressed?	N/A	N/A	N/A
Possible Score (Standard is 42)	N/A	36	
Components Score	N/A	33	
Percentage	N/A	92%	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
1. Mixture of Uses			
<p>A. Does the development incorporate a mixture of complementary land uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: There are 3 or more complementary uses within the development. • 2 points: There are 2 complementary uses within the development and is located within a short walking distance (less than 1/2 mile) to external complimentary land uses. • 1 points: The development is located within a short walking distance (less than 1/2 mile) to external complementary land uses. 	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>B. Does the development have vertically mixed uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development contains three or more vertically mixed uses. • 2 point: The development contains two or more vertically mixed uses. 	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>C. The development contains or is in close proximity to active or passive greenspace?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development contains both an active and passive greenspace. • 2 points: The development is adjacent to active or passive greenspace with connections. • 1 point: The development is within 1/2 mile of an active or passive greenspace. 	N/A	2	The development contains passive greenspace and consists of approximately 40% open space.
2. Jobs to Housing Balance			
<p>Is the development located in close proximity to a metro job center (as defined and listed in the Guidebook)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/2 mile of a defined metro job center. • 2 points: Yes, the development is located within 1 mile of a defined metro job center. 	N/A	0	The development is located within 1.5 miles of the Sugar Hill "Town Center" and within 4 miles of the Mall of Georgia "Regional Center".
3. Housing Diversity and Affordability			
<p>A. For developments with a residential component, are at least 10% of the residential units of differing housing type? (See guidebook for definition of housing types).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes. 	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>B. For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediate (1/4 mile) surrounding neighborhood?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes. 	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>C. For developments with a multifamily rental component, does the development achieve certain affordability levels?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: At least 30% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income. • 2 points: At least 20% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income. • 1 points: At least 10% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income. 	N/A	N/A	N/A

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
D. For developments with a multifamily senior rental component, does the seniors component achieve certain affordability levels? • 3 points: 100% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income. • 2 points: 60% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income. • 1 point: 40% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income.	N/A	N/A	N/A
E. For developments with a homeownership component, does the development achieve certain affordability levels? • 3 points: At least 20% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income. • 2 points: At least 10% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income. • 1 point: At least 5% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income.	N/A	N/A	N/A
F. For developments without a residential component, does the development add a new use that is not prevalent in the immediate (1/4 mile) surrounding neighborhood? • 3 points: Yes.	N/A	3	
4. Aging in Place			
F. If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include accessibility features and location to services and transportation alternatives? • 3 points: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures and is located within 1/4 mile of basic services and transportation alternatives. • 2 points: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures and is located within 1/2 mile of basic services and transportation alternatives. • 1 point: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures.	N/A	N/A	N/A
A. For developments with multifamily senior rental component, does the development offer services and/or facilities to accommodate aging in place (see Guidebook for more details). • 3 points: Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
5. Accessibility - Non-motorized			
A. Are there sidewalks within the development? • 3 points: There are sidewalks on both sides of all streets. • 2 points: There are sidewalks on both sides of all internal collector streets and one side on all other streets . • 1 point: There are sidewalks on one side of all streets.	✗	1	There are sidewalks on both sides or at least one side of all internal collector streets and one side on all other streets
B. Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network? • 3 points: Yes	✗	3	Yes. There are existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network.
C. Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential, multi-family buildings and other key destinations? • 3 points: Yes and includes 'end of trip' facilities such as covered shelters, secure parking, shower facilities, etc. • 2 points: Yes.	✗	0	No. Bicycle parking is not available on site.
D. Does the development include construction of multi-use trails? • 3 points: Trails will be constructed at least 10 feet wide within the development that will shorten walking distances between complimentary uses and/or the external sidewalk/trail network. • 2 points: Trails at least 10 feet wide are constructed within the DRI boundary only.	✗	N/A	No.
E. Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and pedestrian actuation devices? • 3 points: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include all of the above listed. • 2 points: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include 3 of the above listed. • 1 point: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include 2 of the above listed.	✗	1	Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include at least 2 of the above listed. Marked crossings are provided at the access points and internal network. Median refuges are provided at the driveway access points.
F. Are pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network provided? • 3 points: All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network and pedestrian entrances are provided at street level along abutting public roads. • 2 points: All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network.	✗	2	All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network.
G. Do the provided non-motorized facilities shorten the distance between land uses that are on and off-site? • 3 points: Yes, both on and off site. • 2 points: Yes, for on site land uses only.	✗	N/A	N/A - The church proposes only one building for the site, so pedestrian networks would not be able to shorten distances b/t on-site uses.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
H. Does the development contribute to public streetscapes with pedestrian-friendly amenities, such as benches, lighting, street trees, trash cans, pedestrian entrance on street level, and windows at street level? • 3 points: Yes.	✗	1	The development proposes pedestrian-friendly facilities such as trash cans, entrance at street level, windows at street level, benches, and lighting. The developer should reconsider the parking and building placement.
I. Is the development's parking located where it does not visually dominate the development from the street and allows for easy and safe pedestrian access to buildings? • 3 points: Parking associated with the development is located in the rear and or includes structured parking. • 2 points: Parking associated with the development is located to the side of the buildings and/or includes on-street parking. • 1 points: If industrial, all trailer parking is screened from the view of the adjacent roadways.	✗	0	A majority of the parking is located in large lots between the building and the street and is not screened from view.
J. Are buildings oriented to existing or proposed public roads with minimum setbacks? • 3 points: Yes, buildings are oriented to the public roads with minimum setbacks. • 2 points: Yes, buildings are oriented to the public roads.	✗	1	The building is somewhat oriented toward the road, but is setback deep into the site.
K. Where there are sidewalks, is the width adequate? • 3 points: All sidewalks meet regional Pedestrian LOS goals. • 2 points: All sidewalks meet the local government's minimum width requirement.	N/A	3	All sidewalks meet regional Pedestrian LOS goals.
6. Accessibility - Transit			
A. Is there a fixed guideway transit station available ? • 3 points: Currently available within 1/4 mile of the DRI boundary. • 2 points: Currently available within 1/2 mile of the DRI boundary. • 1 point: There is a transit station planned near the DRI and the DRI is compatible with that plan.	✗	N/A	No fixed guideway transit station is available or planned in this area.
B. Is local bus service currently available? • 3 points: Available on/adjacent to the site. • 2 points: Available within 1/4 mile of the DRI boundary. • 1 point: Available within 1/2 mile of the DRI boundary.	✗	N/A	Transit is not available in this area.
C. Is the applicant providing transit services such as dedicated park and ride facility or shuttle service (for at least 2 years)? • 3 points: Yes, the development is providing facilities.	✗	N/A	Transit is not available in this area.
D. Is the applicant providing amenities at existing or proposed transit facilities, such as covered bus shelters, trash receptacles, benches, landing pads, lighting, or bicycle parking? • 3 points: Providing three or more amenities. • 2 points: Providing two or more amenities. • 1 point: Providing one amenity	✗	N/A	Transit is not available in this area.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
E. Is the development proposed at "transit ready" densities, based on potential future service? • 3 points: Yes	✕	N/A	
F. For developments earning at least 1 point under Affordability Levels, is the development located in proximity to transit? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/4 mile to transit. • 2 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/2 mile to transit. • 1 point: Yes, the development is located within 1 mile to transit.	N/A	N/A	
G. Is transit available beyond peak-hours of travel?	✕	N/A	Transit is not available in this area.
H. Is the proposed development consistent with other transit related issues not fully addressed above?		N/A	(List of other transit related issues and describe developments consistency)
7. Access Management			
A. Is access provided from internal roadways, access road, or shared driveways only? • 3 points: Access is provided from internal roadways or access road connecting to side streets with minimum curb cuts along the arterial road and share driveways are proposed. • 2 points: Shared driveways are proposed with an internal roadway.	✕	0	The development proposes two full access points on Peachtree Industrial Blvd and one full access driveway on Level Creek Road.
B. If the development is adjacent to more than one roadway, is access provided via the lowest functionally classified roadway? • 3 points: The development proposes all access via the lowest functionally classified roadway. • 2 points: The development proposes primary access from the lowest functionally classified roadway.	✕	0	The development is adjacent to more than one roadway but is providing to full access driveways onto Peachtree Industrial Blvd. The developer should consider having one full access driveway and one right-in/right-out driveway on Peachtree Industrial Blvd
C. Do access points align with opposing access points or with existing median, planned, or likely location of future median breaks? • 3 points: All access points align with existing median breaks. If no median exists, all access points align with existing opposing access points. • 2 points: All full access points align with existing median breaks. If no median breaks exists, all full access points align with existing opposing access points. • 1 point: Access points align with likely locations of future median breaks.	✕	0	The development is slightly relocating (50-60') and utilizing one existing median break on Peachtree Industrial Blvd and is proposing an additional median break. There is no existing median at the driveway location of Level Creek Road.
D. Are proposed traffic signals located at the intersection of public roadways that provide access to the entire site and serve as many properties and interests as possible? • 3 points: Yes.	✕	1	The property does not currently warrant a traffic signal, and weekday traffic generated by the site will be minimal; however, the development will provide police to direct traffic during peak periods on Sunday.
E. Does the proposed development provide an adequate, uninterrupted driveway throat length for the corridor? • 3 points: Yes.	✕	3	Yes.
F. Are all proposed access points outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections? • 3 points: All proposed access points are outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections. • 2 points: Access points within the functional area of any adjacent intersections are right in/right out.	N/A	0	ARC has concerns about the spacing of the two proposed driveways and median breaks.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
G. If the development is adjacent to a designated scenic byway, the development maintains the natural vegetative character of the scenic byway. • 3 points: The development is not proposing any access onto the scenic byway and is preserving the natural vegetation for at least 200 feet from the right-of-way. • 2 points: The development is proposing no more than one access point onto the scenic byway and is preserving the natural vegetation for at least 200 feet from the right-of-way. • 1 point: The development is proposing no more than one access point onto the scenic byway and is preserving the natural vegetation for at least 100 feet from the right-of-way.	N/A	N/A	
H. Do the proposed access points meet minimum spacing requirements established by GDOT or other permitting agency?	✗	1	Applicant working with County on this matter
I. Is the development consistent with other access management related issues not fully addressed above?	N/A	N/A	N/A
8. Connectivity			
A. Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple roadways? • 3 points: There are separate ingress/egress points in 3 or more cardinal directions. • 2 points: There are separate ingress/egress points in 2 cardinal directions. • 1 point: There are separate ingress/egress points.	✗	2	There are separate ingress/egress points in 2 cardinal directions.
B. Do internal streets within the development connect to adjacent parcels at stub outs or dead end streets? • 3 points: There are connections to all adjacent stub outs or dead ends. • 2 points: There are stub outs to adjacent developable land (either undeveloped or underdeveloped) and cross access easements are provided. • 1 point: There are stub outs to adjacent developable land (either undeveloped or underdeveloped).	✗	0	There are no stub-outs or interparcel access proposed for this development.
C. Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation throughout the site? • 3 points: All proposed land uses within the development are connected via the internal street network. • 2 points: Most of the proposed land uses within the development are connected via the internal street network.	✗	3	All proposed land uses within the development are connected via the internal street network.
D. Can the internal street network be reasonably anticipated to add to the public roadway? • 3 points: No restricted access • 2 points: Internal restricted access with multiple access points	✗	0	The two access points on Peachtree Industrial Blvd will remain open. The access point on Level Creek Road may be gated during non-peak hours for the church.
E. Is the development consistent with other connectivity related issues not fully addressed above? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
9. Project Character and Design			
<p>A. Is the development a redevelopment site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development is a redevelopment site that requires environmental remediation. • 2 points: The development is located in a tax abatement zone, enterprise zone, or other governmentally supported redevelopment zones. • 1 point: The development is a redevelopment site. 	N/A	N/A	No.
<p>B. Does the development re-use or rehabilitates existing and/or historic structures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, a majority of the existing and/or historic structures will remain on the site and incorporated into the development. • 2 points: Yes, some of the existing and/or historic structures will remain on the site and incorporated into the development. 	N/A	N/A	N/A - There are no historic structures on site.
<p>C. Does the development create or enhance community spaces such as public plazas, squares, parks, etc?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes and on-site community spaces are open to the general public. • 2 points: Yes. 	N/A	1	The site plan shows a large open space located in the front of the church.
<p>D. Does the development provide no more parking than the minimum required by the local jurisdiction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: A parking variance is being requested to provide less than the minimum required. • 2 points: Yes. 	N/A	0	No. The site plan has proposed 2,435 spaces. Sugar Hill requires 1 space per 4 seats or 750 total spaces. The difference between what is required and what is proposed should be reduced. discrepancy should be The developer should reduce the amount of parking spaces dramatically in order to avoid having large fields of impervious parking that is unused, especially when the building is not at full capacity during the weekdays.
<p>E. Does the site design incorporate alternative design principles, including but not limited to reduced lot sizes, rear access via alleyway network, shared driveway, reduced building setbacks, architectural compatibility, screening of equipment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, the development includes a 4 of the above listed and other alternative design principles. • 2 points: Yes, the development includes 3 of the above listed. • 1 point: Yes, the development includes 2 of the above listed. 	N/A	0	The development includes screening of equipment. However the building can be brought closer to the street and the parking can be reduced and screened the from view.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
10. Community Facilities			
A. Does the development require new and/or additional services and/or facilities (fire, police, school)? • 3 points: No, new facilities are not needed. • 2 points: New facilities are needed and are being provided for within the development or by the applicant.	N/A	3	New facilities are not needed.
11. Infrastructure Adequacy			
A. Is the development located in an area where adequate infrastructure is in place? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located in an area where there is existing infrastructure in place to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development. • 2 points: There will be infrastructure in place by development build-out to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development.	N/A	3	Yes, the development is located in an area where there is existing infrastructure in place to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development such as sidewalks, water, sewer, etc. Traffic during weekday peak hours is anticipated to be negligible.
B. If the development is predominately industrial, what is the proximity to the nearest intermodal station or other freight transfer location? • 3 points: Rail is on site and the development is connecting to the rail. • 2 points: A rail transfer, airport transfer or intermodal transfer station is located within 2 miles. • 1 point: A rail transfer, airport transfer or intermodal transfer station is located within 3 miles.	N/A	N/A	N/A
C. If the development is predominately industrial, what is the proximity to interstate access? • 3 points: The development has interstate access within 1 mile. • 2 points: The development has interstate access within 2 miles. • 1 points: The development has interstate access within 3 miles.	N/A	N/A	N/A
D. Does the development propose clean-fueled vehicles? • 3 points: Development is proposing 5% per each 10% of fleet. • 2 points: Development is proposing 3% per each 10% of fleet. • 1 point: Development is proposing 2% per each 10% of fleet.	N/A	N/A	N/A
E. Is the development consistent with other infrastructure related issues not fully addressed above? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	N/A	(List of other infrastructure related issues and describe developments consistency)
Possible Score	N/A	84	
Component Score	N/A	34	
Percentage	N/A	40%	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
C. Open Space and Preservation/ Environmental Quality			
1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas			
A. Does the development avoid critical historical and environmental areas (State Planning Part V Criteria, small water supply watersheds, etc)? • 3 points: Yes, the development avoids critical historical and environmental areas	N/A	3	Yes, the development avoids critical areas.
B. Does the development encroach upon habitat currently under or flagged for conservation under a local, regional, state conservation or green infrastructure plan? • 3 points: No.	N/A	3	No.
C. Is the development located on land physically suitable for development (avoids steep slopes greater than 20%, floodplains, stream corridors, groundwater recharge areas or wetlands) ? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located on land physically suitable for development. • 2 points: The development is avoiding land on the site that is not suitable for development and is taking the appropriate mitigation measures.	N/A	2	The development is avoiding land on the site that is not suitable for development and is taking the appropriate mitigation measures.
2. Conservation			
A. How much land is being preserved as open space? • 3 points: 50% of the site is preserved as open space • 2 points: 40% of the site is preserved as open space • 1 points: 30% of the site is preserved as open space.	N/A	2	40% of the site is preserved as open space.
B. Does/will the development incorporate native plant and drought tolerant landscaping? • 3 points: All landscaping is drought tolerant and native. • 2 points: All landscaping is drought tolerant. • 2 points: No invasive plant species are used as identified by the local Cooperative Extension Service.	N/A	1	Landscaping within surface stormwater detention areas will be draught tolerant native plant life. Some of the landscaping in other areas of the site will also be such, but the extent of these areas is unknown at this time.
D. Does the development exclude ornamental water features and fountains? • 3 points: The applicant will not install or facilitate installations of any ornamental water features or fountains.	N/A	3	The applicant will not install or facilitate installations of any ornamental water features or fountains.
E. Does the development include permeable pavement in driveways and parking areas? • 3 points: 75% of driveways and parking areas use permeable pavement. • 2 points: 50% of driveways and parking areas use permeable pavement. • 1 point: All driveways use permeable pavement.	N/A	0	No. Due to the excessive amount of parking proposed, the developer should consider utilizing permeable pavement or other pervious material.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
C. Open Space and Preservation/ Environmental Quality			
3. Stormwater Management			
<p>A. Does the development have a stormwater management plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The stormwater management plan will result in a 25% decrease in the rate and quantity of post-development development stormwater runoff when compared with pre-development stormwater rates and quantities. • 2 points: The development maintains stormwater volume rates such that post-development development does not exceed the pre-development development (based on the 2 year, 24 hour peak discharge volume) 	N/A	2	Crystal Stream Technologies water quality units will be used in combination with two underground stormwater detention systems. The remaining seven stormwater facilities will be dry extended detention ponds, including water quality treatment. All nine detention facilities will reduce developed peak flow rates to at-or-below pre-developed rates for one to 100 year storms and detain the 1 year, 24-hour storm runoff for 24-hours.
4. Buffers			
<p>A. Will the proposed development require a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development does not require a stream buffer variance. 	N/A	3	The city is not requiring a variance to their ordinance or from the EPD based on EPD guidance regarding road crossing and exemptions.
5. Environmental Protection			
<p>C. Is the development seeking a LEED certification?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development is seeking LEED-ND certification or all buildings are seeking LEED certification for non residential developments. • 2 points: At least half of the non-residential buildings are seeking LEED certification. • 1 point: One non residential buildings is seeking LEED certification. 	N/A	N/A	
<p>D. Is the development seeking an EarthCraft certification?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development is seeking Earthcraft Communities certification. • 2 points: At least half the residential homes will be certified an Earthcraft Home. 	N/A	N/A	
Possible Score	N/A	27	
Component Score	N/A	19	
Percentage	N/A	70%	

ARC Score Sheet

Enter the values for the appropriate numbered section.

A. Regional Development Plans and Policies (50% of the Total Score)

1. Unified Growth Policy Map	Section Score:	6
2. Metro North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) Plan Compliance	Section Score:	9
3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Transportation	Section Score:	0
4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	Section Score:	3
5. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)	Section Score:	0
6. Regionally Adopted Plans	Section Score:	3
7. Locally Adopted Plans	Section Score:	12
	A. Component Points:	33
	B. Points Possible Points:	36
	C. Component Percentage	92%

B. Project (30% of the Total Score)

1. Mixture of Uses	Section Score:	2
2. Jobs to Housing Balance	Section Score:	0
4. Housing Diversity and Affordability	Section Score:	3
5. Aging in Place	Section Score:	0
6. Accessibility-non motorized	Section Score:	12
7. Accessibility- transit	Section Score:	0
8. Access Management	Section Score:	4
9. Connectivity	Section Score:	5
10. Project Character and Design	Section Score:	1
11. Community Facilities	Section Score:	3
12. Infrastructure Adequacy	Section Score:	3
	A. Component Points:	34
	B. Points Possible Points:	84
	C. Component Percentage	40%

C. Open Space and Preservation/Environmental Quality (20% of the Total Score)

1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas	Section Score:	8
2. Conservation	Section Score:	6
3. Stormwater Management	Section Score:	2
4. Buffers	Section Score:	3
5. Environmental Protection	Section Score:	0
	A. Component Points:	19
	B. Points Possible Points:	27
	C. Component Percentage	70%

A. Total Points:	86
B. Total Possible Points:	147
C. Unweighted Score	58.5%

**Overall Project
Score**

72%

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
E. Expedited Review Criteria Only			
1. Limited Trip Generation (pick one)			
A. Is the proposed development project to generate no more than one thousand (1,000) gross daily trips?	✗	N/A	No.
B. Is the proposed development projected to generate more than one thousand (1,000) but no more than three thousand (3,000) gross daily trips?	✗	N/A	Yes.
C. Is the proposed development projected to generate fewer than one hundred (100) gross PM peak hour weekday trips?	✗	N/A	Yes.
2. Mixed Uses			
A. Does the proposed development contain two or more complementary, interconnected, and interdependent land uses?	✗	N/A	No.
B. Due to the interconnected, mixed-use nature of the development, is a twenty percent (20%) reduction in trip generation between dissimilar land uses reasonably anticipated?	✗	N/A	No.
C. Is the site designed so as to support the trip reductions taken and to maximize the likelihood of the use of on-site alternative modes of transportation by residents, employees, and visitors to the DRI?	✗	N/A	No transit is available in the area.
D. Are all of the land uses within the proposed development accessible by vehicles and pedestrians, with no single use restricting access to, from, or within the site?	✗	N/A	Yes.
3. Area of Influence			
A. Is the proposed development located within an area designated in the Regional Development Plan (RDP) and the Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), or its successor, as being located within the Central City, a Regional Center, a Mega Corridor, or an Urban Redevelopment Corridor?	✗	N/A	No.
B. Is the proposed development consistent with the RDP and UGPM in both density and proposed development type(s)?	✗	N/A	Yes.
C. Are at least sixty-five percent (65%) of the single occupant automobile trips generated by the proposed development reasonably anticipated to have a trip bound by a three mile radius or less?	✗	N/A	No.
3. Alternative Modes of Transportation			
A. Are at least twenty-five (25%) of the trips generated by the proposed development likely to be by way of modes of transportation other than the single occupant vehicle?	✗	N/A	No.
OR:		N/A	
A. Is the proposed development located within an area which has been designated by GRTA as a Transit Enable Area (TEA) and is consistent with any land use parameters established by GRTA as a part of designation of the area as a TEA?	✗	N/A	No.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Is the development majority or wholly (50.1% to 100%) within a designated TEA; and,	✗	N/A	No.
C. Does the project meet or exceed the residential and/or employment densities established by the RDP and UGPM, or its successor; and,	✗	N/A	N/A - The proposed development is a church.
D. Is the project consistent with regionally adopted transportation plans; and,	✗	N/A	Yes. The Gwinnett County Comprehensive Transportation Plan serves as the official document for transportation planning in the region and is adopted by Sugar Hill. There are no planned transportation projects fronting the North Point Community Church site, and the proposed development is not expected to greatly impact the road network in this area.
E. Are proposed land uses limited to residential, commercial, office, hospitals or health care facilities, hotels, and post secondary schools; and,	✗	N/A	N/A - The proposed development is a church.
F. Does the development contribute to an improvement in the Jobs to Housing Balance; and,	✗	N/A	N/A - The proposed development is a church.
G. Is the development pedestrian oriented so that the movement of pedestrians is not restricted and access to transit facilities is convenient and logical in placement so as to maximize transit ridership to and from the site; and,	✗	N/A	N/A - The development provides dequate pedestrian facilities on site, but there is no transit available in this area.
H. If the development is primarily residential in nature, does it provide at least ten percent (10%) of the residential units as workforce housing, defined here as affordable to households earning seventy-five percent (75% of the region's median income; and,	✗	N/A	N/A
I. Is the majority of parking provided within structures and is parking limited by providing no more than the minimum required by the local jurisdiction; and,	✗	N/A	No.
J. Does the development conform to existing street block patterns or introduce new public roadways/pedestrian paths to create block patterns or shorten block lengths; and,	✗	N/A	No.
K. Is at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the street frontage occupied by active street level uses?	✗	N/A	The majority of the street frontage on the site is anticipated for parking use.
3. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)			
A. Is the proposed development located within an area approved for inclusion within the LCI program by the ARC?	✗	N/A	No.
B. Is the development consistent with the policies, design elements, and overall standards established by the LCI study and any subsequently funded Supplemental Study(s)?	✗	N/A	N/A
C. Has the affected local government completed and adopted the initial LCI Study within their adopted Comprehensive Plan?	✗	N/A	N/A
D. Has the local government shown efforts towards implementation of the adopted study?	✗	N/A	N/A
E. Do the staffs of the local government(s), ARC, and GRTA agree upon the eligibility of the proposed DRI for this type of Expedited Review?	✗	N/A	Yes.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Jon Tuley, Land Use Division

FROM: Lyubov Zuyeva, Transportation Planning Division

DATE: April 6, 2010

SUBJECT: **TPD Review of DRI # 2109**

Project: North Point Community Church at Sugar Hill

County: Gwinnett

Location: On Peachtree Industrial Boulevard, just south of intersection with Commerce Parkway NE.

Analysis:

Expedited

☒

Non-Expedited

☐

cc: David Haynes
TPD

The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the site plan prepared by Travis Pruitt & Associates, Inc. on behalf of North Point Ministries, for the proposed North Point Community Church at Sugar Hill.

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Expedited Review Process, based on expected DRI-generated trips of more than 1,000 but no more than 3,000 gross daily trips. The church site consists of 50.6 acres, on which 2,400 parking spaces and two buildings (175,000 square feet and 3,200 square feet) would be constructed.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation

How many site access points will be associated with the proposed development? What are their locations?

Site access is intended to be provided via two driveways off Peachtree Industrial Boulevard, northeast of intersection with North Price Road, and southwest of intersection with Commerce Parkway NE. Peachtree Industrial Boulevard is a median divided highway and has a grassy, landscaped median along the proposed site. One median break is currently in place, and a second median break is proposed, to be aligned with the two proposed driveways. The resulting

spacing between the two median breaks will be 638 feet. Georgia DOT Driveway Manual designates a minimum median crossover distance of 1320 feet, and a preferred distance of 2640 feet, on rural median-divided state highways (GDOT Driveway Manual, p. 33). It appears that the proposed median spacing violate the GDOT minimum since Peachtree Industrial Boulevard is a state highway.

Access Management principles, as well as the draft version of Model Access Management Ordinance that the ARC is considering adopting as part of ASTRoMaP study, indicate that on rural median-divided highways, a spacing of 1320-2640 is preferred, even when such a highway does not have state highway designation.

The ARC Transportation Planning staff would advise that only one of the driveways be allowed a median opening, with the other driveway operating as a right-in, right-out driveway only. This would minimize the traffic conflicts imposed by the DRI, and protect the mobility along Peachtree Industrial Boulevard. Due to potential future median opening at the intersection with Commerce Parkway (currently lacking a median opening; a right-in, right-out intersection), it would be advisable to retain the median opening furthest away from Commerce Parkway (already existing), and to eliminate from the plans the median opening nearest to Commerce Parkway.

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

(Detailed analysis not provided; between 1000-3000 daily trips, likely occurring primarily on Sunday, outside of peak hours, due to church schedule)

List the transportation improvements that would affect or be affected by the proposed project.

None known

Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for the DRI.

New deceleration lanes for the two proposed driveways; a u-turn lane at the south-most (existing) median opening; a left-turn lane at the south-most (existing) median opening; and a left-turn lane at the north-most (proposed) median opening

Is the site served by transit? If so, describe type and level of service and how it will enhance or be enhanced by the presence of transit? Are there plans to provide or expand transit service in the vicinity of the proposed project?

The immediate vicinity of the site area is not serviced by local transit.

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

None proposed.

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

The following roadway improvements should be built, as proposed:

- Build deceleration lanes as proposed for the two driveways
- Build left-turn lane and u-turn lane as proposed at the south-most (existing) median opening

ARC makes the following additional recommendations for the proposed development consistent with adopted local and regional plans:

- Allow two driveways, but only one median opening (retaining the existing median opening), such that the north-most driveway would operate as a right-in, right-out driveway
- Consider the throat length for the north-most driveway: the length should be at least 200 feet, prior to allowing right or left turns into the parking lot. From the site plan, the distance appears right at 200 feet or slightly shorter. If the distance is shorter, amend the plan to allow sufficient throat length.
- Connection to current and future surrounding developments:
 - The development, as proposed, provides no connectivity between the residential neighborhood to the north of the site (The Glen at Level Creek) and the church parking lot. The developer is encouraged to approach residents whose properties abut the proposed northwestern “arm” of the parking lot, to see if a location for a walk-through easement could be identified. This would allow walking access the church parking lot from the residential development, and could be of particular advantage to the senior members of the neighborhood who might prefer to take a leisurely stroll to church over driving on Sunday mornings. Such a walking connection would be in direct support of ARC Lifelong Communities principles. Unless the neighborhood residents are openly hostile to the idea of a walking connection, a sidewalk stub-out from the church parking lot to the residential property line should be provided, at a location which is logical based on topography, and does not present naturally-existing barriers to walking.

NORTH POINT COMMUNITY CHURCH SUGAR HILL DRI
City of Sugar Hill
Environmental Planning Division Review Comments
April 6, 2010

Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection

The project property is within the Chattahoochee River Corridor watershed, but it is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor. The Chattahoochee Basin upstream of Peachtree Creek is also a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles). Under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act, the only requirements in a large water supply watershed without a water supply reservoir are restrictions on hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal within seven miles upstream of an intake.

A stream is shown running across the southwestern corner of the property. The submitted plans show both the State Sediment and Erosion Control 25-foot buffer and the City's 50-foot stream buffer (which overlaps the state buffer) and its additional 25-foot impervious setback. The USGS coverage for the project area shows a blue line tributary to Level Creek near the southeastern corner of the property. If any portion of the stream or its buffer area extends onto the project property, those buffers will need to be shown.

Any additional state waters on the property will be subject to the State Erosion and Sedimentation Act 25-foot stream buffer, which is administered by the Environmental Protection Division of Georgia DNR.

Stormwater/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 that will be produced after construction of the proposed development. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr) from typical land uses in the Atlanta Region. The loading factors are based on the results of regional stormwater monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. Because there are no estimates for institutional uses, office/light industrial was used for this project. Actual pollutant loadings will depend on the actual impervious coverage developed on the property and may differ from the figures shown. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants per Year

Land Use	Land Area (ac)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Office/Light Industrial	50.60	65.27	866.78	5768.40	35824.80	74.89	9.61
TOTAL	50.60	65.27	866.78	5768.40	35824.80	74.89	9.61

Total impervious: 70%

There is the potential for major impacts on project area streams from mass clearing and grading and increased impervious surface without proper stormwater management planning. A stormwater plan needs to be developed fully addressing how stormwater impacts will be controlled, including water quality, downstream channel protection and attenuation of peak flows to prevent downstream flooding. 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.

Jonathan Tuley

From: Cook, Brent [bcook@dot.ga.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 4:49 PM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Cautela, Daphne
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Jon – just wanted to let you know that portion of PIB is a County Road. However, we have reviewed this request because of the proximity of the proposed median break to the potential ramp operation for the Gwinnett County Cross County Connector project proposed to use the old Outer Perimeter ROW. We will have to work with them on an encroachment permit for a decel lane into the northernmost drive. The decel lane will extend into the Outer Perimeter Limited Access ROW.

I don't believe there will be serious conflicts with the future operation of the Cross County Connector ramps as the church's hours are way different than peak hours. I do have concerns that a future traffic signal could be installed at the northern median break. That would be too close to the ramps and could cause operational problems. The church development may not cause this, but if the property across from the church were to develop, then I am sure a signal request would be made.

All that being said, I would recommend that the spacing requirement in the GDOT Driveway manual be followed. If a variance is requested, then a justification should be provided.

Hope this helps.

Brent E. Cook, P.E.
District Traffic Engineer
770-532-5563
770-532-5581 (fax)



PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION:

The information transmitted may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action based on the contents is strictly prohibited. If you received this information in error, please notify the sender immediately and discard the information.

From: Lobdell, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 1:01 PM
To: Cook, Brent
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Mike Lobdell, P.E.
(770) 986-1257
mlobdell@dot.ga.gov

Please note my email has changed.

From: Jonathan Tuley [mailto:JTuley@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 11:50 AM
To: Cautela, Daphne; Lobdell, Mike
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

I just wanted to make sure you got this DRI preliminary report (info below and report attached). There are some Peachtree Industrial Blvd access issues that we would like you all to take a look at and if possible provide comments.

Let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,
Jon

From: Jonathan Tuley
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 5:16 PM
To: 'Allen Barnes (allen.barnes@dnr.state.ga.us)'; 'mfowler@dot.ga.gov'; 'angela.alexander@dot.state.ga.us'; 'alware@dot.ga.gov'; 'michawilliams@dot.ga.gov'; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; 'lbeall@grta.org'; 'Mike.Lobdell@dot.state.ga.us'; 'Julie McQueen'; 'wstinson@itsmarta.com'; 'Hlkwt@itsmarta.com'; 'jmaximuk@livablecommunitiescoalition.org'; 'dlewis@ajc.com'; 'kawana@cityofsugarhill.com'; 'john.tuminello@northpoint.org'; 'Jeffrey.West@gwinnettcounty.com'; 'gwinnettplanning@gmail.com'; 'campbell@suwanee.com'; 'mdickison@suwanee.com'; 'dcautela@dot.ga.gov'
Cc: Landuse; Jim Santo; Jim Skinner; Lyubov Zuyeva; Sammie Carson
Subject: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Development of Regional Impact Request for Comments

This E-Mail serves as notice that the ARC staff has begun the review for DRI #2109, North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill.

We request that you or a member of your staff review the attached preliminary report and provide comments to ARC by Tuesday, April 20, 2010.

North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill: Proposed Church building on the west side of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard, northwest of the intersection of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and W. Price Road / N. Price Road in Sugar Hill, Georgia. The development is proposed to consist of a 175,000 s.f. church building with 3,000 seats as well as 2,435 parking spaces on a 50.6 acre site.

Preliminary Report: April 6, 2010

Comments Due: April 20, 2010

Final Report: May 6, 2010

For more information regarding the DRI processes, information needed for the review or other DRI's reviewed by ARC, please see the [DRI website](#).

Please call Jon Tuley at (404-463-3309) if you have any questions about the review.

Jon Tuley
Senior Planner
Atlanta Regional Commission
Land Use Planning Division
40 Courtland Street, NE

Atlanta, GA 30303
(P) 404-463-3309 (F) 404-463-3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com

Jonathan Tuley

From: Vince.Edwards@gwinnettcountry.com
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 8:32 AM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Jeffrey.West@gwinnettcountry.com; gwinnettplanning@gmail.com;
Brian.Allen@gwinnettcountry.com; David.Tucker@gwinnettcountry.com;
Lewis.Cooksey@gwinnettcountry.com
Subject: RE: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Jon:

The proposed development has been reviewed by Gwinnett DOT through our normal process. Staff comments can be summarized as:

- This section of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard is a County maintained roadway, not State Route 141 as described in ARC report.
- The ARC report refers to the roadway as a “rural median-divided state highway.” Peachtree Industrial Boulevard is classified as an Urban Principal Arterial by the Georgia Department of Transportation (Source: GDOT Highway Functional Classification System Map) and Peachtree Industrial Boulevard is classified as a Principal Arterial by Gwinnett County (Source: Gwinnett County Long Range Road Classification Map, Rev. February 25, 2003).
- Minimum recommended spacing for median crossovers on urban roadways is 1000 feet. Gwinnett County DOT recommends approving a variance that would allow a minimum 660 feet spacing for this development.
- Proposed development is at or near the terminus of the proposed Sugarloaf Parkway Extension, Phase 3 (GW-308C, PI# 0006925). The minimum spacing takes into account the ramps built in conjunction with that project.
- Entrances must be shifted at least an additional 80' away from the terminus of the proposed Sugarloaf Parkway Extension, Phase 3.
- Correct turn lane dimensions on drawings showing appropriate lengths.
- Guard rail removal and replacement plan.
- 5ft. sidewalk required on all frontage roads.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Vince

Vincent Edwards, AICP | Traffic Engineering & Planning | Gwinnett County Dept. of Transportation | 770.822.7452 |
Vince.Edwards@gwinnettcountry.com

From: Jonathan Tuley [mailto:JTuley@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 4:04 PM
To: Edwards, Vince
Cc: West, Jeffrey F. (P&D); gwinnettplanning@gmail.com
Subject: RE: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

The review period for this DRI will close soon and I wanted to include the County's comments if you had any. See email below. I can send the preliminary report to you again if you need me to. Let me know.

Thanks,
Jon

From: Jonathan Tuley
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 5:11 PM
To: 'vince.edwards@gwinnettcountry.com'
Cc: 'Jeffrey.West@gwinnettcountry.com'; 'gwinnettplanning@gmail.com'
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Vince/Jeff,

I wanted to see if the county had any comments on the proposed access, parking, etc for this DRI (attached).

ARC has concerns over the spacing of the two median breaks, especially considering the potential development/redevelopment of the property across PIB. See GDOT's comments below. Since this is a county road and not a state route, we wanted to get your input.

Let me know.

Thanks,

Jon Tuley
Senior Planner
Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30303
(P) 404.463.3309 (F) 404-463-3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com

Check out ARC's Land Matters Blog!
<http://landmatters.wordpress.com/>

From: Cook, Brent [mailto:bcook@dot.ga.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 4:49 PM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Cautela, Daphne
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Jon – just wanted to let you know that portion of PIB is a County Road. However, we have reviewed this request because of the proximity of the proposed median break to the potential ramp operation for the Gwinnett County Cross County Connector project proposed to use the old Outer Perimeter ROW. We will have to work with them on an encroachment permit for a decel lane into the northernmost drive. The decel lane will extend into the Outer Perimeter Limited Access ROW.

I don't believe there will be serious conflicts with the future operation of the Cross County Connector ramps as the church's hours are way different than peak hours. I do have concerns that a future traffic signal could be installed at the northern median break. That would be too close to the ramps and could cause operational problems. The church development may not cause this, but if the property across from the church were to develop, then I am sure a signal request would be made.

All that being said, I would recommend that the spacing requirement in the GDOT Driveway manual be followed. If a variance is requested, then a justification should be provided.

Hope this helps.

Brent E. Cook, P.E.
District Traffic Engineer
770-532-5563
770-532-5581 (fax)



PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION:

The information transmitted may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action based on the contents is strictly prohibited. If you received this information in error, please notify the sender immediately and discard the information.

From: Lobdell, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 1:01 PM
To: Cook, Brent
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Mike Lobdell, P.E.
(770) 986-1257
mlobdell@dot.ga.gov
Please note my email has changed.

From: Jonathan Tuley [mailto:JTuley@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 11:50 AM
To: Cautela, Daphne; Lobdell, Mike
Subject: FW: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

I just wanted to make sure you got this DRI preliminary report (info below and report attached). There are some Peachtree Industrial Blvd access issues that we would like you all to take a look at and if possible provide comments.

Let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks,
Jon

From: Jonathan Tuley
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 5:16 PM
To: 'Allen Barnes (allen.barnes@dnr.state.ga.us)'; 'mfowler@dot.ga.gov'; 'angela.alexander@dot.state.ga.us'; 'alware@dot.ga.gov'; 'michawilliams@dot.ga.gov'; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; 'lbeall@grta.org'; 'Mike.Lobdell@dot.state.ga.us'; 'Julie McQueen'; 'wstinson@itsmarta.com'; 'Hlkwt@itsmarta.com'; 'jmaximuk@livablecommunitiescoalition.org'; 'dlewis@ajc.com'; 'kawana@cityofsugarhill.com'; 'john.tuminello@northpoint.org'; 'Jeffrey.West@gwinnettcounty.com'; 'gwinnettplanning@gmail.com'; 'campbell@suwanee.com'; 'mdickison@suwanee.com'; 'dcautela@dot.ga.gov'
Cc: Landuse; Jim Santo; Jim Skinner; Lyubov Zuyeva; Sammie Carson
Subject: DRI Review Notification - North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill - DRI #2109

Development of Regional Impact Request for Comments

This E-Mail serves as notice that the ARC staff has begun the review for DRI #2109, North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill.

We request that you or a member of your staff review the attached preliminary report and provide comments to ARC by Tuesday, April 20, 2010.

North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill: Proposed Church building on the west side of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard, northwest of the intersection of Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and W. Price Road / N. Price Road in Sugar Hill, Georgia. The development is proposed to consist of a 175,000 s.f. church building with 3,000 seats as well as 2,435 parking spaces on a 50.6 acre site.

Preliminary Report: April 6, 2010

Comments Due: April 20, 2010

Final Report: May 6, 2010

For more information regarding the DRI processes, information needed for the review or other DRI's reviewed by ARC, please see the [DRI website](#).

Please call Jon Tuley at (404-463-3309) if you have any questions about the review.

Jon Tuley

Senior Planner

Atlanta Regional Commission

Land Use Planning Division

40 Courtland Street, NE

Atlanta, GA 30303

(P) 404-463-3309 (F) 404-463-3254

jtuley@atlantaregional.com



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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



DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Development Center for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient project of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is actually located, such as adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included on this form and give us your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to the RDC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: North Point Community Church – Sugar Hill *See the Preliminary Report.*

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Sugar Hill officials would like to see the third access drive entering Level Creek Rd gated except during weekend or special services.

Do we need such an excess of parking?

Potential to plan/develop for compatible mixed uses along PIB frontage.

Parking and/or site lighting should be avoided on tract 2.

In addition to standard light trespass restrictions most of the site lighting should only be lit during hours of use to avoid unnecessary glare/sky glow from vast parking areas when the site is not in use balancing security concerns with light pollution and energy issues.

Provision for inter-parcel access is a development standard in Sugar Hill.

Individual Completing Form: Kaipo Awana

Local Government: City of Sugar Hill

Department: Planning & Development

Telephone: (770) 945-6734, Ext. 318

Signature:

Date:

4/14/2010

Please Return this form to:

Jon Tuley, Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street NE
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph. (404) 463-3309 Fax (404) 463-3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com

Return Date: *Apr 20 2010*

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2109**

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.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government:	Sugar Hill
Individual completing form:	Kaipo Awana
Telephone:	7709456734
E-mail:	kawana@cityofsugarhill.com

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):	LL274 District 7 Parcel 004
Brief Description of Project:	Proposed church building and associated parking & maintenance facility on 50.6 acres.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale & Distribution | <input type="radio"/> Attractions & Recreational Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal Terminals |
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools | <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	175,000 S.f.; 2,435 Parking Spaces; 50.6 acre site
Developer:	North Point Ministries
Mailing Address:	4350 North Point Parkway
Address 2:	
	City:Alpharetta State: GA Zip:30022
Telephone:	6788925678
Email:	john.tuminello@northpoint.org
Is property owner different from developer/applicant?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, property owner:	Wendell M. Starke, Trustee
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?	Gwinnett County
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, provide the following information:	Project Name:
	Project ID:
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning <input type="checkbox"/> Variance <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input type="checkbox"/> Permit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Concept Plan
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 1/2013 Overall project:
Back to Top	

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2109**

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.	
<hr/>	
Local Government Information	
Submitting Local Government:	Sugar Hill
Individual completing form:	Kaipo Awana
Telephone:	7709456734
Email:	kawana@cityofsugarhill.com
<hr/>	
Project Information	
Name of Proposed Project:	North Point Community Church - Sugar Hill
DRI ID Number:	2109
Developer/Applicant:	North Point Ministries
Telephone:	6788925678
Email(s):	john.tuminello@northpoint.org
<hr/>	
Additional 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.)	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.	
<hr/>	
Economic Development	
Estimated Value at Build-Out:	Its a Church. 10-15 Mil. +/-
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	What Taxes? 0
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Will this development displace	

any existing uses?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc): One (1) 1,452 s.f. single-family dwelling (residence)	
Water Supply	
Name of water supply provider for this site:	Gwinnett County Public Utilities
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.002
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity: N/A	
Is a water line extension required to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? N/A	
Wastewater Disposal	
Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	F. Wayne Hill Water Resources Center - GCPW
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.002
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity: N/A	
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?N/A	
Land 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.)	WEEKDAY PEAK: Minimal SUNDAY PEAK: 876/876 Entering/Exiting
Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe below:This DRI has been recommended by GRTA and ARC staff for an expedited review due to limited trip generation, which under the RDC policies does not require a detailed traffic study. The preliminary DRI report demonstrates that the development will not generate significant traffic during the weekday and will generate no more than 3,000 gross daily trips during the Sunday peak hour. The development proposes the following access improvements: - 150'	

right turn lane on Level Creek Road at entrance - 150' left turn lane with 200' taper at each entrance on Peachtree Industrial Blvd - 150' u-turn lane with 200' taper at west entrance on Peachtree Industrial Blvd - 200' right turn lane at each entrance on Peachtree Industrial Blvd - New median Break and relocation of existing median break on Peachtree Industrial Blvd

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?

23

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity: N/A

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain: N/A

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?

60%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Crystal Stream Technologies water quality units will be used in combination with two underground stormwater detention systems. The remaining seven stormwater facilities will be dry extended detention ponds, including water quality treatment. All nine detention facilities will reduce developed peak flow rates to at-or-below pre-developed rates for one to 100 year storms and detain the 1 year, 24-hour storm runoff for 24-hours. The site will preserve 1.15 acres of undisturbed stream buffer.

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

1. Water supply watersheds?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. 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:

Natural stream will be piped for a length of 295 feet for a permanent road crossing to provide a required access point.

[Back to Top](#)

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	DESCRIPTION	BY
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				
61				
62				
63				
64				
65				
66				
67				
68				
69				
70				
71				
72				
73				
74				
75				
76				
77				
78				
79				
80				
81				
82				
83				
84				
85				
86				
87				
88				
89				
90				
91				
92				
93				
94				
95				
96				
97				
98				
99				
100				
101				
102				
103				
104				
105				
106				
107				
108				
109				
110				
111				
112				
113				
114				
115				
116				
117				
118				
119				
120				
121				
122				
123				
124				
125				
126				
127				
128				
129				
130				
131				
132				
133				
134				
135				
136				
137				
138				
139				
140				
141				
142				
143				
144				
145				
146				
147				
148				
149				
150				
151				
152				
153				
154				
155				
156				
157				
158				
159				
160				
161				
162				
163				
164				
165				
166				
167				
168				
169				
170				
171				
172				
173				
174				
175				
176				
177				
178				
179				
180				
181				
182				
183				
184				
185				
186				
187				
188				
189				
190				
191				
192				
193				
194				
195				
196				
197				
198				
199				
200				
201				
202				
203				
204				
205				
206				
207				
208				
209				
210				
211				
212				
213				
214				
215				
216				
217				
218				
219				
220				
221				
222				
223				
224				
225				
226				
227				
228				
229				
230				
231				
232				
233				
234				
235				
236				
237				
238				
239				
240				
241				
242				
243				
244				
245				
246				
247				
248				
249				
250				
251				
252				
253				
254				
255				
256				
257				
258				
259				
260				
261				
262				
263				
264				
265				
266				
267				
268				
269				
270				
271				
272				
273				
274				
275				
276				
277				
278				
279				
280				
281				
282				
283				
284				
285				
286				
287				
288				
289				
290				
291				
292				
293				
294				
295				
296				
297				
298				
299				
300				
301				
302				
303				
304				
305				
306				
307				
308				
309				
310				
311				
312				
313				
314				
315				
316				
317				
318				
319				
320				
321				
322				
323				
324				
325				
326				
327				
328				
329				
330				
331				
332				
333				
334				
335				
336				
337				
338				
339				
340				
341				
342				
343				
344				
345				
346				
347				
348				
349				
350				
351				
352				
353				
354				
355				
356				
357				
358				
359				
360				
361				
362				
363				
364				
365				
366				
367				
368				
369				
370				
371				
372				
373				
374				
375				
376				
377				
378				
379				
380				
381				
382				
383				
384				
385				
386				
387				
388				
389				
390				
391				
392				
393				
394				
395				
396				
397				
398				
399				
400				
401				
402				
403				
404				
405				
406				
407				
408				
409				
410				
411				
412				
413				
414				
415				
416				
417				
418				
419				
420				
421				
422				
423				
424				
425				
426				
427				
428				
429				
430				
431				
432				
433				
434				
435				
436				
437				
438				
439				
440				
441				
442				
443				
444				