



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: Oct 18 2012

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1209281

TO: Mayor Donnie Henrigues
ATTN TO: Richard McLeod, Director of Community Development
FROM: Douglas A. Hooker, Executive Director

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.

Name of Proposal: Watermarke Church
Submitting Local Government: City of Woodstock

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact
Date Opened: Sep 28 2012

Description: This project, located in the City of Woodstock, is a proposed church consisting of a 3,500 seat worship facility with 250,000 total square feet and 2,400 total parking spaces. This project is proposed to be located near the intersection of Ridgewalk Parkway and Ridge Trail, just off of Interstate 575.

DRI Checklist Summary:

Regional Consistency Assessment (50%): 100%
Local Impacts Assessment (30%): 100%
Quality Development Assessment (20%): 64%

Overall Weighted Score: 93%

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: Regional Context:

According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) and Regional Development Guide (RDG), the proposed Watermarke Church development is within an area designated as Developing Suburbs. The RDG states that Developing Suburbs are areas in the region where suburban development has occurred, and the conventional development pattern is present but not set.

These areas are characterized by limited commercial and residential development. These areas represent the extent of the urban service area, and the region's first attempts at suburban smart growth can be found in these areas. The region should strive to develop these areas in a more sustainable way than the existing development model. To this end, there is a need for additional preservation of critical environmental locations, as well as agricultural and forest uses adjacent to rural areas.

Limited existing infrastructure in these areas will constrain the amount of additional growth that is possible. Some transportation improvements may be needed within these developing suburbs, but care should be taken not to spur unwanted growth.

Observations:

The proposed Watermarke Church development includes several good site design characteristics including placing buildings close to the public street, multiple access points to the site, creation of an "urban blocks" within the site, and overflow parking areas employing pervious materials.

The applicant is proposing to provide more parking than is required by the City of Woodstock's zoning ordinance. The proposal will include 2,400 parking spaces while the City only requires 622 spaces.

Recommendations:

If the applicant is proposing to build more parking than required by local regulations, pervious materials should be used to limit the amount of storm water runoff from the parking areas. Additionally, since the entire parking area will only be used one or two days a week, the applicant should consider other uses for the parking area on those days that it will not be fully utilized. This may include allowing park-and-ride services or the City to use these facilities to prevent additional redundant parking from having to be created in the community.

See additional ARC staff comments which are attached

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING	ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH	ARC AGING DIVISION	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	CHEROKEE COUNTY
CITY OF HOLLY SPRINGS	COBB COUNTY	

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please contact Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3307 or jtuley@atlantaregional.com. This finding will be published to the ARC website.

The ARC review website is located at: <http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/planreviews>.



RCA



RCA



**ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW
PART 1: REGIONAL CONSISTENCY ASSESSMENT**

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	CITY OF WOODSTOCK	Date RCA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 10/16/2012
DRI #:	2301	RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Watermarke Church	
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Other	Action Triggering Review: Zoning

I. REGIONAL PLAN	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development consistent with the Regional Development Map and Defining Narrative?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is the development consistent with the Guiding Principles of the Regional Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
II. REGIONAL RESOURCE PLAN AND RIRs	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
If within one mile of any area on the RIR map, is the development consistent with the Guidance for Appropriate Development Practices in the Regional Resource Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
III. INTERJURISDICTIONAL IMPACTS	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development avoid or mitigate negative effect on public facilities (roads, stormwater / floodplain management, water quality, etc.) in neighboring jurisdictions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are neighboring jurisdictions aware of, and prepared to manage, impacts of the development on public facilities (roads, stormwater / floodplain management, water quality, etc.) in their jurisdictions?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are other affected jurisdictions, including school boards, aware of, and prepared to manage, the impacts of this development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
IV. TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)

Is this project consistent with any applicable regional transportation plan(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development avoid or mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding transportation network?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If not, do pending projects included in the funded portion of the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP) mitigate all identified project impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development consistent with the host government's Future Development Map and any applicable sub-area plans?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDs)	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development consistent with the region's CEDs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
RCA POINTS:				30	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	30
RCA SCORE:				100	RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%):	50

ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AS WELL AS PART 3 – QUALITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT, WILL BE USED IN DETERMINING THE STAFF FINDING FOR THIS DRI AS WELL.

FINDING (OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF REGIONAL CONSISTENCY)

<i>Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES , "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." <input type="checkbox"/> NO , "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern:
<i>Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES. <input type="checkbox"/> NO. Narrative:
<i>Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding. <input type="checkbox"/> NO.

NOTE: This and other DRI Review forms provided by the Department are intended for use as tools to assist regional staff in the formulation of their recommendations to their executive directors and Regional Councils and to the communities they serve. Their proper use facilitates statewide procedural consistency and service delivery. Regardless of the recommendations generated by this form, all findings subsequently issued by the Regional Commission are reflective solely of the Commission's own judgment and discretion. Nothing presented in this form is binding upon the exercise of the authority granted to the Regional Commission by Georgia law and Departmental rules. The findings issued by the Regional Commission are purely advisory and are in no circumstance binding upon the authority granted to the host local government by Georgia law.



LIA



LIA



ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW PART 2: LOCAL IMPACTS ASSESSMENT

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	CITY OF WOODSTOCK	Date LIA completed, M/D/YYYY: 10/16/12
DRI #:	2301	RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Watermarke Church	
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Other	Action Triggering Review: Zoning

I. ADEQUACY OF LOCAL ASSETS/SERVICES	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Do adequate wastewater/sewerage facilities currently exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate water supply and treatment facilities exist to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate stormwater management facilities exist to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate solid waste facilities exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the local school system have the capacity necessary to adequately support the development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the local workforce possess the skills/expertise/education to effectively support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are all other assets/services (public safety, etc.) adequate to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is the local government fiscally capable of adequately providing any new facilities/services anticipated/likely to be required by the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
II. ADEQUACY OF TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Do adequate transportation facilities currently exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If the development is predominately industrial, is it located in close proximity to an interstate highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

If the development is predominately industrial, is it located with reasonable proximity to an intermodal station or other freight transfer location?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will developer-funded mitigation of the transportation impacts of this development be adequate to address needs generated by the project? enhancements and/or improvements of the items already listed in the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If not, will enhancements and/or improvements already listed in the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP) be adequate to address needs generated by the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
III. ACCESS MANAGEMENT	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
If the size and type of development warrant, is access to the site effectively managed through the use of internal roadways, access roads, or shared driveways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If the development is adjacent to more than one roadway, is access provided via the lowest functionally classified roadway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are access points to the site aligned with opposing access points and with existing, planned or likely median breaks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are proposed traffic signals located at the intersection of public roadways that provide access to the entire site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Relative to the size and traffic volume of the adjacent roadways, does the proposed development provide an adequate, uninterrupted driveway throat lengths at all access points?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are all proposed access points outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do the proposed access points meet minimum spacing requirements established by GDOT (and GRTA, where appropriate)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
IV. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Are potential impacts upon WATER SUPPLY WATERSHEDS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon WETLANDS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Are potential impacts upon GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon RIVER CORRIDORS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon PROTECTED MOUNTAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon COASTAL RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon FLOODPLAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon SENSITIVE SOIL TYPES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon STEEP SLOPES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon PRIME AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon RARE/ENDANGERED SPECIES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon FEDERAL, STATE OR REGIONAL PARKS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon HISTORIC RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon DESIGNATED SCENIC BYWAYS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Are potential impacts upon VIEWSHEDS OR SCENIC AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

LIA Points:	42	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	42
--------------------	-----------	---------------------------	-----------

LIA Score:	100	LIA WEIGHTED SCORE (30%):	30
-------------------	------------	----------------------------------	-----------

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LOCAL IMPACTS

<i>Does the host local government need to take action to manage potential adverse impacts of this development?</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NARRATIVE:
<i>Should special requirements be placed on the developer(s) to mitigate adverse development impacts?</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NARRATIVE:



QDA



QDA



**ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW
PART 3: GEORGIA QUALITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT**

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	CITY OF WOODSTOCK	Date QDA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 10/16/2012
DRI #:	2301	RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Watermarke Church	
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Other	Action Triggering Review: Zoning

I. MIX OF USES	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development incorporate a mixture of complementary land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development have vertically mixed uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If the development is primarily residential, are a healthy mix of uses (e.g., corner grocery stores, community facilities) located within an easy walking distance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
For developments without a residential component, does the development add a compatible new use that is not prevalent in the immediately surrounding area/neighborhood?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
II. TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Are there sidewalks within the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	SIDEWALKS ARE NOT INDICATED ON THE SITE PLAN	
Are sidewalks designed to comply with ADA, AASHTO standards of width and accessibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential buildings, multi-family buildings, and other key destinations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development include multi-use trails that will connect to the external trail network(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and/or pedestrian actuation devices?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	NOT INDICATED ON THE SITE PLAN	
Does the design include pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development employ pedestrian-friendly block sizes (e.g., block face no more than 500 ft, average block perimeter 1350 ft)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	THE SITE PLAN DOES INCLUDE BLOCKS, THOUGH SOME MAY BE LONGER THAN 500 FT.	
Will the development incorporate traffic calming measures, such as narrower street widths, raised pedestrian crossings, or rough pavement materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
III. CONNECTIVITY	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Will the development employ street layouts that match those in older parts of the community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Will the developments internal street network connect to the existing surrounding street network at many points?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the proposal allow for direct connection to adjacent developments/uses in the future (at stub outs, dead end streets, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development include external and internal connections that allow motorists to avoid using the surrounding roadways to access adjacent uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation throughout the site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Can the internal street network be reasonably anticipated to add to the public roadway network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Where appropriate, will the development employ mid-block alleys?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

IV. PARKING	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development provide no more parking than the minimum required by the local jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	PROVIDING 2400 SPACES, REQUIRED 622 SPACES	
Does development seek reduced parking requirements for commercial and residential developments, particularly when nearby parking alternatives or public transit is available?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does development seek shared parking arrangements that reduce overall parking needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does development use landscaped tree islands and medians to break up large expanses of paved parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		THE APPLICANT SHOULD CONSIDER ADDING LANDSCAPING TO BREAK UP THE LARGE PARKING AREAS	
Is the development's parking located where it does not visually dominate the development from the street?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the parking design allow for easy and safe pedestrian access to buildings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	PEDESTRIAN ACCESS FROM PARKING TO THE BUILDINGS IS NOT SHOWN ON THE SITE PLAN	
V. INFILL DEVELOPMENT	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development proposing to locate on an infill site with existing infrastructure in place?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does this project involve redevelopment of abandoned structures; a brownfield site; other underutilized properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development re-use or rehabilitate existing and/or historic structures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development designed to blend into existing neighborhoods with compatible scale and design (e.g., small scale apartment buildings, multi-family that looks like a single residence from the street, etc)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are new housing opportunities being created out of former, underused commercial, warehouse, or industrial spaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development designed to revitalize existing neighborhood commercial centers (or create a new one on an infill site) that will serve as a focal point for the surrounding neighborhood and community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is this a greyfield redevelopment that converts vacant or under-utilized commercial strips to mixed-use assets?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

VI. SENSE OF PLACE	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Does the development create or enhance community spaces such as public plazas, squares, parks, etc?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development consistent / compatible with the traditional character of the community, incorporating appropriate scale, placement and massing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If "big box" retail, is the development designed in a way that complements surrounding uses (e.g. appropriate massing and scale when in developed areas; landscaped buffers/berms when in less developed areas; etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If "big box" retail, is the development designed in a way that promotes long-term usability (e.g. allows for subsequent adaptation to other tenants/uses)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are structures oriented toward and located near existing and proposed street front(s) with parking located in places other than between the structure and the street/sidewalk?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development design include restrictions on the number and size of signs and billboards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If applicable, will the natural vegetative character of surrounding roadways be maintained (e.g., with setbacks, vegetative buffers, landscaped berms)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
VII. TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (TND)	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Is the development designed to be an attractive, pedestrian-friendly activity center serving surrounding residential areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development include a mix of housing types and sizes evocative of the "traditional" development styles/patterns of the community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Do planned street widths employ TND width standards (i.e. narrow)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are structures designed with small setbacks, and porches (where appropriate) that contribute to a continuous orientation to the street that is pedestrian-friendly and encourages interaction with neighbors and/or passers-by?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are accommodations included for on-street parking and/or rear alleyway access for residents'/visitors' automobiles?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

VIII. OPEN/GREEN SPACE CONSERVATION	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Is the development in close proximity with direct access to permanently protected open/greenspace?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development clustered to preserve open/green space within the development site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development set aside a substantial percentage of total land area as permanently protected open or green space, preferably connected to a green space network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the design of the development include provisions to permanently preserve environmentally sensitive areas by setting them aside as public parks, trails, greenbelts, etc?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the design of the development incorporate significant site features (view corridors, water features, farmland, wetlands, etc.) as amenities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If public water/sewer is unavailable, does the design of the development make use of common area drain fields and/or neighborhood-scale wastewater treatment systems to reduce parcel size and facilitate cluster development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
IX. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the project avoid land physically unsuitable for development (steep slopes greater than 20%, floodplains, stream corridors, groundwater recharge areas or wetlands), prime agricultural lands/soils and/or propose the appropriate mitigation measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development include measures to retain/protect a large proportion of existing trees and to maintain the health of new trees included in the development's landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development incorporate native and drought-tolerant landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development designed to avoid the need for a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development's stormwater management plan avoid increasing the rate and quantity of post-development stormwater runoff when compared with pre-development stormwater rates and quantities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Does the development reflect best management practices (e.g., bioretention strips, rain gardens or swales as alternatives to conventional practices) for water quality protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Do the parking lots incorporate innovative on-site stormwater mitigation or retention features that are not covered elsewhere in this checklist?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is a substantial proportion of the total paved area (total of driveways, parking, etc) covered with permeable surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development propose water conservation covenants or employ other appropriate water conservation measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development seeking independent certification/recognition by a widely acknowledged development accreditation organization (e.g. LEED, EarthCraft, Green Globes, Energy Star, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development make use of alternative building materials that promote environmental protection and energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
X. HOUSING CHOICES	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
For developments with a residential component, will a diversity of housing types be provided in the development, including: Single family; Accessory housing units; Multi family; Affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately surrounding neighborhood?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include affordability and accessibility features and proximity to services and transportation alternatives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development provide greater housing options for low and middle income residents and families?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
XI. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Are the economic returns associated with the development projected to offset the local/regional costs for any infrastructure and service enhancements necessary to serve development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development enhance diversity in the local/regional economic base?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Does the design/location of this development clearly reflect consideration of the local and regional jobs/housing balance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development located in a tax abatement zone, a tax allocation district, a designated/planned redevelopment area, an enterprise zone, or other governmentally supported redevelopment zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will this development use or is it likely to enhance local or regional small-business development program(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development provide greater employment opportunities for low and middle income residents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development likely to spur other activities aimed at improving the quality of the local/regional workforce?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

QDA POINTS:	25	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	39
QDA SCORE:	64	QDA WEIGHTED SCORE (20%):	13

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY

<i>Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES , the proposed development qualifies for expedited review. <input type="checkbox"/> NO , the proposed development <u>DOES NOT</u> qualify for expedited review.
------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<i>And is the development generally reflective of the best quality growth practices?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES , this regional commission recommends this development for Georgia Quality Development designation. <input type="checkbox"/> NO NARRATIVE:
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<i>To improve the overall quality of the development, does the regional commission recommend that the local government seek additional alterations to the proposal that have not been described above?</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NARRATIVE:
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------

NORTHPOINT CHURCH WOODSTOCK DRI
City of Woodstock
Environmental Planning Division Comments
August 1, 2012

Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The project property is in the Allatoona Lake Water Supply watershed, which is a large water supply watershed (more than 100 square miles) as defined in the Part 5 Environmental Minimum Criteria. Under the current Criteria, because Allatoona is a Corps of Engineers lake, it is exempt from the Part 5 criteria, so no special Part 5 requirements apply to this proposed project.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no streams on or near the project property. Any unmapped streams that may be located on the property would be subject to the requirements of the City of Woodstock stream buffer ordinance. Any state waters that may be on the property are subject to the State 25-foot erosion and sedimentation buffer requirements.

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 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). Because there are no estimates for institutional uses, and because of the coverage shown on the submitted plans, office/light industrial was used for this project. 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:

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year:

Land Use	Land Area (ac)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Office/Light Industrial	22.00	28.38	376.86	2508.00	15576.00	32.56	4.18
TOTAL	22.00	28.38	376.86	2508.00	15576.00	32.56	4.18

Total % impervious 70%

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.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Jon Tuley, Land Use Division

FROM: Nathan Soldat, Transportation Planning Division

DATE: September 24th, 2012

SUBJECT: **Transportation Division Review of DRI # 2301**
Project: North Point Church
County: Cherokee
Location: Ridgewalk Parkway at Ridge Trail
Analysis:
Expedited
Non-Expedited

cc: David Haynes
TD

The following input is provided for the Infrastructure section of the DRI Report. This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Expedited Review Process. The proposed North Point Church is located at the intersection of Ridgewalk Parkway and Ridge Trial just off of Interstate 575 within the jurisdiction of the City of Woodstock. The development is located on the southern side of Ridgewalk Parkway between Ridge Trial and the rail track, west of Main Street.

The proposed development will consist of approximately 22 acres of disturbed area. The proposed North Point Church development is 250,000 square feet with an anticipated 3,500 seat worship facility with 2,400 parking spaces.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation

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

The proposed site will have two full access driveways along Ridge Trial, two right-in and right-out driveways along Ridgewalk Parkway and two pedestrian only entrances along the Ridgewalk parkway.

Pedestrian Entrances: Two pedestrian entrances will be provided along Ridgewalk Parkway, east of Ridge Trial. The first pedestrian entrance will be provided approximately 450' east of Ridge Trail and the second entrance will be provided approximately 350' east of the first entrance.

Driveway-1: Driveway 1, the main entrance, will be a standard commercial driveway with two 12 foot lanes and a 50 foot radius at its intersection with Ridgewalk Parkway with a right-in and right out at the intersection. The driveway will operate as one-way stop sign for the traffic exiting the driveway. Driveway 1 is located approximately 750' west of the Main Street.

Driveway-2: Driveway 2 will be a standard commercial driveway with two 12 foot lanes and a 50 foot radius at its intersection with Ridgewalk Parkway with full access movement. The driveway will operate as one-way stop sign for the traffic exiting the driveway. Driveway 2 is located approximately 950' west of the Main Street.

Driveway-3: Driveway 3 will be a standard commercial driveway with two 12 foot lanes and a 50 foot radius at its intersection with Ridge Trial. The driveway will operate as one-way stop sign for the traffic exiting the driveway. Driveway 3 is located approximately 600' south of the Ridgewalk Parkway. This driveway will be constructed as a full movement drive.

Driveway-4: Driveway 4 will be a standard commercial driveway with two 12 foot lanes and a 50 foot radius at its intersection with Ridge Trial. The driveway will operate as one-way stop sign for the traffic exiting the driveway. Driveway 4 is located approximately 600' south of the Driveway 3. This driveway will be constructed as a full movement drive.

How much average daily traffic will be generated by the proposed project?

Based on the information presented during the Pre-application meeting on July 30, 2012, a traffic memo presented by Vamshi Mudumba, LAI Engineering, on July 30, 2012, the DRI meets GRTA's criteria for expedited review under the DRI Permanent Policy Section 3-102.B.3, Limited Daily Trip Generation, which requires the proposed DRI project to generate no more than 100 gross PM peak hour weekday trips. As a result, GRTA Staff has recommended APPROVAL of the request for expedited review under Section 2-202.B of the Procedures and Principles for GRTA Development of Regional Impact Review. GRTA's Executive Director will make the final decision regarding the request for expedited review on September 28, 2012. GRTA does not require any further materials or submissions at this time.

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

PLAN 2040 RTP (Long Range Projects)*

ARC Number	<i>Route</i>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
CH-167	Arnold Mill Road Extension/Connector	Roadway/General Purpose Capacity	Long Range 2018-2030

**The ARC Board adopted the PLAN 2040 RTP and FY 2012-2017 TIP on July 27th, 2011.*

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 site is not directly served by transit.

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

None proposed.

What other issues should be considered during the traffic study or in general for the proposed development?

- The developer should review design guidelines related to ARC’s Policy and Investment Networks. The proposed development is located near Main Street which is on the Strategic Truck Route Network, Regional Thoroughfare Network, Bicycle and Pedestrian, and Concept 3 networks.
- Please refer to GDOT’s “Regulations for Driveway and Encroachment Control” manual as an additional resource regarding access points to the site.

Jonathan Tuley

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2012 10:30 AM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Comer, Carol; Sands, Carla Jo; Eleam, Katie; Von Hagel, Karl; cptzero@windstream.net
Subject: RE: DRI Review Notification - Watermarke Church (DRI #2301)

Jon,

The proposed development is located approximately 8 miles North East of Cobb County Airport (RYY), and approximately 14 miles South West of Cherokee County Airport (CNI) and should not impact these airports. However if the proposed project's vertical construction exceeds 200ft above ground level, an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration.

That may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/portal.jsp>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notification, no later than 45 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impact of the project on protected airspace associated with these airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary. I have copied Mr. Karl Von Hagel, Manager of the Cobb County Airport (telephone: (770) 528-1615), and Don Stevens, Chairman of Airport Authority of Cherokee County Airport (telephone: (770) 826-4796).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

Alan Hood | Airport Safety Data Program Manager
Georgia Department of Transportation - Aviation Programs
600 West Peachtree Street, N.W. | 9th Floor | Atlanta, Georgia 30308
T: 404-631-1343 | F: 404-631-1414 | M: 404-660-3394 | E: achood@dot.ga.gov

View our website at <http://www.dot.ga.gov/aviation>

From: Jonathan Tuley [mailto:JTuley@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2012 4:08 PM
To: jud.turner@gaepd.org; Fowler, Matthew; VanDyke, Cindy; Ware, Alan; Williams, Michael V.; Comer, Carol; Hood, Alan C.; Lobdell, Mike; lbeall@grta.org; 'wstinson@itsmarta.com'; 'Crocker, John'; 'Floyd, Greg'; 'Jon West'; rmcleod@woodstockga.gov; bstockton@woodstockga.gov; John Tuminello (john.tuminello@northpoint.org); jwatkins@cherokeega.com; 'nmoon@hollyspringsga.us'; 'John.Pederson@cobbcounty.org'
Cc: Landuse; Jim Santo; Nathan Soldat; Jim Skinner; Sammie Carson; Carolyn Rader
Subject: DRI Review Notification - Watermarke Church (DRI #2301)

Development of Regional Impact Request for Comments

This e-mail serves as notice that the ARC staff has begun the review for **Watermarke Church (DRI #2301)**. We request that you or a member of your staff review the attached preliminary report and provide comments to ARC by **Friday, October 12, 2012**.

This project, located in the City of Woodstock, is a proposed church consisting of a 3,500 seat worship facility with 250,000 total square feet and 2,400 total parking spaces. The project is proposed to be located near the intersection of Ridgewalk Parkway and Ridge Trail, just off of Interstate 575.

Review opened: September 28, 2012

Comments Due: October 12, 2012

Review will close on or before: October 18, 2012

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

Please let me know if you have any questions about the review.

Jon Tuley, AICP
Principal Planner

Atlanta Regional Commission
regional impact + local relevance

40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2538
P | 404.463.3307
F | 404.463.3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com
atlantaregional.com

Connect with ARC

Like us on [Facebook](#) »

Follow us on [Twitter](#) »

ARC Land Matters [Blog](#) »

Get connected on [LinkedIn](#) »

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are intended solely for the use of the named recipient or recipients. Any dissemination of this e-mail by anyone other than an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not a named recipient, you are prohibited from any further viewing of the e-mail or any attachments or from making any use of the e-mail or attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments, and all copies.

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Logout](#)**DRI #2301**

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:

Woodstock

Individual completing form:

Richard McLeod

Telephone:

770-592-6050 ext 160

E-mail:

rmcleod@woodstockga.gov

*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:

Watermark Church

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Land Lots 878, 922,923 of the 15th District, 2nd Section of Cherokee County.
SE corner of Ridgewalk

Brief Description of Project:

Proposed church facility with associated parking and drives on 32.5 acres

Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

DRI Initial Information Form

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	250,000 sf of buildings, 2400 parking spaces on 32.5 acres		
Developer:	North Point Ministries		
Mailing Address:	4350 North Point Parkway		
Address 2:			
	City: Alpharetta	State: GA	Zip: 30022
Telephone:	678-892-5678		
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:	Currently under contract by North Point Ministries		
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		
If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?			
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: <input type="text"/>		
	Project ID: <input type="text"/>		
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rezoning <input type="checkbox"/> Variance <input type="checkbox"/> Connect Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Connect Water <input type="checkbox"/> Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="text"/>		
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	Aproximatley 10-15%		
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: June 2015 completion		
	Overall project: Unknown		
<input type="button" value="Save Updates to Submitted Form"/> <input type="button" value="Save without Submitting"/> <input type="button" value="Cancel"/>			
Back to Top			

You are logged in to the DRI Website as **jtuley**. | [Change Password](#) | [Go to Applications Listing](#)

[GRTA Home Page](#) | [ARC Home Page](#) | [RDC Links](#) | [DCA Home Page](#)

[Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)

Copyright © 2010 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](#)

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: City of Woodstock

Individual completing form: Richard McLeod

Telephone: 770-592-6050 ext 1600

Email: rrmcleod@woodstockga.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Watermarke Church

DRI ID Number: 2301

Developer/Applicant: North Point Ministries

Telephone: 678-892-5678 John Tuminello

Email(s): john.tuminello@northpoint.org

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.)

(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: 25 Million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$ 0 - Church

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):

--

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:	<input type="text" value="City of Woodstock"/>
----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	<input type="text" value="0.002 mgd"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

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:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px;"></div>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

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?	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px;"></div>
---------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	<input type="text" value="City of Woodstock"/>
------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	<input type="text" value="0.002 mgd"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------

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:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 50px;"></div>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
-----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?	<input type="text" value="+/- 300 feet"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

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.)	<input type="text" value="Weekday Gross PM Peak Hour 100 trips"/> <input type="text" value="Sunday Gross Daily Peak Hour 1,100 trips"/>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 <input type="text" value="Traffic Methodology Study provided to GRTA"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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:	<p>Improvements include two full access driveways along Ridge Trail, two right-in and right out driveways along Ridgewalk Parkway and two pedestrian entrances along Ridgewalk Parkway. Ridgewalk Parkway currently has 2 lanes of the proposed 4 lanes constructed, improvements for this project will complete the 2 lanes that have not been constructed. The City may have additional requirements based on finalized site plan.</p>
--------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	<input type="text" value="25"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Is sufficient landfill 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 landfill capacity:

--

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
-----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

If yes, please explain:

--

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	<input type="text" value="approximately 70%"/>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management:

Measures proposed water quality/detention ponds, pervious (grass) parking areas, buffers, proprietary water quality units. Proposed measures will reduce peak developed flow rates to at or below pre-developed rates for the one to 100 year storm events and detain the 1 year, 24 hour storm runoff for 24 hours.

Environmental Quality

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

1. Water supply watersheds?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
3. Wetlands?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
4. Protected mountains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
5. Protected river corridors?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
6. Floodplains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
7. Historic resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:

--

[Submit Application](#)

[Save without Submitting](#)

[Cancel](#)

[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.

