

# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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

**DATE**: April 21, 2016 **ARC REVIEW CODE**: V1604211

**TO:** Chairman Tim Lee, Cobb County Board of Commissioners

ATTN TO: David Breaden, Cobb County Water System FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC

Digital signature Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has received the following proposal and is initiating a regional review to seek comments from potentially impacted jurisdictions and agencies. The ARC requests your comments related to the proposal not addressed by the Commission's regional plans and policies.

Name of Proposal: RC-16-02CC Encore Center

Review Type: Metro River MRPA Code: RC-16-02CC

<u>Description</u>: An application for a Metropolitan River Protection Act (MRPA) Certificate for the construction of a mid-rise office building that is similar to an office building that was previously proposed on this property and reviewed as a MRPA application in 2001 (RC-01-01CC).

<u>Preliminary Finding:</u> ARC's preliminary finding is that the proposed development, while not consistent with the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan in all respects, will provide a level of land and water resource protection equivalent to an application consistent with the Plan.

<u>Submitting Local Government</u>: Cobb County <u>Land Lot:</u> 1014, 1015, 1026 <u>District:</u> 17 <u>Section:</u> 2

Date Opened: April 21, 2016

**Deadline for Comments:** May 2, 2016

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: May 2, 2016

#### THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES ARE RECEIVING NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVERKEEPER THE RIVER LINE HISTORIC AREA, INC.

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION GEORGIA CONSERVANCY CITY OF ATLANTA GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

If you have questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at <a href="mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.com">asmith@atlantaregional.com</a> or (404) 463–5581. If ARC does not receive comments from you on or before **May 2, 2016**, we will assume that your agency has no additional comments and will close the review. Comments by e-mail are encouraged. The ARC review website is located at <a href="http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/planreviews">http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/planreviews</a>.

#### Attached is information concerning this review.

### ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

**DATE**: April 21, 2016 **ARC REVIEW CODE**: V1604211

**TO**: ARC Community Development, Natural Resources Division Managers

FROM: Andrew Smith, Extension: 3–5581

#### Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

<u>Community Development:</u> Smith, Andrew <u>Transportation Access & Mobility:</u> N/A

Natural Resources: Santo, Jim Research & Analytics: N/A Aging & Health Resources: N/A

Name of Proposal: RC-16-02CC Encore Center

**Review Type:** Metro River

<u>Description:</u> An application for a Metropolitan River Protection Act (MRPA) Certificate for the construction of a mid-rise office building that is similar to an office building that was previously reviewed in 2001 (RC-01-01CC).

**Submitting Local Government:** Cobb County

Date Opened: April 21, 2016

Deadline for Comments: May 2, 2016

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: May 2, 2016

#### Response:

- 1) Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
- 5) Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

COMMENTS.		

# APPLICATION FOR METROPOLITAN RIVER PROTECTION ACT CERTIFICATE

	cord of Property to be Revie	wed:		
Name(s):_				
0	dress: 50 Cates Ridge	Claston	Goorgia	771 20227
City: Atla			Georgia	Zip: 30327
Contact Ph	one Numbers (w/Area Code e Phone: (404) 386-4506	):	E	
•			_Fax:	
Other	lumbers:			
Applicant(s) or Name(s):	Applicant's Agent(s): Harvey Rudy, Greenstone Prope	rties		
	dress: 3301 Windy Ridge Park		320	
	nnta	State:		Zip: 30339
Contact Ph	one Numbers (w/Area Code 678) 589-7619	):		77.
Daytim	e Phone: (6/8) 589-7619		Fax:	
Other N	lumbers:	12		
Name of De Description	or Water Use: evelopment: Encore Ce of Proposed Use: Office		CHE T LIN	#11 and #12 at
Name of De Description  Property Descri	evelopment: Encore Cello of Proposed Use: Office  ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:	tion and V		#11.00mm
Name of De Description Property Descri	evelopment: Encore Ce of Proposed Use: Office  ption (Attach Legal Descrip ), District, Section, County:	tion and V	ECTION 2 (	COBB COUNTY GA
Property Descri	ption (Attach Legal Descrip ), District, Section, County:	tion and V	ECTION 2 (	COBB County らA Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s LL 10 Subdivision 3400	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  14,1015,1026, DIST  1, Lot, Block, Street and Add  Conbergance Descripe  1, Lot, Block, Street and Add  Conbergance But	tion and V	ECTION 2 (	COBB COUNTY 6A Intersection:
Property Description  Land Lot(s  LL 10  Subdivision  3400  Size of Deve	ption (Attach Legal Descrip ), District, Section, County: 14,1015, 1026, DIST 1, Lot, Block, Street and Add COMBERLAND BUR elopment (Use as Applicable	tion and V	ECTION 2 (	COBB COUNTY GA Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s LL 10 Subdivision 3400	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  LULUS, 1026, DIST  LOt, Block, Street and Add  COMBERGAND BLOCH  elopment (Use as Applicable  Inside Corridor:  5.5	tion and V	ECTION 2, Cance to Nearest	COBB COUTY, GA Intersection:
Property Description  Land Lot(s  LL 10  Subdivision  3400  Size of Deve	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  L. Lot, Block, Street and Add Conberger Building  clopment (Use as Applicable Inside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:	tion and V	ECTION 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s) LL 10 Subdivision 3400 Size of Deve	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  Lot, Block, Street and Add Conberger (Use as Applicable Inside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:  5.59 Acres	tion and V 17, S ress, Dista 10. 1: 9 Acres cres	ect70≥ 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Description  Land Lot(s  LL 10  Subdivision  3400  Size of Deve	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  LULLIS, 1026, DIST  LOT, Block, Street and Add  CONBERGAND BLOCH  elopment (Use as Applicable Inside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:  Total:  1.5.59 Acres  Inside Corridor:	tion and V  17 S ress, Dista D. S Acres cres	ection 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s) LL 10 Subdivision 3400 Size of Deve	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  L. Lot, Block, Street and Add Conservance Business (Use as Applicable Inside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:	tion and V  17 S ress, Dista D. S Acres cres	ect70≥ 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Description  Land Lot(s  LL 10  Subdivision  3400  Size of Deve Acres:  Lots:	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  Lot, Block, Street and Add Conberger Busine Corridor:  Outside Corridor:	tion and V 17 S ress, Dista D. S Acres cres	ection 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s  LL 10  Subdivision  3400  Size of Deve	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  LULLE, 1026, DIST  LOT, Block, Street and Add  CONBERGAND BLA  elopment (Use as Applicable Inside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:  Outside Corridor:  Total:  Inside Corridor:	tion and V 17, S ress, Dista 10. 9 Acres cres	ection 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Description  Land Lot(s  LL 10  Subdivision  3400  Size of Deve Acres:  Lots:	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  L. Lot, Block, Street and Add Conservance Buside Corridor: Outside Corridor:	tion and V 17, S ress, Dista 10. 9 Acres cres	ection 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s LL 10 Subdivision 3400 Size of Deve Acres:  Lots:  Units:	ption (Attach Legal Descripe), District, Section, County:  L. Lot, Block, Street and Add Conberger Burel  elopment (Use as Applicable Inside Corridor: Outside Corridor: Outside Corridor: Outside Corridor: Total: Inside Corridor: Outside Corridor: Total: Inside Corridor: Total:	tion and V  17 S ress, Dista  0. 9 Acres cres	ection 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s LL 10 Subdivision 3400 Size of Deve Acres:  Lots:  Units:	ption (Attach Legal Description), District, Section, County:    Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Conservation   County:   Co	tion and V  17 S ress, Dista  2 Acres cres N/A  Width of H	ection 2, Cance to Nearest	Intersection:
Name of De Description  Property Descri Land Lot(s LL 10 Subdivision 3400 Size of Deve Acres:  Lots:  Units:	ption (Attach Legal Description), District, Section, County:    Conservant Burel   Lot, Block, Street and Add   Conservant Burel   Lot, Block, Street and Add   Conservant Burel   Lot, Block Street and Add   Lot, Block Street and Add	tion and V  17 S ress, Dista  10. 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 17 17 17 18 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	Easement):	Intersection:

- 6. Related Chattahoochee Corridor Development:
  - A. Does the total development include additional land in the Chattahoochee Corridor that is not part of this application?

    No

    If "yes", describe the additional land and any development plans:
  - B. Has any part of the property in this application, or any right-of-way or easement bordering this land, previously received a certificate or any other Chattahoochee Corridor review approval?

    Yes

    If "yes", please identify the use(s), the review identification number(s), and the date(s) of the review(s):

    The property has been reviewed for a previous office development (not built)

    in 2001

    A Color of C
- 7. How Will Sewage from this Development be Treated?
  - A. Septic tank

Note: For proposals with septic tanks, the application must include the appropriate local government health department approval for the selected site.

- B. Public sewer system Yes
- 8. Summary of Vulnerability Analysis of Proposed Land or Water Use:

Vulnerability Category	Total Acreage (or Sq. Footage	e) (or Sq. Footage)  Land Disturbance	UTO	Percent Percent Land Imperv. Disturb. Surf. (Maximums Shown In
A	S-FI N/A	N/A	CONS 4/06/10) N/A	(90) N/A (75) N/A
ASS.	Laws a D.	7.77-		

A	N/A	N/A	N/A	(90) N/A (75) N/A
В	4,359 Sq. Ft.	4,359 Sq. Ft.	0 Sq. Ft.	<b>(80)</b> 100 <b>(60)</b> 0.00
C	114,980 Sq. Ft.	88,021 Sq. Ft.	6,399 Sq. Ft.	<b>(70)</b> 76.55 <b>(45)</b> 5.57
D	4,322 Sq. Ft.	4,104 Sq. Ft.	1,516 Sq. Ft.	<b>(50)</b> 94.96 <b>(30)</b> 35.08
E	88,721 Sq. Ft.	63,004 Sq. Ft.	45,243 Sq. Ft.	<b>(30)</b> 71.01 <b>(15)</b> 50.99
F	31,188 Sq. Ft.	15,836 Sq. Ft.	10,547 Sq. Ft.	<b>(10)</b> 50.78 <b>(2)</b> 33.82
Total:	243,570 Sq. Ft.	175,324 Sq. Ft.	63,705 Sq. Ft.	N/A N/A

Note: This property was first reviewed in 2001 (Review Number RC-01-01CC) for a similar office building. At that time, it was determined that the Georgia Power easement running along the eastern side of the property constituted a hardship under Part 1.B.9 of the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan because the easement predated the Act and because the easement, which is considered disturbed under the Plan, exceeded the limits of land disturbance in the B and C categories without other activity on the property. At that time, the proposed project was determined to be equivalent to a consistent project, as provided for in Section 12-5-445 (a)(1)(B)of the Metropolitan River Protection Act. The determination was based on an average weighted runoff coefficient test. The project approved in 2001 was never built. The current proposal includes some changes to the original numbers, requiring a new review. The average weighted runoff coefficient test, which compares the proposed project to a fully consistent project on the property (with no easement), was performed for this proposal. The current proposed project meets the average weighted runoff coefficient test and, while not consistent with the Plan in all respects, is equivalent to a fully consistent project, and can be built as proposed.

The test and the determination are described in the memorandum attached to this application.

9.	Is any of this Land within the 100-Year Floodplain of the Chattahoochee River? No If "yes", indicate the 100-year floodplain elevation:
	NOTE: For this review, river floodplain is determined from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' "Floodplain Information - Chattahoochee River, Buford Dam to Whitesburg, Georgia", November, 1973 and its Supplement of March, 1982.  NOTE: All river 100-year floodplain is assigned to the "E" Category; its allowable allocations can be combined with those of other "E" land in the review. Also, 100-year floodplain cannot be reanalyzed and cannot accept transfers.
10.	Is any of this land within the 500-year floodplain of the Chattahoochee River? No
10.	If "yes", indicate the 500-year flood plain elevation:
	NOTE: Plan Standards include a 35-foot height limit above the pre-construction grade within the 500-year floodplain (includes the 100-year floodplain).  Adherence to this standard must be noted on the submitted plans (see Part 2.B.(4) of the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan).
11.	The following is a checklist of information required to be attached as part of the application. Individual items may be combined.
FOI	R ALL APPLICATIONS:
<u>X</u>	Description of land in the application and any additional land in the project (attach legal description or surveyed boundaries).
X	Name, address, and phone number(s) of owner(s) of record of the land in the application. (Space provided on this form)
X	Written consent of all owners to this application. (Space provided on this form)
<u>X</u>	Name, address, and phone number(s) of applicant or applicant's agent. (Space provided on this form)
<u>X</u>	Description of proposed use(s). (Space provided on this form)
<u>X</u>	Existing vegetation plan.
<u>X</u>	Proposed grading plan.
X	Certified as-builts of all existing land disturbance and impervious surfaces.
<u>X</u>	Approved erosion control plan.
<u>X</u>	Detailed table of land-disturbing activities. (Both on this form and on the plans)

<u>X</u>	Plat-level plan showing (as applicable): lot boundaries; any other and rights-of -way; 100- and 500-year river floodplains; vulneraboundaries; topography; any other information that will clarify	ability category
N/A	Documentation on adjustments, if any.	
<u>X</u>	Cashier's check or money order (for application fee).	
	SINGLE-STEP APPLICATIONS (NON-SUBDIVISION): Site plan.	
<u>X</u>	Land-disturbance plan.	
_	TWO-STEP SINGLE-FAMILY SUBDIVISION APPLICATION Concept plan.	NS ONLY:
N/A	Lot-by-lot and non-lot allocation tables.	
	I (we), the undersigned, authorize and request review of this appunder the provisions of the Metropolitan River Protection Act: necessary)	(use additional sheets as
	Col Sland	3/29/15
	Signature(s) of Owner(s) of Record	Date /
13.	I (we), the undersigned, authorize and request review of this appunder the provisions of the Metropolitan River Protection Act:	olication for a certificate
	Signature(s) of Applicant(s) or Agent(s)	3/29/16 Date
14.	The governing authority of	requests bed use under the
	Jedu Breaker	4-4-2016
	Signature of Chief Elected Official or Official's Designee	Date

## Memorandum

Date:

April 11, 2016

To:

File

From:

Jim Santo

Subject:

Equivalent Consistency Calculations for Encore Center, 3400 Cumberland

Boulevard Metro River Review

Once a hardship has been established on a property that has been submitted for review, an average weighted runoff coefficient test is used to determine if the proposed project on a such a property can be considered equivalent to a consistent project, even though it cannot meet Plan requirements in all respects.

The first step is to calculate the maximum amounts and percentages for each category on the subject property, ignoring any pre-existing conditions (the property is treated as if it were completely undisturbed). Then, based on these numbers, natural areas (the undisturbed areas in each category) are broken out, as well as landscaped areas (disturbed but not impervious) and impervious areas. The amounts in each category are totaled and divided by the total property area, resulting in the average percentages of natural, landscaped and impervious areas for the entire property, not by category. These percentages are then multiplied by the appropriate runoff coefficient: 0.30 for natural, 0.35 for landscaped and 0.95 for impervious. The three resulting numbers are added together and the result is the average weighted runoff coefficient for a maximum consistent project on the subject property.

The process is then repeated for the proposed project on the property, including any existing conditions. If the average weighted runoff coefficient for the proposed project is the same as, or less than, the coefficient for the maximum consistent project, the proposed project is considered to be equivalent to a fully consistent project.

The category areas and the maximum allowable areas and percentages for land disturbance and impervious surface for this site are shown below. All areas are in square feet:

Category	Total Area	Land Disturbance	Impervious Surface
В	4,359	3,487 (80%)	2,615 (60%)
C	114,980	80,486 (70%)	51,741 (45%)
D	4,322	2,161 (50%)	1,297 (30%)
E	88,721	26,616 (30%)	13,308 (15%)
F	31,188	3,119 (10%)	624 (2%)
Totals:	243,570	115,869	69,585

Memorandum April 11, 2016 Page Two

Based on these numbers, the natural, landscaped and impervious percentages for the entire property were calculated, and from those numbers, the average weighted runoff coefficient for the maximum consistent project was calculated:

Average weighted runoff coefficient:					0.495
Impervious	69,585 SF / 243,570 SF Total Area	=	0.286 x 0.95	=	0.272
Landscaped:	46,289 SF / 243,570 SF Total Area	=	$0.164 \times 0.35$	=	0.066
Natural:	127,701 SF / 243,570 SF Total Area	=	0.524 x 0.30	=	0.157

For the proposed project (including new and pre-existing land disturbance), the areas and percentages breakdown as follows:

Category	Total Area (In Sq. Ft.)	Land Disturbance (In Sq. Ft.)	Impervious Surface (In Sq. Ft.)
В	4,359	4,359 (100%)	0 (0%)
C	114,980	88,021 (76.6%)	6,399 (5.6%)
D	4,322	4,104 (95%)	1,516 (35%)
E	88,721	63,004 (71%)	45,243 (51%)
F	31,188	15,836 (51%)	10,547 (34%)
Totals:	243,570	175,324	63,705

The average weighted runoff coefficient for the Proposed Project:

Impervious	$63,705 \text{ SF} / 243,570 \text{ SF Total Area} = 0.262 \times 0.95 = 0$	0.493
Landscaped:	$111,619 \text{ SF} / 243,570 \text{ SF Total Area} = 0.458 \times 0.35 = 0$	
Natural:	68,206  SF / 243,570  SF Total Area = 0.280  x  0.30 = 0	).084

The proposed project's average weighted runoff coefficient is lower than that for the maximum consistent project, and therefore meets the coefficient test.