ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - 40 COURTLAND STREET, NE - ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30203

April 29, 2004

The Honorable Nick Masino City of Suwanee 373 Highway 23 Suwanee, Georgia 30024

RE: Development of Regional Impact Review Suwanee Dam Road Tract

Dear Mayor Masino:

I am writing to let you know that the ARC staff has completed the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review known as the Suwanee Dam Road Tract development. 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 State. The Atlanta Regional Commission reviewed the proposed project 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 project is or is not in the best interest of the City of Suwanee.

The proposed residential development is consistent with the majority of regional plans and policies due to its intensity, mix of uses, and location. It is an infill development located near the City of Suwanee Livable Centers Initiative Study Area (LCI), which is a regional town center. The development design includes sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and interconnectivity among the uses within the site. Similarly, the use of alleys and interconnected streets will help to foster pedestrian activity along the internal streets. The development also includes numerous, well-designed, park areas. The development's walking areas are designed along the exterior provide the potential for connections to adjoining properties.

The development is proposed to be a gated community, which will lessen the pedestrian activity between the site and adjoining area. Similarly, the commercial development follows the existing strip development along the Peachtree Industrial Blvd. corridor. Based on the review of the policies, it is strongly recommended the development not be constructed as a gated community and the commercial development be redesigned to create a more livable, pedestrian oriented shopping district instead of commercial area primarily designed for access by the automobile. Establishing main commercial areas along the exterior thoroughfares that provide denser, multistory buildings along with smaller neighborhood scaled retail throughout the site, particularly along "Private Street A" would better serve the residents of the development and existing residents in the larger community. It is strongly encouraged that the entrance gates are removed

Honorable Masino April 29, 2004 Page 2

and "Private Street A" is designated as a public street to better ensure service and connectivity of the development to the City of Suwanee and future developments.

This particular development has great potential to link with the LCI areas and the City of Suwanee Master Plan that was adopted by the City Council. It is recommended that careful consideration of these plans and studies be considered in proceeding with the development of Suwanee Dam Road Tract. Further refinement of the development proposal could create a strong precedent for future development that will link this area to LCI areas to the southwest.

I am enclosing a copy of our final review and comments we received during the review. Please feel free to call me, or Haley Fleming (404-463-3311), if you have any questions concerning the review.

Sincerely,

Charles Krautler

Director

CK/mhf

Enclosures

C: Mr. Marvin Allen, City of Suwanee

Mr. Mike Smith, Developer

Mr. Warren Jolly, Jolly Development

Mr. Harold Linnenkohl, GDOT

Mr. Rick Brooks, GDCA

Mr. David Word, GEPD

Mr. Steven Stancil, GRTA

Mr. William Fernandez, MARTA

| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

REPORT SUMMARY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The Suwanee Dam Road development proposed is approximately 61.54 acres in size that includes a total of 72,000 sq. ft. of office space, 73,500 sq. ft. of commercial space (49,500 sq. ft. of general retail, 12,000 sq. ft. of high turn over restaurant, and 12,000 sq. ft. quality restaurant), 118 single family detached homes and 157 townhomes. There is at least one 17 acres of designated open space. The development is located on the corner of Peachtree Industrial Blvd and Suwanee Dam Road in the City of Suwanee.



PROJECT PHASING:

The project is to be completed as a single phase with completion projected for 2008.

GENERAL

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

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

Yes, the development is consistent with the City of Suwanee's Comprehensive Plan. Currently, the site is zoned for commercial and residential uses. The future land use plan for the City of Suwanee has the site zoned as a mixed use center. The development is proposing a planned mixed use development (PMUD) zoning.

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

The proposed mixed use development is consistent with a mix of commercial and residential uses that are designated on the Gwinnett 2020 Land Use Plan Map.

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

No impacts were determined during the review

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

Yes, the proposed development would increase housing and employment opportunities in the area and provide services and employment opportunities for existing and future residents.



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

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

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

| Year | Name |
|------|-------------------------------------|
| 2000 | Suwanee Junction |
| 2000 | McGinnis Station |
| 2000 | Trammel Crow Industrial Development |
| 1997 | Medusa Cement |
| 1996 | Allen Subdivision on Chatt |
| 1996 | Aamco Paving Company |
| 1986 | Shawnee Ridge |

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

Based on information submitted during the review, it appears the development is likely to displace approximately four units of single-family housing.

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

Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

The proposed residential development is consistent with the majority of regional plans and policies due to its intensity, mix of uses, and location. It is an infill development located near the City of Suwanee Livable Centers Initiative Study Area (LCI), which is a regional town center. The development design includes sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and interconnectivity among the uses within the site. Similarly, the use of alleys and interconnected streets will help to foster pedestrian activity along the internal streets. The development includes numerous, well-designed, park areas throughout the development. The development's walking areas are designed along the exterior provide the potential for connections to adjoining properties.

The development is proposed to be a gated community, which will lessen the pedestrian activity between the site and adjoining area. Similarly, the commercial development follows the existing strip development along the Peachtree Industrial Blvd. corridor.

Based on the review of the policies, it is strongly recommended the development not be constructed as a gated community and the commercial development be redesigned to create a more livable, pedestrian oriented shopping district instead of commercial area primarily designed for access by the automobile. Providing denser, multi-story buildings in the main commercial areas with smaller scaled neighborhood retail, interconnected throughout the site along "Private Street A" would better serve the residents of the new development and existing surrounding residents. Allowing "Private Street A" to be a public street with commercial uses could better connect the development with existing and future developments in the immediate vicinity. Further refinement of the development proposal could create a strong precedent for future development that will link this area to the LCI areas to the southwest.



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

FINAL REPORT

Regional Development Plan Policies

- 1. Provide development strategies and infrastructure investments to accommodate forecasted population and employment growth more efficiently.
- 2. Guide an increased share of new development to the Central Business District, transportation corridors, activity centers and town centers.
- 3. Increase opportunities for mixed-use development, infill and redevelopment.
- 4. Increase transportation choices and transit-oriented development (TOD).
- 5. Provide a variety of housing choices throughout the region to ensure housing for individuals and families of diverse incomes and age groups.
- 6. Preserve and enhance existing residential neighborhoods.
- 7. Advance sustainable greenfield development.
- 8. Protect environmentally sensitive areas.
- 9. Create a regional network of greenspace that connects across jurisdictional boundaries.
- 10. Preserve existing rural character.
- 11. Preserve historic resources.
- 12. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local and neighborhood levels.
- 13. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support the RDP.
- 14. Support growth management at the state level.

BEST LAND USE PRACTICES

- Practice 1: Keep vehicle miles of travel (VMT) below the area average. Infill developments are the best at accomplishing this. The more remote a development the more self contained it must be to stay below the area average VMT.
- Practice 2: Contribute to the area's jobs-housing balance. Strive for a job-housing balance with a three to five mile area around a development site.
- Practice 3: Mix land uses at the finest grain the market will bear and include civic uses in the mix.
- Practice 4: Develop in clusters and keep the clusters small. This will result in more open space preservation.
- Practice 5: Place higher-density housing near commercial centers, transit lines and parks. This will enable more walking, biking and transit use.
- Practice 6: Phase convenience shopping and recreational opportunities to keep pace with housing. These are valued amenities and translate into less external travel by residents if located conveniently to housing.
- Practice 7: Make subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges. This is traditional development.
- Practice 8: Reserve school sites and donate them if necessary to attract new schools. This will result in neighborhood schools which provide a more supportive learning environment than larger ones.
- Practice 9: Concentrate commercial development in compact centers or districts, rather than letting it spread out in strips.



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

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

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

BEST TRANSPORTATION PRACTICES

- Practice 1: Design the street network with multiple connections and relatively direct routes.
- Practice 2: Space through-streets no more than a half mile apart, or the equivalent route density in a curvilinear network
- Practice 3: Use traffic-calming measures liberally. Use short streets, sharp curves, center islands, traffic circles, textured pavements, speed bumps and raised crosswalks.
- Practice 4: Keep speeds on local streets down to 20 mph.
- Practice 5: Keep speeds on arterials and collectors down to 35 mph (at least inside communities).
- Practice 6: Keep all streets as narrow as possible and never more than four traffic lanes wide. Florida suggests access streets 18 feet, subcollectors 26 feet, and collectors from 28 feet to 36 feet depending on lanes and parking.
- Practice 7: Align streets to give buildings energy-efficient orientations. Allow building sites to benefit from sun angles, natural shading and prevailing breezes.
- Practice 8: Avoid using traffic signals wherever possible and always space them for good traffic progression.
- Practice 9: Provide networks for pedestrians and bicyclists as good as the network for motorists.
- Practice 10: Provide pedestrians and bicyclists with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets.
- Practice 11: Incorporate transit-oriented design features.
- Practice 12: Establish TDM programs for local employees. Ridesharing, modified work hours, telecommuting and others.

BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

- Practice 1: Use a systems approach to environmental planning. Shift from development orientation to basins or ecosystems planning.
- Practice 2: Channel development into areas that are already disturbed.
- Practice 3: Preserve patches of high-quality habitat, as large and circular as possible, feathered at the edges and connected by wildlife corridors. Stream corridors offer great potential.
- Practice 4: Design around significant wetlands.
- Practice 5: Establish upland buffers around all retained wetlands and natural water bodies.
- Practice 6: Preserve significant uplands, too.
- Practice 7: Restore and enhance ecological functions damaged by prior site activities.
- Practice 8: Detain runoff with open, natural drainage systems. The more natural the system the more valuable it will be for wildlife and water quality.
- Practice 9: Design man-made lakes and stormwater ponds for maximum environmental value. Recreation, stormwater management, wildlife habitat and others.
- Practice 10: Use reclaimed water and integrated pest management on large landscaped areas. Integrated pest management involves controlling pests by introducing their natural enemies and cultivating disease and insect resistant grasses.
- Practice 11: Use and require the use of XeriscapeTM landscaping. XeriscapingTM is water conserving landscape methods and materials.

BEST HOUSING PRACTICES

- Practice 1: Offer "life cycle" housing. Providing integrated housing for every part of the "life cycle".
- Practice 2: Achieve an average net residential density of six to seven units per acre without the appearance of crowding. Cluster housing to achieve open space.



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

Practice 3: Use cost-effective site development and construction practices. Small frontages and setbacks; rolled curbs or no curbs; shared driveways.

Practice 4: Design of energy-saving features. Natural shading and solar access.

Practice 5: Supply affordable single-family homes for moderate-income households.

Practice 6: Supply affordable multi-family and accessory housing for low-income households.

Practice 7: Tap government housing programs to broaden and deepen the housing/income mix.

Practice 8: Mix housing to the extent the market will bear.

LOCATION

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

The proposed development is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Blvd in the City of Suwanee. It is approximately three miles west of I-85

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

The property is located in west/northwest quadrant of Gwinnett County; however, it is only two miles from Fulton County and Forsyth County. Although the site is entirely within the City of Suwanee, it is only half a mile from the southwestern corner of the City of Sugar Hill.

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

The proposed development would be located close to existing commercial uses and single family residential within the City of Suwanee. The City of Sugar Hill is within a half mile of the proposed development; however, it does not appear that the land uses of the proposed development would greatly impact the surrounding land uses.

ECONOMY OF THE REGION

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

What new taxes will be generated by the proposed project?

Estimated value of the development is \$78,200,000 with an expected \$783,000 in annual local tax revenues.

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

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

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



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

Yes.

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

The proposed development will increase housing and employment opportunities in the area and provide services and employment opportunities for existing and future residents.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located in or near wetlands, groundwater recharge area, water supply watershed, protected river corridor, or other environmentally sensitive area of the Region? If yes, identify those areas.

Based on the information submitted during the review, the proposed development will impact the Chattahoochee Water Supply Watershed; however, it is not likely to affect and significant groundwater recharge areas, wetlands, protect mountains, floodplains, or protected river corridors.

In addition to comments made in the preliminary review report, EPD adds the following:

Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection

The property is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor but it is in the Corridor watershed. As such, the property is subject any applicable ordinances required under the Metropolitan River Protection Act. In this area, the only applicable ordinance would be the City of Suwanee Tributary Buffer Ordinance. Under the Act, local jurisdictions within the basin of the Corridor portion of the Chattahoochee River are required to adopt ordinances creating vegetative buffers along tributaries to the river. At a minimum, a tributary is defined as a perennial stream, as indicated by a solid blue line on the applicable USGS 1:24,000 quad sheet for the area. The applicable quad sheet for this area, the Suwanee Quad, shows no streams on the project property.

The Chattahoochee Basin upstream of Peachtree Creek is also a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles). Under the Part 5 minimum criteria, the only requirements in a large water supply watershed without a water supply reservoir are restrictions on the handling of certain hazardous materials (specified by DNR) within seven miles upstream of an intake.

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. Actual loading factors will depend on the amount of impervious surface in the specific project design. Because there is no loading factor for high-density single-family residential (lots with areas of less than 0.25 acres), all residential area with lot sizes of less than 0.25



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

acres were classified as townhouse/apartment. Although 17 acres of open space is noted on the submitted plans, it has not been separated out from the other uses and is not included as a separate entry in these calculations. 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 |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|-------|------|
| Commercial | 6.33 | 10.82 | 110.14 | 683.64 | 6222.39 | 7.79 | 1.39 |
| Office/Light Industrial | 4.56 | 5.88 | 78.11 | 519.84 | 3228.48 | 6.75 | 0.87 |
| Townhouse/Apartment | 50.65 | 53.18 | 542.46 | 3393.55 | 30643.25 | 38.49 | 7.09 |
| TOTAL | 61.54 | 69.89 | 730.72 | 4597.03 | 40094.12 | 53.03 | 9.35 |

Total % impervious

53%

The totals for Total Phosphorus and Total Nitrogen do not match the sum of the land use amounts due to rounding.

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

HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

There are no historic resources or nationally registered sites located near the proposed development.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

INFRASTRUCTURE Transportation

Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Review Findings

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Non-expedited Review. The proposed development will be situated along Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Boulevard in the City of Suwanee. There will be 118 single-family detached units, 157 townhouse units, 72,000 square feet of general



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

office space, 49,500 square feet of retail shopping, 12,000 square feet of quality restaurant space, and 12,000 square feet of sit-down (high-turnover) restaurant space. There will be 6 site access locations for the proposed development. Three will be along Peachtree Industrial Blvd. and three additional full movement access points will be along Suwanee Dam Road. Pedestrian access will be provided along with pedestrian trails within the site. Build out is scheduled for 2008 and is to be completed in one phase. How much traffic (both average daily and peak am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. performed the transportation analysis. GRTA and ARC review staff agreed with the methodology and assumptions used in the analysis. The net trip generation is based on the rates published in the 6^{th} edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

| Land Use | A.N | I. Peak H | our | P. N | 1. Peak 1 | Hour | Daily |
|--|-------|-----------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|--------|
| Land Ose | Enter | Exit | 2-Way | Enter | Exit | 2-Way | 2-Way |
| Single-Family Detached | | | | | | | |
| 118 units | 23 | 69 | 92 | 78 | 46 | 124 | 1,211 |
| Townhome 157 units | 13 | 61 | 74 | 58 | 29 | 87 | 942 |
| General Office Building 72,000 square feet | 127 | 17 | 144 | 27 | 132 | 159 | 1,036 |
| Shopping Center 50,000 square feet | 63 | 40 | 103 | 189 | 205 | 394 | 4,300 |
| Quality Restaurant 12,000 square feet | 8 | 2 | 10 | 60 | 30 | 90 | 1,079 |
| Sit Down Restaurant 12,000 square feet | 72 | 66 | 138 | 80 | 51 | 131 | 1,526 |
| Internal Capture | 0 | 0 | 0 | -70 | -90 | -180 | -2,482 |
| Pass-by Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | -79 | -72 | -151 | -2,118 |
| TOTAL NEW TRIPS | 306 | 255 | 561 | 343 | 331 | 654 | 5,494 |

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

Incorporating the trip generation results, the transportation consultant distributed the traffic on the current roadway network. An assessment of the existing Level of Service (LOS) and projected LOS based on the trip distribution findings helps to determine the study network. The results of this exercise determined the study network, which was approved by ARC and GRTA. If analysis of an intersection or roadway results in a substandard LOS "D", then the consultant recommends improvements.

Projected traffic volumes from the Regional Travel Demand Model are compared to the assigned capacity of facilities within the study network. This data is used to calculate a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The V/C ratio values that define the LOS thresholds vary depending on factors such as the type of terrain traversed and the percent of the road where passing is prohibited. As a V/C ratio reaches 1.0, congestion increases. The V/C ratios for traffic in various network years are presented in the following table. Any facilities that have a V/C ratio of 0.8 or above are considered congested.



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

V/C Ratios

| V/C Kath | | | | A | M | | | | | P | M | | |
|--------------------|--|--------|------------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| | | | Volume | | | V/C | | | Volume | | | V/C | |
| | Lns/dir. | Total | SB/EB | NB/WB | Total | SB/EB | NB/WB | Total | SB/EB | NB/WB | Total | SB/EB | NB/WB |
| | | | S | uwanee D | am Road | (north of | Peachtre | e Industri | al Blvd) | | | | |
| 2005 | 1 | 5,650 | 3,120 | 2,530 | 0.79 | 0.87 | 0.70 | 7,060 | 3,460 | 3,600 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 1.00 |
| 2010 | 1 | 5,410 | 2,960 | 2,450 | 0.80 | 0.87 | 0.72 | 6,260 | 3,170 | 3,090 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.91 |
| 2025 | 1 | 5,110 | 2,720 | 2,390 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 6,860 | 3,220 | 3,640 | 1.07 | 1.00 | 1.14 |
| % Change 2005-2010 | | -4.2% | -5.1% | -3.2% | 1.3% | 0.0% | 2.9% | -11.3% | -8.4% | -14.2% | -6.1% | -3.1% | -9.0% |
| % Change 2010-2025 | | -5.5% | -8.1% | -2.4% | 0.6% | -2.3% | 4.2% | 9.6% | 1.6% | 17.8% | 16.3% | 7.5% | 25.3% |
| % Change 2005-2025 | | -9.6% | -12.8% | -5.5% | 1.9% | -2.3% | 7.1% | -2.8% | -6.9% | 1.1% | 9.2% | 4.2% | 14.0% |
| | Peachtree Industrial Blvd (east of Suwanee Dam Road) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2005 | 1 | 3,170 | 730 | 2,440 | 0.40 | 0.18 | 0.61 | 4,910 | 3,220 | 1,690 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.42 |
| 2010 | 2 | 4,070 | 1,030 | 3,040 | 0.27 | 0.14 | 0.40 | 7,260 | 4,700 | 2,560 | 0.48 | 0.62 | 0.34 |
| 2025 | 2 | 5,140 | 1,290 | 3,850 | 0.36 | 0.18 | 0.53 | 8,370 | 5,150 | 3,220 | 0.58 | 0.71 | 0.45 |
| % Change 2005-2010 | | 28.4% | 41.1% | 24.6% | -31.6% | -22.2% | -34.4% | 47.9% | 46.0% | 51.5% | -21.3% | -22.5% | -19.0% |
| % Change 2010-2025 | | 26.3% | 25.2% | 26.6% | 31.5% | 28.6% | 32.5% | 15.3% | 9.6% | 25.8% | 20.8% | 14.5% | 32.4% |
| % Change 2005-2025 | | 62.1% | 76.7% | 57.8% | -10.1% | 0.0% | -13.1% | 70.5% | 59.9% | 90.5% | -4.9% | -11.3% | 7.1% |
| | | Lawren | ceville Su | wanee Ro | ad (Betw | een Peach | tree Indu | strial Blv | d and Bu | ford High | way) | | |
| 2005 | 2 | 5,940 | 3,070 | 2,870 | 0.42 | 0.43 | 0.40 | 8,500 | 4,190 | 4,310 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.60 |
| 2010 | 2 | 5,680 | 2,810 | 2,870 | 0.42 | 0.41 | 0.42 | 7,290 | 3,610 | 3,680 | 0.54 | 0.53 | 0.54 |
| 2025 | 2 | 5,040 | 2,530 | 2,510 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.39 | 7,930 | 4,090 | 3,840 | 0.62 | 0.64 | 0.60 |
| % Change 2005-2010 | | -4.4% | -8.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -4.7% | 5.0% | -14.2% | -13.8% | -14.6% | -9.3% | -8.6% | -10.0% |
| % Change 2010-2025 | | -11.3% | -10.0% | -12.5% | -4.8% | -2.4% | -7.1% | 8.8% | 13.3% | 4.3% | 15.9% | 20.8% | 11.1% |
| % Change 2005-2025 | | -15.2% | -17.6% | -12.5% | -4.8% | -7.0% | -2.5% | -6.7% | -2.4% | -10.9% | 5.1% | 10.3% | 0.0% |
| | | | | McGinni | Ferry R | oad (sout | h of Peach | ntree Indu | strial) | | | | |
| 2005 | 2 | 8,340 | 4,020 | 4,320 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.63 | 11,200 | 5,830 | 5,370 | 0.83 | 0.86 | 0.79 |
| 2010 | 2 | 7,190 | 3,650 | 3,540 | 0.53 | 0.54 | 0.52 | 9,380 | 4,760 | 4,620 | 0.69 | 0.70 | 0.68 |
| 2025 | 2 | 5,840 | 3,050 | 2,790 | 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.41 | 8,030 | 3,960 | 4,070 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.60 |
| % Change 2005-2010 | | -13.8% | -9.2% | -18.1% | -13.1% | -8.5% | -17.5% | -16.3% | -18.4% | -14.0% | -16.4% | -18.6% | -13.9% |
| % Change 2010-2025 | | -18.8% | -16.4% | -21.2% | -18.9% | -16.7% | -21.2% | -14.4% | -16.8% | -11.9% | -14.5% | -17.1% | -11.8% |
| % Change 2005-2025 | | -30.0% | -24.1% | -35.4% | -29.5% | -23.7% | -34.9% | -28.3% | -32.1% | -24.2% | -28.5% | -32.6% | -24.1% |

For the V/C ratio table, the data is based on 2005, 2010 and 2025 A.M./P.M. peak volume data generated from ARC's travel demand model for the 2025 RTP Limited Update and FY 2003-2005 TIP, adopted in October 2002. The demand model incorporates lane addition improvements and updates to the network as appropriate. As the life of the RTP progresses, volume and/or V/C ratio data may



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

appear inconsistent due to (1) effect of implementation of nearby new or expanded facilities or (2) impact of socio-economic data on facility types.

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

2003-2005 TIP*

| ARC Number | Route | Type of Improvement | Scheduled Completion Year |
|------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| FN-AR-201 | McGinnis Ferry Road from Sargent Road to Chattahoochee River | Roadway Capacity | 2007 |
| GW-AR-221G | Lawrenceville – Suwanee Road ATMS from Peachtree Industrial Boulevard to SR 120 | Roadway Operations | 2004 |

2025 RTP Limited Update*

| ARC Number | Route | Type of Improvement | Scheduled Completion Year |
|------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| FN-112B | McGinnis Ferry Road at Chattahoochee River | Roadway Capacity | 2020 |

^{*}The ARC Board adopted the 2025 RTP Limited Update and FY 2003-2005 TIP in October 2002. USDOT approved in January 2003

Impacts of Suwanee Dam Road Tract: What are the recommended transportation improvements based on the traffic study done by the applicant?

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **background** traffic. As a result, the transportation consultant has indicated improvement recommendations to allow for an upgrade of the existing level of service to occur. Such improvements will establish an adequate level of service for the area and are as follows:

Suwanee Dam Road and Level Creek Road

- Install a southbound right turn lane along Level Creek Road
- Add permissive and protected phasing for the northbound left-turn movement
- Widen Suwanee Dam Road to a five lane facility (two eastbound and westbound through lanes and a shared center left-turn lane)
- Optimize signal timing

Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Boulevard

- Widen Peachtree Industrial Boulevard to a six lane divided facility
- Convert the eastbound right-turn lane along Suwanee Dam Road to a free-flow right-turn lane
- Widen Suwanee Dam Road to a five lane facility (two eastbound and westbound through lanes and a shared center left-turn lane)
- Optimize signal timing



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

Suwanee Dam Road and Buford Highway

- Widen Buford Highway to a four lane facility
- Install a northbound right-turn lane along Buford Highway
- Optimize signal timing

Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and Moore Road

- Widen Peachtree Industrial Boulevard to a six lane divided facility
- Optimize signal timing

Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and McGinnis Ferry Road

- Widen Peachtree Industrial Boulevard to a six lane divided facility
- Optimize signal timing

Suwanee Dam Road and Settles Bridge Road

- Widen Suwanee Dam Road to a five lane facility (two eastbound and westbound through lanes and a shared center left-turn lane)
- Signal needed to improve LOS, but likely not warranted

Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and Existing Median Break

- Widen Peachtree Industrial Boulevard to a six lane divided facility
- Signal needed to improve LOS, but likely not warranted

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **total** traffic. As a result, the transportation consultant has indicated improvement recommendations to allow for an upgrade of the existing level of service to occur. Such improvements will establish an adequate level of service for the area and are as follows:

Suwanee Dam Road and Settles Bridge Road

- Signalize the intersection
- Install an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along Suwanee Dam Road

Peachtree Industrial Boulevard and Existing Median Break

- Signalize the intersection
- Install an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane exiting the development

Suwanee Dam Road and West Office Drive

- Signal needed to improve LOS, but not likely warranted
- Provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along Suwanee Dam Road

Suwanee Dam Road and East Office Drive

- Signal needed to improve LOS, but not likely warranted
- Provide an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along Suwanee Dam Road



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

Will the proposed project be located in a rapid transit station area? If yes, how will the proposed project enhance or be enhanced by the rapid transit system?

The proposed project will be located in an area with no existing rapid transit.

Is the site served by transit? If so, describe type and level of service.

The site area is currently not served by transit.

Are there plans to provide or expand transit service in the vicinity of the proposed project?

The proposed commuter route from Atlanta to Gainesville includes a rail station stop in Suwanee.

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

None proposed.

The development **PASSES** the ARC's Air Quality Benchmark test.

| Air Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based on ARC strategies) | Type Yes below if taking the credit or blank if not | Credits | Total |
|--|---|---------|-------|
| Traditional Single-Use | | | |
| SF Detached Dwellings With all of the below: | Yes | 15% | 15% |
| Has a neighborhood center or one in close proximity? | | | |
| Has Bike and Pedestrian Facilities that include? | | | |
| connections between units in the site? | | | |
| connections to retail center and adjoining uses with the project limits? | 1 | | |
| Total Calculated ARC Air Quality Credits (15 % reduction required) | | 15% | 15% |
| | | | |

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

Based upon previously mentioned V/C ratios of area roadways around the proposed site, Suwanee Dam Road is forecasted to be the most congested. Other surrounding roadways are forecasted to have



| Preliminary | March 29, | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam |
|--------------|-----------|--------------------------------|----------|----------------|
| Report: | 2004 | | | DRI #509 |
| Final Report | April 29, | REVIEW REPORT | Comments | April 12, 2004 |
| Due: | 2004 | | Due By: | |

high volumes of traffic resulting in large V/C ratios. Although residential uses do not generate large amounts of traffic, there is concern over how the office and commercial land uses will affect traffic flow around the development. According to the consultant's recommendations, there are a number of improvements needed which should be implemented if necessary to mitigate any existing capacity deficiencies. The lack of transit within the vicinity of the site does not aid in alleviating congestion despite the proposed project being mixed use in nature. However, if demand were to occur for future transit service in the area, it would greatly enhance the area not only for the automobile, but for the pedestrian as well. Pedestrian access within the site appears to be accommodating to those who walk for recreational purposes or by choice.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Wastewater is estimated at 0.13 MGD based on information provided with the review. Comments received during the review suggest that the projected flows are too low and do not take into account any peaking. Instead of .13 MGD, flows are more likely to be in the range of .3MGD. Furthermore, comments received indicate that the existing 8-inch lines that presently serve this corner of that intersection are too small to provide adequate capacity. Therefore, the developer may need to make additional improvements to the offsite collection systems that can only be determined after a detailed analysis of the existing system.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Information submitted with the review state that the Gwinnett County Public Utilities will provide wastewater treatment service to the project. Currently, the Sugar Hill Facility is being planned to be taken off-line with the plant flows to be conveyed to F. Wayne Hill WRC in 2006.

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

The capacity of the F. Wayne Hill plant is listed below:

| PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD 1 | DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD | 2001MMF, MGD | 2008 MMF, MGD | 2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD | PLANNED EXPANSION | REMARKS |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| 20 | 20 | 9 | 20 | 0 | Expansion to 60mgd by 2005. | Combined discharge to Chattahoochee River with Crooked Creek plant. 40mgd expansion to discharge Lake Lanier. |

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



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

¹ Source: Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District **LONG-TERM WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN**, September, 2003.

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

ARC has reviewed a number of major developments that will be served by this plant. Construction of the proposed development should be arranged consistent with any expansion of the F. Wayne Hill WRC

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.15 MGD based on information provided with the review.

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

Solid Waste

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

Information submitted with the review estimates 1,043 tons of solid waste per year and the waste will be disposed of in Gwinnett County.

Other than adding to a serious regional solid waste disposal problem, will the project create any unusual waste handling or disposal problems?

No.

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

None stated.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Other facilities

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

· Levels of governmental services?



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

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

The proposed development is approximately less than one mile from the Suwanee City Hall, Police Department, and Fire Station. It is just over a mile to both Suwanee Elementary School and North Gwinnett High School. The closest middle school is Lanier Middle School which is just over two miles from the proposed development. Currently under construction is a new elementary school located on Tench Road. The school site is adjacent to the development site. The site plan indicates pedestrian access to the school via sidewalk.

AGING

Does the development address population needs by age?

There are many components in this development that are important aspects to consider when planning for an aging population including a range of housing types, the close proximity of retail space to residential space and the creation of a pedestrian friendly environment.

But thus far, nothing in the development addresses the housing, retail or transportation needs of this market, a market that is likely to be reconsidering its current housing situation and changing both its employment and consumption patterns.

What is the age demographic in the immediate area of the development?

Given this particular development's location there are a couple additional facts to consider in order to address the needs of the area's older adult population:

Many of the census tracts in the AOI have high concentrations of older adults:

| Census Tract | 1305.1 | 1305 | 1306 | 116.08 | 501.03 | 501.04 | 501.05 | 502.02 | 502.02 | 502.04 | 502.05 |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 55+ Population | 1791 | 1737 | 3106 | 2058 | 1118 | 1284 | 724 | 1047 | 1563 | 1728 | 545 |
| % of total population 55+ | 20.63% | 16.60% | 11.48% | 7.01% | 16.13% | 11.95% | 17.89% | 15.63% | 8.41% | 11.08% | 13.15% |



| Preliminary Report: | March 29, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Suwanee Dam DRI #509 |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | April 29, 2004 | REVIEW REPORT | Comments Due By: | April 12 , 2004 |

As older adults are some of the lowest users of public transportation, the lack of transit near this development does not greatly impact the older adult population. However, it is critical not only that the development be pedestrian friendly but that the decreased walking distances of an older population be considered in order to make the Suwanee Dam Road development truly accessible to older adults no longer able to drive.

It is recommended that the developers contact and work with the Gwinnett County Senior Services to gain a better understanding of the older adult population immediately surrounding the project.

For additional information on the characteristics of an Age Friendly Community, see the Aging in Place Toolkit: http://www.atlantaregional.com/qualitygrowth/toolkits.html#aging

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

No, this project will add 275 residential units to the area.

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

Yes, once developed, this project will provide housing and employment into an existing employment center. The proposed development is within a mile of Suwanee Town Center and three miles from Sugar Hill Town Center. It is also with approximately five miles of the Mall of Georgia Regional Center.

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

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 502.02. This tract had a 27.7 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2003 according to ARC's Population and Housing report. The report shows that 86 percent of the housing units are single-family, compared to 69 percent for the region; thus indicating a need for additional housing options in the development area.

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

Likely, assuming the development is approved with multiple price ranges of housing.

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



71 0 A Service Suwanee Dam Road ON EXCESSED STREET OF THE DESCRIPTION Cand Plan III DON The second secon Control of the contro PLANCES OF PERSONS

THE DRIVE STATE STATES

THE THE CONTROL OF STATES

FROM THE CONTROL OF STATES

FROM THE ANY ALBECTA October 25, 2003

1

Your DRI ID NUMBER for this submission is: 509 Use this number when filling out a DRI REVIEW REQUEST. Submitted on: 10/31/2003 2:49:56 PM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Gwinnett County Initial DRI Information (Form1b)

This form is intended for use by local governments within the Metropolitan Region Tier that are also within the jurisdiction of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA). The form is to be completed by the city or county government for submission to your Regional Development Center (RDC), GRTA and DCA. This form provides basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Local governments should refer to both the Rules for the DRI Process 110-12-3 and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds established by DCA.

| Local Gover | nment Information |
|--|---|
| Submitting Local Government: | City of Suwanee |
| *Individual completing form and Mailing Address: | Marvin Allen 373 Highway 23 Suwanee, GA 30024 |
| | 770-945-8996 |
| Fax: | 770-945-2792 |
| E-mail (only one): | mallen@suwanee.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 | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Nan | ne of Proposed | Project: Suwanee Dam Road Tra | ict |
| Development Type | | Description of Project | Thresholds |
| Mixed Use | | idential units; 61500 sq. ft of etail uses; 72000 sq. ft of office acre tract | View Thresholds |
| Developer / Applicant and M | ailing Address: | Jolly Development c/o Kathryn M Suite 3100 Atlanta, GA 30309 | . Zickert 1230 Peachtree St. NE |
| | Telephone: | 404-815-3500 | |
| | Fax: | 404-685-7002 | - |
| | Email: | kmzickert@sgrlaw.com | |
| Name of property owner(s) devel | f different from oper/applicant: | Peachtree/Suwanee Properties, I Emogene Hope; Marge M Cronar James R. Bailey & Glinda Bailey | |
| Provide Land-Lot-D | istrict Number: | 7th District, Land Lot 252 | |
| What are the principal streets or revehicular aco | roads providing ess to the site? | Suwanee Dam Road and Peacht | ree Industrial Boulevard |
| Provide name of nearest street(s) or intersection: | | Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Boulevard | |
| Provide geographic coordinates (lati of the center of the proposed pro | | 7 | |
| If available, provide a link to a web- general location map of the pr (http://www.ma http://www.mapbiast.com are helpfu | oposed project (optional). apquest.com or | | |
| Is the proposed project entirely local local governmen | | Y | |
| If yes, how close is the boundary of the nearest other local government? | | Approximately 1,100 feet from City of Sugar Hill | |
| f no, provide the following information: | | | |
| In what additional jurisdictions is the p | roject located? | | |
| located? (give percent of project) review process. | | Name: (NOTE: This local government is review process.) | responsible for initiating the DR |
| | | Percent of Project: | |
| is the current proposal a continuation of a | or expansion of previous DRI? | N | |

| If you provide the following left was in | Name: |
|--|---|
| If yes, provide the following information (where applicable): | |
| Approactor; | App #: |
| The initial action being requested of the local government by the applicant is: | Rezoning |
| What is the name of the water supplier for this site? | Gwinnett County Public Utilities |
| What is the name of the wastewater treatment supplier for this site? | Gwinnett County Public Utilities |
| Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? | N |
| If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent? | |
| Estimated Completion Dates: | This project/phase: Overall project: |

Local Government Comprehensive Plan

Is the development consistent with the local government's comprehensive plan, including the Future Land Use Map? Y

If no, does the local government intend to amend the plan/map to account for this development?

If amendments are needed, when will the plan/map be amended?

Service Delivery Strategy

Is all local service provision consistent with the countywide Service Delivery Strategy? If no, when will required amendments to the countywide Service Delivery Strategy be complete?

Land Transportation Improvements

Are land transportation or access improvements planned or needed to support the proposed project? N

If yes, how have these improvements been identified:

Included in local government Comprehensive Plan or Short Term Work Program?

Included in other local government plans (e.g. SPLOST/LOST Projects, etc.)?

Included in an official Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)?

Developer/Applicant has identified needed improvements?

Other (Please Describe):

Submitted on: 3/23/2004 3:09:04 PM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT DRI Review Initiation Request (Form2a)

| Local Government I | nformation | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | | |
| Submitting Local Government: | City of Suwanee | |
| Individual completing form: | Marty Allen | |
| Telephone: | 770-945-7034 | |
| Fax: | 770-945-2792 | |
| Email (only one): | mallen © suwanee.com | |

| Proposed | Project Information |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name of Proposed Project: | Suwanee Dam Road Tract |
| DRI ID Number: | 509 |
| Developer/Applicant: | Jolly Development Corporation, Inc. |
| Telephone: | 678-475-1800 |
| Fax: | 678-475-1801 |
| Email(s): | msmith @ jollydevelopment.com |

| DRI Review Proce | SS | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proc | ceed with the official regional (If no, proceed to Eco | review process? | Y |
| If yes, has that additional information been pro | | | Y |
| no, the official review process can not start until this additional information | | And the second second second second | |
| Economic Impact | s | | |
| | stimated Value at Build-Out: | \$78,200,000 | |
| Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) t | ikely to be generated by the proposed development: | \$783,000 | |
| Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand create | ed by the proposed project? | Y | |

3) 7-252-013; 2395 sq. ft.; 4) 7-252-005; 2,026 sq. ft.

| Community Facilities Impacts | |
|--|--------------------|
| Water Supply | |
| Name of water supply provider for this site: | Gwinnett |
| What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | 0.15 |
| is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? | Y |
| If no, are there any current plans to expand existing water supply capacity? | |
| there are plans to expand the existing water supply capacity, briefly describe below: | |
| water line extension is required to serve this project, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? | |
| Wastewater Disposal | |
| Name of wastewater freatment provider for this site. | Gwinnett County |
| What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | 0,13 |
| is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? | Y |
| If no, are there any current plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity? | |
| there are plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity, briefly describe below. | |
| If sewer line extension is required to serve this project, how much additional line (in miles) will be | |

| How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips pe day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide | er 10 |
|---|---------|
| Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project | 9 |
| If yes, has a copy of the study been provided to the local government. | 2 4 |
| If transportation improvements are needed to serve this project, please describe below: Left-turn and right-turn lanes and traffic signalization | |
| Solid Waste Disposal | |
| How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? | 1.043 |
| Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? | V |
| If no, are there any current plans to expand existing landfill capacity? | N |
| If there are plans to expand existing landfill capacity, briefly describe below: | |
| Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: | N |
| Stormwater Management | |
| What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? | •/• 50° |
| Is the site located in a water supply watershed? | Υ |
| If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: Chattahoochee | |
| Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate project's impacts on stormwater management: stream buffers and detention ponds per local regulations | the |
| Environmental Quality | |
| is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following: | |
| Water supply watersheds? | 1 |
| 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? | 1 |
| 3. Wetlands? | |
| 4. Protected mountains? | 1 |
| 5. Protected river corridors? | 1 |
| If you answered yes to any question 1-5 above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected below: Mitigated by stormwater BMP's, sanitary sewer service, stream buffers | |
| Has the local government implemented environmental regulations consistent with the Department of Natural Resourc Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria? | ces' |
| Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following: | |
| 1. Floodplains? | 1 |
| 2. Historic resources? | 1 |
| 3. Other environmentally sensitive resources? | I N |
| Voll answered yes to any question 1.3 above deposits bout to ideally d | - |

GWINNETT COUNTY



Department of Planning & Development (678)518-6000

April 13, 2004

Ms. Haley Fleming Senior Planner Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Courtland Street Atlanta, GA 30303

RE: Development of Regional Impact Review Suwanee-Dam Road Tract (City of Suwanee)

Dear Ms. Fleming:

The Department of Planning and Development has reviewed the information forwarded regarding the proposed Development of Regional Impact on Peachtree Industrial Boulevard in the City of Suwanee. Based on the City of Suwanee's land use plan, the property has been projected for a mix of commercial and residential uses on the Gwinnett 2020 Land Use Plan Map. The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with this designation.

The Department of Planning and Development requested review of the project by the Gwinnett Departments of Transportation and Public Utilities. Please note the following comments:

Department of Transportation:

A copy of the Development of Regional Impact for the Suwanee Dam Road Tract has been forwarded to this office for comment. Unfortunately, we have not received a copy of the consultant's traffic impact study, which GRTA had instructed the consultant to forward to Gwinnett County and, without this report, it is not possible to comment in detail on the traffic impacts of the proposed development.

Based on the information at hand, we do offer the following comments and observations:

- (1) The intersections of the two main site driveways with Peachtree Industrial Blvd and Suwanee Dam Road will require channelization and possible signalization and widening. This work should include completing traffic signal warrant studies and designing and installing any indicated signalization.
- (2) The existing intersection of Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Road will likely be impacted and may require widening to include additional or extended turn lanes or other improvement.
- (3) From the very small scale site plan included in the DRI report there appears to be an excessive number of driveways on Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Blvd. The number and location of driveway cuts will be determined by the Gwinnett County Development Regulations and subject to review and approval by Gwinnett Department of Transportation.

Page 1

While the development is located in the City of Suwanee, both Suwanee Dam Road and Peachtree Industrial Blvd are county roads and we would therefore require the developer to undertake and complete any work required in order to mitigate the traffic impact associated with the development at no cost to Gwinnett county, and subject to review and approval by the Gwinnett County Department of Transportation.

Department of Public Utilities:

The Department of Public Utilities review of the Suwance Dam Road DRI for City of Suwanne indicates that there appears to be sufficient water delivery available to serve the projects anticipated needs. Although there should be sufficient sewerage treatment capacity available, it appears that the projected flows are too low, and do not take into account any peaking. Instead of .13 MGD, flows are more like to be in the range of .3 MGD. This would possibly indicate that the existing 8-inch lines that presently serve this corner of that intersection are too small to provide adequate capacity, and may therefore, require the developer to make additional improvements to the offsite collection systems. The nature and extent of these of improvements can only be determined after a detailed analysis of the existing system is provided by the developer's engineer.

The developer should also coordinate the construction of the project with the Gwinnett County Departments of Public Utilities and Transportation. Any cost associated with necessary off- site improvements to county roads or utilities shall be the responsibility of the approving jurisdiction or the developer. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding our comments.

Sincerely,

Michael Williams

Director, Planning and Development

c: F. Wayne Hill, Chairman, County Commission Marcia Neaton, Commissioner, District 1 Charlotte Nash, County Administrator, Commission Office Steve Logan, AICP, Director, Planning Division Don Jascomb, AICP, Director, Development Division Nancy Roney, AICP, Manager, Long Range Planning Files