



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: Aug 22 2005

ARC REVIEW CODE: R508221

TO: Chairman Vernon Jones
ATTN TO: John Bell, Planner
FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is 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 regarding related to the proposal not addressed by the Commission's regional plans and policies.

Name of Proposal: River Village

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: The proposed River Village mixed use development is located on approximately 109 acres of in DeKalb County and will consist of 133 single family homes, 149 townhomes, 240 apartments, and 167,000 square feet of combination retail/office space. It is assumed that the retail and office space is broken out into 160,000 square feet of retail, and 7,000 square feet of office. Access to the site is proposed a two location along Rock Chapel Road.

Submitting Local Government: DeKalb County

Date Opened: Aug 22 2005

Deadline for Comments: Sept 5 2005

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Aug 21 2005

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DEKALB COUNTY SCHOOLS
CITY OF STONE MOUNTAIN
DEKALB COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF LITHONIA
CITY OF PINE LAKE

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
ROCKDALE COUNTY
GWINNETT COUNTY

Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Mike Alexander, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3302. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you by 2005-09-05 00:00:00, we will assume that your agency has no additional comments and we will close the review. Comments by email are strongly encouraged.

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



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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



DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT

DRI- REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

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

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: **River Village** See the Preliminary Report .

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

Individual Completing form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: ()

Signature:

Date:

Please Return this form to:

Mike Alexander, Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street NE

Atlanta, GA 30303

Ph. (404) 463-3302 Fax (404) 463-3254

malexander@atlantaregional.com


Return Date: Sep 5 2005

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

PRELIMINARY REPORT SUMMARY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The proposed River Village mixed use development is located on approximately 109 acres of in DeKalb County and will consist of 133 single family homes, 149 townhomes, 240 apartments, and 167,000 square feet of combination retail/office space. It is assumed that the retail and office space is broken out into 160,000 square feet of retail, and 7,000 square feet of office. Access to the site is proposed a two location along Rock Chapel Road.



PROJECT PHASING:

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

GENERAL

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

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

The project site is currently zoned a combination of R-100 and M (industrial). The proposed zoning for the site is PCD-3 (pedestrian community district). Information submitted for the review states that the proposed zoning is not consistent with DeKalb County's Future Land Use Map which designates the site as low to medium density residential and industrial. The developer is seeking to amend the Map with the site area being classified as OMX (office/mixed use).

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

This will be determined based on comments received from potentially impacted local governments.

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

This will be determined based on comments received from potentially impacted local governments.

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 the need for services in the area for existing and future residents.

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 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 three mile radius of the proposed project.

YEAR	NAME
2004	ROCK CHAPEL ROAD MUD
1997	COVINGTON HIGHWAY TRACT

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

Based on information submitted for the review, the site is currently occupied by four single family houses.

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 River Village development is a mixed use development that incorporates residential, office and retail uses. The development also proposes live work units along the main corridor of the development. Although, the proposed development meets several ARC's Regional Development Policies; however, ARC encourages refinement of the site plan to create a more cohesive development and community. ARC would like to meet with the developer and DeKalb County to further discuss refinement of the site plan and the comments before.

The proposed development does not pass ARC's Air Quality Benchmark Test, scoring a 9 out of desirable 15 percentage points. ARC would like to discuss with the developer ways in which to bring this score up. One such possibility is incorporating a shuttle service from the site to a transit service access point nearby. As noted in information submitted for the review, there is not transit service within several miles of the development; therefore, offering shuttle service for the residents of the development would provide an alternative to getting to work other than the single occupancy automobile. Also, as discussed below, ARC strives to advance sustainable development. Residential developments in rural areas can accomplish this through conservation subdivisions. ARC recommends 40% open space for conservation subdivision based on the ARC's Community Choice Toolkit. Based on information submitted for the review, the development is proposing 34% open space. ARC would like to developer to consider portions of the development where more open space could be preserved.

The development proposes several front loaded townhomes with 2 car garages. It is important to encourage pedestrian safety within the development. Where the majority of the front of the townhome is dedicated to the automobile, as is seen with 2 car garages on the first floor, it is strongly recommended that the site plan be revised to reflect rear auto entry townhomes and alley access or

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

increase the lot size so that no more than 50% of the lot width is dedicated to the automobile. The northern townhome development on the site does reflect alley access and rear entry.

Another recommendation is to develop a continuous street frontage along Streets A and B. At the southern end of the development along Street A, parking becomes more prevalent along the street front and the plan becomes characteristic of auto oriented development. It is recommended that the site plan be revised to continue the pattern established in the northern portion of Street A and along Street B where the buildings are built to the street and the parking is located in the back.

The Regional Development Policies adopted by the ARC strive to advance sustainable development, protect environmentally sensitive areas, and create a regional network of greenspace. Residential developments in rural areas can accomplish these goals through conservation subdivisions that protect rural character, reduce public infrastructure costs, and create areas of greenspace. The ARC Community Toolkit for Conservation Subdivision designs recommends in rural areas that at least 40% of the site, specifically the developable area, be dedicated to greenspace and remain in its natural state. Residential is then clustered in the remainder of the site. The rural character of the site and surrounding area in DeKalb County should prompt the County to achieve a conservation subdivision with this development or at minimum, preserving a maximum of greenspace.

The development proposes a greenway system that will connect to a neighboring church, park, and elementary school with possible future connections to a larger greenway system on the Yellow River. ARC strongly recommends greenway trails and connecting developments, activity centers, and other destination places to one another through a larger interjurisdictional system. This development promotes this goal of interconnected greenways and will allow residents an alternate mode of accessing other development and institutions in the immediate area.

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

PRELIMINARY 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:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 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 Xeriscape™ landscaping. Xeriscaping™ 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:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 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 project is located in southeast DeKalb County at the intersection of Rock Chapel Road and Hightower Trail.

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.

It is entirely within the DeKalb County boundaries; however, it is approximately two miles from Rockdale County, three miles from Gwinnett County, and two miles from the City of Lithonia.

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

None have been identified.

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 \$115,000,000 million with an expected \$1,300,000 in annual local tax revenues.

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

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

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

Yes.

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

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

To be determined during the review.

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.

To be determined during the review.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

None have been identified.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation

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

Access to the site is proposed at two locations: one full-movement and one right-in/right-out driveway along Rock Chapel Road.

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

Kimley-Horn and Associates 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 7th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

Land Use	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			24-Hour
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	2-Way
133 Single-Family Homes	26	77	103	88	51	139	1352
149 Town Homes	12	59	71	56	27	83	902
240 Apartments	26	105	131	105	56	161	1714
137,000 sq ft Commercial	171	71	242	320	426	746	7412
Pass By Reductions	0	0	0	-106	-106	-212	-2310
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	235	312	547	463	454	917	9070


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 has been 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. LOS A is free-flow traffic from 0 to 0.3, LOS B is decreased free-flow from 0.31 to 0.5, LOS C is limited mobility from 0.51 to 0.75, LOS D is restricted mobility from 0.76 to 0.9, LOS E is at or near capacity from 0.91 to 1.00, and LOS F is breakdown flow with a V/C ratio of 1.01 or above. As a V/C ratio reaches 0.8, 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 1.0 or above are considered congested.

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004


V/C Ratios




2005 AM Peak




2005 PM Peak




2010 AM Peak



2010 PM Peak



2030 AM Peak



2030 PM Peak

Legend	
AM/PM Peak V/C Ratio	LOS A: 0 - 0.3 LOS B: 0.31 - 0.5 LOS C: 0.51 - 0.75 LOS D: 0.76 - 0.90 LOS E: 0.91 - 1.00 LOS F: 1.01+

For the V/C ratio graphic, the data is based on 2005, 2010 and 2030 A.M./P.M. peak volume data generated from ARC's travel demand model for Mobility 2030, the 2030 RTP and the FY 2005-2010 TIP, approved in December 2004. The travel 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 appear inconsistent due to (1) effect of implementation of nearby new or expanded facilities or (2) impact of socio-economic data on facility types.

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

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

2005-2010 TIP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
DK-270A1	LITHONIA INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD: PHASE I	Roadway Capacity	2007
DK-270C	LITHONIA INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD EXTENSION: PHASE II	Roadway Capacity	2007
DK-270A2	LITHONIA INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD EXTENSION: PHASE I	Roadway Capacity	2007
DK-270B	LITHONIA INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD EXTENSION: PHASE I	Bridge Capacity	2007

2030 RTP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
DK-342B	ROCKBRIDGE ROAD	Roadway Operations	2020

**The ARC Board adopted the 2030 RTP and FY 2005-2010 TIP in December 2004. USDOT approved in December 2004.*

Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for Cosmopolitan North Mixed-Use.

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **background** traffic. The transportation consultant has made recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service.

Rock Chapel Road at Asbury Drive

- Add a traffic signal.
- Improve the eastbound Asbury Drive approach to a 2-lane approach (one left-turn and a shared thru/right turn lane) in conjunction with signalization.

Rock Chapel Road at Stephenson Road

- Provide permissive + overlap phasing for the eastbound right-turn movement along Stephenson Road.

Rock Chapel Road at Future Lithonia Industrial Boulevard

- Add a traffic signal.

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **total** traffic. The transportation consultant has made recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service. The recommendations stated in the no-build condition are also applicable to the build condition.

Rock Chapel Road at Asbury Drive at Site Driveway

- Provide three westbound egress lanes exiting the development (a separate left-turn, through, and right-turn lane).

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

Rock Chapel Road at Southern Site Driveway

- Provide a northbound exclusive right-turn lane along Rock Chapel Road into the development.
- Provide separate westbound right-turn lane exiting the development.

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?

Local or regional transit does not currently serve the area of the proposed development.

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

None proposed.

The development **DOES NOT PASS** the ARC's Air Quality Benchmark test.

Air Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based on ARC strategies)	Credits	Total
Where Residential is dominant, 10% Retail or 10% Office	4%	4%
Bike/ped networks that meet Mixed Use or Density target and connect to adjoining uses	5%	5%
Total		9%

The proposed development does not pass ARC's Air Quality Benchmark Test; however, the developer could incorporate a shuttle service from the site to a transit service access point nearby. As noted in information submitted for the review, there is not transit service within several miles of the development; therefore, offering shuttle service for the residents of the development would provide an alternative to getting to work other than the single occupancy automobile.

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

Traffic impacts associated with this development are minimal. However, the area surrounding the project has high peak hour congestion. There is currently no transit service available within several miles of this project. Due to the dense, walkable character of this project, it would be beneficial to the development and the surrounding area to include a direct connection to MARTA or the GRTA Xpress bus service within the site. It is suggested the developer work with MARTA or GRTA to offer greater transit access.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Based on regional averages, wastewater is estimated at 0.16 MGD.

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Pole Bridge will provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development.

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

The capacity of Pole Bridge Site is listed below:

PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD ₁	DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD	2001 MMF, MGD	2008 MMF, MGD	2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD	PLANNED EXPANSION	REMARKS
20	20	13	30	-10	Combine Pole Bridge and Snapfinger into one 86mgd plant at Pole Bridge, provide service to portions of Rockdale, Gwinnett, Henry, and Clayton	Approximately 80 mgd interbasin transfer at full design flow. DeKalb Co. and EPD must resolve interbasin transfer issues prior to permitting.

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

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

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.19 MGD based on regional averages.

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

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

INFRASTRUCTURE

Solid Waste

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

Information submitted with the review 1249 tons of solid waste per year and the waste will be disposed of in DeKalb County.

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

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?**
- **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.)?**

To be determined during the review.

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

No, the project will provide an additional 522 housing units that will include single family homes townhomes and apartments.

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

Yes, once developed, this project will provide housing opportunities for existing employment centers.

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

Preliminary Report:	August 22, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	River Village #762
Final Report Due:	September 21, 2004		Comments Due By:	September 5, 2004

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 233.02. This tract had a 12.3 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2003 according to ARC's Population and Housing Report. The report shows that 99 percent of the housing units are single-family, compared to 69 percent for the region; thus indicating a lack of housing options around 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.

Your DRI ID NUMBER for this submission is: **762**
 Use this number when filling out a DRI REVIEW REQUEST.
 Submitted on: 3/22/2005 9:13:17 AM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT

DeKalb 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 Government Information

Submitting Local Government:	DeKalb County
*Individual completing form and Mailing Address:	John Bell 330 W. Ponce de leon Avenue Suite 500 Decatur, GA 30030
Telephone:	404-371-4404
Fax:	404-371-2813
E-mail (only one):	jabell@co.dekalb.ga.us

*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:		River Village
Development Type	Description of Project	Thresholds
Mixed Use	109-acre mixed use development to consist of retail office & resident	View Thresholds
Developer / Applicant and Mailing Address:		T.K. Moreland Inc 143 Lee Byrd Road, P.O. Box 2838 Loganville, GA 30052
Telephone:		770-466-5240
Fax:		770-466-0870
Email:		klender@landerlaw.com
Name of property owner(s) if different from developer/ applicant:		see attached exhibit A
Provide Land-Lot-District Number:		16-191; 193; 194; 223; 224
What are the principal streets or roads providing vehicular access to the site?		Rock Chapel Road
Provide name of nearest street(s) or intersection:		Hightower Trail
Provide geographic coordinates (latitude/longitude) of the center of the proposed project (optional):		/
If available, provide a link to a website providing a general location map of the proposed project (optional). (http://www.mapquest.com or http://www.mapblast.com are helpful sites to use.):		
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?		Y
If yes, how close is the boundary of the nearest other local government?		1 mile to Gwinnett County

If no, provide the following information:	
In what additional jurisdictions is the project located?	
In which jurisdiction is the majority of the project located? (give percent of project)	Name: (NOTE: This local government is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.)
	Percent of Project:
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	N
If yes, provide the following information (where applicable):	Name:
	Project ID:
	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?	DeKalb County
What is the name of the wastewater treatment supplier for this site?	DeKalb County
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: 2010

Local Government Comprehensive Plan

Is the development consistent with the local government's comprehensive plan, including the Future Land Use Map?	N
If no, does the local government intend to amend the plan/map to account for this development?	Y
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?	N
Included in other local government plans (e.g. SPLOST/LOST Projects, etc.)?	N
Included in an official Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)?	Y
Developer/Applicant has identified needed improvements?	
Other (Please Describe):	
The transportation analysis is in progress and will document necessary roadway improvements	

Submitted on: 8/12/2005 2:15:41 PM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT DRI Review Initiation Request (Form2a)

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government:	DeKalb County
Individual completing form:	Kevin Hunter
Telephone:	404-371-4922
Fax:	404-371-2813
Email (only one):	khunter@co.dekalb.ga.us

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	River Village
DRI ID Number:	762
Developer/Applicant:	T.K. Moreland Inc. 143 Lee Byrd Road, P.O. Box 2838, Loganville, GA 30052
Telephone:	770-466-5240
Fax:	770-466-0870
Email(s):	klender@landerlaw.com

DRI Review Process

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)	N
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?	
If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.	

Economic Impacts

Estimated Value at Build-Out:	\$115,000,000
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$1,300,000
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	Y
If the development will displace any existing uses, please describe (using number of units, square feet., etc):	

Community Facilities Impacts

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:	DeKalb County
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.19 MGD
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?	
If there are plans to expand the existing water supply capacity, briefly describe below:	
If water line extension is required to serve this project, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?	

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	DeKalb County
--	---------------

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.16 MGD
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?	N
If 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 required?	

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.)	11,377 vpd
Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	Y
If yes, has a copy of the study been provided to the local government?	Y

If transportation improvements are needed to serve this project, please describe below:
Proposed signalization @ Ashbury Drive/Rock Chapel (Proposed site driveway) with separate left turn lanes entering and existing the site. A northbound right-turn lane along Rock Chapel Road into the site and a right-turn existing the site.

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1249 tons
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	Y
If no, are there any current plans to expand existing landfill capacity?	
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?	41.4 acres
Is the site located in a water supply watershed?	Y
If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: OCMULGEE	
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Detention ponds, water quality features, and buffers would be implemented in accordance with DeKalb County Standard.	

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:	
1. Water supply watersheds?	Y
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?	N
3. Wetlands?	Y
4. Protected mountains?	N
5. Protected river corridors?	N
If you answered yes to any question 1-5 above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected below: Wetlands exists on the project site, however, stream buffer requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Impacts on environmentally sensitive areas should be less than significant.	

Has the local government implemented environmental regulations consistent with the Department of Natural Resources' Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria?	Y
Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:	
1. Floodplains?	Y
2. Historic resources?	N
3. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	N
If you answered yes to any question 1-3 above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected below: Floodplains exists on the project site, however, impacts should be less than significant. DeKalb County Regulations requires protection of floodplain areas.	

Clark
Design Group



PLANNING • ENGINEERING • ENVIRONMENTAL
SURVEYING • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

3305 Breckinridge Blvd. - Suite 112
Duluth, Georgia 30096
Phone: 678-580-6007 Fax: 678-580-0371




Land Lots 191, 192, 193, 224
16th District

Rezonning / Multi-Modal Access Site Plan

River Village
Rezoning Exhibit B,H,I

Dekalb County,
Georgia



OWNER / DEVELOPER

T.K. Moreland, Inc.
Ken Lander

March 10, 2005


Scale : 1" = 100'







County Project Number ?

CN: 05009concept07SUB.3-10-05.dwg

Job Alias: Rock Chapel Tract

Sheet 1 of 2





**Clark
Design Group**

PLANNING • ENGINEERING • ENVIRONMENTAL
SURVEYING • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

3305 Breckinridge Blvd. • Suite 112
Duluth, Georgia 30096
Phone: 678-380-6007 Fax: 678-380-0371

Rezoning Site Plan

River Village

Land Lots 191,192,193,224
16th District

Dekalb County,
Georgia

OWNER / DEVELOPER

T.K. Moreland, L.L.C.

Ken Lander

P.O. Box 2838, Legonville, GA 30052
Tele (770) 466-5210 Fax (770) 466-0870

March 10, 2005

Scale : $\gamma' = 100'$

County Project Number ?

CN: 05009concept\05SUB-3-10-05.dwg

Job Alias: Rock Chapel Tract

Sheet 2 of 2