



# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax: 404.463.3105 • [www.atlantaregional.com](http://www.atlantaregional.com)

DATE: 1/31/2006

ARC REVIEW CODE: R601311

TO: Chairman Charles Bannister  
ATTN TO: Jeff West, Manager  
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:** Bighorn Investments (Hurricane Shoals)

**Review Type:** Development of Regional Impact

**Description:** The proposed Bighorn Investments Development, also known as Hurricane Shoals, is a 89.03 acre mixed use development in Gwinnett County. The proposed development will consist of 313 single family detached residential units, and 119,075 square feet of retail space. The proposed development is located at the intersection of Hurrican Shoals Road and Rabbit Hill Road. Access to the development is propsoed at thirteen locations along the three public road: Hurrican Shoals Road, Rabbit Hill Road, and Rabbit Hill Circle.

**Submitting Local Government:** Gwinnett County

**Date Opened:** 1/31/2006

**Deadline for Comments:** 2/14/2006

**Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed:** 3/2/2006

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING  
ARC DATA RESEARCH  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
CITY OF LAWRENCEVILLE  
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY  
NORTHEAST GEORGIA RDC

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
ARC AGING DIVISION  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CITY OF DACULA  
CITY OF AUBURN

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
GWINNETT COUNTY SCHOOLS  
BARROW 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 2006-02-14 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](http://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: **Bighorn Investments (Hurricane Shoals)** *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](mailto:malexander@atlantaregional.com)


**Return Date: 2/14/2006**

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

## **PRELIMINARY REPORT SUMMARY**

### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

The proposed Bighorn Investments Development, also known as Hurricane Shoals, is a 89.03 acre mixed use development in Gwinnett County. The proposed development will consist of 313 single family detached residential units, and 119,075 square feet of retail space. The proposed development is located at the intersection of Hurrican Shoals Road and Rabbit Hill Road. Access to the development is propsoed at thirteen locations along the three public road: Hurrican Shoals Road, Rabbit Hill Road, and Rabbit Hill Circle.



### **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-200 and R-100 (residential). The proposed zoning for the site is RZT (residential, allowing up to 6 units/acre) and C-2 (commercial). Information submitted for the review states that the proposed zoning is not consistent with Gwinnett County's Future Land Use Map which designates the area as low density single family (2-3 units/acre). Information submitted for the review states that the County does not intend to amend its map to account for this development.

**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?**

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

Yes, the proposed development would increase the need for services in the area for existing and future residents.

**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
1989	Hurricane Shoals Mixed Use
1985	Gwinnett Progress Center

**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 undeveloped except for a barn on the property.

**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 Bighorn Investments development is a mixed use development that meets several of ARC's Regional Development Policies, yet fails to meet ARC's Air Quality Benchmarks. The proposed development received a score of 9 out of 15 points on the Benchmark Test. ARC staff would like to discuss with the developer and Gwinnett County ways in which to improve upon the score.

The proposed development is increasing mixed use development in a fast growing part of the region. The ARC forecasts significant population and employment growth in eastern Gwinnett County over the next 25 years. ARC forecasts a population of over 134,000 residents in eastern Gwinnett County and an employment base of greater than 26,000 jobs. Overall, Gwinnett County's population is forecasted by the ARC to be just under one million and a total employment base for the County of over half a million jobs by 2030. The incorporation of higher density housing with convenient access to neighborhood services is essential to accommodating the expected growth efficiently.

Located in an area of the county dominated by single family subdivisions, the proposed development is located conveniently between the Cities of Lawrenceville and Dacula, just north of Hwy 316. The proposed development is also located adjacent to the Gwinnett Progress Center, a 125 acre industrial, distribution project. The proposed development will be providing housing opportunities for employment areas within a few miles of the site, allowing for the opportunity for short commutes between employment opportunities and services.

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

The proposed development is also providing 26.5 acres of land for a future middle school that is expected to hold approximately 1800 students. It is recommended that appropriate bike and pedestrian connections are provided from the residential portions of the development to the future school development. Information submitted for the review also states that the proposed development is located adjacent a county park. Again, it is strongly recommended that the proposed development provide appropriate pedestrian and bike access from the residential portion of the site to the park. Finally, it is recommended that pedestrian and bike connections between the residential and commercial areas are incorporated, where possible.

The proposed development incorporates several site plan elements that encourage connectivity and alternative modes of transportation. The site plan depicts interconnected streets throughout the development. Alleyways with rear parking are also shown on the site plan. Sidewalks are included on both sides of the street. The development proposes a neighborhood center, conveniently located within the development and easily accessible. The site plan illustrates several double frontage lots along Hurricane Shoals Road and Rabbit Hill Road. It is recommended that adequate vegetation buffers along the road frontages. Finally, it is also recommended that the site plan be refined to reflect more of a grid street network. There are several long blocks proposed in POD B. Breaking up the long blocks would allow to shortcuts to the neighborhood center to be established. ARC staff would also like the developer to explore diversifying the housing product to ensure that there will be a variety of housing provided for individuals of different age groups and different incomes.

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

## **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:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

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:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

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 eastern Gwinnett County at the intersection of Hurricane Shoals Road and Rabbit Hill Road.

### **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 Gwinnett County boundaries; however, it is approximately one mile from the City of Dacula and three miles from the City of Lawrenceville.

### **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.**

To be determined during the review.

## **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 \$102,475,000 million with an expected \$1,323,000 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:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

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.**

### **Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection**

The property appears to be located in the Alcovy River Water Supply Watershed, which is a small water supply watershed (less than 100 square miles). Alternative criteria to the State's Part 5 minimum criteria were developed in the March, 2001 Alcovy River Watershed Protection Plan. The proposed project should conform to Gwinnett County's Alcovy watershed requirements. The USGS regional coverage shows no blue line streams on the project property. Any unmapped stream on the property may be subject to the Gwinnett stream buffer ordinance, which was adopted in March 2005 and requires a 50-foot undisturbed buffer and an additional 25-foot impervious surface setback on most streams in the County.

For all state waters on the property, the State 25-foot erosion and sedimentation buffer is required. Any work in those buffers must conform to the state E & S requirements and must be approved by the appropriate agency.

### **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. Because the typical land uses do not include a factor for single-family residential with densities greater than 4 units per acre, the single-family portions of this project have been classified as townhouse/apartments. 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. 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	15.92	27.22	277.01	1719.36	15649.36	19.58	3.50
Medium Density SF (0.25-0.5 acres)	12.16	16.42	71.87	522.88	9740.16	4.13	0.97
Townhouse/Apartment	61.00	64.05	653.31	4087.00	36905.00	46.36	8.54
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>89.08</b>	<b>107.69</b>	<b>1002.18</b>	<b>6329.24</b>	<b>62294.52</b>	<b>70.08</b>	<b>13.02</b>

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

Total % impervious	52%						

- 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](http://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.**

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 development is proposed at thirteen locations along the three public roads.

- Three of the driveways are dedicated to the residential components of the site: One driveway along the west side of the relocated Rabbit Hill Road, one along the south side of Hurricane Shoals Road, and one along the west side of Rabbit Hill Circle.
- The remaining ten site driveways will be dedicated to different retail parcels. There are five driveways on the east side and one driveway on the west side of the relocated Rabbit Hill Road, one driveway on the east side of Rabbit Hill Circle, and two driveways on the south side and one driveway on the north side of Hurricane Shoals 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

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

the rates published in the 7<sup>th</sup> edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

Land Use	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			24-Hour
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	2-Way
313 Single-Family Homes	57	172	229	188	111	299	2971
119,075 sq ft Retail	106	68	174	337	365	702	7607
Reductions	-	-	-	-36	-36	-72	-731
<b>TOTAL NEW TRIPS</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>9847</b>


**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:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006


## 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:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

**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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### **2030 RTP\***

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
<a href="#">AR-H-501</a>	SR 316 HOV LANES	HOV Lanes	2024
<a href="#">GW-308B</a>	BUFORD / DACULA / EAST-CROSS COUNTY CONNECTOR	Roadway Capacity	2030
<a href="#">GW-AR-249C.D</a>	SR 316: SEGMENT 3	Roadway Capacity	2025

*\*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 Hurricane Shoals.**

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.

#### **Hurricane Shoals Road at Old Peachtree Road**

- Install a northbound and southbound left-turn lane along Old Peachtree Road.
- Install a traffic signal when warranted. (Note: Peak hour warrants are projected to be met in the No-Build year during the AM and PM peak conditions).

#### **Hurricane Shoals Road at Dacula Road**

- Install a northbound left-turn lane and southbound right turn lane along Dacula Road.
- Install an eastbound right turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road to separate left and right turning traffic.
- Install a traffic signal when warranted. (Peak hour warrants are projected to be met in the No-Build year during the AM and PM peak conditions).

#### **SR 316 at Fence Road**

- Widen SR 316 from a four-lane facility to a six-lane facility.
- Add westbound and eastbound through lanes through the intersection.
- Install a westbound right-turn lane along SR 316
- Install a traffic signal when warranted. (Peak hour warrants are projected to be met in the No-Build year during the AM and PM peak conditions).

#### **Rabbit Hill Circle at Old Peachtree Road**

- Install a southbound right-turn lane along Old Peachtree Road.
- Install an eastbound right-turn lane along Rabbit Hill Circle.



Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

- Install a traffic signal when warranted. (Peak hour warrants are projected to be met in the No-Build year during the AM peak conditions).

#### Old Peachtree Road at Old Fountain Road

- Install northbound and southbound left-turn lanes along Old Peachtree Road.

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.

#### Hurricane Shoals at Driveway #1

- Install an eastbound and westbound left-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install an eastbound right-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install a separate northbound left-turn and shared thru/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Hurricane Shoals Road at Driveway #2

- Provide an eastbound left-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install a westbound right-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install a southbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Hurricane Shoals Road at Driveway #3

- Provide a westbound left-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install an eastbound right-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install a northbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Hurricane Shoals Road at Driveway #4

- Provide a westbound left-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install an eastbound right-turn lane along Hurricane Shoals Road.
- Install a northbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Rabbit Hill Circle at Driveway #5

- Install an eastbound shared left/through/right-lane exiting the site.

#### Rabbit Hill Circle at Driveway #6

- Install an eastbound shared left/thru/right lane exiting the site.

#### Rabbit Hill Road at Driveway #7 & #8

- Provide a southbound and northbound left/turn lane along Rabbit Hill Road.
- Install an eastbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.
- Install a westbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Rabbit Hill Road at Driveway #9

- Provide a southbound left-turn lane along Rabbit Hill Road.
- Install a westbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

#### Rabbit Hill Road at Driveway #10

- Provide a southbound left-turn lane along Rabbit Hill Road.
- Install a westbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Rabbit Hill Road at Driveway #11 & #12

- Provide a southbound and northbound left/turn lane along Rabbit Hill Road.
- Install a separate eastbound left/turn and shared thru/right/turn lane exiting the site.
- Install a separate westbound left-turn and shared thru/right-turn lane exiting the site.

#### Rabbit Hill Road at Driveway #13

- Provide a southbound left-turn lane along Rabbit Hill Road.
- Install a westbound shared left/right-turn lane exiting the site.

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

The nearest transit service located approximately six miles from the proposed development and is provided by Gwinnett County Transit's bus route #40 which runs from Lawrenceville to the Gwinnett Transit Center from 6:00 am till 10:25 pm Monday through Friday. Saturday service is provided from 6:30 am till 8:25 pm.

**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.

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

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

Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

The area surrounding this proposed project suffers from high peak hour congestion. In addition, this same area is experiencing rapid development. It is suggested that all recommended improvements be implemented prior to the completion of the project and that the developer work with Gwinnett County Transit to provide service to the site.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Wastewater and Sewage**

Based on regional averages, wastewater is estimated at 0.133 MGD.

#### **Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?**

The F. Wayne Hill facility will provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development.

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

The capacity of F. Wayne Hill Site is listed below:

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

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 0.133 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?**



Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

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 1,277.50 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?**
- **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?**



Preliminary Report:	January 31, 2006	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT</b>	Project:	Bighorn Investments #961
Final Report Due:	March 2, 2006		Comments Due By:	February 14, 2006

No, the project will provide an additional 313 housing units that will include single family homes.

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

No.

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

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 506.02. This tract had a 54.2 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2003 according to ARC's Population and Housing Report. The report shows that 98 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: **961**  
 Use this number when filling out a DRI REVIEW REQUEST.  
 Submitted on: 11/21/2005 10:27:13 AM

## 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 Government Information

Submitting Local Government:	Gwinnett County
*Individual completing form and Mailing Address:	Jeff West, Manager, Dept of Planning and Development 446 W. Crogan St, Ste 150 Lawrenceville, GA 30045
Telephone:	678-518-6200
Fax:	678-518-6275
E-mail ( <b>only one</b> ):	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.west@gwinnettcountry.com">jeffrey.west@gwinnettcountry.com</a>

\*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:	Bighorn Investments, LLC	
Development Type	Description of Project	Thresholds
Mixed Use	313 detached residences; 89225 sq ft retail	<a href="#">View Thresholds</a>
Developer / Applicant and Mailing Address:	Bighorn Investments, LLC c/o Millcreek Consulting 4480 Commerce Drive Buford, GA 30518	
Telephone:	770-614-6511	
Fax:		
Email:	<a href="mailto:millcreek@bellsouth.net">millcreek@bellsouth.net</a>	
Name of property owner(s) if different from developer/applicant:	C. E. Smith, et al	
Provide Land-Lot-District Number:	Dist 7, LL 17; Dist 5, LL272	
What are the principal streets or roads providing vehicular access to the site?	Hurricane Shoals Road, Fence Road & Georgia 316	
Provide name of nearest street(s) or intersection:	Hurricane Shoals Road @ Rabbit Hill Road	
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). ( <a href="http://www.mapquest.com">http://www.mapquest.com</a> or <a href="http://www.mapblast.com">http://www.mapblast.com</a> 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 Dacula city limits
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: Gwinnett County (NOTE: This local government is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.)
	Percent of Project: 100
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?	Gwinnett County
What is the name of the wastewater treatment supplier for this site?	Gwinnett 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: 2009 Overall project: 2009+

### 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?	N
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?	Y
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?	Y
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)?	N
Developer/Applicant has identified needed improvements?	Y
Other (Please Describe): See traffic impact study	

Submitted on: 1/12/2006 4:59:39 PM

## DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT DRI Review Initiation Request (Form2a)

### Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government:	Gwinnett County
Individual completing form:	Jeff West
Telephone:	(678) 518-6200
Fax:	(678) 518-6275
Email ( <b>only one</b> ):	<a href="mailto:jeffrey.west@gwinnettcountry.com">jeffrey.west@gwinnettcountry.com</a>

### Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	Bighorn Investments
DRI ID Number:	961
Developer/Applicant:	Bighorn Investments LLC
Telephone:	(770) 614-6511
Fax:	(770) 614-5711
Email(s):	millcreek@bellsouth.net

### 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.)	Y
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?	Y
If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.	

### Economic Impacts

Estimated Value at Build-Out:	\$102,475,000.00
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	1,323,000.00 (property tax)
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): none	

### Community Facilities Impacts

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:	Gwinnett County
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.133 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:	Gwinnett County
--	-----------------

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.133 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?	Y
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?	0.20 miles

### 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.)	see traffic study
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?	N
If transportation improvements are needed to serve this project, please describe below: Relocate Rabbit Hill Road/Hurricane Shoals Road intersection to align with Rabbit Hill Circle. Deceleration lanes. See traffic study for additional recommendations.	

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1,277.50 Tons annually
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?	45.75%
Is the site located in a water supply watershed?	Y
If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: Alcovy River	
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 BMP's, Greenspace	

### 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: Stormwater BMP's will address runoff. Development will be served by sanitary sewer. Wetland would be preserved within greenspace.	

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?	N
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:	



