



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: Nov 15 2006

ARC REVIEW CODE: R611151

TO: Mayor Harold Logsden
ATTN TO: David Rast, Planner
FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital
signature. Original on file.

SUPPLEMENTAL MEETING SCHEDULED

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has received the following proposal and is initiating a regional review. During the initial preliminary review, several issues related to this development were found. In order to complete this review, a supplemental meeting has been scheduled.

Name of Proposal: West Village

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Meeting Date: Thursday, November 30th

Time: 11:00 am

Location: GRTA OFFICES

Description: The proposed West Village development is located on 878 acres in Peachtree City. The proposed development will consist of 1,079 single family lots, 335 townhomes, and 160 courtyard homes. West Village is comprised of two components that will be reviewed as one development. The northern component is 403 acres, to be developed by Levitt and Sons, will consist of 539 single family lots and 160 courtyard homes. The central component is 475 acres, to be developed by John Wieland Homes, is comprised of 540 single family homes, 335 townhomes, and 15,000 square feet of retail. The proposed development is located west of Senoia Road and Joel Cowan Parkway, also known as State Route 74. Vehicular access to the development is proposed along the proposed MacDuff Connector Extension, which will provide primary access to State Route 74 and Senoia Road to the north and to State Route 54 to the south.

Submitting Local Government: City of Peachtree City

Date Opened: Nov 15 2006

Deadline for Comments: Nov 29 2006

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Dec 15 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
COWETA COUNTY
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY
CSX RAILROAD/TRANSPORTATION

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FAYETTE COUNTY
TOWN OF TYRONE

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CHATTAHOOCHEE-FLINT RDC
FAYETTE COUNTY SCHOOLS

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Mike Alexander, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3302.



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: Nov 15 2006

ARC REVIEW CODE: R611151

TO: Mayor Harold Logsden
ATTN TO: David Rast, 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: West Village

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: The proposed West Village development is located on 878 acres in Peachtree City. The proposed development will consist of 1,079 single family lots, 335 townhomes, and 160 courtyard homes. West Village is comprised of two components that will be reviewed as one development. The northern component is 403 acres, to be developed by Levitt and Sons, will consist of 539 single family lots and 160 courtyard homes. The central component is 475 acres, to be developed by John Wieland Homes, is comprised of 540 single family homes, 335 townhomes, and 15,000 square feet of retail. The proposed development is located west of Senoia Road and Joel Cowan Parkway, also known as State Route 74. Vehicular access to the development is proposed along the proposed MacDuff Connector Extension, which will provide primary access to State Route 74 and Senoia Road to the north and to State Route 54 to the south.

Submitting Local Government: City of Peachtree City

Date Opened: Nov 15 2006

Deadline for Comments: Nov 29 2006

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Dec 15 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
COWETA COUNTY
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY
CSX RAILROAD/TRANSPORTATION

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FAYETTE COUNTY
TOWN OF TYRONE

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CHATTAHOOCHEE-FLINT RDC
FAYETTE COUNTY SCHOOLS

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 2006-11-29 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/landuse> .



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 in which 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: **West 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: Nov 29 2006

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

PRELIMINARY REPORT SUMMARY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The proposed West Village development is located on 878 acres in Peachtree City. The proposed development will consist of 1,079 single family lots, 335 townhomes, and 160 courtyard homes. West Village is comprised of two components that will be reviewed as one development. The northern component is 403 acres, to be developed by Levitt and Sons, will consist of 539 single family lots and 160 courtyard homes. The central component is 475 acres, to be developed by John Wieland Homes, is comprised of 540 single family homes, 335 townhomes, and 15,000 square feet of retail. The proposed development is located west of Senoia Road and Joel Cowan Parkway, also known as State Route 74. Vehicular access to the development is proposed along the proposed MacDuff Connector Extension, which will provide primary access to State Route 74 and Senoia Road to the north and to State Route 54 to the south.



PROJECT PHASING:

The project is being proposed in one phase with a project build out date for 2012.

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 GI (general industrial) within the City, R-70 and AR-Agricultural Residential within the County. The proposed zoning is LUR (limited use residential). The DRI trigger for this development is the annexation into Peachtree City as well as the rezoning request. There are 790 acres within unincorporated Fayette County for potential annexation and an adjoining 88 acres within the City of Peachtree City for rezoning. Information submitted for the review states that Fayette County's Future Land Use Map designates the area as low density residential and that Peachtree City's Future Land Use Map will be updated to account for this development, if approved.

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.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

**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.

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

ARC has not 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.

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 mostly undeveloped.

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 mixed use development meets many of ARC's Regional Development Policies. The proposed development is consistent with the Unified Growth Policy Map which identifies the area as suburban neighborhoods. Development types that are recommended in suburban neighborhoods include general commercial, regional parks, residential small, medium and large lots, residential very low, and conservation subdivisions. The proposed development is a total of 877.79 acres with 492.7 acres in open space.

Site Access to the development is proposed along the MacDuff Extension Parkway. ARC staff has several concerns about the numerous access points proposed along the Parkway. Information submitted for the review states that Peachtree City's intention for the Parkway is a two lane median divided roadway. On the site plan, the Parkway is not shown as a median divided roadway. ARC staff would like to discuss with the developers and Peachtree City the MacDuff Extension Parkway and the number of access points proposed.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Regional Development Plan Policies

1. Provide sustainable economic growth in all areas of the region.
2. Encourage new homes and jobs within existing developed areas of the region, focusing on principal transportation corridors, the Central Business District, activity centers, and town centers.
3. Increase opportunities for mixed use development, transit-oriented development, infill, and redevelopment.
4. At strategic regional locations, plan and retail industrial and freight land uses.
5. Design transportation infrastructure to protect the context of adjoining development and provide a sense of place appropriate for our communities.
6. Promote the reclamation of Brownfield development sites.
7. Protect the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods, while also meeting the needs of communities to grow.
8. Encourage a variety of homes styles, densities, and price ranges in locations that are accessible to jobs and services to ensure housing for individuals and families of all incomes and age groups.
9. Promote new communities that feature greenspace and neighborhood parks, pedestrian scale, support transportation options, and provide an appropriate mix of uses and housing types.
10. Promote sustainable and energy efficient development.
11. Protect environmentally-sensitive areas including wetlands, floodplains, small water supply watersheds, rivers and stream corridors.
12. Increase the amount, quality, and connectivity, and accessibility of greenspace.
13. Provide strategies to preserve and enhance historic resources
14. Through regional infrastructure planning, limit growth in undeveloped areas of the region
15. Assist local governments to adopt growth management strategies that make more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
16. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local, and neighborhood levels.
17. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support Regional Policies
18. Encourage the development of state and regional growth management policy.

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.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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.

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.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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.

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 Peachtree City with Senoia Road and Joel Cowen Parkway to the east, Line Creek and Coweta County to the west, a rock quarry to the north, and a subdivision to the south.

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

The proposed development will be entirely within Peachtree City's boundaries pending annexation into the City; however, the site is adjacent to Coweta County.

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.

Other residential, light industrial, limited commercial uses and undeveloped land surround the site.

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?

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

Estimated value of the development is \$493,145,000 with an expected \$751,916 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?

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.

Water Supply Watersheds and Stream Buffers

The project property is located within the Line Creek Water Supply Watershed, a small (less than 100-square mile) water supply watershed serving both Fayette County and the City of Newnan in Coweta County. The property is within seven miles upstream of both intakes. The USGS regional coverage shows several perennial and intermittent streams on the property, which have been included on the project plans. The City of Peachtree City requires has adopted water supply watershed regulations as required under the minimum planning criteria of Part 5 of the Georgia Planning Act. These regulations include a 100-foot undisturbed vegetative buffer and a 150-foot impervious surface setback that are required on all perennial streams (as shown on the applicable USGS coverage) within seven miles upstream of a public water-supply intake. A 25-foot undisturbed buffer is required on all other streams. The site plan show 25-foot buffers on the tributaries to Line Creek, but no 100-foot undisturbed buffer or 150-foot setback is shown either on Line Creek or the perennial portions of its tributaries. While most of the streams are within wetland and open space areas, the buffers should be shown where applicable to meet City requirements and to indicate area of restricted activity in the future. The overall impervious surface for the project is estimated at about 14 percent, well within the 25 percent maximum required under the Part 5 criteria in small water supply watersheds.

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

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

Storm Water/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, using impervious areas based on estimated averages for land uses in the Atlanta Region. The amount of impervious surface areas in a project may vary from this average, and the actual loadings will vary with the actual land use and the actual amount of impervious coverage. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

Land Use	Pollutant loads (lb./yr.)						
	Land Area (acres)	TP	TN	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Commercial	5.70	9.75	99.18	615.60	5603.10	7.01	1.25
Forest/Open	492.70	39.42	295.62	4434.30	115784.50	0.00	0.00
Med. Density SF (0.25-0.5 ac)	313.40	423.09	1852.19	13476.20	251033.40	106.56	25.07
Townhouse/Apartment	66.00	69.30	706.86	4422.00	39930.00	50.16	9.24
TOTAL	877.80	541.55	2953.85	22948.10	412351.00	163.73	35.57

Total Estimated Impervious: 14% in this analysis

There is the potential for major impacts on project area streams from mass clearing and grading and increased impervious surface without proper stormwater management planning. A stormwater plan needs to be developed addressing how stormwater impacts will be controlled, including water quality, downstream channel protection and attenuation of peak flows to prevent downstream flooding. In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual.

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



Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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

Two access scenarios were analyzed as part of the transportation report. Both include the proposed MacDuff Connector Extension to the north to Kedron Drive North via a bridge at the railroad tracks and a new signalized intersection at Senoia Road. MacDuff Connector Extension would provide primary access to SR 74 and Senoia Road to the north and continue to provide access to SR 54 to the south.

The two access scenarios differ in that the Case 1 scenario includes an additional roadway connection from MacDuff Connector Extension to SR 74 at Kedron Drive South and the Case 2 scenario does not. Driveway #15 also differs between Case 1 and Case 2 as described below.

There are a total of 15 proposed driveways along MacDuff Connector Extension that will serve the West Village development (two associated with the North Component and thirteen associated with the Central Component). These 15 driveways will form 10 separate intersections along MacDuff Connector Extension. Driveway #1 serves the retail portions of the development, and the other driveways serve the residential portions. Two additional driveways are proposed along the possible Kedron Drive South extension that will serve the proposed town homes.

- Driveway #1 is a full-movement driveway located along the MacDuff Connector Extension, approximately 2,100 feet west of Senoia Road. Driveway #1 serves 15,000 SF of retail space, and forms the east leg of the intersection of the MacDuff Connector Extension and Driveway #2.
- Driveway #2 is a full-movement driveway located along the MacDuff Connector Extension approximately 2,100 feet west of Senoia Road. Driveway #2 serves active adult residential homes, and forms the west leg of the intersection of the MacDuff Connector Extension and Driveway #1.

Driveways #3 - #14 are located along MacDuff Connector Extension and provide access to the John Wieland Homes residential units.

- Driveway #3 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 1,700 feet south of Driveway #1 and Driveway #2, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #4 is a full-movement driveway opposite Driveway #3, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #5 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 460 feet south of Driveway #3 and Driveway #4, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #6 is a full-movement driveway opposite Driveway #5, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #7 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 420 feet south of Driveway #5 and Driveway #6, serving residential single family homes.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

- Driveway #8 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 250 feet south of Driveway #7, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #9 is a full-movement, approximately 250 feet south of Driveway #8, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #10 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 400 feet south of Driveway #9, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #11 is a full-movement driveway opposite Driveway #10, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #12 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 630 feet south of Driveway #10 and Driveway #11, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #13 is a full-movement driveway, approximately 1,360 feet south of Driveway #12, serving residential single family homes.
- Driveway #14 is a full-movement driveway opposite Driveway #13, serving residential single family homes and town homes.

Driveways 15 and 16 are located along the east-west road that stems to the east from MacDuff Connector Extension.

- Driveway #15, a full movement driveway, is located along the Kedron Drive South extension (Case 1) or along a proposed internal road that does not connect to SR 74 (Case 2), approximately 350 feet west of SR 74. Driveway #15 serves town homes.
- Driveway #16, a full movement driveway, is located opposite Driveway #15, serving town homes.
- Driveway #17 is a full movement driveway located approximately 940 feet west of Senoia Road along MacDuff Connector Extension, serving the active adult residential homes.

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:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

Land Use	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			24-Hour
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	2-Way
752 Active Adult Residential Units	60	98	158	128	82	210	3010
335 Town Homes	23	113	136	109	53	162	1794
540 Single Family Homes	97	290	387	308	181	489	4906
15,000 sq ft Retail Space	91	98	189	25	32	57	678
Reductions	-14	-30	-44	-42	-31	-73	-846
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	257	569	826	528	317	845	9542


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:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 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 2006-2011 TIP, approved in March of 2006. 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:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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

2006-2011 TIP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
FA-074A1	SR 74 (JOEL COWAN PARKWAY): SEGMENT 1	Roadway Capacity	2008
FA-AR-179	SR 54 WEST BRIDGE AND GATEWAY	Multi-Use Bike/Ped Facility	2008
FA-AR-180	SR 54/CSX R/R PEDESTRIAN PATH	Pedestrian Facility	2007
FA-AR-183	SR 74 NORTH MULTI-USE TUNNEL	Multi-Use Bike/Ped Facility	2009

2030 RTP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
FA-106	COLLINSWORTH ROAD / PALMETTO ROAD	Roadway Capacity	2030
FA-074A2	SR 74 (JOEL COWAN PARKWAY) GRADE SEPARATION	Interchange Capacity	2016
FA-263	SR 74 CORRIDOR STUDY	Study	2015

**The ARC Board adopted the 2030 RTP and FY 2006-2011 TIP on February 22, 2006. USDOT approved on March 30th, 2006.*

Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for West Village.

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.

Senoia Road at Crabapple Lane

- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct a separate left-turn lane along all four approaches.

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. The Build condition is divided into Case 1, including the Kedron Drive South extension to MacDuff Connector Extension, and Case 2, not including the Kedron Drive South extension to MacDuff Connector Extension. The improvements for both Case 1 and Case 2 scenarios are listed below:

CASE 1 Scenario: 2012 Build Case 1 recommended improvements (includes the traffic associated with the West Village DRI, and assumes Kedron Drive South is extended from SR 74 to MacDuff Connector Extension):

Senoia Road at Kedron Drive North / MacDuff Parkway

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct an eastbound left-turn lane and an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a westbound left-turn lane and a westbound shared through/right-turn lane along Kedron Drive North.
- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along Senoia Road.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane and a southbound right-turn lane along Senoia Road.

Joel Cowan Parkway (SR 74) at Crabapple Lane

- Construct an eastbound right-turn lane along Crabapple Lane.
- Install dual left-turn lanes on the westbound approach along Crabapple Lane.

Joel Cowan Parkway (SR 74) at Kedron Drive South

- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct an eastbound left-turn lane along Kedron Drive South.
- Construct a westbound left-turn lane along Kedron Drive South.

CASE 2 Scenario: 2012 Build Case 2 recommended improvements (includes the traffic associated with the West Village DRI, without the Kedron Drive South extension from SR 74 to MacDuff Connector Extension):

Senoia Road at Kedron Drive North / MacDuff Parkway

- Install a traffic signal.
- Construct an eastbound left-turn lane and an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a westbound left-turn lane and a westbound shared through/right-turn lane along Kedron Drive North.
- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along Senoia Road.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane and a southbound right-turn lane along Senoia Road.

Joel Cowan Parkway (SR 74) at Crabapple Lane

- Construct an eastbound right-turn lane along Crabapple Lane.
- Install dual left-turn lanes on the westbound approach along Crabapple Lane.

For both scenarios, the following intersection geometry and improvements are recommended at the project site driveways

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #1 and Driveway #2

- The proposed Driveway #2 eastbound approach should have one ingress lane and two egress lanes (one exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane).
- The proposed Driveway #1 westbound approach should have one ingress lane and two egress lanes (one exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane).

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a southbound right-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #3 and Driveway #4

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #5 and Driveway #6

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #7

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #8

- Construct a southbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #9

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #10 and Driveway #11

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #12

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #13 and Driveway #14

- Construct a northbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a southbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #15 and Driveway #16

CASE 1 Scenario:

- Construct an eastbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a westbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

CASE 2 Scenario:

- No additional turn lanes into Driveway #15 or Driveway #16 are necessary.

MacDuff Connector Extension at Driveway #17

- The proposed Driveway #17 southbound approach should have one ingress lane and two egress lanes (separate left-turn lane and right-turn lane).
- Construct an eastbound left-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.
- Construct a westbound right-turn lane along MacDuff Connector Extension.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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?

MARTA express bus route #289 provides service from Downtown Fairburn, located approximately 11 miles north of the proposed development, to the MARTA College Park rail station Monday through Friday from 5:30 a.m. till 7:15 p.m. with headways between 15 and 28 minutes.

GRTA Xpress route #450 provides service from the Newnan Park and Ride lot, located approximately 12 miles west of the proposed development, to Downtown Atlanta. Service is provided Monday through Friday from 5:30 a.m. till 7:30 a.m. in the morning with returning service offered from 3:50 p.m. till 6:00 p.m. in the evening. Headways are between 30 and 40 minutes.

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

None proposed.

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

Air Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based on ARC strategies)	Credits	Total
<i>SF Detached Dwellings</i>		
With all of the below:	15%	15%
Has a neighborhood center or one in close proximity?		
Has Bike and Pedestrian Facilities that include?		
connections between units in the site?		
connections to retail center and adjoining uses with the project limits?		
Bike/ped networks connecting to land uses within and adjoining the site	4%	4%
Total		19%

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

According to the impact section of the traffic study, two intersections will fall below the acceptable level of service D, for both scenarios 1 and 2, as a result of future year total traffic without implementing the recommended improvements. Additionally, this project is located in a rapidly growing section of the region where no local or express transit service is provided within close enough proximity to the site to offer significant congestion relief to the surrounding roadway network. The site is located far from an interstate or freeway causing increased pressure on the surrounding roadway network. It is suggested that all recommended improvements, specific to the scenario developed, be implemented prior to completion of construction. The area immediately to the west of the proposed project consists of large sections of undeveloped land. It is recommended that stub-outs be provided onto roadways on the western side of the development to allow for future connections through the project when the land to the west of the proposed site is developed.

Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Based on regional averages, wastewater is estimated at 0.367 MGD.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

The Rockaway 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 the Rockaway Site is listed below:

PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD¹	DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD	2001 MMF, MGD	2008 MMF, MGD	2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD	PLANNED EXPANSION	REMARKS
2	2	1.63	2	0	Planned expansion to 4 mgd by 2004.	

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 0.406 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



Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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

Information submitted with the review 1204 tons of solid waste per year and the waste will be disposed of in Fulton County

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 1,627 housing units that will include single family residential, townhomes, and active adult residential units.

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

No.



Preliminary Report:	November 15, 2006	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	West Village #1184
Final Report Due:	December 15, 2006		Comments Due By:	November 29, 2006

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

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 1402.05. This tract had a 26.4 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2005 according to ARC's Population and Housing Report. The report shows that 76 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: **1184**
 Use this number when filling out a DRI REVIEW REQUEST.
 Submitted on: 8/3/2006 4:51:01 PM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT

Fayette 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:	Peachtree City
*Individual completing form and Mailing Address:	David E. Rast, ASLA City of Peachtree City 153 Willowbend Road Peachtree City, GA 30269
Telephone:	770.487.5731
Fax:	770.631.2552
E-mail (only one):	planner@peachtree-city.org

*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:	West Village - north & central components	
Development Type	Description of Project	Thresholds
Mixed Use	Potential annexation and rezoning of 779.799-acres within unincorporated Fayette County and rezoning of adjoining 89.146-acre tract within Peachtree City for residential use. As submitted overall development will consist of 335 attached townhomes 1298 detached single-family homes and 15000 SF of neighborhood retail. 752 units will be designated as age-restricted homes for active senior adults.	View Thresholds
Developer / Applicant and Mailing Address:	central component John Wieland Homes and Neighborhoods 1950 Sullivan Road Atlanta, GA 30337 northern component Levitt & Sons, Inc. 675 Mansell Road, Suite 115 Roswell, GA 30076	
Telephone:	770.703.2140/ 770.642.3996	
Fax:	770.907.3419/ 770.642.4924	
Email:	dan.fields@jwhomes.com / stephen.tyde@levittandsons.com	
Name of property owner(s) if different from developer/applicant:	Brent Scarborough/ Roy and Donna Stillwell (Levitt tract)	
Provide Land-Lot-District Number:	165, 166, 167, 183, 184, 185/ 7th District/ Fayette County, GA	
What are the principal streets or roads providing vehicular access to the site?	MacDuff Parkway(planned extension) Kedron Drive (planned extension) Old Senoia Road (planned intersection improvements)	
Provide name of nearest street(s) or intersection:	MacDuff Parkway/ Centennial Drive MacDuff Parkway/ Chadsworth Way	

Provide geographic coordinates (latitude/longitude) of the center of the proposed project (optional):	33 25 16.81 N / 84 36 43.14 W
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.):	http://local.google.com/local?f=q&hl=en&q=MacDuff+Parkway+Peachtree+City,+GA&ie=UTF8&ll=33.421628,-84.60391&spn=0.061035,0.12188&om=1
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	N
If yes, how close is the boundary of the nearest other local government?	
If no, provide the following information:	
In what additional jurisdictions is the project located?	Fayette County - pending annexation
In which jurisdiction is the majority of the project located? (give percent of project)	Name: Peachtree City (pending annexation) (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, Other annexation
What is the name of the water supplier for this site?	Fayette County Water Department
What is the name of the wastewater treatment supplier for this site?	Peachtree City Water and Sewerage Authority (septic at present)
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: 2012 Overall project: 2012

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?	when annexed

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):

Applicant will be responsible for all transportation and multi-use path system improvements

Y

Submitted on: 10/28/2006 1:01:06 PM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT DRI Review Initiation Request (Form2a)

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government:	City of Peachtree City
Individual completing form:	David E. Rast, ASLA
Telephone:	7704875731
Fax:	7706312552
Email (only one):	planner@peachtree-city.org

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	West Village - north and central components
DRI ID Number:	1184
Developer/Applicant:	Levitt & Sons (north)/ John Wieland Homes and Neighborhoods (central)
Telephone:	(770) 642-3996 (Levitt)/ (770) 703-2140 (Wieland)
Fax:	(770) 642-4924 (Levitt)/ (770) 907-3419 (Wieland)
Email(s):	stepeh.tyde@levittandsons.com/ danfields@jwhomes.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.)	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:	\$493,145,000
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$751,916
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 - property currently undeveloped	

Community Facilities Impacts

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:	Fayette County
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.406
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:	Peachtree City Water and Sewerage Authority
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.367
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?	
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.)	AM - 271 (enter)/ 599 (exit) PM - 570 (enter)/ 348 (exit)
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: Refer to Transportation ANalysis prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (dated 09-27-06)	

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1204
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?	27
Is the site located in a water supply watershed?	Y
If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: Line Creek	
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Development of the north and central components is planned to be consistent with Federal, State and local requirements. Specific measures will be determined during the site plan review process but will be consistent with similar developments in Peachtree City.	

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:

1. Potential impacts to streams have been significantly reduced through careful site design. Central sewer will reduce consumptive use and reduce nutrient loading as compared with septic alternative. 3. Potential impacts to wetlands have been significantly reduced through careful site design. Required state and local buffers are to be maintained and impacts for each development are anticipated to be below Nationwide permit thresholds of the US Army Corps of Engineers.

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:

1. Potential impacts to existing floodplain areas have been significantly reduced due to careful site design. Peachtree City prohibits any development within designated floodplain areas and this has been reflected in the site design.

