

*Appl OK'd 10/15
before Australia
trip - HW not here
10/16 as Lew X'd*

October 5, 1998

Honorable Mitch Skandalakis, Chairman
Fulton County Commission
141 Pryor Street, SW
Atlanta, GA. 30303

RE: Development of Regional Impact Review--Park Lake

Dear Mitch:

I am writing to let you know that the ARC staff has completed review of the Park Lake Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Our finding is that this DRI is in the best interest of the State.

Enclosed is a copy of our review report. Our favorable finding is based on information submitted with the review and some revisions to the plan which the applicant submitted relating to air quality. The revisions were (1) agreement that the areas proposed for office and commercial would be allocated so that at least ten percent of the total floor space in the development would be retail and at least ten percent would be office, which we understand is allowed under the requested commercial zoning; (2) addition of bike and pedestrian paths which will connect all parts of the development and allow connection from adjoining future developments (see September 14, 1998 version of the site plan); (3) a pull-through area off Campbellton-Fairburn Road for MARTA buses to use when service is available to the site (also shown on the September 14 site plan); and (4) a proposed shuttle to MARTA service if a MARTA route is not available by the time the majority of the development is completed. In an effort to address air quality concerns by reducing reliance on automobile trips, particularly single-occupant vehicle trips, we would ask that the County include these agreements in the zoning conditions if the development is approved.

Also enclosed is a copy of comments from Fulton County Schools. It is our understanding that the applicant offered to reserve a school site, but other sites had already been identified.

Please feel free to call us if you have any questions concerning this review.

Sincerely,

Harry West
Director

Enclosure

c Ms. Marian Eisenberg, Fulton County
Mr. Carl Jones, Abermarle Partners, Ltd.
Mr. Wayne Shackelford, GDOT
Mr. Harold Reheis, GEPD
Mr. Rick Brooks, GDCA
Mr. Jim Welsh, Fulton County Schools

Facility: Park Lake
Preliminary Report: September 17, 1998
Final Report: _____

DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT

REVIEW REPORT

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: 832 single-family homes, 82 townhomes, 411,925 sq. ft. retail, 303,075 sq. ft. office, 237 personal care beds, church, school, fire station sites, golf courses.

GENERAL

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

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

Yes, according to information submitted with the review.

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

To be determined in the review process.

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

To be determined.

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?

The proposed development could accommodate a population of 2,440, including 627 students, and 1,953 employees.

What other major development projects are planned in the vicinity of the proposed project?

None in the immediate vicinity.

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

No.

Will the development cause a loss in jobs? If yes, how many.

No.

LOCATION

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

The development site is in South Fulton County, south of South Fulton Parkway and bounded on the west by Campbellton-Fairburn Road with Red Mill Road running through a portion of the property. 33°36'/84°36'

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 site is near the cities of Fairburn and Union City.

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.

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?

\$1,914,044 annual property taxes.

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

1,200 plus 1,923 long-term.

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?

N/A

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.

The proposed development site includes a portion of Deep Creek and its associated floodplains and likely wetlands.

In what ways could the proposed project create impacts that would damage or help to preserve the resource?

Fulton County has recently established 75-foot buffer zones along perennial streams in an effort to protect the streams from erosion and sedimentation.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

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

No.

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

N/A

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

N/A

INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation

How much traffic (both average daily and peak a.m./p.m.) will be generated by the proposed project?

Preliminary estimates are 28,896 average daily vehicle trip ends.

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

To be determined.

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

To be determined.

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

No.

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

Not at this time although the site is in the MARTA service area.

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

When there is sufficient development, MARTA could extend the route serving South Fulton Parkway. The developer plans a bus pull-in area for MARTA.

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

- 10% retail and 10% office - 9%
- MARTA shuttle until service extended - 3%
- Bicycle/pedestrian network - 5%
in and connecting to
adjoining uses

What is the cumulative trip generation of this and other DRI's or major developments? Is the transportation system (existing and planned) capable of accommodating these trips?

N/A

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

How much wastewater and sewage will be generated by the proposed project?

According to regional averages 0.479 MGD.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Camp Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

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

Permit = 13.0 MGD

Flow = 11.74 MGD

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

ARC has reviewed developments which, if built as planned, would add 3.077 MGD flow to the plant.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Again according to regional averages, 0.551 MGD.

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

The City of Atlanta serves this area according to information submitted. Supply should be sufficient but water conserving measures are essential in all new developments.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Solid Waste

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

5,225 tons per year.

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 service?
- 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.)?

As this part of the county develops, there will be a need to increase all services. Schools will certainly be impacted by this development but the developer has provided a future school site.

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

The development is mostly housing.

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?

Yes, but in limited supply.

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

Likely.

* Defined as 30 percent of the income of a family making 80 percent of the median income of the Region. 1996 median family income of \$52,100 for Atlanta MSA.

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION

DECEMBER 1985

RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL REZONING

ZONE #	# OF UNITS	SCHOOLS	# OF STUDENTS GENERATED BY DEVELOPMENT	STATE CAPACITY	1992-93 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT - CLASSROOMS	NUMBER OF PORTABLE CLASSROOMS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT OVER CAPACITY	CAN FACILITY BE EXPANDED OR INCREASED DEMAND =
98Z077	832	Evolline West Elementary	271 to 647	525	470	0	-55	No
et al.		Bear Creek Middle	121 to 289	875	1065	8	110	No
SING. FAM.		Creekside High	141 to 336	1450	1296	8	-154	No
		Totals	533 to 1272					
98Z077	82	Evolline West Elementary	27 to 84	525	470	0	-55	No
et al.		Bear Creek Middle	12 to 28	875	1065	8	110	No
TOWNHOME		Creekside High	14 to 33	1450	1296	8	-154	Yes
		Totals	53 to 125					

ZONING
PETITIONS
PROPOSED COMMERCIAL USE

981J-060
et al.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Date assembled by Karen X. Keddah Date 9/30/98

Responders approved by James B. Webb Date 9/30/98

Responses reported by
James D. Wood
Date: 9/30/98

The projected enrollment does not contain the number of students that would be generated by the proposed rationing.