Atlanta Regional Commission
200 Northcreek, Suite 300
3715 Northside Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30327-2809

ARC

Harry West
Director

December 30, 1997

Honorable W. L. Mabry, Mayor
City of Roswell
38 Hill Street
Roswell, GA. 30075

RE: Development of Regional Impact--LeCraw Mixed Use Development

Dear Pug:

I am writing to let you know that the ARC staff has completed review of the LeCraw Mixed Use Development, a Development of Regional Impact. Our finding is that the proposed project is in the best interest of the State.

Along with our finding, we would like to note two items that will need to be addressed in the future by the City of Roswell. First, the City of Alpharetta noted that there may be situations which require their emergency services in the development. This should be discussed as Fulton County and its cities negotiate service agreements. Second, Fulton County Schools responded that the schools serving the area of the proposed development are above or nearing capacity and may not be able to handle the increased demand from the apartments.

We are enclosing copies of our final report and comments received from the City of Alpharetta and Fulton County Schools. Please call me or Beverly Rhea (404-364-2562) if you have any questions about the review.

Sincerely,

Harry West
Director

Enclosures
c Mr. Michael K. McGuire, City of Roswell
Mr. Scott McGregor, Julian LeCraw & Co., Inc.
Hon. Mitch Skandalakis, Fulton County
Hon. Charles Martin, City of Alpharetta
Dr. Stephen Dolinger, Fulton County Schools
Mr. Wayne Shackelford, GDOT
Mr. Harold Reheis, GDNR
Mr. Paul Radford, GDCA

Facility: LeCraw Mixed Use Development
Preliminary Report: December 4, 1997
Final Report: December 30, 1997

DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT

REVIEW REPORT

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.

No specific inconsistencies were identified; however, Alpharetta noted the potential for impacts to the major intersection for the project, Mansell and Old Roswell Roads, which is within their jurisdiction.

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

Alpharetta also noted that there may be situationswhere their emergency services are required. This should be a matter for discussion as Fulton County and its cities work on service agreements.

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?

According to regional averages, the development could accommodate a population of 778, including 127 students, and 1,768 jobs.

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

ARC has reviewed numerous major developments in the vicinity of this project with the nearest being located between Old Roswell/Rock Mill Roads and Georgia 400 and bisected by the Mansell Road extension.

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 site is in eastern Roswell at the northwest quadrant of Mansell and Old Roswell Roads with a 2.36 acre strip being in the City of Alpharetta. 34°02'35"/84°20'

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.

Yes, see above.

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.

See previous discussion.

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?

$2,000,000.00

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

Number of short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule. By regional averages, the development could accommodate 1,768 long-term jobs.

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?

The development has some unique characteristics but nevertheless will compete with other similar developments in this part of the Region.

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

Watershed Protection

The proposed project site is located within the Big Creek watershed, a small water supply watershed, and is located within seven miles of the City of Roswell's water supply intake. The proposed site is bounded on the north by Foe Killer Creek, a perennial stream, tributary to Big Creek. The following DNR minimum protection apply:

1. A buffer shall be maintained for a distance of 100 feet on both sides of perennial streams as measured from the stream banks.
2. No impervious surface shall be constructed within a 150 foot setback on both sides of the perennial stream as measured from the stream banks.
3. Septic tanks and septic tank drainfields are prohibited in the setback area of (2) above.
4. The impervious surface area, including all public and private structures, utilities, or facilities, of the entire water supply watershed shall be limited to twenty-five (25) percent, or existing use, whichever is greater.
5. New facilities which handle hazardous materials of the types and amount determined by the Department of Natural Resources, shall perform their operations on impermeable surfaces having spill and leak collection systems as prescribed by the Department of Natural Resources.

The development plan, as reviewed, appears to meet these criteria.

Floodplains

Areas within the proposed site are located in the 100 year floodplain. Steps should be taken by the City of Roswell to mitigate potential impacts on these floodplains. The Atlanta Regional Commission's Regional Development Plan notes "all structures that can be damaged or land uses that can impede flood waters or reduce storage volume must be built outside the intermediate region (one percent) flood limits (i.e., outside the 100-year flood limit), with the exception that a stream crossing may vary from this policy, if constructed so as to permit passage of a 100-year flood with minimum feasible flow impedance, storage volume reduction, and upstream or downstream erosion or deposition."

Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act / Stream Buffer Requirements

This act requires that a 25 ft. wide natural vegetated buffer be maintained on both sides of streams designated as "State Waters." ARC recommends that the developer work with the state to determine if the portion of Foe Killer Creek within the proposed site is considered "State Waters," and provide protection measures if appropriate. ARC also recommends that the developer work with the City of Roswell to be sure that the proposed stream buffers meet the City's Storm Water Management ordinance.

Storm Water / Water Quality

Steps should be taken to limit the amount of pollutants that will be produced during and after construction. During construction, the project should conform to the City's erosion and sediment control requirements. After construction, water quality can be impacted without storm water pollution controls. The amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed LeCraw Mixed Use Development was estimated by ARC. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs\ac\year). The loading factors are based on the results of regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

Estimated Pounds Of Pollutants Per Year

Land Coverage	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Open Space (92.46 ac.)	7.40	36.06	832.14	21728.10	0.00	0.00
Office/Light Industrial (30.82 ac.)	39.76	375.39	3513.48	21820.56	45.61	5.86
Total (123.28 ac.)	47.15	411.45	4345.62	43548.66	45.61	5.86

If the development is approved, the City of Roswell should take steps to mitigate potential impacts. The Interim Storm Water Quality Management Guidelines, adopted by the Atlanta Region, provide suggestions for addressing storm water quality. These guidelines offer general guidance for the control of post-development pollution in storm water (find attached).

The proposed site includes both wetlands and a perennial stream. Site design features such as incorporating wetlands into landscaping and maintaining natural buffers adjacent to streams should be considered. Both of these approaches are suggested in the Interim Regional Storm Water Quality Management Guidelines.

Structural Storm Water Pollution Controls

The City of Roswell should require that the developer submit a storm water management plan as a key component of the Plan of Development. The storm water plan should include location, construction and design details, and all engineering calculations for all storm water quality control measures. Atlanta Regional Commission staff recommends that the City require that any structural controls be maintained at an 80% -90% total suspended solid removal efficiency.

The Plan should also include a monitoring program to ensure storm water pollution control facilities function properly. Atlanta Regional Commission recommends that structural controls be designed to accommodate the installation, operation and maintenance of automatic equipment at inlet and outlet locations for the monitoring of flow rates and water quality. It is recommended that the monitoring program consists of the following minimum elements:

- monitoring of four storms per year (1 per quarter);
- collection of a flow weighted composite of the inflow to the structure during the entire storm event;
- collection of a flow weighted composite of the outflow from the structure - the sampling period should include the peak outflow resulting from the storm event;
- analysis of inflow and outflow flow weighted composite samples for biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), total suspended solids (TSS), zinc, lead, total phosphorus (TP), and total nitrogen (TKN & NO_3); and ,
- collection of grab samples at the inlet and outlet locations during the periods of peak inflow and outflow for pH, dissolved oxygen (DO) and fecal coliform bacteria.

The City's Engineering Department should finalize the number and size of storms to be monitored as well as who should be responsible for conducting the monitoring. Monitoring should be conducted at the developer's and owner's expense. Analysis should conform to EPA standards. Specific monitoring procedures and parameters analyzed may change in the future based on continuing storm water runoff and water quality studies.

The storm water plan should require the developer to submit a detailed, long-term schedule for inspection and maintenance of the storm facilities. This schedule should describe all maintenance and inspection requirements and persons responsible for performing maintenance and inspection activities. These provisions and the monitoring program should be included in a formal, legally binding maintenance agreement between the City and the responsible party.

In addition to inspections required in the storm water management plan, the formal maintenance agreement between the developer and the City of Roswell should allow for periodic inspections of the storm water facilities to be conducted by appropriate City personnel. If inadequate maintenance is observed, the responsible party should be notified and given a period of time to correct any deficiencies. If the party fails to respond, the City should be given the right to make necessary repairs and bill the responsible party.

The City should not release the site plans for development or issue any grading or construction permits until a storm water management plans has been approved, and a fully executed maintenance/monitoring agreement is in place.

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 am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?

Land Use	Acres Sq. Feet Units	Weekday	AM Peak Hour Enter	AM Peak Hour Exit	PM Peak Hour Enter	PM Peak Hour Exit
General Office	469,000	4,514	565	70	99	482
Retail	22,650	924	70	75	64	48
Business Hotel	120 rooms	872	41	29	45	30
Assisted Living	80 beds	215	13	8	4	6
Apartments	452 units	2,894	38	187	223	105
Total		**9,419**	727	369	435	671

The above trip generation figures were calculated using the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation (5th Edition) manual.

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

The following volumes are based on 1995 GDOT coverage counts from area facilities that will likely provide the primary routes for traveling to the proposed development. 2010 volumes for these facilities were obtained from the ARC transportation model.

Facility	1996 Number of Lanes	1996 Volume	1996 V/C Ratio	2010 Number of Lanes	Forecast 2010 volume	2010 V/C Ratio
Mansell Rd from GA 400 to Old Roswell Rd	4	39,800	0.9	4	46,200	1.1
Mansell Rd from Old Roswell Rd to SR 9/ 120	4	31,700	0.7	4	52,900	1.2
Old Roswell Rd/ Rock Mill Rd from SR 92 to Maxwell Rd	2	12,100	0.6	2	22,252	1.1
SR 9/120 from Houze Rd to Hembree Rd	4	40,000	0.9	4	49,200	1.1
GA 400 from SR 92 to Mansell Rd	6	97,300.	1.0	6	131,000	1.3
GA 400 from Mansell Rd to Haynes Bridge Rd	6	88,300	0.9	6	116,000	1.1

The above table indicates that roads in the vicinity of the site operate near peak hour capacity. Projected 2010 volumes suggest that peak hour travel demand will exceed the capacity of the area road network.

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)?

The ARC's adopted Atlanta Regional Transportation Improvement Program FY 1996 - FY 2001 (TIP), as amended September 25, 1996, includes the following proposed projects in the vicinity of this site:

FN 067A SR 9 from Academy St to Windward Pkwy. Widen 2 to 4 lanes. CST scheduled FY 2002 or later.

FN 067B SR 9 from Upper Hembree Road to Academy Street. Widen 2 to 4 lanes. CST scheduled FY 2002 or later.

FN 095 Grimes Bridge Road at Big Creek. Bridge improvement. ROW scheduled FY 1998, CST FY 2002 or later.

FN 090 Mansell Rd @ SR 9. TSM. CST scheduled 1996.

The long range element of ARC's Regional Transportation Plan: 2010 includes the following projects in the vicinity of this site. The RTP scheduled no work to begin on these projects until FY 2002 or later.

FN 067 SR 9 from Upper Hembree Road to Academy Street. Widen 2 to 4 lanes.

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.

MARTA bus route 142 serves the site, but runs only during peak hours with very low ridership. The area is served by a moderate level of transit service however, with route 141 running between the Medical Center Station and the Mansell Road Park and Ride Lot, route 85 running between downtown Alpharetta and the Medical Center Station, and route 141 circulating between North Point Mall and the Mansell Road Park and Ride lot.

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

A working group including MARTA, Fulton County, Alpharetta, and Roswell staff are preparing to begin a review of transit service in North Fulton County to assess ways to better meet travel demand and increase transit ridership. Area growth makes increases in transit service levels likely in the vicinity of the site.

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

None.

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

The area includes Kingswood, a major development plan reviewed by ARC. The cumulative effect of Kingswood (if built as proposed, with 2,196,000 sq. ft. office and 1,064,000 sq. ft. retail) and this development are:

		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Weekday	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit
Kingswood	**52,208**	**2,757**	**532**	**1,955**	**3,520**
LeCraw MUD	**9,419**	727	369	435	671
Total	**61,627**	3,484	901	2,390	4,191

Extensive development and increasing population and employment have produced significant increases in area traffic. As stated above, roads in the vicinity of the site operate near peak hour capacity. Projected 2010 volumes suggest that peak hour travel demand will exceed the capacity of the area road network. This makes viable transportation alternatives increasingly necessary for this area.

The site should be designed to include pedestrian paths/ sidewalks connecting the apartments, office, retail, hotel, and assisted living uses. Such a network should provide suitable connections to possible future sidewalks on Mansell Road, Warsaw Road and Old Roswell Road. The internal street system should be designed to accommodate bus turn arounds and van pick up and drop off areas. If a Transportation Management Association (TMA) is developed in this area in the future, the participation of this site is strongly encouraged.

Commute options programs could provide substantial benefits to this development. Commute options involve employers in providing innovative solutions to employee mobility needs. Such programs can include ridesharing, telecommuting, transit ridership subsidies, staggered work hours, flex time and more. The Commute Connections program at ARC is available at no cost to assist the developer and employers in the consideration and implementation of such programs.

INFRASTRUCTURE
Wastewater and Sewage

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

According to regional averages, the development could generate 0.23 MGD of wastewater.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Big Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

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

Permitted capacity = 24 MGD.

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

ARC has reviewed many developments which could increase the flow to the Big Creek Wastewater Treatment beyond the plant's treatment capacity. Fulton County would like to expand this capacity but expansion would require EPD approval.

INFRASTRUCTURE
Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Again by regional averages, 0.268 MGD.

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

The North Fulton Treatment Plant should have sufficient supply, but water conserving measures are important in all developments.

INFRASTRUCTURE
Solid Waste

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

To be determined - private hauler.

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; however, this mixed use type of development especially with office, hotel apartment, and assisted living facility would provide a unique recycling opportunity and contact should be made with Roswell Clean and Beautiful to establish such programs.

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.)?

The development will have some impact on the schools which cannot meet increased demand, according to information submitted.

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

There is a very limited supply of low cost housing in the vicinity.

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 t he Region. 1996 median family income of $52,100 for Atlanta MSA.

May 22, 1995

ARC Storm Water Management Task Force
INTERIM STORM WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

Introduction

The following are suggested interim guidelines for local governments that want to protect and improve water quality by minimizing the potential harmful impacts generated by pollution in storm water runoff from urban land uses. These guidelines are focused on practices to minimize long-term impacts of developed areas on water quality. In general, the objectives of these interim guidelines include minimizing imperviousness, providing areas to capture overland flow of storm water and allow it to infiltrate into the soil, treating other runoff that leaves a developed site and designing sites to protect water quality.

Although many pollutants in storm water runoff must be considered in storm water design, one of the primary pollutants used as a design parameter is total suspended solids, or TSS. The following table is provided as information on post-development characteristics of average annual TSS loads (pounds per acre per year) associated with various land uses and development types. The source of this information is based on storm water samples collected for the Atlanta Region Storm Water Characterization Study and is supplemented with national data for the non-urban land uses.

Land Use	TSS (lbs/ac/yr.)
Forest/Open	235
Agriculture/Pasture/Cropland	327
Large Lot Single Family (>2ac)	355
Low Density S.F. (1-2ac)	447
Low-Medium Density S.F. (0.5-1.0ac)	639
Medium Density S.F. (0.25-0.5ac)	801
Townhouse/Apartment	605
Commercial	983
Office/Light Industrial	708
Heavy Industrial	795

The Atlanta Region Storm Water Management Task Force is working to develop a detailed manual of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for reducing TSS and other pollutants in storm water runoff from urban areas. The Task Force generated the following protection measures as interim recommendations to be used until the BMP manual is completed. This guidance document includes a variety of recommended practices which are presented below as options for developers and engineers to consider in designing controls for storm water runoff quality from developed areas. These practices are options and may be used alone or in combination - selection of appropriate controls will be site-specific.

Practice 1: Minimize Impervious Surface

This option may be most appropriately applied to larger sites. Minimizing the amount of impervious surface on a site allows for more infiltration of storm water into the ground, thereby reducing both pollutants and the runoff from the site. This approach to managing storm water runoff does not require extensive maintenance. Therefore, when possible, limiting impervious surface on a site should be encouraged. This basically involves leaving part of a site undeveloped to achieve lower percentages of impervious surface. It is recommended that impervious surface on a site be limited to the impervious surface equivalent to medium density, single family residential (approximately 1/4 - 1/2 acre average lot sizes) development. This type of development typically has 25% or less impervious surface. If a developer restricts impervious surface to these levels, construction of structural controls for water quality would probably not be necessary. Any development more dense than medium density single family residential should employ structural controls (see Practice 2 below).

Building/Site Design

- Direct roof downspouts away from direct connection with impervious surfaces.
- Use grassed swales/vegetative filter strips whenever feasible for the drainage collection system (eliminate curb and gutter). Because of decreased storm water runoff, a reduction in pollutant loads will also be realized.
- Landscape with terraces rather than aggressive slopes.
- Encourage the use of bioengineering practices to rehabilitate unstable stream channels resulting from impacts of urbanization.
- Protect and maintain natural, undisturbed buffers adjacent to streams.
- Keep development out of wetland and floodplain areas. Encourage incorporating wetlands into landscaping, upgrading wetlands where possible.
- Design and locate buildings, roads, parking and landscaping to conform with the natural terrain and to retain natural features.
- Minimize impervious surface in river and stream corridors.

Erosion and Sediment Controls

- Leave generous buffers or natural areas between bare land areas.
- Regrass/landscape bare soil.
- Check for volume transfer and velocities of water downstream of project to protect downstream areas from increased erosion and to prevent streambank and natural area destruction.
- For controls during construction, refer to the State Erosion and Sediment Control Act and pending State construction permit.

Recommended References

- United States Environmental Protection Agency, January 1993. Guidance Specifying Management Measures for Sources of Nonpoint Pollution in Coastal Waters.

- Schueler, Thomas R., Department of Environmental Programs, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, July 1987. Controlling Urban Runoff: A Practical Manual for Planning and Designing Urban BMPs.

- Georgia Soil & Water Conservation Commission, Metro Atlanta Association of Conservation Districts, USDA Soil Conservation Service and Georgia Environmental Protection Division, 1994. Guidelines for Streambank Restoration.

- Pitt, Dr. Robert E. Excerpts from Detention Pond Design to Control Quality and Quantity, University of Alabama, Birmingham Continuing Education Workshop. For more information, contact David Eckhoff, Director of Engineering Professional Development, (205)934-8268.

- Camp Dresser & McKee, prepared for the Atlanta Region Storm Water Task Force, Atlanta Region Storm Water Characterization Study, 1993.

Fulton County Schools
Where Students Come First

December 16, 1997

Ms. Beverly Rhea, Review Coordinator
Atlanta Regional Commission
200 Northcreek, Suite 300
3715 Northside Parkway
Atlanta, GA 30327-2809

RE: Development of Regional Impact - LeCraw Mixed Use Development

Dear Ms. Rhea:

Enclosed is the impact information you requested regarding the proposed 452 apartment units and other commercial development related to the LeCraw request. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

James B. Welsh

James B. Welsh

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION
NORTH FULTON
DECEMBER 1997

LeCraw Mixed Use Development

	# OF UNITS	SCHOOLS	# OF STUDENTS GENERATED BY DEVELOPMENT	STATE CAPACITY	1997-98 PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT OVER CAPACITY	NUMBER OF PORTABLE CLASSROOMS	CAN FACILITY MEET INCREASED DEMAND? **
PARTMENTS	452	Mimosa Elementary***	52 to 127	725	680	-45	0	No
		Crabapple Middle	23 to 56	1075	1288	213	24	No
		Roswell High	27 to 66	2150	2109	-41	0	No
		Totals	102 to 249					

The office, 120 room hotel, 80 room assisted living facility, and retail building will not impact the enrollments of the schools in the area.

	Ave.		Highest	
One single family unit generates:	0.3259	to	0.7778	elementary school students per unit.
One multifamily or apartment unit generates:	0.1150	to	0.2800	elementary school students per unit.
	Ave.		Highest	
One single family unit generates:	0.1453	to	0.3469	middle school students per unit.
One multifamily or apartment unit generates:	0.0513	to	0.1248	middle school students per unit.
	Ave.		Highest	
One single family unit generates:	0.1690	to	0.4034	high school students per unit.
One multifamily or apartment unit generates:	0.0597	to	0.1452	high school students per unit.

	AVERAGE CONSTRUCTION COST PER STUDENT	ANNUAL OPERATING COST PER STUDENT	STATE PERATING COST PER STUDENT		FULTON OPERATING COST PER STUDENT
Single Family Subdivisions	$10,395	$5,690	$2,001	=	$3,689
Multifamily or Apartments	$10,395	$5,690	$2,001	=	$3,689

Data assembled by Marian L. Rainey Date 12/16/97

Responses approved by James B. Welsh Date 12/17/97

* The projected enrollment does not contain the number of students that would be generated by the proposed rezoning.
** Previous approved rezonings could overcrowd this school beyond the projected enrollment.
*** This school has already exceeded its projected enrollment.

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 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 and comments of the RDC:

LeCraw Mixed Use Development, City of Roswell - see preliminary report.

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

See Attached

Individual completing form: Dian Wheeler

Local Government: City of Alpharetta

Department: Community Dev. Dept.

Telephone: (770) 410 5720

Signature: _____ Date: 12-15-97

Please return this form to:

Atlanta Regional Commission
200 Northcreek, Suite 300
3715 Northside Pkwy
Atlanta GA 30327-2809
ATTN: Beverly Rhea

Return Deadline: December 17, 1997

December 15, 1997

Ms. Beverly Rhea
Atlanta Regional Commission
200 Northcreek, Suite 300
3715 Northside Parkway
Atlanta, Georgia 30327-2809

via facsimile

Dear Ms. Rhea:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the recent DRI proposed at the northwest quadrant of Mansell Road and Old Roswell Road. We have the following comments regarding this application:

1. **Traffic generation:** Although the applicant's original application was somewhat vague, our traffic generation model estimated in excess of 25,000 daily trips. However, the applicant's trip generation model estimated 10,753 daily trips. It is likely that either one of these figures will be of a major impact on the traffic flow, traffic congestion, and air quality of the area.

2. **Intergovernmental impacts:** Due to the proximity of the project to the city limits of Alpharetta, it is apparent that there will be some impact upon Alpharetta's services. We anticipate that the increased traffic generated will affect fire, police, and emergency medical services within the city limits. The major intersection for this project (Mansell Road and Old Roswell Road) is within Alpharetta's jurisdiction and will see increased traffic. Additionally, due to the state's mutual aid requirements, there may be situations that require Alpharetta's emergency services within the project area.

3. **Infrastructure needs:** Has the applicant provided traffic studies to determine the need for improved infrastructure? It would seem that additional turn lanes would be needed in several locations.

4. **Multifamily housing:** Has the applicant conducted a study to determine if the approval of additional multifamily housing would provide a balance with single family development within the area?

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to participate in the DRI review process. We look forward to receiving a copy of your final report.

Sincerely,

Diana Wheeler
Community Development Director

cc: Mayor Chuck Martin