

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



Harry West  
Director

November 28, 1994

Honorable Jimmy Phillips, Mayor  
City of Alpharetta  
Two South Main Street  
Alpharetta, GA 30201

Re: Development of Regional Impact Review - North Point Square

Dear Jimmy:

The ARC staff has completed review of the proposed North Point Square as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Our finding is that the proposed project is in the best interest of the State. Along with our finding we recommend that if the development is approved, the governmental entities involved proceed forthwith to provide or commit to the required infrastructure so that it is coordinated with the timing of the development. We also recommend the City of Roswell's requests concerning preservation of water quality of Big Creek.

Enclosed is a copy of our complete review report.

Please let me know if you have any questions concerning our review or the enclosed report or if you would like for me to arrange any meetings concerning these.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment and hope that this is helpful as the City considers the project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Harry West", is written over the typed name and title.

Harry West  
Director

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Carol Lewis, City of Alpharetta  
Mr. Paul Radford, Georgia DCA  
Mr. Wayne Shackelford, Georgia DOT  
Mr. Richard Goodsell, Owner  
Hon. W. L. Mabry, City of Roswell

Facility: North Point Square  
Preliminary Report: November 4, 1994  
Final Report: November 23, 1994

## **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.

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

No inconsistencies were noted in the review process; Roswell, however, did express concerns about impact on their water supply.

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

No impacts on short-term work program were identified in the review process.

**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 proposed development could accommodate 3,970 jobs. This, combined with the other unprecedented growth in the vicinity, is necessitating improvements in all infrastructure and facilities.

## **LOCATION** (continued)

**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.**

No impacts were identified in the review process.

## **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?**

According to information submitted with the review, the development at build out would generate \$1,324,800 taxes based on 1993 dollars.

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

According to information submitted with the review, 1,820 short-term jobs will be created.

**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 proposed office and retail developments will compete with other nearby office and retail.

## **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.**

According to information submitted with the review, 64 of the 134.36 acres are wetlands. The site also is in the Big Haynes small water supply watershed and the creek itself flows through the southern-most part of the site.

## NATURAL RESOURCES (continued)

The proposed development should conform to DNR buffer and impervious surface criteria for small water supply watersheds. While DNR criteria do not restrict every property to 25% impervious, allocating too much impervious surface to a single development could have the effect of reducing development potential in the other properties within the City of Alpharetta and other jurisdictions in the Big Creek basin. The applicant estimates the percent impervious on the property will be fairly close to the DNR 25% figure (approximately 28%). This low percentage impervious will help significantly in protecting water quality. In addition to this low impervious figure, the City should consider incorporating water quality requirements into structural facilities built to control runoff from the developed areas of the site. These facilities should reduce the average annual total suspended solid loadings by 80% and, to the extent practicable, maintain postdevelopment peak runoff rate and average volume at levels that are similar to predevelopment levels. For any detention ponds constructed, the City and developer should establish a plan to ensure long-term maintenance of the ponds.

### **Wetlands**

ARC staff considers the preservation of wetlands an important contribution to the protection of streams and the quality of their water, as well as providing significant wildlife habitat areas. As a protective measure, the applicant proposes to maintain the wetland areas on site as natural open space/recreation areas. ARC staff believes this approach will help protect Big Creek and adjacent wetlands, provided recreational activities in this sensitive area are limited to only those with minimal environmental impact. (Buildings, ball fields, etc. should not be allowed.)

The applicant has taken great care to incorporate many features designed to protect environmentally sensitive areas of this site. Therefore, it is important to ensure that development activities in the upland portions of the site do not interfere with protection of the environmentally sensitive site areas. The developer should consider working with the Corps of Engineers and/or EPA to determine the interaction between upland and wetland site areas. They should determine if pollutant runoff from the office and retail areas will affect the wetland habitat adversely. Second, they should determine if alteration of intermittent streams on the site will have a negative impact on the hydrology of this wetland system. Buffers and/or structural controls (see above) could provide protection of these streams if an impact is determined. If the site is developed with these environmental considerations in mind, ARC staff believes this development could serve as an excellent example for future development in the Big Creek watershed to follow.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**Transportation (continued)**

<u>Road</u>	<u># of Lanes</u>	<u>GDOT 1993 Count</u>	<u>V/C Ratio</u>
Haynes Bridge South of GA 400	4	12,037	0.67
GA 400 North of Haynes Bridge	4	67,480	1.39
South of Haynes Bridge	6	76,300	1.05

Future traffic forecasts for area facilities were obtained from the ARC transportation model and are as follows:

<u>Road</u>	<u># of Lanes</u>	<u>2010 Volume</u>	<u>V/C Ratio</u>
Haynes Bridge Road South of GA 400	4	16,700*	0.93
GA 400 North of Haynes Bridge	4	83,557	1.72
South of Haynes Bridge	6	90,569	1.24

\* Recent large-scale development in the GA 400 corridor, spurred by the completed GA 400 extension and the opening of the North Point Mall, will probably result in higher 2010 daily volumes than estimated previously by ARC. The ARC forecasts used for generating the 2010 traffic assignments cited above were last revised in 1987. Recently, ARC completed producing new socio-economic forecasts for the year 2020 which include updated forecasts for the year 2010. Comparison of the 1987 and updated 2010 forecasts for the census tract in which the North Point Mall is located shows the increase in anticipated growth. The 1987-revised forecasts for the year 2010 anticipated about 26,000 jobs in the census tract. The 2020 revised forecasts, however, anticipate about 57,600 jobs for the same geographical area by the year 2010, about a 120% increase.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Transportation (continued)**

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

Several large-scale project proposals have been reviewed in the GA 400 corridor in North Fulton. The North Point Mall, located adjacent to North Point Square across Haynes Bridge Road, has the most direct impact on the facilities which will serve the project site. The North Point Mall, when reviewed in February 1990, was expected to generate about 101,000 daily vehicle trips.

The North Point Mall has served as a catalyst for additional development in the GA 400 corridor including the proposed North Point Square and other large-scale projects in the GA 400 corridor. Recent proposed projects near North Point Mall include:

- (1) Mansell Crossing (reviewed January 1991): Proposal to construct 645,900 square feet of retail space and 958,500 square feet of office space east of GA 400 and north of Mansell Road. This project was anticipated to generate about 29,400 daily vehicle trips.
- (2) Northwind (reviewed July 1993): Proposal to construct 2,800,000 square feet of office space, 225,000 square feet of retail space, 200 single family units and 1,300 multi-family units, and a 200-room hotel in the northeast quadrant of the GA 400/Haynes Bridge interchange. This project was anticipated to generate about 49,000 daily vehicle trips.

The high growth rate along the GA 400 corridor will result in congested facilities despite recent and planned improvements to the transportation system. A comparison of GDOT counts from 1991 to 1993 shows the impact of increase commercial and residential development on transportation facilities. The 1991 GDOT daily vehicle count for GA 400 north of Haynes Bridge was 48,360 which grew to 67,480 by 1993, a 40% increase. South of Haynes Bridge, GA 400 daily traffic grew from 59,690 in 1991 to 76,300 by 1993, a 28% increase.

Competition for the limited federal funding available to the Atlanta Region and the federal air quality regulations will make it difficult to fund additional road capacity in the North Fulton area. Currently, there are not any improvements identified to improve GA 400 in the project area. Therefore, all additional traffic generated by new development will result in increased congestion on local and regional facilities. It is increasingly important to effectively manage the existing transportation system and pursue alternative travel modes.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Water Supply and Treatment (continued)**

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

The new Atlanta-Fulton County Water Plant will provide water to the development. However, it is important that water conserving measures be used in all phases of this development.

### **Solid Waste**

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

According to information submitted with the review, solid waste is estimated at 62 tons per year. Private companies will collect and dispose of waste from the development.

**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.

### **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?**

*from City of Roswell*

**DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT**

**Comments from Affected Parties Form**

**Attachment**

The project affects wetlands which are contiguous with the watershed basin of Big Creek. This area is approximately 5.5 miles upstream from the intake of our water purification plant. We have completed a \$1.8 million renovation and expansion of our water purification plant and preservation of the water quality of Big Creek, as much as possible, is of the utmost concern to us. Therefore, we would recommend that the developer be required to employ above standard erosion and sediment control practices so as to minimize additional deterioration of Big Creek due to increases in the amounts of silt or any other contaminants that may result from this project.

We further recommend that the developer be required to frequently monitor the affects of this project on Big Creek during construction by taking samples from the creek just above and below the project location and analyzing for Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Turbidity and Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD). The difference in the results of these analyses should be compared to the pre-construction period and not be allowed to vary by more than ten (10) percent maximum.

We do not feel comfortable with the developer disturbing the wetlands. However, if allowed, the actual disturbing process and mitigation efforts should be closely scrutinized in order to prevent any detrimental effects to Big Creek.

With the considerable amount of development occurring on Big Creek upstream of our intake, we need assurances that the ultimate in protecting this valuable resource will be accomplished.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and if you have any questions, please call.



*from City of Roswell*

**DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT**

**Comments from Affected Parties Form**

**Attachment**

The project affects wetlands which are contiguous with the watershed basin of Big Creek. This area is approximately 5.5 miles upstream from the intake of our water purification plant. We have completed a \$1.8 million renovation and expansion of our water purification plant and preservation of the water quality of Big Creek, as much as possible, is of the utmost concern to us. Therefore, we would recommend that the developer be required to employ above standard erosion and sediment control practices so as to minimize additional deterioration of Big Creek due to increases in the amounts of silt or any other contaminants that may result from this project.

We further recommend that the developer be required to frequently monitor the affects of this project on Big Creek during construction by taking samples from the creek just above and below the project location and analyzing for Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Turbidity and Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD). The difference in the results of these analyses should be compared to the pre-construction period and not be allowed to vary by more than ten (10) percent maximum.

We do not feel comfortable with the developer disturbing the wetlands. However, if allowed, the actual disturbing process and mitigation efforts should be closely scrutinized in order to prevent any detrimental effects to Big Creek.

With the considerable amount of development occurring on Big Creek upstream of our intake, we need assurances that the ultimate in protecting this valuable resource will be accomplished.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and if you have any questions, please call.