

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



Harry West  
Director

April 12, 1996

Hon. Wayne Hill, Chairman  
Gwinnett County Commission  
75 Langley Drive  
Lawrenceville, GA. 30245

RE: Development of Regional Impact Review  
Wesley Place Apartments, Phases I-IV

Dear Wayne:

I am writing to let you know that the ARC staff has completed the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of the Wesley Place Apartments, Phases I-IV. We are aware that Phases I and II have been completed and only Phases III and IV (which cause the development to exceed the DRI threshold) are currently under consideration by the County. For information, our review and report look at the impact of the entire development, Phases I-IV. Our finding is that the proposed development is in the best interest of the State.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not point out the serious nature of the traffic problem in this area of the County. Yet, the close proximity of these apartments to the Gwinnett Place employment center will provide additional housing near employment. Also the close proximity could provide the County and the developer an opportunity to work together on a demonstration project of targeted marketing and vanpools or shuttles to the Mall and surrounding employment and shopping.

Please let me know if you have any questions at all about our review or if we can provide any further assistance or information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bundy Rhea", is written over the typed name "Harry West".

Harry West  
Director

Enclosure

c Mr. David Gill, Gwinnett Planning & Development  
Mr. Ignacio Diego, Convest Development Corp.

Facility: Wesley Place I - IV  
Preliminary Report: March 20, 1996  
Final Report: April 10, 1996

## 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 identified.

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

No.

**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 existing and proposed phases of Wesley Place Apartments could accommodate a population of 1,754 including 252 students.

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

ARC has reviewed 16 major developments within a two-mile range of the Wesley Place site. Those nearest the site are:

- Sweetwater Oaks - 1,335 multi-family units and 50,000 square feet office
- Koger Center - 547,000 square feet office
- Breckinridge - 753,900 square feet office
- Breckinridge Place - 3,271,400 square feet office and 250-room hotel
- Gwinnett Commerce Center - 1,198,000 square feet office

**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 project is located in central Gwinnett County, south of the I-85/316 split, across I-85 from Gwinnett Place Mall. 84° 07' / 33° 57'

**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 development site is between Lawrenceville and Lilburn but not contiguous to either.

**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.

### **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?**

At build out, the development would generate \$815,100 in taxes.

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

Two hundred, according to information received with the review. Also, nine 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?**

The apartments will compete with others in this area and will provide additional housing for the nearby Gwinnett Mall employment area.

### **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 project site is not located in either a large or small water supply watershed. Therefore, no DNR watershed protection criteria apply. The proposed project site does include perennial streams which flow into Sweetwater Creek. Water quality in these tributaries and Sweetwater Creek can be impacted without stormwater pollution controls, both during and after construction. Need for appropriate erosion and sedimentation measures during construction are essential. In addition, the amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed Wesley Place Apartments 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 stormwater monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

**Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year**

<u>Land Coverage</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus</u>	<u>Total Nitrogen</u>	<u>BOD</u>	<u>Zinc</u>	<u>Lead</u>
Apartment (67.52ac)	70.9	723.1	4,523.8	340.0	51.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>70.9</b>	<b>723.1</b>	<b>4,523.8</b>	<b>340.0</b>	<b>51.3</b>

Gwinnett County should ensure that the developer takes steps to mitigate potential impacts. The proposed site's inclusion of perennial streams and upstream location to Sweetwater Creek highlights the need to mitigate the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff from this site. The "Interim Regional Storm Water Quality Management Guidelines," adopted by the Atlanta Region, provide suggestions for addressing stormwater quality (find attached).

Areas within the proposed project site are located within the 100-year floodplain. Gwinnett County should ensure that the developer takes steps to mitigate potential impacts on these floodplains. The Atlanta Regional Commission's Regional Development Plan notes that "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."

### 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?

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Sq. Feet or No. of Units</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	<u>AM Peak Hour</u>		<u>PM Peak Hour</u>	
			<u>Enter</u>	<u>Exit</u>	<u>Enter</u>	<u>Exit</u>
Multi-Family	877	5,705	205	284	299	266

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 1994 GDOT coverage counts from area facilities that will likely provide the primary route for traveling to the proposed Wesley Place Apartments. 2010 volumes for these facilities were obtained from the ARC Regional Transportation Model.

<u>Facility</u>	<u>1994 Number of Lanes</u>	<u>1994 Volume</u>	<u>1994 V/C Ratio</u>	<u>2010 Number of Lanes</u>	<u>Forecast 2010 Volume</u>	<u>2010 V/C Ratio</u>
Pleasant Hill Rd. from Club Dr. to I-85	4	35,900*	1.00*	6	55,320	1.03
Old Norcross Rd. from Pleasant Hill Rd. to Satellite Boulevard	4	17,300	0.73	4	36,300	1.08
Satellite Boulevard from Old Norcross Road to Boggs Road	4	34,400	1.02	4	42,000	1.25
I-85 from Steve Reynolds Blvd to Pleasant Hill Road	8	179,700	1.16	10	202,400	1.06
I-85 from Pleasant Hill Road to SR 316	8	170,200	1.10	10	186,190	0.99
Sugarloaf Parkway from North of Satellite Boulevard to I-85	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	30,300	0.90
I-85 C-D Facilities - North of Sugarloaf Parkway	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	14,700	0.60
I-85 C-D Facilities - South of Sugarloaf Parkway	N/A	N/A	N/A	6	9,500	0.39

\*1993 volumes used

The table above shows that facilities in the project vicinity operate above their respective carrying capacities. Future volume forecasts show that all facilities in the project vicinity will be congested in 2010. This congestion will exist despite the addition of capacity that is currently planned for roads in the project area.

**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) includes seven proposed transportation projects in the general vicinity of this development.

GW-R 072 This project has two main components: (a) Construct Sugarloaf Parkway, a new four-lane facility, from SR 120 to Satellite Boulevard including an interchange with I-85. Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition have begun and construction is schedule to begin in 1996. This component of the project is funded by National Highway System and Interstate Maintenance funds; and (b) Construct a collector-distributor system consisting of three northbound and three southbound lanes adjacent to I-85 from Boggs Road to Old Peachtree Road including the reconfiguration of the I-85/Boggs Road interchange, addition of auxiliary lanes on I-85, and improvement of I-85 mainline to provide full standard shoulder widths. Preliminary engineering has begun, right-of-way acquisition is scheduled to begin in 1997/1998 and construction is scheduled to begin in 1999. This component of the project is funded by National Highway System and Interstate Maintenance funds.

- GW 088     Widen SR 120 from two to four lanes from I-85 to McKendree Church Road. Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition have begun and construction is scheduled to occur after 2001. This project is funded by Surface Transportation Program 33C funds.
  
- GW R 053   Reconstruct the I-85/SR 316 interchange. Preliminary engineering is scheduled to begin in 1998 and right-of-way acquisition is scheduled to begin in 2001. Construction will not begin until after 2001. This project is funded by Interstate Maintenance funds.
  
- R 177       Construct bicycle/pedestrian facilities at various locations throughout the Region including along Satellite Boulevard. Construction on this project is scheduled to begin in 1996. This project is funded by Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds.
  
- R 177       Construct bicycle/pedestrian facilities at various locations throughout the Region including sidewalks along Pleasant Hill Road. Construction on this project is scheduled to begin in 1998. This project is funded by Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds.
  
- GW 059     Extend Satellite Boulevard, a four-lane facility, from Sugarloaf Parkway to Wildwood Road. Preliminary engineering has begun and right-of-way acquisition and construction are scheduled to begin in 1996. This is a locally funded project.
  
- GW 118     Widen Pleasant Hill Road from four to six lanes from Club Drive to I-85. Construction has been initiated. This project is locally funded.
  
- GW 120     Widen Pleasant Hill Road from four to six lanes from Satellite Boulevard to Old Norcross Road. Construction has been initiated. This project is locally funded.

In addition, the Long Range Element of ARC's Regional Transportation Plan: 2010 includes three proposed projects in the vicinity of the proposed development:

- GW 068     Improve the intersection of Satellite Boulevard and Eldridge/Old Norcross Roads. No work on this project is scheduled to begin until FY 2002 or after.
  
- GW 093     Construct Sugarloaf Parkway from Satellite Boulevard to Peachtree Industrial Boulevard (four lanes). No work on this project is scheduled to begin until FY 2002 or after.
  
- GW R 053   Widen SR 316 from I-85 to SR 120 from 4 to 6 lanes. No work on this project is scheduled to begin until FY 2002 or after.

**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.**

No.

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

Gwinnett County is currently in the process of establishing demand responsive and fixed-route transit service. Once service is implemented, the project site could be served.

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

None.

**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?**

Six Major Development Area Plans have been reviewed in the project area. The trip generation for these developments and the Wesley Place apartments appears below:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	<u>AM Peak Hour</u>	<u>PM Peak Hour</u>
Sweetwater Oaks	11,490	1,310	1,280
Koger Center	7,285	1,080	1,055
Satellite MUD	44,910	1,770	4,500
Breckinridge	7,900	1,260	835
Gwinnett Commerce Center	12,000	1,980	1,880
Breckinridge Place	33,350	4,520	2,560
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>116,935</b>	<b>11,920</b>	<b>12,110</b>
Wesley Place Apartments	5,705	490	565
<b>Total</b>	<b>122,640</b>	<b>12,410</b>	<b>12,675</b>

The table above shows that the above-developments at buildout will add approximately 122,640 additional daily trips to the local road network. Even with the transportation improvements currently proposed and under construction in the project area, it appears that the area transportation system will be unable to accommodate these trips.

As shown earlier, most roadways in the project vicinity currently experience congestion and congestion will worsen in the future despite roadway widenings and construction. Increased congestion on these and other facilities as a result of major developments will



Increased congestion on these and other facilities as a result of major developments will result in a degradation in the areawide transportation system. County officials should work with the developer, ARC, and the Georgia Department of Transportation to ensure the integrity and efficient interaction of the Atlanta Region's transportation facilities.

Growth in this section of Gwinnett County, as exemplified by the Wesley Place Apartments and other major developments, has resulted and will continue to result in substantial and ever-increasing levels of traffic on the surrounding road system. In view of the situation, efforts should be made to expedite those RTP/TIP projects previously mentioned. In addition, additional highway and transit projects should be identified and implemented for congested facilities in this area. The degree of the severity of congestion in this area necessitates the pursuit of strategies other than highway and transit projects for congestion relief. Strategies, such as carpool and vanpool programs, should be identified and implemented in order to help alleviate the serious traffic congestion in this area.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Wastewater and Sewage**

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

According to regional averages, the development could generate 0.22 MGD. The development's early experience indicates as little as 0.11 MGD.

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

The development site is located in the Beaver Ruin/Sweetwater Water Reclamation Facility sewer service area. This plant has excess flows going to the Yellow River Water Reclamation Facility.

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

If both service areas are combined for this analysis, the combined capacity is 16.5 MGD with 12.11 MGD combined flow in 1992.

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

Including this development, ARC has reviewed proposed major developments which would add 13 MGD combined flow to these wastewater treatment plants if all the developments were built as reviewed. It is very important, therefore, that local officials carefully monitor available short-term treatment capacity and timing of proposed developments along with alternative technologies. Long-term relief will be provided by the North Advanced Water Reclamation Facility as some of the flow going to Yellow River will be intercepted and pumped to the North Plant.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Water Supply and Treatment**

**How much water will the proposed project demand?**

According to regional averages, Wesley Place could have a demand for 0.25 MGD of water. The development's early experience indicates this may be as low as 0.13 MGD.

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

While Gwinnett has sufficient water supply for the proposed development, it is important, nevertheless, that the development incorporate water-conserving fixtures and xeriscaping plans.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Solid Waste**

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

The apartments, by national averages, could generate 1,280 tons of solid waste per year. The development would contract with one of the private waste collection companies operating in Gwinnett. It is likely that waste would be disposed in one of three private landfills in Gwinnett.

**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.)?

No. While regional averages would suggest 252 students, it is likely the number will be less since this is an upscale facility near a major employment area and likely to house many young professionals.

## **HOUSING**

**Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?**

The proposed project is multi-family housing.

**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?**

Yes.

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

N/A

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

## 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.

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>TSS (lbs/ac/yr.)</u>
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).

The development site should be planned so that open space areas act as a pollutant filter and buffer for storm water flow from the site. Environmentally sensitive portions of a development site such as river and stream corridors and wetlands should be targeted for the undeveloped, "open space" or "greenbelt" areas. Local governments can encourage the concept of "cluster development," which allows higher levels of impervious (over 25%, for example) on portions of a site if sensitive areas are left undeveloped and maintained as undisturbed open space and they function to reduce the pollutant load in storm water runoff. Provisions should be made so that any open space areas are maintained in their natural state. If any development in these areas occurs in the future, the site would have to be re-reviewed, for storm water quality purposes, by the local government.

As a general guideline to local governments, several studies indicate that watershed-wide impervious surface amounts should not exceed 10-25% of the total land area in a water supply watershed.

## **Practice 2: Structural Controls**

If the developer selects storm water management options which involve structural controls, it is important for local governments to 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 the location, construction and design details and all engineering calculations for all storm water quality control measures.

### Wet Ponds

This practice recommends that structural controls be designed to control water quality in addition to the quantity controls typically required by local governments. At this time, the preferred approach to achieve water quality goals is construction of wet ponds. However, wet ponds may be more appropriately suited for larger developments or a group of developments. To develop an appropriate wet pond, additional storage provided above the permanent pool, combined with an appropriately designed outlet control structure, could give the necessary control for both storm water quality and quantity. Other structural control methods such as constructed wetlands could be explored as long as they were shown to achieve the desired pollutant removal.

As an example, the following design guidelines typically achieve a TSS reduction of 65%.

- Keep pond shape simple for good circulation.
- Inlets should be widely spaced from the outlets to avoid short-circuiting.
- Length should be three to five times the width.
- At least three, and preferably six to seven feet of permanent pool depth is needed for the majority of the pond.
- An underwater shelf (approximately 6"-12" deep and at least 3' wide) around the perimeter of the pond should be planted with rooted aquatic plant species.
- The pond should be designed with a sediment forebay which is easily accessible for maintenance and periodic cleaning. The forebay should be designed so as to minimize the resuspension of previously deposited sediments. The forebay storage capacity should be about 10% of the permanent pool storage to accommodate sediment accumulations over a 10- to 20-year period.
- The pond surface area should correspond to approximately 1% of the total drainage area. The minimum drainage area is 20-25 acres; the maximum is 100-300 acres depending on the level of imperviousness in the drainage basin.
- For water quality benefits, the pond should provide storage for runoff depths as listed below. The pond volume above the normal pool required for water quality may be calculated by multiplying the runoff depth by the contributing drainage area.

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Inches of Runoff</u>	
	<u>Sandy Soil</u>	<u>Clayey Soil</u>
Freeways	0.35	0.40
Totally Paved Area	1.10	1.10
Industrial	0.85	0.90
Commercial	0.75	0.85
Schools	0.20	0.40
Low Density Res.	0.10	0.30
Medium Density Res.	0.15	0.35
High Density Res.	0.20	0.40
Developed Parks	0.50	0.60

- Storage for flood control should be provided above the level of storage provided for water quality benefits.
- The ratio of outlet flow rate to pond surface area for each stage value needs to be at the most 0.002 cfs/ft<sup>2</sup> for the water quality portion.

#### Extended Detention with Wetland Plantings

For smaller sites, with a drainage area less than 20-25 acres, it may be appropriate for the developer to use the option of a detention facility system established to provide water quality improvement through much longer detention times in contact with wetland plantings. Research has shown that storm water impounding areas which capture the first flush of runoff in a wetland setting for several days, in concert with an outlet control system for extending the detention times of larger storms, demonstrate measurable improvements in water quality. As an example, the following general design guidelines typically achieve a TSS reduction of between 45 and 80%.

If this type of system is desired, the pond area should follow the 1% of drainage basin rule presented above. The first flush capture should be at least 1/2 inch runoff from all impervious surfaces. The bottom of the pond should be cultivated with plantings indigenous to local wetlands. The first flush should be held so as to prevent its complete release in less than a 48 hour period. Each pond should provide the forebay sediment storage area already presented, as well as layout to prevent short circuit. Water velocity through the pond should be kept as low as possible with a maximum goal of 1/2 fps. Where possible, the outlet control system should be located adjacent to a public street to allow maximum access.

#### Maintenance of Structural Controls

If structural storm water controls are not maintained properly, they will provide no benefit. The developer's Storm Water Management Plan should require the developer to submit a detailed, long-term schedule for inspection and maintenance of any structural storm water facilities included. This schedule should be consistent with the maintenance policy of the local government and should describe all maintenance and inspection requirements and persons responsible for performing maintenance and inspection activities. Provisions should be made for the local government to inspect the facilities during and after construction.

#### **Practice 3: Other Controls**

Many of the following suggested controls are applicable to all developments. In general, the objectives of the following storm water runoff controls include minimizing imperviousness, providing areas to capture overland flow of storm water and allow it to infiltrate into the soil, reducing sediment flows, and avoiding directly connected impervious surface areas.

### **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.

# DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT

## Comments from Affected Parties Form

Project I.D.: Wesley Place Apts.  
(From Request for Comments Form)

Name of Commenting Organization: Gwinnett County Schools

Address: 320 Pike Street  
Lawrenceville, GA. 30245  
Attn: Planning Dept.

Contact Person: Greg Stanfield Telephone Number: 822-6499

Do you believe your jurisdiction will be affected by the proposed development? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Please describe the effects (positive and/or negative) the proposed project could have on your jurisdiction:

The proposed development, Wesley Place Apartments  
will affect the following schools:

- (1) Kanoheda Elementary School
- (2) Sweetwater Middle School
- (3) Berkman High School

We are also enclosing our 5-year forecast  
for these schools. This forecast will provide  
the enrollment forecast, the capacity of the  
school, and whether the school is over or  
under capacity.

Next year's forecast of the affected schools  
is recorded below, and is included in the attachment.

	(Capacity)	(96-97 Enrollment)
<u>- Kanoheda Elementary</u>	<u>990</u>	<u>1036</u>
<u>- Sweetwater Middle</u>	<u>1275</u>	<u>1758</u>
<u>- Berkman High</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1889</u>

(Attach Additional Pages if Necessary)

Form Completed By: Greg Stanfield

Title: Planning Coordinator

Signature: Greg Stanfield

Date: 04-05-96

RETURN TO: ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
3715 Northside Parkway  
200 Northcreek, Suite 300  
Atlanta, Ga. 30327

ATTENTION: REVIEW OFFICE

FAX NO. 404-364-2599

DCA/OCP 10/7/91



3/26/96

# **Berkmar Cluster**

	1996-97	1996-97	1996-97	1997-98	1997-98	1997-98	1998-99	1998-99	1998-99	1999-00	1999-00	1999-00	2000-2001	2000-2001	2000-2001	2000-2001	2000-2001
	Capacity	Enrollment	Over/Under	Capacity	Enrollment	Over/Under	Capacity	Enrollment	Over/Under	Capacity	Enrollment	Over/Under	Capacity	Enrollment	Over/Under	Capacity	Enrollment
Berkmar HS	1975	1889	-86	1975	2104	129	1975	2241	266	1975	2183	208	1975	2279	304	1975	2279
Sweetwater MS	1275	1758	483	1675	1789	114	1675	1862	187	1675	1905	230	1675	1949	274	1675	1949
Benefield ES	967	953	-14	967	975	8	967	1011	44	967	1053	86	967	1095	128	967	1095
Bethesda ES	832	866	34	832	920	88	1102	975	-127	1102	1033	-69	1102	1100	-2	1102	1100
Kancheda ES	990	1036	46	990	1103	113	990	1159	169	990	1213	223	990	1260	270	990	1260
Minor ES	990	1085	95	990	1095	105	990	1119	129	990	1139	149	990	1156	166	990	1156
Totals:	7029	7587	558	7429	7986	557	7699	8367	668	7699	8526	827	7699	8839	1140	7699	8839