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

May 22, 1996

Harry West
Director

Honorable Norman E. Davis, Mayor
Town of Tyrone
881 Senoia Road
Tyrone, GA. 30290

RE: Development of Regional Impact
John Wieland Homes Tyrone PUD

Dear Mayor Davis:

I am writing to officially transmit the resolution that the Atlanta Regional Commission adopted on May 22, 1996, concerning the proposed John Wieland Homes PUD in Tyrone. Enclosed is a copy of the resolution finding the proposed development *not in the best interest of the State at this time*. The concerns are spelled out in the resolution and also noted in our review report and comments received from Fayette and Coweta Counties, Peachtree City, and the Chattahoochee-Flint RDC. Copies of the report and comments are also enclosed.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DRI. We ask that you please call us if you have any questions at all about the review or if we can help in any other way.

Sincerely,

Harry West
Director

Enclosures

c Mr. Bill Johnston, Community Relations Plus
Mr. Kirk Culler, John Wieland Homes
Mr. John Gillespie, John Wieland Homes
Hon. Rick Price, Fayette County
Hon. Robert Lenox, Peachtree City
Hon. Jim Morgan, Coweta County
Mr. Paul Radford, GDCA
Mr. Wayne Shackelford, GDOT
Mr. Lonice C. Barrett, GDNR
Ms. Donna Lackey, Chatt-Flint RDC

RESOLUTION BY THE ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION CONCERNING THE JOHN WIELAND HOMES TYRONE PUD DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT

WHEREAS, on March 29, 1996, the Atlanta Regional Commission received from the Town of Tyrone, for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI), a proposed planned unit development known as the John Wieland Homes Tyrone Planned Unit Development, to be located on 361.5 acres on Joel Cowan Parkway and consisting of 320 planned single-family homes and 465,000 sq.ft. of office space; and

WHEREAS, the Commission initiated a DRI review as required by the Georgia Planning Act of 1989; and

WHEREAS, the proposed development has limited accessibility to Joel Cowan Parkway and no public sewerage; and

WHEREAS, the review process identified serious potential impacts including significant traffic generation beyond the capacity of existing and planned facilities and possible negative water quality effects from on-site drip irrigation of wastewater and storm water runoff in the Line Creek small water supply watershed; and

WHEREAS, Fayette County, Peachtree City, Coweta County, and the Chattahoochee-Flint Regional Development Center have all expressed concerns about the impacts of the DRI;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Atlanta Regional Commission finds the proposed John Wieland Homes Tyrone PUD is not in the best interest of the State at this time.

JOHN WIELAND HOMES
Tyrone PUD

Location:
- Town of Tyrone
- Office and Subdivision west of Joel Cowan Parkway
- Some office east of Parkway
- 361.5 Acres

Developer:
- John Wieland Homes

Proposed Development:
- 320 S.F. Houses on 320 Acres
- 465,000 square feet Office on 41.5 Acres

Potential Impacts:
- Traffic - 7,500 trips (Access only to Joel Cowan Parkway)
- 1,550 long-term jobs
- Water - .346 MGD
- Wastewater - .346 MGD - No public sewerage; On-site drip irrigation
- $1,238,080 Annual Property Tax
- Floodplains, wetlands, tributaries to Trickum Creek, a major tributary to Line Creek
- Line Creek Small Water Supply Watershed
- Next to Quarry
- Concerns about impact on County public safety services

DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT
Comments from Affected Parties Form

Project I.D: Wieland Tyrone PUD
(From Request for Comments Form)

Name of Commenting Organization: Fayette County

Address: 140 Stonewall Avenue

Fayetteville, GA 30214

Contact Person: Chris Venice Telephone Number: 770-460-5730 x163

Do you believe your jurisdiction will be affected by the proposed development? X Yes ____ No

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

1. We are concerned with the proposed on-site drip irrigation sanitary sewer system with respect to its impact on downstream water quality, especially considering the nearby flood plain and wetland areas and the fact that the development lies within the same basin as the proposed Lake McIntosh Reservoir. We would express the same concerns regarding stormwater issues.

2. We are concerned with the project's impact on public services, particularly demands placed on services provided by Fayette County Fire and Emergency Services and county sheriff personnel.

3. We are concerned about the amount of traffic generated by such a development, the circulation pattern, and its effect on county-maintained roads.

4. We ask to be notified of all future hearings on this project and also to be advised of the developer's response to the concerns raised regarding this project.

(Attach Additional Pages if Necessary)

Form Completed By: Chris Venice Title: Director of Plng. & Zng.

Signature: Chris Venice Date: April 26, 1996

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

DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT
Comments from Affected Parties Form

Project I.D: Wieland Tyrone PUD
(From Request for Comments Form)

Name of Commenting Organization: City of Peachtree City

Address: 151 Willowbend Road
Peachtree City, GA 30269

Contact Person: James B. Williams Telephone Number: 770/487-5731

Do you believe your jurisdiction will be affected by the proposed development? X Yes ____ No

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

1. We are concerned with the potential strip commercial appearance along GA 74 on both sides of the street. An office complex of 465,000 square feet seems unrealistic in this area.

2. We are concerned about the wastewater treatment issues with respect to maintaining water quality in our downstream areas, including drinking water facilities for both Fayette County and the City of Newnan.

3. We are concerned about stormwater management issues and how they might affect areas within our jurisdiction.

4. We would like to be notified of all hearings on this project so that we will be able to be fully informed, and perhaps participate in the discussions.

5. We are not opposed to the proposed project. If it is properly executed with attention to the above concerns, it will be an important asset to the entire area.

(Attach Additional Pages if Necessary)

Form Completed By: James B. Williams Title: Director of Developmental Services

Signature: James B. Williams Date: April 9, 1996

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

Coweta County Commissioners

April 12, 1996

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

Re: Development of Regional Impact Review
Wieland Homes Tyrone PUD

VIA FAX

Dear Ms. Rhea:

Reference is made to your letter of April 2, 1996 to The Honorable Jim Morgan, Chairman, Coweta County Commission, SAB. In response to the reference, Coweta County has the following comments:

TRANSPORTATION:

The majority of traffic generated by the proposed development will likely access I-85 via Hwy 74. However, as traffic volumes increase at the I-85/ Hwy 74 interchange, commuters to Atlanta may use an alternative route through Coweta County, i.e., Palmetto-Tyrone Road to the Collingsworth interchange. The impact of this additional traffic on the Coweta County road system most likely would be minimal.

LINE CREEK WATERSHED/WATER SUPPLY

We are concerned with any conflicts that this PUD has with rules and regulations pertaining to set backs from the stream, impervious structure issues, wetlands, erosions and sedimentation control and disposal of sanitary sewer effluent. The private sanitary sewer is assumed to be an on-site proposition utilizing drip irrigation. We are concerned with an estimated sewage flow of .346 MGD utilizing this method of treatment and disposal. Detailed plans for this method of disposal of sanitary sewer should be considered prior to permitting this Plan Unit Development. The integrity of the water quality of Line Creek must be maintained. Impact from failed sanitary sewer systems could have significant downstream consequences. Also, non-point loadings from storm water run off should be considered as pollutant sources for Line Creek. Has any information been submitted on the estimated impact from this pollution source?

Since the City of Newnan's Water & Light withdraws water downstream on Line

22 East Broad Street Newnan, Georgia 30263 Phone: (404) 254-2601 Fax: (404) 254-2606

DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT
Comments from Affected Parties Form

Project I.D: Wieland Homes Tyrone PU
(From Request for Comments Form)

Name of Commenting Organization: Chattahoochee-Flint RDC

Address: P.O. Box 1600 Franklin, GA 30217

Contact Person: Lisa Hollingsworth, P.G., AICP Telephone Number: 706-675-6721

Do you believe your jurisdiction will be affected by the proposed development? x Yes ____ No

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

Water Supply Watershed: Coweta County withdraws public drinking water supply from Line Creek. This development could pose short- and long-term water quality impacts to Line Creek. Erosion and sedimentation control measures, as well as urban stormwater runoff control, are critical to protecting Coweta County's drinking water supply. The drip irrigation system is also a concern from a water quality standpoint. Coweta has had less than desirable performance from the systems currently operating in the Thomas Crossroads areas. Poorly-operating drip irrigation systems are a threat to the quality of both surface and groundwater resources. Consequently, Coweta County has issued a moratorium on the installation of these systems until further research can be conducted.

(Attach Additional Pages if Necessary)

Form Completed By: Lisa Hollingsworth Title: Planning Director

Signature: [signature] Date: 4/15/96

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

May 9, 1996

Ms. Beverly Rhea
Atlanta Regional Commission
(404) 364-2500

From: Dennis E. Chase
(770) 719-8425

As a follow up to our conservation on Wednesday, May 8, I am providing information on the home development in the Tyrone area. In addition to sampling that I have done in several areas of Line Creek, the following list of studies either reference water conditions or were specific to water quality problems in Line Creek:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
field notes (7/15/92) - Line Creek at Highway 54
"Everything was covered by a flocculent layer of red silty material; that when disturbed, didn't settle readily. ... It appears that this stretch of Line Creek is degraded, based upon the amount of silt covering everything."

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Report January, 1996
"Selected Sampling Sites for Mussels in Line Creek and Environs, Upper Flint River System, Central Georgia" By Robert S. Butler, Jacksonville, Florida.
Discussion section at page 5: "...several of the sites on Line Creek appeared to be impacted by fine sediment loading." (later same page) "...Georgia Route 85 crossing (Site D), this site was noticeably impacted by sediment and possibly deleterious water quality,..."

Georgia Department of Natural Resources, April 2, 1991, Memo report by Max W. Walker. Conclusions 4 and 9 state, in part, that there is an indication of elevated organic levels in Line Creek. The final statement is: "In order to maintain adequate dissolved oxygen concentrations and avoid a reduction in biotic integrity, care must be taken in limiting organic loadings from the three Peachtree City water pollution control plants."

Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division 1992, report "A water Quality Investigation of Line Creek 1992" Summary point number 13 states "Several erosion and sedimentation problems were found in the Line Creek drainage basin during the reconnaissance. A letter was sent to Fayette County involving tow sites and to Peachtree City involving one site."

There have been numerous complaints filed with the GA EPD Municipal Permitting Office regarding sewage problems at the three treatment plants that have been operating in Peachtree City

Facility: Wieland Homes Tyrone PUD
Preliminary Report: April 1, 1996
Final Report: May 22, 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.

The adopted Future Land Use Plan for Tyrone depicts the development site as farm which apparently would allow residential use on minimum three-acre lots. There are also a number of other plan issues and policies which would need to be addressed if this project proceeds.

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

While the proposed land uses do not appear to conflict with potentially affected local governments' proposed land uses, there are a number of other concerns as evidenced in the comments received.

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

Fayette County's short-term work program includes work related to protecting small water supply watersheds and groundwater recharge areas and the proposed development is located in such areas.

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 development, as proposed, would accommodate a population of 800, including 232 students and 1,550 jobs according to regional averages. This would require improvements to schools, traffic management, public safety and provision of wastewater treatment.

What new taxes will be generated by the proposed project?

Approximately $1,238,080 at build-out according to information provided by the review.

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

The number of short-term jobs will be determined by the construction schedule. According to regional averages, the 465,000 square feet of office space could accommodate 1,550 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 site will be competing with other similar developments in the 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 development site includes 18.21 acres of wetland according to information submitted with the review. There are also floodplains, groundwater recharge areas, and tributaries to Line Creek, a Fayette/Coweta water supply source. The site is the Line Creek water supply watershed which is a small water supply watershed under EPD's classification.

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

EPD requirements for the Line Creek water supply watershed require an undisturbed vegetation buffer for 50 feet on both sides of any perennial streams on this site, a 75-foot setback for impervious surfaces and no septic tanks or drain fields within 75 feet. Also, the watershed would be limited to 25 percent impervious surface.

ARC Regional Development Plan policy on floodplains requires that all structures that can be damaged or land uses that can impede flood waters or reduce storage volume must be built outside the 100-year flood limit.

EPD input is needed to determine potential impact of a private on-site drip irrigation sanitary sewer system in a ground water recharge area which is also a small water supply watershed. The developer or Town of Tyrone should contact EPD immediately concerning

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

If the farm buildings are historically significant, they might be used for community amenities.

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

See above.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation

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

Land Use	Square Feet	Weekday	AM Peak Hours Enter	AM Peak Hours Exit	PM Peak Hours Enter	PM Peak Hours Exit
Office Space	465,000	4,485	560	70	100	480
Single Family Residential	320 units	3,015	60	175	200	110

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 development. 2010 volumes for these facilities were estimated using GDOT coverage counts in a linear regression mold.

Facility	1994 Number of Lanes	1994 Traffic Volume	1994 V/C Ratio	2010 Number of Lanes	2010 Traffic Volume	2010 V/C Ratio
Fayetteville-Palmetto Road from Coweta County to SE 74	2	3,131	.25	2	6,480	.69
Senoia Road from Castlewood Road to SR 74	2	5,452	.50	2	10,545	1.20
SR 74 from Senoia Road to Sandy Creek Road	4	22,980	.58	4	49,600	1.61

The table above shows that all of the facilities in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project currently operate at an acceptable level of service. The 2010 volume estimates indicate that volumes will increase significantly between now and 2010 and that Senoia Road and SR 74 will experience congestion during peak periods.

A major concern of ARC is the fact that this project proposes access only by Joel Cowan Parkway. The Parkway is projected to have a 2010 V/C ratio ranging from 1.29 - 1.61 and cannot handle all the traffic that the proposed project would generate.

INFRASTRUCTURE
Wastewater and Sewage

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

According to regional averages, this PUD could generate 0.22 MGD of wastewater.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

There is no wastewater treatment available. The developer proposes a private on-site drip irrigation sanitary sewer system and this is of great concern to ARC and the potentially affected governments which depend on water from this small watershed.

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

N/A

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

N/A

INFRASTRUCTURE
Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Again, according to regional averages, the development could have a demand for 0.25 MGD of water.

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

Water service is provided by Fayette County.

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

The PUD proposes both housing and office development.

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?

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.

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.

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.