

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



Harry West  
Director

March 24, 1999

Honorable Jere Wood, Mayor  
City of Roswell  
38 Hill Street  
Roswell, GA. 30075

RE: Development of Regional Impact  
Mansell Overlook

Dear Mayor Wood:

I am writing to let you know that the Atlanta Regional Commission has completed the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review of Mansell Overlook. **The Commission's finding is that this DRI is not in the best interest of the State.** The Commission adopted a motion with this finding on March 24, 1999. The proposed development exceeds 25 percent impervious surface. In 1993 the Commission requested that local governments in the Big Creek Small Water Supply Watershed allow only rezonings and permits that would not exceed 25 percent impervious surface until such time as a watershed protection plan is developed and worked out among all governments in the watershed.

I am enclosing a copy of our review report on this development. Please feel free to call me or Beverly Rhea (404-364-2562) if you have any questions concerning the review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Harry West", is written over a horizontal line.

Harry West  
Director

Enclosure

c Mr. Michael McGuire, City of Roswell  
Mr. Bo Jackson, Colonial Properties Trust  
Mr. Bob Hughes, Hughes, Good, O'Leary, & Ryan  
Mr. Wayne Shackelford, GDOT  
Mr. Harold Reheis, GDNR  
Mr. Rick Brooks, GDCA

## DEVELOPMENTS OF REGIONAL IMPACT

### REVIEW REPORT

**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** 672,000\_sq.ft. office space and 75,000 sq.ft. commercial/retail space on 67.45 acres

#### **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.**

According to information submitted with the review, the Roswell Land Use Plan shows this property as light industrial/wholesale as it is the current site of the Herman Miller complex. However, 80 percent of the site was previously zoned for the proposed uses and 20 percent (currently zoned I1) is being proposed for rezoning. The proposed development, according to information submitted by the City, is compatible with surrounding development.

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

No inconsistencies with comprehensive plans were identified by the notified local governments.

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

No impacts were identified by the notified local governments.

**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?**

Based on regional averages, the development could accommodate 2,390 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?**

Approximately 63 acres are located within the City of Roswell and 4 acres within the City of Alpharetta. The site is at the northwest quadrant of Mansell and Old Roswell Roads. 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.**

See above regarding the site's location partly in the City of Roswell and partly in the City of Alpharetta in Fulton County.

**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.**

Two 15,000 sq.ft. commercial buildings are proposed on the 4.35 acres within the City of Alpharetta in order to provide a mix of uses and services within the development.

## **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?**

Information submitted with the review estimates \$2,332,400 annual property tax revenue based on an estimated \$140,000,000 build-out value.

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

The number of short-term jobs will depend on the construction schedule and is estimated at 500 on information submitted with the review.

**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 will compete with nearby office and commercial developments in this part of the Region. Existing office buildings across Mansell Road are owned by the prospective developer of this office space.

## **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 in the Big Creek watershed, which is classified as a small water supply watershed. Also, the site is located within seven miles of the City of Roswell's water supply intake and is bounded in part by portions of Foe Killer Creek, a perennial stream as indicated by a solid blue line on USGS quad sheets. The following Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) minimum protection rules apply to the development:

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 streams 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 EPD regulations further provide that all the local governments in a small water supply watershed may present an alternative plan that provides an equivalent level of protection to the water supply, but the alternative plan must meet the EPD minimum stream buffer and setback requirements.

An ARC facilitated study of the Big Creek watershed is currently underway to develop an alternative protection plan. The final plan is scheduled to be completed in January, 2000. Information compiled for the study using 1995 data indicates that impervious surface in the City of Roswell's portion of the watershed already exceeds 25 percent.

In 1993, the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) adopted a resolution requesting local governments to take action to protect the Big Creek watershed. The resolution encouraged all local governments in the Big Creek watershed to allow only rezonings and permits that would result in development which does not exceed 25 percent impervious surface until a watershed protection plan is developed and worked out among all governments in the watershed.

The Mansell Overlook plan reviewed by ARC meets the stream buffer and setback requirements and does not propose septic tanks or drainfields or handling of hazardous materials; however it proposes approximately 48 percent impervious surface—approximately 46 percent of the site in Roswell and approximately 78 percent of the site in Alpharetta. **Therefore, on March 24, 1999, the Atlanta Regional Commission passed a motion finding that Mansell Overlook is not in the best interest of the State.**

## Floodplains

Portions of the proposed project site are located within the 100-year floodplain. If the Mansell Overlook plan is approved and development or fill should be proposed in the 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 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 impedence, storage volume reduction, and upstream or downstream erosion or deposition." This policy is in addition to EPD watershed protection requirements.

### Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act/Stream Buffer Requirements

This act requires that a 25-foot wide natural vegetated buffer be maintained on both sides of streams designated as "State waters." ARC recommends that the City work with the State to determine if the portions of creeks and tributaries within the development are considered State waters and provide protection measures if appropriate. ARC staff also recommends that any development on this site meet the Roswell Tributary Buffer Zone requirements adopted pursuant to the Metropolitan River Protection Act.

### Storm Water/Water Quality

Steps must be taken to limit the amount of pollutants that will be produced during and after construction from any development. If this development is approved, during construction, the project should conform to the County's erosion and sediment control requirements. After construction, water quality can be impacted without storm water pollution controls. ARC staff estimated the amount of pollutants that would be produced after construction of the Mansell Overlook proposal. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (pounds/acre/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**

<b>Land Coverage</b>	<b>Total Phosphorous</b>	<b>Total Nitrogen</b>	<b>BOD</b>	<b>TSS</b>	<b>Zinc</b>	<b>Lead</b>
Commercial (7.3ac)	12.5	127.0	788.4	7175.9	9.0	1.6
Office/Light Industrial (60.1ac)	77.5	1029.5	6851.4	42550.8	89.0	11.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>1156.1</b>	<b>7639.8</b>	<b>49726.7</b>	<b>98.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>

If the City approves the development, steps to mitigate these potential impacts should be taken.

### Structural Storm Water Pollution Controls

If the development is approved, 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 design details, and all engineering calculations for all storm water quality control measures. ARC staff recommends that the City consider that structural controls be maintained at an 80% to 90% total suspended solids removal efficiency.

The Plan should also include a monitoring program to ensure storm water pollution control facilities function properly. Staff recommends that structural controls be designed to accommodate 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 consider 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<sub>3</sub>); 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 determine the actual 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

developers' and owners' 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 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 plan has been approved and a fully executed maintenance 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?**

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Transportation**

**How much traffic (both average daily and peak am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?**

ARC staff estimates 11,397 weekday trips with 831 entering and 630 exiting during am peak hour and 391 entering and 961 exiting during pm peak hour. These estimates were prepared using the Institute of Traffic Engineers Trip Generation (5<sup>th</sup> Edition) manual. The estimates do not reflect pass-by trip reduction, possible additional internal trip capture associated with the mixed use character of the proposed development or reductions due to use of alternative modes provided (bus, bike, pedestrian).

**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 1997 GDOT coverage counts and projected 2010 volumes from ARC's Travel Demand Model from area facilities—Mansell Road and Old Roswell Road—that will provide the primary routes for traveling to the proposed development.

Facility	Lanes	1997	V/C Ratio
		Volume	
Mansell-west	4	30,647	.50
Mansell-east	4	42,207	.68
Old Roswell-south	2	12,236	.40

Based on current data, the traffic analysis suggests that area facilities have adequate capacity to serve the access and mobility needs of motorized vehicle traffic.

**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)?**

None in short- or long-range.

**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?**

Currently no. However, in 2010 a MARTA North Point station is expected to be open.

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

MARTA Bus Route 140 serves the Mansell Park and Ride to the Medical Center rail station via Georgia 400 on weekdays only. Route 141 serves Alpharetta Highway, Holcomb Bridge Road, and North Point Mall but does not directly access the property. This service is provided seven days a week. Route 142 serves Mansell Road providing direct access to the property. However, this route runs only in the morning and evening peak periods.

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

Yes. The aforementioned MARTA North Line rail extension. It is expected that bus service will be modified to service the new rail station.

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

To achieve 15 percent reduction in vehicle miles traveled/emissions, the development plan includes more than 10 percent retail (4 percent credit), location within one-fourth mile of a MARTA bus stop (3 percent credit), bike/pedestrian network within the development and allowing connection by adjoining development (5 percent credit), and a parking management program (3 percent credit) which will provide preferential parking and incentives for carpooling as well as recharging facilities for electric vehicles.

**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?**

The traffic analysis suggests that area roads have adequate capacity to serve the access and mobility needs of motorized vehicles though operational improvements may be required.

## **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **Wastewater and Sewage**

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

Based on regional averages 0.142 MGD.

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

The site is located in the Big Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant sewer service area.

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

Big Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant has a current permitted capacity of 24.0 MGD with 19.71 MGD 1998 annual average flow and 23.49 MGD 1998 maximum monthly average flow. Therefore, there is little capacity left at this plant.

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

ARC has reviewed several major developments which would add flow to this plant beyond its capacity if all were built as proposed, which is unlikely. The County is looking at ways to expand treatment capacity in this and other service areas.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Water Supply and Treatment**

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

Again according to regional averages, 0.163 MGD.

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

There should be sufficient water supply for the development but water conserving measures are essential in all new developments.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Solid Waste**

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

Approximately 53 tons per year according to information submitted with the review. The development will contract with a private handler.

**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, the City of Roswell has an extensive recycling program 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 services?
- 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.)?**

In a previous review of this site, the City of Alpharetta noted there could be occasion when their emergency services would be required for the development.

## **HOUSING**

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

Yes.

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

No.

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

There is a limited supply of low-cost housing.

**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.



MAYOR  
Chuck Martin

COUNCIL  
Debbie Gibson  
Sandra B. Johnson  
R.J. Kurey  
Arthur Letchas  
Jim Matoney  
Jim Paine

INTERIM CITY  
ADMINISTRATOR  
Robert J. Regus

Community Development  
Director  
Diana Wheeler  
287 South Main Street

Planning, Zoning, and  
Economic Development  
678 / 297-6070  
Fax 678 / 297-6071

Building Construction &  
Code Enforcement  
678 / 297-6080  
Fax 678 / 297-6081

City Hall  
Two South Main Street  
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004

<http://www.alpharetta.ga.us>

24-Hour Information  
678 / 297-6015



February 24, 1999

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

Dear Ms. Rhea:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Development of Regional Impact known as Mansell Overlook. The following comments were submitted to the City of Roswell and are noted below for your review:

1. Provide traffic study . Deceleration lanes should be installed along Mansell Road and Old Roswell Road. We do not recommend additional traffic lights. Perhaps, it would be best to handle circulation with one access point from each roadway.
2. Buildings visible from Mansell and Old Roswell should be designed with 360 degree architecture and with the appearance of a front elevation.
3. All rooftop equipment should be screened from ground view.
4. Save all specimen trees.
5. Pedestrian walkways should be included throughout development.
6. Provide MARTA bus stop with drop-off area along Mansell Road or internal to the project, per MARTA approval.
7. Explore possibility of developing a pedestrian connection between this development and the restaurant / conference facility to the north
8. No gas station or restaurant with drive-through use allowed on the corner
9. No stockpiling of dirt on the corner
10. No detention facilities visible from the rights-of-way.
11. City of Alpharetta engineering department to review erosion control and stormwater regarding impact to Foe Killer Creek.
12. The location and configuration of the curb cuts at Mansell and Old Roswell are to be approved by the City of Alpharetta Engineering Director. Approval of the zoning for this project does not include approval of full movement access or traffic signalization for these curb cuts.

Thanks for your time in reviewing our comments for this project. We look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

G. Brian Patton, ASLA  
Zoning Administrator

**RESOLUTION BY THE ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
CONCERNING  
MANSELL OVERLOOK DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the Georgia Planning Act of 1989 and Georgia Department of Community Affairs Rules for the Review of Developments of Regional Impact (DRI), the Atlanta Regional Commission has reviewed the Mansell Overlook office and commercial development proposed mainly (63 acres) in the City of Roswell with a small part (4 acres) located in the City of Alpharetta; and

**WHEREAS**, the development site is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Mansell and Old Roswell Roads and is bounded in part by Foe Killer Creek, a tributary to Big Creek; and

**WHEREAS**, the development would consist of 672,000 square feet of office space and 75,000 square feet of commercial/retail space; would include a 100-foot undisturbed buffer and 150-foot impervious surface setback along Foe Killer Creek; and would have approximately 46% of the site in Roswell and approximately 78% of the site in Alpharetta covered with impervious surface; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed location is within the Big Creek Water Supply Watershed; and

**WHEREAS**, Big Creek provides a portion of the water supply for the City of Roswell; and

**WHEREAS**, under rules of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD), the Big Creek Water Supply Watershed is classified as a small water supply watershed because it is less than 100 square miles in size; and

**WHEREAS**, EPD rules for protection of water supply in small water supply watersheds require certain stream buffers and setbacks, limits on certain activities, and also require that the impervious surface area, including all public and private structures, utilities, or facilities, of the entire water supply watershed shall be limited to 25%, or the existing use, whichever is greater; and

**WHEREAS**, the EPD regulations further provide that all the local governments in a small water supply watershed may present an alternative plan that provides an equivalent level of protection to the water supply, but the alternative plan must include the EPD minimum, or greater, buffers and setback areas; and

**WHEREAS**, the local governments in the Big Creek watershed (Fulton, Forsyth, and Cherokee Counties and the Cities of Roswell, Alpharetta, and Cumming) are participating in a watershed study with the goal of establishing alternate criteria; and

**WHEREAS**, data compiled in the study and the rate of growth in the watershed indicate that the watershed is likely to exceed 25% impervious surface; and

**WHEREAS**, the study is looking at alternative measures that might be used to protect the Big Creek water supply in place of the 25% impervious limit for the watershed, including such measures as wider stream buffers, regional detention ponds, preserved wetlands, enhanced wetlands, etc.; and

**WHEREAS**, the study will not be complete until January, 2000, and protection agreements would have to be formalized following the study;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Atlanta Regional Commission finds that the Mansell Overlook DRI is not in the best interest of the State at this time since it exceeds 25% impervious surface.

**MANSELL OVERLOOK  
DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT**

<b>PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	672,000 sq.ft. office space 75,000 sq.ft. commercial/retail space
<b>LOCATION</b>	NW quadrant of Mansell/Old Roswell Roads Roswell (63 acres) & Alpharetta (4 acres)
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Colonial Properties Trust
<b>POTENTIAL IMPACT</b>	
Jobs	2,390
Build Out Value/Tax	\$140 million/\$2.3 million
Wastewater Generation/Treatment Plant	0.142 MGD/Big Creek Capacity 24.0 MGD Average Flow 18.72 MGD
Water Demand	0.163 MGD
Trip Generation/AM Peak/PM Peak	11,397/1,461/1,352 Mansell-west .50 Mansell-east .68 Old Roswell-south .40
Air Quality Benchmarks	10% retail=4% credit Bus service=3% credit Bike/ped network=5% credit Parking mgt plan=3% credit
Big Creek Small Water Supply Watershed	100-foot creek buffer 150-foot setback 46% impervious-Roswell 78% impervious-Alpharetta

## **MANSELL OVERLOOK DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT**

Mansell Overlook is a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) proposed at the northwest quadrant of Mansell and Old Roswell Roads, with approximately 63 acres located in the City of Roswell and 4 acres in the City of Alpharetta. The development would include 672,000 sq. ft. of office space and 75,000 sq.ft. of commercial/retail space.

The site is located in the Big Creek watershed and is bounded in part by Foe Killer Creek, a tributary to Big Creek. It includes 100-foot undisturbed buffers and 150-foot impervious surface setbacks on Foe Killer Creek and approximately 46% of the site in Roswell would be covered with impervious surface and approximately 78% of the site in Alpharetta.

Big Creek provides a portion of the water supply for the City of Roswell. Under the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) system, the Big Creek watershed is classified as a small water supply watershed because it is less than 100 square miles in size.

The following EPD minimum criteria for small water supply watersheds relate to this site:

1. The perennial stream corridors of a small water supply watershed within a seven mile radius upstream of a governmentally owned public drinking water supply intake or water supply reservoir are protected by the following criteria:
  - (i) A buffer shall be maintained for a distance of 100 feet on both sides of the stream as measured from the stream banks.
  - (ii) No impervious surface shall be constructed within a 150 foot setback area on both sides of the stream as measured from the stream banks.
  - (iii) Septic tanks and septic tank drainfields are prohibited in the setback area of (ii) above.
2. The impervious surface area, including all public and private structures, utilities, or facilities, of the entire water supply watershed shall be limited to 25%, or existing use, whichever is greater.

The EPD regulations further provide that all the local governments in a small water supply watershed may present an alternative plan that provides an equivalent level of protection to the water supply, but the alternative plan must include the EPD minimum, or greater, buffers and setback areas.

During the DRI review of the Hines' Georgia 400 mixed use development (now called Deerfield), the governments in the Big Creek watershed (Fulton, Forsyth, and Cherokee Counties and the Cities of Roswell, Alpharetta, and Cumming) agreed to undertake a watershed study with the goal of establishing alternate criteria. Further, they agreed to include Deerfield's 43.72 % impervious surface in the study and the Commission found the proposed development was in the best interest of the State. The watershed study is now underway with a tentative completion date of January, 2000.

1995 data compiled in the study estimate the following:

Percentage of impervious surface	
In City of Roswell	30.83%
In City of Alpharetta	23.35%
In City of Cumming	31.96%
In Unincorporated Fulton County	16.81%
In Unincorporated Forsyth County	8.93%
In Unincorporated Cherokee County	4.79%

Percentage of impervious surface in the total watershed	15.43%
---	--------

Based on the rate of growth in the watershed, ARC staff believes that the watershed will exceed 25% impervious surface.

The study is looking at alternative measures that might be used to protect the Big Creek water supply in place of the 25% impervious limit for the entire watershed. Such measures might include wider stream buffers, regional detention ponds, preserved wetlands, enhanced wetlands, etc.

However, as stated above, the study will not be complete until sometime around January, 2000. Also, it may take up to a year after the study is completed to formalize a protection agreement based on the study. In the meantime, the question for Committee consideration is whether each DRI in the watershed should be held to 25% impervious surface.

1993  
Resolution

**A RESOLUTION BY THE ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
REQUESTING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO TAKE ACTION  
TO PROTECT THE BIG CREEK WATERSHED**

**WHEREAS, Big Creek is a valuable water resource to the City of Roswell and Alpharetta and Fulton County, as well as other governments along the Chattahoochee River; and**

**WHEREAS, Big Creek provides water supply for the City of Roswell, recreational and park amenities to Alpharetta and Fulton County; and**

**WHEREAS, Big Creek also is a major tributary to the Chattahoochee River and impacts water supply withdrawals from the River and impacts recreational opportunities in the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area such as fishing, rafting or hiking; and**

**WHEREAS, the Atlanta Regional Commission (the Commission), pursuant to Georgia Code Section 50-8-97, shall engage in planning to control water pollution; and**

**WHEREAS, the Atlanta Regional Commission has the responsibility to promote coordinated and comprehensive planning by local governments within the Region, in conformity with the standards and procedures established pursuant to Georgia Laws Act 634; and**

**WHEREAS, among these standards are the Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds, Wetlands and Groundwater Recharge Areas, Chapter 391-3-16-.01, Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria of the Rules of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division; and**

**WHEREAS, these standards provide minimum criteria for the protection of water resources including criteria for the protection of existing and proposed water supply watersheds with areas of less than 100 square miles, defined as "small" water supply watersheds; and**

**WHEREAS, the small watershed criteria apply to the Big Creek water supply watershed; and**

**WHEREAS, continued rezoning of land for large developments in the Big Creek watershed jurisdictions can result in the unfair allotment of all the allowable development rights or impervious surface amounts in a jurisdiction before coordinated watershed protection plans are passed; and**

**WHEREAS, this may preclude future development in a jurisdiction or take impervious surface allotments from another jurisdiction; and**

**WHEREAS, the water quality of Big Creek will be degraded, flooding will increase, and low flows will be reduced; and**

**WHEREAS, water resources watershed protection is important to the public health and welfare of the Atlanta Region; and**

**WHEREAS, watershed protection depends upon the cooperation of all local governments having jurisdiction over land within the watershed;**

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Atlanta Regional Commission encourages all local governments within the Big Creek watershed to allow only rezonings and permits that would result in development which does not exceed the 25 percent impervious surface as required for small water supply watersheds in Chapter 391-3-16-.01, Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria of the Rules of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division and to take such other action as may be appropriate which will have the effect of maintaining the use of characteristics of land within the watershed until such time as a watershed protection plan is developed and worked out among all governments in the watershed.**