REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

DATE: Nov 17 2008

ARC REVIEW CODE: R810171

CEO Vernon Jones TO: **ATTN TO:** Karmen White, DeKalb County NOTE: This is digital signature. FROM: Charles Krautler, Director (on l. The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Below is the ARC finding. The Atlanta Regional Commission reviewed the DRI with regard to conflicts to regional plans, goals, and policies and impacts it might have on the activities, plans, goals, and policies of other local jurisdictions and state, federal, and other agencies. The finding does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government. Submitting Local Government: DeKalb County Name of Proposal: Executive Park **<u>Review Type:</u>** Development of Regional Impact Date Opened: Oct 17 2008 Date Closed: Nov 17 2008 FINDING: After reviewing the information submitted for the review, and the comments received from affected agencies, the Atlanta Regional Commission finding is that the DRI is in the best interest of the Region, and therefore, of the State. Additional Comments: The proposed development meets many of ARC's Regional Development Policies and is generally consistent with the Atlanta Region Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM). The proposed development is located within a Mega Corridor, according to the Atlanta Region UGPM. Mega Corridors are defined as the most intensely developed radial corridors in the region. Due to the proposed development's proximity to a neighboring jurisdiction, an amendment to the DeKalb County FLUM and /or comprehensive plan would require a regional review under the major amendment provisions for DCA comprehensive planning. THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW: ARC LAND USE PLANNING ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING ARC DATA RESEARCH ARC AGING DIVISION GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY DEKALB COUNTY SCHOOLS METRO ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY CITY OF ATLANTA If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Jon Tuley at (404) 463–3309. This finding will be published to the ARC website. The ARC review website is located at: <u>http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse</u>.

FINAL REPORT SUMMARY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

October 17,

November 16, 2008

2008

The proposed Executive Park is a mixed use infill development that is located on 70 acres in DeKalb County. The proposed development will include 850,000 square feet of new office, 488,000 square feet of retail, 785 apartments, a 200 room hotel and 5,000 square feet of civic space. The proposed development will also retain 527,755 square feet of existing office. It is located southwest of the interchange of Interstate 85 and North Druid Hills Road in DeKalb County.

PROJECT PHASING:

The project is being proposed in one phase with a project build out date for 2016.

GENERAL

Preliminary

Final Report

Report:

Due:

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 project site is currently zoned O-I. The proposed zoning is OCR. Information submitted for the review states that the proposed development is inconsistent with the Future Development Map which designates the property as Office Professional. The development is requesting a change to the Future Development Map from Office Professional to Town Center.

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

No comments were received identifying inconsistencies with any potentially affected local government's comprehensive plan.

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

No comments were received concerning impacts to the implementation of any local government's short term work program.



| Preliminary Report: | October 17, 2008 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Executive Park #1583 |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | November 16, 2008 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due Bv: | October 31, 2008 |

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?

Yes, the proposed development would increase the need for services in the area for existing and future residents.

What other major development projects are planned near the proposed project?

The ARC has reviewed other major development projects, known as Area Plan (1984 to1991) or as a DRI (1991 to present), within a mile radius of the proposed project.

| Year | Name | |
|------|--------------------------|--|
| 2008 | Buford Highway Mixed Use | |
| 2007 | The Heights at Clairmont | |
| 2004 | The Reserve at Cranbrook | |
| 1997 | Post Briarcliff | |
| 1986 | Lenox Park | |
| 1985 | Wood Hills | |

Will the proposed project displace housing units or community facilities? If yes, identify and give number of units, facilities, etc.

No, the proposed development will displace office space. Based on information submitted for the review, 365,000 square feet of office space will be demolished.

Will the development cause a loss in jobs? If yes, how many?

No.

Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

The proposed development meets many of ARC's Regional Development Policies and is generally consistent with the Atlanta Region Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM). The proposed development is located within a Mega Corridor, according to the Atlanta Region UGPM. Mega Corridors are defined as the most intensely developed radial corridors in the region.

Due to the proposed development's proximity to a neighboring jurisdiction, an amendment to the DeKalb County FLUM and /or comprehensive plan would require a regional review under the major amendment provisions for DCA comprehensive planning.

The Livable Communities Coalition, with the support of DeKalb County, funded a study of the four quadrants at the North Druid Hills Road and Briarcliff Road intersection. "A New Public Realm for DeKalb County" addressed the implications redevelopment in this area and recommended transportation and greenspace improvements the County should pursue through various mechanisms. The developer should work with the County to ensure the plan is implemented where possible.



FINAL REPORT

Regional Development Plan Policies

- 1. Provide sustainable economic growth in all areas of the region.
- 2. Encourage new homes and jobs within existing developed areas of the region, focusing on principal transportation corridors, the Central Business District, activity centers, and town centers.
- 3. Increase opportunities for mixed use development, transit-oriented development, infill, and redevelopment.
- 4. At strategic regional locations, plan and retail industrial and freight land uses.
- 5. Design transportation infrastructure to protect the context of adjoining development and provide a sense of place appropriate for our communities.
- 6. Promote the reclamation of Brownfield development sites.
- 7. Protect the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods, while also meeting the needs of communities to grow.
- 8. Encourage a variety of homes styles, densities, and price ranges in locations that are accessible to jobs and services to ensure housing for individuals and families of all incomes and age groups.
- 9. Promote new communities that feature greenspace and neighborhood parks, pedestrian scale, support transportation options, and provide an appropriate mix of uses and housing types.
- 10. Promote sustainable and energy efficient development.
- 11. Protect environmentally-sensitive areas including wetlands, floodplains, small water supply watersheds, rivers and stream corridors.
- 12. Increase the amount, quality, and connectivity, and accessibility of greenspace.
- 13. Provide strategies to preserve and enhance historic resources
- 14. Through regional infrastructure planning, limit growth in undeveloped areas of the region
- 15. Assist local governments to adopt growth management strategies that make more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
- 16. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local, and neighborhood levels.
- 17. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support Regional Policies
- 18. Encourage the development of state and regional growth management policy.

BEST LAND USE PRACTICES

Practice 1: Keep vehicle miles of travel (VMT) below the area average. Infill developments are the best at accomplishing this. The more remote a development the more self contained it must be to stay below the area average VMT.

Practice 2: Contribute to the area's jobs-housing balance. Strive for a job-housing balance with a three to five mile area around a development site.

Practice 3: Mix land uses at the finest grain the market will bear and include civic uses in the mix.



Practice 4: Develop in clusters and keep the clusters small. This will result in more open space preservation. Practice 5: Place higher-density housing near commercial centers, transit lines and parks. This will enable more walking, biking and transit use.

Practice 6: Phase convenience shopping and recreational opportunities to keep pace with housing. These are valued amenities and translate into less external travel by residents if located conveniently to housing.

Practice 7: Make subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges. This is traditional development.

Practice 8: Reserve school sites and donate them if necessary to attract new schools. This will result in neighborhood schools which provide a more supportive learning environment than larger ones.

Practice 9: Concentrate commercial development in compact centers or districts, rather than letting it spread out in strips.

Practice 10: Make shopping centers and business parks into all-purpose activity centers. Suburban shopping centers and their environs could be improved by mixing uses and designing them with the pedestrian amenities of downtowns.

Practice 11: Tame auto-oriented land uses, or at least separate them from pedestrian-oriented uses. Relegate "big box" stores to areas where they will do the least harm to the community fabric.

BEST TRANSPORTATION PRACTICES

Practice 1: Design the street network with multiple connections and relatively direct routes.

Practice 2: Space through-streets no more than a half mile apart, or the equivalent route density in a curvilinear network.

Practice 3: Use traffic-calming measures liberally. Use short streets, sharp curves, center islands, traffic circles, textured pavements, speed bumps and raised crosswalks.

Practice 4: Keep speeds on local streets down to 20 mph.

Practice 5: Keep speeds on arterials and collectors down to 35 mph (at least inside communities).

Practice 6: Keep all streets as narrow as possible and never more than four traffic lanes wide. Florida suggests access streets 18 feet, subcollectors 26 feet, and collectors from 28 feet to 36 feet depending on lanes and parking. Practice 7: Align streets to give buildings energy-efficient orientations. Allow building sites to benefit from sun angles, natural shading and prevailing breezes.

Practice 8: Avoid using traffic signals wherever possible and always space them for good traffic progression.

Practice 9: Provide networks for pedestrians and bicyclists as good as the network for motorists.

Practice 10: Provide pedestrians and bicyclists with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets. Practice 11: Incorporate transit-oriented design features.

Practice 12: Establish TDM programs for local employees. Ridesharing, modified work hours, telecommuting and others.

BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

Practice 1: Use a systems approach to environmental planning. Shift from development orientation to basins or ecosystems planning.

Practice 2: Channel development into areas that are already disturbed.

Practice 3: Preserve patches of high-quality habitat, as large and circular as possible, feathered at the edges and connected by wildlife corridors. Stream corridors offer great potential.

Practice 4: Design around significant wetlands.

Practice 5: Establish upland buffers around all retained wetlands and natural water bodies.

Practice 6: Preserve significant uplands, too.

Practice 7: Restore and enhance ecological functions damaged by prior site activities.

Practice 8: Detain runoff with open, natural drainage systems. The more natural the system the more valuable it will be for wildlife and water quality.

Practice 9: Design man-made lakes and stormwater ponds for maximum environmental value. Recreation, stormwater management, wildlife habitat and others.



| Preliminary | October 17, |
|--------------|-------------|
| Report: | 2008 |
| Final Report | November |
| Due: | 16, 2008 |

Practice 10: Use reclaimed water and integrated pest management on large landscaped areas. Integrated pest management involves controlling pests by introducing their natural enemies and cultivating disease and insect resistant grasses.

Practice 11: Use and require the use of Xeriscape[™] landscaping. Xeriscaping[™] is water conserving landscape methods and materials.

BEST HOUSING PRACTICES

Practice 1: Offer "life cycle" housing. Providing integrated housing for every part of the "life cycle". Practice 2: Achieve an average net residential density of six to seven units per acre without the appearance of crowding. Cluster housing to achieve open space.

Practice 3: Use cost-effective site development and construction practices. Small frontages and setbacks; rolled curbs or no curbs; shared driveways.

Practice 4: Design of energy-saving features. Natural shading and solar access.

Practice 5: Supply affordable single-family homes for moderate-income households.

Practice 6: Supply affordable multi-family and accessory housing for low-income households.

Practice 7: Tap government housing programs to broaden and deepen the housing/income mix.

Practice 8: Mix housing to the extent the market will bear.

LOCATION

Where is the proposed project located within the host-local government's boundaries?

The proposed development is located southwest of the interchange of Interstate 85 and North Druid Hills Road, in DeKalb County

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 proposed development is entirely within DeKalb County and is within a mile of the City of Atlanta.

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.

None were determined during the review.

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?

Estimated value of the development is \$312,000,000 with an expected \$4,779,840 in annual local tax revenues.



| Preliminary Report: | October 17, 2008 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Executive Park #1583 |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | November 16, 2008 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | October 31, 2008 |

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

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?

Yes.

In what ways could the proposed development have a positive or negative impact on existing industry or business in the Region?

The proposed development will add a mix of uses to the area, providing opportunities for individuals to live, work, and shop within close proximity.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The project is located in the Peachtree Creek watershed. The USGS coverage for the area shows no streams on or near the project site. However, the plans identify an existing stream alongside Executive Park Drive starting near the center of the property in Parcel B and running south under the drive to its intersection with Sheridan Road. No buffers are shown. Both the DeKalb County 75-foot stream buffer ordinance and the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer should be shown, if applicable, streams and the State buffer should be shown along all state waters on the property. Work in these buffers may require variances.

Stormwater / Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants produced after the construction of the entire proposed development, based on the submitted site plan. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr). The loading factors are based on the results of regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region with impervious areas based on estimated averages for land uses in the Atlanta Region. If actual impervious percentages are higher or lower than the estimate, the pollutant loads will differ accordingly. The proposed project is being developed primarily over existing developed areas, which will affect the actual increases caused by the new development. Given the coverage of the proposed and existing development and the identified acreages for each use, commercial, office/light industrial and roads were selected as the uses on the property. Since open space was not shown as a separate acreage, it is not included as a separate use. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:



| DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | | #1583 |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| REVIEW REPORT | Comments | October 31, 2008 |
| | REVIEW REPORT | REVIEW REPORT Comments Due By: |

| Land Use | Land Area (ac) | Total Phosphorus | Total Nitrogen | BOD | TSS | Zinc | Lead |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|-------|-------|
| Commercial | 35.30 | 60.36 | 614.22 | 3812.40 | 34699.90 | 43.42 | 7.77 |
| Office/Light Industrial | 26.00 | 33.54 | 445.38 | 2964.00 | 18408.00 | 38.48 | 4.94 |
| Roads | 8.70 | 15.66 | 159.30 | 991.80 | 8995.80 | 11.22 | 2.00 |
| TOTAL | 70.00 | 109.56 | 1218.90 | 7768.20 | 62103.70 | 93.12 | 14.71 |

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year

Total Impervious = 80%

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located near a national register site? If yes, identify site.

None have been identified.

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

To be determined during the review.

The development **PASSES** the ARC's Air Quality Benchmark test.

| Air Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based | | |
|--|---------|-------|
| on ARC strategies) | Credits | Total |
| Where Retail/Office is dominant, FAR .68 | 4% | 4% |
| Where Office is dominant, 10% Residential | | |
| and 10% Retail | 9% | 9% |
| w/in 1/4 mile of Bus Stop (CCT, MARTA, | | |
| Other) | 3% | 3% |
| Bike/ped networks that meet Mixed Use or | | |
| Density target and connect to adjoining uses | 5% | 5% |
| Total Calculated ARC Air Quality | | |
| Credits (15 % reduction required) | | 21% |

What are the conclusions of this review? Is the transportation system (existing and planned) capable of accommodating these trips?

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Wastewater is estimated at 0.474 MGD based on information submitted for the review.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

R.M Clayton will provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development.

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

The capacity of R.M. Clayton Site is listed below:

| PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD 1 | DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD | 2001 MMF, MGD | 2008 MMF, MGD | 2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD | PLANNED EXPANSION | REMARKS |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| No Flow Limit | 122 | 99 | 120 | 2 | None. Plan before EPD to permit plant at design capacity consistent with draft Chattahoochee River Model. | Existing Consent Decree with the U.S. EPA and Georgia EPD require CSO and SSO improvements throughout the City of Atlanta wastewater system by 2007 and 2014, respectively |

MMF: Maximum Monthly Flow. Mgd: million of gallons per day.

¹ Source: Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District SHORT-TERM WASTEWATER CAPACITY PLAN, August 2002.



| Preliminary Report: | October 17, 2008 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Executive Park #1583 |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | November 16, 2008 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | October 31, 2008 |

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

ARC has reviewed a number of major developments that will be served by this plant.

<u>INFRASTRUCTURE</u> Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.545 MGD based on information submitted for the review.

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

Information submitted with the review suggests that there is sufficient water supply capacity available for the proposed project.

INFRASTRUCTURE Solid Waste

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

Information submitted with the review indicates the proposed development will generate 5,739 tons of solid waste per year and the waste will be disposed of in DeKalb County.

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 services?
- Administrative facilities?
- Schools?
- Libraries or cultural facilities?
- Fire, police, or EMS?



| Preliminary Report: | October 17, 2008 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Executive Park #1583 |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | November 16, 2008 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due Bv: | October 31, 2008 |

- Other government facilities?
- Other community services/resources (day care, health care, low income, non-English speaking, elderly, etc.)?

None were determined during the review.

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

No, the proposed development will add 804 new residential units.

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

Yes, once developed, this project will provide housing opportunities for existing employment centers as well as providing opportunities for individuals to live and work within close proximity to one another.

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

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 215.02. This tract had a .7 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2007 according to ARC's Population and Housing Report. The report shows that 53 percent, respectively, of the housing units are single-family, compared to 69 percent for the region; thus indicating is a variety of multi-family housing options around the development area.

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

Likely, assuming the development is approved with multiple price ranges of housing.

* Defined as 30 percent of the income of a family making 80 percent of the median income of the Region – FY 2000 median income of \$51,649 for family of 4 in Georgia.

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home

DRI Rules Thresholds Tier Map

FAQ

Apply

View Submissions

Login

DRI #1583

| | | project information that will allow the RDC to Refer to both the <u>Rules for the DRI Process</u> and | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Local Government Inform | nation | | | | |
| Submitting Local Government: | DeKalb | | | | | |
| Individual completing form: | Karmen Swan White | | | | | |
| Telephone: | 404-371-2155 | | | | | |
| E-mail: | kswhite@co.dekalb.ga.us | | | | | |
| erein. If a project is to be loca | | e for the accuracy of the information contained he project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the esponsible for initiating the DRI review process. | | | | |
| | Proposed Project Inform | ation | | | | |
| | Project: Executive Park | | | | | |
| Name of Proposed Project: | | | | | | |
| Name of Proposed Project: Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road | | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road | | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road | | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road | | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: evelopment Type: | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road | D sf retail; 1,074,000 sf office; 57,000 sf | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: evelopment Type: (not selected) | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road | D sf retail; 1,074,000 sf office; 57,000 sf | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: evelopment Type: (not selected) | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road Mixed Used with 772 multifamily units; 693,00 restaurant Hotels Mixed Use Airports | D sf retail; 1,074,000 sf office; 57,000 sf | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: evelopment Type: (not selected) Office Commercial | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road Mixed Used with 772 multifamily units; 693,00 restaurant Hotels Mixed Use Airports Attractions & Recreational Facilities | D sf retail; 1,074,000 sf office; 57,000 sf | | | | |
| Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: evelopment Type: (not selected) Office Commercial Wholesale & Distributio Hospitals and Health Ca | Executive Park Drive at North Druid Hills Road Mixed Used with 772 multifamily units; 693,00 restaurant Hotels Mixed Use Airports Attractions & Recreational Facilities | D sf retail; 1,074,000 sf office; 57,000 sf Wastewater Treatment Facilities Petroleum Storage Facilities Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs Intermodal Terminals | | | | |

| Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): | see project description above | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Developer: | Reit Management and Research | | | |
| Mailing Address: | 4 Executive Park Drive | | | |
| Address 2: | uite 1408 | | | |
| | ity:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30329 | | | |
| Telephone: | 404-633-5684 | | | |
| Email: | bmcgahan@reitmr.com | | | |
| Is property owner different from developer/applicant? | (not selected) Yes No | | | |
| If yes, property owner: | | | | |
| Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? | ◯ (not selected) | | | |
| If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located? | | | | |
| Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? | (not selected) Yes No | | | |
| If yes, provide the following | Project Name: | | | |
| information: | Project ID: | | | |
| The initial action being requested of the local government for this project: | Rezoning Variance Sewer Water ✓ Permit Other | | | |
| Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? | (not selected) Yes No | | | |
| If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent? | | | | |
| Estimated Project Completion Dates: | This project/phase: 2011 Overall project: 2011 | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

GRTA Home Page | ARC Home Page | RDC Links | DCA Home Page

Site Map | Statements | Contact

Copyright © 2007 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home

DRI Rules Thresholds

Tier Map

FAQ

Apply

View Submissions

Login

DRI #1583

| DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information | | |
|---|---|--|
| | anty government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the <u>DRI Process</u> and the <u>DRI Tiers and Thresholds</u> for more information. | |
| Loc | al Government Information | |
| Submitting Local Government: | DeKalb | |
| Individual completing form: | Karmen Swan White | |
| Telephone: | 404-371-2155 | |
| Email: | kswhite@co.dekalb.ga.us | |
| | Project Information | |
| Name of Proposed Project: | Executive Park | |
| DRI ID Number: | 1583 | |
| Developer/Applicant: | Reit Management and Research | |
| Telephone: | 404-633-5684 | |
| Email(s): | bmcgahan@reitmr.com | |
| Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.) | (not selected) Yes No | |
| information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA? | ◯ (not selected) | |
| If no, the official review process can not start | until this additional information is provided. | |
| | Economic Development | |
| Estimated Value at Build-Out: | \$312,000,000 | |
| Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: | \$4,779,840 | |
| Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project? | (not selected) Yes No | |
| Will this development displace | | |

| any existing uses? | ◯ (not selected) ● Yes ◯ No |
|---|---|
| million square feet in 22 buildings; however the ex | square feet, etc): Existing Executive Park office complex includes 1.1 kisting office space is approximately 62% occupied. Also, approximately tal Information for RDC's DRI Review" for more detail. |
| | Water Supply |
| Name of water supply provider for this site: | Scott Candler Plant |
| What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | .545 MGD |
| Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? | (not selected) 	Yes No |
| If no, describe any plans to expand the existing wa | ater supply capacity: |
| Is a water line extension required to serve this project? | (not selected) Yes No |
| If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be r N/A. Water lines are existing at the site. See "Sup | |
| | |
| W | Vastewater Disposal |
| Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: | R.M. Clayton WWTP |
| What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | .474 MGD |
| Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? | (not selected) Ves No |
| If no, describe any plans to expand existing waste | water treatment capacity: |
| Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project? | ◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ◉ No |
| If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be re Information" for details. | equired?N/A. Sewer lines are existing at the site. See "Supplemental |
| | |
| L | and Transportation |
| How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) | 31,933 24 hr. 2-way at build out |
| Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? | ◯ (not selected) |
| Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? | ◯ (not selected) |
| If yes, please describe below:All necessary transp as a supplement to this form. | portation improvements are identified in the associated Traffic Study, provide |

| | Solid Waste Disposal |
|---|--|
| How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? | 5,739 tons/yr |
| s sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? | ◯ (not selected) |
| f no, describe any plans to expand existing lar | dfill capacity: |
| Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? | ◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ◉ No |
| f yes, please explain: | |
| | |
| S | tormwater Management |
| What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious | 47% |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and | fers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the mpervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In additio water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as but project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as but project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality ffect any of the following: |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as but project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. s the development located within, or likely to a 1. Water supply watersheds? 2. Significant groundwater | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality Iffect any of the following: (not selected) |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. s the development located within, or likely to a 1. Water supply watersheds? 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality ffect any of the following: (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. s the development located within, or likely to a 1. Water supply watersheds? 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? 3. Wetlands? | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality ffect any of the following: (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. s the development located within, or likely to a 1. Water supply watersheds? 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? 3. Wetlands? 4. Protected mountains? | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality ffect any of the following: (not selected) Yes No (not sele |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. s the development located within, or likely to a 1. Water supply watersheds? 2. Significant groundwater echarge areas? 3. Wetlands? 4. Protected mountains? 5. Protected river corridors? | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality ffect any of the following: (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No |
| surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buf project's impacts on stormwater management: new detention ponds, underground vaults and See "Supplemental Information" for details. s the development located within, or likely to a 1. Water supply watersheds? 2. Significant groundwater echarge areas? 3. Wetlands? 4. Protected mountains? 5. Protected river corridors? 5. Floodplains? | Impervious surface area is slightly less than existing development. In addition water quality measures will significantly improve existing drainage condition Environmental Quality ffect any of the following: (not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No |

GRTA Home Page | ARC Home Page | RDC Links | DCA Home Page

Site Map | Statements | Contact

Copyright © 2007 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.

