



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTICE

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

DATE: May 22 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R905212

TO: Mayor Shirley Franklin
ATTN TO: Shelley Peart, City of Atlanta
FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature.
Original on file.

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.

Name of Proposal: Conley Village

Submitting Local Government: City of Atlanta

Review Type: DRI

Date Opened: May 22 2009 **Deadline for Comments:** Jun 5 2009 **Date to Close:** Jun 21 2009

DRI Checklist Preliminary Summary:

Regional Policies and Adopted Plans: 100%

Project Score: 70%

Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality Score: 67%

Overall Score: 75%

Overall Weighted Score: 85%

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the Unified Growth Policy Map, the proposed development is located in an area designated as an urban neighborhood. Urban Neighborhoods are defined as distinct areas that are located in an urban area that may have a small commercial component that serves the local area. The proposed development is consistent with many Regional Development Policies including encouraging mixed use development with access to the regional transportation system and pedestrian access though the site.

The developer should work with MARTA and CTRAN to ensure improvements to local bus stops are up to standards, do not interfere with transit operations, and encourage transit ridership.

ARC recommends that the developer investigate the possibility of creating a stub to the property to the west of the proposed development. This will improve interparcel access in the area and create another path for residents and visitors to use coming to and from the site.

Angeline Way is located with the functional area of the Conley Road and Forrest Park Road intersection. The road may need to be realigned in order to mitigate this. A connection should be made from Angeline Way to the town houses in tract 4 to create better access within the site. This road should be publicly accessible with pedestrian amenities and on-street parking.

With on-street parking proposed, and more possible on Angeline Way, the developer should seek to decrease the amount of impervious pavement being provided for parking on site.

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CITY OF ATLANTA
DeKALB COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF ATLANTA SCHOOLS
CLAYTON COUNTY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
FULTON COUNTY
CITY OF FOREST PARK

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please contact Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3309 or jtuley@atlantaregional.com. This finding will be published to the ARC website.
The ARC review website is located at: <http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse> .



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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



DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Development Center for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient project of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is actually located, such as adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included on this form and give us your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to the RDC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: **Conley Village** *See the Preliminary Report.*

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: ()

Signature:

Date:

Please Return this form to:

Jon Tuley, Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street NE
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph. (404) 463-3309 Fax (404) 463-3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com

Return Date: *Jun 5 2009*

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: May 22 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R905212

TO: ARC Land Use, Environmental, Transportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs

FROM: Jon Tuley, Extension: 3-3309

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Land Use: Calvert, Brad

Transportation: Kray, Michael

Environmental: Santo, Jim

Research: Skinner, Jim

Aging: Rader, Carolyn

Name of Proposal: Conley Village

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: This project, located in the City of Atlanta, is a proposed mixed use development consisting of 260 multifamily units, 200 senior units and 7500 square feet of retail space. The proposed project is located at 3755 Forrest Park Road in south Atlanta.

Submitting Local Government: City of Atlanta

Date Opened: May 22 2009

Deadline for Comments: Jun 5 2009

Date to Close: Jun 21 2009

Response:

- 1) ☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 5) ☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
- 6) ☐ Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

COMMENTS:

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

General Project Information

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Project name: | Conley Village |
| DRI number: | 2009 |
| Local jurisdiction: | City of Atlanta |
| Local government action requested: | Rezoning (from RG-2) to MR-3; change of land use to Medium Density Residential |

Project description (include acreage): This project, located in the City of Atlanta , is a proposed mixed use development consisting of 260 multifamily units, 200 senior units and 7500 square feet of retail space. The proposed project is located at 3755 Forrest Park Road in south Atlanta.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Project phasing/buildout: | Three phases/2010 |
| Project location: | The Project is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Conley Road and Forrest Road, northeast of State Route 54 (Jonesboro Road) and east of Interstate I-285, in the southeast portion of the City of Atlanta in fulton County, Georgia. |

Current description of the site: There are two existing apartments consisting of 295

Is any portion of the project built or under construction?

No

If you answered the previous question with "Yes", please describe.

N/A

Affected local governments (3 miles of project site): Fulton County, Clayton County, DeKalb County, Forest Park

Adjacent/surrounding land uses and development: Single family houses and apartments

Estimated value at build-out: \$50,000,000

Expected annual local tax revenues: \$250,000

Site access roads: Conley Road and Forest Park Road

Number of site driveways proposed: 3

Total traffic volume to be generated by the proposed development: Trip generation (ADT, AM, PMPeak) = 2,744/418/225 at buildout.

Estimated water supply demand to be generated by project: 261,000 gal/day

Sufficient water capacity available: Yes

Estimated sewage flow to be generated by project: 101,000 gal/day

Sufficient wastewater capacity available: Yes

Estimated solid waste generated by the project annually: 107 tons/month

Sufficient landfill capacity available: Yes

Number of students expected to be generated by the project: 275

Schools expected students to attend and capacity:

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| School 1: | Heritage Academy Elementary School | Capacity: | 536 |
| School 2: | Howell Elementary School | Capacity: | 431 |
| School 3: | South Atlanta High | Capacity: | 1275 |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|---|---------------|-----------|---|
| A. Regional Policies and Adopted Plans | | | |
| 1. Unified Growth Policy Map | | | |
| A. Is the development consistent with the Unified Growth Policy Map and the Developments Type Matrix? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | (Indicate Regional Place Type shown on Map) Urban Neighborhoods |
| B. Is the development consistent with the Regional Development Plan Policies? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | |
| 2. Metro North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) Plan Compliance | | | |
| A. Is there adequate water provisions available and accessible to the site? • 3 points: Yes | N/A | 3 | |
| B. Is there adequate sewer capacity available and accessible to the site? • 3 points: Yes | N/A | 3 | |
| C. Does the development incorporate stormwater best management practices from the State of Georgia Manual? • 3 points: Yes | N/A | 3 | |
| 3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Goals & Objectives | | | |
| A. Is the development located on or within half a mile of a roadway designated on the Regional Strategic Transportation System (RSTS)? • 3 points: Located on the RSTS or within 1/2 mile and all access points align with existing or planned median breaks. If no median exists or is planned, all access points align with existing opposing access points. | | 3 | |
| 4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) | | | |
| A. Are the transportation impacts identified consistent with the TIP/RTP? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | (List all TIP/RTP projects located within the surrounding network and identify any inconsistencies) |
| 5. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) | | | |
| A. Is the development located in an LCI Study area? • 3 points: The project is located in an LCI Study Area and meets the intent of the Study. | | N/A | (Including any LCI transportation projects) |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|---|---------------|-------------|---|
| A. Regional Policies and Adopted Plans | | | |
| 6. Regionally Adopted Plans | | | |
| A. If the development is located within a transportation study area, indicate which study area. | N/A | N/A | (Provide the name of the study in which the development is located) |
| B. Is the development consistent with the recommendations set forth in any sub-area or multi-modal corridor study? • 3 points: Yes | | N/A | |
| C. Is the proposed development consistent with the Atlanta Regional Freight Mobility Plan? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | |
| 7. Locally Adopted Plans | | | |
| A. Is the development consistent with the host local government's Future Development Map or other comparable document? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | The city of Atlanta has proposed to change the Land Use Plan for this area to a use which is consistent with the proposed Project |
| B. Is the development consistent with the local government's transportation plans? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | |
| C. Is the development consistent with any local government sub area plans? • 3 points: Yes | | N/A | |
| D. Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | |
| E. Do local regulations impact the ability of the project to meet GRTA's DRI Review Criteria? | | N/A | (List any local regulations that impact the ability of the project to meet GRTA's DRI Review Criteria) |
| F. Is the development consistent with other regional and/or local policies/adopted plans that have not been fully addressed? | | N/A | |
| | | | |
| Possible Score (Standard is 42) | N/A | 33 | |
| Components Score | N/A | 33 | |
| Percentage | N/A | 100% | |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|--|---------------|-----------|--|
| B. Project | | | |
| 1. Mixture of Uses | | | |
| <p>A. Does the development incorporate a mixture of complementary land uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: There are 3 or more complementary uses within the development. • 2 points: There are 2 complementary uses within the development and is located within a short walking distance (less than 1/2 mile) to external complimentary land uses. • 1 points: The development is located within a short walking distance (less than 1/2 mile) to external complementary land uses. | N/A | 2 | The development will include housing and retail |
| <p>B. Does the development have vertically mixed uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development contains three or more vertically mixed uses. • 2 point: The development contains two or more vertically mixed uses. | N/A | 2 | |
| <p>C. The development contains or is in close proximity to active or passive greenspace?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development contains both an active and passive greenspace. • 2 points: The development is adjacent to active or passive greenspace with connections. • 1 point: The development is within 1/2 mile of an active or passive greenspace. | N/A | 3 | |
| 2. Jobs to Housing Balance | | | |
| <p>Is the development located in close proximity to a metro job center (as defined and listed in the Guidebook)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/2 mile of a defined metro job center. • 2 points: Yes, the development is located within 1 mile of a defined metro job center. | N/A | 3 | |
| 3. Housing Diversity and Affordability | | | |
| <p>A. For developments with a residential component, are at least 10% of the residential units of differing housing type? (See guidebook for definition of housing types).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes. | N/A | 3 | |
| <p>B. For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediate (1/4 mile) surrounding neighborhood?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes. | N/A | 3 | |
| <p>C. For developments with a multifamily rental component, does the development achieve certain affordability levels?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: At least 30% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income. • 2 points: At least 20% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income. • 1 points: At least 10% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income. | N/A | 0 | The applicant has indicated that 30% of the mulitfamily units will be affordable to those who make 80% of the AMI. In order to receive points for this, ARC needs a letter from the applicant stating this intent. |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|--|---------------|-----------|--|
| B. Project | | | |
| D. For developments with a multifamily senior rental component, does the seniors component achieve certain affordability levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: 100% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income. • 2 points: 60% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income. • 1 point: 40% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income. | N/A | 0 | The applicant has indicated all of the senior units will be affordable to those at or below 60% of the AMI. In order to receive points for this, ARC needs a letter from the applicant stating this intent. |
| E. For developments with a homeownership component, does the development achieve certain affordability levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: At least 20% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income. • 2 points: At least 10% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income. • 1 point: At least 5% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income. | N/A | 0 | The applicant has indicated that 20% of the for-sale units will be affordable to those who make 110% or less than AMI. In order to receive points for this, ARC needs a letter from the applicant stating this intent. |
| F. For developments without a residential component, does the development add a new use that is not prevalent in the immediate (1/4 mile) surrounding neighborhood? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes. | N/A | N/A | |
| 4. Aging in Place | | | |
| F. If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include accessibility features and location to services and transportation alternatives? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures and is located within 1/4 mile of basic services and transportation alternatives. • 2 points: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures and is located within 1/2 mile of basic services and transportation alternatives. • 1 point: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures. | N/A | 3 | |
| A. For developments with multifamily senior rental component, does the development offer services and/or facilities to accommodate aging in place (see Guidebook for more details). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes | N/A | 3 | |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|--|---------------|-----------|----------|
| B. Project | | | |
| 5. Accessibility - Non-motorized | | | |
| A. Are there sidewalks within the development? • 3 points: There are sidewalks on both sides of all streets. • 2 points: There are sidewalks on both sides of all internal collector streets and one side on all other streets . • 1 point: There are sidewalks on one side of all streets. | | 3 | |
| B. Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | |
| C. Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential, multi-family buildings and other key destinations? • 3 points: Yes and includes 'end of trip' facilities such as covered shelters, secure parking, shower facilities, etc. • 2 points: Yes. | | 2 | |
| D. Does the development include construction of multi-use trails? • 3 points: Trails will be constructed at least 10 feet wide within the development that will shorten walking distances between complimentary uses and/or the external sidewalk/trail network. • 2 points: Trails at least 10 feet wide are constructed within the DRI boundary only. | | N/A | |
| E. Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and pedestrian actuation devices? • 3 points: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include all of the above listed. • 2 points: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include 3 of the above listed. • 1 point: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include 2 of the above listed. | | 1 | |
| F. Are pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network provided? • 3 points: All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network and pedestrian entrances are provided at street level along abutting public roads. • 2 points: All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network. | | 2 | |
| G. Do the provided non-motorized facilities shorten the distance between land uses that are on and off-site? • 3 points: Yes, both on and off site. • 2 points: Yes, for on site land uses only. | | 2 | |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|--|---------------|-----------|--|
| B. Project | | | |
| H. Does the development contribute to public streetscapes with pedestrian-friendly amenities, such as benches, lighting, street trees, trash cans, pedestrian entrance on street level, and windows at street level? • 3 points: Yes. | | 3 | |
| I. Is the development's parking located where it does not visually dominate the development from the street and allows for easy and safe pedestrian access to buildings? • 3 points: Parking associated with the development is located in the rear and or includes structured parking. • 2 points: Parking associated with the development is located to the side of the buildings and/or includes on-street parking. • 1 points: If industrial, all trailer parking is screened from the view of the adjacent roadways. | | 3 | |
| J. Are buildings oriented to existing or proposed public roads with minimum setbacks? • 3 points: Yes, buildings are oriented to the public roads with minimum setbacks. • 2 points: Yes, buildings are oriented to the public roads. | | 2 | |
| K. Where there are sidewalks, is the width adequate? • 3 points: All sidewalks meet regional Pedestrian LOS goals. • 2 points: All sidewalks meet the local government's minimum width requirement. | N/A | 3 | (PLOS B or above in LCI areas and regional places, PLOS C or above outside of those areas) |
| 6. Accessibility - Transit | | | |
| A. Is there a fixed guideway transit station available ? • 3 points: Currently available within 1/4 mile of the DRI boundary. • 2 points: Currently available within 1/2 mile of the DRI boundary. • 1 point: There is a transit station planned near the DRI and the DRI is compatible with that plan. | | N/A | |
| B. Is local bus service currently available? • 3 points: Available on/adjacent to the site. • 2 points: Available within 1/4 mile of the DRI boundary. • 1 point: Available within 1/2 mile of the DRI boundary. | | 3 | MARTA and CTRAN serve the site |
| C. Is the applicant providing transit services such as dedicated park and ride facility or shuttle service (for at least 2 years)? • 3 points: Yes, the development is providing facilities. | | N/A | |
| D. Is the applicant providing amenities at existing or proposed transit facilities, such as covered bus shelters, trash receptacles, benches, landing pads, lighting, or bicycle parking? • 3 points: Providing three or more amenities. • 2 points: Providing two or more amenities. • 1 point: Providing one amenity | | 0 | The applicant has indicated that landing pads and bicycle parking will be provided. In order to receive points for this, ARC needs a letter stating this intent. |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|---|---------------|-----------|---|
| B. Project | | | |
| E. Is the development proposed at "transit ready" densities, based on potential future service? • 3 points: Yes | | 3 | |
| F. For developments earning at least 1 point under Affordability Levels, is the development located in proximity to transit? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/4 mile to transit. • 2 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/2 mile to transit. • 1 point: Yes, the development is located within 1 mile to transit. | N/A | 3 | |
| G. Is transit available beyond peak-hours of travel? | | N/A | |
| H. Is the proposed development consistent with other transit related issues not fully addressed above? | | N/A | (List of other transit related issues and describe developments consistency) |
| 7. Access Management | | | |
| A. Is access provided from internal roadways, access road, or shared driveways only? • 3 points: Access is provided from internal roadways or access road connecting to side streets with minimum curb cuts along the arterial road and share driveways are proposed. • 2 points: Shared driveways are proposed with an internal roadway. | | 2 | |
| B. If the development is adjacent to more than one roadway, is access provided via the lowest functionally classified roadway? • 3 points: The development proposes all access via the lowest functionally classified roadway. • 2 points: The development proposes primary access from the lowest functionally classified roadway. | | 2 | |
| C. Do access points align with opposing access points or with existing median, planned, or likely location of future median breaks? • 3 points: All access points align with existing median breaks. If no median exists, all access points align with existing opposing access points. • 2 points: All full access points align with existing median breaks. If no median breaks exists, all full access points align with existing opposing access points. • 1 point: Access points align with likely locations of future median breaks. | | 0 | |
| D. Are proposed traffic signals located at the intersection of public roadways that provide access to the entire site and serve as many properties and interests as possible? • 3 points: Yes. | | N/A | |
| E. Does the proposed development provide an adequate, uninterrupted driveway throat length for the corridor? • 3 points: Yes. | | 3 | (Minimum 200 feet on state routes and major arterials. Minimum of 100 feet on all other roadway corridors.) |
| F. Are all proposed access points outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections? • 3 points: All proposed access points are outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections. • 2 points: Access points within the functional area of any adjacent intersections are right in/right out. | N/A | 0 | Angeline Way is within functional area of the Conley Road/Forrest Park Intersection and is not a right in/right out |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|---|---------------|-----------|--|
| B. Project | | | |
| G. If the development is adjacent to a designated scenic byway, the development maintains the natural vegetative character of the scenic byway. • 3 points: The development is not proposing any access onto the scenic byway and is preserving the natural vegetation for at least 200 feet from the right-of-way. • 2 points: The development is proposing no more than one access point onto the scenic byway and is preserving the natural vegetation for at least 200 feet from the right-of-way. • 1 point: The development is proposing no more than one access point onto the scenic byway and is preserving the natural vegetation for at least 100 feet from the right-of-way. | N/A | N/A | |
| H. Do the proposed access points meet minimum spacing requirements established by GDOT or other permitting agency? | | N/A | |
| I. Is the development consistent with other access management related issues not fully addressed above? | | N/A | (List of other access management related issues and describe developments consistency) |
| 8. Connectivity | | | |
| A. Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple roadways? • 3 points: There are separate ingress/egress points in 3 or more cardinal directions. • 2 points: There are separate ingress/egress points in 2 cardinal directions. • 1 point: There are separate ingress/egress points. | | 2 | |
| B. Do internal streets within the development connect to adjacent parcels at stub outs or dead end streets? • 3 points: There are connections to all adjacent stub outs or dead ends. • 2 points: There are stub outs to adjacent developable land (either undeveloped or underdeveloped) and cross access easements are provided. • 1 point: There are stub outs to adjacent developable land (either undeveloped or underdeveloped). | | 0 | There may be the opportunity to provide a stub out to the west |
| C. Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation throughout the site? • 3 points: All proposed land uses within the development are connected via the internal street network. • 2 points: Most of the proposed land uses within the development are connected via the internal street network. | | 3 | |
| D. Can the internal street network be reasonably anticipated to add to the public roadway? • 3 points: No restricted access • 2 points: Internal restricted access with multiple access points | | 3 | Restricted access to parking but access provided through the site |
| E. Is the development consistent with other connectivity related issues not fully addressed above? • 3 points: Yes | | N/A | (List of other connectivity related issues and describe developments consistency) |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|--|---------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| B. Project | | | |
| 9. Project Character and Design | | | |
| <p>A. Is the development a redevelopment site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development is a redevelopment site that requires environmental remediation. • 2 points: The development is located in a tax abatement zone, enterprise zone, or other governmentally supported redevelopment zones. • 1 point: The development is a redevelopment site. | N/A | 2 | |
| <p>B. Does the development re-use or rehabilitates existing and/or historic structures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, a majority of the existing and/or historic structures will remain on the site and incorporated into the development. • 2 points: Yes, some of the existing and/or historic structures will remain on the site and incorporated into the development. | N/A | N/A | |
| <p>C. Does the development create or enhance community spaces such as public plazas, squares, parks, etc?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes and on-site community spaces are open to the general public. • 2 points: Yes. | N/A | 2 | |
| <p>D. Does the development provide no more parking than the minimum required by the local jurisdiction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: A parking variance is being requested to provide less than the minimum required. • 2 points: Yes. | N/A | 1 | Required 574; proposed 634 |
| <p>E. Does the site design incorporate alternative design principles, including but not limited to reduced lot sizes, rear access via alleyway network, shared driveway, reduced building setbacks, architectural compatibility, screening of equipment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, the development includes a 4 of the above listed and other alternative design principles. • 2 points: Yes, the development includes 3 of the above listed. • 1 point: Yes, the development includes 2 of the above listed. | N/A | 3 | |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|---|---------------|------------|---|
| B. Project | | | |
| 10. Community Facilities | | | |
| A. Does the development require new and/or additional services and/or facilities (fire, police, school)? • 3 points: No, new facilities are not needed. • 2 points: New facilities are needed and are being provided for within the development or by the applicant. | N/A | 3 | |
| 11. Infrastructure Adequacy | | | |
| A. Is the development located in an area where adequate infrastructure is in place? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located in an area where there is existing infrastructure in place to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development. • 2 points: There will be infrastructure in place by development build-out to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development. | N/A | 3 | (Please explain) |
| B. If the development is predominately industrial, what is the proximity to the nearest intermodal station or other freight transfer location? • 3 points: Rail is on site and the development is connecting to the rail. • 2 points: A rail transfer, airport transfer or intermodal transfer station is located within 2 miles. • 1 point: A rail transfer, airport transfer or intermodal transfer station is located within 3 miles. | N/A | N/A | |
| C. If the development is predominately industrial, what is the proximity to interstate access? • 3 points: The development has interstate access within 1 mile. • 2 points: The development has interstate access within 2 miles. • 1 points: The development has interstate access within 3 miles. | N/A | N/A | |
| D. Does the development propose clean-fueled vehicles? • 3 points: Development is proposing 5% per each 10% of fleet. • 2 points: Development is proposing 3% per each 10% of fleet. • 1 point: Development is proposing 2% per each 10% of fleet. | N/A | N/A | |
| E. Is the development consistent with other infrastructure related issues not fully addressed above? • 3 points: Yes | | N/A | (List of other infrastructure related issues and describe developments consistency) |
| | | | |
| Possible Score | N/A | 120 | |
| Component Score | N/A | 84 | |
| Percentage | N/A | 70% | |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|---|---------------|-----------|--|
| C. Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality | | | |
| 1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas | | | |
| A. Does the development avoid critical historical and environmental areas (State Planning Part V Criteria, small water supply watersheds, etc)? • 3 points: Yes, the development avoids critical historical and environmental areas | N/A | 3 | |
| B. Does the development encroach upon habitat currently under or flagged for conservation under a local, regional, state conservation or green infrastructure plan? • 3 points: No. | N/A | 3 | |
| C. Is the development located on land physically suitable for development (avoids steep slopes greater than 20%, floodplains, stream corridors, groundwater recharge areas or wetlands) ? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located on land physically suitable for development. • 2 points: The development is avoiding land on the site that is not suitable for development and is taking the appropriate mitigation measures. | N/A | 3 | |
| 2. Conservation | | | |
| A. How much land is being preserved as open space? • 3 points: 50% of the site is preserved as open space • 2 points: 40% of the site is preserved as open space • 1 points: 30% of the site is preserved as open space. | N/A | 1 | |
| B. Does/will the development incorporate native plant and drought tolerant landscaping? • 3 points: All landscaping is drought tolerant and native. • 2 points: All landscaping is drought tolerant. • 2 points: No invasive plant species are used as identified by the local Cooperative Extension Service. | N/A | 0 | The applicant has indicated that all landscaping will be drought tolerant and native. In order to receive points for this, ARC needs a letter stating this intent. |
| D. Does the development exclude ornamental water features and fountains? • 3 points: The applicant will not install or facilitate installations of any ornamental water features or fountains. | N/A | 3 | |
| E. Does the development include permeable pavement in driveways and parking areas? • 3 points: 75% of driveways and parking areas use permeable pavement. • 2 points: 50% of driveways and parking areas use permeable pavement. • 1 point: All driveways use permeable pavement. | N/A | N/A | |
| 3. Stormwater Management | | | |

| | GRTA Criteria | ARC Score | Comments |
|--|---------------|------------|----------|
| C. Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality | | | |
| A. Does the development have a stormwater management plan? • 3 points: The stormwater management plan will result in a 25% decrease in the rate and quantity of post-development development stormwater runoff when compared with pre-development stormwater rates and quantities. • 2 points: The development maintains stormwater volume rates such that post-development development does not exceed the pre-development development (based on the 2 year, 24 hour peak discharge volume) | N/A | 3 | |
| 4. Buffers | | | |
| A. Will the proposed development require a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances? • 3 points: The development does not require a stream buffer variance. | N/A | 0 | |
| 5. Environmental Protection | | | |
| C. Is the development seeking a LEED certification? • 3 points: The development is seeking LEED-ND certification or all buildings are seeking LEED certification for non residential developments. • 2 points: At least half of the non-residential buildings are seeking LEED certification. • 1 point: One non residential buildings is seeking LEED certification. | N/A | N/A | |
| D. Is the development seeking an EarthCraft certification? • 3 points: The development is seeking Earthcraft Communities certification. • 2 points: At least half the residential homes will be certified an Earthcraft Home. | N/A | N/A | |
| | | | |
| Possible Score | N/A | 24 | |
| Component Score | N/A | 16 | |
| Percentage | N/A | 67% | |

ARC Score Sheet

Enter the values for the appropriate numbered section.

A. Regional Policies and Adopted Plans (50% of the Total Score)

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|------|
| 1. Unified Growth Policy Map | Section Score: | 6 |
| 2. Metro North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) Plan Compliance | Section Score: | 9 |
| 3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Transportation | Section Score: | 3 |
| 4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) | Section Score: | 3 |
| 5. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) | Section Score: | 0 |
| 6. Regionally Adopted Plans | Section Score: | 3 |
| 7. Locally Adopted Plans | Section Score: | 9 |
| | A. Component Points: | 33 |
| | B. Points Possible Points: | 33 |
| | C. Component Percentage | 100% |

B. Project (30% of the Total Score)

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Mixture of Uses | Section Score: | 7 |
| 2. Jobs to Housing Balance | Section Score: | 3 |
| 4. Housing Diversity and Affordability | Section Score: | 6 |
| 5. Aging in Place | Section Score: | 6 |
| 6. Accessibility-non motorized | Section Score: | 24 |
| 7. Accessibility- transit | Section Score: | 9 |
| 8. Access Management | Section Score: | 7 |
| 9. Connectivity | Section Score: | 8 |
| 10. Project Character and Design | Section Score: | 8 |
| 11. Community Facilities | Section Score: | 3 |
| 12. Infrastructure Adequacy | Section Score: | 3 |
| | A. Component Points: | 84 |
| | B. Points Possible Points: | 120 |
| | C. Component Percentage | 70% |

C. Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality (20% of the Total Score)

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas | Section Score: | 9 |
| 2. Conservation | Section Score: | 4 |
| 3. Stormwater Management | Section Score: | 3 |
| 4. Buffers | Section Score: | 0 |
| 5. Environmental Protection | Section Score: | 0 |
| | A. Component Points: | 16 |
| | B. Points Possible Points: | 24 |
| | C. Component Percentage | 67% |

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| A. Total Points: | 133 |
| B. Total Possible Points: | 177 |
| C. Unweighted Score | 75.1% |

**Overall Project
Score**

84%

CONLEY ROAD FAMILY BOND DRI
City of Atlanta
Environmental Planning Division Review Comments
May 18, 2009

Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection

The property is in the South River watershed, which is not a water supply watershed in the Atlanta Region. The project site plan shows an unnamed tributary of Poole Creek just north of the project property. The plans show the City's 75-foot stream buffer extending into the property along this stream as well as along an apparently unmarked stream in the northwestern corner of the property. A sidewalk comes up to the edge of the buffer, but no intrusion into the buffer is shown. Any intrusions into the buffer or setback that are not allowed under the City ordinance will require variances as provided in the ordinance.

All state waters that may be on the property are also subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer requirements.

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 that will be produced after construction of the proposed development. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr) from typical land uses in the Atlanta Region. The loading factors are based on the results of regional stormwater monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. Actual pollutant loadings will depend on the actual project area and the actual impervious coverage developed on the property and may differ from the figures shown. The project area is an estimate as no precise area was provided in the plans. + The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants per Year

| Land Use | Land Area (ac) | Total Phosphorus | Total Nitrogen | BOD | TSS | Zinc | Lead |
|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|
| Townhouse/Apartment | + 22.00 | 23.10 | 235.62 | 1474.00 | 13310.00 | 16.72 | 3.08 |
| TOTAL | + 22.00 | 23.10 | 235.62 | 1474.00 | 13310.00 | 16.72 | 3.08 |

Total % impervious 48 %

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 (www.georgiastormwater.com) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual and as required by Cobb County. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2009**

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Initial DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government:

Atlanta

Individual completing form:

Shelley Peart

Telephone:

404-330-6781

E-mail:

speart@atlantaga.gov

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:

Conley Village

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

3755 Forrest Park Road (Parcel ID #140001 LL 067 0) 3765 Forrest Park Road (Parcel ID #140001 LL 06)

Brief Description of Project:

The Villages at Conley is proposed on what are now two derelict apartment complexes that are a known problem and eyesore to the South River Garden community. Starting with Southern Trace and the property located at 950 Conley Road, we plan to demolish the apartment complexes on both sides of Conley Road. Our development plan calls for the construction of new intergenerational and mixed income housing. The most visible portion of the first phase will consist of a mixed use/mixed income building fronting Conley Road, with a 7500sf retail/commercial space. The remaining mixed income housing units will be located further within the site. The second phase will consist of age restricted housing with the possibility of a restaurant serving both our residents and the neighborhood. The final phase will be attached or semi-detached for sale housing. This phase will have to wait for market conditions to improve. Funding for the first phases is being sought now with the plan to start phase I in 2009. All housing will be wood frame with durable low maintenance exterior finishes, attractive detailing and fenestration as required by the requested MR-3 zoning. The buildings will be 3 and 4 story. Both of the initial phases will be provided with age and resident appropriate amenities, including community rooms, exercise/fitness rooms, computer rooms, a swimming pool & playgrounds for the family component, and other activity rooms & outdoor spaces for our seniors.

Development Type:

☐ (not selected)☐ Hotels☐ Wastewater Treatment Facilities☐ Office☒ Mixed Use☐ Petroleum Storage Facilities☐ Commercial☐ Airports☐ Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs☐ Wholesale & Distribution☐ Attractions & Recreational Facilities☐ Intermodal Terminals

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops | |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities <input type="radio"/> Any other development types | |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |
| If other development type, describe: | |
| <hr/> <hr/> | |
| Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): | 260 Multi-Family units/200 Senior units |
| Developer: | Conley Village Partners, I |
| Mailing Address: | 300 Peachtree Road |
| Address 2: | Suite 21L |
| | City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30303 |
| Telephone: | 215-869-9233 |
| Email: | khanna21@tmo.blackberry.net |
| Is property owner different from developer/applicant? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, property owner: | James Zohoury |
| Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located? | |
| Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, provide the following information: | Project Name: |
| | Project ID: |
| The initial action being requested of the local government for this project: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rezoning <input type="checkbox"/> Variance <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input type="checkbox"/> Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other Z-09-001 |
| Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent? | |
| Estimated Project Completion Dates: | This project/phase: 12/31/10 Overall project: 12/31/10 |
| <hr/> <hr/> | |
| Back to Top | |

[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 #2009**

| DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information | |
|---|--|
| This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the proposed DRI. Refer to both the Rules for the DRI Process and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds for more information. | |
| | |
| Local Government Information | |
| Submitting Local Government: | Atlanta |
| Individual completing form: | Shelley Peart |
| Telephone: | 404-330-6781 |
| Email: | speart@atlantaga.gov |
| | |
| Project Information | |
| Name of Proposed Project: | Conley Village |
| DRI ID Number: | 2009 |
| Developer/Applicant: | Conley Village Partners, I |
| Telephone: | 215-869-9233 |
| Email(s): | khanna21@tmo.blackberry.net |
| | |
| Additional Information Requested | |
| Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.) | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA? | <input checked="" type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided. | |
| | |
| Economic Development | |
| Estimated Value at Build-Out: | \$50,000,000 |
| Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: | \$250,000 at Build-Out |
| Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| Will this development displace | |

| | |
|--|--|
| any existing uses? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc): The development plan calls for the demolition of two existing apartment complexes, neither of which have been properly maintained and one of which is completely boarded up and vacant. | |
| | |
| Water Supply | |
| Name of water supply provider for this site: | City of Atlanta |
| What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | 100,000 gal/day at Build-Out |
| Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity: | |
| Is a water line extension required to serve this project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? | |
| | |
| Wastewater Disposal | |
| Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: | City of Atlanta |
| What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | 45,000 gal/day at Build-out |
| Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity: | |
| Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? | |
| | |
| Land 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.) | ADT: 2,744; AM Peak: 418; PM Peak: 225 |
| Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, please describe below: | |
| | |
| | |

Solid Waste Disposal

| | |
|--|--|
| How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? | 42 tons per month; 504 tons per year |
| Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity: | |
| Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If yes, please explain: | |

Stormwater Management

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? | Approximately 25% |
| Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: The Project will maintain and underground storage system and an aboveground retention pond. In addition, the northernmost edge of the property will be maintained as a wetland. | |

Environmental Quality

| | |
|---|--|
| Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following: | |
| 1. Water supply watersheds? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 3. Wetlands? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 4. Protected mountains? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| 5. Protected river corridors? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 6. Floodplains? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 7. Historic resources? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| 8. Other environmentally sensitive resources? | <input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No |
| If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: | |
| | |
| Back to Top | |

PLOTTED: May 15, 2009 - 11:40am LOCATION: K:\1800\1899-1 Conley Village DRI 2009\Reference Documents\Infor From Site Planner\ Sldwg Plotted By: sholevlab - Copyright 2009


LOCATION MAP:



APT. DEMO. PLAN



ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS TO BE DEMOLISHED AND NONE TO BE REUSED.



| SITE USAGE AND DENSITY: | | |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| USAGE TYPE | # OF UNITS | TOTAL ACREAGE |
| DWELLING UNITS | 527 UNITS | +/- 25 ACRES |
| UNITS PER ACRE: | 21 | COMMERCIAL F.A.R. = .37 |

GREEN SPACE = 100,048 SF TOTAL

ALLOWABLE FLOOR AREA RATIO: 25,616 SF BY CITY.
PROPOSED RETAIL & SERVICES: 12,250 SF.

RETAIL & SERVICES BUILDING COMPONENT CALS.:

| BUILDING NAME | # OF FLOORS | SQUARE FOOTAGE |
|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| BLDG "100" | 1 FLOOR | 7,500 SF |
| BLDG "600" | 1 FLOOR | 4,600 SF |

BUILDING DATA:

| BUILDING NAME | # OF FLOORS | SQUARE FOOTAGE (FOOTPRINT) |
|---------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| BLDG "100" | 4 FLOORS | 22,962 SF |
| BLDG "200" | 4 FLOORS | 18,766 SF |
| BLDG "300" | 3 FLOORS | 20,676 SF |
| BLDG "400" | 3 FLOORS | 11,998 SF |
| BLDG "500" | 3 FLOORS | 30,200 SF |
| BLDG "600" | 3 FLOORS | 23,481 SF |

LEGEND:

- PROPERTY LINES
- SIDEWALKS
- CROSSWALKS

NOTES:

- THERE ARE NO JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES SHOWN AND THE DISTANCE TO EACH ADJACENT JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARY IS .1 MILES TO CLAYTON COUNTY AND .48 MILES TO DEKALB COUNTY.
- ALTHOUGH THE DEVELOPMENT IS TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN PHASES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE DRI REVIEW, THE SITE COMPLETION IS BEING TREATED AS A SINGLE PHASE.
- BIKE RACKS ARE TO BE LOCATED AT ALL LOGICAL ENTRANCES TO ALL BUILDINGS.

PARKING REQUIREMENTS:

| TRACT INFO. | REQ. # OF PARKING | PROVIDED |
|---|---|------------|
| TRACT 1-A RESIDENTIAL BLDG. 1 91,848 SF | SPACE PER 600 SF (13 SPACES) 74 SPACES 1.0 SPACES PER UNIT (60 SPACES) TOTAL: 73 SPACES | |
| TRACT 1-B RESIDENTIAL BLDGS. 1.1 173,086 SF | SPACES PER UNIT (215 SPACES) TOTAL: 215 SPACES | 248 SPACES |
| TRACT 2 RESIDENTIAL BLDGS. 1 161,043 SF | SPACE PER 600 SF (8 SPACES) 206 SPACES 1.0 SPACES PER UNIT (198 SPACES) TOTAL: 206 SPACES | |
| TRACT 3 RESID. TOWNHOMES | 1.1 SPACES PER UNIT (40 SPACES) | 40 SPACES |
| TRACT 4 RESID. TOWNHOMES | 1.1 SPACES PER UNIT (40 SPACES) | 40 SPACES |

ZONING AND SITE ANALYSIS

LOCATION:
950 CONLEY ROAD
ATLANTA, GA

CLIENT:
KEVIN HANNA
300 PEACHTREE ST. SUITE 21 L
ATLANTA, GA 30308
(215) 869-9233

ARCHITECT:
MARTIN RILEY & ASSOCIATES
215 CHURCH ST.
DECATUR, GA 30030
CONTACT: MIKE RILEY

ZONING:
EXISTING ZONING IS RG-2
PROPOSED ZONING MR-3C

LAND-USE:
EXISTING: INDUSTRIAL
PROPOSED: MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

BUILDING HEIGHT:
MAX. ALLOWABLE BLDG HEIGHT: 80'-0"
PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT: 54'-0"
MAXIMUM 3 STORIES AND 40': TRACT 3 & 4.

TRACT 1A: RESIDENTIAL /RETAIL
NET LAND AREA: 95,832 SF
GROSS LAND AREA: 114,127 SF
RETAIL & SERVICES SF: 7500 SF
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 60
UNITS PER ACRE: 27.27

PARKING:
REQ. CITY RESIDENTIAL: 1.0 SPACES PER UNIT.
REQ. CITY PARKING SPACES: 60
REQ. RETAIL: 1 PER 600 SF
REQ. CITY RETAIL & SERVICES PARKING SPACES: 13
PROPOSED PARKING: 74 SPACES
TOTAL REQ. CITY PARKING SPACES: 73
REQ. DCA PARKING: 1.5 SPACES PER UNIT
TOTAL REQ. PARKING SPACES BY DCA: 103

TRACT 1B: RESIDENTIAL
NET LAND AREA: 340,601 SF
GROSS LAND AREA: 355,847 SF
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 195
UNITS PER ACRE: 27.19
PARKING:
REQ. CITY RESIDENTIAL: 1.1 SPACES PER UNIT.
TOTAL CITY REQ. PARKING: 215
PROPOSED PARKING: 248 SPACES
REQ. DCA PARKING: 1.5 SPACES PER UNIT
TOTAL REQ. PARKING SPACES BY DCA: 293

TRACT 2: SENIOR LIVING
NET LAND AREA: 233,917 SF
GROSS LAND AREA: 257,004 SF
RETAIL & SERVICES SF: 4,750 SF
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 200
UNITS PER ACRE: 37.31
PARKING:
REQ. CITY RESIDENTIAL: .99 SPACES PER UNIT.
REQ. CITY PARKING: 198
REQ. RETAIL: 1.0 SPACES PER 600 SF
REQ. RETAIL & SERVICES PARKING SPACES: 8
TOTAL CITY REQ. PARKING: 206
PROPOSED PARKING: 206 SPACES
POSSIBLE FUTURE EXEMPTION TO REDUCE PARKING BY SENIOR.
REQ. DCA PARKING: .75 SPACES PER UNIT
TOTAL REQ. PARKING SPACES BY DCA: 158

TRACT 3: FOR SALE ATTACHED HOUSING
NET LAND AREA: 138,884 SF
GROSS LAND AREA: 150,210 SF
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 36
UNITS PER ACRE: 11.28
PARKING:
REQ. RESIDENTIAL: 1.1 SPACES PER UNIT.
TOTAL CITY REQ. PARKING: 40
PROPOSED PARKING: 40 + OPTIONAL GARAGES.

TRACT 4: FOR SALE ATTACHED HOUSING
NET LAND AREA: 100,407 SF
GROSS LAND AREA: 93,652 SF
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS: 36
UNITS PER ACRE: 15.65
PARKING:
REQ. RESIDENTIAL: 1.1 SPACES PER UNIT.
TOTAL CITY REQ. PARKING: 40
PROPOSED PARKING: 40 + OPTIONAL GARAGES.

TOTAL PARKING:
CITY REQUIRED: 574 SPACES
DCA REQUIRED: 634 SPACES
PROPOSED PARKING: 608 SPACES

MARTIN RILEY ASSOCIATES - ARCHITECTS, P.C.
215 CHURCH STREET SUITE 200 DECATUR GEORGIA 30030-3329 404-373-2800

CONLEY ROAD FAMILY BOND
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

SAI

NOT RELEASED FOR CONSTRUCTION