



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: Aug 21 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R908211

TO: Chairman Elizabeth "BJ" Mathis
ATTN TO: Jeremy Gibert, Planner I
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: King Mill-Lambert Development

Submitting Local Government: Henry County

Review Type: DRI

Date Opened: Aug 21 2009 **Deadline for Comments:** Sep 4 2009 **Date to Close:** Sep 20 2009

DRI Checklist Preliminary Summary:

Regional Policies and Adopted Plans: 94%

Project: 48%

Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality: 42%

Overall Score: 61%

Overall Weighted Score: 70%

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), the proposed development is located in an area designated as suburban development that recommends development at a more suburban scale with appropriate commercial development and low intensity mixed use. However, the proposed development is adjacent to a freight area on the UGPM.

The proposed development is located in an area that is rapidly changing but is still primarily dominated by industrial and warehouse uses within Henry. It is important to consider compatible uses as the area continues to develop.

The project property is located in the head waters of the Tussahaw Creek Water Supply Watershed, which is a small (less than 100-square mile) water supply watershed for Henry County. The County has developed a watershed protection district for Tussahaw Creek under Article VIII, Section 3-7-159 of the Henry County Code. The project will need to conform to all County Watershed District requirements. The USGS coverage for the project area shows an intermittent (dashed blue line) stream at the eastern edge of the property. No streams or buffers are shown on the submitted plans. For all affected streams on the property, the project must meet the requirements of the County's Stream Buffer Ordinance, which has been adopted as one of the stormwater ordinances required under the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District's District-wide Watershed Management Plan. Any work in the County buffers must meet ordinance requirements or a variance must be approved by the County.

There is the potential for major impacts on project area streams from mass clearing and grading and increased impervious surface without proper stormwater management planning. A stormwater plan needs to be developed fully addressing how stormwater impacts will be controlled, including water quality,

downstream channel protection and attenuation of peak flows to prevent downstream flooding. 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.

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
HENRY COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF McDONOUGH

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF LOCUST GROVE

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: **King Mill-Lambert Development** *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: *Sep 4 2009*

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Aug 21 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R908211

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

FROM: Jon Tuley, Extension: 3-3309

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Land Use: Rice, LeVar

Transportation: Kray, Michael

Environmental: Santo, Jim

Research: Skinner, Jim

Aging: Rader, Carolyn

Name of Proposal: King Mill-Lambert Development

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: The proposed King Mill-Lambert development is an industrial development consisting of two buildings totalling 3,048,300 SF of warehouse space on 180 acres in Henry County. The proposed development is located on King Mill Road east of I-85.

Submitting Local Government: Henry County

Date Opened: Aug 21 2009

Deadline for Comments: Sep 4 2009

Date to Close: Sep 20 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:		King Mill - Lambert	
DRI number:		2035	
Local jurisdiction:		Henry County	
Local government action requested:		Rezoning	
Project description (include acreage):		The proposed King Mill-Lambert development is an industrial development consisting of two buildings totalling 3,048,300 SF of warehouse space on 180 acres in Henry County. The proposed development is located on King Mill Road east of I-85.	
Project phasing/buildout:		2014	
Project location:		King Mill Road between SR 42 and Iris Lake Road	
Current description of the site:		Vacant, undeveloped	
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):		City of McDonough and City of Locust Grove	
Adjacent/surrounding land uses and development:		Distribution / warehouse uses, residential uses, and undeveloped land uses.	
Estimated value at build-out:		\$105,000,000	
Expected annual local tax revenues:		\$900,000	
Site access roads:		King Mill Road	
Number of site driveways proposed:		2	
Total traffic volume to be generated by the proposed development:		6,362 Daily trips; 517 AM peak hour trips; 534 PM peak hour trips	
Estimated water supply demand to be generated by project:		0.05 MGD	
Sufficient water capacity available:		Yes	
Estimated sewage flow to be generated by project:		0.05 MGD	
Sufficient wastewater capacity available:		Yes	
Estimated solid waste generated by the project annually:		40 Tons	
Sufficient landfill capacity available:		Yes	
Number of students expected to be generated by the project:		0	
Schools expected students to attend and capacity:			
School 1:	N/A	Capacity:	N/A
School 2:	N/A	Capacity:	N/A
School 3:	N/A	Capacity:	N/A

	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	The UGPM identifies the area as Suburban Neighborhood; however it is directly adjacent to an area identified as Freight Corridor.
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.		1	SR 42 is just over 1/2 miles from the proposed development
4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)			
A. Are the transportation impacts identified consistent with the TIP/RTP? • 3 points: Yes		3	See the DRI traffic study for a list of TIP and RTP projects. The DRI traffic study recommends the widening of SR155, and this improvement listed in the TIP as AR-HE-113. (GDOT NO. 0007856)
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 Henry County 2030 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use (Dated April 20, 2009) identifies the area as industrial.
B. Is the development consistent with the local government's transportation plans? • 3 points: Yes		3	The county has identified and allocated SLOST funding toward improving and realigning King Mill Road.
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	31	
Percentage	N/A	94%	

	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	N/A	
<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	N/A	
<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	N/A	
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	N/A	
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	N/A	
<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	N/A	
<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	N/A	

	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	N/A	
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	N/A	
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	N/A	
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	N/A	

	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.		N/A	Sidewalks should be provided between buildings and from the buildings to the parking areas and public streets.
B. Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network? • 3 points: Yes		0	No sidewalks are existing or proposed along external streets.
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.		N/A	Not at this time. The developer should consider providing bicycle parking
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.		0	Intersections of driveways and King Mill Road as well as King Mill Road and Iris Lake Road do include provisions for pedestrians. The proposed signalized intersection of SR 42/King Mill Road will include pedestrian actuation.
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.		0	Sidewalks should be provided from the building to the parking areas and to public streets.
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.		N/A	

	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.		N/A	
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.		0	The site plan shows trailer parking fronting all public streets. The parking should be relocated or screened from view.
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.		N/A	Buildings should be oriented to the street with appropriate façade treatment or should have a landscaping buffer to screen them from view.
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	N/A	(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.		N/A	
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		N/A	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
E. Is the development proposed at "transit ready" densities, based on potential future service? • 3 points: Yes		N/A	
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	N/A	
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.		1	Driveways #1 and #2 are shared driveways for car and truck traffic. The developer should investigate the opportunity to give both buildings access from driveways #1 and #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.		N/A	
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.		N/A	
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.		3	A planned traffic signal is proposed at the intersection of SR 42 and King Mill Road.
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	3	

	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.		1	The developer should investigate giving both buildings access from driveways #1 and #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).		1	A future stub-out is proposed along driveway #1 to connect to land located toward 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.		2	Building A will utilize Driveway #1. Building B will utilize Driveway #2.
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		N/A	
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	N/A	
<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	N/A	
<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	2	Parking required is less than parking provided.
<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	N/A	

	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	No new services required
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	2	King Mill Road realignment will be in place at the build out of the development. Other infrastructure completion dates, such as the proposed widening of SR 155 is unknown at this time.
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	1	The nearest freight transfer location along the Norfolk Southern - McDonough line is located at 101 Thoroughbred Rd approximately 2.6 miles from the site.
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	1	The development is located approximately 2.3 miles from the nearest access to I-75.
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	48	
Component Score	N/A	23	
Percentage	N/A	47.9%	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
C. Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality			
1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas			
<p>A. Does the development avoid critical historical and environmental areas (State Planning Part V Criteria, small water supply watersheds, etc)?</p> <p>• 3 points: Yes, the development avoids critical historical and environmental areas</p>	N/A	1	The project property is located in the head waters of the Tussahaw Creek Water Supply Watershed, which is a small (less than 100-square mile) water supply watershed for Henry County. The site is located within the Tussahaw Watershed Protection District.
<p>B. Does the development encroach upon habitat currently under or flagged for conservation under a local, regional, state conservation or green infrastructure plan?</p> <p>• 3 points: No.</p>	N/A	3	
<p>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) ?</p> <p>• 3 points: Yes, the development is located on land physically suitable for development.</p> <p>• 2 points: The development is avoiding land on the site that is not suitable for development and is taking the appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	N/A	1	The USGS coverage for the project area shows an intermittent (dashed blue line) stream at the eastern edge of the property. No streams or buffers are shown on the submitted plans. ARC would like more information on this stream and how the developer plans to incorporate it into the site.
2. Conservation			
<p>A. How much land is being preserved as open space?</p> <p>• 3 points: 50% of the site is preserved as open space</p> <p>• 2 points: 40% of the site is preserved as open space</p> <p>• 1 points: 30% of the site is preserved as open space.</p>	N/A	1	Approximately 80% impervious. The site plan states at least 12% of the site will be open space. The developer should look for opportunities to create greenspace or open space especially in the form of natural areas or buffers/vegetative screening.
<p>B. Does/will the development incorporate native plant and drought tolerant landscaping?</p> <p>• 3 points: All landscaping is drought tolerant and native.</p> <p>• 2 points: All landscaping is drought tolerant.</p> <p>• 2 points: No invasive plant species are used as identified by the local Cooperative Extension Service.</p>	N/A	0	Information not submitted for the review. If the developer wishes to, a letter should be submitted to ARC expressing the intent to use native and drought tolerant landscaping.
<p>D. Does the development exclude ornamental water features and fountains?</p> <p>• 3 points: The applicant will not install or facilitate installations of any ornamental water features or fountains.</p>	N/A	3	
<p>E. Does the development include permeable pavement in driveways and parking areas?</p> <p>• 3 points: 75% of driveways and parking areas use permeable pavement.</p> <p>• 2 points: 50% of driveways and parking areas use permeable pavement.</p> <p>• 1 point: All driveways use permeable pavement.</p>	N/A	N/A	
3. Stormwater Management			

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
C. Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality			
<p>A. Does the development have a stormwater management plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	0	To receive points for this question in the final report, ARC needs documentation of the stormwater management plan.
4. Buffers			
<p>A. Will the proposed development require a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: The development does not require a stream buffer variance. 	N/A	1	The USGS coverage for the project area shows an intermittent (dashed blue line) stream at the eastern edge of the property. No streams or buffers are shown on the submitted plans. ARC would like more information on this stream and how the developer plans to incorporate it into the site.
5. Environmental Protection			
<p>C. Is the development seeking a LEED certification?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	
<p>D. Is the development seeking an EarthCraft certification?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	10	
Percentage	N/A	41.7%	

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:	1
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:	31
	B. Points Possible Points:	33
	C. Component Percentage	94%

B. Project (30% of the Total Score)

1. Mixture of Uses	Section Score:	0
2. Jobs to Housing Balance	Section Score:	0
4. Housing Diversity and Affordability	Section Score:	0
5. Aging in Place	Section Score:	0
6. Accessibility-non motorized	Section Score:	0
7. Accessibility- transit	Section Score:	0
8. Access Management	Section Score:	10
9. Connectivity	Section Score:	4
10. Project Character and Design	Section Score:	2
11. Community Facilities	Section Score:	3
12. Infrastructure Adequacy	Section Score:	4
	A. Component Points:	23
	B. Points Possible Points:	48
	C. Component Percentage	48%

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

1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas	Section Score:	5
2. Conservation	Section Score:	4
3. Stormwater Management	Section Score:	0
4. Buffers	Section Score:	1
5. Environmental Protection	Section Score:	0
	A. Component Points:	10
	B. Points Possible Points:	24
	C. Component Percentage	42%

A. Total Points:	64
B. Total Possible Points:	105
C. Unweighted Score	61.0%

**Overall Project
Score**

70%

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
D. Non-Expedited Review Criteria Only (GRTA)			
1. Vehicle Miles Traveled			
A. Is off-site trip generation to/from the development reduced by at least 15%?		N/A	
B. For developments with residential components, is the development located within 1/2 mile of a number of existing jobs equal to or greater than 50% of the number of dwelling units in the development?		N/A	Development has no residential component.
C. For developments without a residential component, is the development located within 1/2 mile of a number of existing dwelling units equal to or greater than 50% of the number of new jobs created by the development?		N/A	Probably not enough homes within 1/2 mile, but development is located 3.3 miles from downtown McDonough. The population of McDonough has grown 190% in the past 10 years according to the US Census.
D. Is the development designed to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes both on-site and off-site?		N/A	The facility is a distribution warehouse, so alternative modes of transportation may be limited.
E. Does the development consist of a mixture of complimentary land uses or is located within a short walking distance (less than 1/2 mile) to external complimentary uses?		N/A	The development has a single land use.
F. Does the traffic analysis utilize all available and practical trip reduction techniques?		N/A	No reductions were found to be applicable.
G. What conditions beyond the control of the developer and local government impact the ability of the development to reduce vehicle miles of travel? (please specify)		N/A	Providing a bus line to serve the site would potentially reduce single occupancy vehicle trips.
2. Transportation and Traffic Analysis			
A. Does the development impact regional mobility?		N/A	The development is along King Mill Road and is not expected to affect regional mobility.
B. Does the development affect the safety or operations of impacted roadways?		N/A	See traffic study
C. Do existing and proposed (in a transportation improvement program) infrastructure of impacted roadways continue to operate in a safe and efficient manner while adequately serving new trips generated by the development?		N/A	See traffic study. Intersections are expected to operate with LOS at or above the GTRA standard during No-Build and Build Conditions.
D. Are proposed mitigation measures (from DRI traffic analysis) feasible and within the control of the applicant or appropriate agencies to implement as a means of addressing negative impacts to the transportation system?		N/A	See traffic study. Some improvements as required by GRTA standards and listed in the report may not be feasible due to right of way constraints, funding, or community support. The major improvement to widen SR 155 is, however, included in the TIP.
E. Can the proposed mitigation measures be implemented within the time frame proposed for development build-out?		N/A	King Mill Road relocation will be completed by build out of the development. Other required improvements and their completion dates are not known at this time.
F. Other issues not fully addressed here which require clarification or explanation?		N/A	None

3. Relationship to Existing Development and Infrastructure			
A. Is the development located within an area where existing or planned infrastructure will be in place by project build-out to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the project?		N/A	King Mill Road Realignment is scheduled to begin construction in 2010.
B. If the development is predominantly industrial, what is the proximity to the nearest intermodal station or other freight transfer location?		N/A	The nearest freight transfer location along the Norfolk Southern - McDonough line is located at 101 Thoroughbred Rd approximately 2.6 miles from the site.
C. If the development is predominantly industrial, what is the proximity to interstate access?		N/A	The development is located approximately 2.3 miles from the nearest access to I-75.
D. Are there other utility/local authorities, other than transportation related, the development team is having discussions with concerning future infrastructure needs?		N/A	None
E. Other issues not fully addressed here which require clarification or explanation?		N/A	None

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
E. Expedited Review Criteria Only			
1. Limited Trip Generation (pick one)			
A. Is the proposed development project to generate no more than one thousand (1,000) gross daily trips?	N/A	N/A	
B. Is the proposed development projected to generate more than one thousand (1,000) but no more than three thousand (3,000) gross daily trips?	N/A	N/A	
C. Is the proposed development projected to generate fewer than one hundred (100) gross PM peak hour weekday trips?	N/A	N/A	
2. Mixed Uses			
A. Does the proposed development contain two or more complementary, interconnected, and interdependent land uses?	N/A	N/A	
B. Due to the interconnected, mixed-use nature of the development, is a twenty percent (20%) reduction in trip generation between dissimilar land uses reasonably anticipated?	N/A	N/A	
C. Is the site designed so as to support the trip reductions taken and to maximize the likelihood of the use of on-site alternative modes of transportation by residents, employees, and visitors to the DRI?	N/A	N/A	
D. Are all of the land uses within the proposed development accessible by vehicles and pedestrians, with no single use restricting access to, from, or within the site?	N/A	N/A	
3. Area of Influence			
A. Is the proposed development located within an area designated in the Regional Development Plan (RDP) and the Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), or its successor, as being located within the Central City, a Regional Center, a Mega Corridor, or an Urban Redevelopment Corridor?	N/A	N/A	
B. Is the proposed development consistent with the RDP and UGPM in both density and proposed development type(s)?	N/A	N/A	
C. Are at least sixty-five percent (65%) of the single occupant automobile trips generated by the proposed development reasonably anticipated to have a trip bound by a three mile radius or less?	N/A	N/A	
3. Alternative Modes of Transportation			
A. Are at least twenty-five (25%) of the trips generated by the proposed development likely to be by way of modes of transportation other than the single occupant vehicle?	N/A	N/A	
OR:	N/A	N/A	
A. Is the proposed development located within an area which has been designated by GRTA as a Transit Enable Area (TEA) and is consistent with any land use parameters established by GRTA as a part of designation of the area as a TEA?	N/A	N/A	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Is the development majority or wholly (50.1% to 100%) within a designated TEA; and,	N/A	N/A	
C. Does the project meet or exceed the residential and/or employment densities established by the RDP and UGPM, or its successor; and,	N/A	N/A	
D. Is the project consistent with regionally adopted transportation plans; and,	N/A	N/A	
E. Are proposed land uses limited to residential, commercial, office, hospitals or health care facilities, hotels, and post secondary schools; and,	N/A	N/A	
F. Does the development contribute to an improvement in the Jobs to Housing Balance; and,	N/A	N/A	
G. Is the development pedestrian oriented so that the movement of pedestrians is not restricted and access to transit facilities is convenient and logical in placement so as to maximize transit ridership to and from the site; and,	N/A	N/A	
H. If the development is primarily residential in nature, does it provide at least ten percent (10%) of the residential units as workforce housing, defined here as affordable to households earning seventy-five percent (75%) of the region's median income; and,	N/A	N/A	
I. Is the majority of parking provided within structures and is parking limited by providing no more than the minimum required by the local jurisdiction; and,	N/A	N/A	
J. Does the development conform to existing street block patterns or introduce new public roadways/pedestrian paths to create block patterns or shorten block lengths; and,	N/A	N/A	
K. Is at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the street frontage occupied by active street level uses?	N/A	N/A	
3. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)			
A. Is the proposed development located within an area approved for inclusion within the LCI program by the ARC?	N/A	N/A	
B. Is the development consistent with the policies, design elements, and overall standards established by the LCI study and any subsequently funded Supplemental Study(s)?	N/A	N/A	
C. Has the affected local government completed and adopted the initial LCI Study within their adopted Comprehensive Plan?	N/A	N/A	
D. Has the local government shown efforts towards implementation of the adopted study?	N/A	N/A	
E. Do the staffs of the local government(s), ARC, and GRTA agree upon the eligibility of the proposed DRI for this type of Expedited Review?	N/A	N/A	



MEMORANDUM

TO: Jon Tuley, Land Use Division

FROM: Lyubov Zuyeva, Transportation Planning Division

DATE: August 20, 2009

SUBJECT: **TPD Review of DRI # 2034**

Project: King Mill-Lambert

County: Henry

Location: At the intersection of King Mill Road and Iris Lake Road, abutting on Nail Mill Road to the north

Analysis:

Expedited

☐

Non-Expedited

☒

cc: David Haynes
TPD

The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the traffic study performed by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. on behalf of the developer of the above referenced proposed project. The following input is provided for the Infrastructure section of the DRI Report.

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Non-expedited Review Process. The proposed 180 acre warehouse development would contain two warehouse buildings, building "A" at 1,540,080 square feet, and building "B" at 1,408,220 square feet, with a total warehouse space of 3,048,300 square feet.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Transportation

How many site access points will be associated with the proposed development? What are their locations?

Site access is intended to be provided for the two warehouses of the DRI via two driveways off King Mill Road, west of the intersection with Iris Lake Road. There is no internal connection intended between the two driveways, i.e. to get from building "B" to building "A", a driver would be required to exit back out onto King Mill Road off driveway 2, and then proceed via driveway 1.

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

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. performed the transportation analysis. GRTA rates based on empirical data from previously conducted studies within greater Atlanta were utilized (resulting in rates higher than ITE warehouse rates based on employees and lower than ITE warehouse rates based on square footage). The ARC staff finds this methodology acceptable. The resulting trip generation rates are listed in the table below.

King Mill-Lambert DRI Gross Trip Generation, Build-Out Year (2014)						
Land Use	Daily Traffic		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit
3,048,300 SF Warehousing	3,181	3,181	424	93	134	400

List the transportation improvements that would affect or be affected by the proposed project.

2008-2013 TIP*

ARC Number	<u>Route</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
HE-175	SR 155 from Spalding Co Line to SR 20	Repaving	2010

**The ARC Board adopted the Envision6 RTP and FY 2008-2013 TIP on September 26th, 2007.*

Envision6 RTP (Long Range Projects)*

ARC Number	<u>Route</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
HE-113	SR 155 from I-75 South to US 23	Capacity Widening	2030

**The ARC Board adopted the Envision6 RTP and FY 2008-2013 TIP on September 26th, 2007.*

County and Local Projects*

Number	<u>Route</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
Henry County SPLOST III SP 3052	Intersection of King Mill Rd and SR 42	Intersection re-alignment and signalization	Realignment expected to be completed in 2010 (per Cheri Hobson-Matthews 08/19/09); Signalization would require final approval by GDOT and might take longer

**SPLOST III list adopted in November 2007 by Henry County voters and revised in December 2008.*

Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for King Mill-Lambert.

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **background** traffic. The transportation consultant has made recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service.

King Mill Road Realignment (Henry County SPLOST project)

- King Mill Road east of SR 42 to be realigned with the southern intersection of King Mill Road at SR 42
- A signal to be installed at the proposed four-leg intersection
- Each of the four approaches along SR 42 and King Mill Road to be improved to consist of one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane

SR 155 from I-75 Southbound Ramps to SR 42 intersection (covered under RTP project HE-113, with expected completion date of 2030)

- Widen SR 155 to accommodate two through lanes in the eastbound and westbound directions at I-75 southbound ramps
- Widen SR 155 to accommodate two through lanes in the eastbound and westbound directions at I-75 northbound ramps
- Widen SR 155 to accommodate two through lanes in the eastbound and westbound directions at King Mill Road
- Widen SR 155 to accommodate two through lanes in the eastbound and westbound directions at SR 42

King Mill Road at SR 155

- Install an additional northbound left-turn lane along King Mill Road, creating dual left-turn lanes with protected-only phasing

Bill Gardner Parkway from I-75 Southbound Ramps to SR 42 intersection

- Provide an eastbound right-turn lane along Bill Gardner Parkway at the I-75 southbound on-ramp; this requirement is indicated as a condition as part of GRTA Notice of Decision for DRI #1610 Locust Grove Retail)
- Provide an additional eastbound right-turn lane along Bill Gardner Parkway at SR 42, with required additional southbound lane on SR 42 to receive the turning traffic

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **total** traffic. The transportation consultant has made recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service.

King Mill Road from future SPLOST realignment project at SR 42 to Driveway 2

- Widen the 10-foot travel lanes to 12-foot travel lanes

King Mill Road at Driveway 1

- Provide an eastbound left-turn lane along King Mill Road

King Mill Road at Driveway 2

- Provide an eastbound left-turn lane along King Mill Road

Is the site served by transit? If so, describe type and level of service and how it will enhance or be enhanced by the presence of transit? Are there plans to provide or expand transit service in the vicinity of the proposed project?

The immediate vicinity of the site area is not serviced by local transit. There is a GRTA Xpress Route 430 from McDonough Park-n-Ride to Downtown Atlanta during AM and PM peak periods. Henry County Comprehensive Transportation Plan indicates a need for transit service on SR 42, which might mean a potential transit stop within 1/4th mile of the development in the future. Currently, no sidewalks exist along King Mill road to support pedestrian access from the development site to transit, even if transit along SR 42 were available.

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

None proposed.

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

Based on the traffic analysis completed by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. and projected traffic volumes derived from the ARC Travel Demand Model (TDM), the transportation system is not fully capable of accommodating the new trips generated by the proposed development and maintaining acceptable LOS standards at the studied intersections.

ARC concludes that the improvements recommended in the traffic analysis are needed and should be implemented to maintain or improve LOS standards on surface streets in the vicinity of the proposed development, with the following changes:

- The expected dates for realignment of SR 42 and King Mill Road, signalization and intersection layout should be confirmed with GDOT. Henry County representatives indicate that the re-alignment work should be completed in the summer of 2010, but signalization might take longer and is subject to GDOT approval.
- SR 155 widening to 4 lanes is already in the RTP and is scheduled to be completed by 2030; unless additional source of local funding becomes available, it would be unreasonable to expect that Henry County could speed up the completion in time for 2014 build-out of the King Lambert development.
- Installation of an additional northbound left-turn lane along King Mill Road at SR 155 is not in the RTP. The high volume of turning vehicles would likely present a challenge, as No Build 2014 northbound left-hand turning volume at the intersection is projected at 467 vehicles per hour (AM peak), and FHWA recommends multiple turn lanes if more than 300 vehicles per hour are taking a left turn (publication FHWA-HRT-04-091, Signalized Intersections: Informational Guide). However the high left-turn volumes are expected as background condition without the development impact, and fixing the issue should not be a condition imposed on this development. A potential solution could be

that Henry County considers this intersection for a future SPLOST project, to coincide in timing with widening of SR 155 (RTP project HE-113).

- Additional eastbound right-turn lanes on Bill Gardner parkway at I-75 southbound on-ramp and at SR 42 are likely to have less relevance to the King Lambert DRI, although important to the functionality of Locust Grove Retail DRI #1610; therefore they are not recommended for consideration as part of this DRI plan

ARC makes the following additional recommendations for the proposed development consistent with adopted local and regional plans:

- Extend King Mill Road lane widening to 12 feet from Driveway 2 to Iris Lake Road, to keep consistency with the proposed King Mill road lane widening (from 10 to 12 feet each lane) from future SPLOST realignment project at SR 42 to Driveway 2
- Connection to current and future surrounding developments
 - The development, as proposed, provides no connectivity between the residential neighborhood to the north of the site and the future residential development to the south. A stub-out for future access to the west is provided from Driveway 1. It would be beneficial to upgrade the proposed Driveway 1 to public road level facility (one lane in each direction), and extend it to the north past Building “A” to connect to Nail Mill Road. Building “A” parking layout might need to be modified to allow the roadway extension to connect to Nail Mill Road. A sidewalk or a paved shoulder along the newly created roadway would be recommended to allow non-motorized transportation access.
- Internal connectivity
 - As proposed, no direct vehicular or pedestrian access exists between the two proposed warehouse buildings. ARC recommends that the two driveways be connected by an internal driveway to allow redundancy in access to both buildings, and to allow better internal circulation. A sidewalk connection between the two buildings is recommended to allow employee foot traffic.

KING MILL LAMBERT DRI
Henry County
Environmental Planning Division Comments
August 17, 2009

Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The project property is located in the head waters of the Tussahaw Creek Water Supply Watershed, which is a small (less than 100-square mile) water supply watershed for Henry County. The County has developed a watershed protection district for Tussahaw Creek under Article VIII, Section 3-7-159 of the Henry County Code. The project will need to conform to all County Watershed District requirements.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows an intermittent (dashed blue line) stream at the eastern edge of the property. No streams or buffers are shown on the submitted plans. For all affected streams on the property, the project must meet the requirements of the County's Stream Buffer Ordinance, which has been adopted as one of the stormwater ordinances required under the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District's District-wide Watershed Management Plan. Any work in the County buffers must meet ordinance requirements or a variance must be approved by the County.

For all state waters on the property, the State 25-foot erosion and sedimentation buffer is required. Any work in those buffers must conform to the state E & S requirements and must be approved by the appropriate agency.

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 proposed development, based on the submitted site plans. 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. Actual pollutant loadings will vary with the actual project design and the final amount of impervious surface. 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
Heavy Industrial	180.9	262.31	3480.52	23155.20	143815.50	300.29	37.99
TOTAL	180.9	262.31	3480.52	23155.20	143815.50	300.29	37.99

Total % impervious 80%

There is the potential for major impacts on project area streams from mass clearing and grading and increased impervious surface without proper stormwater management planning. A stormwater plan needs to be developed fully addressing how stormwater impacts will be controlled, including water quality, downstream channel protection and attenuation of peak flows to prevent downstream flooding. 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.

Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2035

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:

Henry County

Individual completing form:

Jeremy Gilbert, Planner I

Telephone:

770-288-7526

E-mail:

Jgilbert@co.henry.ga.us

*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:

King Mill - Lambert Development

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

33.40386 degrees North, 84.12461 degrees West Northwest quadrant of Kings Mill Road and Iris Lake R

Brief Description of Project:

A 180.9 +/-acre development containing two industrial distribution facilities. Rezoning from RA to M-2. Warehouse/Distribution

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☐ Hospitals and Health Care
Facilities☐ Post-Secondary Schools☐ Truck Stops☐ Housing☐ Waste Handling Facilities☐ Any other development types☒ Industrial☐ Quarries, Asphalt & Cement
Plants

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	3,048,300 SF
Developer:	The Alter Group
Mailing Address:	5 Concourse Parkway
Address 2:	Suite 1900
	City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30328
Telephone:	770-392-0092
Email:	rposey@Altergroup.com
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:	Lambert Family Investments
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
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: 2014 Overall project: 2014
Back to Top	

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2035**

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:	Henry County
Individual completing form:	Jeremy Gilbert, Planner I
Telephone:	770-288-7526
Email:	Jgilbert@co.henry.ga.us
Project Information	
Name of Proposed Project:	King Mill - Lambert Development
DRI ID Number:	2035
Developer/Applicant:	The Alter Group
Telephone:	770-392-0092
Email(s):	rposey@Altergroup.com
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:	105,000,000
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	900,000
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 type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc):	
Water Supply	
Name of water supply provider for this site:	The Henry County Water & Sewerage Authority
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.05
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:	The Henry County Water & Sewerage Authority
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.05
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 checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? 0.1 miles (500' extended from the site toward the south).	
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.)	6,362 Daily trips; 517 AM peak hour trips; 534 PM peak hour trips
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 checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe below: Please refer to the traffic study performed by Kimley-Horn and Associates.	
Solid Waste Disposal	

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	40 tons
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:	
<hr/> <hr/>	
Stormwater Management	
What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	approximately 70 percent
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Five detention areas are proposed on the site. All local and state-wide stormwater management best practice guidelines will be adhered to.	
<hr/> <hr/>	
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 checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input 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: The site is located in the Tussahaw Watershed District.	
<hr/> <hr/>	
Back to Top	

