



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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

DATE: Sep 4 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R909041

TO: Mayor Mickey Thompson
ATTN TO: Michelle Wright, Planning Dir.
FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature.
Original on file.

SUPPLEMENTAL MEETING SCHEDULED

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has received the following proposal and is initiating a regional review. During the initial preliminary review, several issues related to this development were found. In order to complete this review, a supplemental meeting has been scheduled.

Name of Proposal: Douglas Place

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Meeting Date: September 21, 2009

Time: 1:30pm

Location: Executive Conference Room at ARC

Description: The proposed Douglas Place is a mixed-use development on approximately 132 acres in the City of Douglasville. The proposed development is bordered by I-20 to the south, Bright Star Road to the west, and Bill Arp Road (SR 5) to the east. The proposed development consists of 1,011,730 square feet of retail space, 20,000 square feet of office space, 510 hotel rooms, 330 multifamily residential units, and a 775 seat theater.

Submitting Local Government: City of Douglasville

Date Opened: Sep 4 2009

Deadline for Comments: Sep 18 2009

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Oct 4 2009

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES ARE RECEIVING NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CITY OF DOUGLASVILLE

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DOUGLAS COUNTY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOLS

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3309.



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: Sep 4 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R909041

TO: Mayor Mickey Thompson
ATTN TO: Michelle Wright, Planning Dir.
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: Douglas Place

Submitting Local Government: City of Douglasville

Review Type: DRI

Date Opened: Sep 4 2009

Deadline for Comments: Sep 18 2009

Date to Close: Oct 4 2009

DRI Checklist Preliminary Summary:

Regional Policies and Adopted Plans: 61%

Project: 61%

Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality: 58%

Overall Score: 60.3%

Overall Weighted Score: 60%

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: Based on preliminary staff review and pending comments from affected parties, ARC staff's preliminary recommendation is Not in the Best Interest of the Region; and therefore, of the State. ARC staff would like to further discuss this preliminary finding and the issues identified below with the applicant and the City of Douglasville. ARC has several concerns that need to be addressed and resolved in order for a positive finding to be issued.

The interchange of I-20 and Bill Arp Road (SR 5), and its approaches, are currently operating at a low level of service. With the additional traffic generated by the proposed development, as well as the other growth in the area, the interchange capacity will need to be expanded. At this time, there is a transportation project in the ARC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identified as long range, (AR-H-201), which the traffic study prepared for this DRI states could include the expansion of the I-20 and Bill Arp Road interchange. AR-H-201 will not be completed by the time the proposed development is scheduled to open. As such the operations of SR 5 (Bill Arp Road) and I-20 will be seriously degraded by the additional traffic added by the proposed development. ARC would like clarification from the City of Douglasville and Douglas County as to the status of AR-H-201 and identified funding sources.

The proposed development is located in an area categorized as suburban neighborhood on the Atlanta Region Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM). Suburban neighborhoods are areas that are located outside the Central City or Activity Centers that will develop at a more suburban scale with appropriate commercial development and low-intensity mixed use serving the local area. Development types recommended include general commercial and residential uses. The proposed development is located just outside the Arbor Place Mall Activity Center and the City of Douglasville Town Center. The area immediately surrounding the proposed development contains a high concentration of retail. ARC strongly suggests that the developer and the City take a closer look at the local and regional retail market to determine if the amount of retail proposed is appropriate.

ARC staff would like the City to clarify its intentions for the Bright Star Connector and how it relates to this proposed development and surrounding properties. Does the city see this roadway as an alternative route to I-20 and thus expect it to carry high volumes of traffic? What will be the speed limit and what are the estimated volumes? Does the design include a pedestrian zone with sidewalks, planting strip or buffer, pedestrian amenities and bike lanes?

Internal to the site, ARC would like the developer to consider expanding on the good qualities present in portions of the proposed development. Street H runs the length of the site and is proposed to have access to the external network via a signalized intersection. This street should be treated more as a main street much like Street K with retail, office, residential, hotel, etc fronting the street and creating a pedestrian friendly walkable environment. Curb cuts and driveways along Street H should be closed to improve both mobility and access. Street H should also stub out to the property to the west of the proposed development. Other connections to be considered include Street B being extended to the north paralleling the proposed New Road and connecting to Wood Road as well as Streets J and K connecting to the west. These street connections are important in that they provided alternative routes to the new Bright Star Connector and I-20.

The developer should provide access to parcels P and N to relieve pressure on Bill Arp Road (SR 5). This can be done through rear access driveways or alleys.

The developer should also plan for infill and redevelopment in the future by placing utilities in proposed street right-of-ways rather than cutting them across parking lots. The proposed development's various streets and driveways create an unconventional set of blocks and the utilities should follow the same pattern.

There is a gas easement running the length of the development from east to west. A bike path or multi-use trail should be added along this easement to create an alternative route for bicyclist and pedestrians to access the site and adjacent properties. The path should connect to adjacent properties to encourage further expansion in the future.

The proposed development has limited active or passive greenspace. The site plan states that 15% of the site is provided as greenspace with the majority of this being found in a retention pond and along the gas easement. Additional greenspace should be added in the form of useable parks and natural areas for use by residents and visitors to the site.

The property is located in the Chattahoochee River watershed but is not in the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor. It is also in the Anneewakee Creek watershed, which was formerly considered a potential water supply source for Douglas County and the City of Douglasville. It is no longer considered a potential water source and is not listed in the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District's May, 2009 Water Supply and Water Conservation Management Plan. Therefore, the watershed and the project are not subject to the State of Georgia's Part 5 Environmental Planning Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds. It will be subject to any watershed protection criteria adopted by the City, however. The USGS coverage for the project area shows two streams at the center of the property. These streams, as well as any unmapped streams that may exist on the site will be subject to the City of Douglasville's stream buffer ordinance requirements. All waters of the state on the property will be subject to the Georgia 25-foot erosion and sedimentation control buffer.

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 DOUGLASVILLE

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DOUGLAS COUNTY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOLS

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: **Douglas Place** *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 18 2009*

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Sep 4 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R909041

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

FROM: Jon Tuley, Extension: 3-3309

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Land Use: Lombard, Jared

Transportation: Kray, Michael

Environmental: Santo, Jim

Research: Skinner, Jim

Aging: Lawler, Kathryn

Name of Proposal: Douglas Place

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: The proposed Douglas Place is a mixed-use development on approximately 132 acres in the City of Douglasville. The proposed development is bordered by I-20 to the south, Bright Star Road to the west, and Bill Arp Road (SR 5) to the east. The proposed development consists of 1,011,730 square feet of retail space, 20,000 square feet of office space, 510 hotel rooms, 330 multifamily residential units, and a 775 seat theater.

Submitting Local Government: City of Douglasville

Date Opened: Sep 4 2009

Deadline for Comments: Sep 18 2009

Date to Close: Oct 4 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:		Douglas Place	
DRI number:		1977	
Local jurisdiction:		City of Douglasville	
Local government action requested:		Development Plan Approval	
Project description (include acreage):		The proposed Douglas Place is a mixed-use development on approximately 132.34 acres, bordered by I-20 to the south, Bright Star Road to the west, and Bill Arp Road (SR 5) to the east. The proposed development consists of 1,011,730 square feet of retail space, 20,000 square feet of office space, 510 hotel rooms, 330 multifamily residential units, and a 775 seat theater.	
Project phasing/buildout:		Year 2014	
Project location:		Northwest of the I-20/Bill Arp Road (SR 5) Interchange	
Current description of the site:		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):		Douglas County	
Adjacent/surrounding land uses and development:		Commercial and residential	
Estimated value at build-out:		Information not submitted for the review	
Expected annual local tax revenues:		Information not submitted for the review	
Site access roads:		Bill Arp Road (SR 5), Bright Star Road, and Bright Star Road Connector	
Number of site driveways proposed:		(1) on Bill Arp Road; (1) service vehicles drive on Bright Star Road; (4) full access driveways on Bright Star Road Connector; (2) T-driveways on Bright Star Road Connector	
Total traffic volume to be generated by the proposed development:		43,795 per day	
Estimated water supply demand to be generated by project:		377,414 gpd	
Sufficient water capacity available:		Yes	
Estimated sewage flow to be generated by project:		272,544 gpd	
Sufficient wastewater capacity available:		Yes	
Estimated solid waste generated by the project annually:		1,9797 tons per year	
Sufficient landfill capacity available:		Yes	
Number of students expected to be generated by the project:		122	
Schools expected students to attend and capacity:			
School 1:	Bright Star E.S.: 66	Capacity:	420
School 2:	Chestnut Log M.S.: 33	Capacity:	650
School 3:	Douglas Co. H.S.: 33	Capacity:	1600

	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		1	The proposed development is located within the Suburban Neighborhood designation on the UGPM and is just outside the Town Center designation for Douglasville. The UGPM defines Suburban Neighborhoods as areas that are located outside the Central City or Activity Centers. They will be developed at a more of a suburban scale with appropriate commercial development and low intensity mixed-use serving the local area . The proposed development is located in an area of Douglasville that already has a heavy concentration of retail and commercial uses.
B. Is the development consistent with the Regional Development Plan Policies? • 3 points: Yes		1	Yes
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	Yes
B. Is there adequate sewer capacity available and accessible to the site? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	3	Yes
C. Does the development incorporate stormwater best management practices from the State of Georgia Manual? • 3 points: Yes	N/A	0	Information not submitted for the review
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	I-20 and Bill Arp Road (SR 5)
4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)			
A. Are the transportation impacts identified consistent with the TIP/RTP? • 3 points: Yes		0	No. New interchange needed at Bill Arp Road (SR 5) and I-20. Project is long range in the RTP with no dedicated funding.
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	Not in an LCI Area

	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	Douglas County Comprehensive Transportation Plan
B. Is the development consistent with the recommendations set forth in any sub-area or multi-modal corridor study? • 3 points: Yes		N/A	Not Applicable.
C. Is the proposed development consistent with the Atlanta Regional Freight Mobility Plan? • 3 points: Yes		3	Yes.
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 Douglasville has the property zoned GC and the mixed-use development fits within this category.
B. Is the development consistent with the local government's transportation plans? • 3 points: Yes		0	ARC needs clarification on the status of the I-20 interchange improvements and their consistency with Douglasville and Douglas County transportation plans.
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	Douglas County also has the Douglas Place property identified for commercial use.
E. Do local regulations impact the ability of the project to meet GRTA's DRI Review Criteria?		N/A	There are no City of Douglasville 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	The development is consistent with the Future Land Use Plan.
Possible Score (Standard is 42)	N/A	33	
Components Score	N/A	20	
Percentage	N/A	61%	

	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	3	Yes. Office, retail, and residential
<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	Two vertically mixed uses. Retail/office is on the first floor and residential is on the second floor.
<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	1	Hunter Memorial Park is 1/2 mile from the development. A gas easement runs the length of the development and will provide linear greenspace. The developer should introduce additional greenspace to the development. The developer should also investigate adding a dedicated multi-use trail along the gas easement and provide connections to adjacent property to provide bicyclist and pedestrians a different route than using the new Bright Star Connector.
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	2	The development is within 1.5 miles of the downtown employment area of the City of Douglasville and Arbor Place Mall.
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	0	All units are condominiums assumed to be for sale units
<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	Yes. Existing residential units in the area are apartments to the northeast and single family detached units on estate lots.
<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	Not Applicable

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
D. For developments with a multifamily senior rental component, does the seniors component achieve certain affordability levels? • 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	Not Applicable.
E. For developments with a homeownership component, does the development achieve certain affordability levels? • 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	No. Information not submitted for the review.
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? • 3 points: Yes.	N/A	N/A	Not applicable.
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? • 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	Not Applicable.
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). • 3 points: Yes	N/A	N/A	Not Applicable.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
B. Project			
5. Accessibility - Non-motorized			
<p>A. Are there sidewalks within the development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		2	There are sidewalks on the both sides of most internal streets. Streets B, C, D, E, F and H should include sidewalks on both sides of the street,
<p>B. Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes 		3	There are external sidewalks on Bright Star Road Connector and Bill Arp Road (SR 5) that connect to the internal sidewalks.
<p>C. Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential, multi-family buildings and other key destinations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes and includes 'end of trip' facilities such as covered shelters, secure parking, shower facilities, etc. • 2 points: Yes. 		2	Yes, bike racks will be provided.
<p>D. Does the development include construction of multi-use trails?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 		0	No. The developer should investigate the opportunity to construct a multi-use trail along the gas easement.
<p>E. Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and pedestrian actuation devices?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	Two of the above are included with marked crosswalks and multi-way stops to control vehicular traffic. Not all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety though most at least have 1 crosswalk. All intersections should have crosswalks and be ADA compliant.
<p>F. Are pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network provided?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network
<p>G. Do the provided non-motorized facilities shorten the distance between land uses that are on and off-site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points: Yes, both on and off site. • 2 points: Yes, for on site land uses only. 		3	Yes for both on-site and off-site land uses.

	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.		1	Yes, in the internal town center area public streetscape and pedestrian amenities are provided. There is additional opportunity for the developer to add sidewalks and pedestrian amenities throughout the site.
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.		1	Several of the parking lots are located behind proposed buildings or in garages. But much of the parking is located in large conventional lots. The developer should revisit the design and layout some of the buildings to break up the large parking lots and locate them behind buildings. The developer should also take advantage of many of the streets within the development to create onstreet parking in order to break up the large lots.
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.		1	Most of the builindgs along Bright Star Connector face the street, but most of the buildings within the development site behind or are surrounded by large parking lots. The developer should revisit the site plan and utilize Street H as a second "Main Street" within the development to which buildings can then be oriented.
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	0	Information regarding sidewalk width was not submitted for the review. All sidewalks should be at least 5 ft wide and multi-use trails 10 ft wide.
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	Not Applicable.
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	Not Applicable.
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	Not Applicable.
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	Not Applicable.

	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	Not Applicable.
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	Not Applicable.
G. Is transit available beyond peak-hours of travel?		N/A	Not Applicable.
H. Is the proposed development consistent with other transit related issues not fully addressed above?		N/A	Not Applicable.
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.		3	Shared driveways are proposed with an internal roadway.
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	The development proposes primary access from the lowest functionally classified roadway.
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.		3	All access points align with existing median breaks.
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	Yes. The developer may want to consider providing a traffic light at the intersection of Gurley Road and Bright Star Connector. If a light is added to the Gurley/Bright Star Connector intersection, then the light at the intersection of Bright Star Connector and the new proposed road may not be necessary
E. Does the proposed development provide an adequate, uninterrupted driveway throat length for the corridor? • 3 points: Yes.		3	Two of the driveways have access within 200' to parking lots. These driveways are median divided and the access to parking is right-in/right-out only.
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	Not Applicable.
H. Do the proposed access points meet minimum spacing requirements established by GDOT or other permitting agency?		N/A	The access points, already permitted, on Bright Star Road Connector meet the City of Douglasville's requirements for spacing.
I. Is the development consistent with other access management related issues not fully addressed above?		N/A	No other access management issues.
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	There are separate ingress/egress to the north, east, and west. I-20 is to the south.
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	The development will construct a roadway to the north to connect with Gurley Road and Bill Arp Road (SR 5). There is the potential for the development to connect to the property to the west using Streets H, J, and K. If parcels B1-2 and C1-2 are owned by the developer, then there is the potential for an additional connection to the north by extending Street B.
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	All proposed land uses within the development are connected via the internal street network.
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	No restricted access.
E. Is the development consistent with other connectivity related issues not fully addressed above? • 3 points: Yes		N/A	No other connectivity related issues.

	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	Not Applicable.
<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	Not Applicable.
<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	1	Yes on-site streets and sidewalks are open to the public. No parks or plazas are located within the development.
<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	0	<p>Required: 6468 Provided: 6699 (231 additional Spaces)</p> <p>The developer should consider eliminating some parking from the large lots and adding additional parking along the internal street network.</p>
<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	<p>Some of the development includes 4 alternative design principals: minimum setbacks, shared driveways, architectural compatibility, and screening of equipment.</p> <p>However, the power center and some of the retail does not incorporate any of the design principles mentioned above.</p> <p>The developer should revisist the design of the power center and some of the outparcels. Many of these buildings could be reoriented to front Street H and create an additioanl walkable mixed-use street.</p>

	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 facilities are not 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	0	The interchange at Bill Arp Road (SR 5) and I-20 will need to be expanded to handle the additional traffic created by this development as well as future growth in the area. There is a long range project in the RTP that will not be constructed by the time this development is complete.
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	Not Applicable.
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	Not Applicable.
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	Not Applicable.
E. Is the development consistent with other infrastructure related issues not fully addressed above? • 3 points: Yes		N/A	No other infrastructure issues.
Possible Score	N/A	99	
Component Score	N/A	60	
Percentage	N/A	61%	

	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	The development does not contain critical historic areas and avoids critical environmental areas.
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	No.
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	2	The majority of the development is on physically suitable land and is implementing best practice techniques for mitigation measures.
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	0	The site plan indicates that 15% of the overall site is provided as greenspace. The developer should provide additional usable and passive greenspace on site.
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 developer has indicated that all proposed landscaping is drought tolerant and native. In order to receive points, ARC needs a letter outlining 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	None indicated on the site plan.
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	No. The developer should seek to install permeable pavement in some of the large surface lots within the site.

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
C. Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality			
3. Stormwater Management			
<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	Information not submitted for the review. To receive points, ARC needs documentation of the stormwater plans for this site.
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	3	The development does require a stream buffer variance.
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	Not Applicable.
<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	Not Applicable.
Possible Score	N/A	24	
Component Score	N/A	14	
Percentage	N/A	58%	

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:	2
2. Metro North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) Plan Compliance	Section Score:	6
3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Transportation	Section Score:	3
4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	Section Score:	0
5. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)	Section Score:	0
6. Regionally Adopted Plans	Section Score:	3
7. Locally Adopted Plans	Section Score:	6
	A. Component Points:	20
	B. Points Possible Points:	33
	C. Component Percentage	61%

B. Project (30% of the Total Score)

1. Mixture of Uses	Section Score:	6
2. Jobs to Housing Balance	Section Score:	2
4. Housing Diversity and Affordability	Section Score:	3
5. Aging in Place	Section Score:	0
6. Accessibility-non motorized	Section Score:	16
7. Accessibility- transit	Section Score:	0
8. Access Management	Section Score:	17
9. Connectivity	Section Score:	9
10. Project Character and Design	Section Score:	4
11. Community Facilities	Section Score:	3
12. Infrastructure Adequacy	Section Score:	0
	A. Component Points:	60
	B. Points Possible Points:	99
	C. Component Percentage	61%

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

1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas	Section Score:	8
2. Conservation	Section Score:	3
3. Stormwater Management	Section Score:	0
4. Buffers	Section Score:	3
5. Environmental Protection	Section Score:	0
	A. Component Points:	14
	B. Points Possible Points:	24
	C. Component Percentage	58%

A. Total Points:	94
B. Total Possible Points:	156
C. Unweighted Score	60.3%

**Overall Project
Score**

60%



MEMORANDUM

TO: Jon Tuley, Land Use Division

FROM: Lyubov Zuyeva, Transportation Planning Division

DATE: September 1, 2009

SUBJECT: **TPD Review of DRI # 1977**
Project: Douglas Place
County: Douglas
Location: At the NW corner of the intersection of I-20 and Georgia Highway (SR 5)
Analysis:
Expedited ☐
Non-Expedited ☒

cc: Michael Kray

The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the traffic study performed by Croy Engineering 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 132.34 acre mixed-use development is projected to house 330 residential units, 955,730 square feet (SF) of retail, 20,000 SF of office, 54,800 SF of restaurant space, 775 theater spaces, 510 hotel rooms, and a 1,200 SF gas station and retail unit.

INFRASTRUCTURE **Transportation**

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

Site access to previously existing low-density commercial developments was provided by Dogwood Hills Dr. Dogwood Hills Drive is in the process of being replaced with a new public road, Bright Star Connector, funded with local SPLOST. Bright Star Connector will provide access to the west (onto Bright Star Road) and to the east (onto SR 5). In addition, a driveway in

continuation of Concourse Parkway and two points of access to the north (“New Road” and Gurley Road) will serve to access the development; all three of those roadways connect to SR 5.

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

Croy Engineering performed the transportation analysis and used 2% growth rate through the year 2014 (expected build-out) to project background traffic. ARC review staff agreed with the methodology and assumptions used in the analysis, with the exceptions specified below. The net trip generation is based on the rates published in the 8th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report.

Land Use	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			Saturday Peak			Daily
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	
Residential (330 dwelling units)	23	111	134	107	53	160	75	64	139	1818
Mixed-use reduction	--	--		28	15	43	42	51	93	
Restaurant	0	0	0	361	251	612	409	362	771	6,968
Mixed-use reduction	--	--	--	60	42	102	21	22	43	
Pass-by reduction	--	--	--	135	94	229	175	153	328	
Theater	NR	NR	NR	22	40	62	30	28	58	NR
Retail/Commercial	356	228	584	1414	1472	1886	1933	1784	3717	29,455
Mixed-use Reduction	--	--	--	43	43	86	56	43	99	
Pass-by	--	--	--	274	286	560	375	348	723	
Office	46	6	52	17	84	101	5	5	10	386
Mixed-use Reduction				5	21	26	3	1	4	
Hotel	188	120	308	159	141	300	195	153	348	4,191
Gas/Retail	49	47	96	58	58	116	NR	NR	NR	977
<i>Total Reductions</i>				<i>545</i>	<i>501</i>	<i>1046</i>	<i>672</i>	<i>618</i>	<i>1290</i>	
<i>Percent Reductions out of Total Trips</i>	--	--	--	<i>25.3</i>	<i>23.9</i>	<i>24.6</i>	<i>25.4</i>	<i>25.8</i>	<i>25.6</i>	
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	662	512	1174	1592	1598	3190	1975	1778	3753	43,795

The ARC staff does not agree with the following aspects of the trip generation rates presented above:

- 37.4% reduction for restaurant P.M. peak hour trips seems unreasonably high
- 19.4% reduction for pass-by trips to and from retail/commercial destinations during P.M. peak hour appears very high, given that the SR 5 corridor currently has much fewer commercial and entertainment options than it will with the addition of the Douglas Place development

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
DO-286	Bill Arp Rd (SR 5) and Rose Avenue Interchange Realignment, lane additions, signalization	Interchange Improvement	2010
AR-616	Bright Star Road Park and Ride Facility for Xpress bus	Transit Facility	2010

Envision6 RTP (Long Range Projects)*

ARC Number	<u>Route</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
AR-H-201	Addition of HOV lanes on I-20, both directions, btw SR6 and Bright Star Road	Capacity	2020
DO-282a	Grade separation of SR 92 on new alignment via an underpass at US 78 (Broad Street) and NS Rail Line	Realignment/ Underpass	2020
DO-282b	SR 92 (Fairburn Road) realignment and widening phase II, south of Hospital Drive to US 78 (Broad Street)	Realignment and Widening	2020
DO-282c	US 78 (Broad Street) to SR 92 (Dallas Highway), phase III	Realignment and Widening	2020

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

Douglas County Comprehensive Transportation Plan

<u>Project Description</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
SR 5 (Bill Arp Rd) at Bright Star Road: intersection improvement	Interchange Improvement	unknown
Hwy 5 Signal Timing Upgrades	Signal Timing Upgrades	unknown

Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for Douglas Place.

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of build out year 2014 **background** traffic. The proposed development will create further pressure on the roadway system. The transportation consultant has made the following recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service (in addition to projects currently in the 2008-2013 TIP list), apart from the improvements already covered by existing TIP, RTP and local SPLOST projects:

Bill Arp Rd and I-20 interchange (those improvements could potentially be done as part of AR-H-201 HOV lanes project scheduled for completion by 2020)

- Bill Arp Rd (SR 5) at Concourse Pkwy: additional through lanes and second northbound left turn lane
- Bill Arp Rd (SR 5) at I-20 WB Ramp: additional through lanes, second northbound left turn lane, and off-ramp dual left turn lanes
- Bill Arp Rd (SR 5) at I-20 EB Ramp: additional through lanes, second southbound left turn lane, and off-ramp dual left turn lanes

Bill Arp Rd and Douglas Blvd

- Dual left turn lane

Bright Star Rd at John West Rd

- Signalization or roundabout

Bankhead Hwy US 78 at John West Rd

- Signalization

Chapel Hill Rd at I-20 WB Off ramp

- Signalization

Cowan Mill Rd at Bright Star Rd

- Signalization or roundabout

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?

Currently, the immediate vicinity of the site area is not serviced by local transit. However, GRTA Xpress facility that will be located south of I-20 will be within ½ mile. If sidewalk connections were available along Bright Star Road, a walking connection could be made from the Xpress bus to the future development.

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

Preferential parking (in closer proximity) for carpools. This is a very limited TDM strategy and will likely have few results

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 Croy Engineering 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. Several suggested improvements might receive funding through the HOV lane addition on I-20; the scope of the I-20 HOV lanes (AR-H-201) should be verified to see how much will be actually covered through the project. The developer might need to be

held responsible for the Bill Arp Road (SR 5) at Concourse Parkway interchange (additional through lanes and second northbound left turn lane), unless it is demonstrated that this interchange is covered under the HOV lanes project. This will be one of the five access points to the development.

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

- Connection to residential development to the NE
 - While the residential development is a separate and gated development, reasonable non-motorized access accommodations should be provided. The sidewalk on both sides of the road should be extended from Bright Star connector along Gurley Road, up to Wood Road. This would give the residential development an opportunity to create a pedestrian stub-out to the sidewalk as new residences are added.
- The driveway extension of Concourse Parkway is currently not treated as a street.
 - The ARC recommends that this driveway be visually treated as a street, in that it should be retrofitted with sidewalks on both sides (instead of just one). Buildings located along this driveway and illustrated as facing the parking lot on the plan should be re-oriented to face the driveway instead.
- Potential bike rack locations
 - The location of bike racks should be confirmed. New bike parking locations should be added to reasonably serve each large building within the development. Specifically, Anchor A, Anchor B, Major 7, Anchor D, Hotel 3 and Hotel 1 should probably have bike parking installed
- Bicycle-supportive infrastructure on the surrounding street network
 - Bike shoulder should be added along Bright Star connector, Bright Star Road (especially south to Douglas Boulevard), Concourse Parkway driveway, Gurley Road and Georgia Highway 5, to coincide with other roadway work being done on those facilities
- The development mentions the presence of the future Douglas Boulevard Park and Ride lot as a possible source of trips reduction. However, no sidewalk connection currently exists along Bright Star Road to connect the proposed development with the Park and Ride lot.
 - The ARC recommends that a sidewalk be added along Bright Star Road, south of Bright Star Connector to Douglas Boulevard. The responsibility for the costs should be negotiated by the developer and Douglas County.

HIGHWAY 5 - I-20 CONROY COMMERCIAL DRI
City of Douglasville
Environmental Planning Division Review Comments
August 31, 2009

Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The property is located in the Chattahoochee River watershed but is not in the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor. It is also in the Anneewakee Creek watershed, which was formerly considered a potential water supply source for Douglas County and the City of Douglasville. It is no longer considered a potential water source and is not listed in the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District's May, 2009 Water Supply and Water Conservation Management Plan. Therefore, the watershed and the project are not subject to the State of Georgia's Part 5 Environmental Planning Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds. It will be subject to any watershed protection criteria adopted by the City, however. The USGS coverage for the project area shows two streams at the center of the property. These streams, as well as any unmapped streams that may exist on the site will be subject to the City of Douglasville's stream buffer ordinance requirements.

All waters of the state on the property will be subject to the Georgia 25-foot erosion and sedimentation control buffer.

Storm Water/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants produced after the construction of the entire proposed development, based on the submitted site 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 based on actual use and the amount of impervious surface in the final project design. 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
Commercial	44.27	75.70	770.30	4781.16	43517.41	54.45	9.74
TOTAL	44.27	75.70	770.30	4781.16	43517.41	54.45	9.74

Total Percent Impervious: 85%

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. 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 #1977**

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:	Douglasville
Individual completing form:	Michelle Wright, Planning Director
Telephone:	(770) 920-3000
E-mail:	wrightm@ci.douglasville.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:	Douglas Place
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):	Land Lots 159,160, 161 & 162, 2nd District, 5th Section City of Douglasville, Douglas County, GA
Brief Description of Project:	Mixed-use Development

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.):		Anchor Retail: 506,000 sf; Major Retail 325,570 sf; In-Line Retail: 155,570 sf; Convenience Retail:
Developer:		Douglas Place Enterprise I LLC
Mailing Address:		33 Miller Street
Address 2:		
		City:Fairfield State: CT Zip:06824
Telephone:		(203) 319-7373
Email:		moconnor@conroydevelopment.com
Is property owner different from developer/applicant?		<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, property owner:		
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 type="checkbox"/> Rezoning <input type="checkbox"/> Variance <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input checked="" 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: 2015 Overall project: 2015
Back to Top		

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #1977**

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:	Douglasville
Individual completing form:	Michelle Wright, Planning Director
Telephone:	(770) 920-3000
Email:	wrightm@ci.douglasville.ga.us
Project Information	
Name of Proposed Project:	Douglas Place
DRI ID Number:	1977
Developer/Applicant:	Douglas Place Enterprise I LLC
Telephone:	(203) 319-7373
Email(s):	moconnor@conroydevelopment.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:	To Be Determined
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	To Be Determined
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:	Douglasville/Douglas County Water and Sewer Authority
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.377
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:	Douglasville/Douglas County Water and Sewer Authority
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.272
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.)	AM: 1,174 PM: 3,190 Sat: 3,753
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: Bright Star Road/Bright Star Road Connector: SB left turn lane; NB right turn lane; traffic signal Bright Star Road and John West Road: traffic signal or roundabout Improvements to Bill Arp Road (SR 5)/I-20 interchange and approaches identified in GDOT Project No. MSL-0003-00(165)	

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1,797
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?	70% to 75%
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: The site is being designed to provide detention to reduce post development runoff to be below pre-development levels. Retention and bio-retention will be provided at double the required rate to mitigate impacts.	

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 checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input 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: Wetlands mitigation is being performed off-site.	

[Back to Top](#)

TABULATIONS

POWER CENTER

SITE ACREAGE	+/- 44.27 AC
ANCHOR A:	140,000 SF
ANCHOR B:	174,000 SF
MAJOR 1:	16,500 SF
MAJOR 2:	30,000 SF
MAJOR 3:	26,250 SF
MAJOR 4:	13,000 SF
MAJOR 5:	22,750 SF
MAJOR 6:	41,100 SF
TOTAL:	463,600 SF

PARKING REQUIRED:
RETAIL @ 4.75 CARS/1000 SF: 2,203 CARS

PARKING PROVIDED: 2,273 CARS⁽¹⁾

LIFESTYLE CENTER

SITE ACREAGE:	+/- 42.92 AC
ANCHOR C (2 LEVELS):	112,000 SF
ANCHOR D (2 LEVELS):	80,000 SF
THEATER (775 SEATS):	30,000 SF
MAJOR 7:	20,400 SF
MAJOR 8 (BOOKS 2 LEVELS):	30,000 SF
IN-LINE RETAIL:	155,570 SF ⁽²⁾
RESTAURANT 4:	6,850 SF
RESTAURANT 5:	8,000 SF
RESTAURANT 6:	7,000 SF
RESTAURANT 7:	9,350 SF
TOTAL:	459,170 SF

HOTEL #3 (5 LEVELS ABOVE RETAIL): 120 ROOMS
RESIDENTIAL (3 LEVELS ABOVE IN-LINE RETAIL): 150 UNITS

PARKING REQUIRED	
RETAIL & RESTAURANTS @ 4.5 CARS/1000 SF:	1,932 CARS
THEATER @ 1 CAR/4 SEATS:	194 CARS
HOTEL #3 @ 1 PER ROOM + 1 PER EMP:	130 CARS
RESIDENTIAL @ 1.5 CARS/UNIT:	225 CARS
TOTAL:	2,481 CARS

PARKING PROVIDED
GRADE (EXCLUDES PARKING AT GRADE UNDER DECKS): 2,101 CARS⁽¹⁾
SUPPORTED PARKING (INCLUDES GRADE LEVEL): 463 CARS⁽¹⁾
TOTAL: 2,564 CARS⁽¹⁾

MULTI-USE

SITE ACREAGE:	+/- 34.80 AC
CONVENIENCE RETAIL:	94,160 SF ⁽³⁾
RESTAURANT 1:	7,750 SF
RESTAURANT 2:	8,850 SF
RESTAURANT 3:	7,000 SF
GAS / RETAIL:	1,200 SF
TOTAL:	118,960 SF

HOTEL #1 (10 STORIES): 250 ROOMS
CONFERENCE CENTER: 20,000 SF

HOTEL #2 (5 STORIES): 140 ROOMS

RESIDENTIAL (3 LEVELS ABOVE CONV. RETAIL): 180 UNITS

PROFESSIONAL OFFICE: 20,000 SF

PARKING REQUIRED	
CONVENIENCE RETAIL / GAS @ 4.5 CARS/1000 SF:	430 CARS
RESTAURANTS @ 15 CARS/1000 SF:	354 CARS
RESIDENTIAL @ 1.5 CARS/UNIT:	270 CARS
HOTEL #1 @ 1 PER ROOM + 1 PER EMP:	275 CARS
CONFERENCE CENTER @ 10/1000 SF:	200 CARS
HOTEL #2 @ 1 PER ROOM + 1 PER EMP:	155 CARS
PROFESSIONAL OFFICE @ 5 CARS/1000 SF:	100 CARS
TOTAL:	1,784 CARS

PARKING PROVIDED
GRADE (EXCLUDES PARKING AT GRADE UNDER DECKS): 892 CARS⁽¹⁾
SUPPORTED PARKING (INCLUDES GRADE LEVEL): 970 CARS⁽¹⁾
TOTAL: 1,862 CARS⁽¹⁾

(1) PARKING PROVIDED TOTALS AS INDICATED ARE PRELIMINARY AND ARE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL LOSSES TO COMPENSATE FOR ANY A.D.A. LANDSCAPING, OR PARKING DECK STRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS THAT MAY BE DEEMED NECESSARY.

(2) LIFESTYLE CENTER IN-LINE RETAIL TOTAL INDICATED IN THIS TABULATION ACCOUNTS FOR A 6% DEDUCT TO COVER POTENTIAL FUTURE LOSSES OF GLA WHEN ACCOMMODATING B.O.H., SERVICE CORRIDORS, UTILITY CHASES, AND EGRESS FOR ANY ASSOCIATED USES LOCATED ABOVE THE IN-LINE RETAIL. THE ACTUAL GROSS BUILDING AREA (GBA) TOTAL FOR THE LIFESTYLE CENTER IN-LINE RETAIL IS 165,500 SF.

(3) MULTI-USE CONVENIENCE RETAIL TOTAL INDICATED IN THIS TABULATION ACCOUNTS FOR A 6% DEDUCT TO COVER POTENTIAL FUTURE LOSSES OF GLA WHEN ACCOMMODATING B.O.H., SERVICE CORRIDORS, UTILITY CHASES, AND EGRESS FOR ANY ASSOCIATED USES LOCATED ABOVE THE CONVENIENCE RETAIL. THE ACTUAL GROSS BUILDING AREA (GBA) TOTAL FOR THE MULTI-USE CONVENIENCE RETAIL IS 100,170 SF.

15% OF OVERALL SITE PROVIDED AS GREEN SPACE.

INDICATES POTENTIAL BIKE RACK LOCATIONS.



0' 100' 200' 400' 600'

SCALE: 1" = 200'-0"

