



# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTICE

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax: 404.463.3105 • [www.atlantaregional.com](http://www.atlantaregional.com)

DATE: Nov 9 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R910091

TO: Chairman John Eaves  
ATTN TO: Morgan Ellington, Fulton County  
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:** Elite Concrete

**Submitting Local Government:** Fulton County

**Review Type:** DRI

**Date Opened:** Nov 9 2009 **Deadline for Comments:** Nov 23 2009 **Date to Close:** Dec 9 2009

**DRI Checklist Preliminary Summary:**

Regional Policies and Adopted Plans: 90%

Project Score: 70%

Open Space, Preservation, and Environmental Quality Score: 57%

Overall Score: 73.8%

**Overall Weighted Score: 77%**

**PRELIMINARY COMMENTS:** None

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING  
ARC DATA RESEARCH  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
FULTON COUNTY  
CITY OF UNION CITY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING  
ARC AGING DIVISION  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CITY OF COLLEGE PARK

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
CITY OF EAST POINT

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please contact Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3309 or [jtuley@atlantaregional.com](mailto: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](http://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: **Elite Concrete** *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](mailto:jtuley@atlantaregional.com)

**Return Date: Nov 23 2009**

## ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Nov 9 2009

ARC REVIEW CODE: R910091

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

FROM: Jon Tuley, Extension: 3-3309

### Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Land Use: Calvert, Brad

Transportation: Zuyev, Luybov

Environmental: Santo, Jim

Research: Skinner, Jim

Aging: Rader, Carolyn

Name of Proposal: Elite Concrete

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: This project, located in south Fulton County, is a proposed concrete batch plant on 5 acres of land. The proposed project is located south of the intersection of Roosevelt Hwy (US 29) and Welcome All Rd.

Submitting Local Government: Fulton County

Date Opened: Nov 9 2009

Deadline for Comments: Nov 23 2009

Date to Close: Dec 9 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:		Elite Concrete	
DRI number:		2071	
Local jurisdiction:		Fulton County	
Local government action requested:		Rezoning	
Project description (include acreage):		This project, located in south Fulton County, is a proposed concrete batch plant on approximately 5 acres of land. The proposed project is located south of the intersection of Roosevelt Hwy (US 29) and Welcome All Rd.	
Project phasing/buildout:		2009	
Project location:		South Fulton County near the intersection of Roosevelt Hwy (US 29) and Welcome All Rd.	
Current description of the site:		Industrial use with several structures that will be used	
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 College Park, City of East Point, and City of Union City	
Adjacent/surrounding land uses and development:		Industrial, residential, undeveloped	
Value at buildout:		\$475,000	
New taxes generated by the project:		\$10,695	
Site access roads:		Stacks Road	
Number of site driveways proposed:		1	
Total traffic volume to be generated by the proposed development:		18 trips per day	
Estimated water supply demand to be generated by project:		0.015	
Sufficient water capacity available:		Yes	
Estimated sewage flow to be generated by project:		0.0001	
Sufficient wastewater capacity available:		Yes	
Estimated solid waste generated by the project annually:		2-3 tons per year	
Sufficient landfill capacity available:		Yes	
Number of students expected to be generated by the project:		N/A	
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
<b>A. Regional Plans and Policies</b>			
<b>1. Unified Growth Policy Map</b>			
A. Is the development consistent with the Unified Growth Policy Map and the Developments Type Matrix? • 3 points: Yes		3	Located in area designated suburban and freight area
B. Is the development consistent with the Regional Development Plan Policies? • 3 points: Yes		3	
<b>2. Metro North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) Plan Compliance</b>			
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	0	Information not submitted for the review
<b>3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Goals &amp; Objectives</b>			
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	Roosevelt Hwy (US 29)
<b>4. RTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</b>			
A. Are the transportation impacts identified consistent with the TIP/RTP? • 3 points: Yes		N/A	(List all TIP/RTP projects located within the surrounding network and identify any inconsistencies)
<b>5. Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)</b>			
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
<b>A. Regional Plans and Policies</b>			
<b>6. Regionally Adopted Plans</b>			
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	
<b>7. Locally Adopted Plans</b>			
A. Is the development consistent with the host local government's Future Development Map or other comparable document? • 3 points: Yes		3	
B. Is the development consistent with the local government's transportation plans? • 3 points: Yes		3	
C. Is the development consistent with any local government sub area plans? • 3 points: Yes		N/A	
D. Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map? • 3 points: Yes		3	Much of the area is planned as having industrial uses
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	
<b>Possible Score (Standard is 42)</b>	N/A	<b>30</b>	
<b>Components Score</b>	N/A	<b>27</b>	
<b>Percentage</b>	N/A	<b>90%</b>	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>B. Project</b>			
<b>1. Mixture of Uses</b>			
<p>A. Does the development incorporate a mixture of complementary land uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: There are 3 or more complementary uses within the development.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 1 points: The development is located within a short walking distance (less than 1/2 mile) to external complementary land uses.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	
<p>B. Does the development have vertically mixed uses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: The development contains three or more vertically mixed uses.</li> <li>• 2 point: The development contains two or more vertically mixed uses.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 3 points: The development contains both an active and passive greenspace.</li> <li>• 2 points: The development is adjacent to active or passive greenspace with connections.</li> <li>• 1 point: The development is within 1/2 mile of an active or passive greenspace.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	
<b>2. Jobs to Housing Balance</b>			
<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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes, the development is located within 1/2 mile of a defined metro job center.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes, the development is located within 1 mile of a defined metro job center.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	
<b>3. Housing Diversity and Affordability</b>			
<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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 3 points: At least 30% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income.</li> <li>• 2 points: At least 20% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income.</li> <li>• 1 points: At least 10% of the residential rental units provided are affordable to those making 80% or less of the area median income.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>B. Project</b>			
D. For developments with a multifamily senior rental component, does the seniors component achieve certain affordability levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: 100% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income.</li> <li>• 2 points: 60% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income.</li> <li>• 1 point: 40% of the residential senior units provided are affordable to those at 60% or below of the area median income.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	
E. For developments with a homeownership component, does the development achieve certain affordability levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: At least 20% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income.</li> <li>• 2 points: At least 10% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income.</li> <li>• 1 point: At least 5% of the for-sale units are affordable to those making 110% or less of area median income.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	
<b>4. Aging in Place</b>			
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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures and is located within 1/4 mile of basic services and transportation alternatives.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures and is located within 1/2 mile of basic services and transportation alternatives.</li> <li>• 1 point: Yes, the development includes accessibility measures.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	



	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>B. Project</b>			
<b>5. Accessibility - Non-motorized</b>			
<p>A. Are there sidewalks within the development?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: There are sidewalks on both sides of all streets.</li> <li>• 2 points: There are sidewalks on both sides of all internal collector streets and one side on all other streets .</li> <li>• 1 point: There are sidewalks on one side of all streets.</li> </ul>		N/A	
<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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes</li> </ul>		0	No sidewalks on adjacent streets
<p>C. Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential, multi-family buildings and other key destinations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: Yes and includes 'end of trip' facilities such as covered shelters, secure parking, shower facilities, etc.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes.</li> </ul>		N/A	
<p>D. Does the development include construction of multi-use trails?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 2 points: Trails at least 10 feet wide are constructed within the DRI boundary only.</li> </ul>		N/A	
<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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include all of the above listed.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include 3 of the above listed.</li> <li>• 1 point: Yes, all intersections are designed for pedestrian safety and include 2 of the above listed.</li> </ul>		N/A	
<p>F. Are pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network provided?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network and pedestrian entrances are provided at street level along abutting public roads.</li> <li>• 2 points: All building entrances are connected to the sidewalk network.</li> </ul>		0	
<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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes, both on and off site.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes, for on site land uses only.</li> </ul>		N/A	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>B. Project</b>			
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.		3	
J. Are buildings oriented to existing or proposed public roads with minimum setbacks? • 3 points: Yes, buildings are oriented to the public roads with minimum setbacks. • 2 points: Yes, buildings are oriented to the public roads.		N/A	
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)
<b>6. Accessibility - Transit</b>			
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>B. Project</b>			
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)
<b>7. Access Management</b>			
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.		N/A	
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.		N/A	
E. Does the proposed development provide an adequate, uninterrupted driveway throat length for the corridor? • 3 points: Yes.		3	(Minimum 200 feet on state routes and major arterials. Minimum of 100 feet on all other roadway corridors.)
F. Are all proposed access points outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections? • 3 points: All proposed access points are outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections. • 2 points: Access points within the functional area of any adjacent intersections are right in/right out.	N/A	3	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>B. Project</b>			
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)
<b>8. Connectivity</b>			
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.		N/A	
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).		N/A	
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.		N/A	
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>B. Project</b>			
<b>9. Project Character and Design</b>			
<p>A. Is the development a redevelopment site?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: The development is a redevelopment site that requires environmental remediation.</li> <li>• 2 points: The development is located in a tax abatement zone, enterprise zone, or other governmentally supported redevelopment zones.</li> <li>• 1 point: The development is a redevelopment site.</li> </ul>	N/A	1	
<p>B. Does the development re-use or rehabilitates existing and/or historic structures?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: Yes, a majority of the existing and/or historic structures will remain on the site and incorporated into the development.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes, some of the existing and/or historic structures will remain on the site and incorporated into the development.</li> </ul>	N/A	3	
<p>C. Does the development create or enhance community spaces such as public plazas, squares, parks, etc?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points: Yes and on-site community spaces are open to the general public.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes.</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• 3 points: A parking variance is being requested to provide less than the minimum required.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes.</li> </ul>	N/A	2	
<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"> <li>• 3 points: Yes, the development includes a 4 of the above listed and other alternative design principles.</li> <li>• 2 points: Yes, the development includes 3 of the above listed.</li> <li>• 1 point: Yes, the development includes 2 of the above listed.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>B. Project</b>			
<b>10. Community Facilities</b>			
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	
<b>11. Infrastructure Adequacy</b>			
A. Is the development located in an area where adequate infrastructure is in place? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located in an area where there is existing infrastructure in place to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development. • 2 points: There will be infrastructure in place by development build-out to meet the service needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the development.	N/A	3	(Please explain)
B. If the development is predominately industrial, what is the proximity to the nearest intermodal station or other freight transfer location? • 3 points: Rail is on site and the development is connecting to the rail. • 2 points: A rail transfer, airport transfer or intermodal transfer station is located within 2 miles. • 1 point: A rail transfer, airport transfer or intermodal transfer station is located within 3 miles.	N/A	N/A	
C. If the development is predominately industrial, what is the proximity to interstate access? • 3 points: The development has interstate access within 1 mile. • 2 points: The development has interstate access within 2 miles. • 1 points: The development has interstate access within 3 miles.	N/A	2	
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)
<b>Possible Score</b>	N/A	<b>33</b>	
<b>Component Score</b>	N/A	<b>23</b>	
<b>Percentage</b>	N/A	<b>70%</b>	

	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>C. Open Space and Preservation/ Environmental Quality</b>			
<b>1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas</b>			
A. Does the development avoid critical historical and environmental areas (State Planning Part V Criteria, small water supply watersheds, etc)? • 3 points: Yes, the development avoids critical historical and environmental areas	N/A	3	
B. Does the development encroach upon habitat currently under or flagged for conservation under a local, regional, state conservation or green infrastructure plan? • 3 points: No.	N/A	3	
C. Is the development located on land physically suitable for development (avoids steep slopes greater than 20%, floodplains, stream corridors, groundwater recharge areas or wetlands) ? • 3 points: Yes, the development is located on land physically suitable for development. • 2 points: The development is avoiding land on the site that is not suitable for development and is taking the appropriate mitigation measures.	N/A	3	
<b>2. Conservation</b>			
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	Information not submitted for the review
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	Information not submitted for the review
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	N/A	
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	



	GRTA Criteria	ARC Score	Comments
<b>C. Open Space and Preservation/ Environmental Quality</b>			
<b>3. Stormwater Management</b>			
A. Does the development have a stormwater management plan? • 3 points: The stormwater management plan will result in a 25% decrease in the rate and quantity of post-development development stormwater runoff when compared with pre-development stormwater rates and quantities. • 2 points: The development maintains stormwater volume rates such that post-development development does not exceed the pre-development development (based on the 2 year, 24 hour peak discharge volume)	N/A	0	Information not submitted for the review
<b>4. Buffers</b>			
A. Will the proposed development require a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances? • 3 points: The development does not require a stream buffer variance.	N/A	3	
<b>5. Environmental Protection</b>			
C. Is the development seeking a LEED certification? • 3 points: The development is seeking LEED-ND certification or all buildings are seeking LEED certification for non residential developments. • 2 points: At least half of the non-residential buildings are seeking LEED certification. • 1 point: One non residential buildings is seeking LEED certification.	N/A	N/A	
D. Is the development seeking an EarthCraft certification? • 3 points: The development is seeking Earthcraft Communities certification. • 2 points: At least half the residential homes will be certified an Earthcraft Home.	N/A	N/A	
<b>Possible Score</b>	N/A	21	
<b>Component Score</b>	N/A	12	
<b>Percentage</b>	N/A	57%	



# ARC Score Sheet

Enter the values for the appropriate numbered section.

## A. Regional Development Plans and Policies (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:	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:	9
	<b>A. Component Points:</b>	27
	<b>B. Points Possible Points:</b>	30
	<b>C. Component Percentage</b>	90%

## 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:	3
7. Accessibility- transit	Section Score:	0
8. Access Management	Section Score:	6
9. Connectivity	Section Score:	0
10. Project Character and Design	Section Score:	6
11. Community Facilities	Section Score:	3
12. Infrastructure Adequacy	Section Score:	5
	<b>A. Component Points:</b>	23
	<b>B. Points Possible Points:</b>	33
	<b>C. Component Percentage</b>	70%

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

1. Protection of Critical Environmental Areas	Section Score:	9
2. Conservation	Section Score:	0
3. Stormwater Management	Section Score:	0
4. Buffers	Section Score:	3
5. Environmental Protection	Section Score:	0
	<b>A. Component Points:</b>	12
	<b>B. Points Possible Points:</b>	21
	<b>C. Component Percentage</b>	57%

<b>A. Total Points:</b>	62
<b>B. Total Possible Points:</b>	84
<b>C. Unweighted Score</b>	73.8%

**Overall Project  
Score**

**77%**

**Baird Transport/Elite Concrete**

1553 Honey Hill Road  
P.O.Box 1696  
Hardeeville, South Carolina 29927  
Phone 843-784-2021 Fax 843-784-2022

---

Date: November 2, 2009  
Memo To: Julie McQueen  
From: Troy Baird  
Subject: *Request for Expedited Review due to the limited number of trips indicated below.*

Mrs. McQueen:

I am writing in response to your question regarding the estimated traffic impact to the area surrounding the proposed mobile concrete plant at Stacks Rd for Elite Concrete. As it stands, we anticipate our operations to begin with 5-6 trucks and (weather permitted) would expect each truck to run a maximum of 3 trips per day. In total I would not expect any more than 15-18 total trips per day.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Regards,



Troy Baird

# Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2071****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:

Fulton

Individual completing form:

Morgan Ellington

Telephone:

404-612-8049

E-mail:

Morgan.Ellington@fultoncountyga.gov

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

**Proposed Project Information**

Name of Proposed Project:

Elite Concrete

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

4140 Stacks Road, College, Park, GA 30349 LL 127, District 9F

Brief Description of Project:

Concrete Batch Plant on 5 acres of land

**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:

<hr/>	
Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	10,000 sf plus 600 sf outside mixing facility
Developer:	Monty Coursey representing Elite Concrete
Mailing Address:	7091 US Highway 84
Address 2:	
	City:Hinesville State: GA Zip:31313
Telephone:	770-560-0626
Email:	Monty@courseyproperties.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:	Community Bank and Trust
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: December 2009 Overall project: December 2009
<hr/>	
<a href="#">Back to Top</a>	

# Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2071**

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 <a href="#">Rules for the DRI Process</a> and the <a href="#">DRI Tiers and Thresholds</a> for more information.	
Local Government Information	
Submitting Local Government:	Fulton
Individual completing form:	Morgan Ellington
Telephone:	404-612-8049
Email:	Morgan.Ellington@fultoncountyga.gov
Project Information	
Name of Proposed Project:	Elite Concrete
DRI ID Number:	2071
Developer/Applicant:	Monty Coursey representing Elite Concrete
Telephone:	770-560-0626
Email(s):	Monty@courseyproperties.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:	\$475,000.00
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$10,695 (2009 property tax)
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):	
<b>Water Supply</b>	
Name of water supply provider for this site:	City of Atlanta
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.015
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?	
<b>Wastewater Disposal</b>	
Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	currently, site is on septic system
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.0001
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: The health department will evaluate the septic system at the time of application for a land disturbance permit.	
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?	
<b>Land Transportation</b>	
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.)	15-18 trips per day
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 type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe below:	

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	2-3 tons per year
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, please explain:	


### Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	10 percent per the applicant
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Perimeter buffers are required around the property.	

### Environmental Quality

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





**ITEM #1:** KEY AND/OR LEGEND AND SITE LOCATION MAP WITH NORTH ARROW.  
-SEE SHEET A1.0 AND 1/A1.0

**ITEM #2:** BOUNDARY SURVEY OF SUBJECT PROPERTY WHICH INCLUDES DIMENSIONS ALONG PROPERTY LINES THAT MATCH THE METES AND BOUNDS OF THE PROPERTY'S WRITTEN LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND CLEARLY INDICATES THE POINT OF BEGINNING.  
-SEE 1/A1.0

**ITEM #3:** ACREAGE OF SUBJECT PROPERTY.  
-SEE SITE DATA

**ITEM #4:** LOCATION OF LAND LOT LINES AND IDENTIFICATION OF LAND LOTS.  
-SEE 1/A1.0

**ITEM #5:** EXISTING, PROPOSED NEW DEDICATED AND FUTURE RESERVED RIGHT-OF-WAY OF ALL STREETS, ROADS, AND RAILROADS ADJACENT TO AND ON SUBJECT PROPERTY.  
-N/A

**ITEM #6:** PROPOSED STREETS ON THE SUBJECT SITE.  
-NO PROPOSED STREETS

**ITEM #7:** POSTED SPEED LIMITS ON ALL ADJOINING ROADS.  
-STAKES ROAD = 25 M.P.H., ROOSEVELT HIGHWAY = 45 M.P.H. (SEE 1/A1.0)

**ITEM #8:** CURRENT ZONING OF THE SUBJECT SITE AND ADJOINING PROPERTIES.  
-ZONING M-2 (SEE SITE DATA)

**ITEM #9:** EXISTING BUILDINGS WITH SQUARE FOOTAGES AND HEIGHTS (STORIES), WELLS, DRIVEWAYS, FENCES, CELL TOWERS, AND ANY OTHER STRUCTURES OR IMPROVEMENTS ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY  
-SEE 1/A1.0, BUILDING DATA

**ITEM #10:** EXISTING BUILDINGS WITH SQUARE FOOTAGES AND HEIGHTS (STORIES), WELLS, DRIVEWAYS, FENCES, CELL TOWERS, AND ANY OTHER STRUCTURES OR IMPROVEMENTS ON ADJACENT PROPERTIES WITHIN 400 FEET OF THE SUBJECT SITE BASED ON THE COUNTY'S AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY OR AN ACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTE AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR.  
-SEE 1/A1.0, BUILDING DATA, & 2/A1.0

**ITEM #11:** LOCATION OF PROPOSED BUILDINGS (EXCEPT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS) WITH TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE.  
-PROPOSED MOBILE CONCRETE PLANT (SEE 1/A1.0)

**ITEM #12:** LAYOUT AND MINIMUM LOT SIZE OF PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY LOTS.  
-NONE PROPOSED

**ITEM #13:** TOPOGRAPHY (SURVEY OR COUNTY) ON SUBJECT SITE AND ADJACENT PROPERTY WITHIN 200 FEET AS REQUIRED TO ACCESS RUNOFF EFFECTS; ONSITE AREAS WITH SLOPES GREATER THAN THIRTY-THREE PERCENT (33%) SHALL BE LABELED AND IDENTIFIED THROUGH CROSS-HATCHING AND/OR SEPARATE COLORS.  
-SEE 1/A1.0

**ITEM #14:** LOCATION OF MAJOR OVERHEAD AND UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL AND PATROLEUM TRANSMISSION/CONVEYANCE LINES.  
-NONE PRESENT ON SITE

**ITEM #15:** REQUIRED AND/OR PROPOSED SETBACKS.  
-NONE REQUIRED/PROPOSED

**ITEM #16:** 100 YEAR FLOOD PLAIN HORIZONTAL LIMITS AND FLOOD ZONE DESIGNATIONS AS SHOWN ON SURVEY OR FEMA FIRM MAPS.  
-SITE OUTSIDE OF 100 YEAR FLOOD PLAIN PER FULTON COUNTY GIS

**ITEM #17:** REQUIRED LANDSCAPE STRIPS, UNDISTURBED BUFFERS, AND ANY OTHER NATURAL AREAS AS REQUIRED OR PROPOSED.  
-20'-0" LANDSCAPE BUFFER (SEE 1/A1.0)

**ITEM #18:** REQUIRED AND PROPOSED PARKING SPACES; LOADING AND UNLOADING FACILITIES.  
-SEE 1/A1.0 FOR LOCATION AND COUNT OF PARKING SPACES. NO LOADING OR UNLOADING FACILITIES PROPOSED.

**ITEM #19:** LAKES, STREAMS, AND OTHER WATERS ON THE SITE AND ASSOCIATED BUFFERS.  
-NONE LOCATED ON SITE OR ASSOCIATED BUFFERS.

**ITEM #20:** PROPOSED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES.  
-NONE PROPOSED

**ITEM #21:** COMMUNITY WASTEWATER FACILITIES INCLUDING PRELIMINARY AREAS RESERVED FOR SEPTIC DRAIN FIELDS AND POINTS OF ACCESS.  
-NONE EXISTING/PROPOSED

**ITEM #22:** AVAILABILITY OF WATER SYSTEM AND SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM.  
-NONE EXISTING ON SITE OR REQUIRED

**ITEM #23:** TREE LINES, WOODLANDS, AND OPEN FIELDS ON SUBJECT SITE.  
-SEE 1/A1.0

**ITEM #24:** ENTRANCE SITE DISTANCE PROFILE ASSUMING DRIVERS EYE AT A HEIGHT OF 3.5 FEET (SEE FULTON COUNTY SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS)  
-NO VISUAL OBSTRUCTION WITHIN APPROX. 50'-0" OF SITE ENTRANCE

**ITEM #25:** WETLANDS SHOWN ON THE COUNTY GIS MAPS OR SURVEY.  
-NO WETLANDS ON SITE

**ITEM #26:** AIRPORT NOISE CONTOURS ON THOSE PROPERTIES WITHIN THE FAR PART 150 AIRPORT NOISE CONTOUR MAP.  
-SITE OUTSIDE OF FAR 150 AIRPORT NOISE CONTOUR MAP PER FULTON COUNTY GIS

<u>  SITE DATA:</u>	
ACREAGE	: 5.47
DISTRICT	: 09F
LAND LOT	: 127
ZONING	: M-2
<u>  BUILDING DATA:</u>	
<u>BUILDING A</u>	
AREA	: 1,900 SQ.FT.
HEIGHT	: 10'-0"
	1-STORY
<u>BUILDING B</u>	
AREA	: 10,360 SQ.FT.
HEIGHT	: 20'-0"
	1-STORY
<u>  PARKING SHOWN:</u>	
20 SPACES	
<u>  24-HOUR CONTACT:</u>	
MONTY L. COURSEY	
COURSEY PROPERTIES, INC.	
1239 MARTIN MILL ROAD	
MORELAND, GEORGIA 30259	
CELL	: (770) 560-0626
FAX	: (770) 881-7485

[illegible]