



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: Nov 12 2010

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1011121

TO: Chairman Tim Lee
ATTN TO: John Pederson, Cobb County
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 will be scheduled.

Name of Proposal: Riverview on the Chattahoochee

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Meeting Date: TBD

Time: TBD

Location: TBD

Description: This project, located in Cobb County, is a proposed mixed use project with 95,000 square feet of retail 155 single family detached units, 332 townhomes, 165 condos/flats, 850 apartments, and 200 senior housing units. The proposed project is located on Riverview Road between Veterans Memorial Highway and I-285. The development currently consists of active and inactive industrial uses as well as undeveloped land.

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County

Date Opened: Nov 12 2010

Deadline for Comments: Nov 26 2010

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Dec 12 2010

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 SMYRNA
UPPER CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVERKEEPER

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF ATLANTA
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3307.



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: Nov 12 2010

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1011121

TO: Chairman Tim Lee
ATTN TO: John Pederson, Cobb 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: Riverview on the Chattahoochee

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County

Review Type: DRI

Date Opened: Nov 12 2010

Deadline for Comments: Nov 26 2010

Date to Close: Dec 12 2010

DRI Checklist Preliminary Summary:

Regional Consistency Assessment: 75%

Local Impacts Assessment: 76%

Quality Development Assessment: 48%

Overall Score: 66%

Overall Weighted Score: 70%

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the Unified Growth Policy Map, the proposed development is located in an area designated as Urban Neighborhood, a freight area, and is within the Veterans Memorial LCI study area. Urban Neighborhoods are defined as distinct areas that are located in an urban area that may have a small commercial component that serves the local area. The proposed development is consistent with many Regional Development Policies.

The site plan as proposed includes buildings and parking within the 100 year floodplain. ARC needs clarification and guidance on the allowance of structures in the floodplain and required mitigation for any potential issues.

The proposed development is located in an area that is rapidly changing with a high concentration of existing freight uses. Cobb County and the developer should work to mitigate any potential conflicts between existing uses and any proposed within this development or future developments.

The proposed development is located within the D L Hollowell Parkway / Veterans Memorial Highway LCI Study which was also based on the Riverline Master Plan developed by Cobb County. The proposed development appears to be consistent with the plan recommendations which include the development of a mixed use node along Riverview Road with additional connections to the surrounding streets, parks, and other greenspace. The LCI study does call for an additional roadway between Dickerson Road and Veterans Memorial Highway which would connect through this development. The site plan should reflect this new parallel route.

As submitted, the site plan shows several roads connecting various parts of the development. The developer should look to realign the internal street network to create more direct routes through the site to create additional streets parallel to Riverview. This would offer drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians an alternative. It appears that Armstrong Place and Nichols Drive could be realigned and include stud outs to adjacent

undeveloped properties. Road C and Road F could also be realigned and continued through to adjacent properties.

The site plan shows limited sidewalks on many of the roads within the development. To create a walkable, mixed use environment, sidewalks should be added to both sides of all internal streets, with marked crosswalks. This should include pedestrian amenities including, but not limited to, street lights, benches, and trash receptacles.

Currently, the site plan shows bike lanes on Riverview Road. Bicycle parking as well as other "end of trip" facilities should be added to all multifamily and non-residential uses within the site. This includes adding bike racks outside commercial buildings or within parking structures as well as bike lockers and showers within non-residential uses.

Senior housing is shown within the development. To accommodate for the aging population, the developer should consider location these units closer to the commercial area of the development and near proposed transit. There is no indication whether or not other units will accommodate seniors by including at least one zero-step entrance, wider doorways, and a bathroom on main floor if two or more levels.

Information submitted for the review did not include proposed price ranges of the for sale or rental units. ARC needs clarification on the affordability of residential units within the development.

The developer should work with Cobb Community Transit and MARTA to ensure coordination with any improvements to local bus routes and stops.

See attached comments from ARC transportation and environmental staff as well as other affected parties.

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 SMYRNA
UPPER CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVERKEEPER

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF ATLANTA
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please contact Jon Tuley at (404) 463-3307 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: **Riverview on the Chattahoochee** *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: Nov 26 2010

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Nov 12 2010

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1011121

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

FROM: Jon Tuley, Extension: 3-3309

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Land Use: Goodwin, Amy

Transportation: Zuyeva, Lyubov

Environmental: Santo, Jim

Research: Skinner, Jim

Aging: Rader, Carolyn

Name of Proposal: Riverview on the Chattahoochee

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: This project, located in Cobb County, is a proposed mixed use project with 95,000 square feet of retail 155 single family detached units, 332 townhomes, 165 condos/flats, 850 apartments, and 200 senior housing units. The proposed project is located on Riverview Road between Veterans Memorial Highway and I-285. The development currently consists of active and inactive industrial uses as well as undeveloped land.

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County

Date Opened: Nov 12 2010

Deadline for Comments: Nov 26 2010

Date to Close: Dec 12 2010

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:

**RCA****RCA****ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW****PART 1: REGIONAL CONSISTENCY ASSESSMENT***To be completed by the ARC Staff*

JURISDICTION:	COBB COUNTY					Date RCA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 11/12/2010
DRI #:	2152					RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Riverview on the Chattahoochee					
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Mixed Use					Action Triggering Review: Rezoning
I. REGIONAL PLAN	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development consistent with the Regional Development Map and Defining Narrative?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is the development consistent with the Guiding Principles of the Regional Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
II. REGIONAL RESOURCE PLAN AND RIRs	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
If within one mile of any area on the RIR map, is the development consistent with the Guidance for Appropriate Development Practices in the Regional Resource Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	<p>USE ALTERNATIVE DESIGNS AND MATERIALS TO MINIMIZE THE USE OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE TO THE GREATEST PRACTICAL EXTENT</p> <p>INSTALL RAIN GARDENS, VEGETATED SWALES OR OTHER ENHANCED WATER FILTRATION DESIGN WITHIN THE LANDSCAPE OF THE PROJECT TO ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF STORMWATER RUN-OFF</p> <p>WHERE POSSIBLE, RETAIN EXISTING VEGETATION AND TOPOGRAPHY</p> <p>WHERE PRACTICAL, EXCEED MINIMUM REQUIRED BUFFERS FROM PROTECTED AREAS</p> <p>LOCATE STRUCTURES AND IMPERVIOUS AREAS AS FAR AWAY AS POSSIBLE FROM WATER RESOURCES, INCLUDING WETLANDS AND FLOOD PRONE AREAS ON THE DEVELOPMENT SITE</p>	

III. INTERJURISDICTIONAL IMPACTS	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development avoid or mitigate negative effect on public facilities (roads, stormwater / floodplain management, water quality, etc.) in neighboring jurisdictions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	THERE APPEAR TO BE BUILDINGS AND PARKING LOTS PLACED IN THE 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN	
Are neighboring jurisdictions aware of, and prepared to manage, impacts of the development on public facilities (roads, stormwater / floodplain management, water quality, etc.) in their jurisdictions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		WAITING ON COMMENTS FROM CITY OF ATLANTA AND CITY SMYRNA	
Are other affected jurisdictions, including school boards, aware of, and prepared to manage, the impacts of this development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		WAITING ON COMMENTS	
IV. TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is this project consistent with any applicable regional transportation plan(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development avoid or mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding transportation network?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If not, do pending projects included in the funded portion of the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP) mitigate all identified project impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development consistent with the host government's Future Development Map and any applicable sub-area plans?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN SHOWS THIS PROPERTY AS INDUSTRIAL, BUT THE RECENTLY COMPLETED RIVERLINE PLAN AND LCI STUDY CALL FOR SOME INFILL AND REDEVELOPMENT WITH A MIX OF RESIDENTIAL, OFFICE, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL USES	
Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		WAITING ON COMMENTS	
VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDs)	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or "N/A" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development consistent with the region's CEDs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
TOTAL RCA SCORE:				18	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	24
SECTION SCORE:				75%		
WEIGHTED SECTION SCORE (50%):				37%		
ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AS WELL AS PART 3 – QUALITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT, WILL BE USED IN DETERMINING THE STAFF FINDING FOR THIS DRI AS WELL.						
FINDING (OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF REGIONAL CONSISTENCY)						
		<input type="checkbox"/> YES , "the proposed action <u>IS</u> in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." <input type="checkbox"/> NO , "the proposed action <u>IS NOT</u> in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern:				

**LIA****LIA****ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW****PART 2: LOCAL IMPACTS ASSESSMENT***To be completed by the ARC Staff*

JURISDICTION:	COBB COUNTY				Date LIA completed, M/D/YYYY: 11/12/2010
DRI #:	2152				RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Riverview on the Chattahoochee				
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Mixed Use				Action Triggering Review: Rezoning
I. ADEQUACY OF LOCAL ASSETS/SERVICES	Yes	No	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Do adequate wastewater/sewerage facilities currently exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate water supply and treatment facilities exist to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate stormwater management facilities exist to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate solid waste facilities exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the local school system have the capacity necessary to adequately support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the local workforce possess the skills/expertise/education to effectively support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are all other assets/services (public safety, etc.) adequate to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is the local government fiscally capable of adequately providing any new facilities/services anticipated/likely to be required by the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		

II. ADEQUACY OF TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE	Yes	No	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Do adequate transportation facilities currently exist to support the development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THERE WILL HAVE TO BE UPGRADES TO THE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE DRIVERS, CYCLISTS, AND PEDESTRIANS. DUE THE INCLUSION OF SENIOR HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO ACCOMMODATE THIS UNIQUE POPULATION.	
If the development is predominately industrial, is it located in close proximity to an interstate highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
If the development is predominately industrial, is it located with reasonable proximity to an intermodal station or other freight transfer location?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Will developer-funded mitigation of the transportation impacts of this development be adequate to address needs generated by the project? enhancements and/or improvements of the items already listed in the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	FROM THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED, IT CANNOT BE DETERMINED WHAT IMPROVEMENTS THE DEVLEOPER WILL BE PROVIDING OR THE AFFECT THIS WILL HAVE ON MITIGATION.	
If not, will enhancements and/or improvements already listed in the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP) be adequate to address needs generated by the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	WHILE THE PLANNED TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS WILL IMPOVE MOBILITY IN THE AREA, THEY WILL NOT ACCOMMODATE FUTURE RESIDENTS, WORKERS, AND VISITORS OF THIS DEVELOPMENT.	
III. ACCESS MANAGEMENT	Yes	No	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
If the size and type of development warrant, is access to the site effectively managed through the use of internal roadways, access roads, or shared driveways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If the development is adjacent to more than one roadway, is access provided via the lowest functionally classified roadway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are access points to the site aligned with opposing access points and with existing, planned or likely median breaks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are proposed traffic signals located at the intersection of public roadways that provide access to the entire site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Relative to the size and traffic volume of the adjacent roadways, does the proposed development provide an adequate, uninterrupted driveway throat lengths at all access points?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		

Are all proposed access points outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do the proposed access points meet minimum spacing requirements established by GDOT (and GRTA, where appropriate)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
IV. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	Yes	No	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (optional for "Yes" answers, required for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Are potential impacts upon WATER SUPPLY WATERSHEDS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are potential impacts upon WETLANDS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are potential impacts upon GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are potential impacts upon RIVER CORRIDORS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		THIS DEVELOPMENT HAS NOT BEEN SUBMITTED FOR MRPA REVIEW AT THIS TIME AND AS SUCH, THIS CANNOT BE DETERMINED.	
Are potential impacts upon PROTECTED MOUNTAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are potential impacts upon COASTAL RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are potential impacts upon FLOODPLAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	BUILDINGS AND PARKING LOTS ARE PROPOSED WITHIN THE 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN WITH NO INDICATION HOW THIS WILL BE ADDRESSED. BUILDINGS SHOULD BE PLACED WHERE THEY WILL NOT CAUSE A THREAT TO PUBLIC SAFETY, AND ALL PARKING, DRIVEWAYS, AND ROADS WITHIN THE FLOODPLAIN, AS WELL AS THROUGHOUT THE SITE, SHOULD USE PERVIOUS MATERIALS.	
Are potential impacts upon SENSITIVE SOIL TYPES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are potential impacts upon STEEP SLOPES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are potential impacts upon PRIME AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are potential impacts upon RARE/ENDANGERED SPECIES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are potential impacts upon FEDERAL, STATE OR REGIONAL PARKS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	

Are potential impacts upon HISTORIC RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are potential impacts upon DESIGNATED SCENIC BYWAYS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are potential impacts upon VIEWSHEDS OR SCENIC AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THERE ARE SEVERAL BUILDINGS AND PARKING LOTS PROPOSED ON THE BANKS OF THE RIVER. FROM THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW, IT CANNOT BE DETERMINED WHAT EFFECT THIS WILL HAVE ON THE VIEWSHEDS OF THE RIVER.	
Total LIA Score:			57	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	75
Section Score:			76%		
WEIGHTED SECTION SCORE (30%):			23%		
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LOCAL IMPACTS					
<i>Does the host local government need to take action to manage potential adverse impacts of this development?</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NARRATIVE:		
<i>Should special requirements be placed on the developer(s) to mitigate adverse development impacts?</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NARRATIVE:		

**QDA****QDA**

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW
PART 3: GEORGIA QUALITY DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	COBB COUNTY				Date QDA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 11/12/2010
DRI #:	2152				RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Riverview on the Chattahoochee				
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Mixed Use				Action Triggering Review: Rezoning

I. MIX OF USES	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development incorporate a mixture of complementary land uses?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development have vertically mixed uses?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If the development is primarily residential, are a healthy mix of uses (e.g., corner grocery stores, community facilities) located within an easy walking distance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
For developments without a residential component, does the development add a compatible new use that is not prevalent in the immediately surrounding area/neighborhood?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	

II. TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Are there sidewalks within the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THRE ARE NO EXISTING SIDEWALKS ADJACENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT.	
Are sidewalks designed to comply with ADA, AASHTO standards of width and accessibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMAITON NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW	
Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential buildings, multi-family buildings, and other key destinations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW	
Does the development include multi-use trails that will connect to the external trail network(s)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		

Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and/or pedestrian actuation devices?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Does the design include pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	CANNOT BE DETERMINED FROM THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED.	
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	CANNOT BE DETERMINED FROM THE INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Will the development employ pedestrian-friendly block sizes (e.g., block face no more than 500 ft, average block perimeter 1350 ft)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	WHILE SOME BLOCKS ARE THE PREFERRED SIZE, MANY ARE LARGER AND DO NOT OFFER BICYCLE OR PEDESTRIAN ALTERNATIVES THROUGH THE SITE.	
Will the development incorporate traffic calming measures, such as narrower street widths, raised pedestrian crossings, or rough pavement materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW	
III. CONNECTIVITY	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Will the development employ street layouts that match those in older parts of the community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THERE ARE SEVERAL ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS THAT DO NOT ALLOW FOR ADDITIONAL CONNECTIVITY. BUT THERE IS OPPORTUNITY FOR ADDITIONAL CONNECTIONS TO ADJACENT UNDEVELOPED PROPERTIES.	
Will the development's internal street network connect to the existing surrounding street network at many points?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AS PROPOSED HAS ONLY TWO PROPOSED FUTURE CONNECTIONS TO THE ADJACENT STREET NETWORK.	
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AS PROPOSED HAS ONLY TWO FUTURE CONNECTIONS TO THE ADJACENT STREET NETWORK.	
Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the proposal allow for direct connection to adjacent developments/uses in the future (at stub outs, dead end streets, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	TWO FUTURE CONNECTIONS TO ADJACENT ROADWAYS ARE SHOWN BUT THERE IS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ADDITIONAL CONNECTIONS AND STUB OUTS.	

Will the development include external and internal connections that allow motorists to avoid using the surrounding roadways to access adjacent uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THERE ARE SEVERAL ADJACENT DEVELOPMENTS THAT DO NOT ALLOW FOR ADDITIONAL CONNECTIVITY. BUT THERE IS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR ADDITIONAL CONNECTIONS TO ADJACENT UNDEVELOPED PROPERTIES.	
Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation throughout the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THE INTERNAL STREET NETWORK COULD BE IMPROVED TO PROVIDE MORE DIRECT CONNECTIONS BETWEEN USES AND THROUGH THE SITE.	
Can the internal street network be reasonably anticipated to add to the public roadway network?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Where appropriate, will the development employ mid-block alleys?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
IV. PARKING	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development provide no more parking than the minimum required by the local jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL PROVIDE MORE PARKING THAN REQUIRED.	
Does development seek reduced parking requirements for commercial and residential developments, particularly when nearby parking alternatives or public transit is available?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Does development seek shared parking arrangements that reduce overall parking needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THE DEVELOPER SHOULD INVESTIGATE THE USE OF A SHARED PARKING ARRANGEMENT	
Does development use landscaped tree islands and medians to break up large expanses of paved parking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is the development's parking located where it does not visually dominate the development from the street?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	WHILE THE PARKING IS LOCATED WHERE IT DOES NOT VISUALLY DOMINATE FROM THE STREET, THERE ARE CONCERNS WITH THE PLACEMENT OF PARKING ON THE BANKS OF THE RIVER AND THE AFFECT THIS WILL HAVE VISUALLY AS WELL AS ON STORMWATER RUNOFF.	
Does the parking design allow for easy and safe pedestrian access to buildings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		

V. INFILL DEVELOPMENT	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development proposing to locate on an infill site with existing infrastructure in place?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	THERE IS THE NEED FOR SOME ADDITIOANL INFRASTRUCTURE TO ACCOMMODATE THIS DEVELOPMENT.	
Does this project involve redevelopment of abandoned structures; a brownfield site; other underutilized properties?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development re-use or rehabilitate existing and/or historic structures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Is the development designed to blend into existing neighborhoods with compatible scale and design (e.g., small scale apartment buildings, multi-family that looks like a single residence from the street, etc)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Are new housing opportunities being created out of former, underused commercial, warehouse, or industrial spaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Is the development designed to revitalize existing neighborhood commercial centers (or create a new one on an infill site) that will serve as a focal point for the surrounding neighborhood and community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Is this a greyfield redevelopment that converts vacant or under-utilized commercial strips to mixed-use assets?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	GREYFIELD REDEVELOPMENT BUT LITTLE TO NO COMMERCIAL REDEVELOPMENT.	
VI. SENSE OF PLACE	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development create or enhance community spaces such as public plazas, squares, parks, etc?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	THERE ARE SEVERAL PARKS AND GREENSPACES INDICATED ON THE SITE PLAN, BUT THERE IS NO INDICATION AS TO WHAT THE PEDESTRIAN REALM WILL BE OR IF THERE WILL BE OTHER PUBLIC SQUARES OR PLAZAS.	
Is the development consistent / compatible with the traditional character of the community, incorporating appropriate scale, placement and massing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	CANNOT BE DETERMINED FROM INFORMATION SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	

If "big box" retail, is the development designed in a way that complements surrounding uses (e.g. appropriate massing and scale when in developed areas; landscaped buffers/berms when in less developed areas; etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
If "big box" retail, is the development designed in a way that promotes long-term usability (e.g. allows for subsequent adaptation to other tenants/uses)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Are structures oriented toward and located near existing and proposed street front(s) with parking located in places other than between the structure and the street/sidewalk?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the development design include restrictions on the number and size of signs and billboards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
If applicable, will the natural vegetative character of surrounding roadways be maintained (e.g., with setbacks, vegetative buffers, landscaped berms)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
VII. TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (TND)	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development designed to be an attractive, pedestrian-friendly activity center serving surrounding residential areas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Will the development include a mix of housing types and sizes evocative of the "traditional" development styles/patterns of the community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do planned street widths employ TND width standards (i.e. narrow)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	THE SITE PLAN APPEARS TO INDICATE NARROWER STREETS, BUT NO TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS ARE PROVIDED.	
Are structures designed with small setbacks, and porches (where appropriate) that contribute to a continuous orientation to the street that is pedestrian-friendly and encourages interaction with neighbors and/or passers-by?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are accommodations included for on-street parking and/or rear alleyway access for residents'/visitors' automobiles?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	THERE APPEARS TO BE ROOM FOR ADDITIONAL ON STREET PARKING REDUCING THE NEED FOR SURFACE PARKING LOTS.	
VIII. OPEN/GREEN SPACE CONSERVATION	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Is the development in close proximity with direct access to permanently protected open/greenspace?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		

Is the development clustered to preserve open/green space within the development site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	THERE MAY BE THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLUSTER THE DEVELOPMENT FURTHER TO CREATE ADDITIONAL GREENSPACE.	
Does the development set aside a substantial percentage of total land area as permanently protected open or green space, preferably connected to a green space network?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the design of the development include provisions to permanently preserve environmentally sensitive areas by setting them aside as public parks, trails, greenbelts, etc?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		THE DEVELOPER HAD PREVIOUSLY INDICATED THE DESIRE TO DEDICATE LAND AS PERMANENT OPEN SPACE.	
Does the design of the development incorporate significant site features (view corridors, water features, farmland, wetlands, etc.) as amenities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If public water/sewer is unavailable, does the design of the development make use of common area drain fields and/or neighborhood-scale wastewater treatment systems to reduce parcel size and facilitate cluster development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
IX. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the project avoid land physically unsuitable for development (steep slopes greater than 20%, floodplains, stream corridors, groundwater recharge areas or wetlands), prime agricultural lands/soils and/or propose the appropriate mitigation measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	BUILDINGS AND PARKING LOTS ARE PROPOSED WITHIN THE 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN.	
Does the development include measures to retain/protect a large proportion of existing trees and to maintain the health of new trees included in the development's landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Does the development incorporate native and drought-tolerant landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Is the development designed to avoid the need for a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	IT IS NOT CLEAR IF THE DEVELOPMENT WILL REQUIRE A STREAM BUFFER VARIANCE.	
Does the development's stormwater management plan avoid increasing the rate and quantity of post-development stormwater runoff when compared with pre-development stormwater rates and quantities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	

Does the development reflect best management practices (e.g., bioretention strips, rain gardens or swales as alternatives to conventional practices) for water quality protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Do the parking lots incorporate innovative on-site stormwater mitigation or retention features that are not covered elsewhere in this checklist?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	
Is a substantial proportion of the total paved area (total of driveways, parking, etc) covered with permeable surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW	
Does the development propose water conservation covenants or employ other appropriate water conservation measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Is the development seeking independent certification/recognition by a widely acknowledged development accreditation organization (e.g. LEED, EarthCraft, Green Globes, Energy Star, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Does the development make use of alternative building materials that promote environmental protection and energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
X. HOUSING CHOICES	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
For developments with a residential component, will a diversity of housing types be provided in the development, including: Single family; Accessory housing units; Multi family; Affordable housing?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately surrounding neighborhood?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include affordability and accessibility features and proximity to services and transportation alternatives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CURRENTLY SHOWS THE SENIOR HOUSING LOCATED OUTSIDE OF THE MAIN COMMERCIAL AREA AND AWAY FROM THE PROPOSED TRANSIT STOP. SENIOR HOUSING SHOULD BE LOCATED IN AN AREA THAT ALLOWS OLDER ADULTS EASY ACCESS TO SERVICES.	
Will the development provide greater housing options for low and middle income residents and families?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	INFORMATION NOT SUBMITTED FOR THE REVIEW.	

XI. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	Yes	No	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain <small>(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)</small>	Recommendations <small>(to the Developer for Improving the Project)</small>
Are the economic returns associated with the development projected to offset the local/regional costs for any infrastructure and service enhancements necessary to serve development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Will the development enhance diversity in the local/regional economic base?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Does the design/location of this development clearly reflect consideration of the local and regional jobs/housing balance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Is the development located in a tax abatement zone, a tax allocation district, a designated/planned redevelopment area, an enterprise zone, or other governmentally supported redevelopment zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Will this development use or is it likely to enhance local or regional small-business development program(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Will the development provide greater employment opportunities for low and middle income residents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
Is the development likely to spur other activities aimed at improving the quality of the local/regional workforce?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		N/A	
TOTAL QDA SCORE			81	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	168
SECTION SCORE:			48%		
WEIGHTED SECTION SCORE (20%):			9%		
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY					
<i>Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES , the proposed development qualifies for expedited review. <input type="checkbox"/> NO , the proposed development <u>DOES NOT</u> qualify for expedited review.				
<i>And is the development generally reflective of the best quality growth practices?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES , this regional commission recommends this development for Georgia Quality Development designation. <input type="checkbox"/> NO NARRATIVE:				

<i>To improve the overall quality of the development, does the regional commission recommend that the local government seek additional alterations to the proposal that have not been described above?</i>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NARRATIVE:



MEMORANDUM

TO: Jon Tuley, Land Use Division

FROM: Lyubov Zuyeva, Transportation Planning Division

DATE: November 8, 2010

SUBJECT: **TPD Review of DRI # 2152**

Project: Riverview on the Chattahoochee

County: Cobb County

Location: Riverview Road, northeast of intersection of Riverview Road and Veterans Memorial Highway

Analysis:

Expedited

☐

Non-Expedited

☒

cc: David Haynes, TPD
Jane Hayse, TPD

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

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Non-Expedited Review Process. The proposed mixed use development would take up 81.95 acres and would contain 1702 residential units and 190,000 sq. feet of commercial, office and industrial uses. The residential units will be of a variety of types, including single family, townhomes, multi-family, senior housing, condominiums, and stack flats.

INFRASTRUCTURE **Transportation**

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

Site access is intended to be provided for this development via nine driveways (including six intersections) along Riverview Road; as well as via one driveway off Dickerson Drive, 10 driveways off Nichols Drive/Nichols Drive Extension and 11 driveways off Armstrong Place/Armstrong Place Extension.

A future connection between Nichols Drive to Oakdale Road SE is possible, and is indicated on the site plan, but will not be implemented as part of the development. A potential future connection to Dickerson Road is suggested on the plan.

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

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. performed the transportation analysis. Background traffic growth rate of 2% per year was utilized, as well as ITE equations based on expected land use categories and square footage for the development. Mixed-use vehicle trip reductions at 8.91% of the weekday trips and 971% of the PM peak trips were applied, as per ITE Trip Generation Handbook, Second Edition, 2004. Alternative transportation mode reduction was not applied. Pass-by reduction of 34% for the weekday and PM peak hour trips were calculated using equation 820 in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, Second Edition. The ARC staff finds this methodology acceptable. The resulting trip generation rates are listed in the table below.

Riverview on the Chattahoochee DRI Gross Trip Generation, Build-Out Year (2018)						
Land Use	Daily Traffic		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit
65,000 SF Industrial	162	162	28	6	7	19
155 Single Family Units	778	778	30	88	100	59
850 Apartment Units	2,630	2,630	84	336	315	170
497 Condo/Townhouse Units	1,254	1,254	32	154	150	74
200 Senior Living Units	315	315	7	9	13	9
30,000 SF Office	264	264	63	9	19	93
95,000 SF Retail	3,284	3,284	93	59	290	315
Total	8,687	8,687	337	661	894	739
Mixed-Use Reduction (8.91% of ADT/9.71% of PM Peak)	-760	-760	-0	-0	-78	-78
Pass-By Reduction at 34%	-988	0988	-0	-0	-90	-90

Net New Trips	6,939	6,939	337	661	726	572
---------------	-------	-------	-----	-----	-----	-----

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
CO-395	Intersection improvements at Veterans Memorial Hwy and Oakdale Rd/Discovery Blvd	Intersection improvement	2013
CO-352	Operational upgrades and sidewalks along Queens Mill Rd from Veterans Memorial Hwy to Mableton Parkway	Operational upgrades	2013

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

Envision6 RTP (Long Range Projects)*

ARC Number	<u>Route</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
CO-347	Operational upgrades and sidewalks along Buckner Rd from Oakdale Rd to Veterans Memorial Hwy	Operational upgrades	2020
CO-175	Roadway capacity widening along South Cobb Dr, from 4 to 6 lanes, from Atlanta Rd to Bolton Rd (SR 70)	Roadway capacity	2030
CO-AR-304	Interchange reconstruction, I-285 at South Cobb Dr	Interchange capacity	2030
AT-001	Widening of D. L. Hollowell Pkwy from Harwell Rd to H.E. Holmes Drive (to 4 lanes); bike lanes and sidewalks to be added	Roadway capacity	2030
AT-AR-214	Interchange reconstruction, I-285 at Veterans Memorial Highway	Interchange capacity	2030
AR-H-302	Addition of managed lanes along I-285 West between I-20 and I-75	Managed lanes	2030

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

Summarize the transportation improvements recommended.

Roadway and Operational Improvements Needed due to Traffic Volumes

Based on the existing 2010 Conditions and projected 2018 conditions, the Traffic Study found that the following improvements would be needed to provided intersection LOS of D or better:

- Veterans Memorial Highway at Riverview Road
 - Construct southbound right-turn lane along Riverview Road and a westbound right-turn lane along Veterans Memorial Highway
 - Consider Veterans Memorial Highway and Riverview Road for signalization, if warranted
 - ARC staff would strongly recommend that in the view of proposed intersection modifications and transit service along Veterans Memorial

Highway which necessitates safe pedestrian crossings, pedestrian refuge islands and countdown signal heads to be provided at intersection of Veterans Memorial Highway and Riverview Road when the proposed turn lane improvements are added

- South Cobb Drive at I-285 Northbound Ramps
 - Construct a westbound right-turn lane along South Cobb Drive; maintain the existing westbound shared through/right-turn lane
- Highlands Parkway at Oakdale Road
 - Construct a 2nd westbound left-turn lane along Highlands Parkway
 - Construct a 2nd southbound receiving lane along Oakdale Road
 - Construct a 2nd northbound right-turn lane along Oakdale Road
 - ARC staff would strongly recommend that when this intersection is being modified, pedestrian refuge islands and countdown signal heads be considered due to larger crossing distances resulting from additional turn lanes

Based on future traffic volumes resulting from the development, and new driveways being added along Riverview, the following additional roadway improvements will be needed for new driveways/roadways (through lanes along Riverview Road not to exceed one lane in each direction):

- Riverview Road at Driveway 4/Driveway 5—provide full access, and construct turn lanes and through lanes as needed/indicated in the traffic study;
- Riverview Road at Nichols Drive Extension (Driveway 6)/Driveway 7—provide full access and construct turn lanes and through lanes as needed/indicated in the traffic study
- Riverview Road at Dickerson Drive/Driveway 8—provide full access and construct turn lanes and through lanes as needed/indicated in the traffic study
- Riverview Road at Driveway 9—provide full access and construct turn lanes and through lanes as needed/indicated in the traffic study
- Nichols Drive at Driveway 10/Driveway 11—provide full access and construct turn lanes and through lanes as needed/indicated in the traffic study
- Driveways 12-19 along Nichols Drive and Nichols Drive Extension—provide full access
- Driveways 20-30 along Armstrong Place and Armstrong Place Extension—provide full access
- Driveway 31 along Dickerson Drive—provide full access

At two intersections where signal control, stop control or roundabouts are considered, ARC staff recommends that the roundabouts be added, in lieu of traffic signals

- Construct a single-lane modern roundabout at Riverview Road and Armstrong Place Extension (Driveway 1)/Driveway 2
- Construct a single-lane modern roundabout at Nichols Drive/Driveway 3

Connectivity and Bike/Ped Facilities

In reviewing the sight plan, new driveways and intersections will help create a good circulation network within the development. However, it appears that the internal circulation, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, and connectivity to adjacent developments

remain somewhat limited and could be improved, based on the site plan as proposed.

Additional recommendations are as follows:

- Two potential future road connections are identified as part of the study, but not expected to be built at this time: potential future extension of Nichols Drive to connect to Oakdale Road to the north; and potential future connection to Dickerson Road. ARC Staff recommends that the ROW be preserved for those future roadway connections as part of this development, where it falls within the boundaries of proposed development.
- ARC TPD strongly recommends a third future roadway connection: an extension of Armstrong Place SE and Alley 2, to connect to Veterans Memorial Highway, passing along the edge of the industrial site. A stub-out and preserved ROW at the end of Alley 2 could be provided at this time for future connection. This would be in line with Hollowell Parkway/Veterans Memorial Highway LCI Study Plan completed for the area: the LCI study envisions a future roadway parallel to Riverview Road that would connect Dickerson Road to Veterans Memorial Highway.
- To create an additional roadway connection throughout the development, it is recommended that Driveway 10 and Driveway 22 be realigned to connect to each other: the resulting north-south roadway through the site parallel to Riverview Road would include Road F, Road C, Driveway 18, Driveway 11, Driveway 22 and Driveway 10. This parallel connection could alleviate the pressure on Riverview Road for trips internal to the development, including bicycle and pedestrian trips
- Consult with local transit providers about the possibility of transit service expansion to coincide with the completion of the development, and provide a well-designed transit stop at a mutually-agreed upon location (including at least a wide concrete slab of 10+ feet for passenger waiting area and a bench; possibly with addition of bus bay and bus shelter)
- To improve bicycle accommodation, sharrows can be installed along Armstrong Place and Nichols Drive, as well as the extensions of those streets. Bicycle parking should be provided for all multi-family residential, office and commercial buildings. For commercial properties, bicycle parking should be provided close to the front door, where it would be easy to find. Motorcycle and scooter parking could also be considered throughout the development.
- “Walking path” throughout the northern segment of the development is recommended to be replaced with a multi-use path of 10-12 feet wide, accessible to bicyclists and ADA-compliant; if permeable, such a trail could be built to be accessible to mountain bike users. This would provide continuity with the multi-use trail proposed along the river.
- While multi-use trails help with pedestrian connectivity and recreational opportunity, sidewalks throughout the development are needed, even where the roadways are currently labeled as “driveways.” Specifically, sidewalks and pedestrian connections are needed as follows:
 - Driveways 2, 3, 5, 7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17, 18, 19, 22, 25,28, 29 (could have sidewalk on one side)
 - Roads C, D, E, F, G (should have sidewalks on both sides)
 - Nichols Drive, Nichols Drive Extension, Armstrong Place and Armstrong Place extension should have sidewalks on both sides

- Ensure that multi-use trails are accessible from the properties, driveways and parking lots in proximity to which they pass

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

The site is within 0.75 miles of two MARTA bus routes, and within 0.5 mile of a Cobb County Transit bus route. There is a potential future transit stop within the development identified on the site plan. No specific amenities identified for the future transit stop.

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

None known

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

Traffic volumes for this development appear reasonable, and the mixed-use development is consistent with “Maturing Neighborhoods” designation on the UGPM. Proximity to transit, compact development nature, and a mix of uses make this a good candidate for reducing the regional VMT by investing in livable communities with a variety of housing and transportation options. While some connectivity and bicycle and pedestrian accommodation improvements are suggested (in particular, ROW set-aside to ensure feasibility of future road in parallel to Riverview Road which would connect Dickerson Road and Veterans Memorial Highway), overall this is a good project from the transportation perspective. The numerous new driveways proposed will be primarily affecting Riverview Road, which is a local road at 35 mph posted speed, and would be redesigned as a “complete streets” corridor throughout the development, with one lane in each direction plus turning lanes, and with sidewalks and bike lanes.

Riverview Road currently carries high volumes of heavy vehicles, due to the strong presence of industrial uses in the area. The Cobb County RiverLine Master Plan and the D. L. Hollowell Parkway/Veterans Memorial Highway LCI Study Plan acknowledge the truck traffic in the area, yet envision future redevelopment and transition of the corridor to more mixed-use types (residential, commercial, office). Both plans indicate that Riverview Road should retain 1 lane in each direction, with addition of turn lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, and possibly medians. As currently proposed for this DRI plan, Riverview Road changes would be consistent with the RiverLine Master Plan and the LCI study, although addition of landscaped median could be considered. 12-foot traffic lanes or providing a 2-foot buffer between the bike lanes and the general-purpose lanes along Riverview Road would be preferable for truck traffic over 11-foot lanes and 5-foot bike lanes. Roundabouts should be carefully designed to allow sufficient clearance for heavy trucks.

Amount of parking proposed might need to be considered, to see if reductions in parking lots could be feasible due to a mix of uses, proximity to transit and pedestrian connectivity opportunities.

RIVERVIEW ON THE CHATTAHOOCHEE DRI
Cobb County
Environmental Planning Division Review Comments
November 10, 2010

Metropolitan River Protection Act and the Chattahoochee River Corridor

The entire 81.95-acre property is within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor and is subject to review under the Metropolitan River Protection Act for consistency with the Standards of the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. Plan Standards include limits on land disturbance and impervious surface, natural vegetative buffers and impervious surface setbacks along the river and designated tributaries streams and floodplain regulations. All applicable standards must be met for a project to be consistent with the Plan. No River Corridor application has been submitted for the review of this project as of this date, and the information provided is not sufficient to determine the project's consistency with the Plan. While impervious surfaces are shown within the 150-foot impervious surface setback along the river, much of this area is currently impervious and has been before the Act took effect in this area in 1998. Under certain circumstances, such impervious areas can be reused without affecting consistency. Again, the plans submitted for this project for review under the Metropolitan River Protection Act and Chattahoochee Corridor Plan will need to meet all applicable Plan standards in order to be found consistent with the Plan, regardless of the density or land use included in the DRI.

Stream Buffers

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no blue-line streams on the project property. However, the submitted plan shows three streams on the property, with no buffers shown. All streams on the property are subject to the requirements of Cobb County stream buffer ordinance and all required County stream buffers should be shown and identified. In addition, all waters of the state on the property are subject to the Georgia EPD 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer, which should also be shown where required. Any activity that is not specifically exempted in any of these buffers will require a variance from the appropriate agency.

Floodplain

The proposed site plan shows proposed structures within the 100-year floodplain of the river. Development of residential buildings in the river floodplain should be avoided. Any structures or facilities developed in the floodplain should, at a minimum, fully conform with all Cobb County Standards for development in the floodplain, which include no intrusion into the floodway, floor elevations above future flood elevations and construction or reconstruction of utilities and roads to minimize or eliminate damage to the infrastructure. Additionally, roads and utilities should be designed ensure that no residential structure is cut off from access or utilities in a flood. As stated in the first section, this work will also need to meet the requirements of the Metropolitan River Protection Act and the standards of the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan.

Stormwater / Water Quality

All projects should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, projects should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants produced after the construction of the entire proposed development, based on the submitted site plan. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr). The loading factors are based on the results of regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. The assumed impervious surface amounts and percentages are those

that are typical for each land use type in the Atlanta Region. Actual loadings will reflect actual impervious amounts and other existing conditions on the site. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis for this proposal:

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants per Year

Land Use	Land Area (ac)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Townhouse/Apartment	81.95	86.05	877.68	5490.65	49579.75	62.28	11.47
TOTAL	81.95	86.05	877.68	5490.65	49579.75	62.28	11.47

Total % impervious 48%

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

Jonathan Tuley

From: Jonathan Tuley
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 6:09 PM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Subject: RE: Riverview DRI

From: Carolyn Rader
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 4:18 PM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Laura Keyes
Subject: Riverview DRI

Jon,
Comments for Riverview:

If there is a 'Senior Housing' component (active adults, assisted living?) there must be accommodations for accessibility and connectivity within the development itself, and to the outlying community for access to basic medical, grocery, social activities, and other services. Provision of transportation services may be necessary due to lack of public transit serving this development. Otherwise, they may be isolating at least ½ of the residents of the senior housing. Design of senior housing component and footprint should incorporate Lifelong Communities design guidelines. Current location of the senior specific housing does not provide for optimum connectivity to the 'town center', park or transit stop indicated in the conceptual plans. Ensure there is a 'third space' for older adults in the town or activity center of the development.

In order for all housing in the development to be 'lifelong' housing it should include at least one zero-step entrance, wider doorways, and a bathroom on main floor if two or more levels. Street grid should optimize connectivity, shorter walking distances, socialization opportunities, and opportunities for physical activity. Road design should accommodate all modes of mobility. Intersections should have crosswalks with curb ramps, pedestrian countdown signals, signal timings calibrated for older adult walking speed and roads with more than two lanes should have median or refuge island (please see LLC guidebook for other considerations). Consider housing types that accommodates multi generational Ensure that there is adequate lighting, safe accessibility to transit stops and the river side multi-use trail – ADA and universal design. For future transit provision, roadways and driveways to senior housing needs to accommodate paratransit and other vehicles.

For safety considerations for traffic flow in and out of the development – Consult the FHWA Highway Design Handbook for Older Drivers and Pedestrians for recommendations on left hand turn signalization (and minimizing need for left hand turns), signage and other considerations for older driver safety.

Thanks,
Carolyn

*Carolyn H. Rader
Principal Program Specialist, Community Development
Area Agency on Aging
Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30030
404-463-3224*

www.atlantaregional.com
www.agewiseconnection.com

Jonathan Tuley

From: Jonathan Tuley
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 6:07 PM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Subject: RE: DRI Pre-App Meeting Notice - Riverview (Cobb County, #2152) - Pre-Application Review Hearing August 9, 2010

From: Sands, Carla Jo [<mailto:csands@dot.ga.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 10:22 AM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Comer, Carol; Douglas Barrett; Jack Joiner
Subject: RE: DRI Pre-App Meeting Notice - Riverview (Cobb County, #2152) - Pre-Application Review Hearing August 9, 2010

Good Morning Jon,

The FAA now requires online submittal of this form. Please visit oeaaa.faa.gov – here you will find instructions on how to register and how to fill out a 7460 form for ‘off airport’ construction. The online form asks the same information as paper form. You will also have to submit a drawing of the location of the requested construction. If you need any help or clarification please let me know.

Thanks!
Carla

Carla Sands
Aviation Project Manager

GDOT - Aviation Programs
4005 Fulton Industrial Boulevard
Atlanta, GA 30336

csands@dot.ga.gov
phone: (404) 505-4866
fax: (404) 505-4870

From: Jack Joiner [<mailto:joiner465@charter.net>]
Sent: Saturday, August 07, 2010 11:42 AM
To: Jon Tuley
Cc: Comer, Carol; Douglas Barrett; Sands, Carla Jo
Subject: FW: DRI Pre-App Meeting Notice - Riverview (Cobb County, #2152) - Pre-Application Review Hearing August 9, 2010

Jon:
Reference subject DRI#2152 Riverview (Cobb Co).
The proposed development is located approximately 5,000 feet North of Fulton County-Brown Field Airport's (FTY) closest runway (approach end of Runway 26). If the proposed project's vertical construction penetrates an imaginary surface which extends from the approach end of Runway 26, extending outward and upward at a 100:1 plane, there is a federal requirement that the proponent of the construction complete and file with the Federal Aviation Administration a "Notice of Proposed Construction" (FAA Form 7460-1, copy attached). At 5,000 feet from the runway, if the vertical

construction exceeds approximately 50 feet above the ground elevation at the construction site, an FAA Form 7460-1 must be completed and sent to Mr. Nick Goodly, Federal Aviation Administration, Atlanta Airports District Office, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2-260, College Park, Georgia 30337 (telephone: 404-305-7148). The FAA must be in receipt of the notification, not later than 30 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impact of the project on protected airspace associated with FTY airport and advise the proponent if any action is necessary. I have copied Mr. Doug Barrett, Director of the Fulton County-Brown Field Airport (telephone: 404-699-4200).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

Jack

Jack Joiner
Aviation Programs, GDOT
465 Abbeywood Drive
Roswell, GA 30075
770-594-9747
Cell (404) 229-1352

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2152**

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:	Cobb County
Individual completing form:	John P. Pederson
Telephone:	770-528-2024
E-mail:	john.pederson@cobbcounty.org

*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:	Riverview on the Chattahoochee
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):	District 18; Land Lots 58, 171, 172, 174, 175, 284
Brief Description of Project:	Mixed used development on 87.605 acres featuring 240,000 s.f. of commercial and 2,180 residential units.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale & Distribution | <input type="radio"/> Attractions & Recreational Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal Terminals |
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools | <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	Mixed used development on 87.605 acres featuring 240,000 s.f. of commercial and 2,180 residential units
Developer:	Green Street Properties/Marthasville Development/Jamestown Properties
Mailing Address:	999 Peachtree Street, Suite 2620
Address 2:	
	City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30309
Telephone:	404-835-8220
Email:	info@gsprop.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:	Riverview Industries
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: 2017 Overall project: 2017
Back to Top	

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2152**

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:	Cobb County
Individual completing form:	John P. Pederson
Telephone:	770-528-2024
Email:	john.pederson@cobbcounty.org
Project Information	
Name of Proposed Project:	Riverview on the Chattahoochee
DRI ID Number:	2152
Developer/Applicant:	Green Street Properties/Marthasville Development/Jamestown Properties
Telephone:	404-835-8220
Email(s):	info@gsprop.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:	316 million dollars
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	6.8 million dollars
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Will this development displace	

any existing uses?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc): The proposed development will displace some older industrial uses.	
Water Supply	
Name of water supply provider for this site:	Cobb County Water System
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.46 MGD average; 1.39 MGD peak.
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:	Cobb County Water System
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.46 MGD average; 1.39 MGD peak.
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.)	13,878 daily trips; 998 Am peak hour; 1,298 pm peak hour.
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: See Traffic study prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates.	

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	2,838 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?	33.27 acres out of 81.95 acres= 40.6% impervious.
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Sustainable low-impact stormwater quality design.	

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:	
1. Water supply watersheds?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
3. Wetlands?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
4. Protected mountains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
5. Protected river corridors?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
6. Floodplains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input 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
<p>If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:</p> <p>The project is located along the banks of the Chattahoochee River. The property is currently occupied by several older industrial uses that may predate existing water quality regulation. The developer's proposal will comply with the Metropolitan River Protection Act and with Cobb County Stormwater Management requirements, which will improve water quality for the property.</p>	
Back to Top	

