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

DATE: Oct 31 2011 ARC REVIEW CODE: R1110281

TO: Chairman Tim Lee

ATTN TO: John Pederson, Zoning Division Manager

I. Emerson Bryan, Interim Executive Director L. Emerson Bryan FROM:

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: Bankhead C&D Transfer Station, LLC

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County Review Type: DRI

Date Opened: Oct 31 2011 Deadline for Comments: Nov 14 2011 Date to Close: Nov 27 2011

DRI Checklist Preliminary Summary:

Regional Consistency Assessment (50%): 60%

Local Impacts Assessment (30%): 100%

Quality Development Assessment (20%): 100%

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) and Regional Development Guide (RDG), the proposed development is in an area designated Maturing Neighborhoods and is along a Redevelopment Corridor. The UGPM and RDG states that Maturing Neighborhoods are areas in

Overall Weighted Score: 80%

the region characterized by older neighborhoods that include both single- and multifamily

development, as well as commercial and offi ce uses at connected key locations. These areas represent the part of the region that is facing infi II and redevelopment pressures. In many cases, the infrastructure is in place to handle the additional growth, however in some areas, infrastructure is built out with limited ability to expand. This may constrain the amount of additional growth possible in certain areas. Many arterial streets in this area are congested due to their use as a regional route for commuters.

The UGPM and RDG state that Redevelopment Corridors are designated to refl ect local policy. Some of these corridors function as retail centers for surrounding communities while many are major commuter routes for the region with high amounts of through traffi c. The nature and needs of each may be unique to their location within the region.

This development is also within the DL Hollowell-Veterans Memorial Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) study area and should be consistent with the recommendations of the LCI plan.

The proposed development is surrounded by existing industrial, residential, and commercial uses with some infill development and redevelopment occuring along Veterans Memorial Highway and Riverview Road. With existing and proposed residential development, schools, and parks near this property, the County should give special consideration to potential land use and transportation conflicts and develop appropriate mitigation strategies where necessary.

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

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

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

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS CITY OF SMYRNA UPPER CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVERKEEPER

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

<u>jtuley@atlantaregional.com</u>. 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.

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 Preliminary Findings of the RDC: Bankhead C&D Transfer Station, LLC See the Preliminary Report. Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed): Individual Completing Form: Local Government: Please Return this form to: Jon Tuley, Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Courtland Street NE Department: Atlanta, GA 30303 Ph. (404) 463-3307 Fax (404) 463-3254 jtuley@atlantaregional.com Telephone: (Return Date: Nov 14 2011 Signature: Date:

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

	ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM
DATE	E: Oct 31 2011 ARC REVIEW CODE: R1110281
TO:	ARC Land Use, Environmental, Transportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs
	M: Jon Tuley, Extension: 3-3307
1101	Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:
	neviewing stait by jurisdiction.
Land	Use: Ghani, Marisa <u>Transportation:</u> Kray, Michael
Envir	conmental: Santo, Jim Research: Skinner, Jim
<u>Aging</u>	g: Rader, Carolyn
	e of Proposal: Bankhead C&D Transfer Station, LLC
	ew Type: Development of Regional Impact
	ription: This project, located in Cobb County, is a proposed expansion of an existing construction and demolition waste transfer
	, to include municipal solid waste. <u>iitting Local Government:</u> Cobb County
	Opened: Oct 31 2011
	line for Comments: Nov 14 2011
	to Close:
Date	to Glose.
	Response:
1)	\Box 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)	\square While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	guide listed in the comment section.
4)	\square The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
5)	\square The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
6)	\Box Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
	COMMENTS:



RCA









ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW PART 1: REGIONAL CONSISTENCY ASSESSMENT

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	совв со	DUN.	TY				Date RCA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 10/8/2011
DRI #:	2236						RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Bankhea	d C	&D 1	ran	sfer Sta	ation, LLC	
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Industria	ıI					Action Triggering Review: Permit and 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 consis Regional Development Ma Defining Narrative?		\boxtimes			3		
Is the development consis Guiding Principles of the R		\boxtimes			3		
II. REGIONAL RESOURCE RIRS	E PLAN AND	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 armap, is the development of the Guidance for Appropriate Development Practices in Resource Plan?	consistent with ate	\boxtimes			3		
III. INTERJURISDICTION	AL 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 avoing ative effect on public fastormwater / floodplain mawater quality, etc.) in neight jurisdictions?	acilities (roads, anagement,				3		
Are neighboring jurisdiction and prepared to manage, development on public factorinwater / floodplain mater quality, etc.) in their	impacts of the ilities (roads, inagement,					WAITING ON COMMENTS	
Are other affected jurisdict school boards, aware of, a to manage, the impacts of development?	ind prepared					WAITING ON COMMENTS	
IV. TRANSPORTATION I	MPACTS	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 regions network? January								
Does the development avoid or mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding transportation network? If not, do pending projects included in the funded portion of the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP) mitigate all identified project impacts? V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS Ves No N/A Score included in the funded portion of the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP) mitigate all identified project impacts? V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS Ves No N/A Score included in the funded portion of the applicable sub-area plans? V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS Is the development consistent with the host government's Future Development Map and any applicable sub-area plans? Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map? VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC powernment's Future Development Map? VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC powernment's Future Development with the region's CEDS? RCA POINTS: 18 Out of a Possible: 30 RCA Score: 60 RCA WEIGHTED Score (50%): 30 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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." NO ther Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state" finding.	applicable regional transportation				3			
If not, do pending projects included in the funded portion of the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/RTP) mitigate all identified project impacts? V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS Ves No N/A Score 0, 1, or 3 Secure 1 SEXPLAIN (GORDINA) Is the development consistent with the bast government's Future Development Map and any applicable sub-area plans? Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map? VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) Is the development consistent with the region's CEDS? RCA POINTS: 18 OUT OF A POSSIBLE: 30 RCA SCORE: 60 RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%): 30 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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." ON, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the Proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the Proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." ONO, "the Proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." ONO, "the Proposed action IS NOT in the	Does the development avoid or mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding	\boxtimes			3			
Step	If not, do pending projects included in the funded portion of the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP)			\boxtimes				
host governments Future Development Map and any applicable sub-area plans? Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local governments Future Development Map? VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) Is the development consistent with the region's CEDS? RCA POINTS: RCA POINTS: RCA SCORE: 60 RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%): 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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state." YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state." YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state." YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state." The Region and therefore of the state." YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state." The Region and there	V. LOCALLY ADOPTED PLANS	Yes	No	N/A		for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or		
adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map? VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) Is the development consistent with the region's CEDS? RCA POINTS: RCA POINTS: RCA POINTS: RCA SCORE: RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%): 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) State Preponderance of answers above "Yes"? Was the preponderance of agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"?	host government's Future Development							
VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) Is the development consistent with the region's CEDS? RCA POINTS: 18 OUT OF A POSSIBLE: 30 RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%): 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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state" finding.	adjacent or potentially affected local							
RCA POINTS: 18 OUT OF A POSSIBLE: 30 RCA SCORE: 60 RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%): 30 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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding.	VI. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC	Yes	No	N/A		for "Yes" answers, required for "No" or		
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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Was the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"?		\boxtimes			3			
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) YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding.	-9		<u> </u>					
Sthe preponderance of answers above "Yes"? YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others YES. NO. Narrative: YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding.			A Po	INTS:	18	OUT OF A PO	SSIBLE:	30
YES, "the proposed action IS in the best interest of the region and therefore of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? NO. Narrative: Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"?		RC				RCA WEIG	GHTED	
therefore of the state." NO, "the proposed action IS NOT in the best interest of the region and therefore not of the state." Other Issues of Regional Concern: Waiting on comments from affected jurisdictions and others Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? NO. Narrative:	ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IM	RC RC	CA SC	ORE:	60 S WELL AS PA	RCA WEIG SCORE (5 ART 3 – QUALITY D	OM): EVELOPMENT	30
the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? Narrative: Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? NO. Narrative: YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding.	ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IM USED IN I	RC RC PACT A DETERM	CA SC SSESSI	ORE: MENT A	60 S WELL AS PA	RCA WEIG SCORE (5 ART 3 – QUALITY D OR THIS DRI AS WE	GHTED 0%): EVELOPMENT LL.	30 ASSESSMENT, WILL BE
Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"? interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding.	ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IM USED IN I FINDING (OVERAL Is the preponderance of answers	RC R	SSESSIBLES (ES, "to fore of the fore not the	ORE: MENT AMENT A	S WELL AS PA FF FINDING FO NT OF R posed action tate."	RCA WEIG SCORE (5 ART 3 – QUALITY D OR THIS DRI AS WE REGIONAL C on IS in the best	GHTED 0%): EVELOPMENT LL. CONSIST interest of to	30 ASSESSMENT, WILL BE ENCY) the region and t of the region and
	ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IM USED IN I FINDING (OVERAL Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"? Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve	RC R	SES	ORE: MENT AMENT A	S WELL AS PA FF FINDING FO NT OF R posed action tate."	RCA WEIG SCORE (5 ART 3 – QUALITY D OR THIS DRI AS WE REGIONAL C on IS in the best	GHTED 0%): EVELOPMENT LL. CONSIST interest of to	30 ASSESSMENT, WILL BE ENCY) the region and t of the region and
	ALL QUESTIONS FROM PART 2 – LOCAL IM USED IN I FINDING (OVERAL Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"? Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above? Was the answer to both questions	RC R	SES ES, "t fore of IO, "th fore no r Issue ictions ES. IO.	ORE: MENT A: HE STA SME he proport of the side of	S WELL AS PAFF FINDING FOR NT OF RESPONDENCE ACTION OF STATE." The posed action of the state." The state of the state of the state. The state of t	RCA WEIG SCORE (5 ART 3 – QUALITY DOR THIS DRI AS WE REGIONAL COMMISSION THE BOTTON TH	EVELOPMENT LL. CONSIST interest of to comments consider ma	ASSESSMENT, WILL BE ENCY) The region and It of the region and from affected

NOTE: This and other DRI Review forms provided by the Department are intended for use as tools to assist regional staff in the formulation of their recommendations to their executive directors and Regional Councils and to the communities they serve. Their proper use facilitates statewide procedural consistency and service delivery. Regardless of the recommendations generated by this form, all findings subsequently issued by the Regional Commission are reflective solely of the Commission's own judgment and discretion. Nothing presented in this form is binding upon the exercise of the authority granted to the Regional Commission by Georgia law and Departmental rules. The findings issued by the Regional Commission



LIA









ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW PART 2: LOCAL IMPACTS ASSESSMENT

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	совв со	OUNTY						Date LIA completed, M/D/YYYY: 10/28/2011	
DRI #:	2236						F	RC DRI Reviewer:	
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Bankhea	ad C&D Transfer Station, LLC							
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Industria	ıl					Action Triggering Review: Permit and Rezoning		
I. ADEQUACY OF LOCA ASSETS/SERVICES	AL	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (option	onal for "Yes" for "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)	
Do adequate wastewate facilities currently exist to development?	o support the	\boxtimes			3				
Do adequate water supp treatment facilities exist development?		\boxtimes			3				
Do adequate stormwate facilities exist to serve the development?		\boxtimes			3				
Do adequate solid waste to support the developm					3				
Does the local school sy capacity necessary to ac support the development	dequately			\boxtimes					
Does the local workforce skills/expertise/education to support the developm	n to effectively	\boxtimes			3				
Are all other assets/serv safety, etc.) adequate to development?		\boxtimes			3				
Is the local government of adequately providing facilities/services anticip be required by the devel	any new ated/likely to	\boxtimes			3				
II. ADEQUACY OF TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE		Yes	No	N/A	Score 0, 1, or 3	Explain (option answers, required		Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)	
Do adequate transportate currently exist to support development?		\boxtimes			3				

If the development is predominately industrial, is it located in close proximity to an interstate highway?				3		
If the development is predominately industrial, is it located with reasonable proximity to an intermodal station or other freight transfer location?	\boxtimes			3		
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)?			\boxtimes			
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?			\boxtimes			
III. ACCESS MANAGEMENT	Yes	No	N/A	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?						
If the development is adjacent to more than one roadway, is access provided via the lowest functionally classified roadway?						
Are access points to the site aligned with opposing access points and with existing, planned or likely median breaks?						
Are proposed traffic signals located at the intersection of public roadways that provide access to the entire site?			\boxtimes			
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?						
Are all proposed access points outside of the functional area of any adjacent intersections?	\boxtimes					
Do the proposed access points meet minimum spacing requirements established by GDOT (and GRTA, where appropriate)?						
IV. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	Yes	No	N/A	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?			\boxtimes			
Are potential impacts upon WETLANDS adequately addressed in the proposal?						

Are potential impacts upon GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Are potential impacts upon RIVER CORRIDORS adequately addressed in the proposal?	\boxtimes			3			
Are potential impacts upon PROTECTED MOUNTAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?			\boxtimes				
Are potential impacts upon COASTAL RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?			\boxtimes				
Are potential impacts upon FLOODPLAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Are potential impacts upon SENSITIVE SOIL TYPES adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Are potential impacts upon STEEP SLOPES adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Are potential impacts upon PRIME AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Are potential impacts upon RARE/ENDANGERED SPECIES adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Are potential impacts upon FEDERAL, STATE OR REGIONAL PARKS adequately addressed in the proposal? Are potential impacts upon HISTORIC							
RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal? Are potential impacts upon							
DESIGNATED SCENIC BYWAYS adequately addressed in the proposal? Are potential impacts upon							
VIEWSHEDS OR SCENIC AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?							
Ll/	A Po	ints:	33		POS	T OF A SIBLE:	33
LI	A Sc	ore:	100			/EIGHTED E (30%):	30
OVE	RAL	L AS	SES	SMENT (OF LOC	AL IMPAC	TS
Does the host local government need to take action to manage potential adverse impacts of this development?	•	YES []	NO		NARRATIV	
Should special requirements be placed on the developer(s) to mitigate adverse development impacts?	•	YES []	NO		NARRATIV	'E:



QDA









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

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	совв с	OUN	TY				Dat	e QDA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 10/28/2011
DRI #:	2236							RC DRI Reviewer: JT
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Bankhea	d C	&D 1	Γran	sfer Sta	ation, LLC		
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	SELECT	ONE						Action Triggering Review: Permit and Rezoning
I. MIX OF USES		Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" an	swers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Does the development i mixture of complementa								
Does the development has mixed uses?								
If the development is pri residential, are a health (e.g., corner grocery sto facilities) located within walking distance?	y mix of uses bres, community							
For developments witho component, does the de a compatible new use the prevalent in the immedia surrounding area/neight	evelopment add nat is not ately							
II. TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES		Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" an	swers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Are there sidewalks with development?	nin the							
Are there existing or pro- sidewalks along all adja street frontages that cor- internal sidewalk network	cent external nnect to the							
Are sidewalks designed ADA, AASHTO standard accessibility?								
Is bicycle parking provid residential buildings, mu buildings, and other key	ulti-family			\boxtimes				
Does the development i use trails that will conne external trail network(s)	nclude multi- ect to the			\boxtimes				

Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and/or pedestrian actuation devices?	_
connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network?	
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?	
Will the development employ pedestrian-friendly block sizes (e.g., block face no more than 500 ft, average block perimeter 1350 ft)?	
Will the development incorporate traffic calming measures, such as narrower street widths, raised pedestrian crossings, or rough pavement materials?	
III. CONNECTIVIT	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
Will the development employ street layouts that match those in older parts of the community?	
Will the developments internal street network connect to the existing surrounding street network at many	
points?	
points? Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways?	
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways? Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses?	
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways? Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses? Does the proposal allow for direct connection to adjacent developments/uses in the future (at stub outs, dead end streets, etc.)?	
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways? Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses? Does the proposal allow for direct connection to adjacent developments/uses in the future (at stub outs, dead end streets, etc.)? Will the development include external and internal connections that allow motorists to avoid using the surrounding roadways to access adjacent uses?	
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways? Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses? Does the proposal allow for direct connection to adjacent developments/uses in the future (at stub outs, dead end streets, etc.)? Will the development include external and internal connections that allow motorists to avoid using the surrounding roadways to access adjacent uses? Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation throughout the site?	
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways? Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses? Does the proposal allow for direct connection to adjacent developments/uses in the future (at stub outs, dead end streets, etc.)? Will the development include external and internal connections that allow motorists to avoid using the surrounding roadways to access adjacent uses? Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation	

IV. PARKING	Yes	No	N/A	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?			\boxtimes			
Does development seek reduced parking requirements for commercial and residential developments, particularly when nearby parking alternatives or public transit is available?						
Does development seek shared parking arrangements that reduce overall parking needs?			\boxtimes			
Does development use landscaped tree islands and medians to break up large expanses of paved parking?			\boxtimes			
Is the development's parking located where it does not visually dominate the development from the street?			\boxtimes			
Does the parking design allow for easy and safe pedestrian access to buildings?			\boxtimes			
V. INFILL DEVELOPMENT	Yes	No	N/A	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?	\boxtimes			3		
Does this project involve redevelopment of abandoned structures; a brownfield site; other underutilized properties?						
Does the development re-use or rehabilitate existing and/or historic structures?						
Is the development designed to blend into existing neighborhoods with compatible scale and design (e.g., small scale apartment buildings, multifamily that looks like a single residence from the street, etc)?			\boxtimes			
Are new housing opportunities being created out of former, underused commercial, warehouse, or industrial spaces?						
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?			\boxtimes			
Is this a greyfield redevelopment that converts vacant or under-utilized commercial strips to mixed-use assets?			\boxtimes			

VI. SENSE OF PLACE	Yes	No	N/A	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?			\boxtimes			
Is the development consistent / compatible with the traditional character of the community, incorporating appropriate scale, placement and massing?			\boxtimes			
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.)?			\boxtimes			
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)?						
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?						
Does the development design include restrictions on the number and size of signs and billboards?						
If applicable, will the natural vegetative character of surrounding roadways be maintained (e.g., with setbacks, vegetative buffers, landscaped berms)?						
VII. TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT (TND)	Yes	No	N/A	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?			\boxtimes			
Will the development include a mix of housing types and sizes evocative of the "traditional" development styles/patterns of the community?						
Do planned street widths employ TND width standards (i.e. narrow)?						
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?			\boxtimes			
Are accommodations included for on- street parking and/or rear alleyway access for residents'/visitors' automobiles?						

VIII. OPEN/GREEN SPACE CONSERVATION	Yes	No	N/A	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				0,1,010		
Is the development clustered to preserve open/green space within the						
development site? 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?						
Does the design of the development include provisions to permanently preserve environmentally sensitive areas by setting them aside as public parks, trails, greenbelts, etc?			\boxtimes			
Does the design of the development incorporate significant site features (view corridors, water features, farmland, wetlands, etc.) as amenities?						
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?						
IX. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	Yes	No	N/A	Score 0,1, or 3	Explain (as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	Recommendations (to the Developer for Improving the Project)
IX. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION Does the development avoid critical environmental areas?	Yes	No	N/A			
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas? 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?		No	N/A	0,1, or 3		
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas? 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? 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		No	N/A	0,1, or 3 3		
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas? 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? Does the development include measures to retain/protect a large proportion of existing trees and to maintain the health of new trees		No		0,1, or 3 3		
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas? 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? 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? Does the development incorporate native and drought-tolerant		No		0,1, or 3 3		

Does the development reflect best management practices (e.g., bioretention strips, rain gardens or swales as alternatives to conventional practices) for water quality protection?			\boxtimes			
Do the parking lots incorporate innovative on-site stormwater mitigation or retention features that are not covered elsewhere in this checklist?						
Is a substantial proportion of the total paved area (total of driveways, parking, etc) covered with permeable surfaces?			\boxtimes			
Does the development propose water conservation covenants or employ other appropriate water conservation measures?			\boxtimes			
Is the development seeking independent certification/recognition by a widely acknowledged development accreditation organization (e.g. LEED, EarthCraft, Green Globes, Energy Star, etc.)?						
Does the development make use of alternative building materials that promote environmental protection and energy efficiency?			\boxtimes			
X. Housing Choices	Yes	No	N/A	Score	Explain	Recommendations
At Tiocomo Gilolozo				0,1, or 3	(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	(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			\boxtimes	0,1, 013	(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	(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? For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately				0,1, 013	(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	(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? For developments with a residential component, does the development add				U,1, OF 3	(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	(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? For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately surrounding neighborhood? If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include affordability and accessibility features and proximity to services and transportation				U,1, OF 3	(as necessary for "Yes" and "No" answers)	(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? For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately surrounding neighborhood? If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include affordability and accessibility features and proximity to services and transportation alternatives? Will the development provide greater housing options for low and middle	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? For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately surrounding neighborhood? If the development includes a senior housing component, does the development include affordability and accessibility features and proximity to services and transportation alternatives? Will the development provide greater housing options for low and middle income residents and families?	Yes	No		Score	Explain	Recommendations

Does the design/location of this development clearly reflect consideration of the local and regional jobs/housing balance?							
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?			\boxtimes				
Will this development use or is it likely to enhance local or regional small-business development program(s)?			\boxtimes				
Will the development provide greater employment opportunities for low and middle income residents?			\boxtimes				
Is the development likely to spur other activities aimed at improving the quality of the local/regional workforce?			\boxtimes				
QDA	QDA POINTS:			12		OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	12
QDA Score:			100			QDA WEIGHTED SCORE (20%):	20
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY							
Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"?	 ☐ YES, the proposed development qualifies for expedited review. ☐ NO, the proposed development <u>DOES NOT</u> qualify for expedited review. 						
And is the development generally reflective of the best quality growth practices?	 YES, this regional commission recommends this development for Georgia Quality Development designation. NO NARRATIVE: 						

BANKHEAD TRANSFER STATION DRI

Cobb County Environmental Planning Division Review Comments October 28, 2011

Chattahoochee Corridor, Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The property is located in the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor and is therefore subject to the requirements of the Metropolitan River Protection Act (Georgia Code 12-5-440 et seq.) and the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. The proposed project would be built on the site of an existing transfer station that was developed prior to the effective date of the Metropolitan River Protection Act and Chattahoochee Corridor Plan in this area. If the proposed project is built within the limits of the existing impervious surface and land disturbance, a review under the Act and Plan may not be necessary. Any increase in the amount of land disturbance or impervious surface on the property would require review for consistency with the standards of the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. The property is not in a water supply watershed and the USGS coverage for the project area shows no perennial or intermittent streams on the site. Any unmapped streams on the property will be subject to the requirements of the Cobb stream buffer ordinance. Any waters of the state on the property will also be subject to the Georgia Department of Natural resources (DNR) 25-foot erosion and sedimentation control buffer.

Storm Water/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants produced after the construction of the entire proposed development, based on the submitted site 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 impervious surface amounts and percentages are those that are typical for each land use type in the Atlanta Region and assume total coverage of the land area shown. This may not reflect the total coverage on this site for this project. Actual loadings will reflect actual impervious amounts and other existing conditions on the site. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis.

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants per Year

Land Use	Land Area (ac)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Heavy Industrial	8.16	11.83	157.00	1044.48	6487.20	13.55	1.71
TOTAL	8.16	11.83	157.00	1044.48	6487.20	13.55	1.71

Total Percent Impervious: 80%

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.

SAMS, LARKIN & HUFF

GARVIS L. SAMS, JR.
JOEL L. LARKIN
PARKS F. HUFF
JAMES A. BALLI

MELISSA P. HAISTEN JUSTIN H. MEEKS Suite 100 376 Powder Springs Street Marietta, Georgia 30064-3448

October 6, 2011

770.422.7016 TELEPHONE 770.426.6583 FACSIMILE

SAMSLARKINHUFF.COM

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Julie Ann McQueen, AICP, Senior Planner Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Suite 900 245 Peachtree Center Avenue, NE Atlanta, GA 30303

Re:

Bankhead C&D Transfer Station, LLC

(Cobb County DRI #2236)

Dear Ms. McQueen:

It was a pleasure meeting with you and representatives of ARC, GDOT and Cobb County earlier this week. In accordance with our discussion, this letter will serve as a request for an expedited review of the case and also provide you with the information which you have requested.

With respect to the foregoing, it is anticipated that there will be approximately forty-eight (48) truck trips per day to and from the subject property predicated upon gaining approval of the Special Land Use Permit from Cobb County. Additionally, it is anticipated that employee car trips to and from the subject property will consist of approximately ten (10) trips per day. Access to the subject property will continue to be from Veterans Memorial Highway with the addition of a deceleration lane and appropriate taper. Sidewalk will be installed along the subject property's frontage on Veterans Memorial Highway.

The hours of operation for the business will continue to be from 5:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and Saturday from 8:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. with the business being closed on Sundays. There will be a total number of five (5) employees who will be going to and from the site which account for the above-mentioned car trips.

The proposal of Bankhead C&D is to expand the existing scope of the Construction and Demolition Transfer Station to include municipal solid waste. It is anticipated that the project will transfer 150,000 tons of waste annually. It is also anticipated that improvements to the subject property will be made (on the existing impervious footprint) which will include a Recovered Material Processing Facility ("RMF"). All processing operations of the RMF will be carried on inside the building, including the delivery of materials and the removal of same for transport. The RMF will contain a dust and odor expression system including overhead misters

SAMS, LARKIN & HUFF A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP VIA EMAIL

Ms. Julie Ann McQueen, AICP, Senior Planner Georgia Regional Transportation Authority October 6, 2011 Page 2

which will apply water and deodorizer periodically to control dust and odor within the building and will contain air dispersion exhaust fans and provide for the manual application of water from wash down stations within the building. Tipping floors where recyclable materials are deposited will be washed down at least two (2) times per week.

As you know, the subject property is located in an area denominated as Industrial on Cobb County's Future Land Use Map and is zoned Heavy Industrial but requires a Special Land Use Permit for the activities mentioned above. My client's name is noted above and its principal is Terry Nicholson whose contact information is as follows:

Mr. V. Terry Nicholson, CEO Bankhead C&D Transfer Station, LLC 1490 Veterans Memorial Highway Mableton, GA 30126

(678) 296-1888 (256) 260-1344 (fax) TNicholson@bankheadtransfer.com

Our engineer, Kenneth Wood, of Planners and Engineers Collaborative, Inc. is going to send you a digital copy of the site plan. If, upon your receipt of this letter you have not received same, please let me know and I will ensure that it is electronically forwarded to you. Please do not hesitate to call should you require any further information or documentation concerning these matters. With regards, I am

Very truly yours,

SAMS, LARKIN & HUFF, LLP

Garvis L. Sams, Jr. gsams@samslarkinhuff.com

SAMS, LARKIN & HUFF

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Julie Ann McQueen, AICP, Senior Planner Georgia Regional Transportation Authority October 6, 2011 Page 3

cc: Mr. John Tuley, Principal Planner, Atlanta Regional Commission (via email)

Mr. Mike Lobdell, P.E., GDOT District Traffic Engineer (via email)

Mr. Patrick Bradshaw, ARC Transportation Planner (via email)

Mr. John P. Pederson, AICP, Zoning Manager, Cobb County Community Development Department (via email)

Mr. Jason Campbell, County Planner (via email)

Ms. Jane Stricklin, P.E., Development & Review Engineer, Cobb County Department of Transportation (via email)

Mr. David Breaden, P.E., Cobb County Stormwater Management (via email)

Mr. Kenneth Wood, P.E., LEED AP, Planners Engineers Collaborative (via email)

Mr. Terry Nicholson, Bankhead C&D Transfer Station, LLC (via email)

30 RESERVECH CONEL = NOKCHOSS

SECURIOR = TYMDSCYPE

SULF PLANUING = LANDSCHOSS

SORPHITE PLANUING

SORPHITE PLANUING = LANDSCHOSS

SORPHITE PLANUING = LANDSCHOSS

SORPHITE PLANUING = LANDSCHOSS

SORPHITE PLANUING

SORPHITE SCALE: 1"=80'
DATE: SEPTEMBER 1, 2011
PROJECT: 11107.00 REVISIONS: SLUP PLAN PHONE ET STATE STATION, LLC.

PANKHEAD TRANSPER STATION, LLC.

BANKHEAD TRANSPER STATION, LLC.

BANKHEAD TRANSPER STATION, LLC. PANKHEAD TRANSFER STATION

108
108 24 HOUR CONTACT: TERRY NICHOLSON @ 678-296-1888 1 (%) (8) (18) OVERALL TOTAL SITE AREA ZONING ZONING JURISDICTION EXISTING ZONING SITE DATA:

.

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home DRI Rules Thresholds Tier Map FAQ Apply View Submissions Logout

DRI #2236 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 Cobb County Government: 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: Bankhead C & D Transfer Station 11C Location (Street Address, 1480 Veterans Memorial Highway GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: Expansion of C & D waste transfer station to include MSW. Development Type: (not selected) Hotels Wastewater Treatment Facilities Office Mixed Use Petroleum Storage Facilities Commercial Airports Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs Wholesale & Distribution Attractions & Recreational Facilities Intermodal Terminals Hospitals and Health Care Facilities Post-Secondary Schools Truck Stops Housing Waste Handling Facilities Any other development types Industrial Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	8.16 acres				
Developer:	Bankhead C & D Transfer Station, LLC				
Mailing Address:	1638 Bethel Road, Decatur GA 35603				
Address 2:	376 Powder Springs Road, Marietta GA 30064				
	City: decatur State: ga Zip: 35603				
Telephone:	770-422-7016				
Email:	gsams@samslarkinhuff.com				
Is property owner different from developer/applicant?	(not selected) Yes No				
If yes, property owner:					
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	(not selected) Yes No				
If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?					
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ◉ No				
If yes, provide the following information:	Project Name:				
	Project ID:				
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	Rezoning Variance Connect Sewer Connect Water Permit Other				
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ◉ No				
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?					
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 2011 Overall project: 2011				
Save Updates to Submitted Form Save without Submitting Cancel					
Back to Top					

You are logged in to the DRI Website as *jtuley*. | Change Password | Go to Applications Listing

GRTA Home Page | ARC Home Page | RDC Links | DCA Home Page | Site Map | Statements | Contact

Copyright © 2010 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home DRI Rules Thresholds Tier Map FAQ Apply View Submissions Logout

DRI #2236

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information			
	nty government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the DRI Process and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds for more information.		
Loc	al 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:	Bankhead C & D Transfer Station, LLC		
DRI ID Number:	2236		
Developer/Applicant:	Bankhead C & D Transfer Station, LLC		
Telephone:	770-422-7016		
Email(s):	gsams@samslarkinhuff.com		
Addit	ional 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.)	(not selected) Yes No		
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?	(not selected) Yes No		
If no, the official review process can not start u	ntil this additional information is provided.		
1	Economic Development		
Estimated Value at Build-Out:	Approximately \$500,000.00		
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$10,000.00 to \$12,000.00		
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	O (not selected) Yes No		
Will this development displace any existing uses?	(not selected) Yes No		

If yes, please describe (including number of un	nits, square feet, etc):
,	
	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)?	70,000 gallons per month
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No
If no, describe any plans to expand the existin	g water supply capacity:
Is a water line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes 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)?	8,000 to 10,000 gallons prt month.
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No
If no, describe any plans to expand existing w	astewater treatment canacity:
Note: property is currently on two 1,000 gall	
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will	be required?
200 feet.	
	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.)	48 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?	(not selected) Yes No
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No

If yes, please describe below:		
	Solid Waste Disposal	
How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	150,000 tons per year.	
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If no, describe any plans to expand existing la	andfill capacity:	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	(not selected) Yes No	
If yes, please explain:		
п уез, рівазе вхріант.		
	Stormwater Management	
	I	
What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	66%	
	uffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the	
project's impacts on stormwater management Stormwater ponds and water quality ponds in	:: may be added if determined to be needed by Cobb County.	
	Environmental Quality	
Is the development located within, or likely to	affect any of the following:	
1. Water supply watersheds?	(not selected) Yes No	
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?	(not selected) Yes No	
3. Wetlands?	(not selected) Yes No	
4. Protected mountains?	(not selected) Yes No	
5. Protected river corridors?	(not selected) Yes No	
6. Floodplains?	(not selected) Yes No	
7. Historic resources?	(not selected) Yes No	

8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	(not selected) Yes No			
If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: The subject property is located within the MRPA corridor. The Turner-Sewell Cemetery is on site and will be preserved with fencing and buffering.				
Save Updates to Submitted Form	Save without Submitting Cancel			
Back to Top				

You are logged in to the DRI Website as *jtuley*. | Change Password | Go to Applications Listing

GRTA Home Page | ARC Home Page | RDC Links | DCA Home Page | Site Map | Statements | Contact

Copyright © 2010 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.