



REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

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

DATE: Dec 16 2012

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1211261

TO: Mayor Mario Avery
ATTN TO: Jessica Guinn, City of Fairburn
FROM: Douglas A. Hooker, Executive Director

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: Exeter Expansions
Submitting Local Government: City of Fairburn

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact
Date Opened: Nov 26 2012

Description: This project, located in the City of Fairburn, is a proposed expansion to an existing warehouse development. The two existing buildings are 346,288 square feet and 400,255 square feet. The proposed expansion will include two additional buildings will be 353,400 square feet and 382,705 resulting in an overall project square footage of 1,482,648 square feet. The proposed project is located northeast of the Oakley Industrial Boulevard and Fayetteville Road intersection.

DRI Checklist Summary:

Regional Consistency Assessment (50%): 100%
Local Impacts Assessment (30%): 100%
Quality Development Assessment (20%): 83%

Overall Weighted Score: 97%

FINDING: After reviewing the information submitted for the review, and the comments received from affected agencies, the Atlanta Regional Commission finding is that the DRI is in the best interest of the Region, and therefore, of the State.

Comments: Regional Context:

According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) and the Regional Development Guide (RDG), the proposed Exeter Expansions development is within an area designated as Developing Suburbs and is also located within an Industrial/Logistics area.

The RDG states that Developing Suburbs are areas in the region where suburban development has occurred and the conventional development pattern is present but not set. These areas are characterized by limited commercial and residential development. These areas represent the extent of the urban service area, and the region's first attempts at suburban smart growth can be found in these areas. The region should strive to develop these areas in a more sustainable way than the existing development model. To this end, there is a need for additional preservation of critical environmental locations, as well as agricultural and forest uses adjacent to rural areas.

Limited existing infrastructure in these areas will constrain the amount of additional growth that is possible. Some transportation improvements may be needed within these developing suburbs, but care should be taken not to spur unwanted growth.

The RDG states that Industrial and Logistics Areas represent the major intermodal freight facilities and major logistics centers of the region. As a strategic economic sector, the region should strive to protect these areas and ensure they are well served by the regional transportation network.

Comments:

The proposed development is located in an area that is rapidly changing and is becoming dominated by industrial and warehouse uses. It is important to promote compatible uses where possible, as well as identify and mitigate potential land use conflicts as the area continues to develop.

Based on the submitted project location map and the USGS coverage for the project area, the proposed project site is located entirely within the Flint River Water Supply Watershed which is a large water supply watershed (greater than 100 square miles in area) as defined in the Part 5 Environmental Minimum Planning Criteria. Under the Part 5 Criteria the only criteria that apply in a large water supply watershed without a water supply reservoir are requirements for hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal.

The USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan show a blue line stream running along a portion of the north side of the project property. No development is shown within City or State buffers on the submitted site plan. All proposed development on the property near the stream will need to conform to the requirements of the Fairburn Stream Buffer ordinance's 75-foot stream buffer as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer. Any other waters of the state on this property will also be subject to the State buffer requirements.

See additional comments from ARC environmental and transportation staff, GDOT and Fayette County.

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING	ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING	ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH	ARC AGING DIVISION	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	FULTON COUNTY
CITY OF UNION CITY	FAYETTE COUNTY	

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/land-use/planreviews>.



RCA



RCA



ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW

PART 1: REGIONAL CONSISTENCY ASSESSMENT

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	CITY OF FAIRBURN				Date RCA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 11/26/12	
DRI #:	2315				RC DRI Reviewer: JT	
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Exeter Expansions					
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Industrial				Action Triggering Review: Land Disturbance Permit	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are other affected jurisdictions, including school boards, aware of, and prepared to manage, the impacts of this development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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		
Is the development consistent with any adjacent or potentially affected local government's Future Development Map?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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		
RCA POINTS:				33	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	33
RCA SCORE:				100	RCA WEIGHTED SCORE (50%):	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)						
Is the preponderance of answers above "Yes"?	<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:					
Has the host local government or the developer agreed to changes that would successfully resolve "No" answers above?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES. <input type="checkbox"/> NO. Narrative:					
Was the answer to both questions in this section "No"?	<input type="checkbox"/> YES. The Regional Commission should consider making a "not in the best interests of the region and therefore of the state" finding. <input type="checkbox"/> NO.					

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 are purely advisory and are in no circumstance binding upon the authority granted to the host local government by Georgia law.



LIA



LIA



ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION - DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW

PART 2: LOCAL IMPACTS ASSESSMENT

To be completed by the ARC Staff

JURISDICTION:	CITY OF FAIRBURN				Date LIA completed, M/D/YYYY: 7/12/2012	
DRI #:	2315				RC DRI Reviewer: JT	
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Exeter Expansions					
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Industrial				Action Triggering Review: Land Disturbance Permit	
I. ADEQUACY OF LOCAL ASSETS/SERVICES	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)
Do adequate wastewater/sewerage facilities currently exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate stormwater management facilities exist to serve the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Do adequate solid waste facilities exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the local school system have the capacity necessary to adequately support the development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the local workforce possess the skills/expertise/education to effectively support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
II. ADEQUACY OF TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE	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)
Do adequate transportation facilities currently exist to support the development?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
If the development is predominately industrial, is it located in close proximity to an interstate highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		

If the development is predominately industrial, is it located with reasonable proximity to an intermodal station or other freight transfer location?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Will developer-funded mitigation of the transportation impacts of this development be adequate to address needs generated by the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
enhancements and/or improvements of the items already listed in the applicable transportation plan (STIP/TIP/LRTP)?						
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If the development is adjacent to more than one roadway, is access provided via the lowest functionally classified roadway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Are proposed traffic signals located at the intersection of public roadways that provide access to the entire site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<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"/>	<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"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon WETLANDS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Are potential impacts upon GROUNDWATER RECHARGE AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon RIVER CORRIDORS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon PROTECTED MOUNTAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon COASTAL RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon FLOODPLAINS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon SENSITIVE SOIL TYPES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon STEEP SLOPES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon PRIME AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon RARE/ENDANGERED SPECIES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon FEDERAL, STATE OR REGIONAL PARKS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon HISTORIC RESOURCES adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon DESIGNATED SCENIC BYWAYS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are potential impacts upon VIEWSHEDS OR SCENIC AREAS adequately addressed in the proposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
LIA Points:		39		OUT OF A POSSIBLE:	39	
LIA Score:		100		LIA WEIGHTED SCORE (30%):	30	
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:	EXETER EXPANSIONS				Date QDA Completed, M/D/YYYY: 11/2	
DRI #:	2315				RC DRI Reviewer: JT	
TENTATIVE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:	Exeter Expansions					
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:	Industrial				Action Triggering Review: Land Disturbance Permit	
I. MIX OF USES	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 incorporate a mixture of complementary land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development have vertically mixed uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
II. TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES	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)
Are there sidewalks within the development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are there existing or proposed sidewalks along all adjacent external street frontages that connect to the internal sidewalk network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are sidewalks designed to comply with ADA, AASHTO standards of width and accessibility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is bicycle parking provided at all non-residential buildings, multi-family buildings, and other key destinations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development include multi-use trails that will connect to the external trail network(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Are intersections designed for pedestrian safety, including marked crossing, curb extensions, median refuges, raised crosswalks, and/or pedestrian actuation devices?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the design include pedestrian connections between building entrances and the internal and external sidewalk network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development incorporate traffic calming measures, such as narrower street widths, raised pedestrian crossings, or rough pavement materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
III. CONNECTIVITY	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)
Will the development employ street layouts that match those in older parts of the community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the developments internal street network connect to the existing surrounding street network at many points?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development provide multiple ingress/egress points and have access to multiple external roadways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the proposal provide appropriate direct connections to existing adjacent developments/uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the internal street network minimize traveling distance by providing relatively direct circulation throughout the site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Can the internal street network be reasonably anticipated to add to the public roadway network?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Where appropriate, will the development employ mid-block alleys?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does development seek shared parking arrangements that reduce overall parking needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does development use landscaped tree islands and medians to break up large expanses of paved parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development's parking located where it does not visually dominate the development from the street?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does the parking design allow for easy and safe pedestrian access to buildings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
Does this project involve redevelopment of abandoned structures; a brownfield site; other underutilized properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development re-use or rehabilitate existing and/or historic structures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are new housing opportunities being created out of former, underused commercial, warehouse, or industrial spaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is this a greyfield redevelopment that converts vacant or under-utilized commercial strips to mixed-use assets?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development consistent / compatible with the traditional character of the community, incorporating appropriate scale, placement and massing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development design include restrictions on the number and size of signs and billboards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development include a mix of housing types and sizes evocative of the "traditional" development styles/patterns of the community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Do planned street widths employ TND width standards (i.e. narrow)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Are accommodations included for on-street parking and/or rear alleyway access for residents'/visitors' automobiles?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

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 protected open/greenspace?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development clustered to preserve open/green space within the development site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the design of the development incorporate significant site features (view corridors, water features, farmland, wetlands, etc.) as amenities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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)
Does the development avoid critical environmental areas?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3		
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development incorporate native and drought-tolerant landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development designed to avoid the need for a stream buffer variance under any applicable ordinances?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is a substantial proportion of the total paved area (total of driveways, parking, etc) covered with permeable surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development propose water conservation covenants or employ other appropriate water conservation measures?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Does the development make use of alternative building materials that promote environmental protection and energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
X. HOUSING CHOICES	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)
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
For developments with a residential component, does the development add a new housing type to the immediately surrounding neighborhood?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development provide greater housing options for low and middle income residents and families?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
XI. ECONOMIC 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)
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development enhance diversity in the local/regional economic base?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Does the design/location of this development clearly reflect consideration of the local and regional jobs/housing balance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
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"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will this development use or is it likely to enhance local or regional small-business development program(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Will the development provide greater employment opportunities for low and middle income residents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Is the development likely to spur other activities aimed at improving the quality of the local/regional workforce?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
QDA POINTS:			15	OUT OF A POSSIBLE:		18
QDA SCORE:			83	QDA WEIGHTED SCORE (20%):		17
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: Marshall Willis, Transportation Planning Division

DATE: November 29, 2012

SUBJECT: **Transportation Division Review of DRI # 2291**
Project: Exeter Expansions
County: Fulton
Location: 7300, 7320 Oakley Industrial Blvd
City of Fairburn, Fulton Co., Georgia

Analysis:

Expedited	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Non-Expedited	<input type="checkbox"/>

cc: David Haynes
TD

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 Expedited Review Process. The Exeter Expansion development is a 92 acre site located on Oakley Industrial Boulevard at Stalwart Drive, near the intersection with Fayetteville Road. The development is comprised of two existing light industrial warehouses, with a proposed expansion from two buildings that total 746,543 square feet to four buildings totaling 1,482,648 square feet.

INFRASTRUCTURE Transportation

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

Site access is proposed to be one existing driveway that connects with two existing warehouses. The location of the entrance is on the site's north side, on Oakley Industrial Boulevard, directly across from Stalwart Drive. There are no additional access points to the site.

How much average daily traffic will be generated by the proposed project?

The site is expected to generate 2,491 weekday daily trips, up from the current count of 976. There are an expected 182 morning peak hour vehicular trips and 189 evening peak hour vehicular trips generated when the expansions are completed. This is an increase of 94 morning peak hour and 131 evening peak hour trips. The new daily trips generated by the expansions are expected to comprise 7% of the Oakley Industrial Boulevard trips, and approximately 5% of the LOS "D" capacity of 14,600 for a 2-lane undivided Non-State Roadway.

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

PLAN 2040 RTP (Long Range Projects)*

ARC Number	<u>Route</u>	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
FS-202B1	Oakley Industrial Boulevard	Roadway/Operations & Safety	Short-Range 2012-2017

**The ARC Board adopted the PLAN 2040 RTP and FY 2012-2017 TIP on July 27th, 2011.*

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 not directly served by transit.

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

None proposed.

What other issues should be considered during the traffic study or in general for the proposed development?

- The developer should review design guidelines related to ARC's Policy and Investment Networks. Oakley Industrial Boulevard connects to the Strategic Truck Route Network, Regional Thoroughfare Network, and is labeled as a Regional Strategic Transportation System Arterial.

EXETER EXPANSIONS OAKLEY INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD DRI
City of Fairburn
Environmental Planning Division Review Comments

November 19, 2012

Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection

Based on the submitted project location map and the USGS coverage for the project area, the proposed project site is located entirely within the Flint River Water Supply Watershed which is a large water supply watershed (greater than 100 square miles in area) as defined in the Part 5 Environmental Minimum Planning Criteria. Under the Part 5 Criteria the only criteria that apply in a large water supply watershed without a water supply reservoir are requirements for hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal.

The USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan show a blue line stream running along a portion of the north side of the project property. No development is shown within City or State buffers on the submitted site plan. All proposed development on the property near the stream will need to conform to the requirements of the Fairburn Stream Buffer ordinance's 75-foot stream buffer as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer. Any other waters of the state on this property will also be subject to the State buffer requirements.

Storm Water/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 total site area, as shown on the submitted plans, is used for this calculation. 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
Heavy Industrial	92.37	133.94	1777.20	11823.36	73434.15	153.33	19.40
TOTAL	92.37	133.94	1777.20	11823.36	73434.15	153.33	19.40

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.

Jonathan Tuley

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2012 9:07 AM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Subject: RE: Pre-Review Meeting October 29, 2012 - 7300 Oakley Industrial Boulevard (City of Fairburn)

Jon,

Please see corrected email below.

The proposed development is located approximately 7 miles South West of Hartsfield Jackson International Airport (ATL), and approximately 13 miles North East of Peachtree City - Falcon Field (FFC). The proposed development will not impact those airports unless construction exceeds 200ft above ground level. If the proposed project's vertical construction exceeds 200ft above ground level, an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration. That may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/portal.jsp>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notification, no later than 45 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impact of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

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

Alan Hood | Airport Safety Data Program Manager
Georgia Department of Transportation - Aviation Programs
600 West Peachtree Street, N.W. | 9th Floor | Atlanta, Georgia 30308
T: 404-631-1343 | F: 404-631-1414 | M: 404-660-3394 | E: achood@dot.ga.gov

View our website at <http://www.dot.ga.gov/aviation>

From: Comer, Carol
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 7:24 PM
To: Hood, Alan C.
Subject: Fwd: Pre-Review Meeting October 29, 2012 - 7300 Oakley Industrial Boulevard (City of Fairburn)

Thanks,
Carol

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jonathan Tuley <JTuley@atlantaregional.com>
Date: October 25, 2012 3:56:33 PM EDT
To: "jud.turner@gaepd.org" <jud.turner@gaepd.org>, "Allen, Patrick" <paallen@dot.ga.gov>, "VanDyke, Cindy" <cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov>, "Ware, Alan" <alware@dot.ga.gov>, "Williams, Michael V." <michawilliams@dot.ga.gov>, "Comer, Carol" <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>, "Lobdell, Mike" <mlobdell@dot.ga.gov>, "Walker, Steven" <stwalker@dot.ga.gov>, "Cautela, Daphne" <dcautela@dot.ga.gov>, "'wstinson@itsmarta.com'" <wstinson@itsmarta.com>, "'lbeall@grta.org'" <lbeall@grta.org>, "'BDennard@grta.org'" <BDennard@grta.org>, "'DRI@grta.org'" <DRI@grta.org>, "'Crocker, John'" <jtcrocker@itsmarta.com>, "'Floyd, Greg'" <gffloyd@itsmarta.com>, 'Jon West' <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>, 'Troy Besseche' <troy@fairburn.com>, "'jguinn@tcfatl.com'" <jguinn@tcfatl.com>, "'jmatthews@arcodb.com'"

<jmatthews@arcodb.com>, "jatcheson@arcodb.com" <jatcheson@arcodb.com>, "bkbrumfield@eberly.net" <bkbrumfield@eberly.net>, "Ellington, Morgan" <Morgan.Ellington@fultoncountyga.gov>, "alippmann@unioncityga.org" <alippmann@unioncityga.org>, "pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov" <pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov>
Cc: Landuse <Landuse@atlantaregional.com>, Jane Hayse <JHayse@atlantaregional.com>, "SDunn@atlantaregional.com" <sdunn@atlantaregional.com>, David Haynes <DHaynes@atlantaregional.com>, Mike Alexander <MAlexander@atlantaregional.com>, Jim Skinner <JSkinner@atlantaregional.com>, Nathan Soldat <NSoldat@atlantaregional.com>, Marshall Willis <MWillis@atlantaregional.com>
Subject: Pre-Review Meeting October 29, 2012 - 7300 Oakley Industrial Boulevard (City of Fairburn)

Development of Regional Impact Pre-Review Meeting Notification

This e-mail serves as notice that based on preliminary information submitted to the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), the proposed development, **7300 Oakley Industrial Boulevard**, may qualify as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) as defined by Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) rules and therefore may warrant regional review. ARC staff will hold a pre-review meeting on **Monday, October 29, 2012, at 1:00pm in the Etowah Room at ARC Offices** to discuss this project, determine if it is a DRI and determine what additional information will be needed to initiate the review.

We request that you or a member of your staff attend the pre-review meeting to review the initial proposal. If you are the applicant/developer, or the developer's representative, you must attend this meeting. Please send us relevant information related to the project, including a digital copy of the site plan prior to the meeting.

7300 Oakley Industrial Boulevard - This project, located in the City of Fairburn, is a proposed expansion to an existing warehouse development. The existing structure is 346,288 square feet and the proposed expansion will take the new total square footage to approximately 700,000 square feet. The proposed project is located northeast of the Oakley Industrial Boulevard and Fayetteville Road intersection. Additional information on this project will be provided at the pre-review meeting.

We are hopeful that any concerns your agency or organization might have about the development can be identified at this meeting. All interested parties are welcome to attend. Please let me know if you have any questions about the meeting.

For more information regarding the DRI processes, and the information needed for the review, please see the [DRI website](#).

For Directions to the Atlanta Regional Commission please visit the [ARC website](#).

Thanks,

Jon Tuley, AICP
Principal Planner

Atlanta Regional Commission
regional impact + local relevance

40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2538
P | 404.463.3307
F | 404.463.3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com
atlantaregional.com

Connect with ARC

Like us on [Facebook](#) »

Follow us on [Twitter](#) »

ARC Land Matters [Blog](#) »

Get connected on [LinkedIn](#) »

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are intended solely for the use of the named recipient or recipients. Any dissemination of this e-mail by anyone other than an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not a named recipient, you are prohibited from any further viewing of the e-mail or any attachments or from making any use of the e-mail or attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments, and all copies.

Over the past decade, Georgia DOT has provided nearly \$860 million to assist cities and counties with the maintenance and improvement of local roads. For more information on our current Local Maintenance and Improvement Grant (LMIG) program.

Visit us at <http://www.dot.ga.gov/LMIG>; or follow us on <http://www.facebook.com/GeorgiaDOT> and <http://twitter.com/gadepthoftrans>

From: Pete Frisina <pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov>
Sent: Friday, December 07, 2012 3:11 PM
To: Jonathan Tuley
Cc: Bryan D. Keller; Philip Mallon
Subject: RE: DRI Review Notification - Exeter Expansions (DRI #2315)

Jonathan,

Please the following comments From Fayette County:

The preliminary report states that adequate transportation facilities exist to support this development. I don't agree with that statement. The I-85 interchanges at SR 74 and SR 138 are not functioning properly under current loads. The problem is significant enough that the local CID has initiated a study to identify improvements at the SR 74 interchange. Funding to implement the needed repairs is uncertain, however. The Exeter expansion will worsen existing transportation congestion and safety issues unless state/federal funding is allocated for the improvements (GDOT PI 0007841). The report should reflect that current conditions are stressed and regional improvements are needed at SR 74, SR 138 and surrounding roads to accommodate this type of expansion.

Phil Mallon, P.E.
Fayette County Public Works
770-320-6010

Stormwater/Watershed Protection

The proposed project is located in the Flint River Watershed which is a major water supply watershed for Fayette County. Therefore, to help our efforts in meeting water quality criteria and ensure the protection of downstream waters, we ask that a surface water monitoring program be incorporated into the project's stormwater management plan. The field data generated through such a plan are critical to assess the effectiveness of the water quality controls and provide indications when maintenance may be required on the Best Management Practices incorporated at the site. Without field data, downstream water users have no quantitative means of checking that the current regulatory changes and BMP requirements are meeting their objective of protecting and/or improving the quality and health of our water resources.

The Review Report notes that a 75 foot undisturbed buffer was indicated on the plans. Currently Fayette County's watershed protection ordinance specifies a 100 foot undisturbed buffer with a additional 50 foot setback for unnamed perennial streams within the Flint River. Because buffers are an effective means of protecting water quality, we ask that Fulton County require the same buffers and setbacks (i.e., greater than 75 feet) for this project to help protect this sensitive drinking water supply.

Fayette County would also ask to be copied on all of the approved hydrology studies, stormwater management plan. If a surface water monitoring plan is required please have us copied on this as well.

Bryan Keller
Stormwater Department

From: Jonathan Tuley [mailto:JTuley@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2012 6:07 PM
To: jud.turner@gaepd.org; 'mfowler@dot.ga.gov'; 'cindy.vandyke@dot.state.ga.us'; 'alware@dot.ga.gov'; 'michawilliams@dot.ga.gov'; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; Hood, Alan C. (achood@dot.ga.gov); 'Mike.Lobdell@dot.state.ga.us'; lbeall@grta.org; 'wstinson@itsmarta.com'; 'Crocker, John'; 'Floyd, Greg'; 'Jon West'; 'troy@fairburn.com'; 'Jessica Guinn';

thazelwood@exeterpg.com; jatcheson@arcodb.com; jmatthews@arcodb.com; bkbrumfield@eberly.net; 'Ellington, Morgan'; 'alippmann@unioncityga.org'; Pete Frisina
Cc: Landuse; Jim Santo; Marshall Willis; Jim Skinner; Sammie Carson; Carolyn Rader
Subject: DRI Review Notification - Exeter Expansions (DRI #2315)

Development of Regional Impact Request for Comments

This e-mail serves as notice that the ARC staff has begun the review for **Exeter Expansions (DRI #2315)**. We request that you or a member of your staff review the attached preliminary report and provide comments to ARC by **Tuesday, December 11, 2012.**

This project, located in the City of Fairburn, is a proposed expansion to an existing warehouse development. The two existing buildings are 346,288 square feet and 400,255 square feet. The proposed expansion will include two additional buildings that will be 353,400 square feet and 382,705 square feet, resulting in an overall project square footage of 1,482,648 square feet. The proposed project is located northeast of the Oakley Industrial Boulevard and Fayetteville Road intersection.

Review opened: 11-26-2012

Comments Due: 12-11-2012

Review will close on or before: 12-16-2012

For more information regarding the DRI processes, information needed for the review or other DRI's reviewed by ARC, please see the [DRI website](#).

Please let me know if you have any questions about the review.

Jon Tuley, AICP
Principal Planner

Atlanta Regional Commission
regional impact + local relevance

40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2538
P | 404.463.3307
F | 404.463.3254
jtuley@atlantaregional.com
atlantaregional.com

Connect with ARC

Like us on [Facebook](#) »

Follow us on [Twitter](#) »

ARC Land Matters [Blog](#) »

Get connected on [LinkedIn](#) »

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachments are intended solely for the use of the named recipient or recipients. Any dissemination of this e-mail by anyone other than an intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not a named recipient, you are prohibited from any further viewing of the e-mail or any attachments or from making any use of the e-mail or attachments. If you believe you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments, and all copies.

Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[DRI Rules](#)[Thresholds](#)[Tier Map](#)[FAQ](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #2315**

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:	Fairburn
Individual completing form:	Jessica Guinn
Telephone:	(404) 684-7031
E-mail:	jguinn@tcfatl.com

*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:	Exeter Expansions
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):	7300, 7320 Oakley Industrial Boulevard
Brief Description of Project:	1,482,648 square feet of light industrial warehouse space in four buildings

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input 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 checked="" type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

DRI Initial Information Form

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	1,482,648 square feet	
Developer:	Exeter Property Group	
Mailing Address:	140 West Germantown Pike	
Address 2:		
	City:Plymouth Meeting State: PA Zip:19462	
Telephone:	(610) 234-3211	
Email:	jhonesty@exeterpg.com	
Is property owner different from developer/applicant?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
If yes, property owner:		
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?		
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
If yes, provide the following information:	Project Name:	
	Project ID:	
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning <input type="checkbox"/> Variance <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?		
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 8/2013 Overall project: 8/2013	
Back to Top		

Developments of Regional Impact

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

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: City of Fairburn

Individual completing form: Jessica Guinn

Telephone: (404) 684-7031

Email: jguinn@tcfatl.com

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Exeter Expansions

DRI ID Number: 2315

Developer/Applicant: Exeter Property Group

Telephone: (610) 234-3211

Email(s): jhonesty@exeterpg.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.)

☐ (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 until this additional information is provided.

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$30,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$500,000

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Will this development displace any existing uses?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc):

--

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:	City of Atlanta
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.084 MGD
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:	Fulton County
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.019 MGD
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.)	2,491 daily trips + 189 peak hour trips (in/out) New trips for this phase: 594 daily + 42 peak hour New trips for build out: 1,237 daily + 92 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 type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Stantec is preparing the traffic study
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, please describe below:	

Solid Waste Disposal	
How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1,200 tons
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, please explain:	
Stormwater Management	
What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	67%
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management:	
Buffers and master stormwater management/water quality pond	
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 checked="" type="radio"/> No
5. Protected river corridors?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
6. Floodplains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
7. Historic resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:	
All stormwater runoff from the site will be collected via storm drainage and directed through a water quality and stormwater management system.	

Submit Application

Save without Submitting

Cancel

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA Home Page](#) | [ARC Home Page](#) | [RDC Links](#) | [DCA Home Page](#)

[Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)

Copyright © 2007 The Georgia Department of Community Affairs. All Rights Reserved.

