ARC REGIONAL REVIEW NOTICE

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

DATE: November 28, 2016

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1611281

TO:Chairman Phillip Beard, City of Buford Board of CommissionersATTN TO:Kim Wolfe, City Clerk/Planning DirectorFROM:Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARCRE:Development of Regional Impact Review

Drayh R. Hok

Digital signature Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed a preliminary regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI with regard to its relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This preliminary report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

Description: This DRI is located in the City of Buford, bounded roughly by SR 13/Buford Highway on the west, Bryant Road on the south, and Interstate 985 on the east. The site features existing direct access from Roy Carlson Boulevard. Additional site access for employees (passenger vehicles) only is proposed on Thompson Mill Road, just west of the Interstate 985 overpass. The project consists of 1,403,120 sq. ft. of warehouse and distribution space and 40,000 sq. ft. of commercial space on approximately 215 acres. The DRI trigger for this project is a land disturbance permit application filed with the City of Buford. The projected build-out for this DRI is 2026.

<u>PRELIMINARY COMMENTS</u>: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), a component of the Atlanta Region's Plan, the proposed development is located in the Developing Suburbs Area of the region. Developing Suburbs are areas of development that occurred from roughly 1995 to today. These areas are projected to remain suburbs through 2040.

The ARC Regional Development Guide (RDG), a related Atlanta Region's Plan component, details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. Recommended policies for Developing Suburbs include:

- New development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions should be discouraged

- Maximize the usefulness of existing recreational facilities in addition to providing new recreational opportunities

- Eliminate vacant or under-utilized parking areas through mechanisms such as out-parceling or conversion to community open space

- Use rain gardens, vegetated swales or other enhanced water filtration design to enhance the quality of stormwater run-off

- Identify other opportunities to foster a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location

-CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE-

This DRI appears to manifest some aspects of regional policy noted above in that it connects to the existing road network in this area and includes potentially complementary commercial uses within the site, near the Buford Highway entrance to the development. This framework offers the potential for workers to conduct trips for shopping or meals on foot or by another alternative mode rather than stricly by car.

Along these lines, ARC encourages the applicant team to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas, especially those connecting light industrial uses to the commercial uses at the front of the project. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities (bicycle racks, etc.) are provided for workers and visitors at key locations throughout the site.

The intensity of this DRI generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in Developing Suburbs. In terms of use, the project appears similar to the complex of existing industrial properties already in operation along Roy Carlson Boulevard and Verona Avenue.

Additional preliminary comments are included in this report.

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES GWINNETT COUNTY GEORGIA MOUNTAINS REGIONAL COMMISSION ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HALL COUNTY ARC NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CITY OF SUGAR HILL

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (404) 463–5581 or <u>asmith@atlantaregional.com</u>. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <u>http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/planreviews</u>.

ARC

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 Commission for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to generate impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is located, for example in 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 in this packet and offer your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to ARC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: Longacre Development See the Preliminary Report.

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Local Government:	<i>Please return this form to:</i> Andrew Smith, Atlanta Regional Commission
Department:	40 Courtland Street NE Atlanta, GA 30303 Ph. (404) 463-5581 Fax (404) 463-3254
Telephone: ()	asmith@atlantaregional.com
	Return Date: December 13, 2016
Signature:	
Date:	

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: November 28, 2016

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1611281

TO: ARC Division Managers **FROM:** Andrew Smith, Ext. 3-5581

<u>Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:</u>

Community Development: Smith, Andrew	Transportation Access and Mobility: Mangham, Marquitrice
Natural Resources: Santo, Jim	Research and Analytics: Skinner, Jim

Name of Proposal: Longacre Development

<u>Review Type:</u> Development of Regional Impact

Description: This DRI is located in the City of Buford, bounded roughly by SR 13/Buford Highway on the west, Bryant Road on the south, and Interstate 985 on the east. The site features existing direct access from Roy Carlson Boulevard. Additional site access for employees (passenger vehicles) only is proposed on Thompson Mill Road, just west of the Interstate 985 overpass. The project consists of 1,403,120 sq. ft. of warehouse and distribution space and 40,000 sq. ft. of commercial space on approximately 215 acres. The DRI trigger for this project is a land disturbance permit application filed with the City of Buford. The projected build-out for this DRI is 2026.

Submitting Local Government: City of Buford Date Opened: November 28, 2016 Deadline for Comments: December 13, 2016 Date to Close: December 19, 2016

Response:

1)	□ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	\square While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	guide listed in the comment section.
3)	🗆 While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	guide listed in the comment section.
4)	\square The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
5)	□ The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.

6) □Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

COMMENTS:

LONGACRE DEVELOPMENT DRI City of Buford Natural Resources Division Review Comments November 22, 2016

Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection

The proposed project property is in the Chattahoochee Corridor watershed, but it is not within the Chattahoochee River Corridor and is not subject to Corridor Plan requirements. The Chattahoochee River watershed upstream of Peachtree Creek is also a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. For large water supply watersheds without a water supply reservoir, the only applicable Part 5 requirements are restrictions on hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal within seven miles upstream of a public water supply intake.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows Suwanee Creek, which is a direct tributary to the Chattahoochee River, crossing the project property. The USGS coverage also shows two blue-line tributaries to Suwanee Creek on the project site, one on the western side of the property and one in the southeastern corner, near Interstate 985 and Bryant Road. The proposed project plans show these streams, although they are not identified. The plans also show two additional tributaries to Suwanee Creek on the eastern side of the property near Interstate 985. Buffers are shown along all these streams but are not identified. In addition, the project plans show proposed buildings and parking directly over the northernmost and southernmost of the tributaries between Suwanee Creek and Interstate 985. The middle tributary has a proposed road crossing. The proposed parkway extension shown on the plans crosses Suwanee Creek. All proposed activity within the City's stream buffers is subject to the requirements of the Buford Stream Buffer Ordinance and may require variances. Activity within the 25-foot State Sediment and Erosion Control 25-foot buffer are subject to state requirements and will require a variance from Georgia EPD. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the requirements of the Buford stream buffer ordinance. In addition, all state waters on the property are subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation buffer requirement.

Stormwater/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, as with all development, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. The amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed development are dependent on the type and intensity of the use and the impervious coverage, which will affect the design of stormwater controls for the project.

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 (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) 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.



regional impact + local relevance

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	2636
DRI Title	Longacre Development
County	Gwinnett County
City (if applicable)	Buford
Address / Location	Roy Carlson Boulevard between I 985 and Buford Highway
Review Process	EXPEDITED
	NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by	ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead	Marquitrice Mangham
Copied	David Haynes
Date	November 21, 2016

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by	A&R Engineering Inc.
Date	November 18, 2016

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?

YES (provide date of RTP project list used below and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)

NO (provide comments below)

The project site is located on approximately 110 acres off Roy Carlson Highway between Buford Highway and I-985. The development proposes 947,520 square feet of warehousing, 455,600 square feet of Industrial Park and 40,000 square feet of shopping center. The Traffic Analysis identifies existing and programmed improvements taken from Plan 2040, GDOT and local comprehensive plans on page 21. It should be noted that the Atlanta Regions Plan is the current regional transportation plan which identifies the following improvements in proximity to the subject site.

GW 408 Last Mile Connectivity/Joint Bike Ped Facilities - Gwinnett County Programmed-Moreno Street Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements from West Main Street to East Main Street- City of Buford

_GW 400- Roadway General Purpose Capacity- Gwinnett County- Programmed SR 20 Buford Highway Widening from South Lee Street to SR 13

REGIONAL NETWORKS

02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

NO NO

YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)

The site plan and traffic analysis indicates two access points to the site. One full movement employee and truck access point on Roy Carlson Boulevard (local) and one right in/right out/left out access on Thompson Mill Road. An existing access point on SR 13 which is a part of the regional thoroughfares network, will be eliminated. NO access is being provided from a regional thoroughfare.

03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

🖂 NO

YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)

The site plan and traffic analysis indicates two access points to the site. One full movement employee and truck access point on Roy Carlson Boulevard and one right in/right out/left out access on Thompson Mill Road. An existing access point on SR 13 which is a part of the regional truck route will be eliminated. NO access is being provided from a regional truck route.

04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

	provennenns.		
\boxtimes	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st station more than one mile away)	
	RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)		
	Operator / Rail Line	Click here to enter name of operator and rail line	
	Nearest Station	Click here to enter name of station.	
	Distance*	Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)	
		0.10 to 0.50 mile	
		0.50 to 1.00 mile	
	Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity	
		Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete	
		Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)	
		Click here to provide comments.	
	Bicycling Access*	Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity	
		Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity	
		Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets	
		Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)	
		Click here to provide comments.	
	Transit Connectivity	Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station	
		Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station	
		No services available to rail station	
		Not applicable (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)	
		Click here to provide comments.	

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or
prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can
help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion
plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give
consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station
locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are
encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected
for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit
agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access
accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements
should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with
improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

- NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
- NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
- NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
- YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
 - CST planned within TIP period
 - CST planned within first portion of long range period
 - CST planned near end of plan horizon

Click here to provide comments.

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who
cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and
jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or
bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable
local government(s) is encouraged to make the connnection a funding priority for future
walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s)	Click here to enter name of operator(s).
Bus Route(s)	Click here to enter bus route number(s).
Distance*	Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
	0.10 to 0.50 mile
	0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
	Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
	Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
	Click here to provide comments.
Bicycling Access*	Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
	Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity
	Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
	Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

According to the transportation analysis and a verification through online search, there is currently no fixed route bus transit service available in close proximity to the site. Gwinnett County Transit provides service from a park and ride at 1985 and SR 20 to downtown Atlanta (Route 101). Transit services are also provided nearby in Hall County.

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

- _ NO
- YES

See # 6. Gwinnett County Transit operates bus transit service in the county.

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile awa	\square	NOT APPLICABLE	(nearest path	or trail more that	n one mile away
--	-----------	----------------	---------------	--------------------	-----------------

YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility	Click here to provide name of facility.
Distance	Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)
	0.15 to 0.50 mile
	0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity
	Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
	Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
	Click here to provide comments.
Bicycling Access*	Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity
	Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
	Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
	Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
	Click here to provide comments.

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible roadway connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent roadway network can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel roadway connections)

The project site is adjacent to existing commercial uses on its west and south boundaries. The configuration of the site is highly irregular with parcels inside the proposed development area that are not a part of the proposed development. The project and surrounding parcels would benefit from shared access and connectivity. No stub outs or inter parcel connectivity is proposed via the site plan.

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- YES (sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network)
- PARTIAL (some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct)
- NO (walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent)
 -] NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips)

The site proposes commercial uses in addition to warehousing and industrial uses which may attract pedestrians and bicycles. The commercial/retail uses are proposed more along the front of the development site adjacent to Buford Highway which is equipped with pedestrian facilities. Bike facilities are programmed for future development along Buford Highway. Bicycle and pedestrian traffic may be limited to employees throughout majority of the site due to its industrial nature. The

site plan and analysis does not indicate plans for future bicycle and pedestrian facilities internal to the site.

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- \boxtimes NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)

NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

The site proposes commercial uses in addition to warehousing and industrial uses which may attract pedestrians and bicycles. The commercial/retail uses are proposed more along the front of the development site adjacent to Buford Highway which is equipped with pedestrian facilities. Bike facilities are programmed for future development along Buford Highway. Bicycle and pedestrian traffic may be limited to employees throughout majority of the site due to its industrial nature. The site plan and analysis does not indicate plans for future bicycle and pedestrian facilities internal to the site.

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space
for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)

- PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
 -] NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
 - NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

The development proposes two access points. Truck and employee traffic is anticipated at the Thompson Mill access however the Roy Carlson Road access point is limited to car/employee traffic due to the truck prohibition on this road. The site plan does not depict designated or separated facilities for the various modes internal to the site. No information on designated facilities interal to the site is provided.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?
 - UNKNOWN (additional study is necessary)
 - YES (based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)
 - NO (see comments below)

System recommendations and improvements found on the first three pages of the report, include constructing a dedicated channelized right turn land on the northbound, southbound and east bound approaches to the intersection of Thompson Mill and N Bogan Road. Also a second westbound left turn lane be constructed using the existing striping on SR 347 at Buford Highway.

- 14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?
 - NO (based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)
 - YES (see comments below)

Click here to enter text.

15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):

With the goal of safety and congestion reduction for all modes of travel in mind, it is the policy of the ARC to encourage sound transportation practices to be incorporated in each development. It is recommended that, where feasible, vehicular and pedestrian connectivity with adjacent parcels be considered and incorporated into the development. Also, consider provision for pedestrian and bicycle facilities internal to the site in the retail phase of the development at a minimum.



If yes, provide the following	Project Name:	
information:	Project ID:	
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:		
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?	N/A	
	This project/phase: 9/2036 Overall project: 9/2036	
Back to Top		

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page Site Map | Statements | Contact

© 2015 Georgia Department of Community Affairs



Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No
If no, describe any plans to e	xpand the existing water supply capacity:
Is a water line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No
	line (in miles) will be required?
	Wastewater Disposal
Name of wastewater	
treatment provider for this site:	City of Buford
What is the estimated sewage flow to be	
generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.05 MGPD
Is sufficient wastewater	
treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No
f no, describe any plans to e	xpand existing wastewater treatment capacity:
ls a sewer line extension required to serve this	(not selected) Yes No
project? If yes, how much additional li	ine (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	AM: 686 / PM: 961 / ADT: 10,104
per day? (If only an alternative measure of	
volume is available, please provide.)	
Has a traffic study been	
performed to determine whether or not	
transportation or access improvements will be	(not selected) Yes No
needed to serve this project?	
Are transportation improvements needed to	(not selected) Ves No
serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No
f yes, please describe below mprovements.	Please refer to the submitted traffic impact study for all recommended transportation
	Solid Waste Disposal
How much solid waste is the	
project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	1260 tons
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this	(not selected) Yes No
proposed project?	
f no, describe any plans to e	xpand existing landfill capacity:
Will any hazardous waste	
be generated by the development?	(not selected) Yes No
-	
lf yes, please explain:	
	2
	Stormwater Management
What percentage of the site is projected to be	
impervious surface once the proposed development has	62%
been constructed?	
	osed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the ter management:Detention and Water Quality Ponds, buffers
รางรอบ อากาศสบเธ บท รเบททิพส	itor managoment. Detention and water Quality Fonds, buildts
	Environmental Quality

1. Water supply watersheds?	◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes ■ No	
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?	◯ (not selected) ◯ Yes [®] No	
3. Wetlands?	O(not selected) Yes No	
4. Protected mountains?	(not selected) Yes No	
5. Protected river corridors?	O(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	
	Jestion above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: ire impact to wetlands and floodplain, which will be permitted with USACE	

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page Site Map | Statements | Contact

© 2015 Georgia Department of Community Affairs

GRANITE HOLDINGS



