

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

**DATE**: May 15, 2017 **ARC Review Code**: R1705151

TO: Chairman Dr. Romona Jackson Jones, Douglas County Board of Commissioners

ATTN TO: Tracy Rye, Planning and Zoning Director
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC
RE: Development of Regional Impact Review

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.

Name of Proposal: DCT Factory Shoals (DRI 2670)

**Review Type:** DRI **Submitting Local Government**: Douglas County

<u>Date Opened</u>: May 15, 2017 <u>Deadline for Comments</u>: May 30, 2017 <u>Date to Close</u>: June 5, 2017

<u>Description</u>: This DRI is located in Douglas County on the east side of Factory Shoals Road, between Thornton Road/SR 6 and Douglas Hill Road. The project consists of 1,104,320 SF of high-cube warehouse/distribution space in one building on approximately 60 acres. Access is proposed via one full-movement site driveway on Factory Shoals Road. The DRI review trigger for this project is a Land Disturbance Permit application. The project's estimated build-out year is 2019.

<u>PRELIMINARY COMMENTS:</u> According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is located in the Developing Suburbs Area of the region. Developing Suburbs are areas that have developed from roughly 1995 to today and are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. Per the UGPM, this DRI site is also within a Regional Industrial and Logistics Area. These areas represent the major intermodal freight facilities and major logistics centers of the region. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. General information and recommendations for Developing Suburbs and Regional Industrial and Logistics Areas are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest some aspects of regional policy in that it is in close proximity to other warehouse/distribution facilities on Thornton Road/SR 6, offering the potential for efficiencies in freight movement. It also offers clear connectivity for freight movement via its access to Thornton Road/SR 6, I-20 to the north and Fulton Industrial Boulevard/SR 70 to the south.

The project could further support The Atlanta Region's Plan if it incorporated other aspects of the regional policy detailed at the bottom of this report, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages. In addition, 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 on the site. This framework can offer the potential for safe internal site circulation for employees on foot or by another alternative mode.

-CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE-

The intensity of this DRI generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in Developing Suburbs. In terms of land use, the project generally aligns with the RDG's recommendations for Industrial and Logistics Areas as well. This DRI's land use is also similar to nearby clusters of warehouse/distribution development, and the project is located in a part of the region that is experiencing demand for the development of warehouse/distribution and logistics facilities.

However, much of the area adjacent to or near this site, particularly to the west, is predominated by low-density residential uses and undeveloped land, as well as Sweetwater Creek State Park. While all adjacent properties are also in unincorporated Douglas County, some nearby areas are in the City of Douglasville and Cobb County. Douglas County's leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should therefore collaborate to balance the goal of new development with the need for sensitivity to nearby land uses, natural resources and local governments, to the greatest extent possible.

Additional preliminary ARC staff comments related to natural resources and transportation are attached to this report. These include comments regarding the project's location and its relation to County and State stream buffers, as well as the watershed protection area for the Chattahoochee River Direct Drainage Basin found in the County's Unified Development Ordinance (Section 907(b)(9)).

Further to the above, regional policy recommendations 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

Further to the above, as a strategic economic sector, the region should strive to protect Regional Industrial and Logistics Areas and ensure they are well served by the regional transportation network. These areas will see increased job growth in the form of industrial and logistics space. Strategies are needed to avoid residential and industrial conflicts while still allowing both uses in proximity to each other, without limiting the operations of industrial land users. Regional policy recommendations in the RDG for Industrial and Logistics Areas include:

- Protect Industrial and Logistics Areas by not allowing conflicting land uses in the vicinity
- Identify key areas to preserve for freight and industrial uses
- Continue to promote Industrial and Logistics Areas as a major resource in recruiting future economic development prospects to the region
- Ensure the continued efficiency of cargo and freight transport with easy connectivity to trucking and shipping routes through the region

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
COBB COUNTY

ARC Transportation Access & Mobility Georgia Department of Community Affairs Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Fulton County ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CITY OF DOUGLASVILLE

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



# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION



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

## **DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REOUEST 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: <u>DCT Factory Shoals</u> See the Preliminary Report. Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed): Individual Completing Form: Local Government: Please return this form to: Andrew Smith, Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Courtland Street NE Department: Atlanta, GA 30303 Ph. (404) 463-5581 Fax (404) 463-3254 asmith@atlantaregional.com Telephone: ( Return Date: May 30, 2017 Signature: Date:

## ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

**DATE**: May 15, 2017 **ARC REVIEW CODE**: R1705151

**TO:** ARC Division Managers

FROM: Andrew Smith, Ext. 3-5581

### **Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:**

<u>Community Development:</u> Smith, Andrew
<u>Natural Resources:</u> Santo, Jim

<u>Transportation Access and Mobility:</u> Mangham, Marquitrice
<u>Research and Analytics:</u> Skinner, Jim

<u>Name of Proposal:</u> DCT Factory Shoals (DRI 2670) <u>Review Type:</u> Development of Regional Impact

<u>Description:</u> This DRI is located in Douglas County on the east side of Factory Shoals Road, between Thornton Road/SR 6 and Douglas Hill Road. The project consists of 1,104,320 SF of high-cube warehouse/distribution space in one building on approximately 60 acres. Access is proposed via one full-movement site driveway on Factory Shoals Road. The DRI review trigger for this project is a Land Disturbance Permit application. The project's estimated build-out year is 2019.

**Submitting Local Government:** Douglas County

Date Opened: May 15, 2017

Deadline for Comments: May 30, 2017

Date to Close: June 5, 2017

	Response:
1)	$\hfill \square$ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	$\Box$ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
3)	$\Box$ 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)	$\hfill\Box$ The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
6)	$\Box$ Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
	COMMENTS:

### DCT FACTORY SHOALS DRI

### Douglas County Natural Resources Division Review Comments May 9, 2017

### **Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers**

The property is located in the Chattahoochee River watershed but it is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor of the Metropolitan River Protection Act. It is located downstream of the portion of the Chattahoochee that serves as a water supply source in the Atlanta Region.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no blue line streams on or near the property. However, the project site plan shows a stream starting west of the center of the property and running south to the property boundary. The County 50-foot stream buffer and the State 25-foot erosion and sedimentation buffer are both shown on the drawing, but the majority of the stream and its buffers will be covered by the proposed building and portions of its parking and loading areas. In addition, the Douglas County Unified Development Code (Section 907(b)(9)) includes a watershed protection area for the Chattahoochee River Direct Drainage Basin, for areas not covered by the Metropolitan River Protection Act, which includes this property. In Table 9.1 under Code Section 908(b), this District requires a 100foot buffer along regulated streams and an additional 50-foot (150-foot total) setback for regulated activities, which include impervious surfaces. If the stream on this property meets the County's regulated stream definition, then the wider buffer and setback will apply. Regardless of the required buffer width, the proposed intrusion will be subject to the requirements of the Douglas County's stream buffer regulations, which may require a variance for this project. A variance will also be required for the State Erosion and Sedimentation Control Buffer. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the requirements of the County stream buffer requirements. All other streams on the property, as well as all waters of the state, are subject to the requirements of the State Erosion and Sedimentation Act, which includes a 25-foot buffer on all state waters.

### **Storm Water/Water Quality**

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, 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 (<a href="www.georgiastormwater.com">www.georgiastormwater.com</a>) 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 #2670

**DRI Title** DCT Factory Shoals

**County** Douglas County

City (if applicable) None / Unincorporated

Address / Location Southside of Factory Shoals Road, West of Thornton Road, East of Douglas Hill Road

Review Process X EXPEDITED

NON-EXPEDITED

### **REVIEW INFORMATION**

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division

Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham

Copied

**Date** May 11, 2017

### **TRAFFIC STUDY**

Prepared by Kimley Horn

**Date** May 2, 2017

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS**

(	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)
	Appendix F of the traffic study contains projects identified in the Atlanta Regions Plan.
[	NO (provide comments below)  Click here to provide comments.
REGION	IAL 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
[	YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)
	The site plan and traffic analysis indicates one (1) site access point located off Factory Shoals Road Factory Shoals Road is identified as a local road.

### 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.

X	NO
	YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)
	The site plan and traffic analysis indicates one (1) site access point located off Factory Shoals Road Factory Shoals Road is identified as a local road. The site is in close proximity to SR 6 (Thornton Road), a heavy freight corridor however, no access points are proposed on SR 6.

## 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.

$\boxtimes$	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st station more than one mile away)
	RAIL SERVICE WITHIN O	NE 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

	<ul> <li>Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)</li> </ul>
	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.

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

$\boxtimes$	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)
	SERVICE WITHIN ONE M	ILE (provide additional information below)
	Operator(s)	Click here to enter name of operator(s).
	Bus Route(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)

\* 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.

these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.
NO
☐ YES
Currently there is no transit service in the County, however, Douglas County is in the process of implementing fixed route transit bus service in parts of the County. Service is to start early 2018 with two fixed routes however, no service is proposed for this area.

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.

$\boxtimes$	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st path or trail more than one mile away)
	YES (provide additional i	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

	<ul> <li>Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)</li> </ul>
	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)
	No multiuse trails are in the study area. The site plan depicts a proposed pervious walking trail within the development
* Following the mos development site	t direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the
OTHER TRANSPORTATION DES	GN CONSIDERATIONS
09. Does the site plan provide adjacent parcels?	for the construction of publicly accessible roadway connections with
The ability for drivers and	I bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent ve time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered
and proactively incorpore	ated into development site plans whenever possible.
	ned into development site plans whenever possible.
YES (connections to a	djacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
<u> </u>	
YES (stub outs will mo	djacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
YES (stub outs will mo	djacent parcels are planned as part of the development) ke future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
YES (stub outs will mo NO (the site plan pred	djacent parcels are planned as part of the development) when future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop) ludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop) acent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future) nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to

	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)		
t p	The site plan and traffic analysis does not indicate bicycle and pedestrian facilities being provided hroughout the development site. Sidewalks currently do not exist along Factory Shoals and are not proposed along the roadway as a part of this development. The site plan depicts sidewalks being added internal to the site along the driveway from the access point. No bicycle facilities are proposed		
	Ooes 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)		
	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)		
r	NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to		

interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

	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 site is not located near high or intense residential land uses and is not located near existing transit or pedestrian facilities. Pedestrian and bicycle traffic should be minimal.			
RECOM	<u>IMENDATIONS</u>			
	Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?			
	UNKNOWN (additional study is necessary)			
	XES (based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)			
	NO (see comments below)			
	Click here to enter text.			
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.			

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible,

15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):	
None.	



### **Developments of Regional Impact**

DRI Home <u>Tier Map</u> <u>Apply</u> <u>View Submissions</u> <u>Logout</u>

### DRI #2670

### **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: Douglas Individual completing form: Tracy Rye

Telephone: 678-838-2060

E-mail: trye@co.douglas.ga.us

\*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: DCT Factory Shoals

Location (Street Address, Factory Shoals Road

GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: One (1) industrial warehouse/distribution facility totaling 1,104,320 SF on 60.1 acres

### Development Type:

(not selected)	Hotels	Wastewater Treatment Facilities
Office	Mixed Use	Petroleum Storage Facilities
Commercial	Airports	Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs
Wholesale & Distribution	OAttractions & Recreational Facilities	Intermodal Terminals
OHospitals and Health Care Facilities	Post-Secondary Schools	Truck Stops
Housing	Waste Handling Facilities	Any other development types
Industrial	Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants	
If other development type, describe:		

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 1,104,320 SF

Developer: DCT Factory Shoals, LLC

Mailing Address: 3340 PEachtree Road, NE

Address 2: Tower 100, Suite 1950

City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30326

Telephone: 404-591-7646

Email: cseward@dctindustrial.com

Is property owner different from developer/applicant? (not selected) Yes No

If yes, property owner: Charles, Jerry, Rickey, Donna, and Debra Garmon; David Childress; TRP Realty

Is the proposed project

entirely located within your local government's (not selected) Yes No

jurisdiction?

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?

ls the current proposal a

continuation or expansion of (not selected) Yes No

a previous DRI?

1 of 2 3/15/2017 4:14 PM

```
If yes, provide the following information:

Project ID:

Rezoning Variance requested of the local government for this project:

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?

If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?

Estimated Project This project/phase: Dec 2018

Completion Dates:

Other

Completion Dates:

Project Name:

Rezoning Variance
Sewer
(not selected) Yes No

In this project does this project/phase: Dec 2018

Completion Dates:

Project Name:

No decident Sewer

Rezoning Variance
Sewer
(not selected) Yes No

Other

Back to Top
```

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

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

© 2017 Georgia Department of Community Affairs

2 of 2



### **Developments of Regional Impact**

**DRI Home** 

Tier Map

Apply

View Submissions

Login

### **DRI #2670**

### **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

#### **Local Government Information**

Submitting Local Government: Douglas

Individual completing form: Tracy Rye

Telephone: 678-838-2060 Email: trye@co.douglas.ga.us

### **Project Information**

Name of Proposed Project: DCT Factory Shoals

DRI ID Number: 2670

Developer/Applicant: DCT Factory Shoals, LLC

Telephone: 404-591-7646

Email(s): cseward@dctindustrial.com

### **Additional Information Requested**

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional

(not selected) Yes No

review process? (If no, proceed to Economic

If ves, has that additional

information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, (not selected) Yes No

If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.

### **Economic Development**

Estimated Value at \$58,000,000.00 Build-Out:

Estimated annual local tax

revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be \$500,000.00 generated by the proposed development:

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand

(not selected) Yes No created by the proposed

Will this development (not selected) Yes No displace any existing uses?

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc): 4 residential structures

### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:

Douglasville-Douglas County WSA

What is the estimated water supply demand to be

generated by the project, measured in Millions of

0.025 MGD

Gallons Per Day (MGD)?

5/4/2017 11:08 AM 1 of 3

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No					
If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:						
Is a water line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No					
If yes, how much additional	line (in miles) will be required?					
	Wastewater Disposal					
Name of wastewater						
treatment provider for this site:	Douglasville-Douglas County WSA					
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project,	0.014 MGD					
measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?						
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No					
If no, describe any plans to	expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:					
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this	(not selected) Yes No					
	line (in miles) will be required?Approximately 0.2 miles from Douglas Hill Road (south of site)					
to site						
	Land Transportation					
How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by	y					
the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips	Approximately: 1,856 net daily trips, 129 trips AM peak, 140 trips PM peak					
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 needed to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No					
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No					
If yes, please describe below:Please refer to traffic study performed by Kimley-Horn and Associates (to be turned in Monday, May 8, 2017.						
	Solid Waste Disposal					
How much solid waste is the						
project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	e 900 tons					
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No					
If no, describe any plans to	expand existing landfill capacity:					
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	(not selected) Yes 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?						
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: The proposed development will be utilizing two wet ponds for water quality, channel protection and detention. In additional, a proprietary device will be utilized to enhance the water quality on the stormwater release.						
-						

2 of 3 5/4/2017 11:08 AM

Environmental Quality  Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:		
Significant groundwater recharge areas?	(not selected) Yes No	
3. Wetlands?	(not selected) Yes No	
4. Protected mountains?	(not selected) Yes No	
5. Protected river corridors?	(not selected) Yes No	
6. Floodplains?	(not selected) Yes No	
7. Historic resources?	(not selected) Yes No	
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	(not selected) Yes No	
	uestion above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: lan for creek impact and wetland impact.	
Back to Top		

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

3 of 3

