

DATE: October 11, 2017

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1709251

TO: Mayor Denis Shortal, City of Dunwoody  
ATTN TO: John Olson, Planning Manager  
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC  
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review



Digital signature  
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed 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 final report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the host local government.

**Name of Proposal:** The Park at Perimeter Center (DRI 2691)

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Dunwoody

**Review Type:** Development of Regional Impact

**Date Opened:** September 25, 2017

**Date Closed:** October 10, 2017

**Description:** This DRI is located on an approximately 19.5-acre site in the City of Dunwoody, north of I-285 and east of Ashford Dunwoody Road, bounded by Abercorn Avenue and Perimeter Center East. The proposed development project will consist of approximately 1,200 residential units, 500,000 SF of office space and 12,000 SF of retail space. The DRI review trigger for this development is a rezoning application, and the projected build-out year is 2028.

**Comments:** According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is located in a Regional Employment Corridor as well as a Regional Center. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. General information and policy recommendations for Regional Employment Corridors and Regional Centers are listed at the bottom of this report.

This DRI appears to manifest many aspects of regional policy in that it generally supports the existing Perimeter LCI plan; converts an underutilized site to an infill, mixed-use development with a significant housing component; and supports transit use given its proximity to MARTA Bus Route 150, connecting to the Dunwoody MARTA Rail station 0.85 miles west as well as Dunwoody Village to the north. Many of these characteristics collectively offer the potential for site residents to work and shop on site, and for workers and visitors to park once or arrive via alternative transportation modes and conduct multiple trips on foot.

Along these lines, care should be taken to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas, as well as any connections to nearby parcels. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities (bicycle racks, etc.) are provided for residents, workers and visitors at key locations throughout the site.

The intensity of this proposed project generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in Regional Employment Corridors.

*–CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE–*

The proposed development is located in the Perimeter LCI study area and is generally consistent with the study's recommendations. The development team should continue to work in close collaboration with the City of Dunwoody and the Perimeter CIDs to ensure that the project, as constructed, is consistent with the recommendations of the LCI plan.

Additional ARC staff comments and external comments are included in this report.

Further to the above, Regional Employment Corridors, along with the Region Core (Downtown, Midtown, Buckhead), form the densest part of the Atlanta region. Connected with transit, this area of the region is typically the most walkable, and redevelopment is the main driver of its growth. The Region Core and Regional Employment Corridors together contain 26 percent of the 10-county region's jobs and eight percent of region's population on approximately 2.25 percent of the region's land area. Regional policy recommendations for Regional Employment Corridors include:

- Continue to invest in the LCI program to assist local governments in center planning and infrastructure.
- Prioritize preservation of existing transit, increase frequency and availability of transit options.
- Encourage compact infill development, redevelopment and adaptive reuse.
- Create a range of housing options to accommodate all sectors of the workforce.
- Encourage active ground floor, pedestrian scale design, and pedestrian amenities in new development and the redevelopment of existing sites

Further to the above, Regional Centers are metro Atlanta's centers for employment, shopping and entertainment. These centers should be connected to the regional transportation network with existing or planned high-capacity transit service. In most cases, these centers have a jobs-housing imbalance, so housing options should be expanded within their boundaries, especially around existing or planned transit. Regional policy recommendations for Regional Centers include:

- Prioritize preservation, expansion and access to existing and planned transit systems and improve the quality and aesthetics of existing facilities.
- Incorporate appropriate end-of-trip facilities, such as bicycle racks and showers/locker rooms, within new and existing development.
- Enhance mobility and accessibility for all by creating Complete Streets that accommodate all modes of transportation.
- Encourage active ground floor, pedestrian-scale design and pedestrian amenities in new development and redevelopment of existing sites.
- Work toward improving the jobs-housing imbalance in Regional Centers and promote housing options to accommodate multiple household sizes and price points in close proximity to jobs.
- Use alternative designs and materials to minimize impervious surfaces to the greatest possible extent.

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
PERIMETER CIDs

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
CITY OF BROOKHAVEN

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY  
CITY OF SANDY SPRINGS

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (470) 378-1645 or [asmith@atlantaregional.org](mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.org). This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews>.

## Andrew Smith

---

**From:** Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 26, 2017 3:05 PM  
**To:** Andrew Smith  
**Cc:** Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; maevans@dekalbcountyga.gov; Kleine, Tracie  
**Subject:** RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: The Park at Perimeter Center (DRI 2691)  
**Attachments:** Preliminary Report - The Park at Perimeter Center DRI 2691.pdf

Andrew,

The proposed development, of approximately 1,200 residential units, 500,000 SF of office space and 12,000 SF of retail space, is located approximately 3 miles north west of the DeKalb-Peachtree Airport (PDK), and is located outside of any of their FAA surfaces, and compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However, if the proposed project's vertical construction, or equipment 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>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notification, no later than 120 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.

I have copied Mr. Mario Evans with DeKalb – Peachtree Airport on this email.

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. | 2nd Floor | Atlanta, Georgia 30308  
M: 404-660-3394 | F: 404-631-1935 | E: [achood@dot.ga.gov](mailto:achood@dot.ga.gov)

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

---

**From:** Andrew Smith [mailto:ASmith@atlantaregional.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 26, 2017 12:54 PM  
**To:** VanDyke, Cindy <cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov>; Peevy, Phillip M. <PPeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Robinson, Charles A. <chrobinson@dot.ga.gov>; Weiss, Megan J <MWeiss@dot.ga.gov>; Comer, Carol <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Zahul, Kathy <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>; DeNard, Paul <pdenard@dot.ga.gov>; Regis, Edlin <eregis@dot.ga.gov>; Woods, Chris N. <cwoods@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; Boone, Eric <eboone@dot.ga.gov>; Annie Gillespie <agillespie@srta.ga.gov>; Emily Estes <eestes@srta.ga.gov>; Parker Martin <PMartin@srta.ga.gov>; 'DRI@grta.org' <DRI@grta.org>; 'Jon West' <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; jud.turner@gaepd.org; chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; Greg Floyd (gfloyd@itsmarta.com) <gfloyd@itsmarta.com>; Patrice Ruffin (patrice.ruffin@brookhavenga.gov) <patrice.ruffin@brookhavenga.gov>; Alexander, Michelle <MAlexander@SandySpringsga.gov>; Mercier-Baggett, Catherine <CMercier-Baggett@SandySpringsga.gov>; Campbell, France <FCampbell@SandySpringsga.gov>; KWescott@SandySpringsga.gov; Hovanesian, Ruben <RHovanesian@SandySpringsga.gov>; John Gurbal <JGurbal@perimetercid.org>; John Olson <John.Olson@dunwoodyga.gov>; Michael Smith <Michael.Smith@dunwoodyga.gov>; eli@veithtraffic.com; Todd Williams <twilliams@grubbproperties.com>; Andrew Rosti <ARosti@grubbproperties.com>; John.Walker@kimley-horn.com; jinwoo.seo@kimley-horn.com; Justin.Houston@kimley-horn.com; elizabeth.johnson@kimley-horn.com; Kirk, David C. <david.kirk@troutmansanders.com>  
**Cc:** Community Development <CommunityDevelopment@atlantaregional.org>; Mike Alexander

<MAlexander@atlantaregional.org>; David Haynes <DHaynes@atlantaregional.org>; Marquitrice Mangham <MMangham@atlantaregional.org>; Patrick Bradshaw <PBradshaw@atlantaregional.org>; Ryan Ellis <REllis@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Santo <JSanto@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Skinner <JSkinner@atlantaregional.org>  
**Subject:** ARC DRI Review Notification: The Park at Perimeter Center (DRI 2691)

### **Development of Regional Impact (DRI) – Request for Comments**

This e-mail serves as notice that the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has begun a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review for **The Park at Perimeter Center (DRI 2691)**.

This DRI is located on an approximately 19.5-acre site in the City of Dunwoody, north of I-285 and east of Ashford Dunwoody Road, bounded by Abercorn Avenue and Perimeter Center East. The proposed development project will consist of approximately 1,200 residential units, 500,000 SF of office space and 12,000 SF of retail space. The DRI review trigger for this development is a rezoning application, and the projected build-out year is 2028.

As a representative of a nearby local government or potentially affected party, we request that you or your staff review the attached Preliminary Report and provide any comments to ARC on or before **October 10, 2017**.

You may also view the Preliminary Report by visiting the [ARC Plan Reviews webpage](#) beginning tomorrow, September 27, and searching for “The Park at Perimeter Center” in the field at the bottom of the page.

For more information regarding the DRI process or other DRIs reviewed by ARC, please visit the [ARC DRI webpage](#).

Regards,

**Andrew Smith**

Principal Planner, Community Development

Atlanta Regional Commission

P | 470.378.1645

[asmith@atlantaregional.org](mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.org)

[atlantaregional.org](http://atlantaregional.org)

International Tower

229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

---

**Roadway fatalities in Georgia are up 33% in two years.** That's an average of four deaths every single day! Many of these deaths are preventable and related to driver behavior: distracted or impaired driving, driving too fast for conditions, and/or failure to wear a seatbelt. Pledge to **DRIVE ALERT ARRIVE ALIVE**. Buckle up – Stay off the phone and mobile devices – Drive alert. Visit [www.dot.ga.gov/DAAA](http://www.dot.ga.gov/DAAA). #ArriveAliveGA

**THE PARK AT PERIMETER CENTER EAST DRI**  
**City of Dunwoody**  
**Natural Resources Review Comments**  
**September 20, 2017**

**Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers**

The proposed project is located on already developed properties in the North Fork Peachtree Creek watershed, which drains into the Chattahoochee River below the water supply intakes in the Atlanta Region. The USGS coverage for the project area shows no blue line streams on or near the project property. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the City of Dunwoody's Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any waters of the state that may be on the property will also be subject to the State 25-foot erosion and sedimentation buffer requirements.

**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, 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. The project is being built on an already developed property with existing impervious surfaces, which will affect the actual increases in stormwater and loading amounts.

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](http://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.

We would also suggest the following additional measures to help reduce stormwater reduction and provide for its reuse:

- Consider using green spaces and tree planting beds as stormwater controls. These can be designed to provide maximum aesthetic value while also providing for water quality treatment and run-off reduction, potentially reducing the need for larger stormwater facilities and helping to minimize the negative effects of stormwater runoff on streams and water quality.
- Consider using pervious concrete or other pervious materials in parking areas. With the proper substrate, such materials can provide a large storage capacity, which will further help to reduce stormwater runoff.
- Consider including rainwater capture in the project design to provide for landscape irrigation during dry periods.

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

### DRI INFORMATION

<b>DRI Number</b>	DRI 2691
<b>DRI Title</b>	The Park at Perimeter Center East
<b>County</b>	DeKalb County
<b>City (if applicable)</b>	Dunwoody
<b>Address / Location</b>	Bounded by Perimeter Center East on the east, west and south sides, bordering Abercorn Avenue on the North
<b>Review Process</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EXPEDITED <input type="checkbox"/> NON-EXPEDITED

### REVIEW INFORMATION

<b>Prepared by</b>	ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
<b>Staff Lead</b>	Marquitrice Mangham
<b>Copied</b>	
<b>Date</b>	September 20, 2017

### TRAFFIC STUDY

<b>Prepared by</b>	Kimley Horn
<b>Date</b>	September 1, 2017

## **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)*

The project is a 19.5 acre mixed used development site located just northeast of Ashford Dunwoody Road and I 285 bounded by Perimeter Center East on the east, West and south sides. Page 25 of the traffic analysis provide a list of programmed projects identified in the RTP in that area.

☐ NO *(provide comments below)*

## **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

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

The project site will be served by seven access points on Perimeter Center East, 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.

☒ NO

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

The project site will be served by seven access points on Perimeter Center East, a local road.



**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.*

☐ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest station more than one mile away)

☒ RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator / Rail Line

**MARTA**

Nearest Station

**Dunwoody 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)

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)

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)

*\* 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

**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 connection 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)

**MARTA**

Bus Route(s)

150

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)

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)

Dedicated bike lanes currently exist along Perimeter Center East.

\* 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 above.

**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 away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

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)

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)

According to the Regional Trails Draft map, there are several planned trails in the area. There are no existing multi use trails.

\* 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 driveway connectivity 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 is bounded by roadways on all sides with existing development north west and south of the site. The site plan does not depict adjacent parcels or their driveways to determine if interparcel connectivity is planned or possible.

### **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 plan does depict some internal sidewalks however bicycle facilities are not depicted.

**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)
- ☐ 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 is bounded by public roadway on all sides. Adjacent parcels are developed. The site plan does not indicate pedestrian or bicycle access or connectivity to adjacent parcels are being added.

**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)

Due to the nature of the development, minimal heavy truck traffic is expected.

## **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)*

**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)*

**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](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)

### DRI #2691

#### 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: City of Dunwoody  
Individual completing form: John Olson  
Telephone: 678-382-6811  
E-mail: [john.olson@dunwoodyga.gov](mailto:john.olson@dunwoodyga.gov)

\*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: The Park at Perimeter Center  
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 41, 47, and 53 Perimeter Center East, Dunwoody, GA  
Brief Description of Project: Mixed-use project surrounding the existing Dunwoody City Hall

#### Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 1050 residential units, 298,000 SF office, 12,000 SF retail

Developer: Grubb Properties

Mailing Address: 4601 Park Road

Address 2:

City:Charlotte State: NC Zip:28209

Telephone: 704-372-5616

Email: [twilliams@grubbproperties.com](mailto:twilliams@grubbproperties.com)

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

If yes, property owner:

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide the following information: Project Name:  
Project ID:

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:

- ☒ Rezoning
- ☐ Variance
- ☐ Sewer
- ☐ Water
- ☐ Permit
- ☐ Other

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: 2028  
Overall project: 2028

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #2691

#### 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 Dunwoody  
Individual completing form: John Olson  
Telephone: 678-382-6811  
Email: john.olson@dunwoodyga.gov

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: The Park at Perimeter Center  
DRI ID Number: 2691  
Developer/Applicant: Grubb Properties  
Telephone: 704-372-5616  
Email(s): twilliams@grubbproperties.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: \$500 million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$10 million

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): 92,686 square feet of office will be demolished and 12,000 square feet of existing office will be converted to retail.

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply: DeKalb County

provider for this site:

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?

0.45 MGD

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: DeKalb County

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?

0.38 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 project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ 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.)

12,369 gross daily trips, 1,297 gross AM trips, and 1,361 gross PM trips (10,789 net daily, 1,143 net AM, 1,160 net PM trips,

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: See DRI 2691 traffic study

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?

3,241 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

70%

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: Water quality features will be added. The site will meet pre-development flows in accordance the

### Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

1. Water supply watersheds? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Wetlands? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
4. Protected mountains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Protected river corridors? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
6. Floodplains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
7. Historic resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)



