

REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 fax: 404.463.3205 • atlantaregional.org

DATE: December 18, 2017

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1712181

TO: Mayor A. Max Bacon, City of Smyrna
ATTN TO: Ken Suddreth, Community Development Director
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 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: Emerson Center (DRI 2764)

Review Type: DRI

Submitting Local Government: City of Smyrna

Date Opened: Dec. 18, 2017

Deadline for Comments: Jan. 2, 2018

Date to Close: Jan. 8, 2018*

**If no significant issues are identified during the comment period, the review will close on January 2, 2018 per the LCI Expedited Review process outlined in ARC's DRI Rules.*

Description: This DRI is located primarily in the City of Smyrna and partially in unincorporated Cobb County. The development is bounded by Spring Road, I-285 and Spring Hill Parkway. The project is a mixed-use redevelopment consisting of approximately 87,500 SF of office, 11,000 SF of retail, 310 apartments and a 200-room hotel. The DRI review trigger is a rezoning and annexation. The development plan proposes one full-access driveway via Spring Hill Parkway and two right-in/right-out driveways via existing curb cuts on Spring Road.

PRELIMINARY 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. It generally supports the goals of the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program in that it converts a strip commercial/suburban office site to an infill, mixed-use development with a significant housing component – in close proximity to existing bus transit service and a developing mixed-use activity center nearby at The Battery Atlanta/SunTrust Park. Many of these characteristics will 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 those 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. 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 project could further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general if it incorporated other aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) as part of any improvements to streetscapes, driveways, parking areas, buildings, etc.

The intensity of this proposed project generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in Regional Employment Corridors. The proposed land use mix and design support the RDG's recommendations in terms of encouraging infill development and housing options. While the land uses appear to be generally compatible with those present in the area, City leadership and staff, along with the development team, should collaborate to ensure sensitivity to nearby neighborhoods, land uses, structures and natural resources.

The proposed development is located in the Spring Road Corridor LCI area and is generally consistent with that study's goals and recommendations. The development team should continue working with City staff and leadership to ensure that the project, as constructed, remains consistent with the recommendations of the LCI plan.

Additional preliminary comments from ARC staff are included in this report.

Further to the above, Regional Employment Corridors, along with the Region Core (Downtown, Midtown and 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
COBB COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CUMBERLAND COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

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



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: **Emerson Center** *See the Preliminary Report.*

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

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: ()

Signature:

Date:

Please return this form to:

Andrew Smith
Atlanta Regional Commission
International Tower
229 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
Ph. (470) 378-1645
asmith@atlantaregional.org

Return Date: *January 2, 2018*

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1712181

TO: ARC Group Managers

FROM: Andrew Smith, 470-378-1645

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Community Development: Smith, Andrew

Natural Resources: Santo, Jim

Transportation Access and Mobility: Mangham, Marquitrice

Research and Analytics: Skinner, Jim

Name of Proposal: Emerson Center (DRI 2764)

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact (DRI)

Description: This DRI is located primarily in the City of Smyrna and partially in unincorporated Cobb County. The development is bounded by Spring Road, I-285 and Spring Hill Parkway. The project is a mixed-use redevelopment consisting of approximately 87,500 SF of office, 11,000 SF of retail, 310 apartments and a 200-room hotel. The DRI review trigger is a rezoning and annexation. The development plan proposes one full-access driveway via Spring Hill Parkway and two right-in/right-out driveways via existing curb-cuts on Spring Road.

Submitting Local Government: City of Smyrna

Date Opened: December 18, 2017

Deadline for Comments: January 2, 2018

Date to Close: January 8, 2018*

**If no significant issues are identified during the comment period, the review will close on January 2, 2018 per the LCI Expedited Review process outlined in ARC's DRI Rules.*

Response:

- 1) ☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) ☐ 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:

[illegible]

EMERSON CENTER DRI
City of Smyrna
Natural Resources Group Review Comments
December 13, 2017

Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection

The proposed project property is located on existing, developed property in the Rottenwood Creek watershed, which is part of the Chattahoochee Corridor watershed. The project property 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 no blue-line streams on or near the project property. No streams or other waters of the State are shown on the submitted site plan and no evidence of streams or other waters is visible in available aerial photo coverage. Any waters of the State that may exist on the property will be subject to the State 25-foot Sedimentation and Erosion Control buffer.

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

- 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 runoff reduction, potentially reducing the need for larger stormwater facilities and helping to minimize the negative effects of stormwater runoff on streams and water quality.
- 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.
- 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

DRI Number #2764
DRI Title Emerson Center Mixed Use Development
County Cobb County
City (if applicable) Smyrna
Address / Location On Spring Road between Cumberland Boulevard and US 41/SR 3 (Cobb Parkway)

Proposed Development Type:

Mixed use development consisting of 11,000 sq ft of retail, 87,500 sq ft of office, 200 room hotel and 310 multifamily units.

Review Process ☒ EXPEDITED
☐ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
Copied [Click here to enter text.](#)
Date December 11, 2017

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by A & R Engineering
Date December 11, 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 the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)*

The traffic analysis includes an appendix of project fact sheets for programmed projects in the network study area as identified in the Atlanta Region's Plan.

☐ 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 site access is proposed one full movement access point from Spring Hill Parkway and two right in right out access points from Spring Road. No regional thoroughfares provide access to the site.

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*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

Nearest Station

[Click here to enter name of operator and rail line](#)

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*)

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 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) Cobb Community Transit, MARTA

Bus Route(s) MARTA Route 12, CCT Route #10 10A 25 50

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.

☐ NO

☒ YES

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	Cobb Parkway Trail, Silver Comet Cumberland connector Trail, Kennesaw -Chattahoochee Trail
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*)

* *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 local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks 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*)
- ☐ OTHER (*Please explain*)

Internal driveways and local roadways provide internal pedestrian and vehicular access to other uses onsite without accessing the external roadways.

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*)
- ☒ OTHER (*Please explain*)

Pedestrian facilities are currently available along existing roadways allowing for safe accessibility. The site plan does not provide information regarding pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

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 plan does not provide specific information or depictions of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. While there are opportunities vis site design to provide connectivity to adjacent parcels, the site plan does not show any proposed connections.

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 mix of uses may cause minor truck traffic for retail deliveries but limited freight traffic is expected to be generated by the proposed uses.

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)*

[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.](#)

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 #2764

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: Smyrna

Individual completing form: Ken Suddreth

Telephone: 678-631-5350

E-mail: ksuddreth@smyrnaga.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: Emerson Center

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 2800 & 2810 Spring Road, Smyrna, GA, 30080

Brief Description of Project: Mixed use development with 310 multi-family units (389,333 sq. ft.), a six-story hotel (127,000 sq. ft.), 18,500 sq. ft. of retail space and a 80,000 sq. ft. office building.

Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 310 multi-family units (389,333 sq. ft.), a six-story hotel (127,000 sq. ft.), 18,500 sq. ft. of retail space

Developer: Westplan Investors Acquisitions, LLC

Mailing Address: One Glenlake Parkway

Address 2: Suite 127

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30328

Telephone: 770-390-9378

Email: b.johnson@westplan.com

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

If yes, property owner: Accent Cumberland Apartments, LP

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? Cobb County. The project is requesting to be annexed into the City of Smyrna as part of the rezoning.

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 Annexation and Rezoning

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

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

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: One Phase Build by 2020
Overall project: 2020

[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 #2764

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: Smyrna
Individual completing form: Ken Suddreth
Telephone: 678-631-5350
Email: ksuddreth@smyrnaga.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Emerson Center
DRI ID Number: 2764
Developer/Applicant: Westplan Investors Acquisitions, LLC
Telephone: 770-390-9378
Email(s): b.johnson@westplan.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: \$110 Million
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: Smyrna: \$1.13 Million / Cobb: \$395,000

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc): 18,000 sf retail; 133,000 sf office

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Cobb County Water System

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

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: Cobb County Water System/R L Sutton

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

0.1 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.)

AM: 408 / PM: 381 / DAILY: 4,897

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 the traffic impact study for all recommended improvements.

Solid Waste Disposal

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

380 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?

65%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: On-site stormwater management mitigation will be provided.

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](#)



DRI NUMBER: 2764

DEVELOPMENT STATISTICS SUMMARY CHART

TOTAL SITE ACREAGE: 8.71 ACRES (379,342 sf)

PARCEL ID: 17088000190 & 17088000030

CURRENT ZONING: NS (SMYRNA) & O&I (COBB COUNTY)

CURRENT ADDRESS: 2800 SPRING RD & 2810 SPRING RD

OWNER: ACCENT CUMBERLAND APARTMENTS LP

*Existing property is a developed office park with four office buildings and surface parking.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS: 310 UNITS

HOTEL: 200 ROOMS

COMMERCIAL / RETAIL: 11,000 SF

OFFICE ABOVE: 7,500 SF

OFFICE BUILDING: 80,000

PROPOSED ZONING: MU CONDITIONAL

PARKING REQUIRED

RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS: 310 UNITS X 1.50/UNIT: 465 SPACES

HOTEL: 200 ROOMS X 1.00/UNIT: 200 SPACES

COMMERCIAL / RETAIL: 11,000 SF X 5/1,000: 55 SPACES

OFFICE ABOVE: 7,500 SF X 5/1,000: 38 SPACES

OFFICE BUILDING: 80,000 SF X 5/1,000: 400 SPACES

RESIDENTIAL PARKING PROVIDED

RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS: 465 SPACES

HOTEL: 200 SPACES

COMMERCIAL / RETAIL: 55 SPACES

OFFICE ABOVE: 38 SPACES

OFFICE BUILDING: 400 SPACES

TOTAL: 1158 SPACES

APARTMENTS (FOOTPRINT): 109,748 SF (29%)

HOTEL (FOOTPRINT): 16,170 SF (4%)

COMMERCIAL / RETAIL (FOOTPRINT): 11,000 SF (3%)

OFFICE (FOOTPRINT): 20,900 SF (6%)

PERCENT OF BUILDING COVERAGE: 41.6%

TOTAL OPEN SPACE COMMITMENT: 132,770 SF (35%)

TOTAL GREEN SPACE COMMITMENT: 94,836 SF (25%)

TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA: 237,904 SF (62.7%)

OUTDOOR RECREATION PLACE: 7,600 SF (2%)

FLOOD PLAIN AREA OF SITE: 0.0%

BUILDING HEIGHTS

APARTMENTS: 5 STORIES

HOTEL: 10 STORIES

COMMERCIAL / RETAIL: 2 STORIES

OFFICE: 4 STORIES

NOTE: THE SUBJECT PROPERTY DOES NOT LIE WITHIN A FLOOD HAZARD AS ESTABLISHED PER F.I.R.M. COMMUNITY PANEL NO. 13067C0138G, DATED DECEMBER 16, 2008.


NOTE: THIS SITE DOES NOT LIE WITH 200 FEET OF AN INTERMITTENT STREAM (STATE WATERS).

PLAN PREPARED BY

SUMMIT ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, INC. 6250 SHILOH ROAD, SUITE 100 ALPHARETTA, GA 30005


TRAFFIC CONSULTANT

A&R ENGINEERING, INC. 2160 KINGSTON CT SUITE O, MARIETTA, GA 30067




LOCATION MAP

GRAPHIC SCALE



CAUTION

THE UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE FOR THE CONTRACTORS CONVENIENCE ONLY. THERE MAY BE OTHER UTILITIES NOT SHOWN ON THESE PLANS. THE ENGINEER ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LOCATIONS SHOWN AND IT SHALL BE THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO VERIFY ALL UTILITIES WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE WORK. ALL DAMAGE MADE TO EXISTING UTILITIES BY THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR.



WESTPLAN INVESTORS

One Glenlake Parkway

Suite 12175

Atlanta, GA 30328

Project No.	5-15-012	No.	
Design By:	CKH / CNR		
Drawn By:	CNR		
Checked By:	CKH		
Date:	12/17		
Scale:	1" = 40'		

DRI SITE PLAN

EMERSON CENTER

LAND LOTS 880 & 881

17th DISTRICT, 2nd SECTION

COBB COUNTY GEORGIA