

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: March 5, 2018

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1803052

TO: Mayor Billy Copeland, City of McDonough
ATTN TO: Rodney Heard, Community Development 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: McDonough Commerce Center II

Review Type: DRI

Submitting Local Government: City of McDonough

Date Opened: Mar. 5, 2018

Deadline for Comments: Mar. 20, 2018

Date to Close: Mar. 26, 2018

Description: This DRI is on approximately 81 acres in Henry County on the east side of SR 42/US 23 (Macon Street), approximately ½ mile south of SR 155. It is proposed to consist of 728,000 SF of warehouse/distribution space in one building. Site access is proposed via two driveways onto SR 42. The estimated buildout year is 2019. The local trigger for this review is annexation into the City of McDonough and a rezoning.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Developing Suburbs Area of the region. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. RDG information and recommendations for Developing Suburbs are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest some aspects of regional policy in that it is in relatively close proximity to other, existing warehouse/distribution facilities along SR 42 and King Mill Road to the south and SR 155 to the southwest, offering the potential for efficiencies in regional freight movement. It also offers connectivity for freight movement through its access to SR 42 and SR 155 and proximity to I-75 to the west.

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.) 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.

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 is similar to nearby warehouse/distribution space and is in an area of the region that is experiencing demand for the development of these types of facilities. However, many areas around this site, particularly to the north and east, are predominated by residential uses of varying densities – including many areas and properties that are outside the City of McDonough, e.g., unincorporated Henry County. City of McDonough leadership and staff, along with the

development team, should therefore collaborate to ensure sensitivity to nearby neighborhoods, land uses, structures and natural resources.

Additional preliminary ARC staff comments are attached to this report.

Further to the above, Developing Suburbs are areas that have developed from roughly 1995 to today and are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. General 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

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF HAMPTON
THREE RIVERS REGIONAL COMMISSION

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF LOCUST GROVE
BUTTS COUNTY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
HENRY COUNTY
CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE
SPALDING COUNTY

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: **McDonough Commerce Center II** *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: *March 20, 2018*

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1803052

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: McDonough Commerce Center II (DRI 2776)

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: This DRI is on approximately 81 acres in Henry County on the east side of SR 42/US 23 (Macon Street), approximately ½ mile south of SR 155. It is proposed to consist of 728,000 SF of warehouse/distribution space in one building. Site access is proposed via two driveways onto SR 42. The estimated buildout year is 2019. The local trigger for this review is annexation into the City of McDonough and a rezoning.

Submitting Local Government: City of McDonough

Date Opened: March 5, 2018

Deadline for Comments: March 20, 2018

Date to Close: March 26, 2018

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]

MCDONOUGH COMMERCE CENTER II DRI
Henry County
Natural Resources Group Review Comments

February 27, 2018

Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection

The proposed project property is located within the Tussahaw Creek Water Supply Watershed, which is a small (less than 100 square mile) public water supply watershed as defined by the Georgia DNR Part 5 Minimum Planning Criteria. It is a public water supply source for the Henry County.

Henry County has developed its own protection measures for water supply watersheds in the County, including Tussahaw Creek. All development in the Tussahaw Creek Watershed, including this project, is subject to all applicable requirements of the Henry County Tussahaw Creek Water Supply Watershed Regulations, as specified in the County Code.

The submitted site plan shows that the property is bounded by Tussahaw Creek on the north side of the property and Wise Creek, a tributary to Tussahaw, on the south and east sides of the property. No other perennial or intermittent streams are shown on the project site plan, and no other blue-line streams are shown on or near the property on the USGS coverage for the project area. The site plan shows on both streams the 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious surface setback required by the Henry County's Stream Buffer Ordinance, as well as the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the County buffers. Any other waters of the state on the property will be subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act 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:

- Use 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.
- Include 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 #2776
DRI Title McDonough Commerce Center II
County Henry County
City (if applicable) McDonough
Address / Location Along SR 42 approx. 2000 feet south of the SR 155/SR 42 Intersection

Proposed Development Type:

An 81.2 acre Industrial development consisting of 728,00 sq ft of warehouse space.

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 February 28, 2018

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley Horn
Date February 23, 2018

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 Appendix F of project fact sheets in the network study area and a chart of programmed projects as identified in the Atlanta Region's Plan on Page 22 of the traffic analysis.

- ☐ 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 development proposes two full movement access points on SR 42, a regional thoroughfare.

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

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

☐ NO

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

The development proposes two full movement access points on SR 42, a regional freight thoroughfare.

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*)

Sidewalk exists sporadically along Marietta Blvd NW which provide access to the rail transit

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) MARTA

Bus Route(s) [Click here to enter bus route number\(s\).](#)

Distance* ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

* 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

[Click here to provide name of facility.](#)

Distance

☐ Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

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*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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)

The development proposes pedestrian facilities throughout the development. No bicycle facilities are proposed internally.

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)

- 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)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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 #2776

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: McDonough

Individual completing form: Rodney C. Heard

Telephone: 678-782-6241

E-mail: Rheard@mcdonoughga.org

*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: McDonough Commerce Center II

Location (Street Address, GPS Hwy 23/42; LL 186, 187, 198 & 199/ 7th District Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: 728,000sf Warehouse Distribution Center with Office Support areas, aligning with existing Industrial development for expansion of city's land use portfolio, abutting Hwy 42 S Village Activity Node (Hwy 42 S & Hwy 155 S) that is a City Gateway.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input checked="" 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.): 728,000sf cross dock

Developer: Ridgeline Property Group, Mike Gray (Rep.)

Mailing Address: 3353 Peachtree Road NE, Suite M-15

Address 2:

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30326

Telephone: 404-441-3222

Email: mkg@ridgelinepg.com

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

If yes, property owner: Lee Investments Properties; William McKibben/Candy Barnett

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?	Unincorporated Henry County
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, provide the following information:	Project Name: Project ID:
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning <input type="checkbox"/> Variance <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer <input type="checkbox"/> Water <input type="checkbox"/> Permit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Annexation into the City of McDonough with subsequent rezoning.
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	N/A
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: N/A Overall project: Spring 2019

[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 #2776

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: McDonough
Individual completing form: Rodney C. Heard
Telephone: 678-782-6241
Email: Rheard@mcdonoughga.org

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: McDonough Commerce Center II
DRI ID Number: 2776
Developer/Applicant: Ridgeline Property Group, Mike Gray (Rep.)
Telephone: 404-441-3222
Email(s): mkg@ridgelinepg.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: \$26,000,000 hard costs

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$330,000

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): Site has been vacant agricultural land for decades.

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Henry County Water Authority

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

0.062 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?
a 12" and 16" water line exists along the ROW of SR 42.

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

McDonough Water Department

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

0.051 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? Sanitary sewer connection is via an existing easement connecting to a public lift station east of the site.

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.)

Approximately: 1,196 net daily trips - 113 trips AM peak - 115 trips PM Peak

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 Study performed by Kimley-Horn and Associates.

Solid Waste Disposal

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

300 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

60%

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: Stream buffers and zoning buffers to be retained. Detention ponds will be constructed and maintained via local and state requirements. All disturbed areas not covered by building or paving will be vegetatively stabilized and landscaped.

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:

212 LF of ephemeral stream & 3410 SF of wetlands will be mitigated/permited via a USACE NWP. Stream buffers to be retained and floodplain impacts to be offset per regulatory requirements.

[Back to Top](#)

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

DRI SUBMITTAL PLAN

DRI # 2776

THIS PLAN IS A CONCEPTUAL REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED SITE DEVELOPMENT. FINAL LAYOUT CONTINGENT UPON PERMITTING, DETENTION AND JURISDICTIONAL PERMITTING. BASE DATA FIELD RUN BY TRAVIS PRUITT SURVEYING

MCDONOUGH COMMERCE CTR. II

MCDONOUGH (UNINCORP. HENRY CO.), GEORGIA

DRI #2776

RIDGELINE PROPERTY GROUP

404.800.7979 WWW.RIDGELINEPG.COM



OWNER: LEE INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, LLLP
KATHI M. LEE
WILLIAM P. McKIBBEN
CANDY M. BARNETT

APPLICANT / LAND PLANNER: RIDGELINE PROPERTY GROUP
3353 PEACHTREE RD. NE / M-15
ATLANTA, GA 30326
404.441.3222
MICHAEL K. GRAY, PRESIDENT

TRAFFIC ENGINEER: KIMLEY-HORN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
11720 AMBER PARK DR. / SUITE 600
ALPHARETTA, GA 30009
470.273.3181
JOHN WALKER

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: MODERN LOGISTICS FACILITY WITH CAR AND TRAILER PARKING.

JURISDICTIONAL REQUEST: ANNEXATION INTO THE CITY OF McDONOUGH. REZONING FROM (COUNTY) RA ZONING TO (CITY) M-1 ZONING.

OWNER + DEVELOPER INFO

EXTG. ZONING: RA - RESIDENTIAL / AGRIC.
PROP. ZONING: M-1 - LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
TAX PARCEL ID #: 108-01027002
ACREAGE: 81.17+/- ACRES
ADDRESS: HWY 23 / 42
McDONOUGH, GEORGIA

SURVEY BY: TRAVIS PRUITT SURVEYING
PLAT UPDATED 6-27-17

404 WATERS: CONTOUR ENVIRONMENTAL
DELINEATED ON 03-31-17

SITE PLAN BY: RIDGELINE PROPERTY GRP.

SETBACKS: 40' FRONT SETBACK;
- AND -
BUFFERS AT RA = 50'

IMPERVIOUS: 80% ALLOWABLE; 60% PROPOSED
F.A.R. 20.59 F.A.R. (BASED ON 728,000SF)

PARKING: 311 CAR SPACES
210 TRAILER SPACES
CITY REQ. TBD - BASED ON SHIFT #

UTILITIES: COUNTY WATER / CITY SEWER

PROJECT INFORMATION



FEBRUARY 22, 2018

