

REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

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

DATE: April 11, 2018 **ARC REVIEW CODE**: R1803231

TO: Mayor Robert Price, City of Locust Grove

ATTN TO: Bert Foster, 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 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: Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699)

Submitting Local Government: City of Locust Grove

Review Type: DRI Date Opened: March 23, 2018 Date Closed: April 11, 2018

<u>Description</u>: This DRI is on approximately 271 acres in the City of Locust Grove along Price Drive, south of Bethlehem Road and north of Bill Gardner Parkway. The project consists of approximately 3,360,650 SF of high cube warehouse/distribution space in five buildings. The review trigger is a rezoning application, and the estimated build-out year is 2022. Site access is proposed via nine driveways on Price Drive. It should be noted that Price Drive will be realigned to intersect with Bethlehem Road approximately 1,800 feet west of the current intersection location. This DRI is adjacent to a related project called "Locust Grove-Clayco" (DRI 2584), which was the first phase and was reviewed in 2016.

<u>Comments:</u> 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 aspects of regional policy in that it is in relatively close proximity to clusters of warehouse/distribution facilities farther north in unincorporated Henry County and the City of McDonough along SR 155 and SR 42/US 23, offering the potential for efficiencies in regional freight movement. It also offers connectivity for regional and interstate freight movement through its access to I–75.

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 relatively nearby warehouse/distribution facilities and is in a part of the region that is experiencing demand for the development of these types of facilities. However, many areas around this site are predominated by

forested land, small farms and homesteads, and low density, single family residential uses – including areas and properties outside the City of Locust Grove, e.g., unincorporated Henry County. This project is also in the Indian Creek Small Water Supply Watershed, a public water supply source for Henry County, and is just east of a tributary to Indian Creek and the City's 500–foot Water Quality Critical Area buffer. City leadership and staff, along with the development team, should therefore collaborate to ensure sensitivity to nearby natural resources and land uses.

Additional ARC staff comments related to transportation and water resources, along with external comments received during the review, are included in 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
HENRY COUNTY
BUILTS COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF HAMPTON
SPAI DING COUNTY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
THREE RIVERS REGIONAL COMMISSION
CITY OF MCDONOUGH
CITY OF IENKINSBURG

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.

Andrew Smith

From: Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 2, 2018 2:24 PM

To: Andrew Smith

Cc: Peevy, Phillip M.; Robinson, Charles A.; DeNard, Paul

Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699)

Good Afternoon, Andrew,

The GDOT Office of Planning has reviewed the Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699) Preliminary report, and there are two (2) GDOT projects in addition to those already mentioned in the preliminary report:

- o GDOT Project Identification No. (PI No.) 0013995 SR 42 @ NS #718418R 5 MI S OF MCDONOUGH Bridge project, CST FY 2020 The GDOT Project Manager for this project is Michael Vincent Hamilton and can be reached at 404-6311780 or mhamilton@dot.ga.gov.
- o GDOT Project Identification No. (PI No.) 0015823 SR 42 FROM CS 636/BILL GARDNER PKWY TO CS 645/PEEKSVILLE RD Widening, CST FY 2020- The GDOT Project Manager for this project is Ricardo Maxwell and can be reached at 404-631-1723 or rmaxwell@dot.ga.gov.

For further information that may be needed concerning this review, please contact Vivian Canizares at 404-631-1794 or mcanizares@dot.ga.gov.

Thank you,
-Vivian Canizares

From: Andrew Smith [mailto:ASmith@atlantaregional.org]

Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 12:41 PM

<george.stock@stockassoc.com>

To: VanDyke, Cindy <cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; Garth Lynch <glynch@HNTB.com>; Wayne Mote (wmote@HNTB.com) <wmote@HNTB.com>; Peevy, Phillip M. <PPeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Robinson, Charles A. <chrobinson@dot.ga.gov>; Weiss, Megan J <MWeiss@dot.ga.gov>; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>; Comer, Carol <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Taylor, Stanford <stataylor@dot.ga.gov>; Baxley, Chance <cbaxley@dot.ga.gov>; Peek, Tyler <tpeek@dot.ga.gov>; Woods, Dan <dwoods@dot.ga.gov>; Wilkerson, Donald <dowilkerson@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; Daunte Gibbs (dauntegibbs@co.henry.ga.us) <dauntegibbs@co.henry.ga.us>; Stacey Jordan <sjordan@co.henry.ga.us>; David Simmons <dsimmons@co.henry.ga.us>; Rodney C. Heard <RHeard@McDonoughGa.org>; daryld@hamptonga.gov; patw@hamptonga.gov; Jeannie Brantley ibrantley@threeriversrc.com>; ksdutton@threeriversrc.com; clawson@buttscounty.org; 'cjones@CityofJenkinsburg.com' <cjones@CityofJenkinsburg.com>; 'cjacobs@spaldingcounty.com' <cjacobs@spaldingcounty.com>; 'bfoster@locustgrove-ga.gov' <bfoster@locustgrove-ga.gov>; tyoung@locustgrovega.gov; 'hornsbyk@realcrg.com' <hornsbyk@realcrg.com>; demperiom@claycorp.com; saundersc@claycorp.com; mosesd@claycorp.com; lchapman@chapmanventuresllc.com; John.Walker@kimley-horn.com; elizabeth.johnson@kimley-horn.com; jinwoo.seo@kimley-horn.com; John Willems (john.willems@stockassoc.com) <john.willems@stockassoc.com>; P. E George M. Stock (george.stock@stockassoc.com)

Cc: Community Development < Community Development@atlantaregional.org>; Mike Alexander < MAlexander@atlantaregional.org>; David Haynes < DHaynes@atlantaregional.org>; Marquitrice Mangham

<MMangham@atlantaregional.org>; Daniel Studdard <DStuddard@atlantaregional.org>; Ryan Ellis
<REllis@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Santo <JSanto@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Skinner@atlantaregional.org>
Subject: ARC DRI Review Notification: Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699)

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 <u>Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699)</u>.

This DRI is on approximately 271 acres in the City of Locust Grove along Price Drive, south of Bethlehem Road and north of Bill Gardner Parkway. The project consists of approximately 3,360,650 SF of high cube warehouse/distribution space in five buildings. The review trigger is a rezoning application, and the estimated build-out year is 2022. Site access is proposed via nine driveways on Price Drive. It should be noted that Price Drive will be realigned to intersect with Bethlehem Road approximately 1,800 feet west of the current intersection location. This DRI is adjacent to a related project called "Locust Grove-Clayco" (DRI 2584), which was the first phase and was reviewed in 2016.

As a representative of a nearby local government or other potentially affected party, we request that you or your staff review the attached ARC Preliminary Report and provide any comments to ARC on or before **April 7, 2018**.

You may also view the Preliminary Report and other project information by visiting the <u>ARC Plan Reviews webpage</u> beginning tomorrow, March 24, and entering "Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II" in the search field at the bottom of the page.

Comments may be directed to me via email to <u>asmith@atlantaregional.org</u> or via U.S. mail to the address noted in my signature below.

For more information regarding the DRI process, please visit the ARC DRI webpage.

Regards,

Andrew Smith

Principal Planner, Community Development
Atlanta Regional Commission
P | 470.378.1645
asmith@atlantaregional.org
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. #ArriveAliveGA

Andrew Smith

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 4:34 PM

To: Andrew Smith

Cc: Brian, Steve; Edmisten, Colette; Comer, Carol; Kleine, Tracie; Michael Toney - Atlanta South Regional

Airport (mtoney@co.henry.ga.us)

Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699) **Attachments:** ARC Preliminary Report - Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II DRI 2699.pdf

Andrew,

The proposed development consisting of approximately 3,360,650 SF of high cube warehouse/distribution space is in five buildings in the City of Locust Grove, on the west side of Price Drive, south of Bethlehem Road and north of Bill Gardner Parkway. It is located more than 10 miles east of Henry County Airport (HMP), and is located outside any of their FAA approach or departure surfaces, and compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However, if any construction equipment reaches higher than 200' above ground, 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 Michael Toney with Henry County Airport (HMP) 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

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

From: Andrew Smith [mailto:ASmith@atlantaregional.org]

Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 12:41 PM

To: VanDyke, Cindy <cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Matthews, Timothy W

<TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; Garth Lynch <glynch@HNTB.com>; Wayne Mote (wmote@HNTB.com)

<wmote@HNTB.com>; Peevy, Phillip M. <PPeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Robinson, Charles A. <chrobinson@dot.ga.gov>; Weiss,

Megan J < MWeiss@dot.ga.gov>; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. < mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>; Comer, Carol

<ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Taylor, Stanford <stataylor@dot.ga.gov>; Baxley, Chance

<cbaxley@dot.ga.gov>; Peek, Tyler <tpeek@dot.ga.gov>; Woods, Dan <dwoods@dot.ga.gov>; Wilkerson, Donald

<dowilkerson@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; Daunte Gibbs (dauntegibbs@co.henry.ga.us) <dauntegibbs@co.henry.ga.us>; Stacey

Jordan <sjordan@co.henry.ga.us>; David Simmons <dsimmons@co.henry.ga.us>; Rodney C. Heard

<RHeard@McDonoughGa.org>; daryld@hamptonga.gov; patw@hamptonga.gov; Jeannie Brantley

<jbrantley@threeriversrc.com>; ksdutton@threeriversrc.com; clawson@buttscounty.org;

'cjones@CityofJenkinsburg.com' <cjones@CityofJenkinsburg.com>; 'cjacobs@spaldingcounty.com'

<cjacobs@spaldingcounty.com>; 'bfoster@locustgrove-ga.gov' <bfoster@locustgrove-ga.gov>; tyoung@locustgrovega.gov; 'hornsbyk@realcrg.com' <hornsbyk@realcrg.com>; demperiom@claycorp.com; saundersc@claycorp.com; mosesd@claycorp.com; Ichapman@chapmanventuresllc.com; John.Walker@kimley-horn.com; elizabeth.johnson@kimley-horn.com; jinwoo.seo@kimley-horn.com; John Willems (john.willems@stockassoc.com) <john.willems@stockassoc.com>; P. E George M. Stock (george.stock@stockassoc.com) <george.stock@stockassoc.com>

Cc: Community Development <CommunityDevelopment@atlantaregional.org>; Mike Alexander <MAlexander@atlantaregional.org>; David Haynes <DHaynes@atlantaregional.org>; Marquitrice Mangham <MMangham@atlantaregional.org>; Daniel Studdard <DStuddard@atlantaregional.org>; Ryan Ellis <REllis@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Santo <JSanto@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Skinner <JSkinner@atlantaregional.org> Subject: ARC DRI Review Notification: Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699)

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 <u>Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II (DRI 2699)</u>.

This DRI is on approximately 271 acres in the City of Locust Grove along Price Drive, south of Bethlehem Road and north of Bill Gardner Parkway. The project consists of approximately 3,360,650 SF of high cube warehouse/distribution space in five buildings. The review trigger is a rezoning application, and the estimated build-out year is 2022. Site access is proposed via nine driveways on Price Drive. It should be noted that Price Drive will be realigned to intersect with Bethlehem Road approximately 1,800 feet west of the current intersection location. This DRI is adjacent to a related project called "Locust Grove-Clayco" (DRI 2584), which was the first phase and was reviewed in 2016.

As a representative of a nearby local government or other potentially affected party, we request that you or your staff review the attached ARC Preliminary Report and provide any comments to ARC on or before **April 7, 2018**.

You may also view the Preliminary Report and other project information by visiting the <u>ARC Plan Reviews webpage</u> beginning tomorrow, March 24, and entering "Locust Grove-Clayco Phase II" in the search field at the bottom of the page.

Comments may be directed to me via email to <u>asmith@atlantaregional.org</u> or via U.S. mail to the address noted in my signature below.

For more information regarding the DRI process, please visit the ARC DRI webpage.

Regards,

Andrew Smith

Principal Planner, Community Development Atlanta Regional Commission P | 470.378.1645 asmith@atlantaregional.org atlantaregional.org International Tower 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 Atlanta, Georgia 30303

There's road work ahead. And roadway work zones are hazardous for workers and the public. In fact, most victims in work zone crashes are drivers or passengers. Work zone safety is everybody's responsibility - pay attention – slow down – watch for workers - expect the unexpected. And whenever you drive, always **Drive Alert Arrive Alive** - buckle up; stay off the phone and no texting. Visit www.dot.ga.gov.

LOCUST GROVE CLAYCO PHASE II DRI City of Locust Grove Natural Resources Group Review Comments

March 19, 2018

Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection

The proposed project property is located entirely within the Indian 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.

Locust Grove has a watershed protection ordinance for water supply watersheds in the City, including Indian Creek. All development in the Indian Creek Watershed, including this project, is subject to all applicable requirements of the City of Locust Grove Watershed District Ordinance as specified in the City Code.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows a blue line stream crossing the central portion of the property as well as a tributary immediately west of the property. The submitted site plan shows these streams as well as two additional tributaries in the central and northern portions of the site. Both the City's stream buffers and the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer are shown on all streams on the property. The stream immediately west of the property is shown as having the City's 500-foot Water Quality Critical Area buffer. Two road crossings and a retaining wall are shown as intruding on the streams in the middle of the property and a portion of Building E and a detention pond are shown intruding on the northern tributary shown on the plans. These and any other intrusions will be subject to the requirements of the Locust Grove Stream Buffer Ordinance as well as the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. In addition, any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the Locust Grove Stream Buffer Ordinance as well as the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. All waters of the state on the property are 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.



regional impact + local relevance

Development of Regional Impact

Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #2699

DRI Title Locust Grove- Clayco Phase II

County Henry County

City (if applicable) Locust Grove

Address / Location The site is located on the west side of Price Drive, between Bethlehem Road and an

area roughly 2,750 feet north of Bill Gardner Parkway

Proposed Development Type:

Development of an approximately 271 acre site for 3,500,000 square feet of high

cube warehouse/distribution space located in five buildings on individual lots.

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 March 15, 2018

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley Horn

Date March 8, 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?
igigigigiggrap YES (provide the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)
Page 32 of the traffic analysis identifies future planned transportation projects in the study network 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 development site plan proposes site access via eight (8) driveways – seven (7) from Price Road (Market place Blvd) and one (1) from Bethlehem Road, both are local roads.

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

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

X	NO
	YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)
	The development site plan proposes site access via eight (8) driveways – seven (7) from Price Road and one (1) from Bethlehem Road, both are local roads.

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

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

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

\boxtimes	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)			
	SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)				
	Operator(s)	Click here to enter name of operator(s).			
	Bus Route(s)	Click here to enter bus route number(s).			
Distance*		☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)			
		☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile			
		0.50 to 1.00 mile			
	Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity			
		Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete			
		Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)			
		Click here to provide comments.			
	Bicycling Access*	Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity			
		Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity			
		Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets			
		Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)			

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

or prefer not to drive, excan help reduce traffic of comprehensive operation serving the site during the nature of the development to the site is not feasible ensure good walking an any routes within a one	developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a consplan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the cent is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should a bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make ding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.
∐ NO □ YES	
] 153	
the development site is	s within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information
n accessibility condition	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
lecess between major e	developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge,	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge,	ot to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu	ot to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu	of to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu	to to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help roor trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (ne	to to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. Pearest path or trail more than one mile away) That information below)
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help roor trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (need no Name of facility	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. Pearest path or trail more than one mile away) Inal information below) Click here to provide name of facility.
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (ne YES (provide addition Name of facility	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. Parest path or trail more than one mile away) Inal information below) Click here to provide name of facility. Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help r or trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (ne YES (provide addition Name of facility	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. Parest path or trail more than one mile away) Click here to provide name of facility. Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) 0.15 to 0.50 mile
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help roor trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (new YES (provide addition Name of facility Distance	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. Parest path or trail more than one mile away) Click here to provide name of facility. Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) 0.15 to 0.50 mile 0.50 to 1.00 mile
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help ror trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (need a second and ition Name of facility Distance	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. Parest path or trail more than one mile away) Click here to provide name of facility. Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) 0.15 to 0.50 mile Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity
who cannot or prefer no and jobs, and can help ror trail is available near facilities is a challenge, funding priority for futu NOT APPLICABLE (need) YES (provide addition Name of facility Distance	to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a re walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. **carest path or trail more than one mile away) **carest path or trail more than one mile away) **Click here to provide name of facility.* Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) 0.15 to 0.50 mile Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with)

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
09. 1	TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS 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) Price Drive (Market Place Blvd) as proposed in the site plan, provides connectivity to buildings internal to the site and to neighboring undeveloped properties.

10		Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?			
	re pl de	ne ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces liance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site ans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key estinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large creage 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)			
	how	acent parcel are undeveloped wooded areas. Existing roadways include pedestrian facilities, vever internal driveways do not include connecting facilities. The site plan and traffic study do not cate pedestrian facilities will be developed.			
11		es the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking nections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?			
	red op	te ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently duces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such portunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans henever 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 appears to include sidewalk provisions along the realignment of Price Road.

of ar se	the ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is sten key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move ound safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be gregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, dewalks, 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)
<u>OMME</u>	<u>INDATIONS</u>
13. Do	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible n a constructability standpoint?
13. Do froi	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible
13. Do froi	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible in a constructability standpoint? UNKNOWN (additional study is necessary) YES (based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a
13. Do froi	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible in 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)
13. Do froi Clic	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible in 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)
13. Do froi	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible in 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) k here to enter text. RC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by
13. Do froi	the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible in 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) It here to enter text. RC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by 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

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

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





Developments of Regional Impact

DRI Home Tier Map View Submissions Login **Apply**

DRI #2699

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: Locust Grove

Individual completing form: Bert Foster

Telephone: 7706922322

E-mail: bfoster@locustgrove-ga.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: Locust Grove - Clayco, Phase II

Location (Street Address, Located west of Price Drive, north of the intersection with Bill Gardner Parkway

GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

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

Brief Description of Project: Light Industrial Warehousing -- Construction of 5 buildings that total approximately 3,500,000 SF of warehouse distribution facility

Development Type:				
O(not selected)		OHotels	OWastewater Treatment Facilities	
Ooffice		OMixed Use	OPetroleum Storage Facilities	
Ocommercial		OAirports	OWater Supply Intakes/Reservoirs	
OWholesale & Distribution		OAttractions & Recreational Facilities	OIntermodal Terminals	
OHospitals and Health Care	Facilities	OPost-Secondary Schools	OTruck Stops	
OHousing		OWaste Handling Facilities	OAny other development types	
•Industrial		OQuarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants		
If other development type, des	scribe:			
Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 5 buildings; total of approximately 3,500,000 SF			
Developer:	Clayco F	Realty Group		
Mailing Address:	2675 Pa	ces Ferry Road		
Address 2:	Suite 29	0		
City:		nta State: GA Zip:30339		
Telephone:	7703179	635		
Email:	hornsbyl	@realcrg.com		
Is property owner different from developer/applicant? O(not selected) O(not selected) O(not selected)				
If yes, property owner:	49th Stre	eet Properties, LP		
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	O(not	selected)@YesONo		

O(not selected)

Yes

No

Back to Top		
	This project/phase: 2022 Overall project: 2022	
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	73%	
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	O(not selected)®YesONo	
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:		
If yes, provide the following information:	Project Name: Locust Grove – Clayco Project ID: 2584	
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?		

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

<u>Login</u>

DRI #2699

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 Locust Grove

Government: Individual completing form: Bert Foster

Telephone: 7706922322

Email: bfoster@locustgrove-ga.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Locust Grove - Clayco, Phase II

DRI ID Number: 2699

Developer/Applicant: CRG Acquisition, LLC

Telephone: 7703179635

Email(s): hornsbyk@realcrg.com

Additional Information Requested

Has the RDC identified any additional information

required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no,

(not selected) Yes No

proceed to Economic Impacts.)

If yes, has that additional information been provided

(not selected) Yes No

to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?

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

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out:

\$170,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be

\$1,500,000

generated by the proposed development:

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed

(not selected) Yes No

project?

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

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

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:

Locust Grove Public Works

```
What is the estimated water 0.047 MGD supply demand to be
generated by the project,
measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?
Is sufficient water supply
capacity available to serve
                               (not selected) Yes No
the proposed project?
If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:
Is a water line extension
required to serve this
                               (not selected) Yes No
project?
If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?
                                               Wastewater Disposal
Name of wastewater
treatment provider for this
                               Henry County Water Authority
site:
What is the estimated
sewage flow to be
generated by the project, measured in Millions of
                               TRD
Gallons Per Day (MGD)?
Is sufficient wastewater
treatment capacity available to serve this proposed
                               (not selected) Yes No
If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:
Is a sewer line extension
required to serve this
                               (not selected) Yes No
project?
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
                               Approximately 5,646 net daily trips, 455 trips AM peak, 433 trips PM peak
vehicle trips per day? (If
only an alternative measure
of volume is available
please provide.)
Has a traffic study been
performed to determine whether or not
transportation or access
                               (not selected) Yes No
improvements will be needed to serve this
project?
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
                               1,150
project expected to
generate annually (in tons)?
Is sufficient landfill capacity
                               (not selected) Yes No
available to serve this
proposed project?
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 63.8% is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management:Comply with the City's and County's stormwater management ordinance, erosion & sedimentation control ordinance and other development regulations		
Environmental Quality		
Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:		
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: See site plan for watershed, wetland and stream impacts		
Back to Top		

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page

DRI Site Map | Contact



