

DATE: September 4, 2018

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1808131

TO: Mayor Eric Dial, Town of Tyrone
ATTN TO: Phillip Trocquet, Planning & Development Coordinator
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review



Digital signature
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI with regard to its relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This final report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the host local government.

Name of Proposal: Founders Studio & Founders Square (DRI 2830)

Submitting Local Government: Town of Tyrone

Review Type: DRI **Date Opened:** August 14, 2018

Date Closed: September 4, 2018

Description: This DRI is in the Town of Tyrone on the east side of SR 74 (Joel Cowan Parkway), south of Sandy Creek Road and north of Jenkins Road. The project is proposed to include two subareas: Founders Studio, containing approximately 462,500 SF of film studio space (five buildings at 92,500 SF each); and Founders Square, containing approximately 76,500 SF of office space, an 80-room hotel, 122 residential units (101 apartments, 21 condominiums), 183,000 SF of retail space, and 35,000 SF of restaurant space. Site access is proposed via one driveway on Sandy Creek Rd., five driveways on SR 74, and one driveway on Jenkins Rd. The local trigger for this DRI review is a rezoning application.

Comments: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is primarily in the Developing Suburbs area of the region, with a portion on the east side of the site in the Developing Rural area. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. RDG information and recommendations for Developing Suburbs and Developing Rural areas are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest certain aspects of regional policy. The plan contemplates a mixed-use development featuring significant housing, retail and employment space – with pedestrian-oriented land uses and gathering spaces in multiple locations – alongside a film studio facility. The mixed-use nature of the development offers the potential for site residents to work and shop on site, and for workers and visitors to park once or arrive via alternative transportation modes and conduct multiple trips on foot.

To capitalize on this potential, care should be taken to ensure that the development promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas. This is particularly important in terms of connections between the two sides of the site, which are oriented differently, for different user groups. Given site security needs for film studios, the studio component is naturally more self-contained and inward-facing. There is one gated connection between the studio and mixed-use components, for vehicles and pedestrians, near the rear (east side) of the site. This location is close to some of the retail/restaurant space and what appear to be upper-floor residential lofts, around the central park area. However, it is a considerable distance from the retail/restaurant node near the northwest corner of the site fronting SR 74 and Sandy Creek Road – as well as from the residential cluster in the northeast corner of the site, which is separated by a creek. The development team should explore providing another, potentially pedestrian-only, connection between the studio and mixed-use components closer to the front (west/SR 74 side) of the development. A potential location could be the north side of Studio Building E, in alignment with the north-south roadway bisecting the central park area. This arrangement would offer studio workers additional and more direct access to

pre- and post-work activities and needs (meals, shopping, entertainment, etc.) without adding car trips to the area road network. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities (bicycle racks, etc.) are provided for residents, workers and visitors at key locations throughout the site.

Additionally, the DRI site plan includes an 8' multi-use trail on the east side (rear) of the film studio tract, connecting Jenkins Road with the mixed-use tract on the north side of the site. Fayette County is developing a Greenways Master Plan, and it is expected that its design standards for shared-use paths will list a preferred width of 12' and a minimum width of 10'. A width of 12' is also appropriate from a practical standpoint, given existing/growing golf cart use in many Fayette County communities, including Tyrone, and the use of golf carts around movie studios. In light of these factors, the development team should strongly consider providing a 12' multi-use path. Also, in line with Fayette County staff comments within GRTA's DRI review process, ARC recommends that the south end of this multi-use path feature a pedestrian crossing across Jenkins Road to the Sandy Creek school complex, as well as a short spur to the adjacent church property to the east.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating 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.

The DRI's land use mix appears to be generally consistent with the RDG, specifically in terms of fostering a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location. The intensity of this proposed project appears to generally align with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights for Developing Suburbs, although some development on the east side of the site is in Developing Rural and is slightly more intense than the RDG's recommendations for that area. In addition, many areas near the site – including to the west, north and east – are predominated by low-density residential uses and undeveloped land. This includes properties in other jurisdictions outside Tyrone, e.g., unincorporated Fayette County to the east. Town leadership and staff, along with the development team, should therefore collaborate to ensure maximum sensitivity to nearby neighborhoods, land uses, structures and natural resources.

Additional ARC staff comments, related to transportation and water resources, are included in this report – along with external comments received from contacted parties during the review period.

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

Further to the above, Developing Rural Areas – together with Rural Areas – are the least developed areas of the region. Developing Rural Areas are being planned for new development, while Rural Areas are planned to see limited or no growth. Both of these areas may have limited infrastructure and services. General policy recommendations for Developing Rural Areas include:

- Maintain rural road characteristics and protect scenic corridors
- Implement conservation design and development as appropriate in new residential neighborhoods
- Develop opportunities for heritage, recreation, and agriculturally-based tourism initiatives

- Identify areas to preserve as future large parks or conservation areas and create partnerships and dedicated funding sources for land conservation activities
- Identify opportunities for the development of rural broadband technology

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
THREE RIVERS REGIONAL COMMISSION
CITY OF PALMETTO
COWETA COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
ARC AGING & INDEPENDENCE SERVICES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF FAIRBURN
CITY OF PEACHTREE CITY
FAYETTE COUNTY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE
CITY OF UNION CITY

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>.

FOUNDERS STUDIO AND FOUNDERS SQUARE DRI # 2830

Town of Tyrone

ARC Natural Resources Group Review Comments

August 9, 2018

Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection

The entire proposed project property is in two water supply watersheds. Most of the project property is in the Whitewater Creek watershed, which is a public water supply source for both the City of Fayetteville and Fayette County. The Whitewater Creek Water Supply Watershed is a small (less than 100 square mile) watershed which is a public water supply source for both Fayette County and the City of Fayetteville. A small portion of the property along Jenkins Road is within the Flat Creek Water Supply Watershed, a small (less than 100 square mile) water supply watershed which is a public water supply source for Fayette County.

Under the Georgia Planning Act of 1989, all development in a public water supply watershed is subject to the DNR Part 5 Water Supply Watershed Minimum Criteria (Chapter 391-3-16-.01, Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds) unless alternative criteria are developed and adopted by the jurisdiction according to the requirements of the Part 5 criteria and are then approved by Georgia EPD and DCA. These criteria require buffers on perennial streams and limits on impervious surface. The Town of Tyrone has adopted a water supply watershed protection ordinance. The ordinance defines perennial streams as streams that are shown as perennial (solid blue line) on a USGS quad sheet. No perennial streams are shown on or near the property on the USGS coverage for the project area. The Town will need to determine if the proposed project meets all applicable requirements of its water supply watershed protection ordinance.

The USGS coverage for the project area does show one intermittent stream (dashed blue line) that extends a short distance into the property on its eastern side near Jenkins Road. It appears to be the stream shown near the area noted as "Base Camp B" on the submitted site plan. No buffers are shown along that stream. The submitted site plan shows two other streams along the eastern edge of the property. The site plan shows a 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback on both of these streams, consistent with the Town's Stream Buffer Ordinance. The Town will need to determine if its ordinance also applies to the intermittent stream at the southern end of the property. All of these streams, as well as any other waters of the state on this property are also be subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer.

Storm Water/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, as with all development, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. The amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed development are dependent on the type and intensity of the use and the impervious coverage, which will affect the design of stormwater controls for the project.

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (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 #2830
DRI Title Founders Studio and Founders Square
County Fayette County
City (if applicable) Town of Tyrone
Address / Location The site is located east of SR 74, South of Sandy Creek Road, and north of Jenkins Road.

Proposed Development Type:

A **110 acre** mixed-use project is proposed to consist of 462,500 SF of film studio, 76,500SF of office, 101 apartment units, 21 townhomes, 183,000 SF of retail, 35,000 of restaurant, and 80 room hotel

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 August 17, 2018

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley Horn
Date August 7, 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 with project fact sheets of fiscally constrained projects in the network study area and a list of programmed projects in the 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 proposes five access points along SR 74 including one full movement driveways and four right in/right out driveways.

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 five access points along SR 74 including one full movement driveways and four right in/right out driveways.

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

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
- ☐ 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)

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	The proposes Inner Loop of Alpha Loop
Distance	<input type="checkbox"/> Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) <input type="checkbox"/> 0.15 to 0.50 mile <input type="checkbox"/> 0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
Bicycling Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> 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*)

The site plan depicts driveways provide for internal movement between uses throughout the site.

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 internally allowing for internal pedestrian connectivity.

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☒ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☐ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

The site plan indicates internal sidewalks that connect to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities along the roadways.

- 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)

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

Andrew Smith

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 1:24 PM
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Founders Studio & Founders Square (DRI 2830)
Attachments: ARC Preliminary Report - Founders Studio and Founders Square - DRI 2830.pdf

Andrew,

The proposed project is to include two subareas in Tyrone, Georgia: Founders Studio, containing approximately 462,500 SF of film studio space (five buildings at 92,500 SF each); and Founders Square, containing approximately 76,500 SF of office space, an 80-room hotel, 122 residential units (101 apartments, 21 condominiums), 183,000 SF of retail space, and 35,000 SF of restaurant space. It is located more than 10 miles any civil open to the public airport, and is located outside of any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact any airport.

However, if any construction equipment reaches 200' or more 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.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

Alan Hood

Airport Safety Data Program Manager



Aviation Programs

600 West Peachtree Street NW
2nd Floor
Atlanta, GA, 30308
404.660.3394 cell

From: Andrew Smith <ASmith@atlantaregional.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 2:38 PM
To: VanDyke, Cindy <cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; Garth Lynch <glynych@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>; Renaud Marshall <rmarshall@srta.ga.gov>; 'DRI@grta.org' <DRI@grta.org>; 'Jon West' <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov; pmallon@fayettecountyga.gov; jrobison@fayettecountyga.gov; srapson@fayettecountyga.gov; Ray Gibson <RGibson@fayetteville-ga.gov>; Jahnee

Andrew Smith

From: McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2018 8:54 AM
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Robinson, Charles A.; Peevy, Phillip M.; DeNard, Paul
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Founders Studio & Founders Square (DRI 2830)

Good Morning Andrew,

GDOT Planning has reviewed the Founders Studio & Founders Square (DRI 2830) Preliminary report and show no additional GDOT projects, other than those already mentioned in the report.

For further information that may be needed concerning this review, please contact Johnathan G. McLoyd at 404-631-1774 or jomcloyd@dot.ga.gov.

Regards,

Johnathan G. McLoyd

Transportation Planner Associate



Office of Planning
One Georgia Center
600 West Peachtree Street, 5th Floor
Atlanta, GA, 30308
404.631.1774 office

From: Andrew Smith <ASmith@atlantaregional.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 2:38 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>; Renaud Marshall <rmarshall@srta.ga.gov>; 'DRI@grta.org' <DRI@grta.org>; 'Jon West' <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov; pmallon@fayettecountyga.gov; jrobison@fayettecountyga.gov; srapson@fayettecountyga.gov; Ray Gibson <RGibson@fayetteville-ga.gov>; Jahnee Prince <jprince@fayetteville-ga.gov>; Julie Brown <jbrown@fayetteville-ga.gov>; jwalls@intse.com; Mike Warrix <mwarrix@peachtree-city.org>; Robin Cailloux <RCailloux@peachtree-city.org>; tpeeks@fairburn.com; Ellis Still <estill@unioncityga.org>; Giavani Smith <gsmith@unioncityga.org>; Maurice Ungaro <mungaro@unioncityga.org>; J. Clark Boddie <mayor@citypalmetto.com>; 'hanson@citypalmetto.com' <hanson@citypalmetto.com>; Jeannie Brantley

Andrew Smith

From: ptrocquet@tyrone.org
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2018 4:34 PM
To: Andrew Smith
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Founders Studio & Founders Square (DRI 2830)

Andrew,

The town may have other specific recommendations for the developer at our rezoning hearing, but the initial comments are as follows:

- CMU zoning development standards require building setbacks from SR-74 to be 100 feet. When measured, some structures are within 35 feet of SR-74.
- CMU zoning development standards require building setbacks from adjoining properties, minor thoroughfares, minor collectors, and residential streets to be 75 feet. When measured, some structures are within 25 feet of the property line.
- The SR-74 Quality Growth overlay district requires a planted buffer be in place for the first 20 feet of all building setbacks adjacent to SR-74. This is not shown on the preliminary plan.
- In an effort to be consistent with the access management goals and objectives of the Highway 74 Gateway Coalition currently underway, the town is in support of no more than two curb cuts along SR-74 for the mixed use portion of the project.

Thanks,

Phillip Trocquet

Town of Tyrone, Georgia

Planning & Development Coordinator

tyrone.org/planning-and-zoning/

Office: (770) 487-4038 | Ext: 108

Mobile: (770) 881-8322

From: Andrew Smith <ASmith@atlantaregional.org>

Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 2:38 PM

To: 'cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov' <cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; Garth Lynch <glynych@HNTB.com>; Wayne Mote (wmote@HNTB.com) <wmote@HNTB.com>; 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>; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov' <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. (achood@dot.ga.gov) <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>; Renaud Marshall <rmarshall@srta.ga.gov>; 'DRI@grta.org' <DRI@grta.org>; 'Jon West' <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov; pmallon@fayettecountyga.gov; jrobison@fayettecountyga.gov; srapson@fayettecountyga.gov; Ray Gibson <RGibson@fayetteville-ga.gov>; Jahnee Prince <jprince@fayetteville-ga.gov>; Julie Brown <jbrown@fayetteville-ga.gov>; jwalls@intse.com; Mike Warrix <mwarrix@peachtree-city.org>; Robin Cailloux <RCailloux@peachtree-city.org>; tpeeks@fairburn.com; Ellis Still <estill@unioncityga.org>; Giavani Smith <gsmith@unioncityga.org>; Maurice Ungaro <mungaro@unioncityga.org>; J. Clark Boddie <mayor@citypalmetto.com>; 'hanson@citypalmetto.com' <hanson@citypalmetto.com>; Jeannie Brantley <jbrantley@threeriversrc.com>;



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2830

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: Tyrone

Individual completing form: Phillip Trocquet

Telephone: 7708818322

E-mail: ptrocquet@tyrone.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: Founders Studio & Founders Square

Location (Street Address, GPS Geolocation: 33.501761181609545,-84.57502798334201 Corner of Sandy Creek Road & SR-74 East. Corner Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: The proposed Founders Studios development will consist of five (5) film studio buildings at approximately 92,500 SF each (~462,000 SF total). The proposed founders Square development will consist of approximately \$476,000 SF of office, hotel, residential, retail, and restaurant land uses. Approximate use and density is detailed below.

Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 462,500 SF of Studio Space, 76,500 SF Office, 60,000 SF Hotel (~80 rooms), 21,000 SF Townhome reside

Developer: Dockery Group

Mailing Address: 103 Guthrie Way

Address 2:

City: Peachtree City State: GA Zip: 30269

Telephone: (770) 632-7716

Email: nathan@dockerygroup.com

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

If yes, property owner: Hobgood Family LP

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

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

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

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

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project: ☒ Rezoning
☐ Variance
☐ Sewer
☐ Water
☐ Permit
☐ Other

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

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

Estimated Project Completion This project/phase: 01/2022
Dates: Overall project: 01/2022

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#)

[DRI Site Map](#) | [Contact](#)



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2830

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: Tyrone
Individual completing form: Phillip Trocquet
Telephone: 7708818322
Email: ptrocquet@tyrone.org

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Founders Studio & Founders Square
DRI ID Number: 2830
Developer/Applicant: Dockery Group
Telephone: 7706327716
Email(s): nathan@dockerygroup.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: 200,000,000

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

Based on build-out value, not assessed value and after expiration of possible tax incentives from the Fayette County Development Authority: 2,311,200

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):

Water Supply

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

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

.10954

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:

Sufficient capacity exists, but there will likely need to be infrastructure improvements done to compensate for a lack of pressure.

Is a water line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

Town of Tyrone

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

.10000

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? A maximum of 350'-400' of line would be needed to connect the development to existing lines. An unknown number of feet/miles of additional sewer line would circulate throughout the development.

Land Transportation

How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.)

AM: 785 | PM: 991 | Total: 13,976

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: Traffic studies are currently under development.

Solid Waste Disposal

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

1147

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

30%

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: A floodplain exists on the site which necessitates that we try to utilize smaller BMP's throughout the site such as rain gardens, pervious parking/pavers, small bio-retention areas within parking lots, linear park areas, conservation areas, swales, and a few detention ponds in the large commercial areas. A full hydrology study outlining specifics will be required before a land disturbance permit can be issued.

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:

Water supply watersheds: Most of the project property is in the Whitewater Creek small water supply watershed, a public water supply source for both the City of Fayetteville and Fayette County. A small portion of the property along Jenkins Road is in the Flat Creek small water supply watershed, a public water supply source for Fayette County. Floodplain: a no-rise verification will be required for the flood elevation as phases are built out. Groundwater Recharge: The entire Town is classified as a groundwater recharge area (probable area of thick soils) by DCA. As site planning moves forward, measures will be taken to conserve areas of significance and prevent groundwater contamination through BMPs.

[Back to Top](#)

