

DATE: October 9, 2018

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1809211

TO: Chairman Charlotte Nash, Gwinnett County Board of Commissioners
ATTN TO: Nancy Lovingood, Department of Planning & Development
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: Revel – Infinite Energy Center (DRI 2822)

Submitting Local Government: Gwinnett County

Review Type: DRI

Date Opened: September 21, 2018

Date Closed: October 8, 2018

Description: This DRI is in unincorporated Gwinnett County, on the site of the existing Infinite Energy Center, south of Sugarloaf Parkway and west of Satellite Boulevard. The project contemplates expansion of existing uses and infill development (primarily on what is currently surface parking) with new uses – consisting of 750,000 SF of office space, 325,000 SF of retail space, 75,000 SF of restaurant space, 950 residential units, and 325 hotel rooms; as well as additions to the existing event complex that include 800 additional arena seats, an additional 91,500 SF of convention space, and an additional 16,000 SF of arts center space. Site access is proposed via a total of 14 driveways (8 existing and 6 new), distributed on Meadow Church Rd., Sugarloaf Pkwy. and Satellite Blvd. The estimated build-out year is 2023. The local trigger for this DRI review is a ground lease agreement between the applicant (North American Properties) and the local agency/land owner (a partnership of Gwinnett County and the Gwinnett County Convention and Visitors Bureau).

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

This DRI appears to manifest aspects of regional policy. The development plan contemplates an infill, mixed-use development on the site of the Infinite Energy Center, in areas currently used for surface parking for events. The project is proposed to include significant office, retail, hotel and housing components, with pedestrian-focused uses and streetscaping at street level. The DRI can also support alternative transportation modes given this new pedestrian streetscaping, proximity to Gwinnett County Transit bus routes 10A and 10B, and proximity to planned future transit routes and multi-use paths in the area. Many of these characteristics collectively offer the potential for site residents to work and shop on site, and for workers and guests 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, as constructed, promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities (bicycle racks/storage, etc.) are provided for residents, workers and visitors at key locations

throughout the site. Shower facilities in office spaces represent another end-of-trip amenity that would support access via alternative transportation modes. 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 applicant team should note that the submitted site plan is not totally clear in terms of the layout of land uses in all areas. Specifically, in Buildings 200 and 300, it is unclear what uses comprise the two stories and four stories, respectively, above ground-floor retail. ARC staff's interpretation is that multi-family residential is above retail in Building 200 and office is above retail in Building 300. Additionally, based on the yellow shading used, it is ARC's assumption that Buildings B, C, 100a-b, 500, 601, 602, 701 and 702 are retail. Finally, it is not clear how many stories are proposed for many of those particular buildings, as well as the townhomes on the northwest corner of the site. More clarity on these items would be beneficial for the local review process going forward. The DRI site plan also shows significant pedestrian and streetscape improvements to the site, but it is unclear if bike lanes are being contemplated in this project; they are strongly recommended in any case.

This DRI is located in the Gwinnett Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) study area. ARC considers this LCI study area to be in good standing. A major update for the northern portion of the study area – where this DRI is located – is also almost complete, which will create the new Sugarloaf LCI area. The Sugarloaf LCI plan is in final draft stage, having been approved by the Sugarloaf CID in August 2018 and with a Gwinnett County vote scheduled for October 2018. It is expected that the Sugarloaf LCI will subsequently be grandfathered into the ARC LCI program as a new area with its own study. In ARC's view, this represents an area already approved within the LCI program, continuing good standing. ARC's assessment is also that this DRI plan supports the goals of the LCI program, is generally consistent with the existing Gwinnett LCI plan, and is specifically consistent with the final draft Sugarloaf LCI plan. The development team should therefore collaborate with the County and the CID to ensure that the project, as constructed, remains consistent with the LCI plan, incorporating all relevant plan recommendations. Likewise, the County and the CID should ultimately incorporate specific key attributes and impacts of this DRI into future updates to the Sugarloaf LCI area.

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

Further to the above, Regional Centers are metro Atlanta's centers for employment, shopping and entertainment. These centers should be connected to the regional transportation network with existing or planned high-capacity transit service. In most cases, these centers have a jobs-housing imbalance, so housing options should be expanded within their boundaries, especially around existing or planned transit. Some Regional Centers could also be considered "Edge Cities," developed in a suburban, auto-oriented way. They have limited multi-modal transportation options and are challenged by increasing congestion. Local plans and policies should support efforts to transform these areas into highly accessible mixed-use urban hubs. General policy recommendations for Regional Centers include:

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

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
GWINNETT COUNTY
CITY OF DULUTH
CITY OF SUWANEE

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
ARC AGING AND INDEPENDENCE SERVICES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
GWINNETT PLACE CID
CITY OF JOHNS CREEK
GEORGIA MOUNTAINS REGIONAL COMMISSION

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
SUGARLOAF CID
CITY OF LAWRENCEVILLE
FORSYTH COUNTY

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



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2822

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: Gwinnett County

Individual completing form: Jerry T. Oberholtzer

Telephone: 678-518-6215

E-mail: Gerald.Oberholtzer@gwinnettcountry.com

*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: Revel/ Infinite Energy Center

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 6400 Sugarloaf Pkwy, Duluth, GA 30097

Brief Description of Project: Infinite Energy Center update/expansion and site-infill with dense mixed-use development. 325 hotel rooms, 850,000 SF office, 50,000 SF restaurant, 350,000 SF retail, 950 residential units; Event Venue - 3,000 additional seats, additional 125,000 SF convention space, additional 25,000 SF arts center space.

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.): 325 hotel rooms, 850,000 SF office, 50,000 SF restaurant, 350,000 SF retail, 950 residential units;

Developer: John Kelley at North American Properties

Mailing Address: 1175 Peachtree Street

Address 2: Suite 1650

City: Atlanta State: Ge Zip: 30361

Telephone: 404-965-9086

Email: John.Kelley@NAProperties.com

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

If yes, property owner: Gwinnett County

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 Ground Lease Agreement

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?

(not selected)

Yes

No

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

Estimated Project Completion Dates:

This project/phase: 2023

Overall project: 2023

Back to Top



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2822

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: Gwinnett County
Individual completing form: Abigail Harwell
Telephone: (678) 518-6204
Email: abigail.harwell@gwinnettcountry.com

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Revel/ Infinite Energy Center
DRI ID Number: 2822
Developer/Applicant: John Kelley at North American Properties
Telephone: 404-965-9086
Email(s): John.Kelley@NAProperties.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: \$900,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$6,590,000

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

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

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

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Gwinnett County Water Resources

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

0.95 MGD

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

Is a water line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

Gwinnett County Water Resources

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

0.79 MGD

Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Land Transportation

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

daily: 24,418 daily trips (12,209 in; 12,209 out) | AM: 1,589 | PM: 1,574

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe below: Please refer to the traffic study performed by Kimley-Horn and Associates.

Solid Waste Disposal

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

15,000 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?

95%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Detention ponds

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:
There is documented wetlands, streams and floodplains on the property. Protection measures for these resources will be observed.

[Back to Top](#)

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

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

Andrew Smith

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 9:24 AM
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; Robinson, Joseph; Matthew.Smith@gwinnettcountry.com
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Revel - Infinite Energy Center (DRI 2822)
Attachments: ARC Preliminary Report - Revel-Infinite Energy Center - DRI 2822.pdf

Andrew,

The proposed project consisting of 750,000 SF of office space, 325,000 SF of retail space, 75,000 SF of restaurant space, 950 residential units, and 325 hotel rooms; as well as additions to the existing event complex that include 800 additional arena seats, an additional 91,500 SF of convention space, and an additional 16,000 SF of arts center space is in unincorporated Gwinnett County, on the site of the existing Infinite Energy Center, south of Sugarloaf Parkway and west of Satellite Boulevard. It is located more than 7 miles west of the Gwinnett County Airport – Briscoe Field (LZU), and is located outside of any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the 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.

I have copied Mr. Matt Smith with Gwinnett County Airport – Briscoe Field (LZU) on this email.

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: Friday, September 21, 2018 5:05 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>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Comer, Carol <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Giles, Shane <shgiles@dot.ga.gov>; Crowe, Richard <rcrowe@dot.ga.gov>; Peevy, Jonathan <jpeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Hunter, William E. <wihunter@dot.ga.gov>; Decker, Sue Anne <sdecker@dot.ga.gov>; Zahul, Kathy <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>; Hatch, Justin A

Andrew Smith

From: McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 1, 2018 12:01 PM
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Peevy, Phillip M.; Robinson, Charles A.; DeNard, Paul
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Revel - Infinite Energy Center (DRI 2822)

Good Afternoon Andrew,

GDOT Planning has reviewed the Revel - Infinite Energy Center (DRI 2822) 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 jomcloyd@dot.ga.gov or 404-631-1774.

Best 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: Friday, September 21, 2018 5:05 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>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Comer, Carol <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Giles, Shane <shgiles@dot.ga.gov>; Crowe, Richard <rcrowe@dot.ga.gov>; Peevy, Jonathan <jpeevy@dot.ga.gov>; Hunter, William E. <wihunter@dot.ga.gov>; Decker, Sue Anne <sdecker@dot.ga.gov>; Zahul, Kathy <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>; Hatch, Justin A <juhatch@dot.ga.gov>; DeNard, Paul <pdenard@dot.ga.gov>; Regis, Edlin <eregis@dot.ga.gov>; Woods, Chris N. <cwoods@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; Boone, Eric <eboone@dot.ga.gov>; Annie Gillespie <agillespie@srta.ga.gov>; Emily Estes <eeestes@srta.ga.gov>; Renaud Marshall <rmarshall@srta.ga.gov>; Parker Martin <PMartin@srta.ga.gov>; 'DRI@grta.org' <DRI@grta.org>; 'Jon West' <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; Greg Floyd (gfloyd@itsmarta.com) <gfloyd@itsmarta.com>; jallen@gwinnettplaceid.com; adavis@sugarloafid.org; Bill Aiken <baiken@duluthga.net>; Dan Robinson

REVEL/INFINITE ENERGY CENTER DRI
Gwinnett County
Natural Resources Group Comments
September 11, 2018

Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The proposed project is located in the Yellow River Watershed, which is not a water supply watershed in the Atlanta Region and no Part 5 Environmental Minimum Planning Criteria for water supply watersheds apply.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows the headwaters of one perennial stream on the project property. It appears to be under the already developed area near the existing Energy Center. What appears to be a stream is shown on the project site plan along the western edge of the property, but it is not identified, and no buffers are indicated. All streams found on the property may be subject to the requirements of the Gwinnett County Stream Buffer Ordinance. All waters of the state will be subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sediment Control Buffer. Intrusion into any of these buffers may require a variance from the appropriate authority.

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.
- Use pervious concrete or other pervious materials in the parking/storage areas. With the proper substrate, such materials can provide a large storage capacity, which will further help to reduce stormwater runoff and can help filter pollutants before reaching streams.
- 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 #2822
DRI Title Revel/Infinite Energy Center
County Gwinnett County
City (if applicable)
Address / Location 119 acre site located southwest of Sugarloaf parkway, south of Meadow Church Road, and northwest of Satellite Boulevard

Proposed Development Type:

A mixed use development consisting of a 296,300 sf convention center, a 50,000 sf art center, 14,508 theatre, a 325 room hotel, 813,000 sf of office, 50,000 sf of restaurant, 350,000 sf of retail, 950 residential units

Review Process ☒ EXPEDITED
☐ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
Copied [Click here to enter text.](#)
Date September 12, 2018

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley Horn
Date September 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 a list of programmed projects on page 39 and Fact Sheets in the Appendix for projects in the network study 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)*

Site access is provided by 13 access points on Sugarloaf Parkway, Satellite Blvd and Meadow Church road.

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

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

☒ NO

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

Site access is provided by 14 access points on Sugarloaf Parkway, Satellite Blvd and Meadow Church road.

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

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

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*nearest station more than one mile away*)

☐ RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (*provide additional information below*)

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

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

Distance*

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

- ☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access*

- ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
- ☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

Transit Connectivity

- ☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
- ☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
- ☐ No services available to rail station
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
- ☒ NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
- ☐ YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
 - ☐ CST planned within TIP period
 - ☐ CST planned within first portion of long range period
 - ☐ CST planned near end of plan horizon

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

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

☐ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

☒ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s) Gwinnett County transit

Bus Route(s) 10A and 10B

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

Gwinnett County Bus Transit

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

Click here to provide name of facility.

Distance

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

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

- ☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

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

Although no multiuse paths currently exist, Gwinnett County Trail Plan proposes a trail connection through the site connecting to existing pedestrian facilities and ultimately The Loop Trail.

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 development proposes 14 driveways that provide connectivity among uses internal to the site. Access to adjacent parcels is also provided by local roads.

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 site plan shows additional pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks and walking trails to be developed throughout the site allowing for better pedestrian connectivity to uses.

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)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

- 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

