

REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

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

DATE: November 26, 2018

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1811051

TO: May ATTN TO: Ellis FROM: Dou RE: Dev

Mayor Vince Williams, City of Union City Ellis Still, Community Development Director Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review

Drayh R. Hok Digital signature

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:
Submitting Local Government:City of Union CityReview Type:DRIDate OpenedDate Opened:November 5, 2018Date Closed:
November 26, 2018

Description: This DRI is on a 132-acre site in the City of Union City, south of McClure Road, west of Campbellton-Fairburn Road (SR 92), north of Line Creek Road, and east of Line Creek itself. The project is planned to consist of 1,333,920 sq. ft. of warehouse/distribution space in two buildings. Site access is proposed via one driveway onto SR 92 across from Rosewood Place, approximately 0.7 miles south of the intersection of SR 92 and South Fulton Parkway. The local trigger for DRI review is a land disturbance permit application. The estimated buildout year is 2022.

<u>Comments</u>: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Rural Area of the region. Rural Areas are the least developed parts of the region and are planned to see limited or no growth. These areas may have limited infrastructure and services. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. General RDG information and recommendations for Rural Areas are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest certain aspects of regional policy. The plan contemplates a 1,333,920-sq. ft. warehouse/distribution facility, supporting regional economic development. Additionally, it offers the potential for efficiencies and connectivity in intraregional and interregional freight movement through its proximity to SR 92, connecting to SR 138, US 29, I-85 and industrial areas (e.g., Oakley Industrial Boulevard) to the south – as well as its proximity to South Fulton Parkway, connecting to other industrial sites, US 29 and ultimately I-285/I-85 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. This is of particular importance in terms of the project's rural setting/context, and given the presence of floodplain and streams on-site and around the site, including Line Creek on the southwestern (rear) property line. More detailed comments on water resources are attached to this report. In addition, ARC encourages the applicant team to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas on the site. This framework can offer the potential for safe internal site circulation for employees on foot or by another alternative mode.

The intensity of this DRI generally falls within with the ARC RDG's recommended parameters for Rural and Developing Rural Areas. In terms of land use, the project is in a part of the region that is experiencing demand for warehouse/distribution development; the site is in relatively close proximity to existing warehouse/distribution uses to the east along South Fulton Parkway and to the southeast along US 29 and I-85. However, many areas adjacent to and near the site – especially to the north, west and south – are unlike this DRI as they are predominated by single family residential uses, small homesteads, and undeveloped/forested land. This includes areas and properties in other jurisdictions besides Union City, e.g., the City of South Fulton immediately south of the entrance to the project site. Therefore it will be critical for Union City leadership and staff, along with the development team, to collaborate to ensure maximum sensitivity to nearby local governments, neighborhoods, natural resources and land uses.

Additional ARC staff comments related to transportation and water resources, along with external comments received from contacted parties during the review period, are attached to this report. ARC Natural Resources Division staff comments include the point that the proposed road crossing and culverting of the stream branch noted on the north side of the site plan, may require variances from State and City stream buffer regulations. GDOT Aviation Division staff comments also note the DRI's proximity to an air traffic navigation/signal facility and the resulting need for the applicant team to file an FAA Form 7460-1 at least 120 days before construction.

Further to the above, general policy recommendations for 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 METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY CITY OF COLLEGE PARK CITY OF PALMETTO FULTON COUNTY ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY ARC AGING & INDEPENDENCE SERVICES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AEROTROPOLIS ATLANTA CIDS CITY OF EAST POINT CITY OF SOUTH FULTON ARC NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CITY OF CHATTAHOOCHEE HILLS CITY OF FAIRBURN DOUGLAS COUNTY

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





Developments of Regional Impact DRI Home View Submissions **Tier Map** Apply <u>Login</u> DRI #2854 **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: Union City Individual completing form: Ellis Still Telephone: 770-515-7955 E-mail: estill@unioncityga.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: Crossroads Business Center Location (Street Address, GPS Located west of Campbellton-Fairburn Road (SR 92) at Rosewood Place Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: Industrial Warehousing - Construction of 2 buildings that total approximately 1,350,000 square feet of warehouse distribution facility. **Development Type:** Hotels (not selected) Wastewater Treatment Facilities Office Mixed Use Petroleum Storage Facilities Airports Commercial Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs Wholesale & Distribution Attractions & Recreational Facilities Intermodal Terminals Truck Stops Hospitals and Health Care Facilities Post-Secondary Schools Housing Waste Handling Facilities Any other development types Industrial Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants If other development type, describe: Project Size (# of units, floor area, 2 buildings, totaling approximately 1,350,000 etc.): Developer: Core5 Industrial Partners Mailing Address: 1230 Peachtree Street NE Address 2: Suite 3560 City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30309 Telephone: 404-262-5431 Email: dnelson@c5ip.com Is property owner different from (not selected) Yes No developer/applicant? If yes, property owner: GR-SF Parkway, LLC Is the proposed project entirely (not selected) Yes No located within your local

government's jurisdiction?

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	Project Name:
information:	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 Dates:	This project/phase: 2022 Overall project: 2022
Back to Top	

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

DRI Site Map | Contact





		Developn	nents of	f Regional Impact		
<u>DRI H</u>	lome	<u>Tier Map</u>	<u>Apply</u>	View Submissions	<u>Login</u>	
DRI #2854						
	DEVE	LOPMENT OF	REGIONA	L IMPACT		
		Additional DF	RI Informat	ion		
This form is to be completed the proposed DRI. Refer to b information.	by the city oth the Rul	or county governmer es for the DRI Proc	nt to provide inf ess and the DI	ormation needed by the RDC for its RI Tiers and Thresholds for more	review of	
	L	ocal Governm	ent Inform	ation		
Submitting Local Government:	Union City	,				
Individual completing form:	Ellis Still					
Telephone:	770-515-7	955				
Email:	estill@uni	oncityga.org				
		Project In	formation			
Name of Proposed Project:	Crossroad	ls Business Center				
DRI ID Number:	2854					
Developer/Applicant:	Core5 Ind	ustrial Partners				
Telephone:	404-262-5	431				
Email(s):	lward@c5	ip.com				
	Ad	ditional Inform	nation Req	uested		
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 sel	ected) Yes No				
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?	(not sel	ected) Yes No				
If no, the official review proce	ess can not	start until this additic	onal informatior	n is provided.		
		Economic D	evelopme	nt		
Estimated Value at Build- Out:	70,000,00	0				
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	650,000					
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	(not sel	ected) Yes No				
Will this development displace any existing uses?	(not sel	ected) Yes No				
If yes, please describe (inclu	ding numbe	r of units, square fee	et, etc):			
		Water	Supply			
Name of water supply	City -5 **	anta	- ""			
provider for this site:	City of At	anta				

DRI Additional Information Form

	Drivid dional mornation rolling
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.0216 MGD
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	◯(not selected)®Yes No
If no, describe any plans to e	xpand 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:	Fulton County
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.018 MGD
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No
If no, describe any plans to e	xpand existing wastewater treatment capacity:
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No
If yes, how much additional li	ine (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.)	Approximately: 2,150 net daily trips; 185 AM peak hour trips; 188 PM peak hour trips
Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	ont 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 completed by Kimley-Horn and Associates:
	Solid Waste Disposal
How much solid waste is the	
project expected to generate annually (in tons)? Is sufficient landfill capacity available to come this	1,248 Ions
proposed project?	~ (IN SOUCH)~ IS TIU
If no, describe any plans to e	xpand existing landfill capacity:
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	O(not selected) Yes No
If yes, please explain:	
	Stormwater Management
What percentage of the site	55 Percent Impervious
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.75 feet vegetated buffers will surround the northern, eastern and southern boundaries. Stormwater detention facilities designed for water quality, channel protection and stormwater volume detention will be utilized.

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 are no proposed wetland impacts, however a Nationwide permit issued by the Army Corp of Engineers will be obtained if any wetlands or buffers onsite area impacted. If any fill is graded within the floodplain area, floodplain compensation will be designed so that the flood elevation is not changed.

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></achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent:	Monday, November 5, 2018 6:04 PM
То:	Andrew Smith
Cc:	Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; Van Prooyen, Chaim
Subject:	RE: ARC DRI Review Notification - Crossroads Business Center (DRI 2854)
Attachments:	ARC Preliminary Report - Crossroads Business Center - DRI 2854.pdf

Andrew,

The proposed project, consisting of 1,333,920 sq. ft. of warehouse/distribution space in two buildings, is in the City of Union City, south of McClure Road, west of Campbellton-Fairburn Road (SR 92), north of Line Creek Road, and east of Line Creek itself. It is located approximately 9.5 miles west of the Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport (ATL), and is located outside or under of any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However the proposed structure is in proximity to a navigation facility and may impact the assurance of navigation signal reception, so 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 Chaim Van Prooyen with Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport (ATL) 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: Monday, November 5, 2018 5:10 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>; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Comer, Carol <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Mertz, Kaycee <kmertz@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@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 <eestes@srta.ga.gov>; Renaud Marshall

CROSSROADS BUSINESS CENTER DRI City of Union City Natural Resources Group Review Comments

November 5, 2018

Watershed and Stream Protection

The project site is in the Deep Creek watershed, which is a tributary to the Chattahoochee River Watershed, but the site is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor of the Metropolitan River Protection Act. Deep Creek enters the Chattahoochee downstream of the portion of the river that serves as a water supply source in the Atlanta Region.

Both the USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan show Line Creek, which is a tributary to Deep Creek, running along the southwestern (or rear) project property line. In addition, the site plan shows streams along the eastern and northwestern sides of the property, each with short branches running into the property. The site plan shows and identifies the 25-foot State Sediment and erosion control buffer, the 50-foot City stream buffer and the 75-foot City impervious setback on all streams shown on the property. The site plan shows one branch of the northwestern stream as impacted by the proposed development, with about 290 feet culverted for a road crossing. This activity will most likely require variances from both the State and City buffers. The site plan does not show any other proposed activity within the stream buffers. Any unmapped streams may also be subject to the requirements of the State and City buffers. Any unmapped waters of the state may be subject to the state 25-foot sedimentation and erosion control buffer requirements.

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 (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) 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, where applicable, to help reduce stormwater reduction and provide for its reuse:

- Use green spaces and tree planting beds as stormwater controls. These can be designed to provide maximum aesthetic value while also providing for water quality treatment and run-off reduction, potentially reducing the need for larger stormwater facilities and helping to minimize the negative effects of stormwater runoff on streams and water quality.
- Include rainwater capture in the project design to provide for landscape irrigation during dry periods.



regional impact + local relevance

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	#2854
DRI Title	Crossroads Business Center
County	Fulton County
City (if applicable)	Union City
Address / Location	West of the intersection of Campbellton Fairburn Road (SR 92) and Rosewood Place
Proposed Developmer	nt Type: 132 acre site with two buildings consisting of 1,333, 920 square foot warehouse distribution center

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	November 5, 2018

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by	Kimley Horn	
Date	October 18, 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 within the study network on page 27.

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 NO

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

The site plan shows one proposed site access from GA SR 92, a regional thoroughfare.

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

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

NO

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

Site access is proposed from SR 92, a designated Regional Truck Thoroughfare.

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

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

NOT APPLICABLE (nearest station more than one mile away)

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.

Ac ca joi bio loo wo	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 (neare	st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)				
\square	SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)					
	Operator(s)	MARTA				
	Bus Route(s)	82				
	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.



🛛 YES

MARTA

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.

XI	
\sim	
	\boxtimes

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

Name of facility	Click here to provide name of facility.
Distance	Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)
	0.15 to 0.50 mile
	0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity
	Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
	Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
Bicycling Access*	Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity
	Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- OTHER (*Please explain*)

Site is currently adjacent to undeveloped land.

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*)

No existing bike ped facilities exist along the SR 92 and none appear to be proposed internal or external to the site.

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.

Γ	YES	(connections to	adiacent	parcels are	planned as	part of	f the develop	oment)
L	0		aajacente					

VEC /atub auto will	manles future		n a a a i b l a with a m	adiagont	nements redeviates)
YES (Stub outs Will	make juture	connections	possible when	aajacent	parceis reaevelop)

- 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 development does not propose bike or pedestrian facilities internal or external to the site.

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)

One driveway will provide access for both heavy truck and vehicle traffic entering and exiting the site.

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):

ARC encourages developments to incorporate alternative modes of transportation access to the site. In this case, sidewalks should be included to provide a safe alternative mode of pedestrian access to the site.





SON MITCHEL

PROJECT: CROSSROADS **BUSINESS CENTER**

SR 92/CAMPBELLTON ROAD LAND LOTS 93, 94, 115, 116 7TH DISTRICT CITY OF UNION CITY FULTON CO., GA 30213

DRI #: 2854



1230 PEACHTREE ST. NE SUITE 3560 ATLANTA, GA 30309

ZONING INFORMATION

ZONING RESEARCH DATE: APRIL 2017 **INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM 2014 UNION CITY ZONING ORDINANCE

JURISDICTION: FRONT: SIDE: REAR:



SITE ANALYSIS			
WAREHOUSE A	1,021,440 S.F.		
TRAILER PARKING REQUIRED	21 SPACES		
TRAILER PARKING PROVIDED	262 SPACES		
EMPLOYEE PARKING REQUIRED	511 SPACES		
EMPLOYEE PARKING PROVIDED	511 SPACES		
FUTURE EMPLOYEE PARKING	342 SPACES		
WAREHOUSE B	312,480 S.F.		
TRAILER PARKING REQUIRED	13 SPACES		
TRAILER PARKING PROVIDED	68 SPACES		
EMPLOYEE PARKING REQUIRED	209 SPACES		
EMPLOYEE PARKING PROVIDED	209 SPACES		
TOTAL BUILDING AREA	1,333,920 S.F.		
FLOOR AREA RATIO 0.			
TOTAL LAND AREA	± 131.57 ACRES		

ZONING CLASSIFICATION CITY OF UNION CITY, GA EX. ZONING: TCMU (TOWN CENTER MIXED USE) PR. ZONING: TCMU (TOWN CENTER MIXED USE) **BUILDING SETBACKS** 50' (SEC. 6-15.E.2.d) 20' BUFFERS FRONT/STREET: 10' LANDSC. STRIP SIDE (TO RESIDENTIAL) 50' (SEC. 6-15.N.3) REAR: ___ **BUILDING SUMMARY** MAX. BUILDING HT .: 20 STORIES MAX. LOT COVERAGE: 80% PARKING SUMMARY 5.0 SPACES/1,000 S.F. RETAIL REQ.: INDUSTRIAL REQ.: SEC. 10-7.M STD. CITY STALL DIMENSIONS: 8'-6" x 18' STALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN: 9'x 18' COMPACT STALLS ALLOWED: $^{--\%}$ MIN. 90°/60° DRIVE WIDTH: 24'/18' LANDSCAPE REGULATIONS TREE DENSITY: 100 IN./ACRE ISLAND REQ.: 1 ISLAND/10 SPACES MIN. ISLAND SIZE/WIDTH: 90 S.F./5' OPEN SPACE %: 15% FEMA MAP 13121C0451F FIRM PANEL #: DRAWING RECORD DRAWN BY: 2018159 – DRI1.dwg 10.22.18

GRTA DRI SITE PLAN

DRI-1

SHEET