

REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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

DATE: September 13, 2019

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1909131

TO: Chair June Wood, Henry County Board of Commissioners
ATTN TO: Stacey Jordan-Rudeseal, Chief Planner, Planning & Zoning
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC
RE: Development of Regional Impact Review



Digital signature
Original on file

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

Name of Proposal: Reeves Creek (DRI 2996)

Review Type: DRI

Submitting Local Government: Henry County

Date Opened: 9/13/2019

Deadline for Comments: 9/30/2019

Date to Close: 10/3/2019

Description: This DRI is a master planned, mixed-use project on approximately 465 acres, mostly in unincorporated Henry County, with portions at its northern edge in both the City of Stockbridge and unincorporated Clayton County. The site is just east of the I-75/I-675 split; north of Walt Stephens Road; west of Flippen Road; and south of SR 138, Walter Way and Davidson Circle. The project is proposed to consist of 529,250 SF of retail space; 720,000 SF of office space; a 1,000-room hotel; a 100,000-SF innovation/research and development center; 150,000 SF of warehouse space; an 18-pump gas station; a 247,000-SF arena, convention center and arts center; 282 single-family residential units; approximately 1,003 mid-rise multi-family residential units (including approximately 130 townhomes); a 429-unit senior housing/care community; a County park; and an area for a proposed future bus or light rail transit station with a park-and-ride lot. The estimated full buildout year is 2035. Per ARC's DRI rules, Henry County is the host local government for this review as the majority of the project acreage is in that jurisdiction. The local trigger for this review is a rezoning application with Henry County. Most of this site was referenced in an Initial Information Form for DRI 2906 (Stockbridge International Business Center), filed by Henry County on February 1, 2019. After that time, the project scope evolved substantially to what is described above, making the DRI 2906 filing invalid. Therefore ARC staff terminated the review of DRI 2906, and Henry County ultimately filed new forms for the Reeves Creek project as DRI 2996.

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

This DRI appears to manifest aspects of regional policy, including many of those at the bottom of this narrative. The plan contemplates a large-scale, mixed-use, infill development featuring significant housing, commercial, office, civic, and recreation/entertainment uses, with pedestrian-oriented infrastructure and amenities indicated for many areas of the site. The mix of uses offers the potential for site residents to work and shop in the same district, and for workers and visitors to park once and conduct multiple trips on foot or via an alternative transportation mode, thereby reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips.

To capitalize on this potential, care should be taken to ensure that the development, as constructed, promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable bike/pedestrian experience on all streets, paths, entrances, and parking areas. Given the scale of the development and its footprint across 465 acres, this is particularly important in terms of creating strong connections between the various

districts within the site, most of which primarily feature a single land use. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities are provided for residents, workers and visitors at key locations throughout the site, e.g., scooter and bicycle storage racks throughout the site, lockers/showers in office buildings, etc. These recommendations are made given that the applicant utilized a 2% alternative mode trip reduction in the SRTA/GRTA-required DRI traffic study. With the provision of high-quality bike/pedestrian facilities and infrastructure, there is the potential for actual alternative mode site access that exceeds 2% as the site fully develops and matures. There is certainly strong potential for the use of alternative modes for circulation within and across the project site.

Along similar lines, this part of the Atlanta region is suburban, but the layout of uses and buildings within this site could be made more urban and walkable, creating a stronger sense of place. In general, ARC recommends a more "fine grain" mixing of uses on the site wherever possible. As mentioned, many of the districts are essentially single-use, for example, with civic uses concentrated near the southern end of the site, residential focused in the eastern area of the project, and most of the retail concentrated in a strip center condition near the northern extent of the site. Likewise, most buildings and facilities within each district are separated from each other by extensive surface parking lots, further distancing people from destinations and therefore creating automobile dependency for internal site circulation. ARC recommends locating more office, retail, restaurant and hotel uses immediately around the arena and convention center, linked with high-quality pedestrian infrastructure. Similarly, the nearby apartments could front their surrounding streets in a more urban condition to better link them with nearby non-residential uses – rather than being separated from their surroundings by surface parking. Broadly speaking, the mass transit complex and arena/convention center area are potentially strong activity centers within the project; they could be joined in a closer or more functional way, including sharing parking, given that peak parking demand and utilization for those uses would likely be complementary (park-and-ride use during weekdays, arena use during evenings and weekends).

The applicant team should also ensure that project driveways and intersections and any associated improvements (e.g., new highway interchanges and ramps, acceleration/deceleration/turn lanes, new traffic signals, relocation of existing signals, etc.) are designed and implemented in full coordination with GDOT (SR 138 provides site access to/from the north, and proposed new northbound-only I-75 ramps provide site access to/from the south), Henry County DOT, Clayton County DOT, and the City of Stockbridge – to safely and efficiently accommodate the DRI's projected auto traffic.

More broadly, diligent coordination between Henry County, Clayton County and Stockbridge will be critical to ensure that the DRI as a whole possesses a unified appearance, form and function of infrastructure such as roadways, sidewalks, signage, landscaping, lighting, stormwater facilities, etc. The same applies to the interface of the DRI's buildings and lots with its street network. As an example, the retail power center, discount club, strip retail and restaurants near the north end of the site are set back from the proposed Reeves Creek Parkway by extensive surface parking. Meanwhile the medical office diagonally across the Parkway fronts the street in a more urban condition. ARC recommends pulling all of the buildings closer to the street and providing extensive inter-parcel access in this area. This is supported by policies for other major roadways in the area, e.g., the Henry County Highway Corridor Overlay. Finally, the applicant team should ensure the installation of high-quality gateway signage and beautification at all project access points. As an example, this could benefit the southern project gateway, across from the proposed new I-75 exit ramp, which is proposed to feature only a gas station, restaurant and existing cell tower.

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 best practices throughout the site in general, in parking areas, on site driveways, in stormwater detention facilities, and as part of any improvements to site frontages.

In a general sense, the DRI's development program is consistent with the RDG, specifically in terms of the project creating community by developing more centralized places/centers, connecting to the existing road network, and providing new recreational opportunities. The intensity of this proposed project is greater than the RDG's recommended parameters, specifically regarding residential density for the

Developed/Established Suburbs area of the region. Along those lines, many areas near the site – particularly to the east, west and south – are unlike this DRI as they are predominated by relatively low-density residential uses. Many of these uses are also outside the jurisdiction of unincorporated Henry County, e.g., the City of Stockbridge and Clayton County. Therefore it will be critical for Henry County leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, to collaborate to the greatest extent possible to ensure maximum sensitivity and mitigate potential impacts to nearby local governments, neighborhoods, natural resources and land uses. The same will be true when the development's phases in Stockbridge and Clayton County are being reviewed and permitted.

Additional preliminary ARC staff comments, focused on transportation and water resources planning, are attached to this report. Of note are the following:

ARC Natural Resources staff comments focus on Reeves Creek, which traverses the DRI site, and its location within the Little Cotton Indian Creek Small Water Supply Watershed. Hooper Reservoir, a public water supply source for Clayton County, is on Little Cotton Indian Creek. Henry County has watershed protection ordinances for its water supply watersheds, including Little Cotton Indian Creek, which requires a 100-foot undisturbed buffer and 150-foot impervious surface setback along perennial streams in this watershed. The DRI site plan shows open space along the entire length of Reeves Creek through the project as well as along its two tributaries. However, the buffer and setback are not identified, and there appear to be intrusions into both the buffer and setback. Any intrusions may require a variance from Henry County. Reeves Creek and its tributaries, as well as all other waters of the state, are also subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer.

ARC Transportation staff comments note that the DRI site plan is not totally clear on the provision and/or design of pedestrian facilities along internal roadways. Pedestrian facilities do not currently exist along many roadways adjacent to the development. They also mention that it appears that trucks serving the commercial and warehouse uses will share local internal roads and access points with passenger vehicles. Coordination and thoughtful design will be critical to prevent conflicts between these vehicle types and to maintain roadways properly.

Further to the above, Developed/Established Suburbs are areas that developed from roughly 1970 to 1995 and are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. Regional policy recommendations for Developed/Established Suburbs include:

- New development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions should be discouraged
- Maximize the usefulness of existing recreational facilities in addition to providing new recreational opportunities
- Eliminate vacant or under-utilized parking areas through mechanisms such as out-parceling or conversion to community open space
- Use rain gardens, vegetated swales or other enhanced water filtration design to enhance the quality of stormwater run-off
- Identify other opportunities to foster a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY
CITY OF McDONOUGH
CLAYTON COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
ARC AGING & INDEPENDENCE SERVICES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
GEORGIA SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
CITY OF MORROW
HENRY COUNTY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
SRTA/GRTA
CITY OF JONESBORO
CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE

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



DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Commission for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to generate impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is located, for example in adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included in this packet and offer your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to ARC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: Reeves Creek *See the Preliminary Report.*

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: ()

Signature:

Date:

Please return this form to:

Andrew Smith
Atlanta Regional Commission
International Tower
229 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
Ph. (470) 378-1645
asmith@atlantaregional.org

Return Date: *September 30, 2019*

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: September 13, 2019

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1909131

TO: ARC Group Managers

FROM: Andrew Smith, 470-378-1645

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Community Development: Smith, Andrew

Transportation Access and Mobility: Mangham, Marquitrice

Natural Resources: Santo, Jim

Research and Analytics: Skinner, Jim

Aging and Health Resources: Perumbeti, Katie

Name of Proposal: Reeves Creek (DRI 2996)

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Description: This DRI is a master planned, mixed-use project on approximately 465 acres, mostly in unincorporated Henry County, with portions at its northern edge in both the City of Stockbridge and unincorporated Clayton County. The site is just east of the I-75/I-675 split; north of Walt Stephens Road; west of Flippen Road; and south of SR 138, Walter Way and Davidson Circle. The project is proposed to consist of 529,250 SF of retail space; 720,000 SF of office space; a 1,000-room hotel; a 100,000-SF innovation/research and development center; 150,000 SF of warehouse space; an 18-pump gas station; a 247,000-SF arena, convention center and arts center; 282 single-family residential units; approximately 1,003 mid-rise multi-family residential units (including approximately 130 townhomes); a 429-unit senior housing/care community; a County park; and an area for a proposed future bus or light rail transit station with a park-and-ride lot. The estimated full buildout year is 2035. Per ARC's DRI rules, Henry County is the host local government for this review as the majority of the project acreage is in that jurisdiction. The local trigger for this review is a rezoning application with Henry County. Most of this site was referenced in an Initial Information Form for DRI 2906 (Stockbridge International Business Center), filed by Henry County on February 1, 2019. After that time, the project scope evolved substantially to what is described above, making the DRI 2906 filing invalid. Therefore ARC staff terminated the review of DRI 2906, and Henry County ultimately filed new forms for the Reeves Creek project as DRI 2996.

Submitting Local Government: Henry County

Date Opened: September 13, 2019

Deadline for Comments: September 30, 2019

Date to Close: October 3, 2019

Response:

- 1) ☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 5) ☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
- 6) ☐ Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

COMMENTS:

[illegible]



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2996

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: Henry
 Individual completing form: Stacey Jordan-Rudeseal
 Telephone: 770-288-7526
 E-mail: sjordan@co.henry.ga.us

*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: Reeves Creek
 Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): East of I-75, South of SR 138, West of Flippen Road, North of Walt Stephens Road 33 degrees 32'14"
 Brief Description of Project: Mixed Use project comprised of Residences, Hotel, General/Medical Office, Retail, Arena, Transit Station

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.): 1.5 Million square feet of non-residential, 1714 housing units, 247000 square foot arena, 300 parkin

Developer: Forest Development Group

Mailing Address: 2819 Fork Creek Church Road

Address 2:

City:Ellenwood State: GA Zip:30294

Telephone: 404-428-7804

Email: gfurrow@fdg-atl.com

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

If yes, property owner: This is an assemblage. Brown, Brunson, Butler, Gann, etc.

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?

Clayton County, City of Stockbridge

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 Dates:

This project/phase: 2029

Overall project: 2035

Back to Top

[GRTA DRI Page](#)

[ARC DRI Page](#)

[RC Links](#)

[DCA DRI Page](#)

[DRI Site Map](#)

[Contact](#)

apps.dca.ga.gov/DRI/InitialForm.aspx?driid=2996

2/2



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #2996

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: Henry
Individual completing form: Stacey Jordan-Rudeseal
Telephone: 7702887526
Email: sjordan@co.henry.ga.us

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Reeves Creek
DRI ID Number: 2996
Developer/Applicant: Forest Development Group
Telephone: 404-428-7804
Email(s): gfurrow@fdg-atl.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: 1120410000.00

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: 14374787.36

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): 7 single-family homes

Water Supply

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

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.79

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:
Based upon letter from HCWA dated 4-30-18

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?
Based upon letter from HCWA dated 4-30-18

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: Henry County Water Authority

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.69

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: Based upon letter from HCWA dated 4-30-18

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? Approximately 3 miles

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.) 2,549 Total Net New Project AM, 2,982 Total Net New Project PM

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 see traffic study prepared by Lowe Engineers dated August 21, 2019.

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 4077.42

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity: Solid waste service will need to be contracted. Henry County does not provide solid waste service.

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 56.61%

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:Best Management Practices and the requirements of Metro North Georgia.

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:Wetland buffers will be required. Not aware of any development proposed within the floodplain.

Back to Top

REEVES CREEK DRI 2996
Henry County
ARC Natural Resources Group Review Comments

August 26, 2019

Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection

The project property is located in the Little Cotton Indian Creek Water Supply Watershed, which is a small (less than 100 square mile) public water supply watershed as defined by the Georgia DNR Part 5 Minimum Planning Criteria. Hooper Reservoir, a public water supply source for Clayton County, is on Little Cotton Indian Creek.

The site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area both show Reeves Creek, a blue line tributary to Little Cotton Indian Creek, crossing the project property. The site plan also shows two tributaries to Reeves Creek. Henry County has watershed protection ordinances for its water supply watersheds, including Little Cotton Indian Creek. The Henry watershed protection ordinance requires a 100-foot undisturbed buffer and 150-foot impervious surface setback along perennial streams in the Little Cotton Indian Creek watershed. The site plan shows open space along the entire length of Reeves Creek through the project property as well as along the two tributaries. However, the buffer and setback are not identified and there appear to be intrusions into both the buffer and setback. Any intrusions may require a variance from Henry County. Reeves Creek and its tributaries, as well as all other waters of the state, are subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer.

Stormwater/Water Quality

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

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

We also suggest the following additional measures to help reduce stormwater reduction and provide for its reuse:

- Using 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.
- Using pervious concrete or other pervious materials in parking areas. With the proper substrate, such materials can provide a large storage capacity, which will further help to reduce stormwater runoff.
- Including 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 #2996
DRI Title Reeves Creek
County Henry County
City (if applicable)
Address / Location 465 acres located East of I-75/I 675, Between SR 138 and Walt Stephens Road

Proposed Development Type:

A mixed use development consisting of 282 SFR units, 1003, multifamily units, 429 Senior housing units, 1000 room hotel, 247,000 SF arena, 820,000 SF office space, 150,000 SF warehouse, +/- 600,000 SF retail and a multimodal lot

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 3, 2019

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Lowe Engineering
Date August 21, 2019

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)*

Programmed projects are listed on page 6 of the traffic analysis.

☐ NO *(provide comments below)*

REGIONAL NETWORKS

02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☒ NO

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

The project proposes 5 drive access points, 3 on newly proposed local roads and 2 on Flippen 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*)

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

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

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

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

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

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

Distance*

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

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

Bicycling Access*

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

Transit Connectivity

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

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

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

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

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) GRTA Express

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

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

☒ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☒ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

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

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NO

☐ YES

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

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

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

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

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

Distance

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

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

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

The site plan shows plans to development two local roads. Adjacent parcels may be accessed by local road.

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 proposed local roads however details on whether pedestrian facilities are proposed are not provided on the site plan or in the analysis. Pedestrian facilities do not exist currently along roadways adjacent to the development.

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 shows proposed local roads however details on whether pedestrian facilities are proposed are not provided on the site pan or in the analysis. Pedestrian facilities do not exist currently along roadways adjacent to the development.

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)

Trucks serving the commercial and warehouse uses will share local roads access points and driveways. The site plan does not designate separate entrance for vehicle and truck traffic. Residential uses are located so that vehicles for residential uses may avoid truck traffic.

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)*

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

