

DATE: April 20, 2020

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2004021

TO: Mayor Angelyne Butler
ATTN TO: James Shelby, Department of Planning & Zoning
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review



Digital signature
Original on file

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

Name of Proposal: Gillem Logistics Center (DRI #3073)

Submitting Local Government: City of Forest Park

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact **Date Opened:** April 2, 2020 **Date Closed:** April 20, 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposal to build additional warehousing, restaurant, and retail space at the Gillem Logistics Center on the site of the former Fort Gillem Army post in the City of Forest Park. The site currently has 3,249,113 SF of warehouse space and was previously entitled for an additional 3,182,741. This DRI review pertains to a proposal for an additional 4,072,307 SF of warehousing, 137,500 SF of restaurant space, and 137,500 SF of retail. The total square footage of all uses would be 10,779,161 SF. The local trigger is the extension of Anvil Block Road extension to Rateree Drive (in the City of Lake City). Proposed build-out is 2030.

Comments: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in a Community Activity Center. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. However, because the primary use for this location is industrial, recommendations from the RDG's Regional Industrial & Logistics section are also included at the end of these comments.

This DRI manifests certain aspects of regional policy. It also offers the potential for efficiencies and connectivity in intraregional, interregional and interstate freight movement given its proximity to Interstates 675, 285, 75, and 20, as well as Hartsfield–Jackson Atlanta International Airport. It's compatible with a range of recommendations in various regional plans, such as the 2016 Atlanta Regional Freight Mobility Plan Update. The expansion of this DRI further supports the City of Forest Park's long-term goal of generating new distribution and e-commerce logistics jobs to replace the local jobs lost with the closing of

Fort Gillem by the U.S. Army in 2012. The addition of new retail and restaurant space supports the City's 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update calling for Mixed-Use Commercial uses at the eastern entrance of the site along Moreland Avenue (US 23/SR 42).

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. Further comments on water resources from ARC's Natural Resources Division are attached.

The DRI's site design should provide sufficient truck parking to prevent trucks from queuing or waiting on any adjacent or nearby roads. Trucks parking in and along public roadways – typically while waiting for an available dock at a nearby facility – is an identified issue in many areas of the region that negatively impacts roadway operations, safety and congestion. Signage and other measures to ensure drivers use the appropriate freight routes should be emphasized.

In addition, ARC encourages the applicant team to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all proposed driveways, paths and parking areas on the site. Because of the likelihood that some employees of existing and future businesses will use transit, the local government, development partners, and MARTA should coordinate on the potential for new internal bus service to the DRI, given its large scale. In the meantime, space and ADA-accessible pads for future bus shelters should be incorporated in streetscape designs at appropriate intervals. Another long-term opportunity for transit accessibility and the site's regional competitiveness in the future is the project to expand MARTA rail service into Clayton County (Clayton County High-Capacity Transit Initiative – Phase 1 ARC Project #AR-485A). No actions should be taken that preclude long-term connections to a rail stop serving the DRI, if one is feasible. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access & Mobility Division are attached. Please see the attached comments from Georgia Department of Transportation's aviation division regarding a nearby navigational facility that will require the filing of an FAA Form 7460-1 to the Federal Aviation Administration.

The ARC's Regional Development Guide defines Community Activity Centers, as areas smaller than regional centers, but serve a similar function on a smaller scale. People travel from the surrounding community to these centers for jobs, shopping and entertainment. These centers should be connected to the regional transportation network with existing or planned transit service. In many cases, these centers have high concentrations of commercial or retail space and local plans call for infill development or redevelopment. These places have potential to emerge as Regional Centers in the future. Local plans and policies should support efforts to transform these centers into accessible mixed-use centers.

Community Activity Centers Implementation Strategies 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, showers/ locker rooms, etc., 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

These recommendations don't fully address the relevant issues with this DRI, so the following RDG recommendations are offered from the Regional Industrial & Logistics section, defined as areas that will see increased job growth in the form of industrial and logistics space. Strategies are needed to avoid residential and industrial conflicts while still allowing both uses in proximity to each other, without limiting the operations of industrial land users.

Recommendations include:

- Protect Industrial and Logistics Areas by not allowing conflicting land uses in the vicinity
- Identify key areas to preserve for freight and industrial uses
- Continue to promote Industrial and Logistics Areas as a major resource in recruiting future economic development prospects to the region
- Ensure the continued efficiency of cargo and freight transport with easy connectivity to trucking and shipping routes through the region

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY	ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS	ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	CLAYTON COUNTY
DeKALB COUNTY	FULTON COUNTY	CITY OF ATLANTA
CITY OF LAKE CITY	CITY OF MORROW	MARTA
GRTA/SRTA		

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Greg Giuffrida at (470) 378-1531 or ggiuffrida@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 #3073

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: Forest Park

Individual completing form: James Shelby

Telephone: 404-608-2300

E-mail: jshelby@forestparkga.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: Gillem Logistics Center

Location (Street Address, Former/decommissioned Fort Gillem property in the City of Forest Park, Clayton County, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Description): GA; East of J

Brief Description of Project: Approximately 4,350,000 SF of warehousing, retail, and restaurant development on the former/decommissioned Fort Gillem property in addition to the 6,431,854 SF of warehousing currently entitled for the site.

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.): 4,075,000 SF Warehousing, 137,500 SF Retail, 137,500 SF Restaurant

Developer: Robinson Weeks

Mailing Address: 3350 Riverwood Parkway

Address 2: Suite 700

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30339

Telephone: 404-815-2019

Email: david@robinsonweeks.com

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

If yes, property owner:

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 Project Name:

information: Project ID:

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:

- ☐ Rezoning
- ☐ Variance
- ☐ Sewer
- ☐ Water
- ☐ Permit
- ☒ Other Anvil Block Road roadway extension to Rateree Drive

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: 2030
Overall project: 2030

[Back to Top](#)

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

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



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3073

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: Forest Park
Individual completing form: James Shelby
Telephone: 404-608-2300
Email: jshelby@forestparkga.org

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Gillem Logistics Center
DRI ID Number: 3073
Developer/Applicant: Robinson Weeks
Telephone: 404-815-2019
Email(s): david@robinsonweeks.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: Approximately \$200 Million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: Approximately \$2.5 - \$3 Million

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: Clayton County

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.71 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: Clayton County

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.050 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.) Approximately: 18,282 net daily trips, 1,653 AM peak trips, 1,342 PM peak trips

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: Refer to DRI#3073 Traffic Study

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 7,344 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? Approximately 85%

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

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?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
4. Protected mountains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
5. Protected river corridors?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
6. Floodplains?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
7. Historic resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:

[Back to Top](#)

Greg Giuffrida

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2020 11:31 AM
To: Greg Giuffrida
Cc: Brian, Steve; Edmisten, Colette; Comer, Carol; Robinson, Joseph; matthew.coffelt@atl.com
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification - Gillem Logistics Center DRI 3073
Attachments: ARC Preliminary Report - Gillem Logistics Center DRI 3073.pdf

Greg,

The proposed additional warehousing, restaurant, and retail space at the Gillem Logistics Center on the site of the former Fort Gillem Army post in the City of Forest Park is approximately 5.5 miles east of the Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport (ATL), and is located outside or under any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However, the proposed development 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 according to the FAA's Notice Criteria Tool found here

(<https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/gisTools/gisAction.jsp?action=showNoNoticeRequiredToolForm>). Those submissions may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notifications, no later than 120 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impacts of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

I have copied Matthew Coffelt with the 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
6th Floor
Atlanta, GA, 30308
404.660.3394 cell
404.532.0082 office

From: Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 2, 2020 3:47 PM
To: aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov; Annie Gillespie <agillespie@srta.ga.gov>; Boone, Eric <eboone@dot.ga.gov>; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; 'chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us'; 'cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov'; 'davinwilliams@dot.ga.gov'; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>; DeNard, Paul <pdenard@dot.ga.gov>; Finch, Ashley M <AFinch@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Hatch, Justin A <juhatch@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; jon.west@dca.ga.gov; Zahul, Kathy <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>; 'kclark@gefa.ga.gov'; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Mertz, Kaycee <kmertz@dot.ga.gov>; Montefusco, Joshua M <JMontefusco@dot.ga.gov>;

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3073
DRI Title Fort Gillem
County Clayton County
City (if applicable) Forest Park
Address / Location Fort Gillem Army Base, West of Moreland Avenue, North of Forest Parkway, South of Slate Road and East of Raretree Drive
Review Process ☐ EXPEDITED
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

The proposed development is 4,072,307 square feet in warehouse space, 137,500 SF restaurant space and 137,500 SF of retail use on approximately 1048 acres.

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
Copied [Click here to enter text.](#)
Date April 20, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley Horn
Date March 10, 2020

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 date of RTP project list used below and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified*)

☐ NO (*provide comments below*)

RTP programmed projects are identified on page 25 and fact sheets are attached as Appendix E.

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 site plan identifies proposed driveways on SR 331 (Forest Parkway) and SR 42 (Moreland Avenue). SR 42 is identified as 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*)

The site will be served by SR 42 (Moreland Avenue) which is identified as a Regional Truck Route.

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

Nearest Station [Click here to enter name of station.](#)

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access*

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

Transit Connectivity

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

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

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

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (*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) MARTA

Bus Route(s) 55, 194 & 195

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

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.

☒ 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 roadway connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent roadway network 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*)
- ☐ 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 roadway connections*)

Access to adjacent parcels are provided through 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*)

The site plan and traffic study does not provide information on whether bike/ ped facilities are proposed internal to the site. Local codes may require sidewalks as a part of redevelopment.

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)

Sidewalks currently exist along Anvil Block Road adjacent to the development. Extension of the sidewalks along the development site are proposed along Moreland Avenue as a part of 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)

The primary use of the site is warehouse with ancillary uses of retail and restaurant. Significant freight truck presence and vehicle presence is anticipated as noted by the traffic counts and parking spaces

provided. The site plan and traffic analysis does not show designated access points or driveways for truck traffic or vehicular 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)*

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.

GILLEM LOGISTICS CENTER DRI
City of Forest Park
Natural Resources Group Review Comments
March 30, 2020

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Group has identified County and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Watershed Protection

The northern portion of the property is located in the South River watershed, which is not a water supply watershed within the Atlanta Region or the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District. The southern portion of the property appears to be almost entirely within the Big Cotton Indian Creek Water Supply Watershed and a small portion of the southwestern portion of the property may be in the Flint River Water Supply Watershed. Both watersheds serve Clayton County and are classified as large (greater than 100 square miles) watershed under the Part 5 Rules for Water Supply Watersheds (Chapter 391-3-16-.01). As water withdrawals in both watersheds are drawn directly from the rivers and the project is more than 7 miles upstream of both river intakes, no Part 5 Water Supply Watershed criteria apply to the property.

Stream Buffers

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no blue-line streams on or near the property. The submitted site plan shows four short segments of unmapped streams on the property. Although not labeled, it appears that the 50-foot stream buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback required under the City of Forest Park's stream buffer ordinance as well as the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer are shown on all the streams. Intrusions into these buffers or setbacks may require variances. Any other streams identified on the property may be subject to the city buffer ordinance and any waters of the state may be subject to the State erosion and sedimentation buffer.

Stormwater/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality.

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.

