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: June 3, 2020 **ARC REVIEW CODE**: R2005151

TO: Mayor Bianca Motley Broom
ATTN TO: Michelle Alexander, City Planner
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review

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: College Park "Airport City" (DRI #3063)
Submitting Local Government: City of College Park
Review Type: Development of Regional Impact **Date Opened**: May 15, 2020 **Date Closed:** June 3, 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a master-planned, mixed-use project proposed for a 320-acre site in the City of College Park, approximately bordered by Camp Creek Parkway to the south, Victoria and McDonald streets to the east, Brady Recreation Center Park to the north, and College Park Municipal Golf Course to the west. The proposed development plan includes 638,000 SF of retail/commercial space, 2.4 million SF of office, 65 detached single-family homes, 697 multifamily units of varying types, four hotels with 1200 rooms total, and a variety of other sports/recreational uses. Additional space is provided for incremental development, with up to 1.27 million SF for mixed commercial, 635,000 SF for office, and 23 single-family parcels. The local trigger for this review is a proposed rezoning for the entire site to PD-C, as defined by the Airport City Master Plan completed in June 2019. The estimated opening year is 2025 and the full build-out year is 2040.

Comments: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Maturing Neighborhoods area, but adjacent to and designed to interact with a Regional Employment Corridor directly to the south (Georgia International Conference Center and Gateway Center amenities). ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. General information and policy recommendations for both Maturing Neighborhoods and Regional Employment Corridors are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest many aspects of regional policy, including many of those at the bottom of this narrative. In the course of preparing these comments, ARC staff compared the proposed site plan to both

the 2017 College Park Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) plan completed in 2017 and the supplemental Airport City Master Plan completed in 2019, upon which this project is based.

The plan contemplates a major mixed-use, infill redevelopment with a variety of housing types, office and retail/restaurant uses, recreational facilities, with pedestrian-oriented infrastructure and amenities throughout the site. Some of the retail is intended to attract customers regionally, while other portions are intended to be locally serving. The mix of uses offers the potential for site residents to work and shop on-site or in the same district, and for workers and visitors to arrive via an alternative transportation mode or park once and conduct multiple trips on foot, 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. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities are provided for residents, workers and visitors at key locations, e.g., scooter and bicycle storage racks throughout the site, lockers/showers in office spaces, etc. These recommendations are made given that the applicant estimated a significant number of vehicle trips to be eliminated (37% AM and 35% PM) from a combination of alternative mode share and internal capture across all uses in the GRTA-required DRI traffic study.

The applicant team should ensure that project driveways and intersections and any associated improvements (e.g., new turn lanes, traffic signals, etc.) are designed and implemented in full coordination with the City of College Park and Georgia Department of Transportation to safely and efficiently accommodate the DRI's projected automobile traffic. Internal streets and driveways should be designed to minimize driving speeds and prioritize safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the site, through the use of reduced lane widths, shorter curb radii, raised crossings, bulb-outs, and other design features. This project is notable for its potential to restore and expand the street grid in the area, and future street connections should be preserved in the site plan. Because the site can expect a mix of local residents, workers, and visitors, the attention to safety and driving speeds will be critical. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access and Mobility Group are attached.

The project's proximity to Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport brings a range of considerations for flight paths, noise, and connectivity. Please see the attached comments from Georgia Department of Transportation's aviation division, which notes the Federal Aviation Administration and planners with HJAIA may have additional questions, comments, and suggestions.

An exciting element of this DRI is the intention to design for a significant portion of the total footprint to be developed incrementally by various partners, which could bring a more organic and varied building typology and mix of uses than would be seen with a mixed-use development built at one time. A risk is that if market conditions delay development, then the eastern portions of Phase 1 (sections E1-E4 in the site plan) could leave a gap in development between historic downtown College Park (and MARTA rail) and the larger, more intense uses farther to the west (A1-A2, B, C, D2-D4, I1-I4, K, L). There is the potential for these undeveloped blocks to act as both a visual and comfort barrier for visitors coming from the east.

Sidewalks, streetscapes, lighting, and clear wayfinding on John Wesley Avenue, Columbia Avenue, and Harvard Avenue between Conley Street and Roosevelt Highway should be an immediate priority.

It's also not completely clear from the proposed site plan what the primary pedestrian route between downtown/MARTA and the center of the project is supposed to be. The 2019 Airport City plan defines John Wesley Avenue as a secondary retail corridor and it ends directly at the existing crosswalk to the MARTA station. However, the current site plan shows multiple parking decks lining the street, which makes for a poor pedestrian environment with blank walls and curb cuts. It may be worth considering whether pedestrians should be directed to Columbia Avenue instead, to take advantage of visual impact of the proposed canopy and draw them into the primary retail corridor.

The City of College Park should also consider long-term improvements to the pedestrian crossing over the freight tracks to the MARTA station, which is not ADA-compliant and potentially unsafe. While the site is fortunate to have a high-frequency and capacity MARTA rail station near the eastern end of the project, it is otherwise not well-served by other transit routes, other than the current bus route #82 on Camp Creek Parkway and route #172 along Princeton Drive. If fully built out, the DRI has potential to justify altering of existing bus routes to serve the interior of the site. Use of circulator shuttles to serve the various hotels and recreational amenities could be considered. Pedestrian access to the south across Camp Creek Parkway will be improved with the addition of a pedestrian bridge from the center of the DRI south to Georgia International Conference Center and Gateway Center Arena). Wayfinding, lighting, landscaping, and security should be considered on both ends and along the bridge to ensure it's comfortable and attractive to use.

Phase 2 of the project generally declines in density and transitions into a more traditional neighborhood footprint. Again, it will be important to build a robust pedestrian and bike network with ample wayfinding to encourage alternative mode travel between these sections and the core of the DRI. The project should coordinate closely with the Aerotropolis Alliance and the Community Improvement Districts to integrate their regional greenway plan.

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. Additional comments from ARC's Natural Resources Group are attached.

The intensity of this proposed project is within the RDG's recommended parameters for density and building height for the Maturing Neighborhoods area of the region. However, it will still be critical for City 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 neighborhoods, natural resources and land uses.

Further to the above, Maturing Neighborhoods were primarily developed prior to 1970. These areas are typically adjacent to the Region Core and Regional Employment Corridors. These three areas, combined, represent a significant percentage of the region's jobs and population. General policy recommendations for Maturing Neighborhoods include:

- Improve safety and quality of transit options by providing alternatives for end-of-trip facilities (such as bicycle racks) and sidewalks and/ or shelters adjacent to bus stops
- Identify and remedy incidents of "food deserts" within neighborhoods, particularly in traditionally underserved neighborhoods and schools
- Promote mixed use where locally appropriate, specifically in areas served by existing or planned transit
- Develop policies and establish design standards to ensure new and infill development is compatible with existing neighborhoods

Because this site is directly adjacent to a Regional Employment Corridor, additional recommendations follow:

- Continue to invest in the LCI program to assist local governments in center planning and infrastructure.
- Prioritize preservation of existing transit, increase frequency and availability of transit options.
- Encourage compact infill development, redevelopment and adaptive reuse.
- Create a range of housing options to accommodate all sectors of the workforce.
- Encourage active ground floor, pedestrian scale design, and pedestrian amenities in new development and the redevelopment of existing sites.

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	GRTA/SRTA
MARTA	FULTON COUNTY	CITY OF ATLANTA
CITY OF EAST POINT	HARTSFIELD-JACKSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	CITY OF UNION CITY
CLAYTON COUNTY	CITY OF HAPEVILLE	AEROTROPOLIS ALLIANCE
AEROTROPOLIS CIDS		

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.

Georgia® Department of Community Affairs

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI #3063

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:	College Park
Individual completing form:	Michelle M. Alexander
Telephone:	4047671537
E-mail:	malexander@tcfatl.com

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	College Park "Airport City"
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):	Boundaried by McDonald Avenue, Princeton Avenue and Camp Creek Parkway
Brief Description of Project:	Approximately 311 acre master planned, mixed-use development initiated by City of College Park and BIDA. To be developed as a public-private partnership with hotel, retail, Class-A office, outdoor parks, recreation, residential and enhancement of existing city golf course, with connectivity to MARTA and

Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	3 million SF office, 548,000 SF commercial, 450 d.u., 1.27 incremental mixed use
Developer:	BIDA with public/private partnerships
Mailing Address:	3667 Main Street
Address 2:	City Hall
	City:College Park State: Ge Zip:30337
Telephone:	4047671537
Email:	Artiejones@collegeparkga.com
Is property owner different from developer/applicant?	○ (not selected) ◉ Yes ○ No
If yes, property owner:	BIDA is the owner and Mr. Jones is the exec staff member
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
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?	Pursuing DRI for entire site, but anticipate phased development
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: phase 1 - 2024 Overall project: 2030

Back to Top

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page DRI Site Map | Contact

Georgia® Department of Community Affairs

Developments of Regional Impact

DRI #3063

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:	College Park
Individual completing form:	Michelle M. Alexander
Telephone:	404.767.1537/404.345
Email:	malexander@tcfatl.com

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	College Park "Airport City"
DRI ID Number:	3063
Developer/Applicant:	City of College Park/BIDA with public/private partnerships
Telephone:	4047671537
Email(s):	Artiejones@collegeparkga.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:	$1.9 Billion
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	$32.8 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:	City of College Park Water & Sewer
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	.79 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:
No extension required, however, a new ater tank will probably be added to the system to increase capacity for fire related service.

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: City of College Park Water & Sewer/Fulton County Water Services Division

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? .66 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.) AM Peak 7,105; Reduced 4,476/ PM Peak Total 9,855; Reduced 6,406

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:See Section 6.0 of the Traffic Study

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 7,000

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? 90%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management:Stormwater detention, water quality and channel protection in accordance with the GA Stormwater Management will be provided. This will be handled through in-place regional detention structures, stormwater retention pond treepod bioretion filters and green infrastructure. Some of this is already in place and operational.

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:

Back to Top

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page DRI Site Map | Contact

COLLEGE PARK AIRPORT CITY DRI
City of College Park
Natural Resources Group Review Comments
May 14, 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 property is in the Camp Creek watershed, which is within the Chattahoochee River watershed The property is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor of the Metropolitan River Protection Act. Camp Creek enters the Chattahoochee downstream of the portion of the river that serves as a water supply source in the Atlanta Region.

Stream Buffers

Both the project conceptual site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show Camp Creek along the northern and northwestern portions of the project property, as well as an unnamed stream and two unnamed tributaries to it running along the southern and southwestern portion of the property to where it meets Camp Creek at the western edge of the project property. The site plan is at a scale that is too large to show details such as stream buffers, but these streams, as well as any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the requirements of the City of College Park's Stream Buffer ordinance as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer. Any unmapped waters of the state on the property may also be subject to the requirements of the State 25-foot 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.

GEORGIA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
WILDLIFE RESOURCES DIVISION

MARK WILLIAMS
COMMISSIONER

RUSTY GARRISON
DIRECTOR

May 29, 2020

Greg Giuffrida
Plan Review Technician
Atlanta Regional Commission
229 Peachtree Street NE
Suite 100
Atlanta, GA 30303

Subject: Known occurrences of natural communities, plants and animals of highest priority conservation status on or near DRI 3063 College Park Airport City aka Six West, Fulton County, Georgia

Dear Mr. Giuffrida:

This is in response to your request of May 15, 2020. The following Georgia natural heritage database element occurrences (EOs) were selected for the current site using the local HUC10 watershed for elements whose range distribution is limited by aquatic systems (AQ) and within 3 miles for all other EOs (TR).

GA *Cambarus howardi* (Chattahoochee Crayfish) in Dog River (AQ), approx. 20.8 mi W of site
GA *Cyprinella callitaenia* (Bluestripe Shiner) [Historic] in Chattahoochee River Huc 10 - 0313000203 (AQ), approx. 9.8 mi W of site
GA *Cypripedium acaule* (Pink Ladyslipper) (TR), approx. 2.4 mi N of site
Micropterus cataractae (Shoal Bass) [Historic] in Anneewakee Creek (AQ), approx. 12.5 mi W of site
Micropterus chattahoochae (Chattahoochee Bass) [Historic] in Snake Creek Huc 10 - 0313000203 Chattahoochee River Lower North 7 (AQ), approx. 27.0 mi W of site
GA *Notropis hypsilepis* (Highscale Shiner) in Keaton Creek, Huc 10 - 0313000203 (Chattahoochee River Lower North 7) (AQ), approx. 24.2 mi W of site
GA *Peucaea aestivalis* (Bachman's Sparrow) (TR), approx. 1.4 mi NE of site
GA *Symphyotrichum georgianum* (Georgia Aster) [Historic] (TR), in an uncertain location near the project site
Andrews [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 2.9 mi N of site
Austin [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 3.0 mi N of site
Betty Harvey [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 2.9 mi N of site
Brannon [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 2.9 mi N of site
Collins [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 3.0 mi N of site
Dunn (Wells Dr) [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 3.0 mi N of site
GALT easement [Georgia-Alabama Land Trust] (TR), approx. 2.0 mi W of site

Hunter [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 2.9 mi N of site
YMCA [Atlanta Greenway] (TR), approx. 2.8 mi N of site
Greenspace program acquisition (TR), approx. 2.7 mi N of site
Greenspace program acquisition (TR), approx. 1.2 mi NW of site
Chattahoochee River Lower North 8 (0313000201) [SWAP High Priority Watershed] (TR), approx. 1.2 mi N of site
Chattahoochee River Lower North 7 (0313000203) [SWAP High Priority Watershed] (TR), on site
Flint River Upper 6 (0313000501) [SWAP High Priority Watershed] (TR), approx. 0.4 mi E of site

Recommendations:

Please be aware that state protected species have been documented near the proposed project. For information about these species, including survey recommendations, please visit our webpage at http://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern#rare-locations.

This project occurs within a high priority watershed. As part of Georgia's State Wildlife Action Plan, high priority watersheds were identified to protect the best-known populations of high priority aquatic species, important coastal habitats, and migratory corridors for anadromous species. Please refer to Appendix F of Georgia's State Wildlife Action Plan to find out more specific information about this high priority watershed:
https://georgiawildlife.com/wildlifeactionplan.

We are concerned about streams and other habitats that could be impacted by the proposed project. We recommend that stringent erosion control practices be used during construction activities and that vegetation is re-established on disturbed areas as quickly as possible. Silt fences and other erosion control devices should be inspected and maintained until soil is stabilized by vegetation. Please use natural vegetation and grading techniques (e.g. vegetated swales, turn-offs, vegetated buffer strips) that will ensure that the project site does not serve as a conduit for storm water or pollutants into the watershed during or after construction. These measures will help protect water quality near the project as well as in downstream areas.

Please be aware that the type of erosion control material used during construction can impact wildlife. We strongly recommend using natural, biodegradable materials such as 'jute' or 'coir'. Mesh strands should be movable, as opposed to fixed. Use of plastic fencing frequently leads to wildlife entrapment and death.

Disclaimer:

Please keep in mind the limitations of our database. The data collected by the Wildlife Conservation Section comes from a variety of sources, including museum and herbarium records, literature, and reports from individuals and organizations, as well as field surveys by our staff biologists. In most cases the information is not the result of a recent on-site survey by our staff. Many areas of Georgia have never been surveyed thoroughly. Therefore, the Wildlife Conservation Section can only occasionally provide definitive information on the presence or

absence of rare species on a given site. Our files are updated constantly as new information is received. **Thus, information provided by our program represents the existing data in our files at the time of the request and should not be considered a final statement on the species or area under consideration.**

If you know of populations of highest priority species that are not in our database, please fill out the appropriate data collection form and send it to our office. Forms can be obtained through our web site (http://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern#rare-locations) or by contacting our office. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Laci Pattavina, Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Reviews
laci.pattavina@dnr.ga.gov, (706) 557-3228

Data Available on the Wildlife Conservation Section Website

- Georgia protected plant and animal profiles are available on our website. These accounts cover basics like descriptions and life history, as well as threats, management recommendations and conservation status. Visit http://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern#rare-locations.
- Rare species and natural community information can be viewed by Quarter Quad, County and HUC8 Watershed. To access this information, please visit our GA Rare Species and Natural Community Information page at: http://georgiabiodiversity.org/
- Downloadable files of rare species and natural community data by quarter quad and county are also available. They can be downloaded from: http://georgiabiodiversity.org/natels/natural-element-locations.html

Greg Giuffrida

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 12:53 PM
To: Greg Giuffrida
Cc: Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; Brian, Steve; Robinson, Joseph; matthew.coffelt@atl.com
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification - College Park Airport City (DRI 3063) aka Six West
Attachments: ARC Preliminary Report - College Park Airport City DRI 3063.pdf

Greg,

The proposed mixed-use project on a 320-acre site in the City of College Park, approximately bordered by Camp Creek Parkway to the south, Victoria and McDonald streets to the east, Brady Recreation Center Park to the north, and College Park Municipal Golf Course to the west, is less than 1 mile west of the Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport (ATL), and is located within the FAA's approach and departure surfaces, and needs to be studied by the FAA to determine the impact of on the airport.

Due to exceeding the instrument approach area, and being in proximity to a navigation facility, a 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). The submissions for the buildings and any associated cranes or vertical construction equipment 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

GDOT Georgia Department of Transportation

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: Friday, May 15, 2020 4:36 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>; Greg Floyd - MARTA (gfloyd@itsmarta.com) <gfloyd@itsmarta.com>; Hatch, Justin A <juhatch@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; Jon West <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; Zahul, Kathy <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>;

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION
regional impact + local relevance

40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
atlantaregional.com

Development of Regional Impact

Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	#3063
DRI Title	Six West
County	Fulton County
City (if applicable)	College Park
Address /	320-acre site in the City of College Park, approximately bordered by Camp Creek Parkway to the south, Victoria and McDonald streets to the east, Brady Recreation Center Park to the north, and College Park Municipal Golf Course to the west
Review Process	☐ EXPEDITED ☒ NON-EXPEDITED 638,000 SF of retail/commercial space, 2.4 million SF of office, 65 detached single-family homes, 697 multifamily units of varying types, four hotels with 1200 rooms total, and sports/recreational uses

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by	ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead	Marquitrice Mangham
Copied	Click here to enter text.
Date	May 18, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by	Michael Baker
Date	May 6, 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)*

The traffic study identifies programmed projects in the study area on page 2 of the analysis under Other Plans and Projects.

REGIONAL NETWORKS

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

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

☐ NO

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

The development proposes several access points of SR 6/ Camp Creek Parkway.

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

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

☐ NO

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

The development proposes several access points on SR 6/ Camp Creek Parkway, a major freight 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)*

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

Nearest Station: College Park

Distance*
- ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
- ☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile
- ☒ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*
- ☒ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
- ☐ Not applicable *(accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)*

Click here to provide comments.

Bicycling Access*	☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
	☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
	☒ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
	☐ Not applicable *(accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)*
Transit Connectivity	☒ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
	☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
	☐ No services available to rail station
	☐ Not applicable *(accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)*
	Click here to provide comments.

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

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

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

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

Click here to provide comments.

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

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

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

☒ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE *(provide additional information below)*

Operator(s) MARTA

Bus Route(s) 84

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 currently exist along some stretches of Roosevelt Highway adjacent to the site. Bowen Road has no pedestrian facilities.

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: Brady Trail, Proposed Aerotropolis Greenway Trail

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)*

Bicycle facilities do not currently exist along roadways adjacent to the development. The site plan and traffic analysis do not propose bicycle facilities.

* *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)*

Local roads provide access to adjacent parcels.

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)*

Several of the existing local roadways, including Harvard and John Wesley Ave, are equipped with sidewalks providing accessibility to adjacent parcels as well as transit connectivity. The site plan shows bicycle facilities proposed along West Harvard Avenue and Columbia Avenue.

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)*

Several of the existing local roadways, including Harvard and John Wesley Ave, are equipped with sidewalks providing accessibility to adjacent parcels as well as transit connectivity. The site plan shows bicycle facilities proposed along West Harvard Avenue and Columbia Avenue.

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

☐ YES *(truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)*

☐ PARTIAL *(while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)*

☐ NO *(one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)*

☒ NOT APPLICABLE *(the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)*

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?

☐ UNKNOWN *(additional study is necessary)*

☒ YES *(based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)*

☐ NO *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?

☒ NO *(based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)*

☐ YES *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):

Significant gaps in sidewalk infrastructure currently exist along roads within the development. It is recommended that additional sidewalk facilities are developed as a part of the project to increase internal circulation by alternate modes.

AIRPORT CITY MASTER PLAN

Master Plan Concept

0 200 400 800 1,200 1,600 FEET

N

LEGEND

- PROPOSED AEROTROPOLIS GREENWAY TRAILS
- PARKING SURFACE/DECK
- STREETS
- BIKE LANES
- MULTI-USE PATHWAYS
- GREENSPACES
- EXISTING PARKS
- MARTA RAIL LINES
- RAILROADS
- RIVERS & STREAMS
- MARTA TRANSIT STATION
- PHASE I
- STUDY AREA

AREA AND LAND USE

A - 2 STORY RETAIL OUTLET/COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT: 448,000 SF TOTAL
- A1: 224,000 SF FAR: 0.8
- A2: 224,000 SF FAR: 0.8

B - 1 STORY RETAIL BIG BOX: 100,000 SF FAR: 0.8

C - 2 STORY RETAIL MALL: 90,000 SF FAR: 0.8

D - 10 TO 12 STORY "CLASS A" OFFICES: 2.4 MILLION SF TOTAL
- D1: 600,000 SF FAR: 2.2
- D2: 600,000 SF FAR: 2.4
- D3: 600,000 SF FAR: 2.5
- D4: 600,000 SF FAR: 2.8

E - PARCELS FOR INCREMENTAL 1 TO 2 STORY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT (RETAIL, OFFICE, RESTAURANT): 1.27 MILLION TOTAL
- E1: 140,000 FAR: 1.0
- E2: 190,000 FAR: 1.0
- E3: 185,000 FAR: 1.0
- E4: 190,000 FAR: 1.0
- E5: 195,000 FAR: 1.0
- E6: 190,000 FAR: 1.0
- E7: 180,000 FAR: 1.0

F - PARCELS FOR INCREMENTAL 1 TO 2 STORY OFFICE DEVELOPMENT: 635,000 SF TOTAL
- F1: 290,000 FAR: 1.0
- F2: 345,000 FAR: 1.0

G - PARCELS FOR INCREMENTAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: 23 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED; 6-7 UNITS/ACRE

H - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH SINGLE FAMILY UNITS, MULTI FAMILY UNITS, AND TOWNHOMES
- 65 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED; 6-7 UNITS/ACRE
- 177 MULTI-FAMILY (LOWRISE); 14-16 UNITS/ACRE
- 260 MULTI-FAMILY (MIDRISE); 28 UNITS/ACRE

I - HOTEL WITH MIXED USE - RETAIL, OFFICE, RESTAURANTS: 1200 ROOMS TOTAL
- I1: 150,000 SF; 140 KEYS; 5 STORY FAR: 1.8
- I2: 180,000 SF; 130 KEYS; 6 STORY FAR: 2.1
- I3: 180,000 SF; 120 KEYS; 6 STORY FAR: 2.0
- I4: 300,000 SF; 290 KEYS; 6 STORY FAR: 1.6
- ADDITIONAL HOTEL MIXED: 520 KEYS

J - GARDEN STYLE RESIDENTIAL: 260 MULTI-FAMILY; 11-12 UNITS/ACRE

K - GOLF CLUB AND EVENT LODGING: 85,000 SF; FAR: 0.18

L - EXPERIENTIAL GOLF VENUE: 60,000 SF; FAR: 0.25

M - INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENTIAL VENUE (ESPORTS): 180,000 SF; FAR: 0.6

N - CULTURAL ARTS CENTER: 50,000 SF; FAR: 0.4

PHASE 1

A - 2 STORY RETAIL OUTLET/COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT: 448,000 SF TOTAL
- A1: 224,000 SF FAR: 0.8
- A2: 224,000 SF FAR: 0.8

B - 1 STORY RETAIL BIG BOX: 100,000 SF FAR: 0.8

C - 2 STORY RETAIL MALL: 90,000 SF FAR: 0.8

D - 10 TO 12 STORY "CLASS A" OFFICES: 1.2 MILLION SF TOTAL
- D2: 600,000 SF FAR: 2.4
- D4: 600,000 SF FAR: 2.8

E - PARCELS FOR INCREMENTAL 1 TO 2 STORY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT (RETAIL, OFFICE, RESTAURANT): 705,000 SF TOTAL
- E1: 140,000 SF FAR: 1.0
- E2: 190,000 SF FAR: 1.0
- E3: 185,000 SF FAR: 1.0
- E4: 190,000 SF FAR: 1.0

H - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH SINGLE FAMILY UNITS, MULTI FAMILY UNITS, AND TOWNHOMES
- 65 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED; 6-7 UNITS/ACRE
- 177 MULTI-FAMILY (LOWRISE); 14-16 UNITS/ACRE
- 260 MULTI-FAMILY (MIDRISE); 28 UNITS/ACRE

I - HOTEL WITH MIXED USE - RETAIL, OFFICE, RESTAURANTS
- 680 ROOMS
- I1: 150,000 SF; 140 KEYS; 5 STORY FAR: 1.8
- I2: 180,000 SF; 130 KEYS; 6 STORY FAR: 2.1
- I3: 180,000 SF; 120 KEYS; 6 STORY FAR: 2.0
- I4: 300,000 SF; 290 KEYS; 6 STORY FAR: 1.6

K - GOLF CLUB AND EVENT LODGING: 85,000 SF; FAR: 0.18

L - EXPERIMENTAL GOLF VENUE: 60,000 SF; FAR: 0.25

M - INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENTIAL VENUE (ESPORTS): 180,000 SF; FAR: 0.6

N - CULTURAL ARTS CENTER: 50,000 SF: FAR: 0.4

Proposed preserved open space and dedicated park space
- College Park Municipal Golf Course (redesigned): 99 acres
- Stormwater Park: 5.68 acres
- Sports Fields: 6.85 acres
- Public Park 1: 2.3 acres
- Public Park 2: 3 acres

WAYMAN & BESSIE BRADY RECREATION CENTER (EXISTING)

CLUB HOUSE

COLLEGE PARK MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE (REDESIGNED)

L EXPERIENTIAL GOLF VENUE

PUBLIC GREEN 1

PUBLIC GREEN 2

ESPORTS FIELDS WITH STORMWATER RETENTION

STORMWATER PARK

INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENTIAL VENUE (PARKING BELOW)

ENCLOSED RETAIL WITH FOOD HALL

ROCK CLIMBING WALL

HERITAGE CENTER/ CULTURAL ARTS CENTER/ MUSIC VENUE

GEORGIA INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CENTER

COLLEGE PARK MARTA STATION
College Park MARTA Station

EXISTING MARTA STATION CONNECTIVITY

PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

TO AIRPORT

TO AIRPORT

Camp Creek

BRADY TRAIL

RUGBY AVENUE

RUGBY LANE

PARK TERRACE

RIDGEWAY AVENUE

RUGBY TERRACE

RUGBY CIRCLE

PARKVIEW DRIVE

HARRIS DRIVE

ALMAND DRIVE

PIERCE STREET

NAPOLEON STREET

CONLEY STREET

ATLANTA STREET

MUIRFIELD PLACE

FAIRWAY DRIVE

ST ANDREWS RIDGE

VALLEY RIDGE

BELLMONTE DRIVE

ODELL WAY

GOLF VIEW DRIVE

ROOSEVELT STREET

RHODES STREET

REDWINE AVENUE

ROSS AVENUE

PRINCETON AVENUE

MCDONALD AVENUE

PRINCETON DRIVE

SIMMONS AVENUE

CANNON COURT

JOHN WESLEY AVENUE

WEST HARVARD AVENUE

EAST HARVARD AVENUE

COLUMBIA AVENUE

YALE AVENUE

OXFORD AVENUE

CHASE COURT

VIRGINIA AVENUE

CAMBRIDGE AVENUE

HARDIN AVENUE

JOHN CALVIN AVENUE

HAWTHORNE AVENUE

TEMPLE AVENUE

PRINCETON AVENUE

LEE STREET

CAMP CREEK PARKWAY

RIVERDALE ROAD EXTENSION

AIRPORT DR

NORTHWEST DRIVE

CONVENTION CENTER CONCOURSE

RIVERDALE RD CON

WASHINGTON STREET

JEFFERSON STREET

MAIN STREET

HEMPHILL STREET

VICTORIA STREET

AIRPORT BLVD

SOUTH TERMINAL PARKWAY

I-85

I-85 SB

I-85 NB

I-85 NB CD

29

139

RANGE