

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 22, 2020

ARC Review Code: R2006051

TO:Chairman Charlotte NashATTN TO:Ashley Nichols, Planning ManagerFROM:Douglas R. Hooker, Executive DirectorRE: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: MFT Braselton Highway Tract (DRI #3077)

<u>Submitting Local Government</u>: Gwinnett County <u>Review Type</u>: Development of Regional Impact <u>Date Opened</u>: June 5, 2020 <u>Date Closed:</u> June 22, 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed mixed-use development in unincorporated Gwinnett County on the northwestern corner of the intersection of Braselton Highway and Spout Springs Road (SR 124). The site is near Interstate 85, but there is no interstate access at Spout Springs Road. The proposal comprises 71,600 SF of retail, 121 single-family detached units, 40 townhomes, and 363 apartment units. The local trigger is a rezoning. Estimated build-out is 2024.

<u>Comments:</u> According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Developing Suburbs area of the region. Developing Suburbs are areas that were constructed from around 1995 to today. These areas are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. General RDG information and recommendations for Developing Suburbs are listed at the bottom of these comments.

ARC's policy guidance for Developing Suburbs recommends that new development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments, and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions, should be discouraged. This DRI features appropriate internal street connectivity, and benefits from multiple access points to distribute trips, with two driveways on Braselton Highway (SR 124) and one on Spout Springs Road. It proposes a future trail connection to the west through adjacent properties to reach Duncan Creek Park.

This DRI appears to manifest certain aspects of regional policy. It offers a variety of housing types and sizes. It incorporates common areas and amenities at multiple locations. It proposes a separated component of office and retail uses that is accessible by both vehicle and walking trips for residents. There are multiple issues with the commercial building orientations that could be improved, which are further detailed below.

The gross residential density of this DRI (3.48 units per acre) is within the ARC RDG's recommended development parameters for Developing Suburbs (up to 5 units per acre). Otherwise, the development appears to be partly compatible with recommendations for the Community Mixed–Use Character Area in the Gwinnett County 2040 Unified Plan. Medium–Scale Mixed–Use developments like this are listed as potential development types.

By the definitions detailed in the 2040 Gwinnett Unified Plan, this location appears to be located at a "node" in the Community Mixed–Use Character Area, being located at the intersection of one arterial and a collector. It states: "A node is defined as the area surrounding the intersection of two roadways classified as 'collectors' or higher. This is characterized by mixed–use developments incorporating mostly commercial uses with some smaller office tenants, and medium to high density residential uses concentrated at major intersections." For building configurations, it recommends: "Within nodes or major intersections, buildings should be set close to the street for pedestrian orientation and engagement; outside of nodes, along the corridors, the buildings may be pulled back to allow for more auto–orientation."

The proposed site plan as currently configured shows the commercial buildings as primarily auto-oriented, by being separated from the street and sidewalk by surface parking, and multiple drive-through restaurants on the portion fronting Braselton Highway. The buildings are surrounded by surface parking, so they also impede pedestrian connections for residents of the development and workers in the other commercial buildings. If the intent of the design recommendations in the Unified Plan are to promote a more pedestrian-oriented environment at the appropriate locations, the buildings should be re-oriented to either or both the external street and internal streets. While drive-through restaurants will always be challenging to balance with a quality pedestrian environment, it is possible to situate the parking and driveways inside the commercial cluster to reduce the conflicts. The proposed commercial outparcels at the northeastern corner of the site are also separated from both the external street and the internal street by surface parking. There appears to be ample space to orient the buildings to the street with parking behind them.

Across the entire project, closer attention needs to be paid to the pedestrian network, including sidewalk location, crosswalks, building orientation, pathways to amenities, and other changes that could reasonably improve internal walkability and reduce the number of internal vehicle trips required to access all the development's features. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access & Mobility Group are attached.

Please see the attached comments from Gwinnett County Department of Transportation regarding the site plan being updated to reflect the planned project to widen SR 124 and add a roundabout at Huntington Hill Trace, among other issues raised with the site plan and traffic study as presented. Additional comments from Georgia Department of Transportation's District 1 office are attached. Georgia DOT's aviation division notes that the project is in proximity to a navigation facility and must file an FAA Form 7460-1.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating other aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design, e.g., pervious pavers, rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc., in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages. Additional comments on water resources from ARC's Natural Resources Group are attached. They note that the site plan doesn't currently show the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer along Duncan Creek.

Further to the above, general regional policy recommendations for Developing Suburbs include:

• New development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions should be discouraged

• Maximize the usefulness of existing recreational facilities in addition to providing new recreational opportunities

• Eliminate vacant or under-utilized parking areas through mechanisms such as out-parceling or conversion to community open space

- Use rain gardens, vegetated swales or other enhanced water filtration design to enhance the quality of stormwater run-off
- Identify other opportunities to foster a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ARC NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GRTA/SRTA

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Greg Giuffrida at (470) 378-1531 or <u>ggiuffrida@atlantaregional.org</u>. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <u>http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews</u>.



The initial action being requested of the local	Vaziance Sewer	
government for this project:	Water Permit Other	
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	◯(not selected)ີYes≣No	
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?		
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 2022-2024 Overall project: 2022-2024	

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

DRI Site Map | Contact



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 Gwinnett County Department of Water Resources site: What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, 0.171 measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (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 (not selected) Yes No required to serve this project? 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 434 AM Peak, 591 PM Peak per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not (not selected) Yes No transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? Are transportation improvements needed to (not selected) Yes No serve this project? If yes, please describe below:Turn lanes and deceleration/acceleration lanes Solid Waste Disposal How much solid waste is the project expected to generate 740 annually (in tons)? Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this (not selected) Yes No proposed project? 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 65 proposed development has been constructed? Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management:50-foot stream buffer, 75-foot impervious setback On-site detention and water quality **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

⊂(not selected) Yes®No	
⊂(not selected) Yes No	
(not selected) Yes No	
◯(not selected)	
◯(not selected) ⊇Yes® No	
⊂(not selected) Yes No	
uestion above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: oodplain Watershed-Mulberry	
	<pre>(not selected) Yes No (not selected) Yes No extra show, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected: oodplain Watershed-Mulberry</pre>

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

DRI Site Map | Contact

MFT BRASELTON HIGHWAY TRACT DRI Gwinnett County Natural Resources Group Comments May 27, 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 project property is located within the Mulberry River watershed, which in turn is part of the Oconee River Basin. The Mulberry River watershed is not a water supply watershed for any jurisdiction in the Atlanta Region or the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District.

Stream Buffers

Both the site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show Duncan Creek crossing the western and northwestern portion of the property. The Gwinnett County 50-foot stream buffer and 75-foot impervious setback are shown, but the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer is not shown along the stream. The site plan shows a portion of a proposed trail within the 75-foot setback and several proposed lots extend into the setback. Activity within the setback that is not specifically allowed under the Gwinnett Stream Buffer Ordinance may require variances. There are no intrusions into the 50-foot buffer or the 25-foot State buffer. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the County and State buffers. Any unmapped waters of the state will also be subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control 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.

Greg Giuffrida

Alex.Hofelich@gwinnettcounty.com
Friday, June 5, 2020 3:51 PM
aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov; Greg Giuffrida; Andrew Smith; acamporatraffic@comcast.net;
Ashley.Nichols@gwinnettcounty.com; Alicia.Mcelheney@gwinnettcounty.com; jdykes@dot.ga.gov;
shgiles@dot.ga.gov; jpeevy@dot.ga.gov; kbowen@dpengr.com; SLanham@mptlawfirm.com;
Corbitt@highglends.com
Tom.Sever@gwinnettcounty.com; Michael.Johnson2@gwinnettcounty.com;
Edgardo.Aponte@gwinnettcounty.com
RE: GRTA Review Schedule: Braselton Hwy DRI 3077

Gwinnett County DOT's comments to the traffic report are as follows:

- Item 6 in the executive summary states, "The widening of GA 124 from two to four lane adjacent to the proposed development was identified as a programmed improvement that is expected to be built during development of this DRI. The plans for the widening include a roundabout at the GA 124 / Huntington Hill Trace / future site full-movement access intersection." Considering this, the site plan and traffic study should depict the programmed widening project along the frontage as part of the build condition.
- 2. Item 7 in the executive summary may be better served to be broken into sub-points, as there is a lot of territory covered in one spot and it is easy to miss things.
- 3. Regarding the intersection at Huntington Hill Trace, this report states, "A signal warrant analysis should be performed to determine if this intersection will satisfy criteria for signalization." This intersection is programmed for a roundabout as part of a capital widening project. Concept and preliminary plans have already been coordinated with GDOT. This traffic study should reflect as a build condition the programmed project. We are not certain that modifications to an active programmed project are appropriate to include as part of the DRI process. If they are to be included in the DRI analysis, greater detail and analysis (including a signal warrant analysis) is needed as part of this report.
- 4. All the access points along the frontage outside the one at Huntington Hill Trace have been identified as right-in, right-out. The programmed project does not include a median along SR 124. Without the construction of a median, and as they satisfy GDOT's driveway spacing criteria, all the driveways should be planned as full access.
 - a. As such, left turn lanes will be required at every entrance on SR 124. Construction of these left turn lanes will need to be coordinated with the capital project.
 - A left turn lane will need to be constructed on Spout Springs Road. This may include up to the addition of a full lane between SR 124 and the site entrance, with the taper to run out before the bridge over I-85. This has the possibility of impacting the signal poles at SR 124, so a signal reconstruction may be required.
 - c. The traffic study calls for the entrance on Spout Springs Road to be a right-in, right-out, but it is depicted on the site plan as a full-access driveway.
- 5. The ICE analysis for the traffic signal does not appear to include the construction cost of turn lanes. The ICE analysis also does not include any crash data.



Alex Hofelich, PE, PTOE | Division Director for Traffic Engineering | Transportation | Gwinne County 678.639.8800 | 75 Langley Drive, Lawrenceville, GA 30046 | www.gwinnettcounty.com

From: Andrew Spiliotis [mailto:aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 02, 2020 2:31 PM
To: Greg Giuffrida; Andrew Smith; 'Marc Acampora'; Sever, Tom; Hofelich, Alex; Johnson, Michael D. (DOT); Nichols, Ashley; McElheney, Alicia; Dykes, Jason; 'Giles, Shane'; 'Peevy, Jonathan'; 'Kyle Bowen'; Shane Lanham; Woods, Corbitt
Subject: GRTA Review Schedule: Braselton Hwy DRI 3077

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Gwinnett County Government. Maintain caution when opening external links/attachments.

All,

Form 2 was submitted for DRI 3077 Braselton Highway yesterday prompting the review timeline to start today. GRTA's preliminary review schedule is below. I'll issue the Certificate of Completeness by June 6 noting whether the study is complete or if additional information is needed. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments on the schedule at this point.

Thanks, Andrew

Certificate of Completeness: June 6 Technical Analysis Transmittal: June 16 Staff Recommendations Report: June 26 Notice of Decision: July 6



Andrew Spiliotis

Transportation Planner Georgia Regional Transportation Authority / State Road & Tollway Authority 245 Peachtree Center Avenue, Suite 2200, Atlanta, GA 30303 o: 404-893-6171 | aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov

From: Andrew Spiliotis Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 9:50 AM

To: corbitt@highglends.com

Cc: Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>; Andrew Smith <ASmith@atlantaregional.org>; 'Marc Acampora' <acamporatraffic@comcast.net>; Tom.Sever@gwinnettcounty.com; Alex.Hofelich@gwinnettcounty.com; 'Michael.Johnson2@gwinnettcounty.com>;

Ashley.Nichols@gwinnettcounty.com; alicia.mcelheney@gwinnettcounty.com; Dykes, Jason <jdykes@dot.ga.gov>; 'Giles, Shane' <shgiles@dot.ga.gov>; 'Peevy, Jonathan' <jpeevy@dot.ga.gov>; 'Kyle Bowen' <kbowen@dpengr.com>; Shane Lanham <SLanham@mptlawfirm.com>

Subject: Braselton Hwy DRI 3077 Traffic Study Submittal

Corbitt,

Greg Giuffrida

From:	Giles, Shane <shgiles@dot.ga.gov></shgiles@dot.ga.gov>
Sent:	Thursday, March 19, 2020 8:21 AM
То:	Greg Giuffrida
Cc:	Dykes, Jason; Peevy, Jonathan; Hunter, William E.; Giles, Shane; Niebauer, Parker J
Subject:	RE: DRI Pre-Review Meeting: MFT Braselton Highway Tract #3077
Attachments:	MFT Braselton Highway Tract DRI 3077_Methodology Memo_Updated.pdf; MFT Braselton Highway
	Tract DRI 3077_Meeting Sign-in Sheet.pdf

Good Morning Greg,

Please see the comments below from the Department of Transportation:

- ? The Methodology is reference two right-in/right-out driveway and one full movement aligning with Huntington Hill Trace. The department needs to see the proposed concept plan because the driveway configuration may need to change to ensure that we provide safety along the mainline
- ? Under the source of Data due to the school closures and the traffic not being balanced at this time, the developer will not be able to collect counts to get an accurate measurement for the traveling public and turning movement distribution
- ? Under the Programmed Transportation Infrastructure Projects Need to add the GDOT projects and project number in the area
- ? Will the intersection below be evaluated also since it will have impacts
 - 1. State Route 124 at Flowery Branch Road
 - 2. Hamilton Mill Road at I-85 at both ramps
- ? Our office will need to see the Traffic Impact analysis to determine what improvements are needed at each intersection for each approach
- ? Any existing driveway along the State Route system will need to be removed
- ? Need to provide an "ICE" (Intersection Control Evaluation) documentation for the driveway entrance
- ? Need to meet the first internal movement spacing requirements per the Driveway and Encroachment manual. This may affect the developers overall site plan
- ? The developer will need to meet all the requirement set forth in the driveway and Encroachment Manual

Please let our office know if you need anything else or have any questions. Thanks

Shane Giles

D1TO Traffic Operations Supervisor



District 1 Traffic Operations 1475 Jesse Jewell Pkwy Suite 100 Gainesville, GA, 30501 770.533.8491 office 678.283.5759 cell

Greg Giuffrida

From:	Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov></achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent:	Wednesday, June 17, 2020 12:35 PM
То:	Greg Giuffrida
Cc:	Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; Robinson, Joseph;
	Matthew.Smith@gwinnettcounty.com
Subject:	RE: ARC DRI Review Notification - MFT Braselton Highway Tract (DRI #3077)
Attachments:	ARC Preliminary Report - MFT Braselton Highway Tract DRI 3077.pdf

Greg,

The proposed mixed use development of 71,600 SF of retail, 121 single-family detached units, 40 townhomes, and 363 apartment units, in unincorporated Gwinnett County on the northwestern corner of the intersection of Braselton Highway and

Spout Springs Road, is approximately 7.5 miles north east of the Gwinnett County Airport – Briscoe Field (LZU), 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

(<u>https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/gisTools/gisAction.jsp?action=showNoNoticeRequiredToolForm</u>). Those submissions for the buildings and any associated cranes may be done online at <u>https://oeaaa.faa.gov</u>. 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 Smith with the Gwinnett County Airport – Briscoe Field (LZU) on this email.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development

Alan Hood

Airport Safety Data Program Manager



Aviation Programs 600 West Peachtree Street NW 6th Floor Atlanta, GA, 30308 404.660.3394 cell 404.532.0082 office

From: Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org> Sent: Friday, June 5, 2020 10:33 AM

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



regional impact + local relevance

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	#3077
DRI Title	MFT Braselton Highway
County	Gwinnett County
City (if applicable)	None / Unincorporated
Address / Location	Northwestern corner of the intersection of Braselton Highway and Spout Springs Road (SR 124)
Review Process	

Review Process

NON-EXPEDITED

77.9 acre development consisting of 524 residential units including 121 detached single family homes, 40 townhomes, and 363 multi-family units; seven (7) commercial outparcels including a 5,600 ft² restaurant, a 3,000 ft² restaurant with drive-through, another 3,000 ft² restaurant with drive-through, 15,800 ft² of office/retail/restaurant,17,200 ft² of office/retail, 12,600 ft² of office/retail, and 14,400 ft² of office/retail/restaurant, for a total of 71,600 ft² of commercial

uses.

REVIEW INFORMATION

- Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
- Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
- Click here to enter text. Copied
- Date May 11, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by	Marc R Acampora, LLC
Date	May 8, 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)

Projects programmed in the RTP are identified in on page 28 in Table 7 of the traffic analysis

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.

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

The site plan identifies access drives on SR 124, a regional highway.

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 NO

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

The site plan shows proposed access on SR 124 which is Identified as a regional connector.

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

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

NOT APPLICABLE (nearest station more than one mile away)

Operator / Rail Line	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

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)	Click here to enter name of operator(s).
Bus Route(s)	Bus Service is more than a mile away
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 Stanley Road however sidewalk facilities along Cobb International are incomplete adjacent to the proposed development site.
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



Gwinnett County Transit, GRTA Express

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)

An access trail to Duncan Creek Park is proposed as a part of the development.

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.

\boxtimes	YES (connections to	adjacent	parcels are	planned as	part o	f the developr	nent)
-------------	---------------------	----------	-------------	------------	--------	----------------	-------

	YES (stub outs will mak	e future connections	possible when ad	ljacent 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 road and access drives proposed in the development.

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.

- \bowtie 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 depicts sidewalks throughout the development.

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)
- Sidewalk facilities are available along Spout Springs road and are sporadic along SR 124 adjacent to the development. The site plan depicts pedestrian facilities proposed throughout 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)

Minimal truck traffic is anticipated under this development

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?
	\boxtimes 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.



. N N

Image: Constraint of the series of the se									
1500 HIGHWAY 124 AUBURN, GA 30011 CONTACT: MR. CORBITT WOODS									
PROJECT NAME: MFT BRASELTON HWY. TRACT									
TASK: CONCEPTUAL REZONING EXHIBIT									
1F rc 9	PR TBP oject -079	OJE RASE Narr	ELTC ne		=OF //Y. ⁻	RMA TRAC	ATIC DT	DN:	
0 r 0 a v is iv	28 B oject 2 an nd Lo d DIS strict VINN	HAS Addr d 00 ot No STRIC	ELTO ress 3 0.(s) CT COL	JNTY	', GA	·VAY			
	12/20/19	01/28/20	02/11/20						
	CHANGES TO LAYOUT AS PER CLIENT REQUEST	CHANGES TO LAYOIUT AS PER CLIENT REQUEST	GWINNETT COUNTY STAFF COMMENTS						
	- KWB ESIG	N N	ຕ່ AS SC,	4 SHC	ى wWQ				
KWB DRAWN HECKED 2/20/19			SHI 19-	EET .079		01	F -	1	
[DATE		PR	OJEC	T Nc).			