

DATE: July 29, 2020

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2007141

TO: Mayor Ollie Clemons Jr.
ATTN TO: Darrell Weaver, Assistant Director, Community Affairs
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review



Digital signature
Original on file

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

Name of Proposal: Thornton Business Park (DRI #3119)

Submitting Local Government: City of Austell

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact **Date Opened:** July 14, 2020 **Date Closed:** July 29, 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed project to build two distribution warehouses in unincorporated Douglas County at the northwest corner of the intersection of Thornton Road (US 278/SR 6) and Veterans Memorial Highway (US 78/SR 8). The project proposes two distribution warehouses totaling 760,000 SF. Access will be provided with five new driveways on Causey Road. The local trigger is a concurrent rezoning and annexation into the City of Austell. The application is being submitted by the City of Austell, but Douglas County remains the jurisdiction until approved. Expected buildout is 2023.

Comments: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in an Established Suburbs area. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. General RDG information and recommendations for Established Suburbs areas are listed at the bottom of these comments. In addition, we have listed recommendations for Regional Industrial & Logistics Areas, considering the proposed use.

This DRI manifests certain aspects of regional policy. It offers the potential for efficiencies and connectivity in intraregional, interregional and interstate freight movement given its accessibility to Thornton Road/Camp Creek Parkway (US 278/SR 6), Veterans Memorial Highway (US 78/US 278/SR 5), and Interstate 20. Although this location is not currently considered an Industrial & Logistics Area in The Atlanta Region's Plan, the growing number of distribution/warehouse facilities in the western Metro area requires considering the logistical issues these bring to the area.

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. Please see the attached comments from ARC's Natural Resources Group. They note that the site is located within the Sweetwater Creek Water Supply Watershed and there are restrictions on handling and storage of hazardous materials with 7 miles upstream of a water supply intake. They also note that any changes to the parking areas on Building B near the County stream buffer may require a local variance.

In addition, ARC encourages the applicant team to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all proposed driveways, paths and parking areas on the site. Pedestrian facilities should connect to the main entrances of both buildings. The site plan currently shows installing new sidewalk on Causey Road only to the driveway for Building A. The local government should consider requiring sidewalk to be extended along the length of the project up to Driveway 1, to serve employees of the DRI, existing residents, and future development accessed by Causey Road. While it's beyond the scope of this project to address, the local governments and Georgia Department of Transportation should plan in the future for continuing the sidewalk on the west side of Veterans Memorial Highway between Thornton Road and its current terminus at the retail building at 10032 Veterans Memorial Highway. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access & Mobility Group and GDOT's aviation division are attached.

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

The underlying area for this location falls under the Established Suburbs category of the Unified Growth Policy Map. Established Suburbs are generally areas of residential development that occurred after 1970 to around 1995 and Developing Suburbs are areas that were constructed from around 1995 to today. These areas are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. Recommendations 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

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

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

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DOUGLAS COUNTY
CITY OF POWDER SPRINGS

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY
ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF DOUGLASVILLE

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GRTA/SRTA
COBB COUNTY

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



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3119

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: Austell

Individual completing form: Darrell Weaver

Telephone: 770-944-4312

E-mail: darrell@austellga.gov

*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: Thorton Business park

Location (Street Address, Located in between Thorton Rd., Veterans Memorial Hwy, and Causey Rd. in
GPS Coordinates, or Legal Austell/Douglas County
Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: Multi parcel assemblage; Building A 420,000 S.F., Building B 220,000 S.F.

Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 2 units Building A 420,000 sf, Building B 220,000

Developer: Logistics Property Co

Mailing Address: 3340 Peachtree Rd

Address 2: Suite 580

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30326

Telephone: 404-358-4992

Email: jmitchell@logisticspropco.com

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

If yes, property owner:

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located? Will be annexed into the city of Austell

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:
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rezoning
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	<input type="checkbox"/> Variance
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer
	<input type="checkbox"/> Water
	<input type="checkbox"/> Permit
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Annexation
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) Yes <input type="radio"/> No
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 2022 Overall project: 2022

[Back to Top](#)[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#)[DRI Site Map](#) | [Contact](#)



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3119

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: Austell
Individual completing form: Darrell Weaver
Telephone: 770-944-4312
Email: darrell@austellga.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Thorton Business park
DRI ID Number: 3119
Developer/Applicant: Logistics Property Co
Telephone: 404-358-4992
Email(s): jmitchell@logisticspropco.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: \$53 Million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$68,900 annual property tax

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 Austell

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 100,000 MGD

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

Is a water line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?
Increased size diameter (relay)

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: City of Austell

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 100,000 GPD

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.) 1pm

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: Causey Rd. improvements

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 75

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? 56.15%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Buffers and Ponds (3)

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](#)

Greg Giuffrida

From: Andrew Smith
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 10:28 AM
To: Greg Giuffrida
Subject: FW: UPDATED ARC DRI Review Notification - Thornton Business Park DRI #3119
Attachments: ARC Preliminary Report - Thornton Business Park DRI 3119.pdf

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 10:11 AM
To: Andrew Smith <ASmith@atlantaregional.org>
Cc: Comer, Carol <ccomer@dot.ga.gov>; Brian, Steve <sbrian@dot.ga.gov>; Edmisten, Colette <CEdmisten@dot.ga.gov>; Robinson, Joseph <JoRobinson@dot.ga.gov>; Kleine, Tracie <TKleine@dot.ga.gov>; Beggerly, Timothy <Timothy.Beggerly@fultoncountyga.gov>
Subject: RE: UPDATED ARC DRI Review Notification - Thornton Business Park DRI #3119

Andrew,

The proposed two distribution warehouses in unincorporated Douglas County at the northwest corner of the intersection of Thornton Road (US 278/SR 6) and Veterans Memorial Highway (US 78/SR 8) is 6.5 miles west of the Fulton County Airport – Brown Field (FTY). It is located outside any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However, the proposed development is in proximity to a navigation facility and may impact the assurance of navigation signal reception, so an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration according to the FAA's Notice Criteria Tool found here (<https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/gisTools/gisAction.jsp?action=showNoNoticeRequiredToolForm>). Those submissions for the buildings and any associated cranes 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 Tim Beggerly with the Fulton County Airport – Brown Field (FTY) 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

THORNTON BUSINESS PARK DRI
Douglas County
Natural Resources Group Review Comments
July 10, 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 and Stream Buffers

The property is located in the Chattahoochee River watershed, but it is not in the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor and is not subject to the requirements of the Metropolitan River Protection Act and the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. It is located downstream of the portion of the Chattahoochee that serves as a water supply source in the Atlanta Region.

The property is also located in the Sweetwater Creek Water Supply Watershed, a large (greater than 100 square mile) watershed as defined by the State of Georgia's Part 5 Environmental Planning Criteria for water supply watersheds. As withdrawals are drawn directly from the Sweetwater Creek and not from a reservoir, the only Part 5 Water Supply Watershed criteria that apply in the Sweetwater Creek watershed are restrictions on the handling and storage of hazardous materials within 7 miles upstream of the intake. (East Point's Sparks Reservoir is located in the basin of a tributary to Sweetwater Creek and receives no direct flow from Sweetwater Creek or the rest of the Sweetwater watershed. This project is not in the Sparks Reservoir watershed.).

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no blue-line streams on the property. The only blue-line stream shown near the property is across Causey Road from the project site. This stream is shown on the project site plan, as well as an unmapped stream and associated wetland areas along the southern and southwestern portions of the project site. The County's 50-foot stream buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer are shown on the site plan. No intrusions into the buffers or setback are shown, but parking areas on the south side of Building B are close to the setback. Any grading or design change that intrudes into the County buffers or setback may require a variance under the County Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any intrusions into the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control may also require variances. Any unmapped State waters identified on the property 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.

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3119
DRI Title Thornton Business Park
County Douglas County
City (if applicable) City of Austell
Address / Location North of Thornton Road, West of Veterans Memorial Hwy, South of Causey Road
Proposed Development Type: Approximately 760,000 square foot warehouse/distribution facility

Review Process ☒ EXPEDITED
☐ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
Copied [Click here to enter text.](#)
Date July 13, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared By: NV5 Engineers
Date July 10, 2020

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?

☐ YES (*provide the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified*)

☒ NO (*provide comments below*)

The traffic study does not identify two projects in the study network:

DO-16 US 78/ Bankhead Highway Road widening to Thornton Road

DO-299 Truck Friendly Lanes along Thornton Road from Garrett Road to I-20

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*)

US 78 Veterans Memorial Hwy and SR 6 /Thornton Road are both regional thoroughfares; however, site access will be by access points on Causey Road, a local road.

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

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

☒ NO

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

Site access will be provided by Causey Road, a local road.

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

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

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

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

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

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

Distance*

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

[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)

Bus Route(s)

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

Distance*

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (No Sidewalks or accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

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

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

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

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

☐ NO

☒ YES

Douglas Connect, GRTA Xpress

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	Chattahoochee Greenway Trail is proposed in the area
Distance	<input type="checkbox"/> Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) <input type="checkbox"/> 0.15 to 0.50 mile <input type="checkbox"/> 0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
Bicycling Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

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

Adjacent parcels are currently undeveloped and zoned for agricultural and residential uses. Local roads provide connectivity 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)
- ☐ OTHER (Please explain)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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)

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

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

- ☐ YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- ☐ PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- ☐ NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
- ☒ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

The development proposes five driveways with designated driveways providing access to vehicle parking and driveways for trucks to freight parking and loading areas.

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)*

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

The programmed projects should be considered when determining long-term traffic impacts of the development.

LS01918017AUG Preliminary 01/17/14 - PS-12- DRWg, MCH FULL BLEED 0 (24.00 X 36.00 INCHES), SCHEME MASTER, DWG TO PDF, AEC, BEN CHAM, July 1, 2009 4:19:42 PM

