

DATE: March 18, 2021

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2102261

TO: Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms  
ATTN TO: Monique Forte, Urban Planner III  
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:** Mayson Avenue Development (DRI #3235)

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Atlanta

**Review Type:** Development of Regional Impact **Date Opened:** Feb. 26, 2021 **Date Closed:** March 18, 2021

**Description:** A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed mixed-use project directly east of the Edgewood–Candler Park MARTA station in the City of Atlanta (DeKalb County). The proposal includes 450 multifamily apartment units, 275 townhomes/condos, and 10,000 SF of retail space. The local trigger is a rezoning from I-2 (industrial) to PD-MU (Planned Development–Mixed Use). Expected buildout is 2023.

**Comments:** Unified Policy Growth Map (UGPM), this DRI is located in the Maturing Neighborhoods area of the region. These were primarily developed prior to 1970 adjacent to the Region's Core and Employment Corridors. They together 49% of region's jobs and 18% of population. Recommended policies for this area are contained at the end of these comments.

This project is generally compatible with regional goals and priorities. It introduces higher-density housing options, in both rental and ownership form, and street-level retail to a location immediately adjacent to high-frequency and high-capacity transit service (Edgewood–Candler Park MARTA station, served by the Blue and Green lines). The proposed density is compatible with the UGPM recommendations for this area: 5–10 stories based on local context. Furthermore, within the ownership portion of the project will be a variety of condominium “flats” in varying sizes, which introduces a variety of price points and options for buyers. The development's density (1.42 residential floor-area ratio) is also consistent with the appropriate density defined for a Neighborhood station in MARTA's Transit-Oriented Development guidelines.

At a higher level unrelated to transit, there is a long-term concern about the ongoing loss of industrial uses and zoning within the City of Atlanta and other major cities, as property values and desirability of traditional industrial areas push land prices higher. This is an ongoing issue along the Atlanta BeltLine and other intown areas along freight rail corridors, like this site. Given the rising property values of the surrounding neighborhoods, it's unlikely this DRI site would have remained much longer in its current use, but there are long-term implications for the City's economy as the industrial job base is eroded.

Housing affordability is also a major concern for this location and surrounding most other MARTA rail stations. This project does not propose any affordable units, in a location where housing costs continue to increase. The neighboring TOD project built in partnership with MARTA provides affordable units under MARTA's TOD requirements. This project will not be required to provide them under current City of Atlanta rules, but the project site is in a prime location and the opportunity to pursue partnerships with Invest Atlanta and other non-profits for subsidizing both rental and ownership units via down-payment assistance and other programs should be a focus moving forward.

The DRI proposes 890 parking spaces, when only 565 parking spaces are required by zoning. As a site adjacent to a MARTA station the site should follow the MARTA's TOD guidelines, which recommend a minimum of 0.75 spaces per unit and a maximum of 1.25 spaces per unit for multifamily and attached residential units within 600 feet of a transit station. The proposed parking ratio is roughly 1.2 for the residential uses, plus about 18 spaces for the retail. This DRI falls within this range, but it's worth noting that since MARTA's TOD guidelines were issued in 2010, there are many more example projects and supporting data nationwide on parking ratios necessary to support transit usage and the needs of the tenants. The orientation of the DRI's parking generally fits with MARTA's TOD guidelines and the City's requirements for this type of zoning, however the opportunity to provide electric charging facilities should be included within all residential garages and identify opportunities for public charging facilities.

La France Street is an important east-west bicycle connection for this area, because it connects the surrounding neighborhoods to the MARTA station. To the east, the Pullman PATH trail serves as a pedestrian and bike connection to College Avenue, the Stone Mountain PATH trail, and the City of Decatur beyond. It's also a safer alternative to DeKalb Avenue in its current condition. It's also an important bike connection to the south, where Arizona Avenue dead-ends into the Arizona Spur, Gilliam Park, and Clifton Street (one of the few lower-stress bike routes across I-20 on the east side of Atlanta).

There is an opportunity and ample right-of-way to build a quality protected bike facility, on-street parking, bulb-outs, crosswalks, and other traffic calming features to improve the street's urban character and service to the MARTA station as the uses surrounding it evolve. The existing wide right-of-way was necessary for larger truck traffic serving the manufacturing use, but encourages higher driving speeds. The feasibility of a curb- or parking-protected bike facility along the full frontage of the DRI should be considered in coordination with Atlanta Department of Transportation. Careful attention will need to be paid to visibility and safety on the western portion of the frontage, where the street curves and climbs as it approaches Mayson Avenue. The intersection at Arizona Street, the eastern terminus, will also require careful design regardless of what type of facility is chosen because of limited visibility and high driving speeds on Arizona where it approaches DeKalb Avenue.

A wide range of other recommendations for the public realm are available in MARTA's TOD guidelines. 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., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages. Additional comments from ARC's Natural Resources Group are attached to this report.

The project proposes four new driveways: One on Mayson Avenue across from the MARTA station, and the other three on La France Street. During the Pre-Review/Methodology meeting for this project on Jan. 19, 2021, a representative from MARTA raised a question about the orientation of the Mayson access possibly conflicting with bus circulation. The design and location of this access should be coordinated with MARTA's bus operations staff. The driveways on LaFrance should be designed to Atlanta DOT standards by incorporating raised pedestrian tables that eliminate the need for ADA ramps. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access and Mobility Group and GDOT's aviation division are attached.

Further to the above, here are recommendations from the Regional Development Guide for Maturing Neighborhoods:

- 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

In summary the following concerns should be addressed:

- The design of the Mayson Avenue connection turning radii for MARTA bus operations.
- The feasibility of a curb- or parking-protected bike facility along the full frontage of the DRI
- Incorporating green infrastructure and/or low-impact design (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages.
- Coordination with housing assistance providers to promote mixed income housing.
- Examine parking reductions to be closer to the zoning requirements.

#### 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	DEKALB COUNTY	FULTON COUNTY

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Greg Giuffrida at (470) 378-1531 or [ggiuffrida@atlantaregional.org](mailto: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](#)[Logout](#)**DRI #3235**

### 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:

Individual completing form:

Telephone:

E-mail:

\*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:

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project:

#### Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):

Developer:

Mailing Address:

Address 2:

City:  State:  Zip:

Telephone:

Email:

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

If yes, property owner:

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

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide the following

information:	Project Name:	<input type="text"/>
	Project ID:	<input type="text"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rezoning	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Variance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Connect Sewer	
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	<input type="checkbox"/> Connect Water	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Permit	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="text"/>
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	<input type="radio"/> (not selected) <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	<input type="text"/>	
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase:	<input type="text" value="2023"/>
	Overall project:	<input type="text" value="2023"/>
<hr/>		
<div><div>Save Updates to Submitted Form</div><div>Save without Submitting</div><div>Cancel</div></div>		
<a href="#">Back to Top</a>		

You are logged in to the DRI Website as **ggiuffrida** . | [Change Password](#) | [Go to Applications Listing](#)

[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 #3235

#### 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: Atlanta  
Individual completing form: Monique Forte  
Telephone: 404-546-0196  
Email: mbforte@atlantaga.gov

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Mayson Avenue Development  
DRI ID Number: 3235  
Developer/Applicant: Chris Rudd - Toll Southeast LP Co. Inc.  
Telephone: 404-474-4814  
Email(s): crudd@tollbrothers.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: \$200M

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

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): approximately 165,000 SF manufacturing facility

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: City of Atlanta

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?  
0.19 MGD - note there will be an estimated decrease from today with the manufacturing plant going of

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

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

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

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

### Wastewater Disposal

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

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.19 MGD - - note there will be an estimated decrease from today with the manufacturing plant going off-line

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.) New new trips: 2,848 Daily, 133 AM, 166 PM

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe below:

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 1,200 tons

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

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please explain:

### Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? 90%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management. The development will utilize stormwater detention and meet or exceed the City requirements for stormwater management.

### 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:** Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 9, 2021 8:58 AM  
**To:** Greg Giuffrida  
**Subject:** RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Mayson Avenue Development DRI #3235  
**Attachments:** ARC Preliminary Report - Mayson Ave Development DRI 3235.pdf

Greg,

The proposed mixed-use project directly east of the Edgewood-Candler Park MARTA station in the City of Atlanta (DeKalb County) includes 450 multifamily apartment units, 275 townhomes/condos, and 10,000 SF of retail space. It is located more than 7 miles from any civil airport and outside any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact any airport.

If any construction equipment or construction exceeds 200' above ground level, 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 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.

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  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Atlanta, GA, 30308  
404.660.3394 cell  
404.532.0082 office

---

**From:** Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, February 26, 2021 4:41 PM  
**To:** Ana.eisenman@kimley-horn.com; ben.skidmore@kimley-horn.com; crudd@tollbrothers.com; Daniel.Kerr@kimley-horn.com; Kennedy.Adams@kimley-horn.com; laurel@glawgp.com; Rob.Ross@kimley-horn.com; Sylvia Smith - DeKalb County (sasmith@dekalbcountyga.gov) <sasmith@dekalbcountyga.gov>; Cedric Hudson - DeKalb County (chudson@dekalbcountyga.gov) <chudson@dekalbcountyga.gov>; Andrew Spiliotis <aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov>; Annie Gillespie <agillespie@srta.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>; Kassa, Habte <hkassa@dot.ga.gov>; Hatch, Justin A <juhatch@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; Jon West <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; 'kclark@gefa.ga.gov'; Kay, Linda M <LKay@dot.ga.gov>; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Mertz, Kaycee <kmertz@dot.ga.gov>;

**MAYSON AVENUE DEVELOPMENT DRI**  
**City of Atlanta**  
**Natural Resources Group Comments**  
**February 24, 2021**

**Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers**

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 City and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

**Water Supply Watersheds**

The proposed project is located in the South River Watershed, which is not a water supply watershed in the Atlanta Region and no Part 5 Environmental Minimum Planning Criteria for water supply watersheds apply.

**Stream Buffers**

Neither the submitted site plan nor the USGS coverage for the project area show any streams on the property. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to buffers required under the City of Atlanta Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any unmapped streams and waters of the state on the property are also subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sediment Control Buffer.

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

**Stormwater and 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](http://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** #3235  
**DRI Title** Mayson Avenue Development  
**County** DeKalb County  
**City (if applicable)** City of Atlanta  
**Address / Location** north of LaFrance St NE, east of Mayson Avenue NE, south of MARTA railroad tracks and west of Arizona Ave NE

**Proposed Development Type:**

The proposed project consists of approximately 450 multi-family apartments, 275 stacked flat condos and attached units, and 10,000 SF of retail space located on an approximate ±13.35-acre lot.

**Build Out : 2023**

**Review Process** ☐ EXPEDITED  
☒ NON-EXPEDITED (for ARC)

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Aries Little  
**Copied** [Click here to enter text.](#)  
**Date** February 26, 2021

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** Kimley Horn  
**Date** February 23, 2021

## **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)

Table 13 (pg. 24) does not include the DeKalb Ave road diet and complete street improvements project (AT-319), which the construction phase is programmed for 2021. The project's description includes road resurfacing, removal and conversion of the reversible lane into left turn/ Two Way Left Turn lane where appropriate, sidewalk and curb improvements, installation of left turn signal phasing at signalized intersections and a ½ mile of protected two-way bike lane facility. DeKalb Ave will have 1 travel lane in each direction from Jackson to Rocky Ford Rd. The bike facility is proposed from Hurt St to Candler St.

## **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

The project's access points are not located on a Regional Thoroughfare; however, the project area is bounded by US 23 and US 278 which can be accessed via DeKalb Ave. NE.

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

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

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

☒ NO

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

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

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

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

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

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station MARTA's Edgewood-Candler Park Station and the

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*)

Based on aerial imagery, there is a potential active construction site near the station's access point from the proposed project site.

*\* 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) Route 102

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)

No additional external connections or improvements are proposed to access MARTA's Route 102 stops, which the bus stops are west of LaFrance Street and Mayson Ave intersection.

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)

Bikeshare opportunities, Relay Bikes- Edgewood/Candler Park MARTA, is located west of LaFrance St. and Mayson Ave. intersection.

\* 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

Route 102 is in service, Route 24 services are currently suspended, and the train station is located near the proposed development. Plus, bikeshare opportunities are near the proposed site.

**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	Pullman PATH trail (partial)
Distance	<input type="checkbox"/> Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) <input checked="" 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

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

According to the traffic analysis, the City of Atlanta's transportation plan proposes improvements; however, no completion date has been identified.

\* 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*)

### **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)

Sidewalks are proposed within the development which will connect to the existing sidewalks.  
Crosswalks are proposed at the project sites' access points.

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

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

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☐ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☒ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

The northern border of the project site faces MARTA's rail line; thus, providing any future connections could warrant safety concerns.

The traffic study proposes improvements to safely allow pedestrians and cyclists to traverse the northern and southern portions of the development bisected by LaFrance St.

**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):**

None



