

# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 fax: 404.463.3205 • atlantaregional.org

**DATE:** July 9, 2021

**ARC REVIEW CODE:** R2107091

**TO:** Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms, City of Atlanta  
**ATTN TO:** Monique Forte, Urban Planner III  
**FROM:** Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director  
**RE:** Development of Regional Impact Review



Digital signature  
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed a preliminary 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 preliminary report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

**Name of Proposal:** Broadstone at Moreland (DRI #3306)

**Review Type:** DRI

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Atlanta

**Date Opened:** July 9, 2021

**Deadline for Comments:** July 26, 2021

**Date to Close:** July 30, 2021

**Description:** This proposed development is located in the City of Atlanta, on an approximately 34-acre site southeast of the intersection of Moreland Ave. (SR 23) and Custer Ave. The project proposes redeveloping an existing shopping center into a primarily residential development consisting of 384 apartments, 188 townhomes, and a 11,019-SF Dollar Tree store (the store is already on-site and will be relocated in the new development). Proposed site access includes a right-in/right-out only (RIRO) driveway on Moreland Ave. and two full access driveways on Custer Ave. The local DRI trigger for this project is a pending Special Administrative Permit (SAP) application with the City of Atlanta.

**PRELIMINARY COMMENTS:** According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Maturing Neighborhoods area. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. General information and policy recommendations for Maturing Neighborhoods are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to implement some aspects of regional policy. It proposes redeveloping a current retail shopping center with a large surface parking lot into a mixed residential project with green amenities and a small amount of new retail space. It is currently served by MARTA bus routes #4 and #9, running on Moreland Avenue and Custer Avenue respectively. The eastern boundary of the site is adjacent to Intrenchment Creek, where long-term community plans call for a pedestrian/bike trail to eventually connect the existing South River Trail to the Atlanta BeltLine Southside Trail.

To capitalize on this long-term potential, care should be taken to ensure that the development, as constructed, promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths, entrances, and parking areas. The City will also need to be clear on whether the internal roadways are to be dedicated as public streets or to become private streets.

The urban design of this project does not reflect best practices for mixed-use design, nor does it conform to many City of Atlanta guidelines for promoting more pedestrian-friendly developments that reduce the need for internal single-vehicle trips. While it appears to implement an orderly street grid, the orientation of the buildings and widespread use of perpendicular parking negate many benefits of a walkable urban street grid. Somehow it manages to be unfriendly to pedestrians both externally and internally.

Road C should be designed as an urban connecting street, with full sidewalks, streetscapes and other Atlanta zoning requirements from Moreland all the way east to Road B. Parallel or angled parking should be used instead of perpendicular parking. All units should be oriented to the street, rather than to the interior courtyards (Units 113-119 and 107-112). Both Road A and Road B/H should also be designed to urban street standards as above.

On a side note, the angled parking on Road A near Drive 2 should be evaluated to ensure it will not cause conflicts between vehicles backing out of spaces and vehicles entering the project, potentially causing queueing onto Custer.

There is a missed opportunity to create a common park/amenity greenspace by re-orienting some of the townhomes (roughly units 113-119). A linear park could create a community gathering place with additional amenities without sacrificing units. Road E could still continue through the space with aggressive traffic calming/shared space design if needed. Ordinarily the preference is for townhomes to be oriented to the street with alley garages, but Road D as configured is probably more desirable to minimize the impact of building an alley along Intrenchment Creek.

At a glance, it appears that the site plan is not compatible with high-level goals of the South Moreland Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) plan, which encourages street-oriented design. While the topography on the western edge of the site is a challenge, it is less so for the northern boundary along Custer. The applicant should consider any opportunities to re-orient the multifamily buildings closer to the roadway on both the Moreland and Custer frontages and make the buildings mixed-use by including ground-floor retail or a similar active use. Activating both "public faces" of the project in this way can orient and connect the project more strongly to the nearby major intersection of Moreland and Custer, which is served by transit.

It appears that the site does not interfere with long-term plans to build a trail along the eastern bank of Intrenchment Creek. GRTA conditions should specify that no part of the site plan shall interfere with those plans. Additional comments from ARC's Transportation Access & Mobility Group are attached.

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. Please see the attached comments from ARC's Natural Resources Group, which note the site plan does not currently show the 25-foot state stream buffer.

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

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

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
MARTA

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY  
ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
DEKALB COUNTY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
GRTA/SRTA

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (470) 378-1645 or [asmith@atlantaregional.org](mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.org). This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews>.



## DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Commission for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to generate impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is located, for example in adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included in this packet and offer your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to ARC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: **Broadstone at Moreland DRI #3306** *See the Preliminary Report.*

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: (     )

Signature:

Date:

***Comments must be emailed to:***

Andrew Smith  
Atlanta Regional Commission  
[asmith@atlantaregional.org](mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.org)  
Ph. (470) 378-1645

**Return Date: July 26, 2021**

# ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: July 9, 2021

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2107091

**TO:** ARC Group Managers

**FROM:** Andrew Smith, 470-378-1645

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

**Community Development:** Smith, Andrew

**Transportation Access and Mobility:** Little, Aries

**Natural Resources:** Santo, Jim

**Research and Analytics:** Skinner, Jim

**Aging and Health Resources:** Perumbeti, Katie

**Name of Proposal:** Broadstone at Moreland DRI #3306

**Review Type:** Development of Regional Impact

**Description:** This proposed development is located in the City of Atlanta, on an approximately 34-acre site southeast of the intersection of Moreland Ave. (SR 23) and Custer Ave. The project proposes redeveloping an existing shopping center into a primarily residential development consisting of 384 apartments, 188 townhomes, and a 11,019-SF Dollar Tree store (the store is already on site and will be relocated in the new development). Proposed site access includes a right-in/right-out only (RIRO) driveway on Moreland Ave. and two full access driveways on Custer Ave. The local DRI trigger for this project is a pending Special Administrative Permit (SAP) application with the City of Atlanta.

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Atlanta

**Date Opened:** July 9, 2021

**Deadline for Comments:** July 26, 2021

**Date to Close:** July 30, 2021

**Response:**

- 1) ☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) ☐ While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 5) ☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
- 6) ☐ Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

**COMMENTS:**

[illegible]



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #3306

#### 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: Atlanta  
Individual completing form: Monique Forte  
Telephone: 470-279-1545  
E-mail: [mbforte@atlantaga.gov](mailto:mbforte@atlantaga.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: Broadstone @ Moreland  
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 1280 + 1296 Moreland Avenue and 1263 Custer Avenue  
Brief Description of Project: The proposal is to develop the property with predominantly residential development.

#### 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.): 354 multifamily units, 188 townhomes and 11,100 square feet of retail

Developer: Alliance Realty Partners, LLC

Mailing Address: 1720 Peachtree Street NW

Address 2: Suite 150

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30309

Telephone: 678-982-2921

Email: [nrandall@allresco.com](mailto:nrandall@allresco.com)

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

If yes, property owner: SRPF A/Moreland, LLC

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

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

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

If yes, provide the following Project Name:

information: Project ID:

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

- ☐ Rezoning
- ☐ Variance
- ☐ Sewer
- ☐ Water
- ☒ Permit
- ☐ Other

Is this project a phase or part  
of a larger overall project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, what percent of the  
overall project does this  
project/phase represent?

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: March 2023  
Overall project: January 2024

[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 #3306

#### 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: 470-279-1545  
Email: [mbforte@atlantaga.gov](mailto:mbforte@atlantaga.gov)

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Broadstone @ Moreland  
DRI ID Number: 3306  
Developer/Applicant: Alliance Realty Partners, LLC  
Telephone: 678-982-2921  
Email(s): [nrandall@allresco.com](mailto:nrandall@allresco.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: \$70,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$620,000

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): Two retail suites totaling 54,108 SF will be displaced. One retail suite totaling 11,019 SF will remain on site.

#### 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)? 0.055

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:  
n/a

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?  
n/a

---

### 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)? 0.055

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: n/a

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? 300 ft = .06 miles (Note: Replaces existing sewer line)

---

### 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.) 3,596 total trips (24 hours), AM peak hour 215 trips, PM peak hour 290 trips

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

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

If yes, please describe below: At the intersection of Moreland Avenue and Custer Avenue, it is recommended that the second eastbound receiving through lane be restriped to a dual westbound left turn lane (currently one left turn lane). Deceleration lanes are recommended at all site entrances (3 total driveways).

---

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 500 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: n/a

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

If yes, please explain: n/a

---

### Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? 44%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: 75' undisturbed stream buffer, Bio swales and infiltration for RRV=1.0 inch runoff-Detention for overbank protection.

---

### 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:  
Entrenchment Creek and associated flood plain are the eastern property boundary. A 75' undisturbed buffer is to be respected with the exception of a sanitary sewer crossing, which will be aerial across the creek. This limits disturbance of the natural channel and buffers.

[Back to Top](#)

**BROADSTONE AT MORELAND DRI**  
**DeKalb County**  
**Natural Resources Group Comments**  
**June 30, 2021**

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 Intrinchment Creek Watershed, which is part of South River Watershed. The South River Watershed 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**

Intrinchment Creek runs just inside the project property at its the eastern boundary. The submitted site plan shows the DeKalb County Stream Buffer Ordinance's 75-foot stream buffer along the entire length of Intrinchment Creek on the project property. The 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation buffer is not shown but does apply to this stream. No intrusions into the buffers are shown on the plans. Any proposed intrusions into the buffers will be subject to the requirements of the DeKalb County Stream Buffer Ordinance and State Erosion and Sedimentation Act and may require variances. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the DeKalb County 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.

**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** #3306  
**DRI Title** Broadstone at Moreland  
**County** DeKalb County  
**City (if applicable)** City of Atlanta  
**Address / Location** Southeast corner of the intersection of SR 42/US 23 (Moreland Avenue) and Custer Avenue.

**Proposed Development Type:**

The develop proposes 354 units of multi-family housing, 188 units of townhomes, and an existing 11,019 sf Dollar Tree store.

**Build Out** : 2024

**Review Process** ☐ EXPEDITED  
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Aries Little  
**Copied** [Click here to enter text.](#)  
**Date** July 6, 2021

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** A&R Engineering Inc.  
**Date** June 29, 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)*

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

☒ NO *(provide comments below)*

The are no projects within the study area. However, there are two trail projects (ARC IDs DK-455 and DK-456) southeast of the project area.

## **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)*

There are three proposed driveways for the development site. Driveway 1 is located on SR42/US 23 (Moreland Avenue) and Drives 1 and 2 are located on Cluster Avenue.

**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*)

Driveway 1 will be directly served by SR 42/US 23 (Moreland), which is a Regional Truck Route.

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

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

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

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

Operator / Rail Line

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

Although there is no nearby rail service planned, there is a long-range Transit/BRT Capital project, ARC-420, on I-20 that will go from Downtown Atlanta to the Stonecrest Mall area.



**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) 4, 832, & 9

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)

Based on aerial view of the sidewalks on Moreland Avenue, the sidewalks appear to be narrow, and portions are missing. The sidewalks on Cluster Avenue are incomplete.

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)

There are no current bicycle accommodations on Moreland Avenue or Cluster Avenue. Moreland Avenue has a higher volume of traffic and a significant amount of truck traffic.

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

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

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

☐ NO

☒ YES

MARTA operates within the jurisdiction.

**08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.**

*Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.*

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

[Click here to provide name of facility.](#)

Distance

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

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access\*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

Bicycling Access\*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

- ☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

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

## **OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS**

### **09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible 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*)

The proposed site plan illustrates 8 ft. sidewalk and crosswalk accommodations throughout the development and at the proposed driveways, including the development frontage.

**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)

Currently, the sidewalk on Cluster Avenue is not continuous. The proposed sidewalks of the development's frontage could potentially connect to future sidewalks.

**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):**



