

GEONG 1 30303

ATLANTS

April 2, 2004

Honorable C. Crandle Bray, Chairman Clayton County Commission 112 Smith Street Jonesboro, Georgia 30236

RE: Development of Regional Impact Review River's Station at W. Fayetteville Road

TONAL COMMISSION

Dear Chairman Bray:

I am writing to let you know that the ARC staff has completed the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of River's Station at W. Fayetteville Road. After reviewing the information submitted for the review, and the comments received from affected agencies, the Atlanta Regional Commission finding is that this DRI is in the bast interest of the State. The Atlanta Regional Commission reviewed the proposed project with regard to conflicts to regional plans, goals, and policies and impacts it might have on the activities, plans, goals, and policies of other local jurisdictions and state, federal, and other agencies. The finding does not address whether the project is or is not in the best interest of Clayton County.

40 COURTLAND STREET, NE

Due to concerns expressed by the City of College Park and Fayette County, it is recommended that all involved parties hold further discussions relating to the transportation impact of the development. This will allow the development to proceed, while offering additional opportunities to resolve and coordinate transportation infrastructure issues in the area. I am enclosing a copy of our final review report and a copy of comments we received during the review from several local jurisdictions. Please feel free to call me, or Mike Alexander (404-463-3302), if you have any questions concerning the review.

Sincerely.

Charles Krautler Director

CK/mda

Enclosures

C: Ms. Teresa A. Crow, Clayton County Mr. Mills M. Bryce, Developer Mr. Harold Linnenkohl, GDOT Mr. Rick Brooks, GDCA Mr. David Word, GEPD Mr. Steven Stancil, GRTA Mr. William Fernandez, MARTA Chairman Gregory M. Dunn, Fayette County Mayor Jack P. Longino, City of College Park Mr. Scott Miller, City of College Park Mr. Christopher Jones, City of College Park Mr. Bill Johnston, Strategic Planning Initiatives Mr. Jeff Metarko, Clayton County Ms. Chris Venice, Fayette County

+

#### **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:**

The River's Station at West Fayetteville Road development includes 20,000 square feet of office space, 200,000 square feet of retail space, 200 single family detached homes, 140 detached townhouses, 120 attached townhouses, and 417 multiple family units on 112 acres of land. There is a central recreational amenity located within 20 acres of designated open space. The development is located along the east and west sides of West Fayetteville Road to the south of I-285 in unincorporated northwest Clayton County.

#### **PROJECT PHASING:**

The project is to be completed as a single phase with completion projected for 2008.

#### **GENERAL**

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

### Is the proposed project consistent with the host-local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

No, the site is designated for "Light Industrial" use with the Clayton County's Future Land Use Plan. The entire site will require rezoning from the current "Industrial" classification to the proposed "Planned Unit Development" (PUD) classification. However, the proposed mix of office, retail, and residential uses is consistent with the local and regional development goals for jobs-housing balance. The proposed project does reflect the mixed-use development policies of Clayton's County Comprehensive Plan.

### Is the proposed project consistent with any potentially affected local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

The site proposed for development is approximately ½ a mile from Fayette County to the west and the ½ a mile to the City of College Park to the north. No inconsistencies were identified; however, concerns were raised by the City of College Park and by Fayette County concerning the potential impacts to the existing road infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of the development. The letters from all impacted governments and agencies are attached to the end of the review report.

# Will the proposed project impact the implementation of any local government's short-term work program? If so, how?

No impact was identified, however several intersections within the City of College Park will be impacted by the development and a greater emphasis may be required upon those intersections in future studies and work.





#### Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

This project meets or exceeds many of the policies and best development practices of the Regional Development Plan (RDP). However, the site design could be further refined to improve the consistency with RDP Policies and Practices. It is strongly recommended that the following policies and practices be used to evaluate the current site design:

#### **Regional Development Plan Policies**

- 1. Provide development strategies and infrastructure investments to accommodate forecasted population and employment growth more efficiently.
- 2. Guide an increased share of new development to the Central Business District, transportation corridors, activity centers and town centers.
- 3. Increase opportunities for mixed-use development, infill and redevelopment.
- 4. Increase transportation choices and transit-oriented development (TOD).
- 5. Provide a variety of housing choices throughout the region to ensure housing for individuals and families of diverse incomes and age groups.
- 6. Preserve and enhance existing residential neighborhoods.
- 7. Advance sustainable greenfield development.
- 8. Protect environmentally sensitive areas.
- 9. Create a regional network of greenspace that connects across jurisdictional boundaries.
- 10. Preserve existing rural character.
- 11. Preserve historic resources.
- 12. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local and neighborhood levels.
- 13. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support the RDP.
- 14. Support growth management at the state level.

#### BEST LAND USE PRACTICES

Practice 1: Keep vehicle miles of travel (VMT) below the area average. Infill developments are the best at accomplishing this. The more remote a development the more self contained it must be to stay below the area average VMT.

Practice 2: Contribute to the area's jobs-housing balance. Strive for a job-housing balance with a three to five mile area around a development site.

Practice 3: Mix land uses at the finest grain the market will bear and include civic uses in the mix.

Practice 4: Develop in clusters and keep the clusters small. This will result in more open space preservation. Practice 5: Place higher-density housing near commercial centers, transit lines and parks. This will enable more walking, biking and transit use.

Practice 6: Phase convenience shopping and recreational opportunities to keep pace with housing. These are valued amenities and translate into less external travel by residents if located conveniently to housing. Practice 7: Make subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges. This is traditional development.

Practice 8: Reserve school sites and donate them if necessary to attract new schools. This will result in neighborhood schools which provide a more supportive learning environment than larger ones.



Practice 9: Concentrate commercial development in compact centers or districts, rather than letting it spread out in strips.

Practice 10: Make shopping centers and business parks into all-purpose activity centers. Suburban shopping centers and their environs could be improved by mixing uses and designing them with the pedestrian amenities of downtowns.

Practice 11: Tame auto-oriented land uses, or at least separate them from pedestrian-oriented uses. Relegate "big box" stores to areas where they will do the least harm to the community fabric.

#### BEST TRANSPORTATION PRACTICES

Practice 1: Design the street network with multiple connections and relatively direct routes.

Practice 2: Space through-streets no more than a half mile apart, or the equivalent route density in a curvilinear network.

Practice 3: Use traffic-calming measures liberally. Use short streets, sharp curves, center islands, traffic circles, textured pavements, speed bumps and raised crosswalks.

Practice 4: Keep speeds on local streets down to 20 mph.

Practice 5: Keep speeds on arterials and collectors down to 35 mph (at least inside communities).

Practice 6: Keep all streets as narrow as possible and never more than four traffic lanes wide. Florida suggests access streets 18 feet, subcollectors 26 feet, and collectors from 28 feet to 36 feet depending on lanes and parking. Practice 7: Align streets to give buildings energy-efficient orientations. Allow building sites to benefit from sun angles, natural shading and prevailing breezes.

Practice 8: Avoid using traffic signals wherever possible and always space them for good traffic progression. Practice 9: Provide networks for pedestrians and bicyclists as good as the network for motorists.

Practice 10: Provide pedestrians and bicyclists with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets. Practice 11: Incorporate transit-oriented design features.

Practice 12: Establish TDM programs for local employees. Ridesharing, modified work hours, telecommuting and others.

#### BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

Practice 1: Use a systems approach to environmental planning. Shift from development orientation to basins or ecosystems planning.

Practice 2: Channel development into areas that are already disturbed.

Practice 3: Preserve patches of high-quality habitat, as large and circular as possible, feathered at the edges and connected by wildlife corridors. Stream corridors offer great potential.

Practice 4: Design around significant wetlands.

Practice 5: Establish upland buffers around all retained wetlands and natural water bodies.

Practice 6: Preserve significant uplands, too.

Practice 7: Restore and enhance ecological functions damaged by prior site activities.

Practice 8: Detain runoff with open, natural drainage systems. The more natural the system the more valuable it will be for wildlife and water quality.

Practice 9: Design man-made lakes and stormwater ponds for maximum environmental value. Recreation, stormwater management, wildlife habitat and others.

Practice 10: Use reclaimed water and integrated pest management on large landscaped areas. Integrated pest management involves controlling pests by introducing their natural enemies and cultivating disease and insect resistant grasses.

Practice 11: Use and require the use of Xeriscape<sup>™</sup> landscaping. Xeriscaping<sup>™</sup> is water conserving landscape methods and materials.

#### BEST HOUSING PRACTICES

Practice 1: Offer "life cycle" housing. Providing integrated housing for every part of the "life cycle".



Practice 2: Achieve an average net residential density of six to seven units per acre without the appearance of crowding. Cluster housing to achieve open space.

Practice 3: Use cost-effective site development and construction practices. Small frontages and setbacks; rolled curbs or no curbs; shared driveways.

Practice 4: Design of energy-saving features. Natural shading and solar access.

Practice 5: Supply affordable single-family homes for moderate-income households.

Practice 6: Supply affordable multi-family and accessory housing for low-income households.

Practice 7: Tap government housing programs to broaden and deepen the housing/income mix.

Practice 8: Mix housing to the extent the market will bear.

### Will the proposed project generate population and/or employment increases in the Region? If yes, what would be the major infrastructure and facilities improvements needed to support the increase?

Yes, the proposed development would increase housing and employment opportunities in the area and provide services and employment opportunities for existing and future residents.

#### What other major development projects are planned near the proposed project?

The ARC has reviewed other major development projects, known as Area Plan (1984 to1991) or as a DRI (1991 to present), within a two-mile radius of the proposed project.

Year	Name
2001	JA Green Development
1999	Flat Shoals Crossing
1993	Commuter Runway at Hartfield's Airport
1999	Hartfields Master Plan

### Will the proposed project displace housing units or community facilities? If yes, identify and give number of units, facilities, etc.

The site is undeveloped.

#### Will the development cause a loss in jobs? If yes, how many.

No.

#### **LOCATION**

#### Where is the proposed project located within the host-local government's boundaries?

The development is located along the east and west sides of West Fayetteville Road just south of I-285. The site includes 15 acres on the west side of West Fayetteville Road on the north side of Pleasant Hill Road with proposed access to Pleasant Hill Road, as well as approximately 99 acres on the east side of West Fayetteville Road with access to Norman Road to the north and three access points on West Fayetteville Road.



# Will the proposed project be located close to the host-local government's boundary with another local government? If yes, identify the other local government.

The property is located in northwest Clayton County. The site proposed for development is approximately  $\frac{1}{2}$  a mile from Fayette County to the west and the  $\frac{1}{2}$  a mile to the City of College Park to the north. No inconsistencies were identified; however, concerns were raised by the City of College Park and by Fayette County concerning the potential impacts to the existing road infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of the development. The letters from all impacted governments and agencies are attached to the end of the review report. The property is approximately 3800ft. from the Fulton County line.

# Will the proposed project be located close to land uses in other jurisdictions that would benefit, or be negatively impacted, by the project? Identify those land uses which would benefit and those which would be negatively affected and describe impacts.

The property is surrounded by industrial land uses to the north and southwest, pubic/institutional uses to the northwest, specifically, North Clayton High School, Northcutt Elementary School and North Clayton Middle School, and townhomes and other residential uses to the east and south.

#### **ECONOMY OF THE REGION**

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

#### What new taxes will be generated by the proposed project?

Estimated value of the development is \$148,770,800 with an expected \$1,550,073 in annual property tax revenues.

#### How many short-term jobs will the development generate in the Region?

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

#### Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?

Yes.

# In what ways could the proposed development have a positive or negative impact on existing industry or business in the Region?

The proposed development will increase housing and employment opportunities in the area and provide services and employment opportunities for existing and future residents. The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 467 jobs and attract approximately 1,516 residents by the build out date in 2008. The proposed development will provide opportunities to live and work within the development's boundary.



#### NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located in or near wetlands, groundwater recharge area, water supply watershed, protected river corridor, or other environmentally sensitive area of the Region? If yes, identify those areas.

No, the project will not impact any water supply watersheds, significant groundwater recharge areas, wetlands, protected mountains, protected river corridors, 100 year floodplain, or historic resources. There is a stream along the southeastern boundary of the site; however, it is protected by the County mandated 100-foot undisturbed buffer.

In addition to comments made in the preliminary review report, EPD adds the following:

#### **Stream and Watershed Protection**

The proposed project is in the Flint River Water Supply Watershed, a water supply source for Clayton County. The watershed is greater than 100 square miles above the intake and there is no reservoir directly on the Flint within this watershed area. Therefore, the only criteria applicable to the property under the Georgia Planning Act's Part 5 minimum water supply watershed criteria apply to the handling and storage of hazardous materials and hazardous waste. No other criteria apply. The State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation buffer is shown along Camp Creek where it runs along the project property line. Although no flood plain is indicated, the area near the creek is designated as open space.

#### Storm Water / Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed development. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr). The loading factors are based on regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. Because there is no factor for single-family residential on lots of less than ¼ acre, all residential has been classified as townhouse apartment. Actual loading factors will depend on the amount of impervious surface in the final project design. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

Land Use	Land Area (ac)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Commercial	20.00	34.20	348.00	2160.00	19660.00	24.60	4.40
Townhouse/Apartment	92.00	96.60	985.32	6164.00	55660.00	69.92	12.88
TOTAL	112.00	449.87	1333.32	8324.00	75320.00	94.52	17.28

#### **Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year:**

Total % impervious

55%

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) and meet the stormwater management quantity



and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

The County should not release the site plans for development or issue any grading or construction permits until a storm water management plan has been approved and a fully executed maintenance/monitoring agreement is in place.

#### **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

Will the proposed project be located near a national register site? If yes, identify site.

No.

In what ways could the proposed project create impacts that would damage the resource?

Not applicable.

In what ways could the proposed project have a positive influence on efforts to preserve or promote the historic resource?

Not applicable.

#### INFRASTRUCTURE Transportation

#### **Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Review Findings**

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Non-expedited Review. The proposed development will be situated on the east and west sides of West Fayetteville Road (SR 314) in Clayton County south of Norman Drive on a 112 acre site. On the west side will be 120 townhouses and retail shopping consisting of 36,000 square feet. On the east side will be apartments at 240 units, townhouses at 140 units, single-family homes at 280 units, office space at 25,000 square feet and 164,000 square feet of retail shopping space. Build-out is scheduled for 2008 and is to be completed in one phase. Access points for the development will be coordinated through seven driveways.

Preliminary Report:	March 2, 2004	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	River's Station DRI #482
Final Report Due:	April 2, 2004	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 16, 2004

### How much traffic (both average daily and peak am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?

Marc R. Acampora, PE, LLC performed the transportation analysis. GRTA and ARC review staff agreed with the methodology and assumptions used in the analysis. The net trip generation is based on the rates published in the 7<sup>th</sup> edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

Land Use	P.M. Peak Hour			Saturday Peak Hour			24-Hour
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	2-Way
	West of W	Vest Fay	etteville R	oad			
Townhouses (120 units)	27	7	34	22	19	41	355
Shopping Center (36,000 square feet)	56	58	114	98	88	187	1,505
East of West Fayetteville Road							
Apartments (240 Units)							
Single-Family Homes (280 Units)							
Townhouses (140 Units)	272	145	417	207	188	395	4,267
Office (25,000 square feet)	18	89	107	7	5	12	458
Shopping Center (164,000 square feet)	256	272	529	443	394	838	6,776
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	546	506	1,053	657	587	1,245	11,501

### What are the existing traffic patterns and volumes on the local, county, state and interstate roads that serve the site?

Incorporating the trip generation results, the transportation consultant distributed the traffic on the current roadway network. An assessment of the existing Level of Service (LOS) and projected LOS based on the trip distribution findings helps to determine the study network. The results of this exercise determined the study network, which has been approved by ARC and GRTA. If analysis of an intersection or roadway results in a substandard LOS "D", then the consultant recommends improvements.

Projected traffic volumes from the Regional Travel Demand Model are compared to the assigned capacity of facilities within the study network. This data is used to calculate a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The V/C ratio values that define the LOS thresholds vary depending on factors such as the type of terrain traversed and the percent of the road where passing is prohibited. As a V/C ratio reaches 1.0, congestion increases. The V/C ratios for traffic in various network years are presented in the following table. Any facilities that have a V/C ratio of 0.8 or above are considered congested.

V/C Ratios

		AM					РМ						
			Volume			V/C			Volume		V/C		
	Lns/dir.	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB
				West F	ayettevill	e Road (S	SR 314) ad	jacent to	site			•	
2005	1	3,120	740	2,380	0.52	0.25	0.79	3,960	2,590	1,370	0.66	0.86	0.46
2010	2	3.660	740	2 920	0.31	0.12	0.49	5.140	3 640	1 500	0.43	0.61	0.25
2025	2	4,940	660	4,280	0.41	0.11	0.71	7,820	4,990	2,830	0.65	0.83	0.47
% Change 2005-2010		17.3%	0.0%	22.7%	- 41.3%	- 52.0%	-38.0%	29.8%	40.5%	9.5%	- 34.8%	- 29.1%	-45.7%
% Change 2010-2025		35.0%	- 10.8%	46.6%	34.4%	-8.3%	44.9%	52.1%	37.1%	88.7%	51.2%	36.1%	88.0%
% Change 2005-2025		58.3%	- 10.8%	79.8%	- 21.2%	- 56.0%	-10.1%	97.5%	92.7%	106.6%	-1.5%	-3.5%	2.2%
				West Fay	etteville H	Road (SR	314) at Fl	at Shoals	s Road				
2005	1	3,820	1,000	2,820	0.56	0.29	0.83	5,040	3,170	1,870	0.74	0.93	0.55
2010	1	4,290	980	3,310	0.63	0.29	0.97	6,110	4,170	1,940	0.90	1.23	0.57
2025	2	6,000	940	5,060	0.44	0.14	0.74	9,410	6,040	3,370	0.70	0.89	0.50
% Change 2005-2010		12.3%	-2.0%	17.4%	12.5%	0.0%	16.9%	21.2%	31.5%	3.7%	21.6%	32.3%	3.6%
% Change 2010-2025		39.9%	-4.1%	52.9%	- 30.2%	- 51.7%	-23.7%	54.0%	44.8%	73.7%	- 22.8%	- 27.6%	-12.3%
% Change 2005-2025		57.1%	-6.0%	79.4%	- 21.4%	- 51.7%	-10.8%	86.7%	90.5%	80.2%	-6.1%	-4.3%	-9.1%
					Riverdal	e Road at	t Phoenix	Blvd.					
2005	2	6.0.40	2.020	4.020	0.49	0.29	0.69	10,05	( 290	2 770	0.70	0.97	0.52
2005	2	0,940	2,020	4,920	0.48	0.28	0.08	8.040	5.(40	2,200	0.70	0.79	0.32
2025	2	7,050	2,030	5,020	0.49	0.28	0.70	8,940	5,640	3,300	0.62	0.78	0.46
%	2	6,810	2,080	4,/30	0.48	0.29	0.66	9,600	6,250	3,350	0.67	0.8/	0.4/
Change 2005-2010		1.6%	0.5%	2.0%	2 1%	0.0%	2 9%	-	- 10.2%	-12 5%	- 10.8%	- 10 3%	-11 5%
%		1.0 /0	0.370	2.070	2.1 /0	0.070	2.970	11.0 /0	10.2 /0	-12.370	10.0 /0	10.5 /0	-11.570
Change 2010-2025		-3.4%	2.5%	-5.8%	-3.1%	3.6%	-5.7%	7.4%	10.8%	1.5%	8.1%	11.5%	2.2%
% Change 2005-2025		-1.9%	3.0%	-3.9%	-1.0%	3.6%	-2.9%	-4.5%	-0.5%	-11.1%	-3.6%	0.0%	-9.6%
				I-2	285 Over	pass alon	g Riverda	le Road					
2005	2	4,940	0	4,940	0.69	0.00	0.69	4,350	0	4,350	0.60	0.00	0.60
2010	2	5,540	0	5,540	0.77	0.00	0.77	4,940	0	4,940	0.69	0.00	0.69
2025	2	6,940	0	6,940	0.96	0.00	0.96	7,420	0	7,420	1.03	0.00	1.03
% Change 2005-2010		12.1%	0.0%	12.1%	11.6%	0.0%	11.6%	13.6%	0.0%	13.6%	15.0%	0.0%	15.0%
% Change 2010-2025		25.3%	0.0%	25.3%	24.7%	0.0%	24.7%	50.2%	0.0%	50.2%	49,3%	0.0%	49.3%



Prelimina Report:	ary	March 2, 2004		DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT					Project	:: R #	iver's Sta 482	tion DRI	
Final Rep	oort	April 2,			KE		EPORT				ents   M	larch 16, 2	2004
Due:		2004								Due by	6		
%													
Change 2005-2025		40.5%	0.0%	40.5%	39.1%	0.0%	39.1%	70.6%	0.0%	70.6%	71.7%	0.0%	71.7%
			,.								, .		
				А	М					Р	М		
			Volume			V/C			Volume			V/C	
	Lns/dir.	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB	Total	SB/EB	NB/WB
	I-285 Underpass along West Fayetteville Road												
2005	1	2,420	630	1,790	0.41	0.21	0.6	3,420	2,240	1,180	0.57	0.75	0.39
2010	2	2,710	580	2,130	0.23	0.10	0.36	4,200	3,000	1,200	0.35	0.50	0.2
2025	2	4,050	220	3,830	0.34	0.04	0.64	3,580	1,020	2,560	0.30	0.17	0.43
% Change 2005-2010		12.0%	-7.9%	19.0%	- 43.2%	- 52.4%	-40.0%	22.8%	33.9%	1.7%	- 38.6%	- 33.3%	-48.7%
% Change 2010-2025		49.4%	- 62.1%	79.8%	47.8%	- 60.0%	77.8%	- 14.8%	- 66.0%	113.3%	- 14.3%	- 66.0%	115.0%
% Change 2005-2025		67.4%	- 65.1%	114.0%	- 16.0%	- 81.0%	6.7%	4.7%	- 54.5%	116.9%	- 47.4%	- 77.3%	10.3%
				Rive	rdale Roa	nd (at I-28	85 EB on/o	off ramp	s)				
2005	2	11 100	2 (90	7.510	0.70	0.51	1.04	15,44	0.010	( (20)	1.07	1.00	0.02
2005	2	11,190	3,080	7,510	0./8	0.51	1.04	15,23	8,810	0,030	1.07	1.22	0.92
2025	2	11,340	3,830	7,510	0.79	0.53	1.04	0	8,230	7,000	1.06	1.14	0.97
	2	11,770	4,330	7,440	0.82	0.60	1.03	0	11,000	8,370	1.35	1.53	1.16
% Change 2005-2010		1.3%	4.1%	0.0%	1.3%	3.9%	0.0%	-1.4%	-6.6%	5.6%	-1.4%	-6.6%	5.4%
% Change 2010-2025		3.8%	13.1%	-0.9%	3.8%	13.2%	-1.0%	27.2%	33.7%	19.6%	27.5%	34.2%	19.6%
% Change 2005-2025		5.2%	17.7%	-0.9%	5.2%	17.6%	-1.0%	25.5%	24.9%	26.2%	25.7%	25.4%	26.1%

For the V/C ratio table, the data is based on 2005, 2010 and 2025 A.M./P.M. peak volume data generated from ARC's travel demand model for the 2025 RTP Limited Update and FY 2003-2005 TIP, adopted in October 2002. The demand model incorporates lane addition improvements and updates to the network as appropriate. As the life of the RTP progresses, volume and/or V/C ratio data may appear inconsistent due to (1) effect of implementation of nearby new or expanded facilities or (2) impact of socio-economic data on facility types.

What transportation improvements are under construction or planned for the Region that would affect or be affected by the proposed project? What is the status of these improvements (long or short range or other)?

2003-2005 TIP\*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Year
AR-508	Riverdale Road – SR 139 from I-285 South to Airport Boulevard	Roadway Operations	2006
CL-062	SR 314 – Fayetteville Road from Norman Drive/CR255 to SR 139/Riverdale Road	Roadway Capacity	2009

#### 2025 RTP Limited Update\*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Year
CL-005	SR 314 – West Fayetteville Road from SR 279 (Fayette County) to Norman Drive	Roadway Capacity	2012

\*The ARC Board adopted the 2025 RTP Limited Update and FY 2003-2005 TIP in October 2002. USDOT approved in January 2003

#### Impacts of River's Station: What are the recommended transportation improvements based on the traffic study done by the applicant?

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year background traffic. As a result, the transportation consultant has indicated improvement recommendations to allow for an upgrade of the existing level of service to occur. Such improvements will establish an adequate level of service for the area and are as follows:

- 1. Widen Riverdale Road between Phoenix Boulevard and Norman Drive to three southbound through lanes.
- 2. Widen Riverdale Road at Flat Shoals Road intersection to three northbound through lanes. Eastbound and westbound left turn phasing should both be changed to protected/permitted.
- 3. Add northbound exclusive right-turn lane, eastbound exclusive right-turn lane, and a southbound exclusive right-turn lane at the intersection of West Fayetteville Road and Phoenix Boulevard.
- 4. Widen southbound West Fayetteville Road to two through lanes from East Fayetteville Road to Creel Drive

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year total traffic only. As a result, the transportation consultant has indicated improvement recommendations to allow for an upgrade of the existing level of service to occur. Such improvements will establish an adequate level of service for the area and are as follows:

- 1. Widen southbound West Favetteville Road from Riverdale Road to Phoenix Boulevard/Godby Road to include two through travel lanes.
- 2. Widen northbound Riverdale Road at Phoenix Boulevard to three through travel lanes.
- 3. Add free-flowing westbound exclusive right turn lane on Riverdale Road at I-85 southbound ramp intersection.
- 4. Widen northbound West Fayetteville Road between Creel Drive and East Fayetteville Road to include two through travel lanes.

Will the proposed project be located in a rapid transit station area? If yes, how will the proposed project enhance or be enhanced by the rapid transit system?



The proposed project is not located in a rapid transit station area.

#### Is the site served by transit? If so, describe type and level of service.

There is a Clayton County Transit (C-TRAN) route along Phoenix Drive and Riverdale Road. However, this route is not within reasonable walking distance of the site area.

Are there plans to provide or expand transit service in the vicinity of the proposed project?

Future plans to expand transit service are currently unknown at this time.

### What transportation demand management strategies does the developer propose (carpool, flex-time, transit subsidy, etc.)?

None proposed.

#### The development PASSES the ARC's Air Quality Benchmark test.

Air Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based on ARC strategies)	Type Yes below if taking the credit or blank if not	Credits	Total
Mixed Use Targets (w/sidewalks)			
Where Residential is dominant, 10% Retail and 10% Office	Yes	9%	9%
Transportation Service Enhancements (choose one)			
TMA or Parking Management Program	Yes	3%	3%
Bike/ped networks connecting to land uses within and adjoining the site	Yes	5%	5%
Total Calculated ARC Air Quality Credits (15 % reduction required)	Meets Bench	mark Standards	17%

# What are the conclusions of this review? Is the transportation system (existing and planned) capable of accommodating these trips?

Although the area surrounding River's Station is low in density, attention must be paid to adjacent existing roadway networks. The V/C ratios previously indicated in this review show that with increased demand on roads such as Riverdale Road, problems may occur in exceeding capacity. V/C ratios for future years already project high levels of congestion on this specific roadway. West Fayetteville Road does not have nor will have problems as serious. Yet with increased demand for access and proximity to I-285, I-85 and Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, congestion will increase further if improvements are not made to signalization coordination and capacity. Despite



the roadway improvements that require attention, River's Station does focus on encouraging pedestrian traffic. However, with schools located across the street from the proposed site and being on a major arterial scheduled for widening, bicycle lanes should be provided for the safety of all cyclists.

#### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

#### Wastewater and Sewage

Wastewater is estimated at 0.276 MGD based on regional averages.

#### Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Information submitted with the review state that Clayton County- RL Jackson and WB Casey Wastewater Treatment Plants will provide wastewater treatment service to the project.

#### What is the current permitted capacity and average annual flow to this facility?

The current permitted capacity to the RL Jackson WTP is 4.5MGD. The current permitted capacity to the WB Casey WTP is 15MGD.

#### What other major developments will be served by the plant serving this project?

ARC has reviewed a number of major developments that will be served by this plant.

#### <u>INFRASTRUCTURE</u> Water Supply and Treatment

#### How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.317 MGD based on regional averages.

### How will the proposed project's demand for water impact the water supply or treatment facilities of the jurisdiction providing the service?

There appears to be sufficient capacity for this project to be constructed. **INFRASTRUCTURE Solid Waste** 

#### How much solid waste will be generated by the project? Where will this waste be disposed?

Information submitted with the review estimates 368,683 tons of solid waste per year. The waste will be disposed at the Clayton County Landfill.

Other than adding to a serious regional solid waste disposal problem, will the project create any unusual waste handling or disposal problems?



No.

Are there any provisions for recycling this project's solid waste.

None stated.

#### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

#### Other facilities

According to information gained in the review process, will there be any unusual intergovernmental impacts on:

- Levels of governmental services?
- Administrative facilities?
- · Schools?
- Libraries or cultural facilities?
- Fire, police, or EMS?
- Other government facilities?

# • Other community services/resources (day care, health care, low income, non-English speaking, elderly, etc.)?

Attached to this report are comments received from the Clayton County school system. Due to the location of three existing schools in the immediate area, it is unlikely a school facility will be constructed on site.

#### **HOUSING**

#### Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

Yes. However, there is a diverse mixture of housing proposed for the development including single-family, townhouse, and multiple-family residential units.

#### Will the proposed project provide housing opportunities close to existing employment centers?

The proposed development is located within two miles of Atlanta Hartsfield Airport.

#### Is there housing accessible to the project in all price ranges demanded?

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 402.01. This tract had a 1.9 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2003 according to ARC's Population and Housing



report. The report shows that 36 percent of the housing units are single-family, compared to 69 percent for the region; thus indicating a need for additional housing options in the development area. The proposed development will provide additional options for single-family residences and provide a senior living component to the area.

### Is it likely or unlikely that potential employees of the proposed project will be able to find affordable\* housing?

Yes. As stated in the Area of Influence study submitted with the review, 89% of the potential new employees of the project will have the ability to living in the most affordable housing of the development.

\* Defined as 30 percent of the income of a family making 80 percent of the median income of the Region – FY 2000 median income of \$51,649 for family of 4 in Georgia.



CITY OF COLLEGE PARK

P.O. BOX 87137 • COLLEGE PARK, GA 30337 • 404/767-1537

March 16, 2004

BY MAIL AND FAXED TO 404-463-3105

Haley Fleming, Senior Planner Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Courtland Street NE Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Re: DRI-River Station at West Fayetteville Road

Dear Mis. Fleming:

Please be advised that the above referenced DRI has the potential to impact College Park's streets network.

Enclosed herewith please find a copy of a memorandum dated March 15, 2004 from Bill Johnston, City Planner, noting the traffic impacts of this DRI on College Park. Hopefully your office will incorporate our comments into the approval process for this DRI.

Should you have any questions on any of College Park's comments, please feel free to contact Mr. Johnston or myself.

Sincerely,

CITY OF COLLEGE PARK

J. Scott Miller

J. Scott Miller City Manager

Enclosure

#### STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVES LLC Planning, Zoning and Economic Development

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Scott Miller, City Manager

FROM: Bill Johnston, City Planner

RE: DRI River Station at West Fayetteville Road

DATE: Monday, 15 March 2004

The proposed River's Station development featuring 200,000 square feet of retail space and 877 dwelling units has the potential to impact College Park's street network. The development would be located on the west and east sides of West Fayetteville Road at Pleasant Hill Road and Norman Drive. This development is just south of College Park city limits. Traffic impacts can be expected to represents the most significant impact. These and other impacts are considered below:

#### Traffic Impacts

While some traffic will access I-285 via Norman Drive and on to Riverdale Road, some will utilize Godby Road and West Fayetteville Road. Phoenix Boulevard could also be impacted.

The DRI reports on page 13 of 16 that "The Volume to Capacity ratios previously indicated in this review show that with increased demand on roads such as Riverdale Road, problems may occur in exceeding capacity. V/C ratios for future years already project high levels of congestion on this specific roadway. West Fayetteville Road does not have nor will have problems as serious. Yet, with increased demand for access and proximity to I-285, I-85 and Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport, <u>congestion will increase further if</u> <u>improvements are not made in regards to signalization coordination and capacity</u>." A number of road improvements accompany the study performed by Marc R. Acampora. Among these are the following:

- Widen Riverdale Road between Phoenix Boulevard and Norman Drive to three southbound through lanes.
- Add northbound exclusive right-turn lane, east bound exclusive right-turn lane and a southbound exclusive right-turn at the intersection of West Fayetteville Road and Phoenix Boulevard.

1883 Princeton Avenue • College Park, GA 30337 • 404.684.6588 • Fax:404.766.0886 • spi.consulting@mindspring.com

#### STRATEGIC PLANNING INITIATIVES LLC Planning, Zoning and Economic Development

DRI River Station at West Fayetteville Road Monday, 15 March 2004 Page Two of Two

The improvements listed in item 2, above, indicate that more traffic will be generated on Phoenix Boulevard. This intersection is located in College Park. An important question to be answered is who will fund these improvements, not only the lane additions, but the signalization coordination and capacity improvements? The DRI references the following added improvements necessary to "allow for an upgrade of the existing level of service to occur:"

- A. Widen southbound West Fayetteville Road from Riverdale Road to Phoenix Boulevard/Godby Road to include two through travel lanes.
- B. Widen northbound Riverdale Road at Phoenix Boulevard to three through travel lanes.
- C. Add free-flowing westbound exclusive right turn lane on Riverdale Road at I-285 southbound ramp intersection.

Again, these improvements are within incorporated College Park. The DRI identifies relevant "Roadway Operations" and "Roadway Capacity" projects to be implemented in 2006 and 2009 on page 12 of 16. However, page 7 of 16 identifies the project build out date as 2008.

The funding, schedule and responsible agency should be identified for all of the signalization and capacity improvements described in the DRI.

#### Other Development Impacts

Other impacts such as those on water, sanitary sewer and solid waste facilities will not directly impact College Park. No doubt the added rooftops will enhance College Park's revitalization efforts on Old National Highway. This positive impact will be partially offset by the addition of the substantial 200,000 square feet of retail space. This represents a considerable addition to a market that is relatively close to Old National Highway.

1883 Princeton Avenue • College Park, GA 30337 • 404.684.6588 • Fax:404.766.0886 • spi.consulting@mindspring.com



### DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT

### **DRI-REQUEST FOR COMMENTS**

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Development Center for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient project of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to have impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is actually located such as 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 on this form and give us your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to the RDC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: River Station at West Favetteville Road See the Preliminary Report .

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

\* The Clayton County Water Authority is responsible for determining reserve water transport and treatment capacity at the R.L. Jackson and W.B. Casey wastewater treatment facilities. X the Infrasture (Wastewater and Sewage Section Pg. 14) section didn't indicate the average annual treated wastewater flow rate, Insufficient data was presented to make a determination on whether reserve transport and treatment capacity exists at both WPCPS, at the estimated wastewater flow generated by this project needs to be detailed by flow estimates for homes, town homes, detached townhomes, apartments, office space, retail space and central amently center.

Individual Completing form: Mark Beebe	
Local Government G.a. EPD - Worter Protection Branch Department Engineering & Technical Support Program	Please Return this form to: Mike Alexander, Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Countland Street NE Atlanta, GA 30303
Telephone ()(404) 675-1601	<ul> <li>Ph. (404) 463-3302 Fax (404) 463-3254</li> <li><u>malexander@atlantaregik mal.co.m</u></li> </ul>
Signature Mark Beele Date 3/10/04	Return Date: March 16, 2004



### DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT

### DRI-REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Development Center for review as a Development of Regional Impact(DRI). A DRU is a development of sufficient project of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to have impacts beyond the juncticiant in which the project is a tatality k cannot such as adjoining chestor meighboring 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 on this form and give us your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to the RDC on or before the specified return deadline.

Pretininary Factings of the RDC. River Station at West Favetaeville Road See the Pretiminary Report.

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

The proposed River's Station project is a mixed-use development that will infuse a significant amount of new retail, office and residential uses within 2 miles of the Old National/Godby Road area, to the east. College Park's future land use pattern [to the east and north of I-85 and I-285] has already been impacted by the acquisition of parcels for the expansion and improvement of Hartsfield-Jackson Airport. And like the Airport, the River's Station project will have both positive and adverse impacts on the City's development efforts.

As indicated, the amount of new retail, office and residential uses slated for the project speaks to the growth trend occurring in the south Atlanta area. And while River's Station will likely spur continued interest in development south of Atlanta [particularly around the Airport], the project may have the effect of diverting developer interest away from the Old National/Godby Road area, at least in the short term.

The impact of the project on traffic patterns, especially given the re-routing and redesign of streets resulting from the airport expansion, must be evaluated. The traffic impact of the project may directly affect Godby Road, making it a significant connector from West Fayetteville Road to Old National Highway.

Individual Completing form: CHRIGOD PHERE M.	толна , Деленуранных Давет	20		
Local Government & iny of CULLEDE PARK		Please Return dis form to:		
Department DEVELymmewr	<ul> <li>Mike Alexander, Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Countand Stream NE Atlanta, GA 30303</li> </ul>			
Tolephone (444) 669.3764		Ph (404) 463-3302 Pax (404) 463-3254 <u>malexander@atanarea.xata.vn</u>		
Signature LI RAME	Date: 3-18-04	Return Date: March 16. 2004		



# Clayton County Public Schools Facilities and Purchasing

218 Stockbridge Road • Jonesboro. Georgia 30236 • (770) 473-2825 • FAX (770) 473-2848 • www.clayton.k12.ga.us

Barbara M. Pulliam, Ed.D. Superintendent of Schools

John Ramage Assistant Superintendent for Facilities and Construction James Conard Director of Maintenance Brian Miller Director of Facilities Auxiliary Services

March 16, 2004

Mike Alexander Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Courtland Street NE Atlanta, GA 30303

RE: River Station at West Fayetteville Road

Dear Mr. Alexander,

Clayton County Public Schools certainly endorses the need for progress; however, continuing land development poses a problem that needs to be addressed. The school system has the responsibility of providing adequate educational facilities for every child in Clayton County. It seems that we can't build schools fast enough to maintain the pace that is set by local development.

In the proposed area alone, our schools are overflowing and modular units are in place at every location.

- King Elementary School
- North Clayton High School
- North Clayton Middle School
- Northcutt Elementary School
- Oliver Elementary School

12 modular units 17 modular units 6 modular units

- 5 modular units
- 4 modular units

The development would potentially add 780 families to this area. Our position has always been that if developers would take education into consideration and provide a portion of their site for educational facilities, we would build "neighborhood schools". However, with the lack of available funding, we hesitate to spend ten million dollars in an area that could easily be taken over by airport expansion.

We continue to look for innovative ways to address these issues and welcome any suggestions that developers and/or contractors may have. Let's work together to make Clayton County great!

Sincerely,

- John Ramage Assistant Superintendent Facilities and Construction
- c: Crandle Bray, Commission Chair Clayton County Board of Commissioners Barbara M. Pulliam, Ed.D, Superintendent of Schools



Gregory M. Dunn. Chairman Linda Wells, Vice Chairman Herbert E. Frady. Commissioner Peter Pfeifer. Commissioner A. G. VanLandingham. Commissioner Chris W. Cofty. County Administrator W. R. McNally. Attorney Carol Chandler. Executive Assistant



Where Quality Is A Lifestyle

March 15, 2004

Mike Alexander, Review Coordinator Atlanta Regional commission 40 Courtland Street NE Atlanta, GA 30303

RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review #482 River Station at West Fayetteville Road

Dear Mr. Alexander:

We are in receipt of the above-referenced DRI Review Report for River Station at West Fayetteville Road. Having examined the Review Report, Fayette County has the following comments and/or concerns:

- 1. This project is within the headwaters of Camp Creek watershed, a tributary to the Flint River which is a major water supply source for Fayette County. For a portion of its run, Camp Creek serves as the boundary for Fayette and Clayton County. While Fayette County does not anticipate significant stormwater management concerns resulting from the project, we would suggest that a surface water-monitoring program be incorporated into the project's stormwater management plan. The data can be used to assess the effectiveness of the water quality controls as well as provide indications when maintenance is required on the Best Management practices.
- 2. Census 2000 data indicated that over 8,400 Fayette County residents work in the transportation sector, most of those being at the airport. SR 314 is the primary transportation corridor for Fayette County access to Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport. This area is already insufficient in providing adequate traffic flow, as evidenced by the improvement projects included in the TIP and the RTP. It is also acknowledged in the DRI that the proposed development will have an adverse impact on this corridor, as several road widening projects are proposed

\$

DRI #482 March 15, 2004 Page 2

Given the timing of the TIP and the RTP, it is apparent that the impacts of this development have not been considered in the timing of these proposed road improvement projects. Development of this project will dictate that these road improvement projects occur much sooner than scheduled in order to avoid capacity deficiencies.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of this major development which will greatly impact the travel patterns of Fayette County citizens. We would suggest that Clayton County work to move these projects up in the TIP and RTP schedules. Developer participation in the funding of these aforementioned road projects could also serve to expedite their completion.

Sincerely,

FAYETTE COUNTY COMMISSION

Dunn Chairman

CC.

Fayette County Commission Members