

# 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:** January 18, 2022

**TO:** Mayor Robert Price, City of Locust Grove  
**ATTN TO:** Anna Ogg, Planner II, City of Locust Grove  
**FROM:** Douglas R. Hooker, ARC Executive Director  
**RE:** Development of Regional Impact Review



Digital signature  
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission has completed a preliminary regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI's 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:** NS Logistics South DRI 3497

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Locust Grove

**Date Opened:** January 18, 2022

**Comments Due:** February 2, 2022

**Date to Close:** February 7, 2022

**Description:** A DRI Review of a proposal to build 1,865,000 SF of warehouse distribution space in 4 buildings on a 306-acre currently wooded site in the City of Locust Grove in Henry County bounded by I-75 on the west, Bethlehem Road on the south, and the Norfolk Southern rail line on the east. The project will include 752 auto and 510 truck parking spaces and five stormwater detention ponds. Vehicular site access is planned via a proposed full movement driveway along Bethlehem Road; no alternative transportation access is envisioned. The local DRI review trigger is an application for a land disturbance permit; the expected build out year is 2026.

## **PRELIMINARY COMMENTS:**

### **Key Comments**

*The proposal is somewhat consistent with policies applicable to the site's Developing Suburbs growth management category designation.*

*Substantial greenspace is proposed to be retained; adjustment of layout to add more greenspace where possible would enhance responsiveness to Developing Suburbs growth policies.*

*Stream buffer areas generally appear to be preserved, but several proposed parking areas appear to directly conflict with existing streams, and stream buffers are not marked on site plan.*

*The associated Transportation Impact Study could be improved with the addition of several planned nearby transportation projects.*

### **General Comments**

According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI site is designated as Developing Suburbs. The Plan's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details general information and policy recommendations for Developing Suburbs which are provided at the end of these comments.

The project proposes to construct 1,865,000 SF of warehouse distribution space in 4 buildings on a 306-acre currently wooded site in the City of Locust Grove in Henry County bounded by I-75 on the west, Bethlehem Road on the south, and the Norfolk Southern rail line on the east. The project will include 752 auto and 510 truck parking spaces and five stormwater detention ponds. Vehicular site access is planned via a proposed full movement driveway along Bethlehem Road; no alternative transportation access is envisioned.

### **Transportation and Mobility Comments**

ARC's Transportation Access and Mobility Group comments are attached.

The project will be served by a Regional Thoroughfare and a Regional Truck Route. There are limited to no opportunities at this time for utilizing or enhancing multi-modal transportation options.

The Transportation Impact Study should be updated to reflect additional relevant transportation projects as detailed in the ARC Transportation and Mobility Group Comments.

Care should be taken to ensure that the development, as constructed, promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all driveways, paths, entrances, and parking areas. To the maximum extent possible, new driveways and intersection corners where pedestrians will cross should be constructed with minimal curb radii to reduce speeds of turning vehicles and decrease crossing distances for pedestrians.

### **Natural Resources and Environment Comments**

ARC's Natural Resources Group comments are attached.

The project site is located entirely within the Indian Creek Water Supply Watershed which is a public water supply source for Henry County. Locust Grove has a protection ordinance for water supply watersheds in the City, including Indian Creek. All development in the watershed, including this project, is subject to all applicable requirements of that ordinance as specified in the Locust Grove City Code.

Three streams are shown on the project site plans and in general the development is proposed away from the stream areas. However, the actual stream buffer dimensions are not shown on the plans and should be added. Further, parking areas noted 20 and 37 on the site plan are placed directly over stream tributaries which is not in keeping with regional stream protection goals.

Additional retention of existing stands of trees would be desirable and in keeping with regional goals regarding carbon sequestration and climate change/heat island effect mitigation.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating other aspects of regional watershed 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.

### **Unified Growth Policy: Developing Suburbs**

There are a number of growth policy guidelines associated with the site's Developing Suburbs designation. Developing Suburb are areas in the region where suburban development has occurred and the conventional development pattern is present but not fully set. These areas are characterized by residential development with pockets of commercial and industrial development and represent the extent of the urban service area. There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses. Limited existing infrastructure in these areas will constrain the amount of additional growth that is possible. Transportation improvements are needed within these developing suburbs, but care should be taken not to spur unwanted growth.

The intensity and land use of this proposed project somewhat aligns with The Atlanta Region's Plan's recommendations for Developing Suburbs. The project could be more responsive to Developing Suburbs policies and goals by retaining additional greenspace area and utilizing green stormwater . City of Locust Grove leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure absolute maximum sensitivity to nearby local governments, neighborhoods, land uses and natural resources.

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

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COMMISSIONGEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY

CITY OF McDONOUGH

THREE RIVERS REGIONAL COMMISSION

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE

GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

GEORGIA CONSERVANCY

HENRY COUNTY

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

CITY OF LOCUST GROVE

SPALDING COUNTY

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Donald Shockey at (470) 378-1531 or [dshockey@atlantaregional.org](mailto:dshockey@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: **NS Logistics South** *See the Preliminary Report.*

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

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: (     )

Signature:

Date:

***Please return this form to:***

Donald Shockey  
Atlanta Regional Commission  
International Tower  
229 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 100  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
Ph. (470) 378-1531  
[dshockey@atlantaregional.org](mailto:dshockey@atlantaregional.org)

Return Date: *Feb 2 2022*

## ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Jan 19 2022

**ARC REVIEW CODE:**

#

**TO:** ARC Group Managers

**FROM:** Donald Shockey, 470-378-1531

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Community Development: Andrew Smith

### Transportation Access and Mobility: Aries Little

**Natural Resources:** Jim Santo

**Research and Analytics:** Jim Skinner

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

**Name of Proposal:** NS Logistics South

**Review Type:** DRI

**Description:** A Development of Regional Impact Review of a proposal to build 1,865,000 SF of warehouse distribution space in 4 buildings on a 306-acre currently wooded site in the City of Locust Grove in Henry County bounded by I-75 on the west, Bethlehem Road on the south, and the Norfolk Southern rail line on the east. The project will include 752 auto and 510 truck parking spaces and five stormwater detention ponds. Vehicular site access is planned via a proposed full movement driveway along Bethlehem Road; no alternative transportation access is envisioned. The local DRI review trigger is an application for a land disturbance permit; the expected build out year is 2026.

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Locust Grove

**Date Opened:** Jan 19 2022

**Deadline for Comments:** Feb 2 2022

**Date to Close:**

**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 #3497

#### 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: Locust Grove

Individual completing form: Anna Ogg

Telephone: 770-692-2324

E-mail: aogg@locustgrove-ga.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: NS Logistics South

Location (Street Address, GPS Land Lots 230, 246, 247,250,251- District 7- City of Locust Grove Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: Approximately 300-acre development consisting of 1,865,000 SF of industrial warehouse space in 4 buildings located along the north side of Bethlehem Rd between I-75 and the Norfolk Southern rail line.

#### Development Type:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected)                       | <input type="radio"/> Hotels                                | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office                               | <input type="radio"/> Mixed Use                             | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities    |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial                           | <input type="radio"/> Airports                              | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input 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 checked="" type="radio"/> Industrial                | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants     |   |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): Approximately 1,865,000 SF of industrial warehouse space

Developer: Majestic Realty Co.

Mailing Address: 3490 Piedmont Rd

Address 2:

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30305

Telephone: 404-467-5245

Email: bmccabe@majesticrealty.com

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

If yes, property owner: Norfolk Southern

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

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

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?

(not selected)Yes

No

If yes, provide the following information:

Project Name:

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: 2026

Overall project: 2026

Back to Top



## Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)**DRI #3497**

### 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: Locust Grove  
Individual completing form: Anna Ogg  
Telephone: 770-692-2324  
Email: aogg@locustgrove-ga.gov

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: NS Logistics South  
DRI ID Number: 3497  
Developer/Applicant: Majestic Realty Co.  
Telephone: 404-467-5245  
Email(s): bmccabe@majesticrealty.com

#### Additional Information Requested

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)  
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?  
☒ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.

#### Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$200M

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$380,000

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):

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Henry County Water Authority



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

0.026895

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Is a water line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?  
Approximately 1.0 miles of water line extension

### Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

Henry County Water Authority

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

0.02445

Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? Approximately 1.2 miles of sewer extension

### 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.)

2,992 Daily Trips | 249 AM Peak Hour | 252 PM Peak Hour

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: Please see traffic impact study prepared by Kimley-Horn

### Solid Waste Disposal

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

350 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

### Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the

50.1%

proposed development has been constructed?

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: The site will contain detention ponds designed to provide water quality, channel protection, and flood protection. The site will also retain natural stream buffers throughout the site.

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:  
River corridors will be protected by maintaining the undisturbed buffers and impervious buffers with a few exceptions for road crossings. Wetland impacts will be mitigated with a NWP 39.

[Back to Top](#)

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

### DRI INFORMATION

**DRI Number** #3497  
**DRI Title** NS Logistics South  
**County** Henry County  
**City (if applicable)** City of Locust Grove  
**Address / Location** East of I-75, west of SR 42/US 23, and north of Bethlehem Road

**Proposed Development Type:** It is proposed to develop 1,865,000 SF of warehousing space.

**Build Out:** 2026

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

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Aries Little  
**Copied** Marquitrice Mangham  
**Date** January 18, 2022

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** Kimley Horn  
**Date** January 12, 2022

## **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)*

Based on the projects referenced on Table 7, the following information should be updated: (1) AR-955 and HE-209 are two separate projects and should be referenced separately. (2) AR-955 and PI 0017182 are corresponding project numbers. (3) HE-209 phases are all in LR 2031-2040. (4) AR-955 phases and corresponding fiscal years should be reflected as PE/ FY 2022, ROW/FY 2023, and CST/FY 2024. (5) All phases for HE-189 are currently in LR 2026-2030. (6) HE-113 ROW phase should be referenced as FY 2023 and UTL phase should be referenced as FY 2024.

☐ NO *(provide comments below)*

## **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)*

I-75 is identified as a Regional Thoroughfare, and the proposed driveway will be located adjacent to Bethlehem Road, which is east of I-75. There is a programmed project (AR-955) that would add an interchange on I-75 south at Bethlehem Road (project referenced on Table 7). SR 42/US 23 is east of the posed driveway, but it is not identified as a Regional Thoroughfare.

**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*)

The proposed driveway will be located adjacent to Bethlehem Road which I-75 is east of the project area and identified as Regional Truck Route. There is a new interchange project programmed at I-75 and Bethlehem (AR-955).

SR 42/US 23 is east of the posed driveway, but it is not identified as a Regional Truck Route. However, the traffic study has identified the corridor as a proposed truck route which connect with the interchanges located on SR 155/N McDonough Rd to the north and Bill Gardner Pkwy to the south.

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

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

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

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

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

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

Distance\*

- ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
- ☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile
- ☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access\*

- ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access\*

- ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
- ☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

Transit Connectivity

- ☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
- ☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
- ☐ No services available to rail station
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

**05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?**

*Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.*

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
- ☒ NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
- ☐ YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
  - ☐ CST planned within TIP period
  - ☐ CST planned within first portion of long range period
  - ☐ CST planned near end of plan horizon

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

**06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.**

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

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

☐ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s) [Click here to enter name of operator\(s\).](#)

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

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access\* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access\* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

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

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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



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

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

☒ NO

☐ YES

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

**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*)

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **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):**

**NS LOGISTICS CENTER SOUTH DRI  
City of Locust Grove  
Natural Resources Group Review Comments**

**January 18, 2022**

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 Watershed Protection**

The proposed project property is located entirely within the Indian Creek Water Supply Watershed, which is a small (less than 100 square mile) public water supply watershed as defined by the Georgia DNR Part 5 Minimum Planning Criteria. It is a public water supply source for the Henry County.

Locust Grove has a protection ordinance for water supply watersheds in the City, including Indian Creek. All development in the watershed, including this project, is subject to all applicable requirements of that ordinance as specified in the Locust Grove City Code.

**Stream Buffer Protection**

Both the USGS coverage for the project area and the project site plan show two intermittent blue line streams running across the property and I-75 to an unnamed tributary of Indian Creek (which is not on this site). A third stream is shown on the submitted site plan that does not appear on the USGS coverage. However, the site plan does not show the 50-foot buffer and 75-foot impervious setback required under the City Stream Buffer Ordinance or the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. If the streams shown on the site plan meet the requirements for the City and State buffers, the buffers should be shown on the plans. The 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer also should be shown on all streams on the property.

The site plan shows a portion of the proposed parking area for Warehouse Number 2 over a branch off the southernmost stream shown on the property. This parking area as well as any other proposed development in these in its buffers may require variances of the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer and the City stream buffers, if they apply. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the Locust Grove Stream Buffer Ordinance as well as the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. All waters of the state on the property are subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer.

**Stormwater/Water Quality**

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

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual ([www.georgiastormwater.com](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.



