

DATE: March 7, 2022

TO: Chairwoman Nicole Love Hendrickson, Gwinnett County Board of Commissioners
ATTN TO: Catherine Long, Long Range Planning Manager
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review – Town Old Peachtree DRI 3551

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

Name of Proposal: Town Old Peachtree DRI 3551

Submitting Local Government: Gwinnett County

Date Opened: March 7, 2022 **Deadline for Comments:** March 22, 2022 **Date to Close:** March 28, 2022

Description: A DRI Review of a proposal to construct 799 residential units at 950/1026 Old Peachtree Road on the 52 acre site of a former church in Gwinnett County. Most of the site was previously developed with the previous church structure, surface parking, and recreation fields; a natural gas easement runs roughly through the middle of the site. Units would be spread among 22 three to four story multi-family buildings and two 8-unit townhome buildings; the project would include a mixture of one, two, and three bedroom units. The project would also include two clubhouses with a pool and other amenities. Two stormwater retention ponds will be created for stormwater treatment. The site will be accessed by two existing full-movement driveways along Old Peachtree Road; the Driveway A entrance will align with Friars Gate Drive and the Driveway B entrance will be just west of Sweetgrass Lane. A total of 1,320 surface parking spaces are proposed. The local DRI review trigger is a request to Gwinnett County to rezone the property from single-family residential to multi-family residential. Project build-out is expected in 2026.

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS:

Key Comments

The project is well-aligned with the Established Suburbs growth policy recommendations applicable to the site in that it proposes a redevelopment of a previously developed site and respects nearby residential and single-family uses.

The project will provide nearly 800 new households that will support adjacent local retail as well as nearby regional retail destinations including the Mall of Georgia and the Exchange at Gwinnett.

Opportunities to utilize multi-modal strategies are limited but the project proposes a robust internal sidewalk system with a new enhanced sidewalk along Old Peachtree Road that will provide walkability to the adjacent Coolray Field and nearby retail and restaurant locations.

Additional retention of the substantial number of trees on the site as well as incorporation of green stormwater and heat island mitigation approaches for the roughly 1,300 surface parking spaces proposed would be highly supportive of regional environmental policies.

General Comments

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

AR Transportation and Mobility Comments

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

Comments note that the project will be served by Buford Drive which is a Regional Thoroughfare and Regional Truck Route. There are no nearby transit service stops.

The project will include a substantial internal sidewalk system that will connect to the adjacent Coolray Field development to the east as well as new 5 ft wide sidewalk with street trees on the north side of Old Peachtree Road that will connect to the retail stores at its intersection with Buford Road.

The project will include a new signalized intersection at Old Peachtree Road and Friars Gate Drive. Consideration should be given to how best to provide for pedestrian access across Old Peachtree Road at this location.

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.

ARC Natural Resources Group Comments

ARC's Natural Resources Group comments are attached.

The USGS coverage and the project site plan for the project area shows an intermittent, unnamed tributary of Little Suwanee Creek along the western edge of the project property. The site plan also shows a tributary of the unnamed tributary starting within the property and then flowing westward to the mapped stream.

Buffers that appear to be the Gwinnett County Stream Buffer Ordinance 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious surface setback, as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer are shown on both streams on the submitted site plan but are not identified.

At the mapped headwaters of the smaller tributary, the buffers end and do not wrap around the headwaters point. This is an already developed area on the property. If this area above the headwaters is subject to the County's stream buffer ordinance and the State Sediment and Erosion buffer, the proposed development in the area may require variances. A retention pond is shown intruding into the buffers along the larger stream, and may also require variances

Any unmapped streams on the property will be subject to the Gwinnett Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any unmapped waters of the State are subject to the requirements of the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer requirement.

Other Environment Comments

Additional retention of the substantial existing trees on the site 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 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: Established Suburbs

Established Suburbs are areas where suburban development has occurred and are characterized by single-family subdivisions, commercial development, and office, industrial and multi-family development. These areas represent the part of the region that has recently reached "build-out." With few remaining large parcels for additional development, these are the areas in which the region may see the least amount of land-use change outside of retail and commercial areas. While there is still room for limited infill development, these areas will begin to focus more on redevelopment over the next 30 years. Preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods is important, and wholesale change will most likely not occur in the single-family subdivisions that make up a majority of these areas. However, infill and redevelopment will occur in areas of retail/commercial concentrations, especially commercial corridors.

The intensity and land use of the proposed project aligns well with The Atlanta Region's Plan's recommendations for Established Suburbs. County leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure 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 NATURAL RESOURCE

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY

GEORGIA CONSERVANCY

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



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3551

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: Gwinnett

Individual completing form: Catherine Long

Telephone: 6785186106

E-mail: catherine.long@gwinnettcountry.com

*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: Town Old Peachtree

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 1026 Old Peachtree Road

Brief Description of Project: multi-family residential

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 checked="" type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 799 multifamily units

Developer: Related Development LLC

Mailing Address: 3372 Peachtree Road NE

Address 2: Suite 300

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30326

Telephone: 404-791-6727

Email: dharari@relatedgroup.com

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

If yes, property owner: North Metro Baptist Church

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?

If yes, provide the following information:

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

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?

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

Estimated Project Completion Dates:

Project Name:

Project ID:

☒ Rezoning

☐ Variance

☐ Sewer

☐ Water

☐ Permit

☐ Other

This project/phase: 2025

Overall project: 2025

[Back to Top](#)



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3551

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: Gwinnett
Individual completing form: Catherine Long
Telephone: 6785186106
Email: catherine.long@gwinnettcountry.com

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Town Old Peachtree
DRI ID Number: 3551
Developer/Applicant: Related Development LLC
Telephone: 404-791-6727
Email(s): dharari@relatedgroup.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: \$160,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$2,500,000

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): existing church will be demolished

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Gwinnett County Department of Water Resources

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

~0.23 MGD

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

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Is a water line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

Gwinnett County

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

~0.20 MGD

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

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Land Transportation

How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.)

4,352 daily trips, 262 AM peak, 326 PM peak

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: see traffic study

Solid Waste Disposal

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

~1, 200 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

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

~45%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: The project proposed two retention ponds to mitigate the impact on stormwater management.

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

- 1. Water supply watersheds? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 3. Wetlands? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 4. Protected mountains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 5. Protected river corridors? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 6. Floodplains? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No
- 7. Historic resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 8. Other environmentally sensitive resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:
There is a proposed retention pond to be constructed within the limits of floodplain zone AE.

[Back to Top](#)

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3551

DRI Title Town Old Peachtree

County Gwinnett County

City (if applicable)

Address / Location West of the SR 20/Buford Drive and Old Peachtree Road intersection

Proposed Development Type: The project proposes to develop 799 multi-family apartment units.

Build Out: 2025

Review Process ☐ EXPEDITED

☒ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division

Staff Lead Aries Little

Copied Marquitrice Mangham

Date February 10, 2022

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc

Date February 7, 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)*

Table 7 incorporates a project (GW-020D) contained in the fiscally constrained RTP. The ROW, UTL and CST phases are currently in LR 2026-2030.

☐ 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)*

There are two proposed access points located along Old Peachtree Road, which Driveway A will be aligned with Friars Gate Drive and Driveway B will be located approximately 220 ft west of Sweetgrass Lane. The driveways are approximately 0.4mi and 0.2mi., respectively, from the intersection of Old Peachtree Road and SR 20/ Buford Drive, which SR 20/Buford Drive is 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*)

There are two proposed access points located along Old Peachtree Road, which Driveway A will be aligned with Friars Gate Drive and Driveway B will be located approximately 220 ft west of Sweetgrass Lane. The driveways are approximately 0.4mi and 0.2mi., respectively, from the intersection of Old Peachtree Road and SR 20/ Buford Drive, which SR 20/Buford Drive is identified as a Regional Truck Route.

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

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

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

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

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

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

Distance*

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

- ☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile
- ☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile
- Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)
- [Click here to provide comments.](#)
- Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
- ☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)
- Transit Connectivity ☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
- ☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
- ☐ No services available to rail station
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

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

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

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

[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

Gwinnett County Transit provides fixed route bus service within the jurisdiction.

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

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

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

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

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

Distance

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

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

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

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

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

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

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- ☐ YES (*sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network*)
- ☐ PARTIAL (*some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct*)
- ☐ NO (*walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent*)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (*the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips*)
- ☒ OTHER (*Please explain*)

Section 1.5 notes that there will be internal pedestrian sidewalk facilities; however, the site plan does not illustrate or clearly define the proposed sidewalks. Intersection #1 doesn't appear to have a pedestrian crosswalk.

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):

TOWN OLD PEACHTREE DRI
Gwinnett County
Natural Resources Group Comments
February 14, 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 County and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Watershed Protection

The proposed project is in the Chattahoochee Corridor watershed, but it is not within the Chattahoochee River Corridor and is not subject to Corridor Plan requirements. The Chattahoochee River watershed upstream of Peachtree Creek is also a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. For large water supply watersheds without a water supply reservoir, the only applicable Part 5 requirements are restrictions on hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal within seven miles upstream of a public water supply intake. This property is more than seven miles upstream of any public water supply intake.

Stream Buffers

The USGS coverage and the project site plan for the project area shows an intermittent, unnamed tributary of Little Suwanee Creek along the western edge of the project property. The site plan also shows a tributary of the unnamed tributary starting within the property and then flowing westward to the mapped stream. Buffers that appear to be the Gwinnett County Stream Buffer Ordinance 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious surface setback, as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer are shown on both streams on the submitted site plan but are not identified. At the mapped headwaters of the smaller tributary, the buffers end and do not wrap around the headwaters point. This is an already developed area on the property. If this area above the headwaters is subject to the County's stream buffer ordinance and the State Sediment and Erosion buffer, the proposed development in the area may require variances. A retention pond is shown intruding into the buffers along the larger stream, and may also require variances. Any unmapped streams on the property will be subject to the Gwinnett Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any unmapped waters of the State are subject to the requirements of the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer requirement.

Stormwater/Water Quality

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

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.



