

DATE: October 17, 2022

---

**TO:** Chairperson Alfred John, Forsyth County  
**ATTN TO:** Leslie Silas, Planning Manager, Forsyth County  
**FROM:** Mike Alexander, Director, ARC Center for Livable Communities  
**RE:** Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review

---

ARC has completed a regional review of the below 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 final report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the host local government.

**Name of Proposal:** Coal Mountain Mixed Use Development DRI 3718

**Submitting Local Government:** Forsyth County

**Date Opened:** September 26, 2022

**Date Closed:** October 17, 2022

**Description:** A DRI review of a proposal to build a mixed-use project with 261 detached single-family homes, 219 attached single-family homes, 300 multi-family units, 20,200 SF of office space, and 73,300 SF of retail and restaurant space on a 140 acre site off of Settingdown Road in Forsyth County.

**Comments:**

**Key Comments**

*The Atlanta Region's Plan assigns the Developing Suburbs growth management designation to the project site. The project is partially aligned with Developing Suburbs policy recommendations which state "There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses." It could be better aligned through retention of additional undisturbed areas, avoidance of stream buffer intrusions, and the inclusion of a mechanism for managing the substantial amount of proposed open space/wetlands preservation area.*

*The proposed mix of office, residential, retail, and restaurant space is highly supportive of regional multi-modal transportation and placemaking policies.*

*There are significant intrusions into protected stream buffers which may require County variances; in particular, many single-family lots extend into buffer areas which will require careful home placement to avoid stream buffer intrusions.*

*The placement of buildings along the project street frontages with parking behind them and the inclusion of various pocket parks and green spaces as central organizing elements are very supportive of regional placemaking goals.*

*Incorporation of green stormwater and heat island mitigation designs for the roughly 2,015 surface car parking spaces proposed would be supportive of regional environmental policies.*

*The project is expected to generate approximately 7,989 daily new vehicular trips; several improvements to mitigate project generated vehicular traffic are identified in the TIS.*

*Provision of generous amounts of bicycle parking spaces and EV charging spaces would be in keeping with regional multi-modal transportation and EV infrastructure policies.*

### **General Comments**

The Atlanta Region's Plan, developed by ARC in close coordination with partner local governments, is intended to broadly guide regional development in the 12-county metro region to ensure that required infrastructure and resources are in place to support continued economic development and prosperity. The Plan assigns a relevant growth management category designation with accompanying policy recommendations to all areas in the region. This DRI site is designated Developing Suburbs; associated policy recommendations are provided at the end of these comments.

The project's robust mix of office, residential, retail, and restaurant space as well as multi-family, single-family attached, single-family detached, and senior housing is strongly supportive of regional multi-modal transportation and placemaking policies.

The project is strongly supportive of regional placemaking goals. The placement of the multi-family and commercial buildings along the project street frontages on Dahlonega Highway and Browns Bridge Road with parking behind them creates a defined street edge. The inclusion of various pocket parks and green spaces as central organizing elements also advances placemaking goals.

### **Transportation and Mobility Comments**

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

The project is expected to generate approximately 7,989 daily new vehicular trips; several improvements to mitigate project generated vehicular traffic are identified in the TIS.

Provision of generous amounts of bicycle parking spaces and EV charging spaces would be in keeping with regional multi-modal transportation and EV infrastructure policies.

Care should be taken to ensure that the constructed development provides 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 Comments**

ARC's Natural Resources Group comments are attached.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows one unnamed intermittent blue line stream running along the northeastern boundary of the project property. The submitted site plan also shows a short branch flowing into the unnamed stream near the northern tip of the property and two streams running through the property and joining before entering the unnamed stream. Although not labelled, the submitted site plan shows the County 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion buffer on all streams on the site plan. Most of the intrusions shown on the plans are transportation crossings. However, one area at the center of the property shows a detention pond intruding into the buffers as well as an intersection and a section of road in the buffer that is not a crossing. Two other areas at tributary headwaters show roads in the buffers that do not cross the streams. These and any other intrusions into the stream buffers may require variances. Buffer intrusions on individual residential lots extending into the buffers may also require variances. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the County stream buffer ordinance and all waters of the state on the property are subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

### **Other Environmental Comments**

Much of the existing site is wooded; additional retention of existing trees on the site would be desirable and in keeping with regional goals regarding carbon sequestration and climate change/heat island effect mitigation. A substantial portion of the site is shown as open space and water quality protection buffer areas. Designation of this area as managed open/conservation space could meaningfully reduce the overall impact of the project. There may be potential opportunities for linking these fragmented undeveloped areas with adjacent undeveloped or protected areas to ensure their maintenance and potential use for recreation or habitat preservation.

The project can 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.

Incorporation of green stormwater and heat island mitigation designs for the approximately 2,015 surface parking spaces would be supportive of regional environmental policies.

## **Atlanta Region's Plan Growth Policy Considerations: Developing Suburbs**

The Atlanta Region's Plan identifies Developing Suburbs as areas in the region where suburban development has occurred, and the conventional development pattern is present but not set. These areas are characterized by residential development with pockets of commercial and industrial development. These areas 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 project is partially aligned with The Atlanta Region's Plan recommendations for Developing Suburbs which call for preserving environmentally sensitive, agricultural, and forested land. The project could be made more responsive to these goals and policies by retaining additional wooded area, dedicating undisturbed areas for conservation uses, and employing green infrastructure in the surface parking areas. Forsyth County leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure optimal sensitivity to the needs of nearby local governments, neighborhoods, and natural systems.

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

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY  
DAWSON COUNTY

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE  
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
CITY OF CUMMING

For questions, 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>.



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #3718

#### 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: Forsyth

Individual completing form: Leslie Silas

Telephone: 770-205-4568

E-mail: [lsilas@forsythco.com](mailto:lsilas@forsythco.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: Coal Mountain Mixed Use Development

Location (Street Address, GPS Latitude: 34°16'21.26"N, Longitude: 84° 5'52.14"W Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description):

Brief Description of Project: Mixed use including office, retail, senior housing, multi-family, townhomes and single family

#### Development Type:

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

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 104,500 sq. ft. of retail/office, 91,212 sq. ft. of senior housing, 1,222,600 sq. ft. of residential

Developer: Toll Brothers

Mailing Address: 2400 Lakeview Parkway, Suite 650

Address 2:

City: Alpharetta State: GA Zip: 30009

Telephone: 678-699-1403

Email: [jcrowe1@tollbrothers.com](mailto:jcrowe1@tollbrothers.com)

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

If yes, property owner: Paran, T&J Burruss, R Armstrong, E Tallant, J Burruss & ETAL, YD Holdings, Harrison 369, 369 Corners

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 This project/phase: 2028  
Dates: Overall project: 2028

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#)

[DRI Site Map](#) | [Contact](#)



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #3718

#### 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: Forsyth  
Individual completing form: Leslie Silas  
Telephone: 770-205-4568  
Email: ldsilas@forsythco.com

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Coal Mountain Mixed Use Development  
DRI ID Number: 3718  
Developer/Applicant: Toll Brothers  
Telephone: 678-699-1403  
Email(s): jcrowe1@tollbrothers.com

#### Additional Information Requested

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

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

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

#### Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$1.49 million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$4,115,122

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): 7 single family detached homes; approximately 1,500 - 2,500 sq. ft. each

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply Forsyth County

provider for this site:

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

0.406

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: Forsyth County

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

0.352

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 1/6 of a mile

### 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.)

561 AM peak hour trips, 748 PM peak hour trips

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

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

If yes, please describe below: See detailed transportation traffic study for additional information.

### Solid Waste Disposal

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

1,001,115

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

Approximately 40%



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: Stormwater management BMPs to be provided in accordance with Ordinance 75, Stormwater Management, and the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual.

### 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:  
Portions of the wetlands will be filled in with a Nationwide Permit approval with the US Army Corps of Engineers. Additionally, the floodplains will not be impacted by this development.

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#)

[DRI Site Map](#) | [Contact](#)

**COAL MOUNTAIN MIXED USE DRI**  
**Forsyth County**  
**Natural Resources Group Comments**  
**September 26, 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 project property is in the Etowah River Water Supply Watershed, which is a large (greater than 100 square miles) water supply watershed as defined in the DNR Part 5 Water Supply Watershed Minimum Criteria. The Etowah River has two direct river intakes, one for the City of Canton and a second for the Cobb-Marietta Water Authority to supply the Hickory Log Reservoir which is off the Etowah. Both are in Cherokee County. Under Part 5, the only criteria for large water supply watersheds with direct river (not reservoir) intakes are that new facilities within 7 miles of a water supply intake which handle hazardous materials of the types and amounts determined by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR), shall perform their operations on impermeable surfaces having spill and leak collection systems as prescribed by DNR. This project is more than 7 miles upstream of the closest intake.

**Stream Buffers**

The USGS coverage for the project area shows one unnamed intermittent blue line stream running along the northeastern boundary of the project property. The submitted site plan also shows a short branch flowing into the unnamed stream near the northern tip of the property and two streams running through the property and joining before entering the unnamed stream. Although not labelled, the submitted site plan shows the County 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion buffer on all streams on the site plan. The only intrusions shown on the plans are transportation crossings. Intrusions into the stream buffers due to overall development of this project may require variances. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the County stream buffer ordinance and all waters of the state on the property are subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

**Storm Water/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.

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

### DRI INFORMATION

**DRI Number** #3718  
**DRI Title** Coal Mountain Mixed-Use Development  
**County** Forsyth County  
**City (if applicable)** N/A  
**Address / Location** Northeast of the intersection of SR 9 (Dahlonega Highway) and SR 369 (Matt Highway/Browns Bridge Road)

**Proposed Development Type:**

Proposed mixed-use project with 261 detached single-family homes, 219 attached single-family homes, 300 multi-family units, 22,200 SF of office space, and 73,300 SF of retail and restaurant space on a 140 acre site off of Settingdown Road.

**Build Out: 2028**

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

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Reginald James  
**Copied** Marquitrice Mangham  
**Date** October 4, 2022

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** A&R Engineering, Inc.  
**Date** September 8, 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)*

Planned and programmed projects as identified by the Regional Transportation Plan can be found on Page 26 in the traffic study.

☐ NO *(provide comments below)*

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

## **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)*

Site Driveway 1 will provide access via SR 9, and Site Driveway 2 will provide access via SR 369. Both highways are identified as regional thoroughfares.

**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*)

Site Driveway 2 will provide access via SR 369, which 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

No transit agency operates within Forsyth County.

**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):**

None at this time.



