

DATE: December 2, 2022

TO: Mayor Vince Williams, City of Union City
ATTN TO: Anthony Alston, Community Development Director, City of Union City
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: 2022 Airport Distribution Center Four DRI 3765

Submitting Local Government: City of Union City

Date Opened: November 9, 2022

Date Closed: December 2, 2022

Description: A DRI review of a proposal to construct a warehouse building of approximately 850,000 SF and an outparcel proposed to serve as a Union City emergency services facility with approximately 30,000 SF in the city of Union City in Fulton County.

Comments:

Key Comments

The Atlanta Region's Plan assigns the Developing Suburbs growth management designation to the project site. The project proposes the elimination of a stream headwaters and wetlands area which is in opposition to 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 with Developing Suburbs policy recommendations through retention of additional undisturbed forest areas, the reduction of the substantial stream and wetland impact, and the designation/management of the proposed open space area for conservation purposes.

The project is expected to generate approximately 1,276 daily new vehicular trips; several improvements to mitigate project generated vehicular traffic are identified in the TIS.

Incorporation of green stormwater and heat island mitigation designs for the approximately 613 surface car and truck parking spaces proposed would be supportive of regional environmental policies.

Sidewalks should be provided along the project Stonewall Tell Road frontage in anticipation of the future proposed police and fire facility use on part of the site and of the need to eventually connect the site to the MARTA bus stop at South Fulton Parkway.

The project will eliminate the headwaters of an unmapped stream and create multiple intrusions into the buffers of the remaining stream area; these intrusions will require variances under the City Stream Buffer Ordinance and the State Erosion and Sedimentation Act, and will need to meet all requirements for mitigation required by the City and Georgia EPD.

The Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division recommends that development of the site preserve the wetland and stream area habitat to the greatest extent possible including stream buffers of at least 100 feet. The preserved portion of the site could be combined with other designated conservation areas west of Stonewall Tell Road to maximize the overall protected contiguous habitat.

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.

Transportation and Mobility Comments

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

The project is expected to generate approximately 1,276 daily new vehicular trips; several improvements to mitigate project generated vehicular traffic are identified in the TIS.

Sidewalks do not appear to be shown in the site plan along the Stonewall Tell Road frontage. Sidewalks are an absolute minimum requirement given the site's Town Center zoning and since a portion of the site may house the future Union City police and fire facilities. Ideally the city will at some point expand the sidewalk system along Stonewall Tell Road to connect to the MARTA bus stop at Stonewall Tell Road and South Fulton Parkway.

No EV charging spaces appear to be included; provision of adequate EV charging spaces would be supportive of regional 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 Group Comments

ARC's Natural Resources Group full comments are attached.

The project is in the portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed drains into the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor, but it is not within the Corridor itself. While this portion of the Chattahoochee watershed is downstream of the existing public water supply intakes on the Chattahoochee, there are two proposed intakes that may affect the project area. The final locations have not been determined for either proposed intake. One intake would serve Coweta County and may be located in Coweta or the southern portion of Fulton County. The second proposed intake would be at or near Bear Creek in Chattahoochee Hills and would serve the southern portions of Fulton County. Once an intake location is approved on the Chattahoochee, the land in the watershed upstream of the intake would be classified as a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. However, the Part 5 criteria are minimal for large water supply watersheds with direct river intakes, consisting of limits on hazardous material storage within seven miles upstream of the intake.

Both the project site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show an unnamed tributary to Wolf Creek, which itself is a tributary to Camp Creek, starting in the center of project property and running north through the property. A mapped pond and an unmapped stream at the southeast corner of the property is also shown. The submitted project site plan shows the 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious surface setback required under the City of Union City Stream Buffer Ordinance, as well as the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Buffer on both streams. However, the proposed building and a portion of the proposed truck access and parking area are shown covering the headwaters of the unmapped stream. In addition, an intrusion into the 75-foot buffer by an access drive is shown on the pond and stream at the southeastern corner of the property. These intrusions will require variances under the City Stream Buffer Ordinance and the State Erosion and Sedimentation Act, and will need to meet all requirements for mitigation required by the City and Georgia EPD. Any other unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the requirements of the City Stream Buffer Ordinance and any other waters of the State on the property will also be subject to the 25-foot state Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffers.

Other Environmental Comments

The 75 acre project site is currently forested with stream and wetland areas and provides valuable ecosystem services. A small portion of the site at the NE corner appears to be retained as open space; retention of additional forested area would be desirable and in keeping with regional goals regarding carbon sequestration and climate change/heat island effect mitigation. Designation of the proposed open space 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 proposes substantial intrusions into wetland and stream buffer and the DRI Form 2 notes: "Waters of the state and wetlands will be affected by this project. A nationwide permit and Army Corps of Engineers permit is being applied for to disturb these areas. These disturbances will be under the threshold amount for both permits." Ideally the plan could be adjusted to reduce the large scale of these intrusions. 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 613 surface car and truck parking spaces proposed would be supportive of regional environmental policies.

Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources Division Comments

Comments from the agency are attached.

Development should occur away from sensitive environmental resources, and we recommend undisturbed buffers of at least 100 feet surrounding any streams or wetlands at proposed development sites.

Records indicate there are several privately-owned conservation easements or covenants within the vicinity of the proposed project including two directly west of Stonewall Tell Road. These parcels provide contiguous forested habitat in an otherwise developing area; further development in the area should attempt to expand the preserved contiguous habitat.

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's elimination of a stream headwaters and wetlands area is in direct opposition to 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 forest areas, the reduction of the substantial stream and wetland impact, and through the designation/management of the proposed open space area for

conservation purposes. City of Union City 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 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	CITY OF SOUTH FULTON
CITY OF ATLANTA	CITY OF EAST POINT	CITY OF COLLEGE PARK
FULTON COUNTY	FAYETTE COUNTY	CLAYTON COUNTY

For questions, 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 #3765

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: Union City

Individual completing form: Anthony Alston

Telephone: 770 515 7955

E-mail: aalston@unioncityga.org

*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: Airport Distribution Center Four

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 33.62536603566177, -84.56027642987853

Brief Description of Project: The proposed project will include one distribution warehouse building of approx. 850,000 SF and an outparcel anticipated to be dedicated to the City with space allocated for approx. 30,000 SF dedicated for City use as an emergency services outpost. The site is located on approximately 50 acres along the east side of Stonewall Tell Road approximately 1/2-mile north of South Fulton Parkway.

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.): Approx. 850,000 SF distribution warehousing, and 30,000 SF emergency services building

Developer: Vision Development Partners

Mailing Address: 6160 Peachtree Dunwoody Road

Address 2: Suite B200

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30328

Telephone: 770-330-3233

Email: steve@visiondevpartners.com

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

If yes, property owner: ADC4 Owner, LLC

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

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

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

(not selected)YesNo

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)YesNo

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

Estimated Project Completion Dates:

This project/phase: 2024

Overall project: 2024

Back to Top



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3765

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: Union City
Individual completing form: Anthony Alston
Telephone: 770 515 7955
Email: aalston@unioncityga.org

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Airport Distribution Center Four
DRI ID Number: 3765
Developer/Applicant: Vision Development Partners
Telephone: 770-330-3233
Email(s): steve@visiondevpartners.com

Additional Information Requested

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

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

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

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: 70,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: 973,000

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): N/A

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: City of Atlanta Watershed Management

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

0.022 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:
N/A

Is a water line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

Fulton County

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

0.016 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: N/A

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? 0.05 miles

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.)

Daily: 1,276 | AM: 95 | PM: 115

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 the traffic study completed my Kimley-Horn

Solid Waste Disposal

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

1,610 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain: N/A

Stormwater Management

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

78.6%

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 two stormwater detention ponds. These ponds are designed to provide water quality treatment and runoff reduction for 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: Waters of the state and wetlands will be affected by this project. A nationwide permit and Army Corps of Engineers permit is being applied for to disturb these areas. These disturbances will be under the threshold amount for both permits.

Back to Top

AIRPORT DISTRIBUTION CENTER FOUR DRI
City of Union City
Natural Resources Group Review Comments
November 21, 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.

Watershed Protection

The project is in the portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed drains into the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor, but it is not within the Corridor itself. While this portion of the Chattahoochee watershed is downstream of the existing public water supply intakes on the Chattahoochee, there are two proposed intakes that may affect the project area. The final locations have not been determined for either proposed intake. One intake would serve Coweta County and may be located in Coweta or the southern portion of Fulton County. The second proposed intake would be at or near Bear Creek in Chattahoochee Hills and would serve the southern portions of Fulton County. Once an intake location is approved on the Chattahoochee, the land in the watershed upstream of the intake would be classified as a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. However, the Part 5 criteria are minimal for large water supply watersheds with direct river intakes, consisting of limits on hazardous material storage within seven miles upstream of the intake.

Stream Buffers

Both the project site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show an unnamed tributary to Wolf Creek, which itself is a tributary to Camp Creek, starting in the center of project property and running north through the property. A mapped pond and an unmapped stream at the southeast corner of the property is also shown. The submitted project site plan shows the 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious surface setback required under the City of Union City Stream Buffer Ordinance, as well as the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Buffer on both streams. However, the proposed building and a portion of the proposed truck access and parking area are shown covering the headwaters of the unmapped stream. In addition, an intrusion into the 75-foot buffer by an access drive is shown on the pond and stream at the southeastern corner of the property. These intrusions will require variances under the City Stream Buffer Ordinance and the State Erosion and Sedimentation Act, and will need to meet all requirements for mitigation required by the City and Georgia EPD. Any other unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the requirements of the City Stream Buffer Ordinance and any other waters of the State on the property will also be subject to the 25-foot state Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffers.

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.

Thanks much.

Donald

Donald P. Shockey, AICP, LEED GA

Plan Review Manager, Community Development

Atlanta Regional Commission

P | 470.378.1531

DShockey@atlantaregional.org

atlantaregional.org

International Tower

229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

From: Nongame Review <nongame.review@dnr.ga.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2022 1:39 PM

To: Donald Shockey <DShockey@atlantaregional.org>

Subject: RE: 2022 Airport Distribution Center Four DRI 3765

Hi Donald,

Our records do not indicate that there are any rare species and/or natural communities at the proposed project site; however, we would like to concur with the ARC's preliminary comments regarding the preservation of sensitive habitats such as wetlands and streams. Development should occur away from sensitive environmental resources, and we recommend undisturbed buffers of at least 100 feet surrounding any streams or wetlands at proposed development sites.

Please note that our records do indicate there are several privately-owned conservation easements or covenants within the vicinity of the proposed Airport Distribution Center. There are two directly west of Stonewall Tell Road. These parcels provide contiguous forested habitat in an otherwise developing area, and we would discourage development in this area in order to aid the preservation of this contiguous habitat.

Thanks,

Maggie Aduddell Hunt

Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife Conservation

Wildlife Resources Division

(706) 557-3228 | M: (470) 316-3071

[Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [Instagram](#)

[Buy a hunting or fishing license today!](#)

A division of the

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

From: Donald Shockey <DShockey@atlantaregional.org>

Sent: Wednesday, November 9, 2022 4:17 PM

To: aalston@unioncityga.org; Alyssa.Gaston@kimley-horn.com; ana.eisenman@kimley-horn.com;

Danielle.Kronowski@kimley-horn.com; eve Smith <Steve@visiondevpartners.com>; Justin Purucker, PE, LSIT

<jpurucker@prime-eng.com>; kalimah.ashby@streamrealty.com; patrick.daugherty@streamrealty.com; Rob

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3765
DRI Title Airport Distribution Center IV
County Fulton County
City (if applicable) Union City
Address / Location Eastside of Stonewall Tell Road just north of South Fulton Parkway

Proposed Development Type: Proposal to construct a warehouse building of approximately 850,000 SF and an outparcel proposed to serve as a Union City emergency services facility with approximately 30,000 SF in the city of Union City in Fulton County.

Build Out: 2024

Review Process ☐ EXPEDITED
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Reginald James
Copied Marquitrice Mangham
Date November 16, 2022

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley-Horn
Date October 1, 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*)

RTP, page 17.

☐ 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*)

Access to the site is not provided via a roadway 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*)

Access to the site is not provided via a roadway 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) MARTA

Bus Route(s) 82

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)

Incomplete sidewalk paths lead up to the site along Stonewall Tell Road.

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

MARTA

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 (Even though sidewalks are planned to provide connections both accessible and nonaccessible adjacent to the building, bicyclists can only access the site via the roadways leading to it.)

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.

