

REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

Atlanta Regional Commission • 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 fax: 404.463.3205 • atlantaregional.org

DATE: January 19, 2023

TO:	Chairman Jeffrey E. Turner, Clayton County
ATTN TO:	Tiras Petrea, Zoning Admininstrator, Clayton 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: Victory Landing Logistics Center DRI 3816

Submitting Local Government:Clayton CountyDate Opened:December 30, 2022Date Closed:January 19, 2023

Description: A DRI review of a proposal to construct 687,250 SF of warehouse/distribution space in 5 buildings on an 86-acre site off of Conley Road and Gilbert Road in Clayton County. The site is currently entirely wooded with a stream running through it.

Comments:

Key Comments

The Atlanta Region's Plan assigns the Regional Employment Corridor growth management designation to the project site. The project is somewhat aligned with Regional Center growth policies and recommendations which note: "There is a lack of accessible public greenspace within Regional Employment Corridors, which affects the overall aesthetics and quality of life for residents and workers."

The project is expected to generate a total of 1,124 daily new vehicular trips; several roadway improvements are proposed to mitigate the impact of these trips.

A multi-use trail is planned along Gilbert Road connecting to Conley Road and should be considered in the final project design.

No intrusions into protected stream buffers are shown on the project property, but road work and right-ofway widening shown on Gilbert Road falls within the buffers and may require variances from Clayton County.

No bicycle parking spaces, or EV charging spaces appear to be proposed; inclusion of a generous amount of both would be strongly supportive of regional EV infrastructure and multi-modal transportation policies.

<u>General</u>

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 Regional Employment Corridor; corresponding 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 a total of 1,124 new vehicular trips. Several improvements are identified to reduce the impact of these new trips on surrounding roadways.

A large number of surface parking spaces are proposed. However, no bicycle parking spaces, or EV charging spaces appear to be proposed; inclusion of a generous amount of both would be strongly supportive of regional EV infrastructure and multi-modal transportation policies.

Six-foot sidewalks are proposed on both sides of Gilbert Road which is supportive of regional multi-modal transportation goals.

Several MARTA bus stops are within walking distance of the project on Conley Road. Care should be taken to ensure that these stops provide at least minimal passenger accommodations (concrete pad, shelter, etc.) and that they are connected by a safe walking route to the project.

A multi-use trail is planned by Aerotropolis Atlanta along Gilbert Road connecting to Conley Road and should be considered in the final project design.

Care should be taken to ensure that the development promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths, entrances, and parking areas. To the maximum extent possible, new driveways and intersection corners where pedestrians will cross

ARC Natural Resource Group Comments

ARC's Natural Resources Group full comments are attached.

Both the USGS coverage for the project area or the submitted site plan show two blue-line streams on the project property. One stream, identified as Poole Creek on the site plan, enters the project property at its south end and flows north through the center of the property. The second stream, an unnamed tributary to Poole Creek, enters the property from the west and meets Poole Creek in the center of the parcel. The Clayton County 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer, are shown on both streams. No intrusions into the buffers are shown on the project property, but road work and right-of-way widening are shown on Gilbert Road in the unnamed tributary's buffers. Road crossings are generally exempt from local stream buffer regulations, but if any proposed work does not meet the exemption, a variance may be required. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the County buffers as well as the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Control Buffer. Any unmapped waters of the state on the property will also be subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Control Buffer.

Other Environmental Comments

The project site is entirely wooded with several stream and flood plain areas. The project proposes no intrusions into the protected buffers of these areas which is in keeping with regional environmental policies. Ideally the protected natural area could be expanded where possible, and a mechanism could be provided for managing the substantial preserved natural space.

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.

City of Atlanta Comments

Comments received from the City of Atlanta are attached.

Dekalb County Comments

Comments received from Dekalb County are attached.

Unified Growth Policy Considerations: Regional Employment Corridor

According to the Atlanta Region's Plan, Regional Employment Corridors represent the densest development outside of the Region Core. Regional Employment Corridors connect several Regional Centers with the Region Core via existing capacity transportation facilities. These areas contain a large share of the region's jobs in a relatively small land area. These areas are also increasing in both housing and job density and are experiencing increased redevelopment and new uses in traditionally employment–focused areas. There is a lack of accessible public greenspace within Regional Employment Corridors, which affects the overall aesthetics and quality of life for residents and workers.

The intensity and land use of this proposed project partially aligns with The Atlanta Region's Plan's recommendations for Regional Employment Corridor primarily through its preservation of a large amount of retained natural greenspace. This alignment could be increased by providing additional retained natural space and by creating a mechanism for managing the space. Clayton County staff and leadership, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure maximum sensitivity to the needs of nearby local governments, stakeholders, 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 City of Atlanta City of East Point Aerotropolis Atlanta GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY GEORGIA CONSERVANCY CITY OF COLLEGE PARK CITY OF RIVERDALE CITY OF HAPEVILLE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION DEKALB COUNTY CITY OF FOREST PARK MARTA

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





Developments of Regional Impact DRI Home <u>Tier Map</u> View Submissions <u>Login</u> Apply **DRI #3816 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: Clayton Individual completing form: Tiras Petrea Telephone: 770.477.3577 E-mail: Tiras.Petrea@claytoncountyga.gov *Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process. **Proposed Project Information** Name of Proposed Project: Victory Landing Logistics Center Location (Street Address, GPS 3996 Gilbert Rd, Atlanta GA 30354 Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: Master-planned industrial park totaling 690,000 SF **Development Type:** Hotels (not selected) Wastewater Treatment Facilities Office Mixed Use OPetroleum Storage Facilities Commercial Airports Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs Wholesale & Distribution Attractions & Recreational Facilities Intermodal Terminals Hospitals and Health Care Facilities OPost-Secondary Schools Truck Stops Housing Waste Handling Facilities Any other development types Industrial Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants If other development type, describe: Project Size (# of units, floor area, 686,000 SF over 90 acres etc.) Developer: OA Development, Inc. Mailing Address: 100 Ashford Ct N #310 Address 2: City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30338 Telephone: 678.441.0001 x1005 Email: josh@oadevelopment.com Is property owner different from (not selected) Yes No developer/applicant? If yes, property owner: Gilbert Road Joint Venture and Victory Landing Partners Is the proposed project entirely (not selected) Yes No located within your local government's jurisdiction?

jurisdictions is the project located?		
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	(not selected) Yes No	
If yes, provide the following information:	Project Name: Project ID:	
The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:	Rezoning Variance Sewer Water Permit Other	
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	◯(not selected)◯Yes◉No	
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?		
Estimated Project Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 12/2024 Overall project:	
Back to Top		

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page

DRI Site Map | Contact





Water Supply

Clayton County Water Authority

Name of water supply 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)?	0.03	
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	◯(not selected) [©] Yes [©] No	
If no, describe any plans to e	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 0.5 miles of water main exter	line (in miles) will be required? nsion.	
	Wastewater Disposal	
Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	Clayton County Water Authority	
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.03	
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If no, describe any plans to e	expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:	
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If yes, how much additional li	ine (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.)	Daily Trips 1,124; AM Peak Hour Trips: 82 entering, 24 existing; PM Peak Hour Trips: 31 entering, 78 exiting	
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 traffic study for more information.	
Solid Waste Disposal		
How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tops)?	620 tons	
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No	
If no, describe any plans to e	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 45% is projected to be impervious surface once the

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:Buffers, Bioretention Ponds, and Detention Ponds.

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:		
Back to Top		

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page

DRI Site Map | Contact

VICTORY LANDING LOGISTICS CENTER DRI Clayton County Natural Resources Department Comments January 6, 2023

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Department has identified County and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Water Supply Watersheds

The proposed project is located in the South River Watershed. The South River is not a water supply watershed in the Atlanta Region and no Part 5 Environmental Minimum Planning Criteria for water supply watersheds apply.

Stream Buffers

Both the USGS coverage for the project area or the submitted site plan show two blue-line streams on the project property. One stream, identified as Poole Creek on the site plan, enters the project property at its south end and flows north through the center of the property. The second stream, an unnamed tributary to Poole Creek, enters the property from the west and meets Poole Creek in the center of the parcel. The Clayton County 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer, are shown on both streams. No intrusions into the buffers are shown on the project property, but road work and right-of-way widening are shown on Gilbert Road in the unnamed tributary's buffers. Road crossings are generally exempt from local stream buffer regulations, but if any proposed work does not meet the exemption, a variance may be required. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the County buffers as well as the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Control Buffer. Any unmapped waters of the state on the property will also be subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Control Buffer.

Stormwater and 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.



regional impact + local relevance

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	#3816
DRI Title	Victory Landing Logistics Center
County	Clayton County
City (if applicable)	N/A
Address / Location	Intersection of Conley Road and Gilbert Road
Proposed Development Type: A DRI review of a proposal to construct 637,250 SF of warehouse/distribus space in 5 buildings on an 86-acre site off of Conley Road and Gilbert Road in Clayton County. The site is currently entirely wooded with a stream running through it.	
	Build Out: 2024
Review Process	EXPEDITED
	NON-EXPEDITED
REVIEW INFORMATIC	<u>DN</u>
Prepared by	ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead	Reginald James
Copied	Marquitrice Mangham
Date	January 13, 2023
TRAFFIC STUDY	

Prepared by	A&R Engineering, Inc.
Date	November 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)

RTP, page 19 of transportation 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)

No roadways identified as regional thoroughfares will provide access to the site.

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 NO

YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)

No roadways identified as regional truck routes will provide access to the site.

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)

Operator / Rail Line

RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information	below)
--	--------

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?

- 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.

Ac ca joi bio loo wo	ccess between major deve nnot or prefer not to drive bs, and can help reduce co cycling between the deve cal government(s) is enco alking and bicycling infras	lopments and transit services provide options for people who e, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and ongestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or opment site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable uraged to make the connection a funding priority for future tructure improvements.
	NOT APPLICABLE (neare	st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)
\square	SERVICE WITHIN ONE M	ILE (provide additional information below)
	Operator(s)	MARTA
	Bus Route(s)	194
	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

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 (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?



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)



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.

Donald Shockey

From:	Donald Shockey
Sent:	Tuesday, January 3, 2023 2:34 PM
То:	Skipper, Jr. Pearley J. (PJ)
Cc:	Smith, Sylvia; Washington, Larry
Subject:	RE: Victory Landing Logistics Center DRI 3816

Hi Skipper,

Thanks very much as always for these welcome comments which will be included in the Final Report.

Best,

Donald Shockey,

Donald P. Shockey, AICP, LEED GA

Plan Review Manager, Community Development Atlanta Regional Commission P | 470.378.1531 <u>DShockey@atlantaregional.org</u> <u>atlantaregional.org</u> International Tower 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 Atlanta, Georgia 30303

From: Skipper, Jr. Pearley J. (PJ) <pjskipper@dekalbcountyga.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:32 PM
To: Donald Shockey <DShockey@atlantaregional.org>
Cc: Smith, Sylvia <sasmith@dekalbcountyga.gov>; Washington, Larry <lwashington@dekalbcountyga.gov>
Subject: Victory Landing Logistics Center DRI 3816

Good afternoon Donald,

- A left turn lane is need on Gilbert Road @ Private Driveway #1 for Building 500
- Need to show future plans with Archcrest Drive @ Gilbert Road entrance since roadway leads into proposed development from the north side.
- Proposed Private Driveway #2/curb cut should align with existing driveway/curb cut @ Alan Baker Field across from proposed development.
- Proposed Private Driveway #3/curb cut should align with existing driveway/curb cut across from proposed development.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me. Thanks!!

Pearley (PJ) James Skipper Jr

Staff Engineer

DeKalb County Planning & Sustainability

Long Range Planning Division

178 Sams Street

Suite A3600

Decatur, GA 30030

(470) 423-4039 - Cell

pjskipper@dekalbcountyga.gov

https://www.dekalbcountyga.gov/planning-and-sustainability/transportation-and-mobility



Atlanta Department of Transportation Comments (Deadline: 1/12/23 for submission by 1/13/23)

DRI #3816 – 2022 Victory Landing Logistics Center (Clayton County)

- Are the proposed Gilbert Road sidewalks going to connect to existing sidewalks? We suggest not leaving any gaps and complete the sidewalk connection, particularly along the east side of roadway.
- Are bike facilities planned for Gilbert Road? It shows as a bicycle-friendly road in Google Maps. Unsure if the county or CID has plans for it.



