

# **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:** April 21, 2023

TO: Mayor Tom Reed, City of Chattahoochee Hills

ATTN TO: Mike Morton, Community Development Director, City of Chattahoochee Hills

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: Project Rosebud DRI 3929

**Submitting Local Government**: City of Chattahoochee Hills

<u>Description</u>: A DRI Review of a proposal to construct a mixed-use project with 2,795,300 SF of film studio space, 290,000 SF of warehouse space, 32 single-family units, 32 attached single-family units, 215,000 SF of retail space, and a 200 room hotel on a 1,668-acre site in the City of Chattahoochee Hills roughly bounded by the Chattahoochee River, Jones Ferry Road, and Campbellton Redwine Road.

#### **Comments:**

#### Key Comments

The project demonstrates an exemplary approach to following applicable Rural Areas policy recommendations set forth in the Atlanta Region's Plan which stress the need to protect rural areas and their character and note: "There is a strong desire from residents and elected officials in these areas to keep them rural...The region is striving to protect these areas by limiting infrastructure investments to targeted areas and allowing no development or only low impact development."

The project proposes to retain 65% of the 1,668-acre site – including much of the currently wooded area traversed by multiple streams and bordering the Chattahoochee River – as open space which is highly supportive of regional land use and environmental policies.

The project will retain a significant area as working agricultural farm and pasture component which is highly aligned with Rural Areas development recommendations.

The concentration of development in previously cleared areas and utilization of winding narrow access roads respects the existing topography and tree canopy and creates appealing view corridors all of which are highly supportive of Rural Areas development recommendations.

The project will provide space for multi-use trails along the Chattahoochee River project frontage as well as the Campbellton Redwine Road frontage which is strongly aligned with regional recreational and multi-modal transportation policies.

The project will generate a total of 4,622 new vehicular trips; a range of modifications of nearby roadways are proposed to help mitigate the traffic impact.

#### **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 to all areas in the region- Rural Areas for this project – and provides accompanying growth policy recommendations which are detailed at the end of these comments.

#### **Transportation and Mobility Comments**

ARC's Transportation and Mobility Group comments are attached.

The project will provide space for multi-use trails along the Chattahoochee River project frontage as well as the Campbellton Redwine Road frontage which is highly supportive of regional recreational and multi-modal transportation policies.

The project will generate a total of 4,622 new vehicular trips; a range of roadway modifications are proposed to mitigate the traffic impact.

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 Resource Group Comments**

ARC's Natural Resource Group comments are attached.

The both the project site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area shows Pine Creek running through the center of the property and White Oak Creek and an unnamed tributary to White Oak along the

southern and southeastern portion of the property. The site plan also shows numerous unnamed streams throughout the property. All show the City of Chattahoochee Hills 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 25-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer. The only intrusions into the buffers shown on the plans are road crossings, which are generally permitted within the buffers. Any other unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the City buffers as well as the State buffer. Any other State waters identified on the property will also be subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

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.

#### **Environmental Comments**

The project proposes to retain 65% of the 1,668-acre site - including much of the currently wooded area traversed by multiple streams and bordering the Chattahoochee River - as open space which is highly supportive of regional land use and environmental policies.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan by incorporating other aspects of regional environmental policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design, e.g., pervious pavers, rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc., in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages.

#### Unified Growth Policy Considerations: Rural Areas

This DRI site falls under the UGPM Rural Areas category which are areas in the region where limited development has taken place or and where development pressure is low. These areas are characterized by sporadic, large single-family lots, agricultural uses, protected lands, and forests. These areas border more central developed and developing areas and represent the limits of the urban service area in the region. There is a strong desire from residents and elected officials in these areas to keep them rural. Increased development threatens existing rural economic uses, such as forestry, agriculture, and tourism. To maintain economic viability without undesirable development, these areas may be appropriate as "sending" areas in potential Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs. The region is striving to protect these areas by limiting infrastructure investments to targeted areas and allowing no development or only low impact development. There will be a continued need to maintain existing transportation infrastructure, but care should be taken not to spur unwanted growth by inappropriate expansion of infrastructure capacity

The project demonstrates an exemplary approach to meeting Rural Areas policy recommendations as presented in the Atlanta Region's Plan. It accommodates significant development while preserving most of the site's significant environmental assets as well as its rural agricultural character. The final design of the project could further the intent of the Rural Areas recommendations by utilizing rural character elements in the design of project roads, bridges, fences, and related components.

City of Chattahoochee Hills 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 resources.

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

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY
COWETA COUNTY
CITY OF PALMETTO

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
GEORGIA CONSERVANCY
CARROLL COUNTY
TOWN OF WHITESBURG

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
DOUGLAS COUNTY
CITY OF SOUTH FULTON
FULTON COUNTY

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





#### **Developments of Regional Impact**

DRI Home <u>Tier Map</u> <u>Apply</u> <u>View Submissions</u> <u>Login</u>

#### **DRI #3929 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 Chattahoochee Hills Individual completing form: Mike Morton Telephone: 770-463-6578 E-mail: mike.morton@chatthillsga.us \*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: Project Rosebud Location (Street Address, 7965 Campbellton Redwine Rd. Chattahoochee Hills, GA 30268 GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Brief Description of Project: Mixed use development with motion picture recording studios, office, onsite food service and retail. The project will have a private road system and private utilities onsite. **Development Type:** Hotels (not selected) Wastewater Treatment Facilities Office Mixed Use Petroleum Storage Facilities Commercial Airports Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs Wholesale & Distribution Attractions & Recreational Facilities Intermodal Terminals Hospitals and Health Care Facilities Post-Secondary Schools Truck Stops Housing Waste Handling Facilities Any other development types Ondustrial Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants If other development type, describe: Project Size (# of units, floor 3,200,000 square feet of mixed use space Developer: Kane Studio, LLC Mailing Address: 2800 Old Dawson Rd. Address 2: Suite 2-207 City:Albany State: GA Zip:31709 Telephone: 310-499-3341 Email: patrick@kanestudio.com (not selected) Yes No from developer/applicant? If yes, property owner: Painted Rock Farm, LLC Is the proposed project (not selected) Yes No entirely located within your

| local government's jurisdiction?   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 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 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? |   |  |
|  | This project/phase: 10/2029<br>Overall project: 10/2029 |  |
| 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** 

<u>Login</u>

#### **DRI #3929**

#### **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**

Government:

Submitting Local Chattahoochee Hills

Individual completing form: Mike Morton

Telephone: 770-463-6578

Email: mike.morton@chatthillsga.us

#### **Project Information**

Name of Proposed Project: Project Rosebud

DRI ID Number: 3929

Developer/Applicant: Kane Studio, LLC Telephone: 310-499-3341

Email(s): patrick@kanestudio.com

#### **Additional Information Requested**

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional

(not selected) Yes No review process? (If no,

proceed to Economic Impacts.)

If yes, has that additional

information been provided (not selected) Yes No

to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?

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

#### **Economic Development**

Estimated Value at Build-

\$700,000,000.00

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be

\$9,886,800.00

generated by the proposed

development:

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?

(not selected) Yes No

Will this development displace any existing uses?

(not selected) Yes No

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc):

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:

City Of Atlanta & Private Well

| What is the estimated water<br>supply demand to be<br>generated by the project,<br>measured in Millions of<br>Gallons Per Day (MGD)?  | 0.1 MGD ~ 26 MGY                                 |  |
|---|--|--|
| 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                           |  |
|   | line (in miles) will be required?                |  |
|   | Wastewater Disposal                              |  |
| Name of wastewater  |  |  |
| treatment provider for this site:   | Douglas County or Fulton County                  |  |
| What is the estimated<br>sewage flow to be<br>generated by the project,<br>measured in Millions of<br>Gallons Per Day (MGD)?  | 0.1 MGD ~ 26 MGY                                 |  |
| Is sufficient wastewater<br>treatment capacity available<br>to serve this proposed<br>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?2.5 (Douglas Co) |  |
|   | 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.) | 2250 (596 enter, 1660 exit)                      |  |
| 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   | r:TBD in Traffic Study                           |  |
| Solid Waste Disposal  |  |  |
| How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?  | 1000 - 3000 tons                                 |  |
| Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?   | (not selected) Yes No                            |  |
| If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:   |  |  |
| Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?   | (not selected) Yes No                            |  |
| If yes, please explain:   |  |  |
|   | Stormwater Management                            |  |
| What percentage of the site   | 30   |  |

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:Conservation of natural areas and stream buffers, providing stormwater BMPs and LID practices to mitigate stormwater impacts to the watershed.  |                       |  |
|   | Environmental Quality |  |
| Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:  |                       |  |
| Water supply watersheds?  | (not selected) Yes No |  |
| 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:  The project falls within the Chattahoochee River Corridor. The are also several streams on the site that may require crossings. While features like floodplains, wetlands, and historic resources can be found on the site, the limited development footprint should reduce or eliminate the project's impact on them. The project will comply with all regulations and variances related to these resources including stream buffer variances as necessary and the MRPA review process. |                       |  |
| Back to Top   |                       |  |

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

DRI Site Map | Contact

#### PROJECT ROSEBUD DRI

## City of Chattahoochee Hills Natural Resources Review Comments March 20, 2023

#### **Chattahoochee River Corridor**

A portion of the proposed project is within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor and is subject to the requirements of the Metropolitan River Protection Act and the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. A review of the Corridor portion of the project by ARC will be required to determine its consistency with the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. The applicant' consultants have been working with Natural Resources staff in preparation for that review. The proposed Corridor portion of the project is minimal and should meet Plan standards if the formal submission is the same as the preliminary plans.

#### **Other Regulations:**

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over other aspects of this project, the ARC 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:

### Watershed Protection

The entire project property is located in the Chattahoochee River watershed While the property is located downstream of the existing public water supply intakes on the Chattahoochee, it is in an area that may become a water supply watershed in the future. The site is downstream of the proposed South Fulton intake, but Coweta County has proposed more than one site for a water supply intake on the river. Depending on the location of the Coweta Intake, this portion of the Chattahoochee basin may become part of a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. However, the only applicable Part 5 requirements for large water supply watersheds without a water supply reservoir are restrictions on hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal within seven miles upstream of a public water supply intake.

#### Stream Buffers

The both the project site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area shows Pine Creek running through the center of the property and White Oak Creek and an unnamed tributary to White Oak along the southern and southeastern portion of the property. The site plan also shows numerous unnamed streams throughout the property. All show the City of Chattahoochee Hills 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 25-foot impervious setback, as well as the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer. The only intrusions into the buffers shown on the plans are road crossings, which are generally permitted within the buffers. Any other unmapped streams on the property may be subject to the City buffers as well as the State buffer. Any other State waters identified on the property will also be 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 (<a href="www.georgiastormwater.com">www.georgiastormwater.com</a>) 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 #3929

**DRI Title** Project Rosebud

**County** Fulton County

City (if applicable) Chattachoochee Hills

Address / Location Encircled by SR 70/Campbellton Redwine Road to the east, the Chattahoochee River

to the west, and Jones Ferry Road to the north.

**Proposed Development Type:** 

A proposed construction of a mixed-use project with 2,795,300 SF of film studio space, 290,000 SF of warehouse space, 32 single-family units, 32 attached single-family units, 215,000 SF of retail space, and a 200 room hotel on a 1,668-acre site in the City of Chattahoochee Hills roughly bounded by the Chattahoochee River, Jones

Ferry Road, and Campbellton Redwine Road.

**Build Out: 2029** 

Review Process EXPEDITED

NON-EXPEDITED

#### **REVIEW INFORMATION**

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division

Staff Lead Reginald James

**Copied** Marquitrice Mangham

Date April 5, 2023

#### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** Southeastern Engineering, Inc.

### **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 are located on page 13 of 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.

| 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 NO  |
| YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)  |
| There are no roadways identified as a Regional Thoroughfare that provides access to the site via ar proposed driveways.  |

#### 03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

| ∑ NO   |
|--|
| YES (identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)  |
| There are no roadways identified as a Regional Truck Route that provides access to the site via an proposed driveways. |
| f the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on                          |

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.

| $\boxtimes$ | NOT APPLICABLE (neares  | st 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  |
|                      | <ul> <li>Not applicable (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the<br/>type of development proposed)</li> </ul> |
|                      | Click here to provide comments.  |

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

| $\boxtimes$ | NOT APPLICABLE (neare | st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)  |
|-------------|-----------------------|--|
|             | SERVICE WITHIN ONE M  | ILE (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) |
|             |                       |  |

|          |   | nich provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the development site is located?   |
|----------|---|--|
|          | or prefer not to drive, excan help reduce traffic of comprehensive operations serving the site during the nature of the development to the site is not feasible ensure good walking and any routes within a one | developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a cons plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the ent is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service eror cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make ding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements. |
|          | ⊠ NO  |  |
|          | YES   |  |
| C        | Click here to provide   | comments.  |
| 08. If   | the development site i  | s within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information  |
|          | n accessibility condition   |  |
|          | who cannot or prefer no<br>and jobs, and can help or<br>or trail is available near<br>facilities is a challenge,  | developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people of to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path by, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.  |
|          | NOT APPLICABLE (ne  | earest path or trail more than one mile away)  |
|          | YES (provide additio  | nal information below)   |
| Chattaha | Name of facility  | Note: The project will provide space for multi-use trails along the ntage as well as the Campbellton-Redwine Road frontage which is strongly   |
|          | • •   | al and multi-modal transportation policies.  |
|          | 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   |
|          |   | <ul> <li>Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with<br/>the type of development proposed)</li> </ul>   |

Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

Bicycling Access\*

|                | 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<br>the type of development proposed   |
|                | * Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site   |
|                |  |
| OTHER TRA      | ANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS   |
|                |  |
|                | s the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible local road or drive aisle nections with adjacent parcels?  |
| Th<br>ar       | te ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent terial or collector roadway networks can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities ould 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)  |
|                | es the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the elopment site safely and conveniently?  |
| re<br>pl<br>de | ne ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces cliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site ans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key estinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large creage 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)  |
|                |  |

| 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)   |
| 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,   |
|  |
| segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways,   |
| 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)   |
| 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)  |
| 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 |

## **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.   |
|     |  |

