

DATE: June 28, 2023

TO: Chairman Phil D. Miller, Douglas County Commission
ATTN TO: Phil Shafer, Zoning Administrator, Douglas 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: 2023 Rock House Road Site DRI 3939

Submitting Local Government: Douglas County

Date Opened: June 9, 2023

Date Closed: June 28, 2023

Description: A DRI Review of a proposal to construct 898,000 SF of warehouse distribution space in two buildings on an approximately 134-acre site located on Rock House Road in unincorporated Douglas County. The site is fully wooded and includes multiple streams and wetlands substantial areas of which will be removed to accommodate the development.

Comments:

Key Comments

The project is not aligned with applicable Developing Rural Areas policy recommendations which note: "These areas are characterized by limited single-family subdivisions, large single-family lots, agricultural uses, protected lands, and forests. The region should strive to protect these areas by limiting infrastructure investments to targeted areas and allowing no development or only low- intensity development. "

Construction of elements of the project will require the removal of two streams and associated wetland and buffer areas which are identified as Regionally Important Resources in ARC's Regional Resource Plan. Permitting for stream and wetland removal is being pursued through a Corps of Engineers permit.

The project could be better aligned with Developing Rural Areas and regional environmental policies by limiting the substantial stream buffer and wetland removals and incorporating low-impact design approaches in constructed areas.

The project is expected to generate 1,458 new daily vehicular trips; associated roadway improvements to accommodate these are proposed.

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- Developing 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 is expected to generate 1,458 new daily vehicular trips and numerous associated roadway improvements are proposed.

Opportunities for alternative transportation modes connections are limited by the rural location.

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 Comments

ARC's Natural Resource Group comments are attached.

The USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan both show an unnamed blue-line stream running from northwest to southeast through the largest part of the site. The submitted site plan also shows a tributary to the mapped stream running from west to east through the center of the, with its own tributary joining it from the south, as well as a second tributary running west to east at the southern boundary of the property. The County 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious surface setback, as well as the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer are shown along all streams on the site plan and are identified on the plans. The site plan shows the structure identified as Building 100 built over the mapped blue-line stream, and the structure identified as Building 200 built over the central tributary and its tributary. All intrusions into the buffers may require variances under the both the County Stream Buffer Ordinance and the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer.

Environmental Comments

Construction of elements of the project will require the removal of two streams and associated wetland and buffer areas which are identified as Regionally Important Resources in ARC's Regional Resource Plan. Permitting for stream and wetland removal is being pursued through a Corps of Engineers permit. A portion of the site is being retained in an undisturbed state and there may be opportunities for linking this area with nearby conserved areas.

The project can 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 site improvements.

Unified Growth Policy Considerations: Developing Rural Areas

Developing Rural Areas designation which denotes areas in the region where little to no development has taken place, but where there is development pressure. These areas are characterized by limited single-family subdivisions, large single-family lots, agricultural uses, protected lands, and forests. The region should strive to protect these areas by limiting infrastructure investments to targeted areas and allowing no development or only low-intensity development. Limited existing infrastructure in these areas will constrain the amount of additional growth that is possible. Some transportation improvements may be needed in developing rural areas.

The project is not aligned with Developing Rural Areas recommendations. It could be better aligned by limiting stream buffer and wetland removals and incorporating low-impact design approaches in constructed areas. Douglas County leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure maximum sensitivity to 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 DOUGLASVILLE
CITY OF ATLANTA	CITY OF AUSTELL	COBB COUNTY
CITY OF SOUTH FULTON		

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 #3939

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: Douglas

Individual completing form: Phil Shafer

Telephone: 770-920-7313

E-mail: pshafer@douglascountyga.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: Rock House Road Site

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 1971 Rock House Road Lithia Springs GA (Douglas County)

Brief Description of Project: The proposed development will consist of 898,000 SF of warehouse space in two buildings on an approximately 134-acre site located in unincorporated Douglas County. The site is proposed to be rezoned from R-A., PSP, and LI-R to LI.

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.): 898,000 SF of industrial warehouse space in two buildings

Developer: Taylor and Mathis

Mailing Address: 400 Interstate North Parkway, Suite 850

Address 2:

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30339

Telephone: 404-259-8223

Email: mirby@taylorandmathis.com

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

If yes, property owner:

Is the proposed project entirely located within your ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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 Name: Rock House Road Site which was withdrawn

Project ID: 3496

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: 2025

Overall project: 2025

Back to Top



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3939

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: Douglas
Individual completing form: Phil Shafer
Telephone: 770-920-7313
Email: pshafer@douglascountygga.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Rock House Road Site
DRI ID Number: 3939
Developer/Applicant: Taylor and Mathis
Telephone: 404-259-8223
Email(s): mirby@taylormathis.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: \$105,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$450,000

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):

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Douglasville-Douglas County Water Sewer Authority (DWCWSA)

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

0.01 MGD

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

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Is a water line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

DDCWSA

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

0.01 MGD

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

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Land Transportation

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

1458 Daily Trips, 131 AM peak hour trips, 134 PM peak hour trips

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe below: Please refer to the traffic study prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates

Solid Waste Disposal

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

850 TPY

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?

☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

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

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?

☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

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

30.4

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: Zoning buffers are provided as required. Four wet extended detention ponds are proposed to provide water quality, channel protection, and detention for the development

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: Wetlands and streams will be impacted for the proposed development's building, truck courts, access roads, parking, and associated grading.

[Back to Top](#)

ROCK HOUSE ROAD DRI
Douglas County
Natural Resources Review Comments
June 22, 2023

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

Watershed Protection

The project property is located in the portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed drains into the Chattahoochee River Corridor, but it is not within the 2000-foot Chattahoochee River Corridor and is not subject to the requirements of the Metropolitan River Protection Act or the Chattahoochee Corridor Plan. This portion of the watershed drains into the Chattahoochee downstream of the existing public water supply intakes on the Chattahoochee. However, proposed intakes in South Fulton and Coweta County would include this portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed as a large water supply watershed (over 100 square miles), as defined under the Part 5 Criteria of the 1989 Georgia Planning Act. However, for large water supply watersheds without a water supply reservoir, the only applicable Part 5 requirements are restrictions on hazardous waste handling, storage and disposal within seven miles upstream of a public water supply intake. This property is more than seven miles upstream of the nearest proposed public water supply intake.

Stream Buffers

The USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan both show an unnamed blue-line stream running from northwest to southeast through the largest part of the site. The submitted site plan also shows a tributary to the mapped stream running from west to east through the center of the, with its own tributary joining it from the south, as well as a second tributary running west to east at the southern boundary of the property. The County 50-foot undisturbed buffer and 75-foot impervious surface setback, as well as the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer are shown along all streams on the site plan and are identified on the plans. The site plan shows the structure identified as Building 100 built over the mapped blue-line stream, and the structure identified as Building 200 built over the central tributary and its tributary. All intrusions into the buffers may require variances under the both the County Stream Buffer Ordinance and the State 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Control buffer..

Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the County buffer ordinance. Any unmapped State waters identified on the property may also be subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

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.

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3939
DRI Title Rock House Road Site
County Douglas County
City (if applicable) N/A
Address / Location 1971 Rock House Road, Lithia Springs, GA

Proposed Development Type:

A DRI Review of a proposal to construct 898,000 SF of warehouse distribution space in two buildings on an approximately 134-acre site located on Rock House Road in unincorporated Douglas County. The site is fully wooded and includes multiple streams and wetlands substantial areas of which will be removed to accommodate the development.

Build Out: 2025

Review Process ☐ EXPEDITED
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Reginald James
Copied Marquitrice Mangham
Date June 13, 2023

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley-Horn
Date May 1, 2023

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)*

The planned and programmed projects list can be found on page 26 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.

☒ NO

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

No proposed driveways provide access to the project site 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*)

No proposed driveways provide access to the project site 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) [Click here to enter name of operator\(s\).](#)

Bus Route(s) [Click here to enter bus route number\(s\).](#)

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

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NO

☐ YES

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

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

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

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

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

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

Distance

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

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

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

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

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

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

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☒ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

- ☐ YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- ☒ PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- ☐ NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?

- ☐ UNKNOWN (additional study is necessary)
- ☒ YES (based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)

☐ NO *(see comments below)*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?

☒ NO *(based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)*



☐ YES *(see comments below)*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):

None at this time.

ACREAGE:	TOTAL	134.6 AC
BUILDINGS :	BUILDING 100	304,000 S.F.
	BUILDING 200	594,000 S.F.
	TOTAL	898,000 S.F.
	BUILDING USE	WAREHOUSING
	ZONING	LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
YIELD:	FLOOR AREA RATIO	15.3%
	IMPERVIOUS COVER	30.4%
	OPEN SPACE	69.6%
PAVEMENT:	MINIMUM REQUIRED PARKING SPACES	193
	MAXIMUM REQUIRED PARKING SPACES (PER EMPLOYEE)	404
	PARKING SPACES	404
	TRAILER SPACES	165
LOCATION:	STREET	ROCK HOUSE ROAD
	JURISDICTION	DOUGLAS COUNTY, GA
	PARCEL NO.	09481820002, 09921820001, 09921820007, 09911820001, 09921820003, 09921820002, 09921820005, 01750150029, 01750150028, 01750150007, 01750150033, 09471820001, 09471820001
SERVICES:	SEWER DEMAND	9,625 GPD
	WATER DEMAND	9,625 GPD




TEL770.452.7849 FAX770.452.0086
2951 FLOWERS ROAD SOUTH
SUITE 119
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30341
WWW.EBERLY.NET

LAND PLANNING
CIVIL ENGINEERING
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

PROJECT:

TAYLOR & MATHIS
ROCK HOUSE RD.
DRI #3939
LAND LOT 17, 94, 95, & 99
1ST, 21ST, 50TH, 71ST & 81ST DISTRICT
DOUGLAS COUNTY, GEORGIA
ROCK HOUSE ROAD



DEVELOPER

TAYLOR & MATHIS
400 INTERSTATE N PKWY
SUITE 850
ATLANTA, GA 30339
(770) 795-1330
MIRBY@TAYLORMATHIS.COM

ENGINEER

WESLEY REED, P.E.
EBERLY & ASSOCIATES, INC.
2951 FLOWERS ROAD SOUTH
SUITE 119
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30341
(770) 452-7849
WREED@EBERLY.NET

TRAFFIC ENGINEER

HARRISON FORDER, P.E. (GA, AL)
JOHN WALKER, PTOE
KIMLEY-HORN
11720 AMBER PARK DRIVE
SUITE 600
ALPHARETTA, GEORGIA 30009
(770) 619-4280

GRAPHIC SCALE

150 0 50 100 200 400
(IN FEET)
1 INCH = 150 FT.

REVISIONS:

12/17/22	REV 1
03/03/23	REV 2
05/16/23	DRI PLAN

DRI #3939 SITE PLAN

SCALE:	1"=100'
DATE:	12/13/22
DRAWN BY:	WESLEY REED, P.E.
PROJECT MANAGER:	WESLEY REED, P.E.
QA/QC CHECK:	WESLEY REED, P.E.

PROJECT NO.

22-130

SHEET NO.

DRI

NOT ISSUED FOR CONSTRUCTION