

# DRI 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: Aprl 1, 2024

TO:	Chairwoman Nicole Hendrickson, Gwinnett County Commission
ATTN TO:	Daniel Robinson, Deputy Director Planning, Gwinnett County
FROM:	Mike Alexander, COO, Atlanta Regional Commission
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:Thompson Mill Village DRI 4098Submitting Local Government:Gwinnett CountyDate Opened:March 12 2024Date Closed:April 1, 2024Date Closed:

**Description**: A DRI review of a proposal to construct a mixed-use development with 141 townhomes, 460 multi-family units, 939 senior residential units, 200 hotel rooms, 105,049 SF of general office space, 254,200 SF of medical office space, 364,218 SF of retail space, a 10,000 SF bank with drive-through, and 50,000 SF of restaurant space on a 110-acre site between Thompson Mill Road and Friendship Road in Hall and Gwinnett Counties.

### <u>Comments:</u>

#### <u>Key Comments</u>

The project is not aligned with applicable Developing Suburbs policy recommendations which state "There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses." It could be better aligned through retention of additional, or clustering of proposed, undisturbed areas, avoidance of stream buffer impacts, and use of green infrastructure and low impact design in the final project design.

The project's robust mix of a range of residential units, hotel rooms, office space, retail space, and restaurant space is strongly supportive of regional placemaking and multi-modal transportation policies.

The project will generate a total of 23,415 daily new vehicular trips. A range of roadway modifications are proposed to address this impact.

The project's walkability and bikability would be signficantly enhanced with strategic extensions of the adjacent multi-use path into the interior of the site.

Regarding stream buffers, the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer is not shown on the site plans and must be included before local review and approval is completed. Intrusions into buffers appear to be proposed for several buildings and a driveway. While various stream buffer variances are potentially available from most local jurisdictions, regional environmental policies recommend avoiding intrusions into buffers which provide the minimum level of stream protection available.

Both senior housing areas are not well intgrated into the site pedestrian networks and could benefit from a more structured arrangment of the multiple individual buildings that provides shorter walking routes to retail and amenities and frees up green space that could be consolidated into several accessible pocket parks or preserved natural areas.

#### General Comments

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

The project's robust mix of a range of residential units, hotel rooms, office space, retail space, and restaurant space is strongly supportive of regional placemaking and multi-modal transportation policies.

Both senior housing areas, which currently appear to be somewhat randomly scattered around the available space, could benefit from a more structured arrangment of the multiple individual buildings that provides shorter walking routes to retail and amenities and frees up green space that could be consolidated into several easily accessible pocket parks or preserved natural areas. The present arrangement randomly scatters the buildings in between open space that will likely be cleared but not provide recreational or environmental functions. The senior housing component at the eastern section of the site is separated from the project's retail areas making it unlikely that residents could access these retail options by walking. There are also no sidewalks depicted in the eastern section.

#### Transportation and Mobility Comments

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

The project will generate a total of 23,415 daily new vehicular trips. A range of roadway modifications are proposed to address this impact.

The site plan includes a network of sidewalks connecting most buildings. A 10-ft multi-use path is already in place on the northern edge of the project along Friendship Road. Additional consideration should be given to extending the multi-use path into the interior of the project along Traverse Road to provide further accommodation to pedestrians and bicyclists. Sidewalks are missing from and need to be added to the eastern senior housing section.

Care should be taken to ensure that the constructed development provides an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all driveways, paths, entrances, and parking areas. To the maximum extent possible, new driveways and intersection corners where pedestrians will cross should be constructed with minimal curb radii to reduce speeds of turning vehicles and decrease crossing distances for pedestrians.

#### ARC Natural Resources Comments

ARC's Natural Resources Group comments are attached.Both the project site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show an intermittent blue-line stream crossing the property roughly south to north in the northeastern portion of the central part of the property. The site plan shows the 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback that are required under both the Hall and Gwinnett County Stream Buffer Ordinances. However, the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer is not shown on the site plans. One transportation route crosses the buffers along the County line. Possible intrusions into the extended impervious setbacks are shown for two buildings and one driveway crossing in the conceptual plans. If these remain in the final plans, variances may be required from Hall and Gwinnett Counties as applicable.

The State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer should be shown on the plans. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the requirements of the applicable County Stream Buffer Ordinance and any other waters of the State on the property will be subject to the 25-foot state Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffers.

#### **Other Environmental Comments**

Additional retention of wooded natural areas on the site would be desirable and in keeping with regional goals regarding carbon sequestration and climate change/heat island effect mitigation. Some intrusions into streams buffers appear to be proposed for several buuldings and a driveway. While various stream buffer variances are potentially available from most local jurisdictions, regional environmental policies recommend avoiding intrusions into buffers which provide the minimum stream protection available. A large number of surface parking spaces are proposed. Utilization of green infrastructure techniques for these areas, including additional trees, the use of flush rather than raised curbed planting islands, and bioswales would be supportive of regional stormwater and environmental policies.

The project can support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating key 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.

#### **GDOT Aviation Comments**

GDOT Aviation comments are attached. They note that the project is more than 10 miles from any airport open to the public and is located outside any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact any airport.

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

The Atlanta Region's Plan identifies Developing Suburbs as areas in the region where suburban development has occurred, and the conventional development pattern is present but not set. These areas are characterized by residential development with pockets of commercial and industrial development. These areas represent the extent of the urban service area. There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses. Limited existing infrastructure in these areas will constrain the amount of additional growth that is possible. Transportation improvements are needed within these Developing Suburbs, but care should be taken not to spur unwanted growth.

The project is not aligned with Developing Suburbs policy recommendations which state "There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses." It could be better aligned through retention of additional undisturbed areas, avoidance of stream buffer impacts, and utilization of green infrastructure and low-impact development approaches in the project design. Gwinnett County leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure optimal sensitivity to the needs of nearby local governments, neighborhoods, and natural systems.

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

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY GEORGIA CONSERVANCY GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

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>.







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

DRI Site Map | Contact





### **Developments of Regional Impact**

<u>DRI H</u>	lome <u>Tier I</u>	<u>Map Apply</u>	View Submissions	<u>Login</u>
DRI #4098				
	DEVELOPME Additic	NT OF REGION	IAL IMPACT ation	
This form is to be completed the proposed DRI. Refer to b information.	by the city or county g oth the <b>Rules for the</b>	overnment to provide DRI Process and the	information needed by the RDC DRI Tiers and Thresholds for i	for its review of more
	Local Go	overnment Infor	mation	
Submitting Local Government:	Gwinnett			
Individual completing form:	Daniel Robinson			
Telephone:	6785186082			
Email:	daniel.robinson@gwi	nnettcounty.com		
	Pro	oject Informatio	'n	
Name of Proposed Project:	Thompson Mill Village	e		
DRI ID Number:	4098			
Developer/Applicant:	VDC			
Telephone: Email(s):	678.353.4417 aframpton@gpsent.c	om		
	Additional	Information Re	equested	
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) Ye	s©No		
If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, it applicable, GRTA?	(not selected) Ye	sONo		
If no, the official review proce	ess can not start until th	his additional informat	tion is provided.	
	Econ	omic Developm	nent	
Estimated Value at Build- Out:	\$650,000,000			
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$4,600,000			
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	(not selected) Ye	sONo		
Will this development displace any existing uses?	(not selected) Ye	s		
If yes, please describe (inclu	ding number of units, s	square feet, etc):		
		Water Supply		
Name of water supply	Coincoville Mater O			
provider for this site:	cancovine water, G			

generated by the project, ( measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.042 MGD			
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No			
If no, describe any plans to exp	pand the existing water supply capacity:			
Is a water line extension required to serve this project?	Is a water line extension required to serve this (not selected) Yes No project2			
If yes, how much additional lin	ne (in miles) will be required?			
	Wastewater Disposal			
Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:	Town of Braselton			
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.042 MGD			
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No			
If no, describe any plans to exp	pand existing wastewater treatment capacity:			
Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No			
If yes, how much additional line	e (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.)	2-way Net Trips:1,486 am peak,2,018 pm peak & 23,415 24-hour			
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:F	Please refer to the DRI study submitted to ARC/GRTA.			
	Solid Waste Disposal			
How much solid waste is the project expected to 3 generate annually (in tons)?	3,000 TPY			
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No			
If no, describe any plans to exp	pand existing landfill capacity:			
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	(not selected) Yes No			
If yes, please explain:				
Stormwater Management				
	<b>.</b>			

	Environmental Quality
s the development located w	ithin, or likely to affect any of the following:
1. Water supply watersheds?	◯(not selected)◯Yes <sup>®</sup> No
2. Significant groundwater echarge areas?	(not selected) Yes No
3. Wetlands?	◯(not selected)◯Yes <sup>®</sup> No
4. Protected mountains?	◯(not selected)◯Yes <sup>®</sup> No
5. Protected river corridors?	◯(not selected)◯Yes <sup>®</sup> No
6. Floodplains?	(not selected) Yes No
7. Historic resources?	◯(not selected)◯Yes <sup>®</sup> No
<ol> <li>Other environmentally sensitive resources?</li> </ol>	◯(not selected)◯Yes SNo

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

DRI Site Map | Contact

#### THOMPSON MILL VILLAGE DRI Hall County and Gwinnett County Natural Resources Review Comments

#### March 19, 2024

This property is located partly in Hall County, which is outside ARC jurisdiction but is within the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District. While ARC and the 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 Watershed Protection

The proposed project property is located entirely within the Mulberry Creek watershed, which is a large (greater than 100 square miles) public water supply watershed as defined by the Georgia DNR Part 5 Minimum Planning Criteria, serving the City of Winder, which is outside the Atlanta Region and the Water District. The project appears to be more than 7 miles upstream of the Winder intake. Under the Part 5 Criteria, no minimum criteria apply more than 7 miles upstream of a public water supply intake or reservoir in large water supply watersheds.

#### **Stream Buffer Protection**

Both the project site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show an intermittent blue-line stream crossing the property roughly south to north in the northeastern portion of the central part of the property. The site plan shows the 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback that are required under both the Hall and Gwinnett County Stream Buffer Ordinances. However, the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer is not shown on the site plans. One transportation route crosses the buffers along the County line. Possible intrusions into the extended impervious setbacks are shown for two buildings and one driveway crossing in the conceptual plans. If these remain in the final plans, variances may be required from Hall and Gwinnett Counties as applicable.

The State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer should be shown on the plans. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the requirements of the applicable County Stream Buffer Ordinance and any other waters of the State on the property will be subject to the 25-foot state Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffers.

#### **Stormwater/Water Quality**

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality.

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual

Thompson Mill Village DRI Natural Resources Comments March 19, 2024 Page Two

(<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) 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.



	Zo	oning Summ	ary						
DATE	JXD	Tax Parcel	CASE	DRI	Area (ac.)	Action	Comm (sf)	Res. (Units)	Hotel (Rms)
2005	Hall			#714 (GMRDC)			143,000	1,300	
3/27/2008	Hall	15039-000002 15039-000640 15039-000641 15039-000642 15039-000643	15039 000002 and 012D, 6052 Deaton Creek Pkwy, 5800 Thompson Mill Road	#1693 (GMRDC)	28.79 ac	Rezone AR-IV/PRD to PCD	529,212	168	200
5/20/2008	Gwinnett	3006 009A	MUO-08-001	#1693 (GMRDC)	43.61	RA-200 to MUO	254,255	549	
2/25/2020	Gwinnett	3006 009A	RZC2020-00001, SUP2020-00006, SUP2020-00007		11.52 (part of prior 43.61)	MUO to O&I w/SUP		192	
1/26/2021	Gwinnett	3006 009A	RZC2020-00028, SUP2020-00070, SUP2020-00069		6.6	RA-200 to O&I w/SUP		132	
1/26/2021	Gwinnett	3006 005 3006 050	RZC2020-00027, SUP2020-00067, SUP2020-00068		24.348	RA-200 to O&I w/SUP		499	
10/12/2023	Hall	15039-000002 15039-000640 15039-000641 15039-000642 15039-000643	5800 Thompsons Mill Rd & 0 Friendship Rd		26.685	Change in Conditions			
10/12/2023	Hall	15039-000656 15039 000004	0 Friendship Rd		11.462	Rezone AR-IV to PCD			
		• · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				TOTAL THIS DRI APP	783,467	1,540	200
						FLOOR AREA RATIO	0.16 FAR		
						GROSS RES. UNITS/AC		14.02 UNITS/AC	



Zoning Summary										
DATE	JXD	Tax Parcel	CASE	DRI	Area (ac.)	Action	Comm (sf)	Res. (Units)	Hotel (Rms)	Note
2005	Hall			#714 (GMRDC)			143,000	1,300		Built-Out, not part of this DRI
		15039-000002								
		15039-000640								
3/27/2008	Hall	15039-000641	15039 000002 and 012D,	#1693 (GMRDC)	28.79 ac	Rezone AR-IV/PRD to PCD	529,212	168	200	
		15039-000642	6052 Deaton Creek Pkwy,							
		15039-000643	5800 Thompson Mill Road							
5/20/2008	Gwinnett	3006 009A	MUO-08-001	#1693 (GMRDC)	43.61	RA-200 to MUO	254,255	549		
			RZC2020-00001,		11.52					308 Ind Liv units replaced 116 TH
2/25/2020	Gwinnett	Gwinnett 3006 009A	SUP2020-00006,		(part of prior	MUO to O&I w/SUP	192		$pot = \pm 102$ units	
			SUP2020-00007		43.61)					
			RZC2020-00028,							
1/26/2021	Gwinnett	3006 009A	SUP2020-00070,		6.6	RA-200 to O&I w/SUP		132		
			SUP2020-00069							
		2000 005	RZC2020-00027,							
1/26/2021	Gwinnett	Gwinnett 3006 005	SUP2020-00067,		24.348	RA-200 to O&I w/SUP	499			
		3006 050	SUP2020-00068							
		15039-000002								
		15039-000640								
10/12/2023	Hall	15039-000641			26.685	Change in Conditions				
		15039-000642	5800 Thompsons Mill Rd & 0			280				
		15039-000643	Friendship Rd							
10/12/2023 Hall 15039- 15039		15039-000656			11.462				0	No additional density
		15039 000004	0 Friendship Rd		11.402	Rezone AR-IV to PCD			-	No additional density
						TOTAL THIS DRI APP	783,467	1,540	200	

For the purposes of updating the 2008 DRI #1693 to reflect all zoning actions to date, this comprehensive, conceptual Master Plan represent the owner's current intent and is representative of one way the site could be developed consistent with the uses, design guidelines, and densities thus far approved.

The depicted access points to Friendship Road, Thomson Mill Road, and internal circulation are known to the Georgia Department of Transportation, and have been discussed with both Hall and Gwinnett counties, but have not gone through design review and permitting. Final subdivision, site/road geometry, building heights, locations of uses, phasing and sequencing of development are not parcel-specific, and may vary as the market demands. All such variations shall be limited by the approved uses, densities, design guidelines, and zoning conditions as interpreted by county staffs.









RETAIL/OFFICE
MIXED-USE (RETAIL/OFFICE AND RESIDENTIAL COMBINATION HOTEL WITH OPPORTUNITY FOR RETAIL/OFFICE AT GROUND LEVEL
APARTMENTS
BIG HOUSE CONDOS
INDEPENDENT LIVING (AGE-RESTRICTED)
RESIDENTIAL TOWNHOMES / LIVE/WORK TOWNHOMES
WELLNESS CENTER



regional impact + local relevance

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

#### **DRI INFORMATION**

DRI Number	#4098
DRI Title	Thompson Mill Village
County	Gwinnett County
City (if applicable)	N/A
Address / Location	West of Highway 211, between Thompson Mill Road and Friendship Road
Proposed Developmer	ht Type: A proposal to construct a mixed-use development with 141 townhomes, 460 multi- family units, 939 senior residential units, 200 hotel rooms, 105,049 SF of general office space, 254,200 SF of medical office space, 364,218 SF of retail space, a 10,000 SF bank with drive-through, and 50,000 SF of restaurant space on a 110-acre site. Build Out : 2028
Review Process	
REVIEW INFORMATI	<u>ON</u>
Prepared by	ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead	Reginald James
Copied	Jean Hee Barrett
Date	March 25, 2024

#### **TRAFFIC STUDY**

Prepared by	A&R Engineering, Inc.
Date	February 21, 2024

#### **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 traffic analysis includes a list of planned and programmed projects in Table 5 on page 35.

NO (provide comments below)

#### **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 access points to the site are 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 access points to the site are 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)

Operator / Rail Line

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

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.

Page 3 of 10

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 (neare	st bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)		
$\leq$	SERVICE WITHIN ONE M	ILE (provide additional information below)		
	Operator(s)	Braselton Trolley		
	Bus Route(s)	6323 Grand Hickory Drive		
	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

Gwinnett County Bus Transit, GRTA Express Bus Service

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*)

The development site is bounded by roadways on two sides. Thompson Mill Road, a local road, provides access to adjacent uses.

# **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.

$\boxtimes$	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*)

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities do not currently exist along the roadway adjacent to the site. The development proposes external and internal sidewalks for access between uses.

**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.

$\ge$	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)

The site plan and analysis states that pedestrian facilities will be constructed along adjacent roadways to provide connectivity to adjacent sites.

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.	L3. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasi 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?		
	$\boxtimes$ 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.

#### **Donald Shockey**

From:	Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov></achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent:	Tuesday, March 26, 2024 12:27 PM
То:	Donald Shockey
Subject:	RE: 2023 Thompson Mill Village DRI 4098 - Review Notice and Comments Request

Donald,

This proposed construction is more than 10 miles from any open to the public airport. It is located outside any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact any airport.

If any construction equipment or construction exceeds 200' AGL, an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration according to the FAA's Notice Criteria Tool found here (https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/gisTools/gisAction.jsp?action=showNoNoticeRequiredToolForm). Those submissions for any associated cranes may be done online at https://oeaaa.faa.gov. The FAA must be in receipt of the notifications, no later than 120 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impacts of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

#### **Alan Hood**

Airport Safety Data Program Manager



Aviation Programs 600 West Peachtree Street NW 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Atlanta, GA, 30308 404.660.3394 cell 404.532.0082 office Website: https://www.dot.ga.gov/GDOT/pages/AirportAid.aspx

From: Donald Shockey <DShockey@atlantaregional.org>

Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 5:24 PM

To: chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; gaswcc.swcd@gaswcc.ga.gov; hhill@gefa.ga.gov; Jon West <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; kmoore@gaconservancy.org; nongame.review@dnr.ga.gov; Sierra Scott <Sierra.Scott@gadca.onmicrosoft.com>; slucki@gefa.ga.gov; Zane Grennell - Georgia DCA (zane.grennell@dca.ga.gov) <zane.grennell@dca.ga.gov>; Andrew Smith <ASmith@atlantaregional.org>; Danny Johnson <DJohnson@atlantaregional.org>; David Haynes <DHaynes@atlantaregional.org>; Eleanor Swensson <ESwensson@atlantaregional.org>; Jean Hee P. Barrett <JBarrett@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Santo <JSanto@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Skinner <JSkinner@atlantaregional.org>; Jonathan Philipsborn <JPhilipsborn@atlantaregional.org>; Katherine Zitsch <KZitsch@atlantaregional.org>; Kristin Allin <KAllin@atlantaregional.org>; Lauren Blaszyk <LBlaszyk@atlantaregional.org>; Marquitrice Mangham <MMangham@atlantaregional.org>; Patrick Bradshaw <PBradshaw@atlantaregional.org>; Ranata Mattison <RMattison@atlantaregional.org>; Reginald James <RJames@atlantaregional.org>; Roshani Thakore <RThakore@atlantaregional.org>; Samyukth Shenbaga <SShenbaga@atlantaregional.org>; Wei Wang <WWang@atlantaregional.org>; Abbie Dean <adean@srta.ga.gov>; Brittany Williams <br/>bwilliams@srta.ga.gov>;