

DATE: JUNE 27, 2024

**TO:** Mayor Rochelle Robinson, City of Douglasville  
**ATTN TO:** Marissa Jackson, Planning and Zoning Administrator, City of Douglasville  
**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.

**Name of Proposal:** Bill Arp Residential DRI 4125

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Douglasville

**Date Opened:** June 12, 2024

**Comments Due:** June 27, 2024

**Description:** *A DRI review of a proposal to construct 320 multi-family rental units and 455 for sale townhome units on a site at the intersection of Bill Arp Road and Rose Avenue in the City of Douglasville in Douglas County.*

**Comments:**

**Key Comments**

*The project is generally aligned with Established Suburbs policy recommendations which emphasize the importance of preserving single-family neighborhoods with appropriate infill development.*

*The project is projected to generate 5,662 daily new vehicular trips; a number of roadway improvements to mitigate the traffic impact are proposed.*

*The project offers a choice of housing options including apartments of varying size and attached townhomes which is supportive of regional housing policy.*

*The project could be more aligned with regional environmental policies by preserving additional wooded land, utilizing green infrastructure in developed areas, and employing environmentally sensitive land clearing and construction methods.*

*Areas designated on the site plan as landscape buffer and open space should preserve the extensive tree cover that currently exists on most of the site.*

### **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 11-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— Established Suburbs for this project - and provides accompanying growth policy recommendations which are detailed at the end of these comments.

The project offers a choice of housing options including apartments of varying size and attached townhomes which is supportive of regional housing policy.

### **Transportation and Mobility Comments**

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

The project is projected to generate 5,662 daily new vehicular trips; a number of roadway improvements to mitigate the traffic impact are proposed.

### **ARC Natural Resources Group Comments**

ARC's Natural Resources Group comments are attached.

The USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan both show Anneewakee Creek crossing the property, roughly paralleling Bill Arp Road and Rose Avenue frontages of the property. The site plan shows the 25-foot State Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer as well as the City of Douglasville Stream Buffer Ordinance's standard 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback along the entire length of the Creek. The City of Douglasville Stream Buffer Ordinance both prohibits impervious surfaces and requires that grading and earthmoving be minimized in that setback. The submitted site plan shows only an existing road, the new access road into the project, a sewer easement and what appear to be trails in the buffer and setback. The transportation and utility crossings, including two trail crossings, are exempted from the buffer and setback requirements. Unpaved trails are also exempt, but if the trails are paved, they may require a variance from the City of Douglasville

### **Environmental Comments**

Additional retention of wooded and stream adjacent areas would be desirable and in keeping with regional goals regarding carbon sequestration and climate change/heat island effect mitigation. There may be potential opportunities for linking these fragmented undeveloped areas with adjacent undeveloped or protected areas to ensure their maintenance and potential use for recreation or habitat preservation.

Incorporation of green stormwater and heat island mitigation designs for the surface car parking spaces proposed and use of an ecosystem-based design for the stormwater detention areas would be supportive of regional environmental policies. The project could be further aligned with regional environmental policies by employing environmentally sensitive land clearing and construction methods and retaining the existing heavy tree canopy in areas designated open space and landscape buffer.

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

### **Atlanta Region's Plan Growth Policy Considerations: Established Suburbs**

According to the Atlanta Region's Plan, Established Suburbs are areas where suburban development has occurred and are characterized by single-family subdivisions, commercial development, and office, industrial and multi-family development. These areas represent the part of the region that has recently reached "build-out." With few remaining large parcels for additional development, these are the areas in which the region may see the least amount of land-use change outside of retail and commercial areas. While there is still room for limited infill development, these areas will begin to focus more on redevelopment over the next 30 years.

Preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods is important, and wholesale change will most likely not occur in the single-family subdivisions that make up a majority of these areas. However, infill and redevelopment will occur in areas of retail/commercial concentrations, especially commercial corridors.

The project is generally aligned with Established Suburbs recommendations. The project could better support regional environmental policies by incorporating green stormwater and heat island mitigation measures, using an ecosystem-based design for the stormwater detention areas and employing environmentally sensitive land clearing and construction methods that retain the existing heavy tree canopy in areas designated open space and landscape buffer. City of Douglasville leadership and staff should collaborate closely with the developer to ensure optimal sensitivity to nearby local governments, neighborhoods, land uses and natural systems.

<b>THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:</b>
---

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	DOUGLAS COUNTY
CITY OF CHATTAHOOCHEE HILLS	CITY OF SOUTH FULTON	COBB 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](#)
[Tier Map](#)
[Apply](#)
[View Submissions](#)
[Login](#)

### DRI #4125

#### 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: Douglasville  
 Individual completing form: Marissa Jackson  
 Telephone: 678-449-3202  
 E-mail: [jacksonma@douglasvillega.gov](mailto:jacksonma@douglasvillega.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: Bill Arp Residential  
 Location (Street Address, 9148 Hwy. 5 Douglasville GA 30134 Intersection of Bill Arp and Rose Ave. parcels:  
 GPS Coordinates, or Legal 016102500043, 016  
 Land Lot Description):  
 Brief Description of Project: The project entails a completely residential development including a multi-family component consisting of 320 apartments for rent units and a townhome component consisting of 455 for sale units

#### 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 checked="" type="radio"/> Housing                   | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities             | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types     |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial                           | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants     |   |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 793 total units, 366 apartment, 457 townhome

Developer: DRB Group GA LLC

Mailing Address: 55 Ivan Allen Jr. Blvd.

Address 2:

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30308

Telephone: 304-268-3768

Email: [cheath@drbgroup.com](mailto:cheath@drbgroup.com)

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

If yes, property owner: Short Hill, LLC

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: Project ID:

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project: ☒ Rezoning ☐ Variance ☐ Sewer ☐ Water ☐ Permit ☐ Other

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: LDP December 2025 Overall project: Completed 2033-2035

---

[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](#)
[Login](#)

### DRI #4125

#### 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: Douglasville  
 Individual completing form: Marissa Jackson  
 Telephone: 678-449-3202  
 Email: jacksonma@douglasvillega.gov

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Bill Arp Residential  
 DRI ID Number: 4125  
 Developer/Applicant: DRB Group GA LLC  
 Telephone: 304-268-3768  
 Email(s): cheath@drbgroup.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: \$250,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$5,000,000

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): There is 1 approximately 2000 square foot building on the property that is currently used as an auto repair facility. the lease will be terminated upon receiving rezoning approval.

#### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Douglasville Water Sewer Authority

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.5 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: Douglas County Water and Sewer Authority

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.5 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.) 794 (359 AM, 435 PM)-see methodology report

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: Recommendations for required traffic improvements are pending in the notice of decision.

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 741

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 60%

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: The development will retain 36% open space including several storm water detention ponds and designated areas. Civil Engineer will comply with all city codes regarding storm water.

### 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:  
There is a road crossing over a flood plain/wetland area.

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#)

[DRI Site Map](#) | [Contact](#)



**2024 BILL ARP RESIDENTIAL DRI**  
**City of Douglasville**  
**Natural Resources Review Comments**  
**June 17, 2024**

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

**Watershed Protection**

The project property is located in the Anneewakee Creek watershed, which is within the portion of the Chattahoochee River watershed that drains into the Chattahoochee River Corridor but 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. Proposed intakes in South Fulton and Coweta County 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 on the Chattahoochee.

**Stream Buffers**

The USGS coverage for the project area and the submitted site plan both show Anneewakee Creek crossing the property, roughly paralleling Bill Arp Road and Rose Avenue frontages of the property. The site plan shows the 25-foot State Sediment and Erosion Control Buffer as well as the City of Douglasville Stream Buffer Ordinance's standard 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious setback along the entire length of the Creek. The City of Douglasville Stream Buffer Ordinance both prohibits impervious surfaces and requires that grading and earthmoving be minimized in that setback. The submitted site plan shows only an existing road, the new access road into the project, a sewer easement and what appear to be trails in the buffer and setback. The transportation and utility crossings, including two trail crossings, are exempted from the buffer and setback requirements. Unpaved trails are also exempt, but if the trails are paved, they may require a variance from the City of Douglasville.

Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the City buffer requirements. 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](http://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** #4125  
**DRI Title** Bill Arp residential  
**County** Douglas County  
**City (if applicable)** Douglasville  
**Address / Location** 9148 Highway 5, Douglasville, GA 30134

**Proposed Development Type:**

A DRI review of a proposal to construct 320 multi-family rental units and 455 for sale townhome units on a site at the intersection of Bill Arp Road and Rose Avenue in the City of Douglasville in Douglas County.

**Build Out: 2034**

**Review Process** ☐ EXPEDITED  
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Reginald James  
**Copied** Jean Hee Barrett  
**Date** June 25, 2024

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** A&R Engineering  
**Date** May 24, 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*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

☒ NO (*provide comments below*)

No improvements have been identified in the Regional Transportation Plan (Plan 2040), GDOT GeoPi, and/or the local comprehensive transportation plan within the vicinity of the proposed development.

## **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*)

Site Driveway 1 provides access to a roadway identified as a Regional Thoroughfare (Highway 5).

**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 roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes provide access to the site.

**04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.**

*Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.*

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*nearest station more than one mile away*)

☐ 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)                      Connect Douglas

Bus Route(s)                     Routes 10 and 20

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

Connect Douglas

**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.



VICINITY MAP  
NOT TO SCALE

