**REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING** 

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

#### **DATE**: 4/11/2005

#### ARC REVIEW CODE: R503111

TO:Mayor Ralph MooreATTN TO:Ann Lippmann, Director, Planning and Economic DevelopmentFROM:Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature. Original on file.

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Below is the ARC finding. The Atlanta Regional Commission reviewed the DRI with regard to conflicts to regional plans, goals, and policies and impacts it might have on the activities, plans, goals, and policies of other local jurisdictions and state, federal, and other agencies. The finding does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

#### <u>Submitting Local Government</u>: City of Union City <u>Name of Proposal</u>: Opus South Corp Royal 85

**<u>Review Type:</u>** Development of Regional Impact

Date Opened: 3/11/2005 Date Closed: 4/11/2005

**<u>FINDING</u>**: After reviewing the information submitted for the review, and the comments received from affected agencies, the Atlanta Regional Commission finding is that the DRI is in the best interest of the State.

<u>Additional Comments:</u> A revised site plan was submitted to ARC and GRTA for information purposes only. The revised site plan reflects additional wetlands and stream delineations that have been determined during the review process. The residential component of this development is still being revised to reflect these environmental issues as well as market conditions that are currently being researched. The original proposed zoning, TCMF, for the multifamily portion of the site is a new zoning district that was approved in late 2004. The intent of the zoning is to create "pedestrian friendly residential uses and accessory non residential uses complete with quality urban design regulations." The multifamily portion of the site is not reflective of the intent of this zoning district at this time. Through discussions with the developer and Union City, ARC expressed several concerns over the proposed zoning, which was developed through an LCI supplemental study. The developer plans to apply now for the MXD (Mixed Use Development) zoning for the multifamily portion of the site. The MXD zoning is an overlay district where the underlying zoning of the property shall be commercial or industrial. The approval of the overlay district is specific to the development plan.

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING ARC DATA RESEARCH GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES CITY OF FAIRBURN CLAYTON COUNTY ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ARC AGING DIVISION GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FULTON COUNTY FAYETTE COUNTY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FULTON COUNTY SCHOOLS SOUTH FULTON CID

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Mike Alexander, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463–3302. This finding will be published to the ARC website.

The ARC review website is located at: <u>http://www.atlantaregional.com/qualitygrowth/reviews.html</u> .

### FINAL REPORT SUMMARY

### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The proposed Opus South Corp- Royal 85 is located on 126.56 acres in the City of Union City on both sides of Royal South Parkway. The proposed development is a mixed use development that will consist of 625,000 square feet of light industrial/distribution space in five buildings, 308 multifamily units, 131 townhomes, and 300,000 square feet of office space. There are swim and clubhouse amenities planned for the multifamily units, and swim, tennis, and clubhouse amenities planned for the townhome units. Access to the development is proposed at ten locations on Royal South Parkway.

### **PROJECT PHASING:**

The project is being proposed in one phase with a project build out date for 2010.

### **GENERAL**

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

# Is the proposed project consistent with the host-local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

The project site is currently zoned M-1 (light industrial) and O-I (office institutional). The warehouse and office portions of the site do not need to be rezoned. The existing zoning for the townhome portion of the site is RM (residential multifamily). The original proposed zoning for the multifamily portion of the site is TCMF (town center multifamily); however, it has been changed to MXD (mixed use development). The site was annexed last year into the city; therefore, it was not part of the future land use plan. Information submitted for the review states that when the future land use plan is updated, the site will be in conformance.

# Is the proposed project consistent with any potentially affected local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

No comments were received by affected local governments concerning comprehensive plans.

# Will the proposed project impact the implementation of any local government's short-term work program? If so, how?

No comments were received concerning the short term work program of affected local governments.

Will the proposed project generate population and/or employment increases in the Region? If yes, what would be the major infrastructure and facilities improvements needed to support the increase?



Preliminary	March 11,
Report:	2005
Final Report	April 11,
Due:	2005

Yes, total employment for the proposed development is estimated to be 1,104. Based on the assumption that one household will be established for each housing units, the number of site households will be 439.

What other major development projects are planned near the proposed project? The ARC has reviewed other major development projects, known as Area Plan (1984 to1991) or as a DRI (1991 to present), within two miles radius of the proposed project.

2005	Majestic Airport Center III
2004	Goodson 1 Distribution Center
2001	Oakley Township
2000	IDI Buffington Industrial Development
1999	Flat Shoals Crossing
1999	Flat Shoals MUD
1997	Majestic Industrial Park 1
1996	Eastern International Speedway
1986	Royal 85 South
1985	C&S Bank Center

# Will the proposed project displace housing units or community facilities? If yes, identify and give number of units, facilities, etc.

Based on information submitted for the review, the site is currently undeveloped.

### Will the development cause a loss in jobs? If yes, how many?

No.

### Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

The development proposes residential, industrial, and office uses on a 126.56 acre site that has been recently annexed into the City of Union City.

A revised site plan was submitted to ARC and GRTA for information purposes only. The revised site plan reflects additional wetlands and stream delineations that have been determined during the review process. The residential component of this development is still being revised to reflect these environmental issues as well as market conditions that are currently being researched.

The original proposed zoning, TCMF, for the multifamily portion of the site is a new zoning district that was approved in late 2004. The intent of the zoning is to create "pedestrian friendly residential uses and accessory non residential uses complete with quality urban design regulations." The multifamily portion of the site is not reflective of the intent of this zoning district at this time. Through discussions with the developer and Union City, ARC expressed several concerns over the proposed zoning, which was developed through an LCI supplemental study. The developer plans to apply now



for the MXD (Mixed Use Development) zoning for the multifamily portion of the site. The MXD zoning is an overlay district where the underlying zoning of the property shall be commercial or industrial. The approval of the overlay district is specific to the development plan.

The buffers should be well covered with vegetation to block the view of the truck courts from the residential areas and from Interstate 85. It is strongly recommended that the developer provide extensive vegetative cover and buffering of the detention pond and the truck court of Building 5 from the residential townhomes proposed. The revised site plan does not reflect an amenity area of the townhomes. Further revisions that include additional townhome development or an amenity area should be adequately buffered from the industrial warehouse operations.

Information submitted for the review states that in the agreement of the annexation of the site into Union City, the greenspace proposed for the site would be put into a conservation easement. It is ARC's understanding that this process is currently underway to place the greenspace area into a conservation easement with the Southern Conservation Trust. It is recommended that the Trust work with the City of Union City and Fulton County toward regional greenspace networks and linkages.

The proposed development also received a score of 5 out of a required 15 points on ARC's Air Quality Benchmark Test. However, the development's close proximity and convenient access to Interstate 85 should be considered. The location of the development does mitigate the truck traffic on local road in the area.

Information submitted for the review states that there is a growing sidewalk network in the area. The existing sidewalk is currently discontinuous, but as the area is developing, sidewalks are being added to the frontage of new developments. It is strongly encouraged that developer continues this pattern and provided sidewalks to the frontage of the development along Royal South Parkway. The developer is proposing to do this according to information submitted for the review. With the close proximity of the MARTA Park and Ride lot and the transit routes servicing this lot, it is strongly recommended that the developer work with the City and with MARTA to provide safe and convenient access for its workers and residents to and from the Park and Ride lot to encourage transit ridership.

It is also recommended that in order to reduce vehicle trips, especially within the site, that as the residential component is revised, significant consideration be given to the placement of the amenity center within the apartment complex. It is encouraged, within the determined market conditions, that the amenity center is centrally located within an appropriate walking distance for all residents of the apartment complex.

Finally, it is strongly encouraged that the parking area of the office development be addressed. In order to encourage transit ridership, reduce impervious surfaces causing additional runoff, and reduce the heat island effect, it is recommended that the required parking for the office component be examined and reduced, if possible. It is also recommended that the developer consider the type of materials used for construction of parking lots. Mitigation strategies could include, but not exclusive, replanting of shade trees and vegetation where possible, use of reflective materials for pavements. It is recommended that resources and information from the U.S Green Building Council, American Planning Association, U.S. EPA, and Project ATLANTA (Atlanta Land Use Analysis: Temperature and Air Quality) study be reviewed.



### FINAL REPORT

### **Regional Development Plan Policies**

- 1. Provide development strategies and infrastructure investments to accommodate forecasted population and employment growth more efficiently.
- 2. Guide an increased share of new development to the Central Business District, transportation corridors, activity centers and town centers.
- 3. Increase opportunities for mixed-use development, infill and redevelopment.
- 4. Increase transportation choices and transit-oriented development (TOD).
- 5. Provide a variety of housing choices throughout the region to ensure housing for individuals and families of diverse incomes and age groups.
- 6. Preserve and enhance existing residential neighborhoods.
- 7. Advance sustainable greenfield development.
- 8. Protect environmentally sensitive areas.
- 9. Create a regional network of greenspace that connects across jurisdictional boundaries.
- 10. Preserve existing rural character.
- 11. Preserve historic resources.
- 12. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local and neighborhood levels.
- 13. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support the RDP.
- 14. Support growth management at the state level.

### BEST LAND USE PRACTICES

Practice 1: Keep vehicle miles of travel (VMT) below the area average. Infill developments are the best at accomplishing this. The more remote a development the more self contained it must be to stay below the area average VMT.

Practice 2: Contribute to the area's jobs-housing balance. Strive for a job-housing balance with a three to five mile area around a development site.

Practice 3: Mix land uses at the finest grain the market will bear and include civic uses in the mix.

Practice 4: Develop in clusters and keep the clusters small. This will result in more open space preservation. Practice 5: Place higher-density housing near commercial centers, transit lines and parks. This will enable more walking, biking and transit use.

Practice 6: Phase convenience shopping and recreational opportunities to keep pace with housing. These are valued amenities and translate into less external travel by residents if located conveniently to housing. Practice 7: Make subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges. This is traditional development.

Practice 8: Reserve school sites and donate them if necessary to attract new schools. This will result in neighborhood schools which provide a more supportive learning environment than larger ones. Practice 9: Concentrate commercial development in compact centers or districts, rather than letting it spread out in strips.



Practice 10: Make shopping centers and business parks into all-purpose activity centers. Suburban shopping centers and their environs could be improved by mixing uses and designing them with the pedestrian amenities of downtowns.

Practice 11: Tame auto-oriented land uses, or at least separate them from pedestrian-oriented uses. Relegate "big box" stores to areas where they will do the least harm to the community fabric.

### BEST TRANSPORTATION PRACTICES

Practice 1: Design the street network with multiple connections and relatively direct routes.

Practice 2: Space through-streets no more than a half-mile apart or the equivalent route density in a curvilinear network.

Practice 3: Use traffic-calming measures liberally. Use short streets, sharp curves, center islands, traffic circles, textured pavements, speed bumps and raised crosswalks.

Practice 4: Keep speeds on local streets down to 20 mph.

Practice 5: Keep speeds on arterials and collectors down to 35 mph (at least inside communities).

Practice 6: Keep all streets as narrow as possible and never more than four traffic lanes wide. Florida suggests access streets 18 feet, subcollectors 26 feet, and collectors from 28 feet to 36 feet depending on lanes and parking. Practice 7: Align streets to give buildings energy-efficient orientations. Allow building sites to benefit from sun angles, natural shading and prevailing breezes.

Practice 8: Avoid using traffic signals wherever possible and always space them for good traffic progression. Practice 9: Provide networks for pedestrians and bicyclists as good as the network for motorists.

Practice 10: Provide pedestrians and bicyclists with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets. Practice 11: Incorporate transit-oriented design features.

Practice 12: Establish TDM programs for local employees. Ridesharing, modified work hours, telecommuting and others.

### BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

Practice 1: Use a systems approach to environmental planning. Shift from development orientation to basins or ecosystems planning.

Practice 2: Channel development into areas that are already disturbed.

Practice 3: Preserve patches of high-quality habitat, as large and circular as possible, feathered at the edges and connected by wildlife corridors. Stream corridors offer great potential.

Practice 4: Design around significant wetlands.

Practice 5: Establish upland buffers around all retained wetlands and natural water bodies.

Practice 6: Preserve significant uplands, too.

Practice 7: Restore and enhance ecological functions damaged by prior site activities.

Practice 8: Detain runoff with open, natural drainage systems. The more natural the system the more valuable it will be for wildlife and water quality.

Practice 9: Design man-made lakes and stormwater ponds for maximum environmental value. Recreation, stormwater management, wildlife habitat and others.

Practice 10: Use reclaimed water and integrated pest management on large landscaped areas. Integrated pest management involves controlling pests by introducing their natural enemies and cultivating disease and insect resistant grasses.

Practice 11: Use and require the use of Xeriscape<sup>™</sup> landscaping. Xeriscaping<sup>™</sup> is water conserving landscape methods and materials.

### BEST HOUSING PRACTICES

Practice 1: Offer "life cycle" housing. Providing integrated housing for every part of the "life cycle." Practice 2: Achieve an average net residential density of six to seven units per acre without the appearance of crowding. Cluster housing to achieve open space.



Practice 3: Use cost-effective site development and construction practices. Small frontages and setbacks; rolled curbs or no curbs; shared driveways.

Practice 4: Design of energy-saving features. Natural shading and solar access.

Practice 5: Supply affordable single-family homes for moderate-income households.

Practice 6: Supply affordable multi-family and accessory housing for low-income households.

Practice 7: Tap government housing programs to broaden and deepen the housing/income mix.

Practice 8: Mix housing to the extent the market will bear.

### **LOCATION**

### Where is the proposed project located within the host-local government's boundaries?

The site is located the City of Union City, adjacent to Fulton County.

Will the proposed project be located close to the host-local government's boundary with another local government? If yes, identify the other local government.

The proposed development is entirely within the City of Union City

### Will the proposed project be located close to land uses in other jurisdictions that would benefit, or be negatively impacted, by the project? Identify those land uses which would benefit and those which would be negatively affected and describe impacts.

None has been determined. Surrounding land uses include undeveloped land, car dealership, and Interstate 85. Future land uses designated the much of the surrounding land as single family residences.

### **ECONOMY OF THE REGION**

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

### What new taxes will be generated by the proposed project?

Estimated value of the development is \$135 million with an expected \$1.65 million in annual local tax revenues.

### How many short-term jobs will the development generate in the Region?

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

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

Yes.

In what ways could the proposed development have a positive or negative impact on existing industry or business in the Region?



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

The proposed development will employ an estimated 1,104 workers.

### NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located in or near wetlands, groundwater recharge area, water supply watershed, protected river corridor, or other environmentally sensitive area of the Region? If yes, identify those areas.

### **Stream and Watershed Protection**

The proposed project is in the Flint River Water Supply Watershed, a water supply source for Fayette and Clayton Counties. The watershed is greater than 100 square miles above the intake and there is no reservoir directly on the Flint within this watershed area. Therefore, the only criteria applicable in such watersheds under the Georgia Planning Act's Part 5 minimum water supply watershed criteria apply to the handling and storage of hazardous materials and hazardous waste. No other water supply watershed criteria apply.

Morning Creek runs roughly north-south through the middle of the property, between the office buildings and the residential and industrial areas. A tributary to Morning Creek also runs through the residential portion of the site. A 25-foot buffer appears to be shown on both banks of Morning Creek and its tributary, but it is not clearly identified as the 25-foot buffer required under the State Erosion and Sedimentation Act. Any other waters of the state on the property, in addition to the indicated streams, are subject to the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffers. These buffers are administered by the Environmental Protection Division of the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Any work within the Erosion and Sedimentation buffers will require a variance from EPD.

Any other buffers required by the City should also be shown on the project plans. This includes buffers required under any ordinance already adopted by the City as its stream buffer ordinance as required by the District-wide Watershed Management Plan adopted by the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District in September, 2003.

### Storm Water / Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed development. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr). The loading factors are based on regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. Actual loading factors will depend on the amount of impervious surface in the final project design. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

### **Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year:**

Land Use	Land Area (ac)	Total Phosphorus	Total Nitrogen	BOD	TSS	Zinc	Lead
Forest/Open	19.68	1.57	11.81	177.12	4624.80	0.00	0.00



Preliminary<br/>Report:March 11,<br/>2005Final Report<br/>Due:April 11,<br/2005</th>

							-
Office/Light Industrial	74.25	95.78	1271.90	8464.50	52569.00	109.89	14.11
Townhouse/Apartment	38.63	40.56	413.73	2588.21	23371.15	29.36	5.41
TOTAL	132.56	137.92	1697.44	11229.83	80564.95	139.25	19.52
Total % impervious	53%						

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual. Some measures to consider include:

- Reducing impervious cover by replacing parking lots with parking decks for the office buildings and the apartments. This would also allow for the preservation of more greenspace and reduce clearing and grading costs.
- Using porous concrete or pavers in areas of low traffic / load where contributing drainage areas are impervious.
- Ensuring that adequate stormwater facilities are provided to treat stormwater runoff from the entire site as well as for detention storage for downstream channel protection and the 25-year storm event (peak flow attenuation) per guidelines in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual. Detention ponds should be designed as multi-purpose (water quality and detention) facilities wherever possible and incorporated into the sign design as amenities. The submitted site plan shows only one stormwater quality structural control (BMP).
- For surface parking areas, using bio-retention facilities in parking lot islands to treat and detain a portion of the runoff from the site. This would reduce the required size of the stormwater wet ponds and/or detention basins. In addition, enhanced swales and/or grass channels could be used to convey and treat stormwater runoff in landscaped areas adjacent to the warehouse facilities and Royal South Parkway.
- Using undisturbed buffers for stormwater treatment per guidelines in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual.
- Minimizing clearing and grading where possible, particularly adjacent to stream buffers and natural drainage ways.

### **HISTORIC RESOURCES**

### Will the proposed project be located near a national register site? If yes, identify site.

None have been identified.

In what ways could the proposed project create impacts that would damage the resource?



Not applicable.

In what ways could the proposed project have a positive influence on efforts to preserve or promote the historic resource?

Not applicable.

### INFRASTRUCTURE Transportation

### Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Review Findings

# How many site access points will be associated with the proposed development? What are their locations?

This site will have ten access driveways on Royal South Parkway. The following list describes the proposed access points in more detail:

- West Office Driveway is the westernmost site driveway. It will serve the office portion of the site on the north side of Royal South Parkway.
- **East Office Driveway** is the next site driveway east of the West Office Driveway. It will also serve the office portion of the site on the north side of Royal South Parkway.
- **Buildings 1 & 2 Driveway** is the next site driveway east of East Office Driveway. It will serve Buildings 1 and 2, both warehouse, on the south side of Royal South Parkway. The buildings 1 & 2 Driveway will align with West Apartment Driveway across the street.
- West Apartment Driveway is directly across from the Buildings 1 & 2 Driveway on the north side of Royal South Parkway. It will serve the multi-family portion of the site on the north side of Royal South Parkway.
- **East Apartment Driveway** is the next site driveway east of Buildings 1 & 2 Driveway and West Apartment Driveway. It will also serve the multi-family portion of the site on the north side of Royal South Parkway.
- **Building 3 Driveway** is the next site driveway east of East Apartment Driveway. It will serve Building 3 (warehouse) on the south side of Royal South Parkway.
- **Townhouses Driveway** is the next site driveway east of Building 3 Driveway. It will serve the townhome portion of the site on the north side of Royal South Parkway.
- **Building 4 Driveway** is the next site driveway east of Townhouses Driveway. It will serve Building 4 (warehouse) on the south side of Royal South Parkway. Building 4 Driveway will align with Building 5 Truck Driveway across the street.



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

- **Building 5 Truck Driveway** is directly across from the Building 4 Driveway on the north side of Royal South Parkway. It will serve as the access driveway for trucks for Building 5 (warehouse) on the north side of Royal South Parkway.
- **Building 5 Car Driveway** is the easternmost site driveway. It will serve as the access driveway for employees for Building 5 (warehouse) on the north side of Royal South Parkway.

# How much traffic (both average daily and peak am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?

Street Smarts performed the transportation analysis. GRTA and ARC review staff agreed with the methodology and assumptions used in the analysis. The net trip generation is based on the rates published in the 7<sup>th</sup> edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

Land Lisa	A.N	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour		
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	2-Way
Warehousing 625,000 sq ft	138	30	168	39	115	154	1,458
Apartments 308 units	31	124	155	122	65	187	2,001
Townhouses 131 units	11	53	64	50	25	75	807
Office 300,000 sq ft	398	54	452	71	344	415	3,109
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	578	261	839	282	549	831	7,375

# What are the existing traffic patterns and volumes on the local, county, state and interstate roads that serve the site?

Incorporating the trip generation results, the transportation consultant distributed the traffic on the current roadway network. An assessment of the existing Level of Service (LOS) and projected LOS based on the trip distribution findings helps to determine the study network. The results of this exercise determined the study network, which has been approved by ARC and GRTA. If analysis of an intersection or roadway results in a substandard LOS "D", then the consultant recommends improvements.

Projected traffic volumes from the Regional Travel Demand Model are compared to the assigned capacity of facilities within the study network. This data is used to calculate a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The V/C ratio values that define the LOS thresholds vary depending on factors such as the type of terrain traversed and the percent of the road where passing is prohibited. LOS A is free-flow traffic from 0 to 0.3, LOS B is decreased free-flow from 0.31 to 0.5, LOS C is limited mobility from 0.51 to 0.75, LOS D is restricted mobility from 0.76 to 0.9, LOS E is at or near capacity from 0.91 to 1.00, and LOS F is breakdown flow with a V/C ratio of 1.01 or above. As a V/C ratio reaches 0.8, congestion increases. The V/C ratios for traffic in various network years are presented in the following table. Any facilities that have a V/C ratio of 1.0 or above are considered congested.



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

#### V/C Ratios



For the V/C ratio graphic, the data is based on 2005, 2010 and 2030 A.M./P.M. peak volume data generated from ARC's travel demand model for Mobility 2030, the 2030 RTP and the FY 2005-2010 TIP, adopted in December 2004. The travel demand model incorporates lane addition improvements and updates to the network as appropriate. As the life of the RTP



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

progresses, volume and/or V/C ratio data may appear inconsistent due to (1) effect of implementation of nearby new or expanded facilities or (2) impact of socio-economic data on facility types.

# List the transportation improvements that would affect or be affected by the proposed project.

#### 2005-2010 TIP\*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
FS-AR-BP087A,B	BUFFINGTON ROAD: SEGMENT 1,2	Multi-Use Bike/Ped Facility	2007
AR-430	I-85 SOUTH ATMS COMMUNICATIONS / SURVEILLANCE	Roadway Operations	2007
AR-H-152	I-85 SOUTH HOV LANES	HOV Lanes	2025
FS-142	BUFFINGTON ROAD	Bridge Upgrade	2008
FS-196	SR 14 SPUR (SOUTH FULTON PARKWAY) ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN	Study	2006

#### 2030 RTP\*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
FS-026	OAKLEY ROAD	Roadway Capacity	2030
FS-202A	OAKLEY INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD EXTENSION	Roadway Capacity	2020
FS-030	US 29 (ROOSEVELT HIGHWAY)	Roadway Capacity	2030

\*The ARC Board adopted the 2030 RTP and FY 2005-2010 TIP in December 2004. USDOT approved in December 2004.

# Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for Royal 85.

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **background** traffic. The transportation consultant has made recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service.

S. Fulton Parkway WB Off-ramp and Buffington Road

• Addition of a traffic signal at the intersection of the South Fulton Parkway westbound offramp and Buffington Road.

Royal South Parkway and Buffington Road

• Addition of a traffic signal at the intersection of Royal South Parkway and Buffington Road.

Old Bill Cook Road and Buffington Road

• Addition of a separate westbound left turn lane on Old Bill Cook Road at Buffington Road.

According to the findings, there will be some capacity deficiencies as a result of future year **total** traffic. The transportation consultant has made recommendations for improvements to be carried out in order to upgrade the existing level of service. The recommendations stated in the no-build condition are also applicable to the build condition.



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

Royal South Parkway and Feldwood Road

• Addition of a traffic signal at the intersection of Royal South Parkway and Feldwood Road.

### Is the site served by transit? If so, describe type and level of service and how it will enhance or be enhanced by the presence of transit? Are there plans to provide or expand transit service in the vicinity of the proposed project?

There is a MARTA Park and Ride lot on the south side of Royal South Parkway just west of the office portion of the proposed development. There are two MARTA bus routes in the vicinity of the site, both servicing the MARTA Park and Ride lot. Routes 89 and 289 stop at the Park and Ride lot, and run from Fairburn on the southern end of their routes to the College Park MARTA rail station on the northeastern end of their routes. Headways on Route 89 are every forty minutes while headways on Route 289 are every twenty minutes.

# What transportation demand management strategies does the developer propose (carpool, flex-time, transit subsidy, etc.)?

None proposed.

### The development DOES NOT PASS the ARC's Air Quality Benchmark test.

Air Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based		
on ARC strategies)	Credits	Total
w/in 1/4 mile of Bus Stop (CCT, MARTA,		3%
Other)		
Bike/ped networks connecting uses w/in the		
site		2%
Total		5%

# What are the conclusions of this review? Is the transportation system (existing and planned) capable of accommodating these trips?

The Royal 85 project is within good proximity to I-85 which provides the potential for efficient regional connectivity, however, accessibility to the interstate is limited to the use of the Flat Shoals Road interchange. The addition of the project's traffic onto the roadway network challenges existing capacity.

Despite the location of the MARTA Park and Ride lot nearby, the character of the development and the site plan do not promote the use of transit to the site. It is suggested that the developer and the city work with one another to provide improved pedestrian connectivity to the MARTA Park and Ride lot from the proposed development. This could leverage more transit ridership and minimize the affect additional trips produced by this project will have on the roadway network.

### **INFRASTRUCTURE**

### Wastewater and Sewage



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

Based on regional averages, wastewater is estimated at 0.14 MGD.

### Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Information submitted with the review states that the Camp Creek plant will provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development.

### What is the current permitted capacity and average annual flow to this facility?

The capacity of Camp Creek is listed below

PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD 1	DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD	2001 MMF, MGD	2008 MMF, MGD	2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD	PLANNED EXPANSION	Remarks
13	13	13	17	-4	Expansion to 24 mgd by 2005.	Step permit (13/19/24) approved by EPD.

MMF: Maximum Monthly Flow. Mgd: million of gallons per day.

<sup>1</sup> Source: Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District SHORT-TERM WASTEWATER CAPACITY PLAN, August 2002.

### What other major developments will be served by the plant serving this project?

ARC has reviewed a number of major developments that will be served by this plant.

### <u>INFRASTRUCTURE</u> Water Supply and Treatment

### How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.14 MGD based on regional averages.

# How will the proposed project's demand for water impact the water supply or treatment facilities of the jurisdiction providing the service?

Information submitted with the review suggests that there is sufficient water supply capacity available for the proposed project.

### INFRASTRUCTURE Solid Waste

### How much solid waste will be generated by the project? Where will this waste be disposed?

Information submitted with the review 7,375 tons of solid waste per year.



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

Other than adding to a serious regional solid waste disposal problem, will the project create any unusual waste handling or disposal problems?

No.

Are there any provisions for recycling this project's solid waste?

None stated.

## INFRASTRUCTURE

### **Other facilities**

According to information gained in the review process, will there be any unusual intergovernmental impacts on:

- Levels of governmental services?
- Administrative facilities?
- · Schools?
- · Libraries or cultural facilities?
- Fire, police, or EMS?
- Other government facilities?
- Other community services/resources (day care, health care, low income, non-English speaking, elderly, etc.)?

None were determined during the review.

#### HOUSING

#### Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

No, the proposed development will add 439 additional residential units.

### Will the proposed project provide housing opportunities close to existing employment centers?

Yes. The site is located in the City of Union City and near by the City of Fairburn.

#### Is there housing accessible to the project in all price ranges demanded?

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tracts 105.11. This tract had a 13.8 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2003 according to ARC's Population and



Preliminary Report:	March 11, 2005	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT	Project:	Opus South Royal Corp # 722
Final Report Due:	April 11, 2005	<u>Review Report</u>	Comments Due By:	March 25, 2005

Housing Report. The report shows that 77 percent of the housing units are single-family, compared to 69 percent for the region; thus indicating a lack of housing options around the development area.

# Is it likely or unlikely that potential employees of the proposed project will be able to find affordable\* housing?

Likely, assuming any future housing development is approved with multiple price ranges of housing.

\* Defined as 30 percent of the income of a family making 80 percent of the median income of the Region – FY 2000 median income of \$51,649 for family of 4 in Georgia.



THE OPUS GROUP A R C H I T E C T S C O N T R A C T O R S D E V E L O P E R S

April 8, 2005

M. Haley Fleming Senior Planner Atlanta Regional Commission 40 Courtland Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30303

Dear Ms. Fleming:

RE: Proposed zoning for Royal South Parkway development

After our meeting of March 28, we reviewed the proposed TCMF (Town Center Multi-Family) zoning and now believe that it is not the appropriate zoning for this site. Incorporating commercial components as required in the TCMF zoning is not economically feasible for this site. We believe the correct zoning for our planned use would be the MXD (Mixed-Use Development) zoning. It is our plan to apply for MXD rezoning on this site and we have already informed Ann Lippmann that this is our intention.

Sincerely,

R. Due Wood

R Duane Wood

THE OPUS GROUP: Atlanta • Austin • Chicago • Columbus • Dallas • Denver • Detroit • Fort Lauderdale • Houston • Indianapolis • Kansas City • Los Angeles • Milwaukee Minneapolis • Orange County • Orlando • Pensacola • Philadelphia • Phoenix • Portland • Sacramento • San Francisco • San Jose • Seattle • St. Louis • Tampa • Washington, D.C.

OPUS SOUTH CORPORATION A member of The Opus Group 925 North Point Parkway, Suite 150 Alpharetta, GA 30005 Phone: 770-521-0045 Fax: 770-521-0046 www.opuscorp.com Your DRI ID NUMBER for this submission is: 722 Use this number when filling out a DRI REVIEW REQUEST. Submitted on: 1/26/2005 9:59:22 AM

### DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Fulton County Initial DRI Information (Form1b)

This form is intended for use by local governments within the Metropolitan Region Tier that are also within the jurisdiction of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA). The form is to be completed by the city or county government for submission to your Regional Development Center (RDC), GRTA and DCA. This form provides basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Local governments should refer to both the Rules for the DRI Process 110-12-3 and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds established by DCA.

### **Local Government Information**

Submitting Local Government:	City of Union City
*Individual completing form and Mailing Address:	Ann Lippmann, AICP 5047 Union Street Union City, GA 30291
Telephone:	770-969-9266
Fax:	770-969-8795
E-mail (only one):	alippmann@unioncityga.org

\*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:	Opus South Corp Royal 85			
Development Type	Description of Project	Thresholds		
Mixed Use	625000 of industrial use; 131 townhouses; 304 multifamily units	View Thresholds		
Developer / Applicant and Mailing Address:	Steve Franks Opus South Corporation 925 North Alpharetta, GA 30005	Steve Franks Opus South Corporation 925 North Point Parkway, Suite 150 Alpharetta, GA 30005		
Telephone:	770-740-7140			
Fax:	770-521-0046			
Email:	steve.franks@opussouth.com			
Name of property owner(s) if different from developer/applicant:	Ivan Allen Company			
Provide Land-Lot-District Number:	LL 87 & 128, District 13	LL 87 & 128, District 13		
What are the principal streets or roads providing vehicular access to the site?	Royal South Parkway, Interstate-85, Buffington R	oad & Flat Shoals Road		
Provide name of nearest street(s) or intersection:	Royal South Parkway	Royal South Parkway		
Provide geographic coordinates (latitude/ longitude) of the center of the proposed project (optional):	/			
If available, provide a link to a website providing a general location map of the proposed project (optional). (http://www.mapquest.com or http://www. mapblast.com are helpful sites to use.):	http://www.mapblast.com/(swxxudajxlcmdf55ysixl L=USA&C=33.58770%2c-84.51584&A=7.166678 +South+Pkwy%2c+Atlanta%2c+GA+30349 L1	sna)/map.aspx? xP= 33.58770%2c-84.51584 1 Royal		

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	Y
If yes, how close is the boundary of the nearest other local government?	property borders unincorporated Fulton County directly
If no, provide the following information:	
In what additional jurisdictions is the project located?	
In which jurisdiction is the majority of the	Name: (NOTE: This local government is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.)
project located? (give percent of project)	Percent of Project:
Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?	Ν
	Name:
(where applicable):	Project ID:
	App #:
The initial action being requested of the local government by the applicant is:	Other Site analysis
What is the name of the water supplier for this site?	City of Atlanta
What is the name of the wastewater treatment supplier for this site?	Fulton County
Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?	N
If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?	
Estimated Completion Dates:	This project/phase: 2010 Overall project:

Local Government Comprehensive Plan			
Is the development consistent with the local government's comprehensive plan, including the Future Land Use Map?	Ν		
If no, does the local government intend to amend the plan/map to account for this development?	Υ		
If amendments are needed, when will the plan/map be amended?	the property was annexed and is not shown on our current FLUM - the city is currently updating our plan and a new map will be available this summer		

Service Delivery Strategy		
Is all local service provision consistent with the countywide Service Delivery Strategy?	Y	
If no, when will required amendments to the countywide Service Delivery Strategy be complete?		
Land Transportation Improvements		

N

Are land transportation or access improvements planned or needed to support the proposed project?

If yes, how have these improvements been identified:

Included in local government Comprehensive Plan or Short Term Work Program?

Included in other local government plans (e.g. SPLOST/LOST Projects, etc.)?

Included in an official Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)?	
Developer/Applicant has identified needed improvements?	
Other (Please Describe):	

Submitted on: 2/23/2005 9:54:42 AM

### DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT DRI Review Initiation Request (Form2a)

Local Government Information		
Submitting Local Government:	City of Union City	
Individual completing form:	Ann Lippmann	
Telephone:	770-969-9266	
Fax:	770-969-8795	
Email ( <b>only one</b> ):	alippmann@unioncityga.org	

Proposed Project Information		
Name of Proposed Project:	Opus South Corp - Royal 85	
DRI ID Number:	722	
Developer/Applicant:	Opus South Corporation	
Telephone:	770-740-7140	
Fax:	770-521-0046	
Email(s):	steve.franks@opussouth.com	

### **DRI Review Process**

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?

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

### **Economic Impacts**

Estimated Value at Build-Out:	\$135,000,000
Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$1.65 million
Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?	Y
If the development will displace any existing uses, please describe (using number of units, square feet., etc):	

### **Community Facilities Impacts**

### Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site:		
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?		
Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project?	Y	
If no, are there any current plans to expand existing water supply capacity?		
If there are plans to expand the existing water supply capacity, briefly describe below:		
If water line extension is required to serve this project, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?		
Wastewater Disposal		

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site:

Fulton County

DRI Record

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.14	
Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? Y	
If no, are there any current plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity?	
If there are plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity, briefly describe below:	
If sewer line extension is required to serve this project, 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.)	7,375
Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	
If yes, has a copy of the study been provided to the local government?	Y
If transportation improvements are needed to serve this project, please describe below: See GRTA DRI Review package prepared by Street Smarts dated March 2005.	
Solid Waste Disposal	
How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	070
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? Y	
If no, are there any current plans to expand existing landfill capacity?	
If there are plans to expand existing landfill capacity, briefly describe below:	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management N	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management N   What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? N	65%
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management N   What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Is the site located in a water supply watershed?	65% N
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management N   What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Is the site located in a water supply watershed?   If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:	65% N
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management N   What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? Is the site located in a water supply watershed?   If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:	65% N
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.	65% N ct's
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality	65% N ct's
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality   Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:	65% N cťs
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality   Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:   1. Water supply watersheds?	65% N ct's
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality   Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:   1. Water supply watersheds?   2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?	65% N ct's
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality   Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:   1. Water supply watersheds?   2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?   3. Wetlands?	65% N ct's
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the proje impacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality   Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:   1. Water supply watersheds?   2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?   3. Wetlands?   4. Protected mountains?	65% N ct's N N Y N
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please explain below: N   Stormwater Management What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?   Is the site located in a water supply watershed? If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below:   Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the projerimpacts on stormwater management:   Detention ponds will be used to mitigate the impacts on stormwater.   Environmental Quality   Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:   1. Water supply watersheds?   2. Significant groundwater recharge areas?   3. Wetlands?   4. Protected mountains?   5. Protected river corridors?	65% N Ct's N N Y N N N

Wetlands have been identified on this property. Opus South Corp. will work with the Army Corp of Engineers to mitigate the wetlands if necessary

Υ

Has the local government implemented environmental regulations consistent with the Department of Natural Resources' Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria?

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:	
1. Floodplains?	Y
2. Historic resources?	N
3. Other environmentally sensitive resources?	N
If you answered yes to any question 1-3 above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected below:	

If you answered yes to any question 1-3 above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected below: There is a 100-year floodplain on Morning Creek. Precautions are being taken during site planning so that development doesn't take place within the 100-year floodplain.



) 2001, EBERLY & ASSOCIATES

