



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: Feb 29 2008

ARC REVIEW CODE: R802011

TO: Mayor Shirley Franklin
ATTN TO: Shelley Peart, Principal Planner
FROM: 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.

Submitting Local Government: City of Atlanta
Name of Proposal: Cityview @ Englewood

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Date Opened: Feb 1 2008

Date Closed: Feb 29 2008

FINDING: 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 Region, and therefore, of the State.

Additional Comments: The proposed development is consistent with many of the Regional Development Plan Policies and the Atlanta Region Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM). The UGPM indicates that the proposed development is located within a mega corridor. Mega corridors are defined as the most intensely developed radial corridors in the region.

The proposed development is adjacent to the proposed Beltline and should therefore be consistent with the Beltline Redevelopment Plan. The proposed development should include convenient and safe access to the proposed Beltline, as shown on the site plan.

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
METRO ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY
ATLANTA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF ATLANTA SCHOOLS

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

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3311. This finding will be published to the ARC website.


The ARC review website is located at: <http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse> .

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

FINAL REPORT SUMMARY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The proposed Cityview at Englewood is a mixed use development located on 10 acres in the City of Atlanta. The proposed development will consist of 15,000 square feet of retail and 600 residential units. The proposed development is located along Englewood Avenue, east of Mailing Avenue.



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 I-1C (industrial). The proposed zoning for the site is MRC-3 (mixed residential-commercial). Information submitted for the review states that the proposed development is consistent with the City of Atlanta's Future Land Use Plan, which designates the area as high density residential.

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

No comments were received identifying inconsistencies with any potentially affected local government's comprehensive plan.

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

No comments were received concerning impacts to the implementation of any local government's short term work program.

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?

Yes, the proposed development would increase the need for services in the area for existing and future residents.

What other major development projects are planned near the proposed project?

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

The ARC has reviewed other major development projects, known as Area Plan (1984 to 1991) or as a DRI (1991 to present), within a mile radius of the proposed project.

Year	Name
2007	Grant Street MUD
2007	Chosewood Park
2006	East Medinah Village

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

No, the proposed development will not displace any housing units or community facilities. Based on information submitted for the review, the site is currently occupied by vacant buildings and a laundry facility.

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

No.

Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

The proposed development is consistent with many of the Regional Development Plan Policies and the Atlanta Region Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM). The UGPM indicates that the proposed development is located within a mega corridor. Mega corridors are defined as the most intensely developed radial corridors in the region.

The proposed development is adjacent to the proposed Beltline and should therefore be consistent with the Beltline Redevelopment Plan. The proposed development should include convenient and safe access to the proposed Beltline, as shown on the site plan.

It is recommended that future access to adjacent properties is considered through the local plan review process as it can be reasonable assumed that the surrounding properties will be redeveloped at some time in the future. Where possible, such future access points are preserved.

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

FINAL REPORT

Regional Development Plan Policies

1. Provide sustainable economic growth in all areas of the region.
2. Encourage new homes and jobs within existing developed areas of the region, focusing on principal transportation corridors, the Central Business District, activity centers, and town centers.
3. Increase opportunities for mixed use development, transit-oriented development, infill, and redevelopment.
4. At strategic regional locations, plan and retail industrial and freight land uses.
5. Design transportation infrastructure to protect the context of adjoining development and provide a sense of place appropriate for our communities.
6. Promote the reclamation of Brownfield development sites.
7. Protect the character and integrity of existing neighborhoods, while also meeting the needs of communities to grow.
8. Encourage a variety of homes styles, densities, and price ranges in locations that are accessible to jobs and services to ensure housing for individuals and families of all incomes and age groups.
9. Promote new communities that feature greenspace and neighborhood parks, pedestrian scale, support transportation options, and provide an appropriate mix of uses and housing types.
10. Promote sustainable and energy efficient development.
11. Protect environmentally-sensitive areas including wetlands, floodplains, small water supply watersheds, rivers and stream corridors.
12. Increase the amount, quality, and connectivity, and accessibility of greenspace.
13. Provide strategies to preserve and enhance historic resources
14. Through regional infrastructure planning, limit growth in undeveloped areas of the region
15. Assist local governments to adopt growth management strategies that make more efficient use of existing infrastructure.
16. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local, and neighborhood levels.
17. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support Regional Policies
18. Encourage the development of state and regional growth management policy.

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.



Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

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.

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

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™ landscaping. Xeriscaping™ 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 proposed development is located in the City of Atlanta along Englewood Avenue with the Atlanta West Point Railroad (proposed Beltline) to the north and Mailing Avenue to the east.

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 Atlanta.

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 were determined during the review.

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 \$85,000,000 with an expected \$1,600,000 in annual local tax revenues.

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

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT <u>REVIEW REPORT</u>	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

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?

The proposed development will provide housing options for individuals to live within close proximity to employment opportunities.

NATURAL RESOURCES

This project is proposed on a site that has no streams and is almost entirely impervious in an existing, heavily developed urban area. Stormwater will be handled by the City stormwater system.

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

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

Vehicular access to City View at Englewood is proposed in two full-movement locations along Englewood Avenue. The first driveway is proposed along Englewood Avenue approximately 275' east of Mailing Avenue. This access point is proposed at the same location as an existing driveway that currently serves the property, and aligns directly across from a private driveway on the southern side of Englewood Avenue. The second driveway is located along Englewood Avenue approximately 600' east of Mailing Avenue, at the same location as an existing driveway that currently serves the property.

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

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

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. 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 7th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

Land Use	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			24-Hour
	Enter	Exit	2-Way	Enter	Exit	2-Way	2-Way
Apartment 600 Units	60	238	298	226	122	348	3,756
Shopping Center 15,000 SF	31	19	50	86	93	179	1,979
<i>Mixed-Use Reductions</i>	-	-	-	-19	-19	-38	-396
<i>Alternative Mode Reductions</i>	-3	-12	-15	-11	-6	-17	-178
<i>Pass-By Reductions</i>	-	-	-	-27	-27	-54	-606
TOTAL NEW TRIPS	88	245	333	255	163	418	4,556


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:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008


V/C Ratios




2010 AM Peak




2010 PM Peak




2020 AM Peak



2020 PM Peak



2030 AM Peak



2030 PM Peak

Legend

AM/PM Peak V/C Ratio — LOS A: 0 - 0.3 — LOS B: 0.31 - 0.5 — LOS C: 0.51 - 0.75 — LOS D: 0.76 - 0.90 — LOS E: 0.91 - 1.00 — LOS F: 1.01 +

For the V/C ratio graphic, the data is based on 2005, 2010 and 2030 AM/PM peak volume data generated from ARC's 20-county travel demand model utilizing projects from Mobility 2030 and the FY 2006-2011 TIP. The 20-county networks are being used since they consist of the most up to date transportation networks and data. The travel demand model incorporates lane addition improvements and updates to the network as appropriate. As the life of the RTP progresses,

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

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.

2008-2013 TIP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
AR-111G	I15/85 from University Ave to Brookwood Split	Roadway Maintenance / Operations	2009
AR-450	Beltline transportation corridor	Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility	2020
DK-AR-BP070	Eastland Rd from Moreland Ave to Bouldercrest Rd	Pedestrian Facility	2013

Envision6 RTP*

ARC Number	Route	Type of Improvement	Scheduled Completion Year
AR-451B	Beltline transportation corridor southeast quadrant	Fixed Guideway Transit Capital	2030
AT-175	University Ave from US 19/41 (Metropolitan Pkwy) to SR 54 (McDonough Blvd)	General Purpose Roadway Capacity	2030

**The ARC Board adopted the Envision6 RTP and FY 2008-2013 TIP on September 26th, 2007.*

Summarize the transportation improvements as recommended by consultant in the traffic study for City View at Englewood.

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.

McDonough Blvd / University Ave at Hank Aaron Dr

- Modify signal timing.

Englewood Ave at Boulevard

- Modify signal timing.

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

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?

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

The proposed development is located along MARTA bus route 49 (McDonough) which travels between the Forsyth Street/Alabama Street intersection (near Five Points MARTA station) and the Constitution Road/Forrest Park Road intersection. Along this route, there are approximately seven (7) bus stops along Englewood Avenue between Hill Street and Boulevard. This bus route provides transit access to the Five Points MARTA station.

In addition, the development backs up to the proposed Beltline project which, upon completion, would provide residents with additional transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel options.

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
Where Residential is dominant, >15 units/ac w/in 1/4 mile of Bus Stop (CCT, MARTA, Other)	6%	6%
Bike/ped networks that meet Mixed Use or Density target and connect to adjoining uses	3%	3%
	5%	5%
Total Calculated ARC Air Quality Credits (15 % reduction required)		13%

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

Based on the traffic analysis completed by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. and projected traffic volumes derived from the ARC Travel Demand Model (TDM), the transportation system is not fully capable of accommodating the new trips generated by the proposed development and maintaining acceptable LOS standards at the studied intersections.

ARC concludes that the improvements recommended in the traffic analysis are needed and should be implemented to maintain or improve LOS standards on surface streets in the vicinity of the proposed development.

ARC makes no further recommendations for the proposed development is consistent with adopted local and regional plans.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Wastewater is estimated at 0.164 MGD based on information submitted for the review.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

R.M Clayton will provide wastewater treatment for the proposed development.

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

The capacity of R.M. Clayton Site 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
No Flow Limit	122	99	120	2	None. Plan before EPD to permit plant at design capacity consistent with draft Chattahoochee River Model.	Existing Consent Decree with the U.S. EPA and Georgia EPD require CSO and SSO improvements throughout the City of Atlanta wastewater system by 2007 and 2014, respectively

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

*₁ 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.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.66 MGD based on information submitted for the review.

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



Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

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

Information submitted with the review 5.900 tons of solid waste per year and the waste will be disposed of in the City of Atlanta.

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 600 new residential units.

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

Preliminary Report:	February 1, 2008	DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REVIEW REPORT	Project:	Cityview @ Englewood #1666
Final Report Due:	March 1, 2008		Comments Due By:	February 15, 2008

Yes, once developed, this project will provide housing opportunities for existing employment centers as well as providing opportunities for individuals to live and work within close proximity to one another.

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

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 64. This tract had a 8.4 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2006 according to ARC's Population and Housing Report. The report shows that 46 percent, respectively, of the housing units are single-family, compared to 69 percent for the region; thus indicating is a variety of multi-family 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 the 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.

February 14, 2008

Ms. Haley Fleming, Principal Planner
Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC)
40 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30303

**RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) # 1666
City View at Englewood**

The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) has completed review of documentation for DRI # 1666 – City View at Englewood – located in City of Atlanta.

This development abuts portions of the SE segment of the proposed Atlanta Beltline corridor. We would therefore suggest that the project concept be coordinated with the Beltline planning effort, if not done already. Specifically, right-of-way provisions for transit, trail, pedestrian walkways, and other proposed Beltline component facilities should not be precluded or compromised. Similarly, the project concept should be sufficiently flexible to provide for appropriate connectivity to the Beltline.

Other than this, the project will have no obvious impact on current MARTA services, and MARTA has no pending plans to expand transit service in the project area. Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposal and do contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Henry Ikwut-Ukwa
Transit System Planning



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELLNESS

Environmental Health Services

99 Jesse Hill Jr. Drive, Suite 101

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Telephone (404) 730-1301, Fax (404) 730-1462

MEMORANDUM

TO: Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator
Atlanta Regional Commission

CC: Dr. Kim Turner, Acting Director
John Gormley, Environmental Health Deputy Director

FROM: Monica Robinson, Environmental Specialist Senior
Environmental Health Services

DATE: February 20, 2008

SUBJECT: Comments to Regional Review for Cityview @ Englewood (R802011)

Fulton County Board of Health

Phoebe Bailey, PhD, Chair
Lynne P. Meadows, RN, MS
Harrison Rogers, MD
Monica Ryan, BS
Khaatim S. El
Samantha P. Williams, PhD
Mary Long, RN

Dr. Kim Turner, Acting Director

ARC REVIEW CODE	COMMENTS
R802011	<p>The Fulton County Department of Health and Wellness recommends that the applicant be required to connect the proposed development to public water and public sanitary sewer available to the site.</p> <p>Since this proposed development constitutes a premise where people work, live, or congregate, onsite sanitary facilities will be mandatory, prior to use or occupancy.</p> <p>This facility must comply with the Fulton County Clean Indoor Air Ordinance.</p> <p>If this proposed development includes a food service facility, the owner must submit kitchen plans for review and approval by this department before issuance of a building permit and beginning construction. The owner must obtain a food service permit prior to opening.</p> <p>If this proposed development includes a public swimming pool as defined in the regulations including spas, whirlpools, etc., the owner or contractor must submit plans for review and approval be this department and must obtain a Department of Health and Wellness permit to construct before issuance of a building permit. Also, the owner of the facility must obtain a Department of Health and Wellness permit to operate the pool prior to opening.</p> <p>This department is requiring that plans indicating the number and location of outside refuse containers along with typical details of the pad and approach area for the refuse containers be submitted for review and approval.</p> <p>This department is requiring that all existing structures to be demolished must be inspected by a certified pest control operator to insure that the premise is rat free. If evidence of rodent infestation is found, the property must be baited prior to demolition.</p>

Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #1666

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: Atlanta

Individual completing form: Shelley Peart

Telephone: 404-330-6781

E-mail: speart@atlantaga.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: City View at Englewood

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 430,440,460 Englewood Avenue

Brief Description of Project: A mixed use development consisting of 600 apartment units and 15,000 SF of retail.

Development Type:

(not selected)

Hotels

Wastewater Treatment
Facilities

Office

Mixed Use

Petroleum Storage Facilities

Commercial

Airports

Water Supply Intakes/
Reservoirs

Wholesale & Distribution

Attractions & Recreational
Facilities

Intermodal Terminals

Hospitals and Health Care
Facilities

Post-Secondary Schools

Truck Stops

Housing

Waste Handling Facilities

Any other development types

Industrial	Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants
If other development type, describe:	
Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.):	600 apt units, 15,00 SF retail
Developer:	Flow Metro
Mailing Address:	3695 Peachtree Street NE
Address 2:	Suite D
	City:Atlanta State: GA Zip:30319
Telephone:	404-348-4506
Email:	marc@flowmetro.com
Is property owner different from developer/ applicant?	(not selected) Yes No
If yes, property owner:	
Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction?	(not selected) Yes No
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 Z-07-113
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: 2010 Overall project: 2010
Back to Top	

Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #1666

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:	Atlanta
Individual completing form:	Shelley Peart
Telephone:	404-330-6781
Email:	speart@atlantaga.gov

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project:	City View at Englewood
DRI ID Number:	1666
Developer/Applicant:	Flow Metro
Telephone:	404-348-4506
Email(s):	marc@flowmetro.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:	\$85,000,000.00
-------------------------------	-----------------

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development:	\$1,600,000.00
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): Industrial laundry facility (approx 57,000 SF)	
Water Supply	
Name of water supply provider for this site:	City of Atlanta
What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.164 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:	City of Atlanta
What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)?	0.66 MGD (Peak)
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.)	5,161 Daily; 333 AM Peak; 473 PM Peak
Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No
Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project?	(not selected) Yes No
If yes, please describe below: Please refer to the DRI Transportation Analysis prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, INC.	
Solid Waste Disposal	
How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)?	5,900 tons annualy
Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project?	(not selected) Yes No
If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:	
Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development?	(not selected) Yes No
If yes, please explain:	
Stormwater Management	
What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed?	68%
Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Proposed development is to have a Stormwater management pond with a pre-treatment measure	
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:			
Back to Top			

[GRTA Home Page](#) | [ARC Home Page](#) | [RDC Links](#) | [DCA Home Page](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)

