



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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

DATE: Oct 6 2008

ARC REVIEW CODE: P810061

TO: Mayor Gary Pirkle
ATTN TO: Kaipo Awana,
FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature.
Original on file.

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has received the following proposal and is initiating a regional review to seek comments from potentially impacted jurisdictions and agencies. The ARC requests your comments related to the proposal not addressed by the Commission's regional plans and policies.

Name of Proposal: City of Sugar Hill Community Agenda
Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The City of Sugar Hill's Community Agenda of their Comprehensive Plan

Submitting Local Government: City of Sugar Hill

Action Under Consideration: Approval

Date Opened: Oct 6 2008

Deadline for Comments: Oct 27 2008

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Dec 5 2008

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES ARE RECEIVING NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
GWINNETT COUNTY
CITY OF SUGAR HILL
CITY OF BERKELEY LAKE
CITY OF LAWRENCEVILLE
CITY OF SNELLVILLE
GEORGIA MOUNTAINS RDC

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
GWINNETT COUNTY SCHOOLS
CITY OF SUWANEE
CITY OF NORCROSS
CITY OF GRAYSON
FORSYTH COUNTY
NORTHEAST GEORGIA RDC

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA ENV. FACILITIES AUTHORITY
CITY OF BUFORD
CITY OF DULUTH
CITY OF LILBURN
CITY OF DACULA
HALL COUNTY

Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3311. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you by Oct 27 2008, we will assume that your agency has no additional comments and we will close the review. Comments by email are strongly encouraged.

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



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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

NOTICE OF LOCAL PLAN SUBMITTAL AND HEARING/COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Submitting Local Government:	City of Sugar Hill	Date Received:	Oct 6 2008
Local Contact:	Kaipo Awana, City of Sugar Hill	Public Hearing Date and Time:	2008-10-31 09:00
Phone:		E-Mail:	
Fax:		Website:	
Street	4988 West Broad Street	City State, Zip:	Sugar Hill, Georgia30518

Department of Community Affairs Review Required

Review Title:	City of Sugar Hill Community Agenda
Description:	The City of Sugar Hill's Community Agenda of their Comprehensive Plan Document can be viewed on the ARC website at: http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse Under Plan Review, search for the City of Sugar Hill.

The submitted documents are available for review at ARC and the local government.

Reviewing Regional Development Center:

Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303
Phone 404.463.3302 FAX 404.463.3254

Contact Person: Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator

E-Mail [hfleming@atlantaregional.com](mailto:h Fleming@atlantaregional.com)

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Oct 6 2008

ARC REVIEW CODE: P810061

TO: ARC Land Use, Environmental, Transportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs

FROM: Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, Extension: 3-3311

Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:

Land Use: Tuley, Jon

Transportation: Trudell, Talya

Environmental: Santo, Jim

Research: Skinner, Jim

Aging: N/A

Name of Proposal: City of Sugar Hill Community Agenda

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The City of Sugar Hill's Community Agenda of their Comprehensive Plan

Submitting Local Government: City of Sugar Hill

Date Opened: Oct 6 2008

Deadline for Comments: Oct 27 2008

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Dec 5 2008

Response:

- 1) Proposal is CONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 2) While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 3) While neither specifically consistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 4) The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
- 5) The proposal does NOT relate to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
- 6) Staff wishes to confer with the applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.

COMMENTS:
