

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: Dec 17 2009 ARC Review Code: P912171

TO: Mayor Evelyn Wynn-Dixon

ATTN TO: Doug Manning, Community Development Director,

FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature.

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: 2009 City of Riverdale Partial Update

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The 2009 Update of the City of Riverdale Comprehensive Plan

Submitting Local Government: City of Riverdale

Action Under Consideration: Approval

Date Opened: Dec 17 2009

Deadline for Comments: Jan 7 2010

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Feb 15 2010

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CLAYTON COUNTY
CITY OF LAKE CITY
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF RIVERDALE
CITY OF FOREST PARK

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA ENV. FACILITIES AUTHORITY
CITY OF JONESBORO
CITY OF ACWORTH
CLAYTON COUNTY SCHOOLS

Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Jared Lombard, at (404) 463-3302. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you by Jan 7 2010, 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	City of Riverdale	Date		
Governmen		Received:	Dec 17 2009	
Local Contact:	Doug Manning, Community Development Director City of Riverdale	Public Hearing Date and Time:	2010-01-21 09:00 AM	
Phone:		E-Mail:		
Fax:		Website:	http:\\www.	
Street	6690 Church Street	City State, Zip:	Riverdale, GA 30274	
	Department of Commu	nity Affairs	Review Required	
Review Title	: 2009 City of Riverdale Partia	l Update		
Description	The 2009 Update of the City	of Riverdale C	omprehensive Plan	
	Document can be viewed on the http://www.atlantaregional.cum.under Plan Review, search for	com/landuse		
The submitted documents are available for review at ARC and the local government.				
Reviewing	Regional Development Cente	er:		
40 Courtland	onal Commission d Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303 63.3302 FAX 404.463.3254			
Contact Person: E-Mail	Jared Lombard, Senior Planner			

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE	D 15 0000	ADOD C POINT
	: Dec 17 2009	ARC REVIEW CODE: P912171
TO:	ARC Land Use Environmental	Transportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs
	1: Haley Fleming, Review Coordin	
1101		Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:
		icviewing stair by juristiction.
Land 1	<u>Use:</u> Lombard, Jared	Transportation: Smiley, Kenyata
Envir	onmental: Santo, Jim	Research: Skinner, Jim
Aging	: Rader, Carolyn	
Review Descri Submi Date (of Proposal: 2009 City of Riverdale In W Type: Local Comprehensive Plan iption: The 2009 Update of the City of Ristting Local Government: City of Formula Dec 17 2009 St the Regional Review can be Constituted.	verdale Comprehensive Plan Riverdale
		Response:
1)	☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the	e following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	- •	ent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	guide listed in the comment section.	
3)	· ·	ent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
3)4)	☐ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section.	ent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
·	□ While neither specifically consists guide listed in the comment section.□ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v	
4)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consisted guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT v □ The proposal does NOT relate to a 	vith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. licant for the reasons listed in the comment section.