

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: Feb. 4 2011 **ARC REVIEW CODE:** P1102041

TO: Chairman Herbert Frady

ATTN TO: Tom Williams, Assistant 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: 2011 Fayette County Fire Impact Fees Annual Update

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The 2011 Update of the Fayette County Fire Impact Fee Capital Improvement Element and Short Term

Work Program

COWFTA COUNTY

Submitting Local Government: Fayette County

Action Under Consideration: Approval

Date Opened: Feb 4 2011

Deadline for Comments: Feb 25 2011

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Apr 5 2011

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

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

ARC AGING DIVISION

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
FAYETTE COUNTY
TOWN OF WOOLSEY
CLAYTON COUNTY

GEOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
COWETA COUNTY
TOWN OF TYRONE
FULTON COUNTY
THREE RIVERS RC

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
TOWN OF BROOKS
CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE
CITY OF FAIRBURN
SPALDING COUNTY

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 Feb 25 2011, 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:	Fayette County	Date Received:	Feb 4 2011
Local Contact:	Tom Williams, Assistant Director Fayette County	Public Hearing Date and Time:	2011-03-01 9:00AM
Phone:	770-305-5163	E-Mail:	
Fax:		Website:	
Street	140 Stonewall Avenue, West	City State, Zip:	Fayetteville, GA 30214
	Department of Commu	nity Affairs	Review Required
Review Title:	2011 Fayette County Fire Imp	oact Fees Annı	ıal Update
Description	The 2011 Update of the Fayette County Fire Impact Fee Capital Improvement Element and Short Term Work Program		
	Document can be viewed on the http://www.atlantaregional.cu	com/landuse	
		<u> </u>	
The submitt	ed documents are available	for review a	t ARC and the local government.
	ed documents are available : Regional Development Cente		t ARC and the local government.
Reviewing R	Regional Development Cente		t ARC and the local government.
Reviewing R Atlanta Region 40 Courtland	Regional Development Centenal Commission Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303		t ARC and the local government.
Reviewing R Atlanta Region 40 Courtland	Regional Development Cente		t ARC and the local government.
Reviewing R Atlanta Region 40 Courtland Phone 404.46	Regional Development Centenal Commission Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303	r:	t ARC and the local government.

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

	ARC STAFF NOTICE OF	
DATE	:: Feb 4 2011	ARC REVIEW CODE: P1102041
TO:	ARC Land Use, Environmental, Trai	nsportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs
FROM	M: Jared Lombard, Principal Planner 3-	-3302
Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:		
	<u>Use:</u> Lombard, Jared	Transportation: Hammond, Regan
	onmental: Santo, Jim	Research: Skinner, Jim
<u>Aging</u>	g: Rader, Carolyn	
Revie Descri Subm Date O	e of Proposal: 2011 Fayette County Fire In Ew Type: Local Comprehensive Plan ciption: The 2011 Update of the Fayette Count citting Local Government: Fayette Count Copened: Feb 4 2011 Siline for Comments: Feb 25 2011 Set the Regional Review can be Completed.	ry Fire Impact Fee Capital Improvement Element and Short Term Work Program nty
		Response:
1)	☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the fol	Response: lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section.
1) 2)	_	Response: lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	_	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section.
	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent regularity 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
2)3)4)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible.
2)3)4)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent reguide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with □ The proposal does NOT relate to any constraints. 	lowing regional development guide listed in the comment section. nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. development guide for which this division is responsible. In the reasons listed in the comment section.