

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: Jun 23 2011 **ARC Review Code:** P1106232

TO: Mayor R.W. Coley

ATTN TO: Cheri Hobson-Mathews, Director Henry County Planning and Zoning

FROM: Emerson Bryan, Interim Director 1. Emerson Bryan

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 City of Hampton STWP/ CIE Annual Update

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The 2011 Annual Update of the City of Hampton's CIE/STWP

Submitting Local Government: City of Hampton

Action Under Consideration: Approval

Date Opened: Jun 23 2011

Deadline for Comments: Jul 14 2011

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Aug 22 2011

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
CITY OF STOCKBRIDGE
CITY OF MCDONOUGH

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CITY OF HAMPTON
HENRY COUNTY
SPALDING COUNTY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF LOCUST GROVE
THREE RIVERS RC
CLAYTON 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 Jul 14 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	City of Hampton	Date Received:	Jun 23 2011	
Local Contact:	Cheri Hobson-Mathews, Director Henry County Planning and Zoning Henry County	Public Hearing Date and Time:	2011-07-11 09:00 AM	
Phone:	770-288-7526	E-Mail:		
Fax:		Website:	http:\\www.	
Street	140 Henry Parkway	City State, Zip:	McDonough, GA 30253	
	Department of Commu	nity Affairs	Review Required	
Review Title:	2011 City of Hampton STWP,	/ CIE Annual	Update	
Description The submitt	The 2011 Annual Update of the City of Hampton's CIE/STWP Document can be viewed on the ARC website at: http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse Under Plan Review, search for the City of Hampton. d documents are available for review at ARC and the local government.			
			erike und the local government.	
Reviewing F	Regional Development Cente	er:		
40 Courtland	nal Commission Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303 3.3302 FAX 404.463.3254			
Person:	Jared Lombard AICP, Principal P	lanner		
E-Mail j	lombard@atlantaregional.com	-		

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DAIE.	Jun 23 2011	ARC REVIEW CODE: P1106232
TO:	ARC Land Use, Environmental, T	Transportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs
FROM	I: Jared Lombard, Principal Planne	r 3-3302
]	Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:
Land I	<u>Jse:</u> Lombard, Jared	Transportation: Hammond, Regan
	onmental: Santo, Jim	Research: Skinner, Jim
	Rader, Carolyn	
Review Descri Submi Date C	of Proposal: 2011 City of Hampton Start Type: Local Comprehensive Plan ption: The 2011 Annual Update of the Citting Local Government: City of Hampton Dened: Jun 23 2011 Start the Regional Review can be Commented: The Commented Commente	ty of Hampton's CIE/STWP Campton
		Response:
1)		following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	☐ While neither specifically consisten	nt nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	guide listed in the comment section.	
3)		nt nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
3) 4)	☐ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section.	nt nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
·	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w 	
4)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
4) 5)	 □ While neither specifically consister guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT w □ The proposal does NOT relate to an 	rith the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. ny development guide for which this division is responsible. icant for the reasons listed in the comment section.