

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: Jul 5 2012

ARC REVIEW CODE: P1207051

TO: Chairman Timothy Lee ATTN TO: Dana Johnson, Planning Division Manager Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director Drych R. Hoken FROM:

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: 2012 Cobb County STWP Update **Review Type:** Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The 2012 Update of Cobb County's Short Term Work Program element of their Community Agenda

Submitting Local Government: Cobb County Action Under Consideration: Approval Date Opened: Jul 5 2012 Deadline for Comments: Jul 26 2012 Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Sep 3 2012

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

- ARC I AND USE PLANNING ARC DATA RESEARCH GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FULTON COUNTY CITY OF ATLANTA CITY OF SMYRNA BARTOW COUNTY CITY OF ROSWELL
- ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ARC AGING DIVISION GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CHEROKEE COUNTY CITY OF MARIETTA CITY OF AUSTELL PAULDING COUNTY CITY OF SANDY SPRINGS

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS COBB COUNTY DOUGLAS COUNTY CITY OF KENNESAW CITY OF ACWORTH NORTHWEST RC CITY OF MILTON

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 26 2012, 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: <u>http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse</u> .

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:	Cobb County	Date Received:	Jul 5 2012		
Local Contact:	Dana Johnson, Planning Division Manager Cobb County	Public Hearing Date and Time:	2012-07-30 00:00:00		
Phone:	770-528-2018	E-Mail:	Dana.Johnson@cobbcounty.org		
Fax:		Website:	http://www.		
Street	PO Box 649	City State, Zip:	Marietta, GA 30061		
	Department of Comm		Review Required		
Review Title:	2012 Cobb County STWP Update				
Description:	The 2012 Update of Cobb County's Short Term Work Program element of their Community Agenda				
	Document can be viewed on the ARC website at: <u>http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse</u> Under Plan Review, search for the Cobb County.				
The submittee	d documents are available	e for review a	t ARC and the local government.		
Reviewing Re	gional Development Cent	ter:			
Atlanta Regiona	l Commission				

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

AR

Contact	Jared Lombard AICP, Principal Planner
Person:	
E-Mail	jlombard@atlantaregional.com

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE: Jul 5 2012

ARC REVIEW CODE: P1207051

TO: ARC Land Use, Environmental, Transportation, Research, and Aging Division ChiefsFROM: Jared Lombard, Principal Planner 3-3302

<u>Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:</u>

Land Use: Lombard, Jared Environmental: Santo, Jim Aging: Rader, Carolyn <u>**Transportation:</u>** Kray, Michael <u>**Research:**</u> Skinner, Jim</u>

Name of Proposal: 2012 Cobb County STWP Update <u>Review Type:</u> Local Comprehensive Plan <u>Description:</u> The 2012 Update of Cobb County's Short Term Work Program element of their Community Agenda <u>Submitting Local Government:</u> Cobb County <u>Date Opened:</u> Jul 5 2012

Deadline for Comments: Jul 26 2012

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Sep 3 2012

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