

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: April 13, 2017 **ARC REVIEW CODE:** P1704131

TO: Mayor Derek Easterling, City of Kennesaw

ATTN TO: Darryl Simmons, Planning & Zoning Administrator

FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director

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: 2017 City of Kennesaw CIE Annual Update

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: A review of the 2017 Annual Update to the City of Kennesaw Capital Improvement Element (CIE).

Submitting Local Government: City of Kennesaw

Action Under Consideration: Approval

Date Opened: April 13, 2017

Deadline for Comments: May 4, 2017

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Upon approval by Georgia DCA

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
BARTOW COUNTY
CITY OF ACWORTH

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CHEROKEE COUNTY CITY OF MARIETTA

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
COBB COUNTY
TOWN CENTER CID

Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at <u>asmith@atlantaregional.com</u> or (404) 463-5581. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you on or before May 4, 2017, we will assume that your agency has no additional comments and we will close the review. Comments via email are strongly encouraged.

The ARC review website is located at http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/planreviews.



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 Kennesaw	Date Received:	April 13, 2017
Local Contact:	Darryl Simmons, Planning & Zoning Administrator, City of Kennesaw		
Phone:	770-590-8268	E-Mail:	dsimmons@kennesaw-ga.gov
Fax:	770-429-4548	Website:	http:\\www.kennesaw-ga.gov
Street	2529 J. O. Stephenson Ave	City State, Zip:	Kennesaw, Georgia 30144
	Department of Commu	ınity Affairs	Review Required
Review Title:	2017 City of Kennesaw CIE A	annual Update	
Description	A review of the 2017 Annual Update to the City of Kennesaw Capital Improvement Element (CIE).		
	Document can be viewed on http://www.atlantaregional. Under Plan Review, search for	com/landuse	
The submitt	ted documents are available	for review a	t ARC and the local government.
Reviewing I	Regional Commission:		
40 Courtland	nal Commission Street NE, Atlanta, GA 30303 33-3302 Fax 404-463-3254		
Contact A Person:	Andrew Smith, Senior Planner		
E-Mail	<u>ismith@atlantaregional.com</u>		

	E: April 13, 2017	ICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM ARC REVIEW CODE: P1704131
IJΑΊ.	E: April 13, 2017	ARG REVIEW GODE: P1704131
ГО:	ARC Division Managers	
FRO	M: Andrew Smith, Senior Planno	er, Ext. 3-5581
		Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:
Land	Use: Ghani, Marisa	Transportation: Roell, Maria
<u>Envi</u>	ronmental: Santo, Jim	Research: Skinner, Jim
	(D 1 2015 C) (AT	
	e of Proposal: 2017 City of Kenness	•
	ew Type: Local Comprehensive Plan	n al Update to the City of Kennesaw Capital Improvement Element (CIE).
	<u>ription:</u> A review of the 2017 Annu nitting Local Government: City o	
	Opened: April 13, 2017	of Keimesaw
	lline for Comments: May 4, 2017	
	•	Completed: Upon approval by Georgia DCA
Lain	est the Regional Review can be	Gompleted. Opon approvar by deorgia Don
		Response:
1\	D 1. CONGRESSE .1	
1)	☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with	the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	-	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	☐ While neither specifically consuide listed in the comment secti	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
2)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section.	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
2)	☐ While neither specifically consuide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consuide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on.
2)3)4)5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible.
2)3)4)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2) 3) 4) 5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible. applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible. applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible. applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible. applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible. applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ While neither specifically consumide listed in the comment section ☐ The proposal is INCONSISTEN ☐ The proposal does NOT related	sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. sistent nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development on. IT with the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. to any development guide for which this division is responsible. applicant for the reasons listed in the comment section.