

REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

ARC REVIEW CODE: P802081 **DATE:** Feb. 8 2008

TO: Mayor Michael Bodker

ATTN TO: Susan Canon.

FROM:

Charles Krautler, Director Charles Krautle

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: City of Johns Creek Comprehensive Plan-Community Assessment and Public

Participation Plan

Review Type: Local Comprehensive Plan

Description: The City of Johns Creek Community Assessment and Public Participation Plan of their Comprehensive

Submitting Local Government: City of Johns Creek

Action Under Consideration: Approval

Date Opened: Feb 8 2008

Deadline for Comments: Feb 29 2008

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Mar 10 2008

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

ARC LAND USE PLANNING ARC DATA RESEARCH GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY **FULTON COUNTY SCHOOLS**

CITY OF DULUTH CITY OF ROSWELL ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ARC AGING DIVISION GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NATIONAL PARK SERVICE **GWINNETT COUNTY** CITY OF MILTON FORSYTH COUNTY

ARC ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GEORGIA ENV. FACILITIES AUTHORITY **FULTON COUNTY** CITY OF ALPHARETTA CITY OF SANDY SPRINGS GEORGIA MOUNTAINS RDC

Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3311. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you by Feb 29 2008, 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 .



Person: E-Mail

hfleming@atlantaregional.com

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 Governmen	t: City of Johns Creek	Date Received:	Feb 8 2008
Local Contact:	Susan Canon, City of Johns Creek	Public Hearing Date and Time:	2008-03-04 09:00:00
Phone:	678.512.3200	E-Mail:	susan.canon@johnscreekga.gov
Fax:	678.512.3199	Website:	
Street	12000 Findley Road, Suite 400	City State, Zip:	Johns Creek, Georgia30097
	Department of Commu		Review Required
Review Title	: City of Johns Creek Compreh Participation Plan	nensive Plan-C	ommunity Assessment and Public
Description	The City of Johns Creek Community Assessment and Public Participation Plan of their Comprehensive Plan		
	Document can be viewed on the http://www.atlantaregional.cu	com/landuse	
The submit	tted documents are available	for review a	t the City and at ARC.
Reviewing	Regional Development Cente	er:	
Atlanta Regi	onal Commission		
40 Courtland	d Street, NE Atlanta, GA. 30303 63.3302 FAX 404.463.3254		
Contact	Haley Fleming, Review Coordinat	_	

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

134000	El coop	1707		
DATE	: Feb 8 2008	ARC REVIEW CODE: P802081		
TO:	ADC Land Has Environmental Torres	portation Descarch and Aging Division Chiefe		
	4: Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, I	ortation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs		
Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:				
	Kevie	wing stair by Jurisuiction.		
Land	Use: Tuley. Jon	Transportation: Hammond, Regan		
	onmental: Santo, Jim	Research: Skinner, Jim		
Aging		<u> </u>		
Revie Descri Submi Date (w Type: Local Comprehensive Plan	<u>d:</u> Mar 10 2008		
		Response:		
1)	$\hfill\Box$ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the follows:	wing regional development guide listed in the comment section.		
2)	☐ While neither specifically consistent not guide listed in the comment section.	inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development		
3)	☐ While neither specifically consistent not guide listed in the comment section.	inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development		
4)	$\hfill\Box$ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with th	e following regional development guide listed in the comment section.		
4) 5)	1 1	e following regional development guide listed in the comment section.		
	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev			
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	velopment guide for which this division is responsible.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		
5)	☐ The proposal does NOT relate to any dev	relopment guide for which this division is responsible. for the reasons listed in the comment section.		