

DRAFT REPORT

**Dawson County
Comprehensive Plan 2006-2026**

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION
PROGRAM**

Prepared for:

Dawson County
Dawsonville, Georgia



MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
Kennesaw, Georgia

June 21, 2006
Project 6311-06-0011

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1-2
1.1	Purpose	1-2
1.2	Scope.....	1-2
2	IDENTIFICATION OF STAKEHOLDERS.....	2-2
3	IDENTIFICATION OF PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES.....	3-5
3.1	Stakeholder interviews	3-5
3.2	Visioning workshops	3-5
3.3	Public Hearing	3-5
3.4	Web Site	3-6
3.5	Preference surveys	3-6
3.6	Steering committee	3-6
3.7	Public Hearing for Plan Transmittal	3-6
3.8	Schedule for Completion of the Community Agenda.....	3-6
	APPENDIX: VISIONING SURVEY RESULTS	3-8

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Community Participation Program is to ensure that the Dawson County Comprehensive Plan reflects the full range of the community's values and desires, by involving a diverse spectrum of stakeholders in development of the Community Agenda. This broad-based participation will help ensure that the plan is implemented because many are involved in its development and thereby become committed to seeing it through. The Community Participation Program provides a concise schedule to guide the development of the Community Agenda, including planned community participation events or meetings at key points during the process. This document includes three required steps described in sections below:

- Identification of Stakeholders
- Identification of Participation Techniques
- Schedule for Completion of the Community Agenda

1.2 Scope

State law requires Dawson County to update its Comprehensive Plan by October 31, 2006. As prescribed by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA), the update of the Comprehensive Plan follows the Standards and Procedures for Local Comprehensive Planning effective May 1, 2005.

The following sections typically would describe how Dawson County plans to involve the public in the creation of the Community Agenda. In addition to describing the future community involvement techniques, this report will also document previous public participation that occurred in 2004-2005 in association with the Community Vision and Future Land Use Element 2005 Update. The Dawson County Board of Commissioners and the Dawsonville City Council adopted the Future Land Use Element Update in 2005. Preparation of the vision and element began when DCA guidelines outlined a much different planning process. The planning process included a variety of public involvement techniques designed to engage the community in the decision-making process in order to create a Community Vision and Future Land Use Map.

The community participation that led to the creation of the Community Vision and Future Land Use map provides the foundation for the Community Agenda of the *Dawson County Comprehensive Plan 2006-2026*. Rather than starting from scratch, Dawson County will lean heavily on analysis of that public input in addition to engaging stakeholders as described below to ensure that the Community Agenda reflects the vision of the community. Additional public hearings will provide opportunities for all citizens to express their concerns.

2 Identification of Stakeholders

Coordination and oversight are very important parts of the overall work effort for this project. This approach, to ensure proper management of the process, includes oversight by the Dawson County Board of Commissioners, the Long Range Planning Committee and other Dawson County organizations. Groups participating as stakeholders are listed below.

Dawson County Board of Commissioners

- Chairman – Mike Berg
- District 1 – Bill Saling
- District 2 – Frank Craft
- District 3 – Jim King
- District 4 – Julie Nix

Dawson County Planning Commission

- Chairman – Dan Bergen
- Vice Chairman – Jason Hamby
- Robert Corey
- Vernon Smith
- David Rhodes

Dawson County Long Range Planning Committee

Phase I (Visioning and Land Use Plan Element Update 2003-2005)

- Lynn Tully – Dawson County Planning Department Director
- Roy Kupkowski – Representing Commissioner Don Roberts (former)
- Ernie Elliott – Representing Commissioner Bill Saling
- Julie Hamby – Representing Commissioner Bill Saling
- George Thompson – Representing Commissioner Kurt Vilendrer
- Roy Coleman – Representing Commissioner Jim King
- Ev McCubrey – Representing Jim King
- Lori McCormick – Commissioner
- Jonathan Cox – City of Dawsonville
- B.J. Farley – City of Dawsonville
- Mike Berg – Dawson County Planning Commission
- Kurt Krattinger – Dawson County Planning Commission
- Jason Hamby – Dawson County Planning Commission
- Sandy Adams – Etowah Water and Sewer Authority
- Doris Cook – Etowah Water and Sewer Authority
- Linda Williams – Dawson County Chamber of Commerce
- Michael Lupo – Dawson County School Superintendent

Phase II (Remaining elements update 2005-2006)

- Lynn Tully – Dawson County Planning Department Director
- George Thompson – Representing Commissioner Kurt Vilendrer
- Roy Coleman – Representing Commissioner Jim King
- Peter Hill
- Terri Tragesser
- Dick Burgen – Dawson County Planning Commission
- Kurt Krattinger – Dawson County Planning Commission
- Jason Hamby – Dawson County Planning Commission
- Bindy Auverman
- Sandy Adams – Etowah Water and Sewer Authority
- Doris Cook – Etowah Water and Sewer Authority
- Curtis Black – Etowah Water and Sewer Authority
- Linda Williams – Dawson County Chamber of Commerce
- Michael Lupo – Dawson County School Superintendent

Project Management Team

- Lynn Tully, AICP – Dawson County Planning Department Director

- Lee Walton, AICP – MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- Ron Huffmanm AICP – MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- Marty Sewell, AICP – MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- Jeff Carroll – Wilbur Smith Associates
- Kalanos Johnson – Wilbur Smith Associates

Department Representatives

- Fire
- Planning
- Public Works
- Recreation
- Sheriff
- Dawson County School System
- Etowah County Water and Sewer Authority

Dawson County Municipalities

- City of Dawsonville

Dawson County Organizations

- Dawson County Development Authority
- Dawson County Chamber of Commerce

3 Identification of Participation Techniques

Dawson County will rely heavily on public input received in preparation of the Community Vision and Land Use Element 2005 Update that took place in 2004-2005. Techniques described below will include those used during that previous process and those planned to develop the new Community Agenda. Techniques described include stakeholder interviews, community visioning workshops, land use plan workshops, steering committee/Long Range Planning Committee, and public hearings.

3.1 Stakeholder interviews

During the development of the Community Vision and Land Use Element Update, the consultant team conducted one-on-one interviews with key community leaders using a standardized series of questions designed to gather detailed information about the county's future. Stakeholders identified below were interviewed for approximately one hour by members of the consultant team.

- Terri Tragesser
- George David, property owner
- Peggy England
- Annie Dean Samples
- Tom French
- Ben Overstreet
- Mark Byrd
- Dr. Jeremiah Ashcroft
- Jerry Hill
- Jerry Cox
- John Jordan, property owner
- Lake Gibson, Lanier Technical College
- Warren King
- Dan Centofani, environmental consultant

3.2 Visioning workshops

Dawson County held three Visioning Workshops at three different locations in the county during June, 2004. The meetings were held at schools, churches and community centers. Approximately 200 stakeholders attended these meetings. The various locations and dates gave residents several opportunities to offer their input on the future of Dawson County. The input from the meetings was used to prepare the Community Vision and the Land Use Element 2005 Update and will also be used in preparation of the Community Agenda.

3.3 Public Hearing

The Dawson County Board of Commissioners will hold public hearings to announce to the public that the planning process for updating the comprehensive plan is underway, as required under the state Standards and Procedures for Local Comprehensive Planning. The meeting is scheduled for June 15, 2006. The public will be informed of the plan's project schedule and how they can get involved as outlined in this document. The public hearing also provides the community an opportunity to comment on the draft Community Assessment that highlights the issues and opportunities that will be taken into consideration in developing the Community Agenda. Following the public hearings, and based on input from the public and county officials, this document and the Community Assessment will be transmitted to the Georgia Mountains Regional Development Center (Georgia Mountains RDC) for their review and comment.

3.4 Web Site

The Dawson County Planning Department will post the Community Assessment, Analysis of Supporting Data, Community Participation Program and the Community Agenda to the Dawson County website. Browsers will be able to download the documents in PDF format and will be provided with contact information in order provide comments by traditional mail, by e-mail, or by telephone. The Dawson County website address is <http://www.dawsoncounty.org/>.

3.5 Preference surveys

The consultant team distributed a survey in June and July, 2004 designed to gather information related to the Community Vision and help respond in terms of accepting or modifying the "quality community objectives." Approximately 100 responses were received during the process, which consisted of pre-specified (i.e., Likert scale) responses and opportunities for open-ended written comments. The results of the questionnaire are summarized in the appendix. Questionnaire results were a principal means of capturing citizen preferences in the form of vision statements, and of determining publicly acceptable responses to the quality community objectives.

3.6 Steering committee

The Dawson County Long Range Planning Committee served as a steering committee for the Community Vision and Land Use Element 2005 Update. The committee continued that role in the development of the Community Assessment and will continue to do so for the development of the Community Agenda. The committee is made up of representatives from local authorities, the business community, key non-profit agencies and citizen groups. The committee met approximately once a month as the consultant developed the Community Assessment, where they received updates on the findings for the planning topics. Committee meetings are open to the public and announced in the local newspapers.

3.7 Public Hearing for Plan Transmittal

The consultant will present the Dawson County Comprehensive Plan 2006-2026 at a public hearing before the Board of Commissioners. The public will have an opportunity to comment on the plan before the plan is transmitted to the Georgia Mountains RDC for review. The tentative date of the transmittal hearings is October 19, 2006.

3.8 Schedule for Completion of the Community Agenda

On the following page is a graphic that shows the schedule for completion of the Community Agenda. Major upcoming milestones in this schedule include:

- Transmittal Hearing for Community Agenda – August 3, 2006
- Adoption of the Community Agenda – October 19, 2006

Figure 3-1 Schedule for completion

<i>May</i>	
<i>Date</i>	<i>Action/Deliverable</i>
5/17	Steering Committee
5/31	Steering Committee (<i>Areas of Special Concern, Character Area Categories and Character Area Map</i>)
<i>June</i>	
6/5	Community Assessment Deliverable to Dawson County
6/5	Community Participation Program Deliverable to Dawson County
6/13	Steering Committee
6/15	Public Hearing 1
6/15	Board of Commissioners Adopt Transmittal Resolution for Community Assessment and Community Participation Program
6/16-6/18	Update Community Assessment and Community Participation Program based on comments from Public Hearing 1
6/19	Submit Community Assessment to GMRDC
6/19	Submit Community Participation Program to GMRDC
6/19-6/25	GMRDC Completeness Check of Submittals (7 Days)
6/26	Begin Interested Parties Notification (GMRDC)
6/26-7/26	DCA Review of Community Participation Program (30 Days)
6/26-7/26	GMRDC Review of Community Assessment (30 Days)
<i>July</i>	
7/6	Steering Committee
7/27	GMRDC Findings Delivered to Dawson County
7/28	Community Agenda Deliverable to Dawson County
<i>August</i>	
TBA	Steering Committee
8/3	Public Hearing 2
8/3	Board of Commissioners Adopt Transmittal Resolution for Community Agenda
8/4-8/10	Update Community Agenda based on comments from Public Hearing 2
8/10	Submit Community Agenda to GMRDC
8/10-8/16	GMRDC Completeness Check of Submittal (7 Days)
8/17	GMRDC Submits Community Agenda to DCA
8/18-9/27	GMRDC Review of Community Agenda (including submitting findings to Dawson County)(40 Days)
8/18-9/22	DCA Review of Community Agenda (submit findings to GMRDC to include in GMRDC findings)(35 Days)
8/18-9/12	Interested Parties Notification and Review (Max 25 Days)
<i>September</i>	
TBA	Steering Committee
<i>October</i>	
10/2-10/10	Steering Committee Adoption
10/19	Board of Commissioners Work Session Presentation
10/19	Board of Commissioners Adoption
10/31	Board of Commissioners Adoption Deadline

Appendix: Visioning Survey Results

**DAWSON COUNTY
 VISIONING QUESTIONNAIRE
 (# RESPONSES SHOWN)
 Final Tabulation Produced August 9, 2004**

1. Dawson County is growing at a rate of development that is too fast.

(n = 98) (68.4% agree or strongly agree)

1	15	15	39	28
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
1%	15.3%	15.3%	39.8%	28.6%

2. Dawson County is a unique place with a character that distinguishes it from other places. (n = 98) (84.3% agree or strongly agree)

3	3	9	38	45
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
3.1%	3.1%	9.2%	38.8%	45.8%

If you agree or strongly disagree, describe the character. Comments tabulated separately.

3. During the next 20 years, Dawson County should strive to become which of the following?

64 → Protected farming	68 → Part of Georgia Mountains region
33 → Rural development	2 → Extension of Atlanta metro area
24 → Gated communities	53 → Light Industry work place
65 → Mountain tourism economy	3 → Distribution center (trucking)
3 → Dense, single-family neighborhoods	30 → Home to major institution(s)
26 → Residential with golf course	25 → Outlet malls/large retailers
16 → Auto dealerships	15 → Commercial recreation (e.g., race track)
53 → Elderly communities	40 → Mixed-use pedestrian centers
13 → Apartment communities	59 → Historic district

4. Future development in the county should be concentrated mostly in the Georgia 400 and State Route 53 highway corridors and in the City of Dawsonville, in order to leave other parts of the county rural/agricultural.

(n = 98) (83.7% agree or strongly agree)

3	7	6	37	45
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
3.1%	7.1%	6.1%	37.8%	45.9%

5. Rural/agricultural areas of Dawson County are appropriate locations for golf course communities and large-scale (100 units or more) residential developments.

(n = 98) (35.7% agree or strongly agree)

34	24	5	30	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
34.7%	24.5%	5.1%	30.6%	5.1%

6. Residential subdivisions consisting of ONE-ACRE lots or larger are appropriate anywhere in Dawson County, especially north of Dawsonville (except in areas with severe environmental limitations). (n = 98) (35.7% agree or strongly agree)

33 Strongly Disagree 33.7%	25 Disagree 25.5%	5 Neutral/No opinion 5.1%	33 Agree 33.7%	2 Strongly Agree 2%
----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------------

7. Residential subdivisions consisting of TWO-ACRE lots or larger are appropriate anywhere in Dawson County, especially north of Dawsonville (except in areas with severe environmental limitations). (n = 94) (43.6% agree or strongly agree)

28 Strongly Disagree 29.8%	18 Disagree 19.2%	7 Neutral/No opinion 7.4%	33 Agree 35.1%	8 Strongly Agree 8.5%
----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

8. Residential subdivisions consisting of FIVE-ACRE lots or larger are appropriate anywhere in Dawson County, especially north of Dawsonville (except in areas with severe environmental limitations). (n = 93) (73.1% agree or strongly agree)

7 Strongly Disagree 7.5%	10 Disagree 10.8%	8 Neutral/No opinion 8.6%	51 Agree 54.8%	17 Strongly Agree 18.3%
--------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

9. Planned residential communities with densities of TWO UNITS PER ACRE are appropriate south of Dawsonville, assuming public water and sanitary sewer are available. (n = 92) (50.6% agree or strongly agree)

18 Strongly Disagree 20%	16 Disagree 17.4%	11 Neutral/No opinion 12%	42 Agree 45.2%	5 Strongly Agree 5.4%
--------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

10. Planned residential communities with densities of FOUR UNITS PER ACRE are appropriate south of Dawsonville, assuming public water and sanitary sewer are available. (n = 94) (23% agree or strongly agree)

40 Strongly Disagree 42.6%	25 Disagree 27%	7 Neutral/No opinion 7.4%	16 Agree 17%	6 Strongly Agree 6%
----------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------

11. Planned residential communities with densities of SIX UNITS PER ACRE are appropriate south of Dawsonville, assuming public water and sanitary sewer are available. (n = 95) (12.6% agree or strongly agree)

49 Strongly Disagree 51.6%	26 Disagree 27.4%	8 Neutral/No opinion 8.4%	7 Agree 7.3%	5 Strongly Agree 5.3%
----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------

12. Planned residential communities with densities of MORE THAN SIX UNITS PER ACRE are appropriate south of Dawsonville, assuming public water and sanitary sewer are available. (n = 92) (9.8% agree or strongly agree)

54 Strongly Disagree 58.7%	24 Disagree 26.1%	5 Neutral/No opinion 5.4%	6 Agree 6.5%	3 Strongly Agree 3.3%
----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------

13. In rural and agricultural areas, if residential subdivisions are proposed, they should be required to maintain some of the land as greenbelts, wildlife corridors, open space, or agriculture (crop production), rather than platting all of the land in residential lots.

(n = 96) (95.9% agree or strongly agree)

1 Strongly Disagree 1%	1 Disagree 1%	2 Neutral/No opinion 2.1%	21 Agree 21.9%	71 Strongly Agree 74%
------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

14. Residential subdivisions should be required to provide park and recreation facilities to serve the residents thereof. (n = 95) (84.2% agree or strongly agree)

2 Strongly Disagree 2.1%	4 Disagree 4.2%	9 Neutral/No opinion 9.5%	43 Agree 45.3%	37 Strongly Agree 38.9%
--------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

15. Apartment complexes and multi-family residential developments should be required to provide park and recreation facilities to serve the residents thereof.

(n = 96) (84.4% agree or strongly agree)

3 Strongly Disagree 3.1%	2 Disagree 2.1%	10 Neutral/No opinion 10.4%	38 Agree 39.6%	43 Strongly Agree 44.8%
--------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

16. The Juno area of Dawson County will eventually (by year 2025) be an appropriate location for a major commercial retailer such as a Home Depot, Wal-Mart, and/or Outlet Mall. (n = 94) (13.8% agree or strongly agree)

37 Strongly Disagree 39.4%	26 Disagree 27.7%	18 Neutral/No opinion 19.1%	10 Agree 10.6%	3 Strongly Agree 3.2%
----------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

17. Dawson County needs special programs and regulations to protect historic buildings and sites. (n = 96) (85.5% agree or strongly agree)

3 Strongly Disagree 3.1%	1 Disagree 1%	10 Neutral/No opinion 10.4%	45 Agree 47%	37 Strongly Agree 38.5%
--------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

18. Special regulations (beyond those existing) need to be placed on development near the Etowah River. (n = 98) (79.6% agree or strongly agree)

6	5	9	25	53
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
6.1%	5.1%	9.2%	25.5%	54.1%

19. Special regulations (beyond those existing) need to be placed on development along Amicalola Creek. (n = 97) (79.4% agree or strongly agree)

5	7	8	21	56
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
5.2%	7.2%	8.2%	21.7%	57.7%

20. Dawson County should acquire parks and open spaces even if it means raising my taxes by \$100 a year. (n = 96) (56.3% agree or strongly agree)

17	17	8	26	28
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
17.7%	17.7%	8.3%	27.1%	29.2%

21. Public water and public sanitary sewer service should eventually be extended to all private lands in unincorporated portions of Dawson County. (n = 98) (32.6% agree or strongly agree)

16	36	14	21	11
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
16.3%	36.7%	14.4%	21.4%	11.2%

22. Residential development like that occurring to the south in Forsyth County (i.e., new residential subdivisions) is desirable in Dawson County. (n = 98) (19.4% agree or strongly agree)

35	39	5	17	2
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
35.6%	39.9%	5.1%	17.4%	2%

23. Dawson County might provide more efficient services if it cooperates more closely with Forsyth County, Lumpkin County, or regional service providers. (n = 93) (49.4% agree or strongly agree)

6	10	31	39	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
6.5%	10.8%	33.3%	41.9%	7.5%

24. Dawson County is doing enough to protect the aesthetic character of the county. (n = 96) (18.8% agree or strongly agree)

34	32	12	18	0
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
35.4%	33.3%	12.5%	18.8%	0

Written comments tabulated separately.

25. Dawson County needs to develop industrial parks and subsidize industry.

(n = 91) (64.9% agree or strongly agree)

10	18	4	37	22
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
10.9%	19.8%	4.4%	40.7%	24.2%

**STATE ROUTE (GEORGIA) 400
 VISIONING RESULTS
 (# RESPONSES SHOWN)
 Final Tabulation Produced August 9, 2004**

1. Architectural designs of new developments need to be reviewed and approved by a committee. (n = 75) (82.7% agree or strongly agree)

4 Strongly Disagree 5.3%	4 Disagree 5.3%	5 Neutral/No opinion 6.7%	32 Agree 42.7%	30 Strongly Agree 40%
--------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

2. The type of development that now exists and is occurring along Georgia 400 south of SR 53 (near Outlet Mall) is appropriately extended north along Georgia 400 to the Lumpkin County line. (n = 72) (51.3% agree or strongly agree)

12 Strongly Disagree 16.7%	19 Disagree 26.4%	4 Neutral/No opinion 5.6%	32 Agree 44.4%	5 Strongly Agree 6.9%
----------------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------

3. During the next 20 years, the Georgia 400 highway corridor SOUTH OF SR 53 will be an appropriate location for which of the following types of development?

Place a checkmark (✓) beside any of the elements that apply. You can check more than one.)

16 → Gated communities	55 → Light Industry work place
13 → Dense, single-family neighborhoods	15 → Distribution center (trucking)
13 → Residential with golf course	26 → Home to major institution(s)
44 → Auto dealerships	48 → Outlet malls/large retailers
20 → Elderly communities	15 → Commercial recreation (e.g., race track)
41 → Apartment communities	30 → Mixed-use pedestrian centers

4. During the next 20 years, the Georgia 400 highway corridor NORTH OF SR 53 will be an appropriate location for which of the following types of development?

Place a checkmark (✓) beside any of the elements that apply. You can check more than one.)

39 → Gated communities	34 → Light Industry work place
11 → Dense, single-family neighborhoods	5 → Distribution center (trucking)
34 → Residential with golf course	27 → Home to major institution(s)
23 → Auto dealerships	17 → Outlet malls/large retailers
41 → Elderly communities	14 → Commercial recreation (e.g., race track)
25 → Apartment communities	29 → Mixed-use pedestrian centers

5. Provisions should be made for the eventual inclusion of transit service (e.g., park and ride lot(s) and/or bus stations) in the 400 corridor. (n = 71) (76% agree or strongly agree)

5 Strongly Disagree 7%	7 Disagree 10%	5 Neutral/No opinion 7%	42 Agree 59.1%	12 Strongly Agree 16.9%
------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

6. There are already a sufficient number of driveways/access points existing along Georgia 400. (n = 71) (70.4% agree or strongly agree)

2	9	10	33	17
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
2.8%	12.7%	14.1%	46.5%	23.9%

7. Frontage roads are needed parallel to Georgia 400. (n = 72) (84.8% agree or strongly agree)

1	5	5	33	28
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.4%	6.9%	6.9%	45.8%	39%

VISIONING QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
STATE ROUTE 53
(From Dawsonville East to the Forsyth County line)
(# RESPONSES SHOWN)
Final Tabulation Produced August 9, 2004

1. Architectural designs of new developments need to be reviewed and approved by a committee. (n = 73) (80.9% agree or strongly agree)

4 Strongly Disagree 5.5%	5 Disagree 6.8%	5 Neutral/No opinion 6.8%	28 Agree 38.4%	31 Strongly Agree 42.5%
--------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

2. There are places and views along SR 53 between Dawsonville and Georgia 400 that are scenic. (n = 75) (86.7% agree or strongly agree)

3 Strongly Disagree 4%	3 Disagree 4%	4 Neutral/No opinion 5.3%	42 Agree 56%	23 Strongly Agree 30.7%
------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------

If you agree or strongly agree, place a checkmark (✓) beside any of the elements that contribute scenic qualities (you can check more than one) to the corridor.

51	→ Open pasture land	40	→ Country stores/rural development
31	→ Vegetation	5	→ Other (specify): rivers, lake, mountain view,
42	→ View of undeveloped hillsides		Historic architecture, lowlands, flood plains

3. Special regulations (beyond those existing) need to be placed on development near the Etowah River. (n = 72) (83.3% agree or strongly agree)

7 Strongly Disagree 9.7%	2 Disagree 2.8%	3 Neutral/No opinion 4.2%	27 Agree 37.5%	33 Strongly Agree 45.8%
--------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

4. An off-road bicycle trail or path should be included in the SR 53 corridor. (n = 72) (63.9% agree or strongly agree)

4 Strongly Disagree 5.6%	8 Disagree 11.1%	14 Neutral/No opinion 19.4%	26 Agree 36.1%	20 Strongly Agree 27.8%
--------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

5. During the next 20 years, the State Route 53 corridor between Dawsonville and Georgia 400 will be an appropriate location for which of the following types of development? Place a checkmark (✓) beside any of the elements that apply. You can check more than one.

32	→ Gated communities	42	→ Light Industry work place
13	→ Dense, single-family neighborhoods	6	→ Distribution center (trucking)
19	→ Residential with golf course	17	→ Home to major institution(s)
5	→ Auto dealerships	16	→ Outlet malls/large retailers
35	→ Elderly communities	17	→ Commercial recreation (e.g., race track)
17	→ Apartment communities	37	→ Mixed-use pedestrian centers