# Q1 Please share your feedback about the four concepts that were discussed at the second community meeting. We will welcome feedback through Tuesday, September 12. Your feedback will be presented to City Council on September 25.

Answered: 68 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I don't have to Google the city's LGBT stance before attending city events or using the library, or sending my kids to public school. The idea that a religious organization will provide the kind of community services the neighborhood requested as some kind of win-win for the city is appalling and short-sighted. We've already lost a beloved neighborhood institution, and the city wants to replace it with a nuisance. Any private sale of the land will likely negatively impact not only our property values but our daily life - especially those of us living on Harlan, and even 109th Ave, and Eaton as increased traffic will follow that loop. Additionally, residents repeatedly said we want to maintain access to the school playground. Our taxes paid for it and our families use it regularly still. Selling it to any private entity will necessitate them fencing it off and residents will have to go through that private entity to use the playground. If the city is unwilling or unable to use the building to offer community services, I'd much rather see it as a public park than any sort of private use. We have the rec center nearby, but that costs money. It's not a place teens can go and just exist without spending money and without getting into trouble for loitering. A mixed use community center with services for seniors, teens, and young families could be a very valuable "3rd space" that benefits the whole community, but selling the property to a church that will provide services for their congregation is NOT the same thing as community services. For any of us who don't share their religion, we get zero services, reduced property values, and the headache of church traffic every weekend.	9/12/2023 3:40 PM
2	NOT A CHURCH	9/12/2023 10:28 AM
3	City retention for the use of all community members is paramount. Releasing the property to a private organization is wrong on a multitude of levels. Utilizing city resources for non-secular purposes is not something the city should be doing.	9/12/2023 10:25 AM
4	The best use of the Sheridan green area is to convert the building into a community center concept with programming for ages 1-5 years old and K-5th grade. This use of the space would serve the kids in the neighborhood who are losing their future and current school. So many of us younger couples moved here specifically for a walkable educational facility for our youngest learners. For example, I moved here from Boulder in 2021 after my son was born in Boulder in 2021. My son's birth records are not linked to this zipcode, therefore he and many other children who have moved here after being born in another zipcode have not been counted in the state demographer's estimates. No data has been collected on the actual demographics of incoming elementary students of Sheridan green. This is compelling evidence to create the Sheridan green space into a space that will serve these young learners experiencing loss of their walkable educational facility. To get to Ryan elementary, we have to cross 112th, a busy street which presents a set of inherent risks. While many of us are devastated that our kids can't attend elementary school at Sheridan Green, converting the school to a community center with programming for these current and incoming elementary school aged kids will help address the large gap left by JeffCo's decision to close so many elementary schools. The second best option is converting to a park concept with a restroom facility. Preserving some of the recreation at a familiar location would help bridge the gap in facilities available for the children of this neighborhood. Improving the park amenities and offerings such as restrooms, a pavilion, and additional outdoor recreation opportunities would also help reduce the negative impacts of the school shutting down. I am opposed to the Rocky Mountain Presbyterian Church purchasing or leasing any part of that property. The church does not serve the people of this neighborhood, and would certainly not be focused on the education and recreation for the elementary ag	9/11/2023 8:24 PM

	people interested in organized religion in the presbyterian denomination and should not proceed as an option for adaptive reuse.	
5	I am a resident of Sheridan Green. I would like to see this space created into a community space, especially one that serves youth and seniors. I would like to see this space have minimal impact on traffic and noise. My preferred option from the community meeting is Concept #1 - the city retains the property and uses it to provide recreation and library programming. Also, I encourage City leadership to see this project through a lens of sustainability. For example, we were told the building needs a new roof, which means that is a perfect time to add rooftop solar panels. We are told the building needs upgraded HVAC, which means it's a perfect time to install efficient heat pumps. Second, as Westminster faces more extreme heat and weather, this space can be used as a community cooling center in the summer, community heating center in the winter, and/or a community emergency shelter after extreme weather events. I would like to see the building reused instead of torn down. If the building must be demolished, building materials should be reused and recycled as much as possible and kept out of the landfill. I would like this to be a space where people can gather and also have access to outdoor spaces like the playground.	9/10/2023 8:00 PM
6	I think concept 1 is preferable. The space was intended for the enrichment of children and it should continue to benefit children. It would be nice to have a children's recreation center folded into the existing Westminster recreation system. Concept 1: City retains the property and utilizes it for community programming including but not limited to recreation, children's summer camps, and library options.	9/9/2023 9:14 AM
7	We would love to see a community center with classes activities childcare in our community!	9/6/2023 10:53 PM
8	I wasn't at the meeting, heard aboutI the idea of a community center with pool for those in Sheridan Green. I also think it would be nice to put a cancer center in here. There are none in Westminster and most have to travel to Thornton for their chemo, radiation, etc.	9/6/2023 2:42 PM
9	We would like concept #4. Expand the existing park and demolish the old building. Seems 5 to 7 million dollars to refurbish that old building is a waste of money. The park could be used buy everyone.	9/5/2023 4:08 PM
10	We vote for concept #4. Expand the existing park and demolish the building.	9/5/2023 3:33 PM
11	Out of the four potential concepts I would prefer that the city create a community center that serves multiple generations. Perhaps pre k programs, art classes, support groups, homework help/afterschool programs could be held there. If not a community center, then I would prefer the concept that the school be demolished and open space be created. I do not want a dog park, turf, or parking lot. We all have back yards for dogs and there is plenty of parking for park users already. Please consider conferring with resource central about planting trees and native perennials. We love our two garden in a box kits. The concepts that involve selling are my least favorite. There is no guarantee that the property will continue to be open and available for community use. Property values are dependant on what becomes of the school. This housing market is already difficult enough. Please don't make this neighborhood a difficult place to sell a house, and an undesirable place to live. My family spends lots of time playing at the school park, walking/riding bikes on the sidewalks to on our way to the school bus stop, piano lessons, etc. This property has always served the community, please don't change that. I am very concerned by the City's presentation. They stood up and stated all the reasons they should not keep the school. I understand the monetary commitment to keeping the building is big, but it felt very similar to the districts approach to closing the school. The district hosted "community conversations" that in reality had nothing to do with getting feedback from the community. It quickly became obvious that the meetings were nothing but a formailty. They had decided the outcome before the closures were even announced. This made the closer more painful. If the city has no intent on listening to and using public feedback, rip the bandaid off and quit giving us hope that our opinion matters.	9/5/2023 3:02 PM
12	The city operating a community center for all ages would be best. The meeting felt like the city isn't interested or able to do that. If a sale is what's needed to have that building serving our community then that's ok. Please put lots of guard rails on the sale and in the planning documents to ensure community-serving remains the core priority of the property. To that end, don't add parking. There's already a ton, and paving more of that property will be a detriment to the community. Lastly, ensure the playground and sidewalks stay open for public use, ideally as city property. Thank you!	9/5/2023 2:25 PM
13	I am a resident of the neighborhood and regularly walk my dog along the sidewalks that	9/4/2023 8:38 PM

surround the elementary school. Our dog is fear reactive and we have worked with multiple trainers to learn to manage and redirect her, but she is still a challenge to walk. We have had numerous issues with people using allowing their dogs to run off leash in the open areas on either side of the school and have had dogs charge us. This is one of the only low traffic public open spaces in the neighborhood and I ask that, whatever future uses are considered, it not be used as a dog park and that signs be installed to remind dog owners that it is a leash law area. We walk our dog in the evening, when less people are around, so these situations happen outside of animal control business hours. I personally prefer concept 1 that was presented at the 8/24 meeting. I think a park expansion will only exacerbate the issue of off leash dogs, so I strongly urge that the city does not go with concept #4. Thank you for considering this feedback.

14	recreation center	9/4/2023 7:34 PM
15	Yes to Concept 1 for the City to retain the building. We are long term residents of the area and see the potential to use it to expand it for kid's enrichment programs, kids arts & music programs such as the Missoula Children's Theater, daycare, after school care and programing, adult programs, adult day care, etc and renting out rooms for non-profits or other recreation usage. The playground that was upgraded by tax payer bond money should remain intact. Perhaps the park could be improved for recreational use. Many of the the above ideas were presented at the meeting were acceptable Unacceptable ideas: concept 2,3,4 We would prefer that a church or other private entity NOT purchase the building. We would NOT like it to be demolished. We would NOT like it to be used as residential such as senior housing or homeless housing. The only acception would be for a natural disaster such as tornados, floods, fires to provide emergency shelter.	9/2/2023 5:14 PM
16	Option 4: Expand the park and put in picnic pavilions and a community pool to generate revenue.	9/2/2023 1:29 PM
17	We liked and strongly encourage option 4- to turn the land into more park, with an updated playground. We also think adding picnic pavilions and a community pool would be a good use of the space and generate revenue. We are opposed to a church going in. It would create more traffic in the neighborhood and we are worried about loosing green space due to a parking lot. We don't feel like they would be able to deliver on their project childcare program. We are also worried about losing access to the current playground if the church takes over. We feel they would gate off any play structure they own and restrict access due to liability reasons.	9/2/2023 1:16 PM
18	As a Sheridan Green resident I would like to see the city sell this property to a church or turn it into a community center. Homeless shelter and court house are absolutely out of the question. With both of those crime and drug use follows.	9/2/2023 11:54 AM
19	Concept 1 is the most appealing as someone who lives in the community. Concept 3 is a palatable alternative, but we already have two mega churches taking up immense amounts of space that are only used a few times a week on Sheridan just a few blocks away. It would be more optimal for the area to be used for a wider range of uses on a more frequent basis.	9/1/2023 8:08 PM
20	I wasn't able to attend the meeting so I have only seen the first 3 options in writing. I did however hear that another option is to tear the building down and make it all a park. I strongly object to that if it is in fact an option. That would be a huge waste of the bond money that was spent on it a couple years ago. All new carpeting was put in, the gym floor was replace, the library and front office areas were all remodeled and reconfigured and a new security system was put in. I would like it to stay child and community centered in some way. I don't necessarily object to another entity buying it with the city leasing back some space but I would like to see any proposals in that case. My yard backs up to the property so I'm concerned about the grounds being kept up as well as the playground. There are also times when people drive behind the school and park on the play pad and sometimes the sprinkler system malfunctions and I'd love to know the right person to call for these kinds of issues. Right now my go to is the non-emergency dispatch which I know is always an option but maybe not the correct path to take. Thank you for allowing us this opportunity to provide feedback. I'd be happy to sit on any committees being formed when and if that happens.	9/1/2023 2:54 PM
21	Option 1 and 4 are my preferred choices. These choices would retain the property values and sense of community for all in the neighborhood. Option 1 would be amazing to have some recreation resources so close by. 4 would be an amazing park for all! Please don't lease or sell to the church, Sunday traffic would be a nightmare through the neighborhood. It is not inclusive and neighbors would lose any decision making in the property aroynd their home.	8/31/2023 8:36 PM

22	Would love to see the park expanded and improved. Love the idea of an outdoor pool! Don't love the idea of the church	8/31/2023 4:15 PM
23	Thank you for considering the various options and listening to the community/neighborhood. I prefer Concept 2 - RMPC as long as there are agreements with the church to: 1) keep and maintain the playground for public use (understanding there are liability issues to be considered); 2) having public options for renting community meeting or event space and after school/other enrichment programming activities (like creative spaces such as STEM labs, dance or art lessons, local speakers, etc.). If that is aligned more with Concept 3, I would prefer Concept 3. The reduced fiscal impact to tax payers/the City, reducing duplication of services, and continued positive/safe use of the space is ideal. The playground is such a positive and valuable part of the neighborhood and it was paid for by Sheridan Green Elementary funds, it should not be removed. If anything, some equipment should be moved to Ryan Elementary. Thank you, again, for the considerations.	8/31/2023 2:42 PM
24	This property needs to be sold to pay for the massive debt recently incurred by this council. There is no reason to cater to a specific neighborhood that doesn't benefit the entire city. The city needs to get away from real estate and focus on running this city and bringing our costs down. Not one tax dollar should be used on this building. We are all watching this decision and will vote accordingly. Watching you Seymore!	8/31/2023 2:29 PM
25	Some sort of community/ after school center. With homework help and activities. Art sports and such , aswell as additional possibly low cost programs for youth to attend	8/31/2023 1:49 AM
26	No church. Use the space for community use or expansion of park.	8/30/2023 9:40 PM
27	Would prefer option 1 to have ownership still belong to the city. A private entity typically does not have the community interests in mind.	8/30/2023 9:26 PM
28	While I don't like tearing down buildings, SGE needs millions in upgrades. Any buyer will expect the city to cover some of the costs. It will be a long time that it may be needed as a school again and the building would need even more upgrades then. I like concept 4 the best. I would love if a facility like The Arbor House at Maple Grove Park in Golden (CO) could be built there and similar park improvements. We've attended several events there and would love such a facility in Westminster! You have a resource for information as to issues Golden has had with this park/facility and maintenance costs. Any park has security issues but with a facility, maybe security cameras could be put in unlike parks with just gazebos. Thanks.	8/30/2023 8:41 PM
29	Concept 1. Senior Center. The city needs more safe spaces for programming that specializes in older adult programming and recreation opportunities.	8/30/2023 8:22 PM
30	I am strongly in favor of concept 1, maintaining the building and adding additional community resources and activity space. It is very hard to get into some community education classes through the city and dedicated space for them would be great. Additional space for public use (band practice, club meetings etc) would be nice. My second preference would be, concept 4, to demolish the school and expand the park. An off leash dog park would be nice in this area. I would also be in favor of selling the property for fair market value as single or multi family residential. I am strongly against selling the property to a church or any commercial development.	8/30/2023 8:20 PM
31	I am for concept 1 or 2.	8/30/2023 8:13 PM
32	Concept 1 (City owned/operated community space) is by far preferred. Concept 4 (City owned/operated expansion of park) is also acceptable. I do not want to see the parcel sold to private groups, including a church. I would be hopeful that a way could be found to incorporate this facility into PRL vision planning to find usage that would be beneficial to the immediate community as well as all Westminster residents. I think ultimately the programming of the facility, if kept and operated by Westy, should be a response to the PRL vision planning process.	8/30/2023 6:16 PM
33	I would really rather not see a church move in to the Sheridan Green space, as it would by its nature not be welcoming to all, contrary to many of the goals put forward by the community. I would much rather see an expanded park (option 4).	8/30/2023 6:11 PM
34	I personally would prefer 1 and 4- we do not need any more churches in the area- there are already TONS between 112 and sheridan and 120th and sheridan. I feel like having a library, or community space would be more welcoming to all. Expanding the park would just be the best option- but we use that park every day!	8/30/2023 6:03 PM

35	I think having a church combined with a public library crosses some lines in separation of church and state. I would no longer use the Westminster public library if associated with a religious organization of any kind. Be a public library or be a church but it can not be both. Even the suggestion really upsets me as Westminster resident who is not Christian. Churches have no need to be anywhere in our city goverment, public schools or public libraries.	8/30/2023 4:44 PM
36	After attending both meetings on the future of Sheridan Green elementary, I think that the best way forward would be to demolish the building and extend the park with shelters and pickleball courts	8/30/2023 4:03 PM
37	I'm most in favor of the concept where the city owns and operates the school building as a multi-generational community center. The presentation clearly implied the city can't afford the capital, operational, and maintenance costs of doing that, but it's what right looks like. My second choice would be selling the property with provisions to lease space for community center programming AND keeping the playground and courts open to community use. If the city chose to demolish the facility for increased park space that should not result in additional turf areas. Other human-centric park elements not available nearby would be fine, but there's already an overabundance of turf that's inadequately maintained. I also want to dispel the notion that more parking is needed for any of the proposed uses. The property already has 80 off-street parking spots and 56 nearby on-street parking spots that don't front houses. There's numerous other on-street spots that front houses that are not for the exclusive use of those properties (including mine). No proposal that includes adding parking should move forward.	8/30/2023 2:56 PM
38	Concept 1: Leave the playground open to the community!!	8/30/2023 2:19 PM
39	I like option 3 to split with the church and gave community programs and camps.	8/30/2023 11:25 AM
40	Concept 4 has my vote: expand the park, revamp the existing tennis courts and add new courts, add pickleball. Possibly add sand volleyball courts. Add more playground equipment for the kids.	8/30/2023 10:17 AM
41	I live in Sheridan Green on 110th circle. One of the reasons we bought here was the school being close by. After closure the council assured us this was to remain a community asset. A community center or expanded park would achieve this goal. A church would benefit the few members of this church (mostly outside this community) and be a net negative for the community itself. It would add increased traffic, potentially get rid of the playground where my kid plays, and overall add an unwanted and already saturated presence around our area. My perception is that very few people in Sheridan Green are in support of a church and selling it to RMPC would be a betrayal of the promises that the council made to our community upon the initial meeting.	8/30/2023 9:47 AM
42	I don't believe pumping 7-9m into updating the building makes good financial sense. I don't know if the estimated cost includes inflation, but the longer a project lasts, the more costly it becomes. Tearing down the building and expanding the park also doesn't make sense. It isn't use much today so expanding something that isn't used seems to be a waste. Selling the property to the church makes the most sense, especially to a church that is so community minded. Some of the proceeds can be used to refurbish other rec centers that could use a face-lift. Additionally, some of the money could be used to enhance the park such as installing in new playground equipment, a picnic pavilion (both on the north end of the park), and additional parking on Harland. Those enhancements will make the park more useful that what it is now. Just a thought or two	8/30/2023 8:07 AM
43	Demo the building and expand the park with Xeriscape and trees. Building is too old & needs too much to fix.	8/30/2023 6:29 AM
44	Please turn into a facility that can be used for City recreation programming.	8/29/2023 11:25 PM
45	SGE was my community since I moved into the neighborhood back on October 29, 2004. My kids attended the school from 2006 until 2013. I have spent many hours and money on the school, our community and neighborhood. This is an opportunity to have something special in our community. I would love to see something that honors our Lil'Gators and improve our neighborhood. I would like to see a Community Center or an amazing park. It should focus on the children that attended the school. I am an empty nester, I can still see the benefit of having programs for our youth.	8/29/2023 9:45 PM
46	Option 4: expanding the park is the best overall choice for the area and the residents that live near the park. It provides an expanded space where neighbors could come together and enjoy the beautiful open space in Westminster. It would also offer additional space where PRL could	8/29/2023 7:05 PM

	host events (ex: movie nights, food truck spots, mobile art etc.) to enhance the sense of community. Option 1: creating a new community center would also be okay but I would be concerned with the duplication of programs that are offered at City Park Rec Center and the fiscal impact. Options 2 & 3 that involve the church I would highly oppose. A church would not unite the community, unless you are part of the congregation - which not everyone wants to be.	
47	Some of those in attendance at the 8/24 open house expressed concern over parking/traffic in regard to selling to the church, but did not consider it an issue for the property being used as a recreation center. It seems to me that a recreation center (or similar city operated facility) would generate more daily traffic and parking concerns than a church that operates at full attendance on one day per week. This speaks more to prejudice against a church than any real concern over parking. Additionally, I have concerns over Concept 1 & 4 regarding the cost to maintain the facility while the city is deciding how to use it, then how to retrofit, and then operate the new facility. I don't see how the city would ever recover the costs associated with this endeavor, which would inevitably lead to an increase in taxes. I believe the city can negotiate a sale of the property that would be advantageous to both the city and a potential buyer.	8/29/2023 4:29 PM
48	Thank you for taking community input on this property. After reviewing the information presented at the meeting, I continue to support the concept of a community use for the building, as most of the neighborhood input pointed to. However, after reviewing the property boundaries map presented at the meeting, the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE to me is that the walking path connecting Jay St, Kendall Dr, Ingalls Cir, and Harlan St REAMINS A WALKING PATH OPEN TO THE PUBLIC AT ALL TIMES. This path is VITAL to the neighborhood and must be maintained by the city or have its public access included as a stipulation in any sale of the property. Thank you. Ammie Grauten 10964 Jay St.	8/29/2023 12:51 PM
49	I or 4 or a combination of 1 and 4. The church is right out due to the traffic and parking issues it would cause as well as the denomination it belongs to being strongly anti-woman and anti-LGBTQ and it's not a good look for Westminster gifting such a church a building.	8/28/2023 8:38 PM
50	Regardless of which option is chosen in the end, it is imperative that the playground and surrounding green space continue to be available to the community. If Westminster were to take the time to complete a use analysis, they would find that these areas are used DAILY by the community and are an integral part of the neighborhood. Please do not discount the residents of Sheridan Green because we are not a rich, HOA community. Many of us are intelligent, community -minded people and would like the neighborhood to be valued as much by Westminster as it is by those of us who live in it. We have noticed that the park area to the west of the school has been neglected since Westminster decided to close the school. The grass is not cut regularly and many of us are concerned that snow removal will falter as well. Many, many of us walk through this area daily and would like the upkeep to be maintained at a reasonable level. Also, a good number of us feel that Westminster is only holding community meetings to create the appearance of caring when in fact decisions are being made behind the scenes that go against the will of our community. I have talked with countless neighbors who don't come to the meetings for just this reason. I suppose we'll find out it this is true once a final decision is made on the property. Yes, we care about this space. Yes, we would like to be able to continue to use this space. No, we do not want it to negatively impact our neighborhood. And yes, we would like our opinions to count! Thank you.	8/28/2023 6:51 PM
51	We are in favor of concept 1 and 4. We don't want it to be sold to RMPC or to be sold to another private company. The city should retain the property.	8/28/2023 2:26 PM
52	I think we need to look at the big picture. Several comments suggested that we utilize the school for different things, based on current dynamics of the neighborhood. Keeping the school in tact for future(which very well may be 20 years), May be the way to go. Updates could bring everything up to code so that once the school is needed, it's ready to go. In the meantime, accessibility to host meeting rooms, maybe a preschool or a daycare program that is not outrageously priced, etc. Thinkking about the comment for use as a senior center, that could help keep the school in tact and yet provide the neighborhood with a "Mac2" option for participation in this area. I love that because, as a senior, it is within walking distance which makes that option very appealing. And when the time comes, the school is ready for those children in need. Perhaps a combination of a those two ideas? If you choose to demolish, I would like to see you expand the park into a very nice neighborhood park with updated playground, swimming pool, and pickle ball courts.	8/28/2023 10:17 AM
53	I would really like a library please!	8/27/2023 11:13 AM

54	Concept 1 seems the best for me and my family. The only concern with selling to RMPC is traffic and parking in the quiet neighborhood and concerns for development or resale to a private party. A pool would also be a welcomed idea.	8/27/2023 10:59 AM
55	Concept 1 seems the best for me and my family. The only concern with selling to RMPC is traffic and parking in the quiet neighborhood and concerns for development or resale to a private party. A pool would also be a welcomed idea.	8/27/2023 10:57 AM
56	Concept 1 seems the best for me and my family. The only concern with selling to RMPC is traffic and parking in the quiet neighborhood and concerns for development or resale to a private party. A pool would also be a welcomed idea.	8/27/2023 10:56 AM
57	Concept 1 seems the best for me and my family. The only concern with selling to RMPC is traffic and parking in the quiet neighborhood and concerns for development or resale to a private party. A pool would also be a welcomed idea.	8/27/2023 10:47 AM
58	Adaptive reuse of the existing building, as a community, senior, recreation center, seems fitting with its place in the neighborhood. Though the city Park rec center is not too far away from this location, it is clear that the center itself cannot accommodate existing groups that request space in the rec center. Though a full-service library might not be feasible, it's possible a smaller space for a children's library would make sense. Conversion of the existing school building and area into a larger park makes sense in the existing residential area and could add more fields for use to the wider community. The sale to, or use by Rocky Mountain Presbyterian Church does not seem to be in keeping with the neighborhood, especially if their hope is to grow the church.	8/26/2023 1:00 PM
59	Would really love to see a community for seniors or church for child care center or a community for kids to go after-school activities!	8/26/2023 12:36 PM
60	Community center/ senior center/ teen center Pickelball Please do not turn it into a court house and bring more rif Raf into our quiet neighborhood. I don't want people just out on bail roaming our streets.	8/25/2023 11:17 PM
61	I and my family would like to see the land stay with the city and not be bought by a private entity. I would be worried if bought, it could be sold in the future with no input from the community. We have a wonderful City Park Rec Center and Fitness Center near by but we don't have an outdoor community pool or community rooms for support groups or more community art classes. We live nearby and have two young kids. We would love to stay in the neighborhood if this site is turned into something that we could utilize on a regular basis. This was turned into a large updated playground and swimming pool with a splash pad this would be a very huge draw for young families to move to the neighborhood as it is seeing a lot of turn over from older residents. I know many young families that already use the current park and playground to meet up with neighbors. It would be so wonderful to have something our whole neighborhood could use that would keep us here for years to come!	8/25/2023 10:27 PM
62	I would like to see the land stay with the city and not be bought by a private entity. I would be worried if bought, it could be sold in the future with no input from the community. We have a wonderful City Park Rec Center and Fitness Center near by but we don't have an outdoor community pool or community rooms for support groups or more community art classes. I live two blocks away and have two young kids. We would love to stay in the neighborhood if this site is turned into something that we could utilize on a regular basis. This was turned into a large updated playground and swimming pool with a splash pad this would be a very huge draw for young families to move to the neighborhood as it is seeing a lot of turn over from older residents. I know many young families that already use the current park and playground to meet up with neighbors. It would be so wonderful to have something our whole neighborhood could use that would keep us here for years to come!	8/25/2023 10:18 PM
63	I need to echo similar sentiments at the meeting on the 25th. We really do NOT need another "place of worship" in this region of Westminster, in our small neighborhood. That would create exclusivity and a lack of access to our local residents and community since religious based functions will have priority. I, as many others, believe the PDP reprogramming of Sheridan Green elementary should have a mixed use program. The presented code updates are going to be required in any event, since there will be a change in use" for any repurposing. It needs to have perhaps have rooms available for use by residents for senior classes, family gathering event, even professional meeting rooms. I for one would rent meeting rooms to do professional training presentations. Or, perhaps small format daycare, etc., all of which was discussed to some extent on the 25th. Building and Fire Code upgrades have to considered a "cost of doing"	8/25/2023 8:03 PM

	business", which at a minimum would include as ADA, restrooms, HVAC, life-safety, etc. Those elements will need to improved regardless. Unless, of course, City Council decides raising the structure is the best option. Then a community park, more play ground elements, community gardens, etc could be created out in its place. We cannot have any organization, religious developer, or otherwise, take ownership of the structure and or land, then develop it autonomously of any input from local residents. You cannot let corporate or religious organizations have unilateral or authoritarian control over directly affecting our property values, and/or our neighborhood fabric. Whether it is increased unrealistic traffic impacts negatively affecting our neighborhood, or affecting our property values, that is what would happen if a church or developer takes control. Lastly, we believe the land it's self should remain in tcontrol of Westminster as a lease to the City, so that land use can remain in the hands of Westminster. I personally believe, that Westminster is the best run City I've lived in, and I've lived in 6 different states and 19 different cities around the US. And I have faith that Westminster city council will do what is the absolute best for the residents of Westminster, and in particular Sheridan Green.	
64	Concept one Acceptable but the expense of renovating the building would have to be taken into consideration. Concept 2 Not acceptable. There is not enough parking. It would make the area too congested and unless the city is in need of money, why would they sell the asset to an entity that does not pay property tax. Concept 3 Not acceptable. Two little city control and too easily subject to change. Concept 4 Acceptable	8/25/2023 7:27 PM
65	I am a Sheridan Green neighborhood resident. My first choice for the space would be to expand Stratford Park. An expansion could add a public pool, pavilions, splash pad, and/or expand the playground. I think it would be important to keep as much of the existing green space as possible. We don't have any outdoor pools on this side of town, and I think the community would get a lot of use out a space like this and it would benefit people of all ages. Fees could be charged for pool admittance and pavilion usage. This would be nominal but at least would bring in a little bit of revenue. My second choice is to keep the building and repurpose it as a community/rec center. While I think it should serve people of all ages, I believe a portion of it could be used as a senior center. I would love to see the stage remain and have it used for community plays and performances. There could be larger spaces to be reserved for parties, non-profit groups, other gatherings. Additionally, there could be some small rooms that could be reserved, similar to at the library, for small groups to meet and/or individual remote workers to reserve if they need a temporary space away from home in which to work. Children's programming such as after school care and camps would be nice too. I really don't care for the concept of having a church on the site. As someone mentioned in the 8/24 meeting there are MANY places of worship within a 2-mile radius. I think the neighborhood's concern about Sunday traffic and parking are valid. Having a church there would significantly reduce the amount of people that would have access/utilize the space. It would not serve the immediate Sheridan Green community. I personally would not feel comfortable attending any "public" events held by a church as I don't want to be solicited on home values for those closest to the site. I urge you to strongly take into consideration the opinions of those in the Sheridan Green neighborhood. We are the ones closest to the site and presumably would be the primary users of	8/25/2023 3:44 PM
66	I've lived in this neighborhood since I was 4, I'm 22 now. I've grown up here and so have my siblings. I would be absolutely heartbroken to watch the place where I learned to be a person and found lifelong friends get turned into something private, like a church. Turning SGE into a church would not only threaten overcrowding in the neighborhood with parked cars, it also discriminates against those with different religions, races, and even potentially those who are LGBTQ+ and may not feel safe in such an environment. This place was not built to shut off a majority of the public. It was built for all children and families, something everyone can enjoy. Keeping it public, such as libraries, rec center, sports, theatre, community center, day care, etc. also allows for more jobs to stay open to the public. As someone who lives right by this building, I just want to emphasize that me and many others want to stay feeling safe and included in our own community.	8/25/2023 2:49 PM
67	I think a library or a rec center would be a great addition!	8/25/2023 2:42 PM
68	concept 4– expand existing park, which would include demolishing the building. Replace with a larger playground and picnic pavilions.	8/25/2023 2:41 PM