

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
1	The gazebo would be a nice gathering place.	Same s for #1 pros and cons	Either would be fine since it's only the sidewalk shapes that vary.
	Like the brick entry.		I would love to see something that provides an active place,
	Benches provide seating.		
	Nothing active to do like an interactive play area		but I guess that's not in the choices.
2	Like the different features shown	Not much	It says it all!
3	Overly formal and geometric	The overall absence of straight lines	See above
4	Like the gazebo.		
	Like the walking sidewalks		
5			#2 better because I like the swirly sidewalks
6	Love the symmetry	Modern feel does not match the District	
	Access to site seems more logical	or BG	
7	Gazebo backs up to the church	Curving paths (less regimented) flows	Both have strong points. Not sure either design is as positive as those created by the BGSU grad students
	Seems like more % of walking paths	Green space not as "chopped" up.	who submitted designs early on in the process with the original committee.
	Walking path behind gazebo allows musicians to access the gazebo easier		
	Reminds me of a ball diamond		
8		Design should not include the metal sculpture for it can be used as a shearing metal object in the event of an EF5 tornado	Designs should include a waterfall-style pond for town fresh water supply fountain that also the fire department can fill trucks with.
		Relaxed, meandering, more interesting.	See above
9	Seems more rigid and formal		
10	Simpler design providing plenty of space to play & plenty paths to walk on.	More modern feel with more of a flowing free form design.	I like how it is different from the traditional straight lines you see in other parks.
	Don't like the straight lines --too architectural	Building and the statue are too close together.	
11	I don't like anything -- too much cement!	Less cement, not so formal, more inviting	
12	Not much -- poor overall design	Curved paths, not as chopped up looking	Don't see the necessity of the brick entrance. Kids are going to climb on it. Should be simplified.
	Straight lines, cluttered looking		Like simplicity, think that usually less is better than a busy overworked design.
13			A drinking fountain, with a lower one for dogs would be nice.
14	Aesthetically pleasing	Don't like the limited amount of paths. Doesn't look like it would show off the gazebo	Shows off the gazebo and overall looks much prettier than #1
15		Like the path	I very like the path
16	Don't like how the path is a triangle	Like the paths	
17	It's ok but not my favorite	More unique than #1	More unique with the sidewalk shape
			Both need some flowers or a garden!
18			
19	Like the symmetry, Like the placement of the art.	Seems more green. Curves are relaxing	Because of the symmetry.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
20	Like the direct paths across the green space.	Like the meandering paths, the extended green space	More relaxed, recreational feeling to it and feels more
	Don't like that this (the paths) aspect quadrants off and	and the fact that the features are further from Wooster.	artful than utilitarian.
	minimizes continuous green space reducing room for	People may walk over the grass to shortcut the path.	
	recreational activities(football, frisbee, concerts).		
21	Nice place to take a walk or roll in a wheelchair	More green space for picnics and shaded area.	#1 has more open space. The other one does too,
	It don't look like it ADA	For people who want to walk on grass and	but I like #1.
		Looks like ADA (compliant) for people in wheelchairs.	
22	Art sculpture is more noticeable	More open, smooth edges to sidewalk flow,	Committee might consider visiting Fisher and Carmel, IN.
		less angular.	They have developed a very eye-pleasing city services/
			city building/library area that fits with the feel of BG.
			Easier accessibility and centrally located.
23	A bit clunky looking and the way the sidewalk narrows	Much more natural and organic in regard to the flow	Possible options to add: A water fountain as the "feature".
	behind the pavillion looks very cut off or unfinished;	of the sidewalks, the 2000 additional square footage	Spot closest to S. Church with the addition of a drinking
	Too much concrete sidewalks and not enough grass	of grassy area in front of the pavilion.	fountain for both people and pets.
	and landscaping.	Overall I like this design better.	
24	...looks forced and does not seem to fit the space well.	Love design2. More organic and seems well thought	Considerations: Instead of a sculpture, maybe a
	Do not like the pavillion so close to the church.	out.	fountain.
		Placement of the pavillion is much better, away from the	There should definitely be drinking fountains as well: the
		church and with a muvh larger green space directly	kind
		in front of it.	that allows you to fill your bottle and has a pet fountain.
25	Design is too harsh	Flowing design is very attractive	Looks like a friendlier site for users.
26	Overall design, gazebo seems to be little more than	More organic flow to the pathways.	See above
	an afterthought.	Gazebo and statue are on equal footing.	
		Nothing (negative) I see.	
27			Like the fact you can see both focal points from
			Wooster.
			Also, the design is more eye catching.
28	All I see is Option #1. I like it but benches or not.		
29	Looks nice, direct walking paths(won't walk on grass),	Very beautiful, lovely features. People will walk on the	#2 is most beautiful, but #1 would be best in reality due
	beautiful access and features	grass for direct cutting across.	to
			walking paths. We don't want dead grass trails or signs
			to
			stay off grass.
30	Too geometric!	Prefer the curvilinear design. Less overly geometric,	
		more interesting. Also, permits more open space	
		and thus gathering area for performances	

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
31	(Don't like): Nothing. I love that it is compatible with the historic district and the Boomtown era. It's a town square not a park. It should look like a turn-of-the-century space.	Don't like the winding pathways. This design feels unbalanced with the East side almost top heavy to the left of the site	Prefer #1 for reasons stated. Love the entry way in both options. Love the logo.
32	Too symmetrical	The lovely flow.	It's artistic.
33	Like the style and the option to use the pavillion.	Don't like the style, but I did like the way green space was saved.	Option #1 for the look and style. Option #2 for the green space A water fountain would be nice.
34	Like the design		Need parking, restrooms, water.
35			Like #2 better because the gazebo is off center allowing space on the church wall to show movies. The south triangle would make a nice space to sit on the lawn & watch movies on the wall.
36	The design is probably more practical from a utilization aspect. It has a better potential viewing area for the gazebo for lawn chairs. Make the gazebo plenty large for music groups of all sizes to perform to an audience.	Not bad, but much of space behind gazebo is not easily accessible. People will cut the corners when walking through the space.	Definitely prefer design 1. Keep space uncluttered with walks lined with hostas and larger vegetation if possible with access into the green space. Both are better than I expected.
37	I think people would stay off the grass more--they can take a shortcut across diagonally if they want to.	Love the curve of the sidewalk. Seems more relaxing.	Probably #1 because I like the view of the sculpture from Wooster.
38	Goes to 4 corners, but too harsh.	Flows better -- very attractive	I would ask the city to consider having a marketing person - at least part-time - for the sole [purpose of setting up events for this area. I am thinking along the lines of family-friendly event such as what is done at Levis Commons...They attract people from outside areas, which is good for business. Private reservations would not do this. Events require a lot of time and effort to plan. Why not make sure this space is a good investment on the city's part by making sure it brings in more business?
39	I like the symetry. I don't like the gazebo where it is. I think the gazebo should be the focal point, not the art work.	Better placement of the gazebo, but I don't like 2 focal points	I would actually prefer design#3, where the gazebo is in the middle with circular paths, etc. and no art work.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
40	A little too geometrical. Very formal	Like the softer lines. Naturalistic	A little more natural and inviting. Do consider the way people walk, arrange themselves...more in real life...not on the drawing board.
41	Lot of space. Very pretty	Very unusual. Like the idea of encouraging meandering.	Either, slight preference for #1/
42	Love the accessibility to each corner of the green space.	This is my least favorite -- Looks like someones back yard. Would have to walk on grass to get from sides	Also, this should be pet-friendly space --put water stations in conspicuous corners
	The space I think is more useable given the layout.	to others which could be bad for handicapped people with walkers and/or wheelchairs. Greater chance for accidents. If Option 2 is selected, a sidewalk needs to be added on the North side of the space.	of the space.
43	The straight paths make it look like a "corporate" design	The meandering paths look more organic and natural	
44	Like: gazebo and paved walkways and benches and trees	Dislike: too plain	
45	Not much -- poor overall design	Everything	Because it looks more unique
46	I like this design	Not appealing to me as Option #1	
47	Option (1) gives a retaining wall that will give drug pushers and prostitutes a chance to exchange mortal sins and break city law, close enough to police view to cause in court the argument for entrapment by line of sight.		That lot is big enough to build a corporate sky tower and invite NSA to live in BG and have new age cyber tools between the midwest and Boston and New York
48	X to cross. Not as much open space	More open space. People will cross NW to SE on the grass.	Needs H2O and restroom (4 handicapped and unisex).
49	Everything --like the design concept	Not as eye appealing.	
50		Like the gazebo location better	Seriously both are nice, but preference is Option 2
51			More like 18th Century estate in France (i.e....look at it... easier on the eyes!!)
52		Like the 4 entrances and the whole layout of park. Well done.	Option #2 by far
53	Less concrete/pavement. More open "green."	Symmetrical. Very European feel.	I see no drinking fountains in either. What about seasonal planting spaces? A water feature?
54			Paths meander invitingly. Need more trees.
55	Beautiful, but too plain	Beautiful design and the curves are pretty.	Option 2 is better, more aesthetically pleasing
56	Seems to flow well from corner to corner.	It's pretty, but I think you'll still have people cutting across the grass to get from W.Wooster to S. Church	
	May need more pavement or sturdier grass around		

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
	gazebo if you have events there, which would be nice to bring folks downtown.		
57			Both are good. How about a bandstand?
58	Don't like the gazebo in the center.	Curves and asymmetry are more interest than #1.	Option 2 because it is more aesthetically pleasing. The
	Like the entrances at the corners	Like the gazebooffset, not in the center. This will	meandering paths discourage using the green as a short
		allow space in the negative areas for community band	cut diagonally from on street to the next.
		performances and tents for open market.	Gazebo (is) too ordinary and off the shelf. It would be nice
			to see a unique design tied to the history of the site for
			BG, i.e., complex that mirrors the police station or the
			court house. Maybe w/similar bricks or stone. See the
			Middlegrounds Park in Toledo: the pavillion is like a train
			roundhouse. BGSU architecture students should design it
			and CM students should build it.
59	I prefer the traffic pattern of #1. It seems to utilize the		
60	Looks more aesthetically pleasing. Better seating options for events in the gazebo. No shade trees in the middle	Like: nothing Looks like crop circles. No shade trees in middle	More aesthetically pleasing and better seating.
61	Like the gazebo placed with the church as backdrop; it gives focus to the beautiful stained glass windows of the church and wide grass space on all sides of the gazebo.	Don't like the crowding of the 2 main features. Don't like the gazebo placed with its back to Grove St. Traffic, cars parked, folks walking toward it during a	Am especially keen about the way the entrance has been reimagined - set back with landscaping, a little grass and benches set as a welcoming gesture.
	Like a wider road behind the gazebo that gives vehicles entry and ...exit on either side. Like attention given to any performance/event/use without any real distraction from the streets om 3 sides of the gazebo. Like the symetry of this design.	performance - may be a distraction. Furthermore,, how do vehicles delivering equipment going to leave the driveway once delivery is made? By backing out?	
62			

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
63	Option 1 is less appealing than Option 2. It is still a great design but does not feel inviting, as if I'm welcome to stay.	Option 2 has more organic, less grid-like pattern. It is consistent with the Metroparks area in the Toledo area. In addition the field area facing north is large and unobstructed.	See #2
	It feels more like an obstacle to get through.	Great for kids and pets.	
64	Like this one best but do not like the sculpture on either one.	Do not see a need for extra walkways and do not like the sculpture there or the prominence of it. Think the pavillion is enough and should be prominent on both #1 and #2.	#1 best - leave out sculpture unless it was a flag or something in honor of Vets/country/BG area.
	Would rather just see flowers.	The simplicity	Thanks for offering input of community.
65	Like: better flow, looks better	Like:Gazebo is more in center focus	It has better flow; looks better
66	Don't like: Gazebo is in the back	Don't like: More congestion in the middle.	
67	Don't like Option #1 at all. This is old style landscape architecture - not very impressive	Offset design offers more flexibility for concerts & other events. Designate space (sw corner?) for natural area vegetation.	Definitely in favor of Option 2.
68	Too typical	More open space for gatherings	Yes, #2
69			Option #1 - the gazebo is off to one side and opens the majority of the space to face it as a focal point. Also, I very much appreciate the addition of sculpture/art
70	Very accessible but not super interesting	Unique flow and more time walking. More organic feel.	Because it's more fun and artsy but either option we should have native plants garden/landscaping. More aesthetically pleasing.
71		Feature the gazebo	Just the archway into the one entrance. Need more paths from the corners direct to features.
72	Too much concrete. Don't like the walk pattern.	Like the walk pattern. No need for brick entrance - just an archway. Need trees to (?) back side of church.	
73			Skip the gateway - it's not needed. Porta Johns in Church St. lot.
74	Like view of sculpture/art from Wooster St.	Like the curves of sidewalks. Place of gazebo	Prefer #2 because of curves and layout. Think brick entry is too "heavy" and prefer no signage - too much. A small plaque would be better.
	Don't like gazebo close to church		
75	More sidewalks	More rounded	I like Option #1 - more ways of walking.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
76	Boring - too sterile. Where is the community use factor?	Ditto (#1 comments)	#2 but still very lacking. Why even bother implementing this?
	It's just a walk through green. Needs to be interactive - a		(and using taxpayer \$\$?) I have a community planning background.
	focal point for activity. Picnic benches, playground equipment,		I've seen too many useless spaces in town where there is
	skateboard ramp, bocce court, horseshoe, urban garden.		potential for so much more.
77		Like the curving sidewalks	
78	You can cut across the middle	I like the curved paths	
79	Don't like this one	Symetry	
80	The gazebo. Don't like the triangle design.	Love the layout of this one. The gazebo is more central in the	I prefer design #2
		design and I like that.	
81		The flow of it.	Design #2 is my favorite
82	I find it more welcoming than #2. Needs more walking space.	Curved lines are nice, but less appealing than #1	#1 preferred overall due to look & functionality.
83	Don't like how the gazebo will have the church as a backdrop.	Like the curving walkways. There's nothing I don't like.	Prefer Option 2. Just a feeling. Option 2 seems like it will flow better.
	The symetry seems to formal.		
84	a) simple - takes into consideration the natural walking paths	Don't like - does not consider where people already walk	
	people take through area.		
	b) suggest mounds or elevation in n.e./n.w. quadrants to		
	help deaden sound from Wooster.		
85	I liked the setup a lot better. I would add, though, a little bit	I do not like the flow of the design.	
	of elevation, like a small hill, and a little playground, that is	People will not walk through that path.	
	convenient for close neighbors or neighborhood.		
86		Like the less rigid paths - much more inviting	Option 2 - love the meandering paths
87	(Like) nothing. Sculpture too close to Wooster. Pavillion in	Like location of artwork and pavillion. No bathrooms or water.	More green space near Wooster. Big lawns
	rear bad. No bathroom or water.		
88			Option 2 - curvy paths.
89			Option 1
90	Simple - cookie cutter	More innovative. Like the walkways and overall design	#2 best for reasons stated in Q.2
91	Option 1 is rogid and busy. The entry is too narrow and	The curved sidewalks are interesting and more direct.	Option #2 is the nicer of the 2 choices.
	unwelcoming.		
92	Symetry is neat. Good access from all sides. Circle walking	Nice flow but lacks the sidewalk around the back side.	#1 for access and the space would be more useable.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
	around art works well.		A water feature would be preferred.
93	Like that the sculpture (fountain?) is near the street.. It leaves more "protected" green area for activities.		
94	Like the idea and purpose of the design. Like how this design gives clear walkways that are handicap friendly in each direction. This design looks like it could be a new place for small weddings.	Like the artistic, almost abstract, direction. However, I feel it cuts off a lot of available travel space for handicapable and or wheelchair.	Prefer #1 because it has cleaner lines and more purposeful direction for every citizen who may... visit.
95	I personally picture the gazebo as a music venue/stage. Its location would allow a large audience.	I enjoy the assymetry. It looks prettier. Please see above about the sculpture. I would probably get rid of it entirely, but at least here it seems more out of the way. The gazebo/stage may have less audience space. I can't tell. Sidewalks are prettier here, but maybe less path-friendly.	#2 - despite my concerns about the audience field for the venue, it is likely sufficient. It is also neat that a show could be in the round. Also, it de-emphasizes the sculpture.
	I don't get the sculpture. It seems awfully prominent. Art is great but it takes up so much of the space.		
96	Forget sculpture	Like: curved walkways, position of gazebo Forget the sculpture. Would prefer more seating there.	In both options: a simpler entry way and more seating
97	Accessibility from all directions	Curves nice but not practical for usage	
98			Gazebo is too small for the space. Something with a stage would be utilized more. It would ground (?) the area better. Also, pull more from area architecture. Water feature/fountain. Pull designs from BGSU art students - even for benches or fixtures like @ Simpson Park.
99	(Like) the straight lines (sidewalks) and the centered bench and art (although benches might be better than artwork).	Too off-center for activities, i.e., concerts, meetings, vigils, etc.	
100	The direct path along the church from Church St. to Grove St. Don't like the straight angles.	(Like) the curving more graceful paths. (Don't like) lack of direct path from Church St. to Grove St. along the church.	I like #2 better - The curving paths seem more restful & soothing

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
101	No provision for restroom	Encroaches toward church, too much concrete and structure	#2 more graceful, less rigid, less concrete. Restrooms: acquire
		too close to church. No provision for restroom.	the closed bank drive-thru and put restrooms there! P.S. if you
			remove the caps from the pens on the response table people
			won't walk off with them.
102			I like the assymetry of #2
103	Like that there are 4 walking paths meeting symmetrically	Do not like the random path directions or the circle placements	Prefer the 1st option for its symetry.
	towards the center of the block. Also the gazebo is more		
	secluded from the road.		
104	I think this is just a more useable design and the X style	Like the swirly looking part but the pattern would have people	Option 2 is nice but option 1 seems more functionable. If I
	pattern lets a person walk from one corner to the other with-	crossing in the grass.	were to build it, it would be 1.
	out going across grass.		
105	Pos: Symmetry. Better/more seating surrounding gazebo.	Pros: More modern, fun design	#1 better layout - function
	Neg: Hopefully water fountain, not just sculpture. More	Neg: Not enough space between gazebo/sculpture/fountain.	
	trees interspersed eventually for shade. Needs brick	More trees needed. 2 brick entrances on Wooster St.	
	entrances on both ends off Wooster St.		
106	Do not like location of statue		#2 over #1
107	Placement of gazebo is better	Placement of gazebo and fountain/statue not as good visually	Prefer option #1
		as in #1.	
108			Prefer design #2 for the curved lines
109	(Like) very little. Too much concrete. Too many smaller green	More inviting; less formal. Less concrete with larger green areas.	I definitely prefer option 2 --for reasons already stated.
	area. Gate NOT welcoming/not necessary and a hazard for	Preferred placement of concert/performance bldg. The current	Start with the basic design and see how the community
	people to climb and fall off of. As a senior citizen you are	corner entrance is much more inviting than the "wall entrance"	uses it. Add accordingly - and as \$ is raised. Seating
	urged to know your surroundings. I would never go anywhere	and lss \$ and less of a hazard. The Wooster Green sign can be	should promote conversation - not line people up along
	near the wall to wait for someone.	incorporated without a brick wall.	concrete walks! Observing what has happened to
			sculptures at the BGSU Alumni Center and Simpson
			Garden - are they worth the \$ and upkeep or loss??
			Temporary art shows might be better.
110	Like the layout better. Better views of things as you go by...	It is more artistic than #1	Prefer #1 - better display, looks more relaxing

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
111			What and how many people could the gazebo hold?
			Would the gazebo affect the view to the "new" Sr. Ctr on
			Grove St.? Would the brick walls of the church affect any
			sounds coming from the gazbo area?
			What will this space be used for? At this time there is
			little shade. Should the gazebo be built now?
112	Too straight	Nice curves	No. 2 more green space
113	Open space. Bad arrangement	Cool design	#2 because I think the layout is better
114	Symmetry	It's nice but I like #1 better	Option 1 - I like the connection of the paths
115	Like the Wooster entry gate BUT a good potential for any	The sculpture is off-center and might allow more space for a	
	graffiti on the brick - plus the sculpture too.	crowd to have easier view of any activity/performers at the gazebo	See #2 above
116	Feels more formal - prefer #2	More space for children to play. Like the way it meanders/feels	
		like a nice park setting. Prefer assemetry.	
117	Yes	It's nice too	
118	It cuts up the green space too much. The symmetry is nice.	Like that there is more green space for activities	Prefer design 2. It leaves more open green space to
	The sculpture seems slightly odd and might be nicer as a		be available for activities.
	fountain		
119	I like that the pavillion is one side.	Like the huge areas of grass space and the curvy sidewalks.	I like design number 2 better
	Don'r like the minimal grass space	I do not have any complaints	
120	Like option one because if there is an activity happening,		
	there is enough room to mingle and pay attention at the same		
	time. Also,there is plenty of space to have several activities		
	going on at the same time.		
121			The stage should be facing east - not west. Most
			performances will be in the evening and viewers are
			facing the sun.
122	More walks than 2. Needs a large gazebo.		
500	I don't like the straight lines. I cuts out the yard in a weird way. However, the pavilion in the middle is nice... just not centered.	I love the entry and the design of walkways. This design is more interesting and would attract people to come explore the space. I don't see any flaws in this design.	I prefer Design #2 because it has a better flow and is more interesting than just straight lines. Design #1 had boring straight lines and didn't even put the pavilion in the middle evenly.
501	it is symmetrical and makes good use of the space.	it has some curves, but looks a it haphazzard	slight preference for number one, but okay with either

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
502	Nice centralized flow. The flow of the walkways seem to be very appealing.	Appears to have a large open area that might be used for other activities like concerts.	The first design seems to be more appealing to the eye.
503	lines are too straight	I like the meandering feeling of the curvy walks.	#2 is more visually appealing
504	I like the way the space is used. Pleasing symmetry.	I just don't like this one. It's not just because it looks like battling sperm.	I like the more traditional village square design of the first design.
505	I don't like putting concrete on green space. Maybe some native vegetation, community gardens, fruit trees, and soft surfaces that can handle people, instead of the old stand by concrete. I like that it's not being developed into a parking lot.	I like that it has less hard spaces. I dislike that it fails to be green beyond grass. It's 1990s style green space. Poggemeyer is stuck in the wrong decade and so too is BG it seems.	Two. Less impact of hard surfaces on the site.
506	by setting the pavillion parallel to the church musicians can perform accoutic ... using the church to project the sound over the park evenly.  can did pavillian borrow some architectural features from the coppula on the police station  a fountain would offer movement instead of the sculpture unless the sculpture moves. ... like a Calder	this design though more organic in shape, does not allow for the pavilion as a focal point. .. the balanced symetry in the first option has greater appeal. again. .. movement would be a great incorporation. .. and please borrow some of the grand architectural features from downtown landmarks to integrate in structures. .. the court house faces, the gargoyles, anything the designer can do within the developers means. a Bg stamp persay	option 1
507	Ordinary looking	A bit more 'asymmetrical'; a more interesting design.	2. More engaging to the eye.
508	I thought this was greenspace, why is there concrete?	Again, I thought this was greenspace, why is there concrete?	I would like the space to remain greenspace.
509		Less concrete! More area for crowds to see performers in Gazebo. I prefer offset features and not those that are so centered.	Option 2
510	It's ok, but there are is a lot of sidewalk.	I like this design. The pavilion is set back in what is probably the least traffic/quietest area. There is less concrete and if you wanted more plants in the back by the church it would be possible to add.	#2 see previous question
511	Too much concrete that takes away from the green space itself.	Love the flow, much more natural feeling and less concrete used.	I prefer option 2. I believe overall it adds to the green space a nice flow between each side. Plus it's less concrete overall, which means more green!
512	There's not much to like--it's rigid and boring, and it chops up the open space. By the way, an event held on the Green is going to generate numerous people looking for restrooms. It's not fair to count on the church for that--that's just asking for misuse of the building, I'm afraid.	The softer, slightly meandering design encourages people to linger, welcomes them onto the grass. There's no sidewalk along the north side of the church, no encroaching walks or walls. Suppose there's a BG band concert on the Green. WHERE ARE THE RESTROOMS?!	I strongly prefer the 2nd design--it's more user-friendly, and it has more openness. It's less formal, more like a real town green. But WHERE ARE THE RESTROOMS? Every other park-like space in BG has provision for this reality. Think!!
513	I like the entrance at the northwest corner. I don't like the side wall of the church as a backdrop for the pavilion.	I like the diagonal view. I think it would be better if the pavilion was slightly closer to the southwest corner.	I prefer design 2 because it has a diagonal layout.
514	Too many sidewalks	Poor use of space	

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
515	Where is parking? It's not much juice if you can't park near it to use it. Shouldn't there be parking on part of the land?		
516	Where is parking? It's not much use if you can't park near it to use it. Shouldn't there be parking on part of the land?	Where is parking? It's not much use if you can't park near it to use it. Shouldn't there be parking on part of the land?	No preference, but each of them needs parking.
517	It's very symmetrical, but that makes is boring too. No direct paths across to the gazebo, so I think there would be more difficulty maintaining the lawn.	Great access, much more organic looking. The paths take a more natural course for walking, which would make lawn maintenance easier.	Option two, because the paths are better for reaching the points of interest, and the overall design is more interesting. (I have to say, though, that the entrance arch on both is pretty blah. Hopefully that's just a placeholder, and there will be an artist commissioned to do something more interesting with it!)
518	I like that it has multiple walking paths across the green space.	I do not like the paths and how the two circles are in close proximity of one another. It keeps people on one side of the green space instead of utilizing all of the space.	I prefer the 1st option due to the path designs.
519	Straight lines - multiple large green areas for multiple event areas	Unique design - only two big green spaces	1 - straight lines and more large spaces
520	Its too normal. Not a good design	Has more of a fancy design. Looks more fun.  It be nice for a small playground of some kind.	2, it has more to it
521	I like how there a walkway from all directions but I don't like the layout.	I like the unique layout and the flow of the pathways. I find the curved paths more relaxing and inviting. I'd like to see some picnic tables so that those of us who work in the downtown area can have a nice place to take our lunch outside to eat.	Yes, design #2
522			Design 1
523	I do like that the gazebo is NOT front and center. I do not like the 'typical' layout of the walkways.	I really like the curved paths, as opposed to the center circle of design 1. Also, I like the addition of a sculpture. I don't really care for the entrance gate; I would rather see this effect done with trees/plants.	Definitely design 2.
524	I like the symmetry. I dislike the amount of concrete around point D. Not sure why there's so much relative to around point B.	I like that it's a bit different, and if it provides for more total green space. I dislike that point D, like in Option 1, has more concrete than around point B. Why?	I like both, but I prefer the symmetry of Option A.
525	Green Space, nice place to relax.		
526	Like green. Would like verbal summary of structures. More trees needed		
527	full use of area	does not allow for walking path through entire space	yes, #1
528	Nothing. Too much concrete.	Seems to be more green space. I would rather it be a green space.	No. I don't really like either.

**Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017**

**Responses 1 - 122: Paper**

**Responses 500 - 656: Online**

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
529	Like the entry/exits from four corners. Dislike the busyness at NE entrance.	Design looks more pleasing to the eye.	Design #2 as it just looks better and pleasing to the eye!
530	I like that the gazebo is in the back. I don't like the fact that the fountain and gazebo are in a straight line	I like the fact that the two features are offset. I might put the gazebo further back	2
531	I like that but Center focal point is on Wooster and not church	Aesthetically pleasing	#1 design. The focal point on wooster
532	The existing street trees.	The flow. The first time I looked at the aerial view I saw an infinity symbol. The City could use the word 'infinity' or 'infinite' in a City branding campaign with green/sustainable/ infinite in the theme. The space would then be landscaped with native plants.	Design 2 for the reasons included in question 2 and it's by far more aesthetically appealing, appears user friendly, and uses less concrete.
533	I like the placement of the gazebo and the sculpture and I like the circular sidewalks surrounding each of these. I don't like the straight main sidewalks coming from each corner.	I like the meandering curved sidewalks coming from the four main entry ways and I like that they are not coming directly from each corner. I also like to circular sidewalks surrounding the gazebo and the sculpture. I don't like the placement of the gazebo and the sculpture. I wish yo could combine the sidewalks from this option with the placement of the gazebo and the sculpture from option 1.	If I had to choose it would be option 1, only because I really like the placement of the gazebo and sculpture in this option. However I really dislike the sidewalk placement and I think combining the curved, offset sidewalks from option 1 would make this much nicer.
534	Gazebo is too close to the church	It needs more trees!	2
535	Love this one	Not so much	I like #1. More symmetrical and eye catching
536	I like the gazebo in the back which allows more space for more area for additional activities.	It feels as if Option 2 has more green space. I like the less structured look with more meandering pathways.	I prefer the less structured Option 2.
537	Very simplistic. Like that this design has sidewalk access from each corner. It leaves large grassy areas for hopefully, community activities i.e.; concerts, art shows, lawn sales, etc. Wish restrooms were included in plans.	It is unique and pleasing to the eye. The sculpture and gazebo are both viewable through northeast gateway. Not sure plan is as conducive for events. Would like to see restrooms included.	I would choose plan 1 because the grassy areas seem to be larger chunks making it good for events.
538		It's nice to have a better visibility of the fountain and the gazebo from the streets. The curved walkways are more pleasing, compared to the utilitarian design of Option 1. This option seems like a more practical, but also aesthetically pleasing version of the different designs.	Definitely prefer Option 2.
539	I like that it leaves a lot of green space. I don't like that it is too symmetrical and the pagoda area near Wooster street doesn't draw people into the grassy area.	It draws people into the area better than the first one. It used the space better and is more interesting in layout.	Number 2.
540	Seems like there is more green space	Seems like less green space	#1 as it looks like more green space - more traditional - but #2 is also ok
541	is simple, but very little artistic value	allows both features to be exposed visually from all streets.	2

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
542	I like the use of space and dislike the rigidity of design as compared to #2.	I like both the use of space and the 'softer' design of the walkways, which seems to accentuate the lawn.	I prefer #2 because it draws attention to the green lawn rather than the walkway geometry.
543	Like symmetry	Don't	#1
544	More walking paths		
545	More walking paths	Enclosed the space too much which isn't that big to begin with	Option 1 view 4
546	The sculpture faces Wooster street and not Church, so it is given more prominence. The gazebo is further back from the road. The plan is symmetrical.	The asymmetrical plan is disconcerting regardless of the angle from which the drawings are viewed. Also, I don't like that there is so much green space near a busy Wooster street, especially if kids or animals will be in the space.	#1. And I already said why; that was the first question. This is a very poorly designed survey for such a brief survey.
547	The gazebo is at the back of the property and would give the most viewing area for events happening in the gazebo. I like the symmetry.	Not enough trees and useable space	#1 space utilized to the fullest
548	To traditional of a green space. Lacking creativity of flow.	This space is much more organic in design. Also appearing to have more GREEN SPACE.	I prefer Option 2. It is less stuffy, more organic, more inviting and friendlier.
549	I like the balance and the several open spaces that could host separate events or one large one easily.	This design feels less welcoming to me and has less 'flow' for pedestrians. It does have larger green space for events but with the placement of the pavilion it would be awkward.	I like design one better. I believe it would be more user friendly. Giving better spaces for events/gatherings.
550	I liked the central focus on the statue, and the nice separation between it and the gazebo. I don't like that there's no walk way between the two	I like that it is unique, the walk ways aren't completely straight. has smaller and larger grass areas for play/families, to spread out.  don't like that there isn't really a walk way between the corners, no way to access from the middle of the road	I like 2 better. connecting the statue and gazebo is nice, and I like the curved sidewalks instead of straight
551	I like the entrance, the gazebo, and the fountain/sculpture.	I don't like the layout.	Option 1, it has a nicer feel to it.
552	Layout and symmetry.	I don't really like the design	1
553	It is well done by the engineering group.  Where do people park?  Do we need another concert/gathering area?	More attractive than #1.  Still wonder why we feel the need to utilize such prime space for downtown when we already have two venues which serve the same purpose but are not used.  Also, purely economics, why spend money if the City says it needs new buildings and we do not have the money to provide them?	I prefer neither. I do not understand why we must create this place when a similar venue at Simpson and at City Park are rarely if ever, used.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
554	It's very generic and the walkways break up the green space too much.	This feels like a better use of the space and the green space doesn't seem as broken up.	Design 2
555	Like: Symmetry Dislike: Gazebo	Like: not much Dislike: Asymmetry, Gazebo.	I prefer Design 1. Design 2 has little to like and looks haphazard.
556	I don't like option 1. It's is too formal and uniform looking. It does not look inventive.	I like option 2. It looks more inviting.it looks like a nice place to relax and have gathering9.	I like option 2 over 1. Two seams more modern and inviting.
557	Because the paved walking routes are more direct, there will likely be few dirt paths worn into the grass.	The curved sidewalks make it a more interesting place to walk through.	I slightly prefer the curved because it's more interesting to walk through, and visually, a more comfortable place to hang out.
558	Boring as hell! Typical poggemeyer stuff.	Yawn! No complexity. No changes of elevation.	Both bad
559	It is a nice design. Straightforward. Kind of boring.	I like the creativeness, it is asymmetrical and fun.	2. I like that it is more fun and creative.
560	This design keeps the focus on the sculpture (include a fountain if possible), while keeping the slightly functional though mostly ugly gazebo as far back as possible. I do not like the entryway being too prominent. Scale it down.	I do not like this design at all. Dead end sidewalks rarely work. It makes the gazebo more prominent from several angles. But to find something positive...curves are kind of nice.	The first design has good balance from multiple angles. It is critical to minimize the gazebo.
561	Don't like visual line	Like you can reach both areas in one path	#2 both areas on same path
562		More green space and less concrete! A more modern design for the future!	I would vote for the design #2 because of the modern feel.
563	If I could choose I would not have the green divided by this much pavement.	I like the off-center walkways. It seems to interrupt the green space less and have fewer objects sitting around.	I prefer Option 2 because it seems to leave more green space with less cement and objects interrupting the space.
564	Too straight, doesn't flow well.	I like how it flows and how it's balanced.	#2, it's just more aesthetically appealing to me.
565	Would it be possible to set up an area where we could have food trucks?  Also, in Traverse City Michigan there is a 'splash pad' with a rubber floor for kids to play on; would BG ever consider that?  Or maybe even a playground for kids if the splash pad isn't an option?	Nice there are 2 gathering areas	2-- 2 areas to gather  It would be great to see an area for kids or food trucks, though
566	I like it fine, but compared to design #2 it is more rigid and less visually appealing.	I like how dynamic the design is. It is very visually appealing and more welcoming as you walk through the entrance of the space.	Design #2.
567	I was initially visually drawn to Option 1. I could see the space between the gazebo and that statue filled with lawn chairs to listen to a performer.	To me this one would be more fun to jog through. I like how option 1 had the extra sidewalk going between Church and Grove (closer to the church)	Option 1 was my gut reaction.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
568	I like the balance view it presents to anyone driving past it on West Wooster and that the layout of the paths facilitates easy transit to opposite corners	I do like the large green spaces and focal locations for the pavilion and artwork. I don't care for the path layout	I prefer design #1, for the symmetry and ease of access to all corners of the green. I think it presents a more refined park area
569	It's boring, not creative at all.	At least the space isn't divided into fourths. A little more creative.	Option 2 because it shows a little more creativity.
570	I like that the design puts sidewalks along typical walking paths. It also allows the area North of the pavilion to be an area for audiences without foot traffic crossing in front. I think this is an ideal design. I don't think there's anything I don't like about the design, other than preferring a gazebo over a pavilion.	The design leaves a bit of an audience area in front of the pavilion, but less than option 1. If there are concerts or speakers, I would rather be seated across from the speaker rather than to the side or even behind. The sidewalks are contrived. It would be difficult to walk from the NE corner to the NW corner without cutting through the grass.	I prefer the first design. It has a more functional layout.
571	I prefer this design - people will utilize the walkways to cross the space and will be less liable to create pathways in the grassy areas. I also like the pavilion in this position as it maintains an open feel.	Too cute. IT seems to fill the area more than necessary.	Option 1, as stated.
572	I don't like that all paths lead to the sculpture. If I want to cut through the green, I'd mostly walk on grass, and that seems counterintuitive to putting in the paths.	I like that there's a clear path to cut through the green and that the pavilion and sculpture are more connected.	Option 2 for all the reasons stated before
573	I like that it is more symmetrical, and there seems to be more entrances towards and an easier 'path' to walk if someone wants to track steps/enjoy a leisurely stroll on a lunch hour.	I like the concept of two focal points/areas where people can convene/relax on park benches....it also gives the option of having two very separate spaces. It doesn't appear to have great 'flow' throughout the park, though...if you were to stroll, you would have to utilize two of the circles, and they don't really lead you to anywhere...	Design 1...Although I love the idea of two separate areas, flow is so much more important to me personally, especially pertaining to a smaller park where I'm more likely to utilize as a lunch and walk area than a sit and read area (like Simpson Garden Park)...
574	I like the clean lines, and the gazebo is nice. Trees would be great. I wonder if there isn't too much pavement. I don't know how that would be minimized at all, but there's something to be said for simple, clean, well maintained, green space.	I like the curved lines. I like that the gazebo is facing a broader green area, so events that are held there might work better? But again, I'm concerned about overdevelopment.	Either one seems fine. I guess the decision is between straight lines and curvy lines. Most of BG's downtown area seems to be more straight lined. So conform or don't? I have no idea. Whatever you do I'm sure it'll be nice.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
575	I like how people can set their chairs or blankets in a semi-circle fashion around the gazebo. I really think both designs need much more seating options if this is going to be space for people to hang-out and realize sporadically, however, if the goal is for this to only be a destination for events, than no seating is necessary. However, most people do not walk around carrying chairs and this makes it inconvenient and less appealing to walk or bike there.	I do not like anything about option #2	#1 - see comments in first question. I also think there needs to be a thought given to the 'bigger picture' - what is the goal of this space? If it is to interact with businesses on Main Street and hold the Farmer's Market at some point, there needs to be a spot 'held' for restrooms/storage. If is it just to 'be there' to eat lunch or interact, then really no structure is needed and seems like a waste of fundraising or the structure should be more adaptable. I am not clear the goal of this green space, but it should be part of a bigger plan to get people there by bicycle or foot and connect other natural destinations. Too little attention is given to this, while attention is given to 'where am I going to park'.
576	I like the entrance get. I don't like the symmetry and way the sidewalk divides the space up. It looks like it might lack flow.	I like how the curving sidewalk connects the two features and how there's a large green area along Wooster. There's nothing I don't like.	I prefer design 2 because it looks like the shape of the walkways will invite people to move into and use the space.
577	I like the simple path to each corner of the green space. I dislike the center circle.	I like the interesting design of the paths. I dislike that the walkway straight across the bottom of the design option #1 has been taken out.	#2. both circular displays are visible from Wooster street instead of lined up one behind the other.
578	For design option 1, I like the symmetry - I think it provides for a clear center. If we were to host any community events in this space, there would be a clear gathering to that, I think. This lends itself to those sorts of gatherings. What I don't like is that it seems to divide the space into almost unusable chunks - If you wanted community members to come use this as a larger green space for activities, this design blocks it off into smaller sections which may limit some of that - in comparison to the second.	I like this one a lot better because I feel like it's less blocked off than the other one. There are less smaller spaces, and more usable spaces (larger spaces for people to play like kickball, flag football, ultimate frisbee, etc.	Design 2 because I think it's more-user friendly. I would come and stay longer.
579		Like that it's not straight lines	
580	There is pretty much nothing good about this design. The sidewalk layout makes no sense at all and they won't be used. They also cut across all the usable field space. The ring around the artwork is illogical. I'm also not sure why the sidewalk is thicker on the bottom left.	At least this preserves reasonably large fields, and the northeast to southwest sidewalk would probably be used, but the other two sidewalks seem almost vestigial. Plus, there are now large rings around both the artwork and the pavilion, which seem both wasteful and make the two shorter sidewalks even more cumbersome to use. Also, various sidewalk segments are various widths for no apparent reason.	The second design appears to be less wasteful than the first, but adding any sidewalks to the space is a poor idea. Feel free to add trees, benches, artwork and pavilions to the space, but the sidewalks just add cost and maintenance while providing very little utility. If sidewalks are a must, wait for usage of the park and then pave the cowpaths.
581	I really don't like this design at all. It is very traditional and boring. Lots of concrete and of all things a gazebo...can we have something less dated than a gazebo? Why not some kind of platform?	I still don't like the gazebo! I think of my grandma when I hear gazebo. At least the sidewalks of this design are not so rigidly drawn.	I guess design 2 but still a gazebo is so dated and painfully so 100 years ago! How will this appeal to younger people?

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
582	The summity of the design. It looks consistent from all angles.	I don't.	I prefer the first, but feel the city building should have been added. I also believe an arched entry should be at both Wooster St entrances.
583	It's fine	Makes sense - paths line up where people will likely walk.	No they are both fine.
584	Very boring	Seems more fluid and inviting.	#2 is much better.
585			2
586	Like: green space & gazebo Dislike: straight sidewalks	Like: green space, gazebo, less formal sidewalk design accentuates green space Dislike: nothing	I prefer #2 because the curved sidewalks seem to detract less from the green space.
587	It's basic	More places to gather	design 2 because if 2 set areas of focus
588	I like the inclusion of trees on the outside border and I also like that there is a gazebo.		
589	I like its symmetry and the way it recalls classic town greens or squares. The placement of the gazebo is optimal if it is used for events, that is, the entire space is arranged around it. Some might say it is too traditional, but I don't find that is such a bad thing.	I like its imaginative design, but I'm not certain that will be so visible from the ground. The curves of the paths make it less rigid, but they are rather gratuitous, since they don't follow natural features.	I prefer #1, because it is classic, clean, straightforward, and open.
590	I like the symmetry and the more traditional, formal look. I think it fits the historic neighborhood well.	I think curved paths are fine for a park, but this isn't a park. I don't like the overall look as much as I like Option 1. Also, I think that with this design, people would be more likely to take shortcuts across the grass, creating dead areas.	Option 1. I think it harmonizes better with the neighborhood and the paved paths correspond better to natural traffic patterns.
591	A 'loveline' will undoubtedly be creative from the front circular location to the gazebo	Again I see more lovelines created here than option #1	Neither one. This town needs more parking for more commerce downtown. More often than not, I will drive to Perrysburg/Maumee/Toledo to eat, where parking is virtually hassle free.
592	I like the full semicircular area in front of the pavilion giving an view that is not interrupted by a walkway, but it's a little too symmetrical.	I like the curving walkways and less concrete, bu those viewing the pavilion for a concert from the right side behind the walkway will have pedestrian walking in front of them.	All things considered, I prefer design two. It has less concrete and I light there is not a walkway straight across the south side of the property.
593	N/A	More green space it looks like	Design 2
594	I like that there is plenty of grass area for people to gather. I don't like that the focal point is a statue? It's so static. The focal point should involve people, life, energy, movement.	I like that there is plenty of green space for people to gather. I like that the design is less formal than option 1. I like that there are two focus areas that are of equal importance. I love everything about option 2!	Option 2 all the way!!!!
595	Too simple. Reminds me of an old town	Interesting shapes and design. Entry to the park still looks too old	Number two is better, but prefer more options. These two have too old a style gazebo which makes it seem like we are going back to the 60s.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
596	I like nothing about it. It's too symmetrical, which makes it boring and old fashioned looking.	I definitely like this one the best. I like the curved paths. It makes it more interesting, less predictable.  I do wonder at the small grassy areas next to the main entrance. Maybe more plants? Because those small areas will make mowing a little more difficult.	Definitely #2. Curving paths make it more interesting. It also has the least concrete.
597	I like that there is a straight line visual from Wooster to the fountain(sculpture?) to the gazebo. It will make for a nice view (fountain foreground, gazebo background)--sort of like the reflecting pool and the Lincoln memorial (on a much, much smaller scale of course). I also like that the gazebo is further away from Wooster than in option 2. More privacy and less noise for gatherings there.	I like the curvy paths, but I don't like that there is no focal point. You're not 'drawn in,' you're more like spiraled in-in a never ending loop. Also, driving past on Wooster, it'd look like, 'Hey, there's this thing, and then there's this thing,' not presented in a nice visual line. No oomph! The ideal option would be to have the focal points located as they are in option 1, for visual effect/privacy reasons mentions, but to make the paths to those points curvy.	Option 1
598	I like the symmetry of the design and the amount of sidewalks. I wonder if people will walk across the grass to the pavilion though.	I really don't like the curvy sidewalks. It feels to forced to make it seem like it is a meandering path. Maybe it would work for a larger area, but not this space. I guess it depends if the space is to be used more for casual strolls or events.	I prefer the first design as I think it fits the space better than design 2. The meandering design just does not fit the size of the space. I understand that people wanted more green space with less concrete, but I just don't think that the design is strong enough to overcome the first design, even with the added amount of grass.
599	Where do people park?	Where will people park?	I think BG should spend money to keep the general fund solvent to pay city employees, not to landscape and maintain a grassy lot.
600	It's a nice design, but I don't love how basic it is.	Design 2 is so fun! The curves in the path make it much softer and unique	2, I like how different it is from what you're used to seeing
601	Too 'boxy'	Looks more relaxing	#2, looks like a more pleasant, relaxing place to be
602	I really think that this design needs to include restrooms and a water fountain. If you want a place that is a 'meeting place', then it needs to have these amenities.	I like this design better than #1 but once again, water and restrooms are key to success.	I like #2. However, without water/bathrooms, I don't see bikers, walkers, strollers, runners, etc wanting to stop in this space to meet and greet. I saw that Mr. Edwards has stated that the new Sr. Center will be across the street. As for now, whether the Sr. Center is across the street or not, it most likely will not have public facilities. Also, in the S-T, the article states that there will be room for about 400 for performances. For than many, it seems pretty essential to have a bathroom and really nice to have a drinking fountain. Thanks for all of the hard work of the various committees. Nice job on this survey!
603	0	Variety	2

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
604		Gazebo should be as close to center as possible.	2. Gazebo closer to middle and less concrete.
605	I like the design and layout	I do not like the design or flow	#1. It looks more aesthetically pleasing
606	Sensible walking routes on paths for people walking through the space on their way to other places. No one will need to cut a path across the grass. I like the large circle in the middle that everyone goes through. However, the northeast entrance looks a bit narrow, maybe separate the brick sections more.	Pedestrians from Wooster street who are walking south and east toward, say, Ben Franklin will definitely cut a path across the grass, and soon there will be a rut in the grass. This is unavoidable and undesirable.	I like #1 better, because the paths make better sense for pedestrians. Both will be nice green space, both have the same basic elements. I appreciate BG doing this survey and doing the work to improve the space!
607	4 paths to access the fountain. Lovely!		
608		Curves and simplicity	2
609	Symmetry.  N/A. I like this design.	The organic feel.  Lack of symmetry. Although unlike the organic piece, I prefer symmetry.	Option 1. It's more clean, simple and visually appealing.
610	To linear	I like the meandering feel of the pathways	2, it feels more inviting and comfortable
611	Direct focus & path to the center. Simple.	Very creative & artistic flow to both areas.	2- I like the creativity & it has more of an invitational pull.
612	Needs more trees, too regimented.	Needs more trees. I like the more casual design, it looks more inviting.	#2 is my preference. It looks more inviting for a casual use of someone walking by.
613	More open nice design	The walking place is concentrated in one area	Design 1
614	the entrance	the curve to the sidewalks is visually appealing. I hope the monument is something meaningful to the city of BG	design two with the curved sidewalks.
615	Maybe the city can buy up the drive-thru bank just south of the police building and turn the space into gender-neutral family-capable restrooms. That bank must already have water and electric.	Maybe the city can buy up the drive-thru bank just south of the police building and turn the space into gender-neutral family-capable restrooms. That bank must already have water and electric.	Maybe the city can buy up the drive-thru bank just south of the police building and turn the space into gender-neutral family-capable restrooms. That bank must already have water and electric.
616	First thought-- Both plans need more trees / shade. Plan #1 has too much cement and not exciting. Not sure a sculpture is needed. A flower bed would be more attractive.	I like the curved lines in Plan #2. Again, I would prefer flower beds over a sculpture. Trees along the outside perimeter will not provide shade. Please add more trees. And the planned entry gateway could be more decorative. Could there be a contest to plan the entryway? Maybe involve City Schools and BGSU students?	I prefer Plan #2. All of BG is on a grid, I would prefer not to see a park / green space planned on a grid as well. Our City Park has curved paths that are functional and attractive. The Green Space is not a cut-through to anything so paths may not be necessary except to reach the gazebo area.
617	Simplicity		
618	I don't like that you cannot walk directly to the gazebo from Wooster St. in this design.	I like that you can walk directly to either feature in this design. In this design, there isn't anything interesting to view from Wooster St., both features are away from the street.	I prefer the second design because it is not as rigid looking.
619	-Nice connecting sidewalks that easily move pedestrians across sight.	Nice design. However, I think pedestrians will create more direct paths in grass.	Design #1 is eye pleasing and more functional.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
620	It is fine, but seems to break up the open expanses of green space more	I like the bigger areas of uninterrupted green space, and the gazebo size and placement seems more versatile	Option two offers more uninterrupted green space and a better gazebo placement
621	I think it fills the space better than option 2. It looks like every other city's green space.	Unique. More grass area. Doesn't fill space. It has a weird balance to me.	Option 1. Even though I like the uniqueness of Option 2, Option 1 fills the space better.
622	Too symmetrical	More artistic	Option #2
623	The designated paths are more favorable to senior citizens or anyone who have problems walking. This design enables a person to more easily access any corner of the property. Also, this design seems to make the distance from any corner to the gazebo equidistant.	This design appears to be 'in sync' with landscape designers' ideas of an appealing, meandering landscape with more 'flow' to it. However, from my realistic viewpoint, I believe it would take me a longer time to get from point A to point B within the park, and more steps, which does not appeal to me. Or, I may be tempted to create my own path across the grass in order to get to where I want to go as quickly as possible.	Design 1 is my choice. It provides more pathways to the different parts of the park that's more convenient, and which would discourage people, more than Design 2, from trampling the grass in order to cut across a section that's made up of a large swath of ground with no pathway.
624	I like that it provides diagonal traffic flow through the space. I feel it needs more trees within the space.	It is a more stylistic design but does not allow for easy diagonal travel. More people will walk off the sidewalks on this one creating worn paths. Needs more trees.	Two is more unique but they are very similar.
625		Not a direct route from one corner to the other. Assume that people will cut through and end up making paths in the grass.	Option 1
626	Too much space is left empty, uninteresting	It offers multiple entrances and more visual interest	I prefer number two, because it is more esthetic ally pleasing
627	Straighter access from Grove Street to Wooster/Church Street.	Aesthetically, it is more appealing than option 1, but walking from the corner of Wooster and Grove to Ben Franklin's people will be cutting across the yard instead of going out of the way to stay on the sidewalk.	I prefer Option 1
628	I like the symmetry of the design. I would like to see fewer trees along the edges.	I like the appearance of more grass because of the placement of the pavilion and sculpture. Same as design 1-fewer trees along the edge.	I would be happy with either one. They both look very appealing.
629	Design seems too rigid compared to design 2.	Seems to fill the space in a more artistic fashion.	Design2. It is visually more pleasing.
630	I like the straight paths, though I feel the gazebo is too close to the church and should be nearer the center.	Visually, there appears to be more green space, which is a plus, but I am not too keen on curving walks, even as contrast to the straight rows of the city blocks. I feel there should be another straight path along the shaded side for those who want to cut through the lot.	I prefer design 1, since it's more feasible to walk through without stepping on the grass. Aesthetically, straight paths appeal to me more.

**Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017**

**Responses 1 - 122: Paper**

**Responses 500 - 656: Online**

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
631	It seems sort of stiff and the multiple roads makes it feel like there is less green space but I like that you can enter from all corners on the sidewalk.	I like the flow of this one much better, it seems more organic and less stiff and it feels like there is more green space	Design number two is my favorite because of the flow and feel of the design
632	I think it carves up the space too much. I think the fountain will look nice from Wooster, but the gazebo is too close to the church. Also, needs more trees.	I like the gentle lines and I like that the gazebo faces a large green space that borders the street. It will make it easy for people to drift in from the sidewalk if something is going on there.	I like number 2 much better. I feel like it will harmonize better with the space and location of the church, and that it yields larger lawn areas.
633	Too traditional and not an optimal use of 'green space.' How do a gazebo and sidewalk contribute to a sense of place and build community?	While less traditional and asymmetric, this option does not develop a sense of place or necessarily build community.	Neither design is adequate. Go back to drawing board and design a GREEN SPACE using 3 dimensions - build low mounds, let users identify paths. An optimal space would be emergent and functional ased on use.
634	I don't like the 'x' pattern	I like the gentle curves and the larger green spaces	#2. The design is asymmetrical and leaves large areas of grass for big activities
635	It looks like short cuts from corner to corner to some businesses. Any kind of event being held there will be for small groups as there is limited parking.	It is an odd design with no direct area to walk to for an event for small groups as limited parking. With out being able to use the parking lot to the north after 5PM or for the Black Swamp Weekend all hours parking.	At this time I do not see much difference between both designs.
636	I like that it's symmetric, clean cut, and modern.	I do like that it has some character and it is artsy, but I don't like that it isn't very practical	I like the first design because it's more practical and in my opinion it's prettier
637	I like this design. Is balanced and more appealing from Wooster St. There is nothing I do not like about Option #1.	I do not like option #2. It looks less balanced.	Option #1 because appears more striking and balanced to me.
638	I like the ease of access to Option #1 ~ people will be able to easily go from one area to another, and the access to the pavilion is better.	Moving through the area is awkward ~ people wanting to go from one area to another will have to negotiate several difficult turns. Option #1 is more user-friendly!	I prefer design #1 because it is more in keeping with the age of our city and reflects an earlier time of graciousness and encourages people to stroll through the area. I'm sure there will be plenty of park benches to encourage people to use the area for lunching, reading, and just enjoying that part of our city.
639			Design option # 2  I like the layout better.
640	Pros: Paved walking access to each of the corners makes for easy travel. Divided green space allows for several groups/activities to occur simultaneously.  Cons: Only including decorative entrance on Church/Wooster. Decorative entrances on Grove/Wooster and/or on Grove would make more sense for citizens coming to the space. Additional landscaping and use of hardscape would be nice	Pros: Less walkways provides more green space to enjoy and allows for larger events.  Cons: No direct walking access from Grove/Wooster corner to Church street near church. I could envision many citizens walking from the surrounding houses to the shops on Main. This would cause them to walk through the grass and make a path where it is not intended.	Option 1 more meets my expectations. The design seems more suited to the use of the space by both organized and unorganized gatherings. I'd recommend moving and/or adding another decorative entrance on Grove/Wooster. Both designs appear to be focused on the downtown and not on the community surrounding the space.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
641			I like design 2 it just appears more interesting to me.
642	I do not like how spread out/open this one seems compared to Option 2. I like the pavilion overlooking the entire green space but do not like the layouts of the walkways and how they cut through every grass area.	Seems much more streamline than option 1. Less walk ways cutting through and opening up bigger, grassy areas for people and kids to enjoy. Nice flow of pathways.	Option 2 for its flow and overall design
643		Nice flow of traffic patterns.	Both are great!
644	Like that's uncluttered. I don't like how much it chops up the space.	Love that it gives the appearance of more green space, and that it seems to invite strolling.	Definitely prefer design #2. It seems to have more green space, and invites a nice stroll instead of a utilitarian crossing of the space.
645	The symmetrical design negates too much space. While mathematically there is maybe as much 'green' as in option two, in practical terms the trees, the proximity of the side walk on the north side, and the way it angles sharper along the north-side sides, creates space likely to be little practical use. Nobody wants to sit with sidewalks too close to them on either side, and especially if others are trying to sit on the grass near them and with people walking, riding bikes, pushing strollers near them. I also don't like how it more effectively streamlines foot traffic to the edge of the church, where there is no cross-walk and heavy traffic.	Option two is truer to the idea of creating green space. The design creates the largest un-interrupted space for the gazebo and the largest expanse of raw green space. It also helps reduce traffic flow from the north side into the area next to the church which has no cross-walk and typically heavy traffic. The pull-in space is more effectively used with this design, especially for shuttles during the Black Swamp Arts Festival. Additionally, should volunteer landscaping ever be added to any extent, this design retains the most desirable layout that allow for that along the south boundary.	Option two. It is the most effective use of the signature features but retains the most truly useable green space. The other option simply creates a lot of area where foot traffic will take short-cuts and wear-down the grass, as well as create more areas where people will avoid going as they don't wish to sit too close to encroaching sidewalks and people on them. This design avoids that by keeping sitting space with good sight-lines at a maximum. Additionally, from low angles, such as those of people actually on the ground, this option is the most visually appealing. The other option from ground level will appear far more like a large patch of sidewalks with a tiny bit of grass. As large as the space is, after construction and sidewalks are in-place, it will seem much smaller. Thus the reason why option two is much better.
646	Like the paths. Straight enough to not have random foot paths.	Like the main winding path. The angle the Pavilion could turn slightly counter clockwise.	Like 1. The paths make more sense.
647	it's simple, and lots of open space, like a park	Nothing, it doesn't flow	No 1, seems more open and yet functional without a lot of clutter
648	We prefer design #1. It is more open and is better for navigation thru the area. Also, we like the walk on the south side.	We do not like the winding walkways.	Definitely prefer design #1.
649	I don't like this design at all. It is too symmetrical, too much concrete and not exciting or interesting.	At least there's less concrete! The curvy paths are a lot better than the straight paths. I don't like having a gazebo. Why do we need a building like that? It's a big maintenance drag on the property. I don't like the looks of a gazebo. It looks really dated.	I guess the second one. I thought we were supposed to have 3 choices! I would prefer a flat stage, rather than a gazebo, that does not look so dated. Is this really set in stone? The last news article said nothing was set in stone.
650	Symmetry, design is well laid out and provides 2 separate focal points.	I don't like it. the angular presentation is unappealing to me. To focused on corner to corner.	#1 looks better. Would make best use of space. Has focus on Wooster St. view.

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
651	It's nicely symmetrical and attractive looking. It focuses on an actual 'center' which I think would provide good attention to events that take place there and a sense of place when it comes to gathering. The only negative I can see is that it does cut the green space up somewhat, but I think it would still be usable.	The thing I like about it is that it seems like more actual green space. What I don't like is that it doesn't have an actual 'center' and does not give a sense of importance to the events that would take place there. It's too free flowing and does not mesh well with the rest of the city surroundings.	Design 1 for sure. For all the reasons already stated. it fits better with the downtown area structure and geometry; it provides an actual center of activity and importance that would be of benefit to events that take place there and it provides a space to downtown BG that is missing currently. It's the equivalent of a downtown 'square' for activity and community gathering. The other design doesn't demonstrate or allow for that in my opinion.
652	Don't like = <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has more concrete/sidewalks</li> <li>• the pavilion and sculpture garden are right in the middle</li> </ul>	Like = <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pavilion location is offset as is sculpture garden, giving appearance of more space</li> </ul> Don't like = <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no trees by the benches (I know trees come later; it's something to consider.)</li> </ul>	Prefer the more organic 2nd design with the meandering sidewalk and feeling of spaciousness.
653	Simple design. I don't like it has too many sidewalks.	It has more movement, makes good use of pavillion for events. I'd like more trees, especially on South side.	I like design #2. It's more inspiring, has less covered surface. I wish any design would have a small place next to Wooster for bands to play.
654	Nothing. I don't like at the entrance. BG has a rich architectural history, for example the nationally-recognized late 19th century Neo-Romanesque/Richardsonian architecture (case in point the Courthouse). Why use a tired Colonial style for the entrance that has nothing to do with our history or the predominant style here in BG? The walkways and placing of statuary and gazebo in an attempt at symmetry is pretentious and stiff...you never see such straight lines in modern landscape architecture, where more natural lines are used, derived from the 'lay of the land."	The use of curvilinear pathways is in keeping with contemporary architectural practice. This design is simply a chopping up of the elements of the first design that are rearranged in a simplistic manner. Overall what is disturbing with both of these designs is I see no creative use of native plantings, that create separate spaces and add interest throughout the seasons. The gazebo brings up negative connotations of a very dated structure, and I really question its usefulness as it is a very limiting space. I am very concerned that so much money is going to be poured into a design that reflects very little research...it's a real shame. There was so much potential here. It's just very disappointing.	The lesser of two evils is #2. How did we get to this point where these are the only choices we have?

Wooster Green Survey Responses - July 19-26, 2017

Responses 1 - 122: Paper

Responses 500 - 656: Online

#	Response to Question #1	Response to Question #2	Response to Question #3
655	I'm really disappointed with both designs...I wish the public could have decided if they wanted a gazebo, and could have picked a nicer style for the entrance.	You know, it's really hard to decide with these drawings being so small. There is no detail to the gazebo or the entranceway, the materials for the paths, or if there will be more plantings, etc. I feel real disappointment.	<p>I'll use this space to share these two definitions:</p> <p><b>GAZEBO:</b> A gazebo is a freestanding garden structure which is usually hexagonal or octagonal in shape with a dome roof. Some also have slabs or other kind of space to side inside. The purpose of these structures is to provide protection from the sun and rain. Gazebos are commonly made of wood and are placed in or near a garden. They act as a good set-up for photo sessions and garden weddings.</p> <p><b>PAVILION:</b> This structure is normally rectangular in shape and has a roof but the main difference between this and gazebo is the size. A pavilion is comparatively larger in size to accommodate more number of people. It can contain 5 to 15 people or even more depending upon its architecture. These were introduced in the 19th century and have been popular ever since to host outdoor events like family lunches, dinners, picnics, etc. So, are we getting a pavilion or a gazebo? Please use the correct terminology!</p>
656	Access in and out (and across) the site seems pretty easy. The location of the gazebo is a good spot.	It is much more interesting. Also, the placement of the gazebo seems better as it opens itself to Wooster Street and the downtown area,	Option 2

Totals