

**From:** Sharyl Prescott <prescottsharyl@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 7, 2025 1:37 PM  
**To:** Natalie Birchak <Natalie.Birchak@dickinsongov.com>  
**Subject:** I Strongly Oppose the Proposed United Way Facility in Our Neighborhood

Dear Ms. Natalie Birchak,

I am writing to state my complete opposition to the proposed United Way facility near our residential neighborhood. I am deeply alarmed by both the nature of the services being offered and the lack of clarity, transparency, and community input surrounding this proposal.

This facility is not just a shelter — it's a multi-service center for individuals experiencing homelessness, mental health crises, and addiction. While I support the need for services to help vulnerable populations, placing such a facility in a residential area is both reckless and irresponsible.

Here are the key reasons for my opposition:

---

**1.**

### **Unacceptable Proximity to Homes and Families**

Placing this facility steps from private homes and shared community spaces places undue risk and stress on the families, retirees, and working individuals who live here. This neighborhood was never intended to serve as an extension of a transitional treatment campus.

---

**2.**

### **Overflow and Loitering Will Affect Residents**

If individuals are turned away for failing screenings or arriving outside operating hours, where will they go? Common sense tells us — they will stay close. That means wandering the area, loitering near buildings, garages, and entryways, and potentially causing disturbances. Our homes are not shelters or holding zones.

---

**3.**

### **Safety and Crime Concerns**

Facilities that are poorly monitored or loosely structured can become hot spots for drug use, theft, vandalism, or worse. We have worked hard to make this community a safe place — and that safety should not be compromised by a facility that lacks a clearly defined security and oversight plan.

---

**4.**

### **Devaluation of Our Property**

The presence of this type of facility — especially without guarantees of safety, transparency, or neighborhood accountability — will very likely lower home values. That is a direct financial loss for residents who have invested in this area in good faith.

---

**5.**

### **Lack of Clear Testing and Entry Requirements**

The proposal suggests a low-barrier, open-door policy. If there are no firm requirements for drug or alcohol testing, or if testing is done only once, the safety of everyone nearby is jeopardized. We cannot be expected to simply trust that this facility will regulate itself effectively.

---

**6.**

## No Community Involvement

This project seems to have been planned with zero input from those it affects most. There have been no community forums, no transparent documentation, and no direct outreach to nearby homeowners. That is unacceptable.

---

To be clear: I am not opposed to helping people — but this location is the wrong place for a facility of this kind. It is simply not compatible with the surrounding residential area, and no version of the proposal has made that compatibility clear.

I urge you and other city leaders to reject this special permit and to instead explore locations that are more appropriate — locations where services can be offered without placing families, homes, and entire neighborhoods at risk.

Sincerely,

John Prescott