

From: Rebecca Schuett
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:52 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Tiny Houses

Hi Tim,
I was told I could email you and have you forward this on to all of the Plan Commission members.
Thank you!

To the Plan Commission Members,
I am writing you as a concerned resident, landlord, and tax payer within the Emerson East neighborhood. The construction, placement, and occupancy of "tiny houses" on this site will undoubtedly impact our neighborhood adversely. Should the city approve use of the site for this proposed plan, the stability of property values and overall community will erode. We have a lot of good things going in this neighborhood, but I feel this plan will only amplify the problems that already exist.

I am on foot on an almost daily basis and already see the problems that come along with homelessness on Sixth Street and at Demetral Park. I think it goes without saying that we would all like to see a solution to homelessness, but I do not see this as a well thought out plan or a long term solution in the slightest.

I strongly support redevelopment within our community that will enhance property values, bring jobs and further strengthen our community. The aforementioned project will not achieve any of those items. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to the Occupy Madison Village plans.

Thank you,
Rebecca Schuett
[REDACTED] E Johnson St
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Emer

Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:48 PM

To: Parks, Timothy

Subject: Tiny Houses Project

To whom it concerns,

I would like to register my opposition to the building of the "Tiny Houses" project on the lot where Sanchez Motors now sits.

I have attended the public meetings and would still like to register my opposition as I feel most of the concerns are still not being addressed.

My main concerns are the policing of issues on the site, self policing by the tenants does not seem like an adequate solution to me.

Also the concern of the fact that the intersection in question frequently floods any time there is significant rain - I have yet to see an adequate solution to that.

There has been no answers to whether these houses will be long term. Nobody has given us an adequate time frame as to how long a tenant will live in the tiny homes.

The lack of facilities to help the residents to find jobs or permanent housing is also a concern.

I also have reservations about the workshop - if they continue building houses, where will they be stored or moved to?

Thank you for your time.

Emer Dahl

Hoard St

Please forward on to all relevant members.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tim Harvey
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:07 PM
To: Palm, Larry; Parks, Timothy
Subject: Tiny Home - OM

Hi Tim,

I am sending this if my voice can not be heard tonight at the Plan Commission meeting.

Intro: I want to thank Occupy Madison, for taking on this dubious task. Trying to influence people to give up hard earned equity they have built into their homes all for helping a few less fortunate. It is a much larger issue than that; you are asking the state, city, neighborhood, families, and business to trust you, after you have failed many times before. OM you are asking, us to give up your vision of your neighborhood plan for your campground vision. It's that simple!

City's Conditional Statement: The city's conditional use standards say development projects must not be detrimental to the "uses, values and enjoyment" of existing residents and/or endanger "public health, safety or welfare." Your plan meets none of these requirements!

USE - Planning/Zoning: This project does fit into the neighborhood plan; there is not one mention about placing a campsite in your neighborhood. This project does not fit the neighborhood business district, housing goals or plans. Think of the possibilities that could go into this space...other developments will be less inclined to invest in your neighborhood. Resent growth of restaurants, cafes, brewery, delis, and stores in Shank/Attwood area..., all within walking/biking distances for residents. Small business growth strengthens a community & its neighborhoods. This is not a business development, nor does it follow your neighborhood comp plan. Scanlon-Morris building; the glass brick building on the 1900 block on East Johnson St. In the neighborhood plan, it mentions Lofts, mix use, or business incubator. Why would anyone invest in that property over looking a campground?...The East-side of Madison already bears major responsibility in helping the less fortunate, why should we have to endure more of this responsibility than the rest of city of Madison. It's not about homelessness its about OM vision does not fit into your neighborhood plan.

Values: This project does not match my values, getting something for nothing is against any moral code. I understand about hard work people put into their trailer but not having to pay rent does not teach any social responsibility or personal growth. A trailer home does not help a person get back to being productive member of society. The biggest homeless problem is finding housing for families and this does not address that issue. It only helps 9 people!

Enjoyment: The 40 or so members of OM and about 9 to 18 residents will enjoy it. The rest of the neighborhood will not share in any enjoyment. Equity Lost: $\$110,000 - 20\% = \$22,000 \times 200 = \$4,400,000$ Lost! All for 9 people and OM vision.

Public Health/Safety: How can you ensure non-residents will not be using OM lounge and shower areas for their own personal Roofless Shelter. Rental Co's. do a credit check on their renter. Why would OM not do that to protect your neighbors (high school & grade school) and protect their investment? Parking: will be a major issues OM 20 (1/2 members) + 5 (1/2 campers) = 25 cars for 2 parking spots. Worst case OM 40 + 18 = 58 cars for 2 parking spots.

In Closing: Occupy Madison selfish agenda, thoughtlessness vision of how we should development your neighborhood. OM will be taking the equity and love people have built into their homes and neighborhood all for their vision of your neighborhood. THIS IS NOT FAIR!

Thank your for efforts into this project,

Tim Harvey

From: markie pendleton
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 1:30 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: OM Tiny House Village

Please allow the building of the proposed Occupy Madison tiny House Village on East Johnson Street. The village is a great idea to help homeless people become responsible homeowners here. I believe they will be able to "get back on their feet" and become better citizens, and get nearby needed social help through this village, as I understand it. Access to services can be a hinderance to many of us, even those of us with cars, in bad weather, with lack of insurance funds, or car maintenance funds, or just due to decreased confidence in our driving as we get older. Not to mention those who have any disabilities!

Also, I have noted that you MUST have a Madison current proof of address to get help such as food stamps. I wonder if these folks fall between the crack of true aid programs without a current address? Living in their own tiny house in this proposed village will certainly help these problems!

I live on the other end of Demetral Park, on Moland St, and I welcome these people and their village into my neighborhood, with the hope that there will be more villages in the not too far future! I believe this village will be copied by other cities, and we will be proud to teach others and show them our compassion and understanding. Forward, Wisconsin!! Thank you.

Markie Pendleton

*Out beyond ideas of wrong doing and right doing,
there is a field. I will meet you there. Rumi*

From: Joanne Brown
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 1:15 PM
To: [Plan Commission]; Cornwell, Katherine
Subject: In support of Tiny Houses proposal

Dear Plan Commission members,

I am unable to attend tonight's Plan Commission meeting, but wish to register my **support** for the proposal for Item 6 on your agenda, to change the zoning of property at 2046-2050 East Johnson Street from NM District to PD District to convert an auto repair facility into a "tiny house" workshop and residential community for 9 units, with retail space and accessory gardens and greenhouse.

This proposal represents a creative approach to one of the city's most pressing issues, the issue of homelessness, and offers homeless adults, most of whom are working, the opportunity to use their time and labor in a meaningful way to change their lives for the better.

I understand that the proposal was developed through numerous meetings with neighborhood residents and meets with the approval of most, some of whom are even quite enthusiastic about this wonderful idea.

Please add your voices to those in support of the Tiny Houses. We all deserve homes, whatever size is possible.

Thank you.

Joanne Brown
[REDACTED] West Lawn Ave.
Madison, WI 53711

From: tanya cohen
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 5:20 PM
To: [Plan Commission]; Parks, Timothy; All Alders
Subject: Planning Commissioners Please Approve Tiny Houses

I am writing today urging you to vote in support of the Planning Commissioners approval of the Tiny Houses on tonight's agenda.

I am a constituent, registered voter in the City of Fitchburg, however, have owned a home in Madison from 1989-2000, rented an apartment in Madison from 1999-2001, and also was a neighbor without permanent housing, homeless, from August 2001 to January 2002, also in Madison.

Tiny homes are dignified living, in a community, and is successful in Washington State, Oregon State and the housing solution is spreading across the United States.

I believe in, and support, the Tiny Houses in Madison in it's proposed location. I'm inspired by the volunteers who make these homes and work tirelessly on every level to make the Tiny Houses Community in Madison a success.

There are many opportunities with the Tiny Home Community in Madison on many levels and it is a creative and effective solution and opportunity for our neighbors without permanent housing in Madison. Again, I currently reside in Fitchburg Wisconsin where I have owned my manufactured home on rented land since 2006.

I wish Tiny Houses had been available during my time in Madison without housing. Madison is where I would go if I were without housing again in the future.. It is important for people to have a space to keep their personal items, have the ability to put "sweat equity" in for their Tiny Home, a sense of community, and simply put, housing is a human need. With 8 hours of sleep a person can dream, the possibilities are endless, sky's the limit. Without sleep, a place to dress, feel safe, our personal items secure, it is nearly impossible to function in this life, to work, to simply see those who love us. I know, I lived in my car, and I felt less than human, leaving me to not feel comfortable being with those who cared and worried about me.

Please approve the Tiny Houses plan tonight. Please let the Tiny Houses Community thrive. Please let people dream.

Respectfully,
Tanya Rae Cohen
■■■■ County Road MM ■■■■
Fitchburg WI 53575

From: smlast
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 7:23 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Little houses

Mr Parks
Please support the little houses project. It would give the homeless people a chance to make it through next winter without freezing.

Susan Last
■■■■ N Hillside Ter
Madison

From: Heidi Wegleitner
Date:04/28/2014 9:40 PM (GMT-06:00)
To: [Brad Cantrell]
Subject: Please support Tiny House Village

Dear Commissioner,

I write in support of the tiny house village. I live two blocks from the site with my husband, a small neighborhood business owner, and our 8 month old son in a small (but certainly not tiny) house we bought years ago. I am really excited about having this development in our neighborhood and think it will be a big improvement for that parcel. We have a serious affordable housing crisis nationwide and in Dane County. We are working at the city and county level to turn that around, but it takes time, planning, and resources. OM has something innovative and low cost that will provide a safe, sustainable home to people currently living in cars and tents. Please approve their plan and don't put onerous restrictions (like a ban on guests) on them that weaken the project. Please help them help our community address our pressing homelessness problem. It is just one piece of the puzzle, but we can't afford to lose any pieces (especially when they are not even asking for any City money)!

Thank you.

Heidi M. Wegleitner
County Supervisor, District 2
[REDACTED]

From: Patricia Hammel
Date: 04/28/2014 6:44 PM (GMT-06:00)
To: [Plan Commission]
Cc: district6@cityofmadison.com
Subject: Tiny houses in Madison

Dear planning commission members;

I am a 40 year Madison resident, homeowner and business owner, and I sincerely hope you will wholeheartedly support this innovative program and use of Madison property. I toured the tiny home last summer (before it was complete) and believe this is an inspired solution to the problem of homelessness in our community, as well as an excellent example of how to live well while using fewer resources when our planet is running short of those. I was up in Hurley last weekend and a local resident expressed interest in the tiny home project. This is a good opportunity for Madison to lead by example, and the neighborhood should make it easier for tiny home residents to access employment and education in the city. Patricia K. Hammel, [REDACTED] Jenifer Street, Madison WI 53703.

From: Heather E oneson
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 11:20 AM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: RE: Om tiny house proposal

I am just writing to show my support for the tiny house village proposal on E. Johnson St. Everyone deserves shelter and a home. Having volunteered with this project I have witnessed the dedication of these future residents to build and live in their own homes. They are already a community, and I have seen them working together in a positive way as much as any community I have personally lived in. They would be a positive addition to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Heather Oneson

From: Satya Rhodes-Conway
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:28 AM
To: Parks, Timothy; Cornwell, Katherine; Palm, Larry; Heather Stouder
Subject: OM Village

Tim - Please share my comments with Plan Commission.

Plan Commissioners -

I urge you to approve the PD-GDP-SIP for OM Village at 2046-2050 East Johnson Street. Having read both the submittal and the staff report, and having attended several neighborhood meetings, I feel the standards for approval can be met, and that this proposed development will be a positive addition to the neighborhood.

I also encourage you to strike staff condition 5, the prohibition of composting toilets. Madison needs to become familiar with new, sustainable technologies, and what better place to do that than a site where Plan Commission and city staff will retain continuing jurisdiction?

I know there has been some concern in the neighborhood about having (formerly) homeless people living on this site. The unfortunate truth is that there are already homeless people living in our neighborhood, in situations that are much worse for them and for the neighborhood. While this development will in no way solve Madison's homeless problem, it will contribute to the solution, and will do so without public subsidy. I support this project, and I urge you to as well.

Finally, I also encourage you to approve outdoor seating at the Tip Top Tavern on North St.

Thank you, as always, for your service.
Satya

Satya Rhodes-Conway
2642 Hoard St.

From: bacantrell
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 9:52 AM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to the rezoning of 2046-2050 E Johnson / Occupy Madison Proposal

Fyi

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S™ III, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Erin Sommerfeld
Date: 04/27/2014 11:38 PM (GMT-06:00)
To: [Plan Commission]
Subject: Opposition to the rezoning of 2046-2050 E Johnson / Occupy Madison Proposal

Dear City Plan Commission Members:

I write to you to voice my opposition to the Occupy Madison proposal to build “tiny houses” at 2046-2-5- East Johnson Steet, and therefore in opposition to the zoning change that would make the proposal possible.

It seems the project comes to you now in its current state from the Urban Design Commission. I am very disappointed in both the report from the City Planning Division and the hasty decision of the Urban Design Commission to recommend approval of this project without it meeting the usual stringent standards of designs approved by said committee. But now that we’re here...

If the Emerson East Elken Park neighborhood plan, from 1998 is to be cited in the report from the Planning Division, I would like to address areas where I believe the plan was ignored or misinterpreted. On page two, the desire to reduce the amount of manufacturing on the edges of the neighborhood is addressed. Rezoning from Neighborhood Mixed Use to Planned Development in this instance would increase the amount of manufacturing in the neighborhood. A step backward from the plan, as Neighborhood Mixed Use is appropriate for this area, the proposed cite is on the edge of a residential neighborhood.

Noted in the Planning Division Staff report, page 5, discussion of how the proposal fits the requirements for the seldom used PD – planned Development zoning, condition b, the PD District shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the comprehensive plan and of adopted neighborhood corridor or special area plans. “...the subject site is located in an area recommended for Low-Density Residential uses by the Comprehensive Plan. Such districts are primarily characterized by relatively low densities and a predominance of single-family and two-unit housing types. Encroachments of higher density or higher intensity uses than presently exist in the neighborhood is generally discouraged, and in fill or redevelopment projects are recommended to be compatible with established neighborhood character and be consistent with an adopted neighborhood

or special area plan. Commercial uses within the Low-Density Residential district are limited in scale and scope to small-scale establishments primarily providing convenience goods or services to neighborhood residents.” That paragraph says a lot. It sounds as though it says, and the staff comments say this too, that this proposal is inconsistent with the low density residential uses for this district recommended by the comprehensive plan. This is a high-density project, at least nine occupants on less than a third of an acre, project with a workshop component, as well as many other components inconsistent with the goals of the comprehensive plan. While understanding that the project may benefit the currently homeless potential residents by providing them shelter, it is not clear how it tangibly benefits the current neighborhood residents, especially those nearest the site or the long term betterment of it’s potential residents.

This staff report goes on to say that because the site is currently an auto repair shop, that it is ok to ignore the reasoning set forth in the comprehensive plan for reducing the manufacturing component and ensuring single family residential or low density residential. The comprehensive plan and neighborhood plan were written as guides to make the city and neighborhood better. While we were comfortable living near a seldom open, seldom noisy auto repair shop – that as I’m sure others will note, has fallen into disrepair since the decision to sell –does not mean we would not rather live near something more fitting of the term residential mixed use and staying with the character of the neighborhood, single family homes, small well-kept apartments.

Also on page 5 of the staff comments, the last paragraph states that staff finds certain aspects of the report to be “consistent with the broader housing goals, policies and objectives in the comprehensive plan, which encourages a wide range of **safe, decent, sanitary, and distinctive housing options to be provided for all Madison residents of all lifestyles and income levels while fostering the creation and maintenance of viable neighborhoods.** How do structures designed to skirt building code, which is in place to protect the health and safety of all citizens, meet this objective of the comprehensive plan? And in terms of fostering the creation and maintenance of viable neighborhoods? This proposal reduces the viability of my neighborhood. Many of the folks in the neighborhood have purchased their homes in the last few years. If we were to lose, say 20% of the value of our homes, we would be underwater on our mortgages. How does passing that risk on to residents further ”maintaining a viable neighborhood”?

Page 6 of the report points to the 1998 Emerson East-Eken Park Neighborhood Plan, which as the report states, includes “broad strategies aimed at maintaining the attractiveness and affordability of the Emerson East and Eken Park neighborhoods, such as reducing the zoning for nearby areas from C3 (Highway Commercial District) to C1 (Limited Commercial District) in an effort to preserve the character of the neighborhood.” That rezoning was effective January 2, 2013, which zoned the site “NMX, the closest equivalent new zoning district C1”. There was and is clearly an intention to reduce manufacturing in this residential area.

Stipulation C of Planned Development Zoning and the staff comments explanation are troubling. C states, “The PD District plan shall not adversely effect the economic health

of the City or area of the City where the development is proposed, including the cost of municipal services.”

The staff comments say “while the actual impacts – if any – on property values or the public health, safety and general welfare for some land use requests (typically conditional uses) may be difficult to gauge initially, some of those can be mitigated through the application of conditions of approval for those special or unique use.

First, impacts on property values will be negative, at least for those living closest to the site. The factors that add to property value simply do not include experimental homeless village not built to code. Neighbors near the site have already received flyers for realtors asking if they’ll be listing their houses. Friends of mine who lived in the neighborhood briefly before moving out of state, and are now looking for a home in Madison have been questioned and dissuaded by realtors from looking at houses in Emerson East, “Are you sure? Do you know about the homeless village?” As mentioned earlier, if I lost 20% of the value of my home I would be underwater on my mortgage, so would many of our neighbors. This is asking too much of my neighborhood. The city would then lose tax revenue too, a negligible amount, but a loss nonetheless.

The proposed site also stifles business development in the area. What new business, store restaurant, etc. would want to locate in the vicinity of the proposed project?

The staff report states that some of the impacts could be mitigated through the conditions described in the report. While I am thankful that, if approved, there will not longer be 12 compost toilets on site, nor will there be 12 trailers (nine instead), there will be adequate bathrooms in phase two or three and access for fire and paramedics. But there will still be a trailer park filled with structures that do not meet minimum building code in my neighborhood, 500 yards from my home. Madison, a city I have called my home for fourteen years will have said, if it approves this project, that there are residents of our city that building code doesn’t protect. Building codes exist to keep all residents safe; it is not an unreasonable expectation that it be enforced equitably.

I have many other concerns, outside of my ability to research. Here are a few:

This project is setting a precedent, whether intentionally or not. What will be the city’s response if a commercial builder wants to build cheap, low-income housing, maybe rentals, that don’t meet code and are set up in a similar situation, around a main building with facilities?

Occupy Madison has had three encampments in different parts of the city, most notably on East Washington Avenue in the former Don Miller lot. What Occupy Madison has referred to, as an “undesirable element” took over their encampment on East Washington Ave. The presence of this element (their words) at this site and subsequently two other sites, lead to increased police calls from disturbances, loitering, littering, panhandling, noise, public intoxication, disorderly conduct, and so on. Specific to the Don Miller lot, the first location, where the assembled “protesters” could not be evicted due to a loophole

in jurisdiction. Here, where the proposed project exists because of loopholes, what will Occupy Madison do when they cannot evict a problematic steward? Occupy Madison has said that the residents of the “tiny houses” are not owners, they are also not tenants, there is not a current law that allows Occupy Madison to evict someone. Three previous locations, three messes. Why are we entertaining the option of a fourth after the group has proved its inability to eliminate “undesirable elements” within itself?

This project needs to be held to the same standards as any other. From what I have found, that would have included a site plan with the proposed changes from staff for the Urban Design Commission before it reaches your committee. For the zoning change alone, a plan for the phases of development – Occupy Madison says they can’t have the building completed with restrooms and kitchen on day one, so what is the timeline? How many people will live on that property before restrooms are completed? When will the kitchen be completed? Will it be a commercial kitchen or a residential kitchen? What will potential residents do in the meantime for a place to go to the restroom and cook? I would like to see the city require proof of financing, just like any other project of this scale. How much money do they need? How much do they have? How are they getting it? If it is through donations, show that they have the capacity to continue to fundraise at the level they have been when the attention dies down- tiny houses are in the new right now, but what about ten years from now?

Have there been environmental impact reports done? Occupy Madison talks about raising the grade of the lot/parcel. Where is the water redirected then?

These tiny trailers are not that unlike an actual trailer in a tornado, will there be a shelter for the residents?

Will there be a thorough code analysis done of the plans for the expanded building, manufacturing shop, retail store, kitchen and restrooms? Will the restrooms and shop have to be ADA compliant as any business would?

How will the issue of sex offenders who may or may not be residents (Occupy Madison has said that they do not screen their residents)? A “tiny house” is not a domicile; if an offender lives there (less than a mile a high school and an elementary school) will they be required to register?

In what way will Occupy Madison be held accountable if they are not compliant with the recommendations of the city staff? Not just now, but in the future. Will they be fined? A letter? I’m concerned that the measures that make this proposal less unthinkable may not be enforceable.

In closing, when I bought my home three years ago, my now neighborhood seemed to be on an upswing, and has been for those three years. Approving this project will be to the detriment of the people living in the homes closest to the site and the neighborhood as a whole. It is my strong belief that this is a step in the wrong direction not only for my neighborhood and the city of Madison, but for the people Occupy Madison seeks to help.

Building code is in place to define a minimum standard of what is acceptable. People should not have to live in conditions that are unsafe or inadequate.

There are many organizations in Madison doing good works to help homeless people not be homeless and help low-income people folks housing crisis to prevent homelessness. The Goodwill apartments on Third Street- in my neighborhood provide housing for formerly homeless people with mental health issues. Porchlight helps over 8,000 people a year, providing assistance in eviction prevention, runs an emergency shelter for men, Safe Haven (housing and intensive services for men and women suffering from serious mental illnesses), 252 single room or efficiency units and 40 family units. All of this while complying with building codes. Occupy Madison needs a zoning change to help between 9 and 18 in a number of years.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Erin Sommerfeld

█ North Second Street

Madison, WI 53704

█

█

From: Morgan Aten
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 10:40 PM
To: Parks, Timothy; Tucker, Matthew; [Plan Commission members]; Justin Aten
Subject: Rezone of 2050 E Johnson Street

To the Members of the Madison Plan Commission:

My name is Morgan Aten and I live at [REDACTED] N Third Street in Madison, directly across E Johnson Street from the proposed Occupy Madison Tiny Homes project. I feel that the proposed Tiny Homes project fails to meet the requirements for approval of the Planned Development District under section 28.098 of the Madison zoning code for the following reasons:

Section 2b under Standards for Approval of Zoning Map Amendment states "The PD District plan shall facilitate the development or redevelopment goals of the Comprehensive Plan and of adopted neighborhood, corridor or special area plans."

Development goals under the Emerson East Neighborhood Plan include increasing the number of owner occupied properties and increasing the number of businesses that serve the neighborhood and attracting businesses that provide services that residents need and use. The manufacturing component of this proposal is inappropriate for a residential neighborhood, it is not the type of industry desired by the neighborhood plan and to trade a property zoned Mixed Use Residential- a zoning designation that serves the neighborhood- for a PD that includes a manufacturing component to operate 7 days a week is incompatible with the neighborhood plan and would be a loss for the neighborhood of a property intended to provide desirable services for residents.

This project is also incompatible with the stated goal in the neighborhood plan of encouraging owner occupancy in dwellings with 1 to 4 units. We intend to turn our owner- occupied single family home into a rental if this project succeeds and we think many of our neighbors may be compelled to do the same. Occupy Madison's 2 previous encampments in the city of Madison at 801 E Washington Avenue and later at Portage Road had a well established reputation in the local press for undesirable behavior such as public intoxication, harassment of neighbors, littering, constant campfires and some more serious concerns in the case of E Washington Avenue. I feel that Occupy Madison will bring its bad reputation to our neighborhood and that we will be unable to sell our home as a result of it. Renting their homes will be the only exit option for neighbors of the property who are unable to sell.

Section 2c under Standards for Approval of Zoning Map Amendment states "The PD District plan shall not adversely affect the economic health of the City or the area of the City where the development is proposed, including the cost of municipal services."

I would argue that this project will adversely affect the economic health of the Emerson East neighborhood if not the City of Madison as a whole. This project proposes an unregulated encampment of up to 18 people in unplumbed trailers that intentionally skirt building code and the negative effect it will have on nearby property values should be obvious. I have submitted to the Plan Commission the signatures of dozens of residents who oppose changing the zoning for

this project and I think the City Assessor can expect dozens of requests for lowered property assessments if this project is approved. This development would therefore lower the City's tax base, at least in its immediate vicinity. The greater cost of this project will be the increased cost of municipal services, both from the zoning department and the Madison Police Department. Our district Police Captain, Jay Lengfield, has stated that he opposes this location for this project because he feels it will increase police service calls for this neighborhood and that his belief is based on the increased police service calls Occupy Madison created at their 2 previous encampments. While I think that the provision for continuing jurisdiction over the residential and manufacturing uses for this property is essential it does put the Madison zoning department in the unfortunate position of permanent referee between a radical organization and an angry neighborhood. Neighbors who have experienced significant financial losses as a result of this project will likely report any and all incidents of non-compliance with the development plan that occur on the property and dealing with those complaints and conflicts may require an inordinate number of man hours for such a small project.

Section 2d under Standards for Approval of Zoning Map Amendment states "The PD District plan shall not create traffic or parking demands disproportionate to the facilities and improvements designed to meet those demands."

The proposal calls for 2 parking spaces on the property, which is inadequate for the manufacturing and retail components of the proposal, let alone up to 18 residents on the property, and Occupy Madison has stated that 3 of their potential residents have cars at this time, so they're already short a parking space for the people who intend to live there. The neighborhood is already dealing with student parking from East High School and there is no parking available on the section of Johnson Street nearest the property so the demands that this will create on neighborhood parking are a legitimate concern.

Section 2f under Standards for Approval of Zoning Map Amendment states "The PD district shall include suitable assurances that each phase could be completed in a manner that would not result in an adverse effect upon the community as a result of termination at that point."

Occupy Madison states in their letter of intent regarding the project that the phasing of the project is dependent on fundraising and that phasing may or may not be exactly as stated depending on funding. Their letter also states that the exterior electrical work that will provide electricity for the Tiny Homes and the proposed kitchenette will be projects for phase 2 of the implementation plan and that this will take place presumably long after the trailers and their residents have moved onto the property. I think it's clear that not having a kitchen will adversely affect the residents of the property and without electricity in the Tiny Homes the residents will be unable to store perishable food in a refrigerator, which will greatly increase the cost of food for a population that has little to no income. The neighborhood would also like to see shower facilities in place before residents move onto the property but it is our understanding that the residents of the completed Tiny Home are living on the Occupy Madison workshop site now, as well as some others who are car camping at that site, so we expect that our urban campground would have campers right away if the project is approved. I think that having several permanent residents in our neighborhood with no means of cooking or bathing at their residence would clearly have an adverse effect upon the community. I ask that the Plan Commission recommend a phasing plan that requires both shower and kitchen facilities prior to moving the trailers and their residents in- if the Commission is not willing to require housing that meets minimum

building code standards could it at least require that this campground meet the basic human needs of its residents?

Section 28.098 (3) Relationship to Other Applicable Regulations States “A Planned Development shall comply with all standards, procedures, and regulations of this ordinance that are applicable to the individual uses within the development.”

I would hope that this section means that the housing standards that apply throughout the City of Madison and the building code regulations that are outlined in this ordinance would apply to the residential use component of this development. Occupy Madison may have gone to great lengths to design campers on wheels that are not subject to building code, but they will only be allowed to be used as permanent, substandard housing in a residential neighborhood where all other buildings must meet code with the Plan Commission’s consent. I ask that the housing standards and the building code regulations outlined in the zoning ordinance be applied to the residential component of this development. I would not object to Occupy Madison housing the homeless on the property across the street from my home- I object to this project because this is not housing, and it is not an appropriate land use in a residential neighborhood where all other housing must comply with the law.

Some other examples of how this project conflicts with the zoning ordinances and the Madison General ordinances are as follows:

- Section 28.131(2)c (4) regarding placement of accessory buildings and structures states “In the side or rear yard setback of a corner lot, a minimum distance from the street side lot line equal to the setback required for a principal building in the district.”

I think it is fair to describe Tiny Homes as accessory structures and since they will be placed more or less permanently on the lot the regulations regarding placement of accessory structures should apply. The 3 Tiny Homes to be placed on the lot line adjacent to Third Street appear to be too close to the street to be in compliance with this ordinance.

-It seems odd and unprecedented to have accessory structures used for housing on a lot where the principal building is used for manufacturing and no part of the principal building could be considered a dwelling. Under section 28.151 accessory dwelling units are not permitted within any district unless the principal building is a dwelling. While tiny homes may not meet the standards for an accessory dwelling unit they are accessory structures on the property and they are intended for and will be used for permanent habitation so I think the Commission should consider this ordinance in considering the appropriateness of the residential component of the project.

-The Tiny Homes were originally introduced to the Madison General Ordinances as portable shelter missions, however this project does not comply with that ordinance as to the requirement that the property owner obtain a campground permit from the State of Wisconsin if there are more than 4 Tiny Homes on the lot, as there would be in this case. It is my understanding that the State of Wisconsin has wisely refused to grant a campground permit for this project, most likely because the intent to house people on a permanent basis is at odds with how State law defines campground (defined as non-permanent overnight housing).

Finally I would ask the Plan Commission to refrain from voting to approve this project until Occupy Madison provides a detailed and updated site plan, which they failed to do at the Urban Design Commission meeting last week and were granted initial approval anyway, an operating budget and proof of financing for the project and complete plans for all building materials to be used and the implementation plan with firm dates of completion. I am also concerned that like most bad legislation this project is being rushed through the approval process while questions about nearly every aspect of the proposal remain unanswered. I would ask the Plan Commission to determine whether Occupy Madison would need a manufacturing permit from the state for the manufacturing component of the project and whether this project complies with the Uniform Dwelling Code for the State of Wisconsin and other aspects of state law. The neighbors of this project find themselves trying to argue against a proposal that works only within the loopholes of the law and defies definition. I would ask the Plan Commission to define what a Tiny Home is and what aspects of the zoning code apply to them and then allow the neighbors and our legal counsel a chance to examine what works within that definition. We are homeowners with families and full time jobs going up against an organization with over 80 volunteers that has planned this project for over a year. We deserve a chance to know what we are dealing with and respond to it, we deserve equal treatment under the law and equal opportunity to defend our homes. I appreciate your consideration of these matters and the assistance provided to us by the staff at the City of Madison zoning department.

Sincerely,

Morgan Aten

From: Brad Cantrell
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 9:40 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Fw: Occupy Madison proposal input

fyi

From: Diane Farsetta
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 9:22 PM
To: [Plan Commission] lpalm@cityofmadison.com
Subject: Occupy Madison proposal input

Dear members of the Plan Commission and Alder Palm,

My husband and I own a home two blocks from the proposed Occupy Madison (OM) Tiny House Village. We fully support the proposal.

I am grateful for the many hours that OM members have poured into the project, their extensive consultations with the neighborhood, and their willingness to adjust their plans to address neighbors' concerns. I would also like to thank city staff for acknowledging the proposal's uniqueness (at least in Madison; the similar Dignity Village in Portland, for example, was established in 2000) and carefully considering what conditions will help it succeed.

I have so far attended five meetings on the OM proposal. I have had the pleasure of meeting current and potential Tiny House-dwellers. I have full confidence that the OM proposal will not only help address the serious issue of homelessness and housing insecurity in our community, but enrich our neighborhood. It will certainly be an improvement over the current Sanchez Motors site.

My sole concern is that, due to the proposal's unique nature and the socioeconomic marginalization of some of the people involved, much more is being expected and required of OM than would be for any other similar-sized project.

For example, I think it's incredibly unfortunate that the gathering circle originally planned for the corner of East Johnson and Third Street has been removed from the proposal. That feature, as I understand it, was meant to encourage interactions between Tiny House-dwellers and other neighbors. How sad that something that could have helped foster community and understanding was not even given a chance.

I understand that the unique nature of the project creates more "gray area" than exists around an average small-scale redevelopment. But I urge you Commission members and Alders to consider the proposal on its merits, and not react to fears or concerns in a way that unfairly burdens OM or weakens the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Diane Farsetta

■ N Fifth St

Madison, WI 53704

From: Carol Weidel
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 2:52 PM
To: [Plan Commission]
Subject: Tiny House Village

Commissioners,

I look forward to your meeting on Monday to approve our project.

We have been working hard to build a community of people with these Tiny Homes and we will be there to answer your questions.

The site is perfect for our volunteers and future residents - near public transportation, on a commercial site, not surrounded by home. We have adjusted our plan to respond to the neighborhood concerns.

Thank you!

Carol Weidel
[REDACTED] E Dayton St
Madison, WI 53703

From: Greta Hansen
Sent: Sunday, April 27, 2014 2:44 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: TINY Houses

I am writing to support the Tiny House plan. It is sensible, affordable and fits neatly into the landscape of Madison. Greta Hansen [REDACTED] Comanche Glen, Madison, WI