

What do you think needs improvement?

- Better definition of who will live there. Definitely fewer homes – 4 to 6?
- Water issue is main concern.
- More details and answer the questions.
- Communication/presentation.
- Everything.
- Concerned about how property will be arranged, additional traffic and potential impact on property values.
- How long residency? What is relationship of “owner” to “occupants”?
- No housing to be used on the property.
- No one living on the property.
- No occupancy in a densely populated urban setting/risk to already fragile neighborhood.
- Smaller, proper answers to concerns.
- Fewer people/uses on lot.
- More planning. Less density on site. Must work with police!!
- Reach out more to near neighbors who oppose the project – often, it seems, on the basis of erroneous information.
- No campground in my neighborhood.
- FAQ re: concerns of neighbors brought up tonight. More info about cooperative process and how neighborhood concerns will be addressed once community is built. Info about proposed completed project.
- Compensation for loss in property value. Where the \$ for ongoing maintenance and management? \$ had to be scraped together just to make an offer!
- Location, slow the process down, background checks, must have a manager on-site, too many homes on site, security, trash, noise pollution, abuse, safety.
- Entire premise. Lack of resident screening, lack of provided services.
- Having so many live in campers, in a campground setting, is not appropriate for a residential neighborhood.
- I want to encourage City staff and Common Council to devote sufficient support.
- The site is FAR too small for 11 houses/occupants and workshop. Zero screening, zero accountability/oversight by any type of authority or staff. Zero.
- So many challenges, rules, restrictions, hostility. I hope OM can overcome this.
- Who is accountable for problems within the community?
- Scratch it.
- This is in the wrong location.
- The number of units. The way it has been handled. The lack of real answers and the defensiveness on the part of Occupy.
- Clearly define rights, responsibilities, consequences, follow-up procedures.
- Good design and landscaping can make the area an asset. Plus currently is the current business anymore than an eyesore.
- There needs to be a way to enforce modifications to the use/density of the site after it is built. It is a new concept and needs to have enough flexibility to evolve to address real issues.
- More communication with neighbors, some specifics on site rules, figure out number of homes people can live with.
- Less tiny houses, need to leave room for cars for residents and volunteers.
- Why 11 to start with?
- The defensiveness is worrisome. Planning. This seems very thrown together and not well thought out at all; timeline is too rushed and this doesn't feel like genuine intent for neighborhood input.
- The condition of the land and street are not good. Would this be a safe location? Really needs further study.
- Our governments – federal, state, local – should put more resources into helping the poor and homeless. It should not be left to the “random kindness” of private citizens.

- City staff attitude towards this innovative idea. This particular use is for formerly homeless people, but tiny houses have appeal to many – let's get this right so we can see more of these.
- Location.
- Work with immediate neighbors to design fence. Are there opportunities for brownfields remediation? Do as much enviro cleanup as possible.
- Ways for the residents to positively interact with neighborhood residents.
- Everything.
- Addressing neighbors' concerns as far as maintaining order at the site.
- Dealing with unruly campers such as panhandlers based on the 3 previous OM sites – learn from past experiences.
- Build real homes.
- Density, screening, sustainability (timewise).
- No services, no food/kitchen, how long are these people going to stay?
- Need to find a different location.
- More info/listening sessions with the neighborhood.
- Would be happier w/build-only and retail use and eco component or only 3 – 4 occupied houses w/very strict screening.
- A different location.
- I'd like to see more appreciation from the government and support for this project. Thank you.
- 11 may be too many units for the site. How about 6 – 8?
- More information on upper limit of residents at a given time, how long people might stay, etc.
- Much more info. Another or more neighborhood meetings!
- Day to day operational process?
- More detailed info available.
- I think some of my neighbors should move to the westside.
- It's unclear to me what kind of turnover is expected in the occupants. Do you expect tenants to stay for long periods of time? I would like to see if fewer houses could be on-site.
- Address clearly the main concerns: real estate value; security.