

**Pilon, Janet**

---

**Subject:** community feedback re: sanctioned site location**From:** Kelly & Bert Oucharek**To:** Danielle Blake <[danielle.blake@hamilton.ca](mailto:danielle.blake@hamilton.ca)>; Grace Mater <[grace.mater@hamilton.ca](mailto:grace.mater@hamilton.ca)>; Andrea Horwath <[andrea.horwath@hamilton.ca](mailto:andrea.horwath@hamilton.ca)>**Cc:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca) <[clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)>**Sent:** Sunday, September 8, 2024 at 01:24:33 a.m. EDT**Subject:** community feedback re: sanctioned site location

Hello

In light of the report coming up later in September, exploring sanctioned sites, I am wondering if there is any plan to consult or engage the community on potential location sites?

I can appreciate that the city went to significant lengths to hear how encampments have impacted businesses, by developing and circulating a survey to effect change on the encampment protocol and to hear how businesses are impacted by encampments and the state of the downtown core. It is clear that the city/police have been motivated by what the business delegates had to say.

What I do not understand, is why, the city has not taken the time to hear from residents who are directly impacted by living in close proximity to an encampment. It seems like an easy task to map the homes within 25-50 m of an encampment and send them an engagement survey.

Taking the time, to treat residents the same as business owners and showing interest in how they have been impacted would go along way in showing the city truly cares for residents experiences as much as business owners. Especially if you consider business are present in their buildings 6-10 hours a day, residents living in close proximity to encampments (sometimes literally abutting in their back yard) 24/7, witnessing all the negative impacts on a continual basis.

Please do not think the unsheltered email is a sufficient outlet for this type of feedback.

I ask you to consider seeking residents input as I fear the lower city, namely Ward 2 will become a "natural choice" given that most social services tend to be planted here.

I fear that the city has accepted Bayfront park as a sanctioned site of sorts, as evidenced by continual disinterest in enforcing the protocol of the numerous non-compliant sites for an extended period of time. It's like you've given up.

I also ask the question because we anticipate Camerson Kroetsch's willingness to offer Ward 2 locations as potential sites, as he did with the HATS initiative, his views do not align with many of Ward 2 residents, particularly the North End.

I have also heard rumors the city is exploring Eastwood Park as a site, which is highly concerning.

I implore you to seek community feedback with respect to the locations chosen for proposed sanctioned sites.  
Kelly Oucharek