

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Correspondence Re: Please re-think Barton/Tiffany

From: Kelly & Bert Oucharek

Sent: Monday, December 30, 2024 1:30 AM

To: Horwath, Andrea <Andrea.Horwath@hamilton.ca>; Baird, Michelle <Michelle.Baird@hamilton.ca>; Blake, Danielle <Danielle.Blake@hamilton.ca>; Mater, Grace <Grace.Mater@hamilton.ca>; Robichaud, Steve <Steve.Robichaud@hamilton.ca>; Kroetsch, Cameron <Cameron.Kroetsch@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Hwang, Tammy <Tammy.Hwang@hamilton.ca>; Francis, Matt <Matt.Francis@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Beattie, Jeff <Jeff.Beattie@hamilton.ca>; Tadeson, Mark <Mark.Tadeson@hamilton.ca>; Cassar, Craig <Craig.Cassar@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Alex <Alex.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Spadafora, Mike <Mike.Spadafora@hamilton.ca>; McMeekin, Ted <Ted.McMeekin@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Correspondence Re: Please re-think Barton/Tiffany

Hello

I am emailing asking you to reconsider Barton/Tiffany project, especially the location. Given the lack of due process, due diligence and research, walking back this impulsive decision seems to be in order.

I don't think it is necessary to review the many ways this project has **floundered**, the media is doing a good job of that. Yet this delay, which I purport some knew about sooner than identified, offers a unique point in time to STOP, PAUSE and THINK.

You may worry it would add further embarrassment to the reputation of the City, to change direction, but to be honest, given the press, I don't think that is possible. It seems quite likely this will not open while any snow is flying; so please take the time do this properly. I am also asking for the record, (as previous email was ignored), **have the sheds been sourced from alibaba.com via microshelters.ca?**

How can you in good conscience, be okay with imposing this project in a residential community? One that will house potentially up to 80 high acuity individuals with mental illness and addiction. Is this fair for the neighbours who live surrounding the site?

You have much land to choose from, deeming this location to be totally unnecessary. This location is a slap in the face for those residents who have already given testimony to the increased crime and trespassing. This location means you care little about the needs and experiences of those in the North End. You have a **duty to use a balanced approach** (Justice Ramsey agreed), one that **considers the safety, well-being**, of the broader community while providing appropriate solutions for the vulnerable. This site does not do that.

Let me take you back in time, to January 21, 2023. Maureen Wilson, you were quoted in a SPEC article about the HATS site, arguing, "**the city cannot endorse a project site without first consulting area residents. We have an obligation to do so**". What abandoned residents want to know is what happened to this obligation?

As you may know, due to the lack of care and concern for the community, you have left us with no choice but to explore our legal options regarding this.

Concerned and underwhelmed,
Kelly Oucharek