

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 10:14 AM
To: Wendy Kaufman
Cc: Pauline Fortin; Fern Cormier; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc; Joscelyn.Landry-Altman@greatersudbury.ca
Subject: Concerns regarding extension of Forestdale Dr.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ms. Kaufmann,

This email is in regards to the upcoming expansion of Dalron homes in and around Forestdale Dr and Montrose Ave. Specifically the extension of Forestdale Dr, to expand North from it's current end of the cul-de-sac. As residents of 122 Forestdale, along with being parents of 5 children (ages 1-16), our concern is in regards to the safety and feasibility of the extension of Forestdale. If you ever visit the area, you will witness many cars having to accelerate up Forestdale to make it to the top of the street, many vehicles do this to main momentum to be able to climb this hill. As they come to the top of the street, there is very limited sight line as you rise over the peak of the street. While there is already a risk for collisions between vehicular traffic and pedestrians, this is mitigated due to the low volume of traffic. If you go at any time, you will see many people accessing Forestdale due to the slope of the hill and the cardio benefits of walking up that hill.

If the extension were to move forward, based on the topography of the area, there will be another large hill to climb to drive south and then east. So you are now having more vehicles accelerating in the opposite direction, which is causing increased traffic volume but also increased acceleration in this pinch point. At present, people do not come to the cul-de-sac for the most part unless to turn around, and this happens 3-4 times a day. But now that this will be open and accessible, you will have vehicles coming from both directions accelerating at a higher rate of speed going from a wide road to a narrow road, on a 80 degree turn angle. I am not a traffic cop or an accident investigator, but this is just calling for some form of accident, whether it be vehicle vs. property, or vehicle vs. pedestrian.

As parents of youth who live at this cul-de-sac, and these youth play with other youth at the end of the cul-de sac who all live within a 50m to 100m radius. The nearest park in proximity to this location is approximately 850m away on Grandview Blvd. There is no easily accessible recreational areas for these youth to go to. To get to the park, would include walking down metal stairs to another area, then down a medium density road (Grandview).

Let's also look out the infrastructure of the current site plan. I am looking at the new re-draft of plan dated March 2024, along with the current Forestdale Dr, both in person, and in the draft plan. You will see the current Forestdale is a narrow undivided road. While there is space for cars to drive in opposite directions if the road is clear, there isn't when there is a car parked on the side of the road. If a car is parked on the street, then it is not capable to pass a car, and a parked car at the same time. There is a large blind spot as people come up, and the typical car coming up Forestdale drives in the middle due to cars being parked on the street.

Forestdale is also void of any sidewalks. So now you are adding people walking up and down the street, increased vehicular traffic, increased speeds, and narrow roads. If you plan on putting a redlight there, fine, but people will blow through that stop sign, and any child or pedestrian that gets hit, is calling for a lawsuit due to poor infrastructure planning.

But let's look also at the physicality of the street and it's components. Will the street hold up to the increased traffic? If you look at that cul-de-sac, in that 20m radius, we have had multiple city of Sudbury crews come in and

fill in potholes in the past few years. Now why is there potholes? There is very limited vehicular traffic. So this gives way to natural elements during the freeze thaw cycle, in addition to the high volumes of water that go the area from run off based on the slope of the hill.

In addition, the new extension will have wider streets, which is great, but this is not continued from where the new extension starts. So we are going from a wider street, to a more narrow street. Logically this doesn't make any sense in a safety sense.

In general we aren't against any development of the area, what we are against is the extension of Forestdale. We do not agree with the development plans for Forestdale based on street size, traffic volume increase, safety of residents, and capability of the street to handle the volume of traffic.

Sincerely,

Chris Bolestridge, RN
Amber Gazdic
122 Forestdale Dr.
[REDACTED]

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Brian and Lori Miller <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 11:53 AM
To: Joscelyne Landry-Altmann; Fern Cormier; Pauline Fortin; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc; Wendy Kaufman; clerks
Subject: Proposed extension of Forestdale Drive

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

This is in regard to the proposed extension of Forestdale Drive northwards, as outlined in the City of Greater Sudbury document: entitled "Notice of Public Hearing", dated February 22, 2024, File #751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023.

I have concerns relating to this proposed extension, as Forestdale Drive is a relatively narrow street, with a very steep slope. Driving up or down Forestdale at any time of the year is not easy, with the glaring sun later in the afternoon that obstructs views due to its steep slope, its narrowness, as well as no sidewalks for pedestrians. During the winter months, it can be even more treacherous with slippery conditions on the hill, snowbanks that obstruct oncoming traffic, and vehicles that speed up the hill in order not to get stuck and/or slip down backwards, which altogether makes for precarious conditions.

One only needs to take a look at the Draft Plan of the Proposed Subdivision that has been included in these City of Sudbury documents, to notice the difference in Forestdale, in comparison to Montrose Avenue, Woodbine Avenue, the proposed "Street A" or the proposed new "north" Forestdale. The widths of the roads in comparison to the existing Forestdale are quite obvious and striking.

In summary, to allow for an extension of Forestdale, that will without a doubt dramatically increase traffic, is not an appropriate or a safe approach and therefore hopefully you will reconsider this proposed extension.

Yours truly,
B.G. Miller, CPA, CMA

Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: Higrader <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 10:24 AM
To: clerks
Cc: Joscelyne Landry-Altmann; Pauline Fortin; Fern Cormier; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc; Higrader Goldpanner
Subject: Comments for Dalron Planning App - Monday
Attachments: Planning_Comments_FINAL.pdf; Village-of-Montrose_Concept_Plan.pdf

Greetings

Please accept the attached TWO files as submission of my comments regards Dalron's Planning Application to be presented to the Planning committee this Monday.

Please confirm receipt before 4pm this afternoon.

Best regards

Denis de Laplante

Comments to Planning Committee re: Dalron planning application, for Notice dated Feb 22, 2024

Via email to: clerks@greatersudbury.ca and Planning committee members

March 14th, 2024

Greetings committee members;

With best intentions, I wish to remind this committee of an implicit promise made by Council to the residents of New Sudbury west regards Montrose N. and how the approval of this application can jeopardize that promise.

Please excuse the length of this letter. I am on the road returning home from an extended holiday and composing as we travel.

Some while back, after being made aware of the dangers on pg 100 of our 2005TS, Council resolved to ensure the safety of the residents, over allowing excess traffic, by implementing two Resolutions.

1. The first passed in Oct 2015, instructed staff to ensure the implementation of a meandering into the Montrose extension. This Resolution included Schedule "A" which described a "4-corner" meandering in the Village of Montrose Concept plan (VoM).
2. The second passed in Dec 2016, instructed staff to commission a Transportation Impact Study for the study, among other items, IF the VoM type of meander was the most effective and safe traffic calming measure that would address the 2005TS warning.

Your resolutions were fulfilled by the Village of Montrose (VoM) Concept Plan presented to us by the developer. But now, for unknown reason, that the plan has been abandoned, and, there no longer exists an effective traffic calming measure. More importantly, there is no indication in this application that another will be developed. This replacement plan does not even speak to future plans for the implementation of such a measure as the 4-corner meander that existed in VoM Concept Plan.

With only half the lands left for development, there is strong possibility that the required space needed to implement such a critically important measure, will not be available and there is a chance of compromising the feasibility of your resolve to keep this neighbourhood safe.

Public commenting on the transportation aspect of this application was denied from the beginning and that decision, as of yet, has not been rescinded. This application is totally mute on future plans. There is no vision and this leaves the local residents fearful for their future safety... especially existing, recent and future residents. We were told that the Transportation matter was to be handled by senior management. It appears that the Montrose Travel Demand Analysis was their source for a solution but that report has been justifiably disqualified due to staff's bungling of your instructions.

As it stands now, you are being asked to approve this application without any plans or idea for a traffic calming solution in sight. There is no vision from the developer on how they intend to address and fulfill Council's resolutions to protect this neighbourhood from a dangerous transportation issue.

Seems the cart has now been placed in front of the horse, and you're all that's left, again, to resolve this problem.

Staff states that because of their bungling the Montrose report, the OP cannot be concluded in time to rightfully enforce the implementation of the developer's meandering conditions. What takes most municipalities and what the Province mandates should be done in FIVE years, for whatever reason takes this City what... 10 years! And because of staff inability to address this issue in normal times, we the residents have to live in fear, again, because our OP has been inordinately delayed! This is not right!

The probability is that this issue will now need to be addressed in the next Phase of development and because we have no idea of the developer's vision, the process could paint this committee into a corner.

It could very well produce a situation that is irreversible once this application gets underway. Unknown and critically important issues may arise and work against in the development of the next parcel.

This is not Planning! This hoping and praying things go well!

Some of these issues that are already presenting themselves, for the next the phase of development, are serious. There a very good chance the next phase might not able to accommodate the requirements for an effective traffic calming measure, such as the 4-corner meander found in the Village of Montrose (VoM) concept plan, the large parkland, containment areas and functional design.

Three known reasons that could render the next phase incapable of adopting a traffic calming measure are...

1. The VoM plan required the relocation of the large parklands block in order to accommodate the effective 4-corner meander and design, within the the boundaries of the next phase. Why would anyone think it will be different this time?
 - The only way to evaluate and ensure the remaining lands can accommodate all that is required, is to have a Concept Plan developed NOW!
2. This planning application has restriction public comments regards the critically important transportation aspect of this plan. The gag order has not been publicly lifted. There is "Consultantinitus Confusion" which cloud sound judgment.

Our 2015TS states that Montrose will have absolutely no extra traffic due to short-cutting. Then you read the more recent Montrose traffic report saying short-cutting traffic will occur creating 27% more traffic! And doesn't even include traffic using the Woodbine connection which now demonstrating a large increase. **These statements come from the very same consultant!** How can this issue be properly resolved when fundamental information needed to make qualified decisions are contradictory? You need public input.

 - You are being asked to approved an application with absolutely no resolution to the critically important Transportation issue. I wonder how a appeal of this decision would go with the government knowing about the gag order?
 - This is placing at risk the future safety of the neighbourhood and it should not be allowed.
3. There are two new conditions being imposed, #48 and #49. These condition are being introduced because Conservation Sudbury has serious concerns. Should we not all have these concerns? The lands north of the hydro easement are in a flood area!

It is known that there is a creek running through this area, but the extent of the affected area is unknown. Depending on severity, there could be serious restriction to the availability of useful lands in the next phase, NOT being available to accommodate all the required elements of a complete plan including a meandering traffic calming measure. There is no one at this meeting that say otherwise as that can only happen AFTER the required study. So... all we all wishing or are praying that the next phase will have the land required to save our butts?

 - This condition alone has the possibility of creating serious implications and the ability to seriously compromise Council's ability to honour their Resolutions.
 -

Approval of this application, without being properly informed is placing at risk the safety of the existing and future Montrose residents. **Approval of this application IS certainly premature.** There is no-one at this meeting qualified to disclose the outcome of the above issues. **Those outcomes could very well create consequences that are irreversible.**

There was an important Planning tool that could have resolved the above issues had it been applied to this application. It's called a Concept Plan (CP). It would have necessitated the completion of required studies, revealed the potential dangers in the above issues and finally, it would have demonstrated to everyone the solutions plus how Council's resolutions would have been handled.

A CP would have given everyone some insight into the developer's vision for this subdivision. The Village of Montrose (VoM) plan was a CP. That plan was holistically designed, incorporating the whole of the subdivision lands. All issues that existed then, and persist today, were resolved!

At this stage of development, this subdivision must be planned with an approach that involves the whole of the remaining lands.

This City **had the opportunity** to implement a CP a plan to this application. For developments with the same situation as this one, they are mandatory in South Sudbury, but not for North Sudbury! Why is that?

- The reason for a CP per OP Sec20.4.3 is "*The purpose of a Concept Plan shall be to assist Council in evaluating the proposal with respect to the long-term development of the site.*" This is 100% applicable in this case.
- A CP is mandatory when the developer is planing for only part of its land holding. This also is 100% applicable in this case...
- But unfortunately...
- Sec 19.12.2 of the OP states that a CP can be requested at any time for the approval of a plan change or zoning application except for the fact that **this request "*is to be determined and confirmed by City Staff during the pre-consultation process.*"**
- **Knowing the implications as we know them now, you have to wonder why a Concept Plan has not been requested by staff for this application?**
- **This is truly incomprehensible!**

I am bringing this to your attention in the hope that this committee can do something about this blatant omission.

Is it not staff's duty to also help this committee achieve whatever its goals are, in order to ensure, as best they can, protect the safety of residents?

I hope this committee will not let itself be persuaded into doing otherwise by approving this plan... it truly is premature and this is grounds for not approving it.

This application demands a strategic vision of what Dalron wishes to achieve within the remainder of the lands... **especially as it pertains to Council's resolve to protect the residents from being overrun by traffic.** This can best be done with the use of a Concept Plan. We all deserve the right to know how and when our safety aspect will be addressed... before it's too late.

There are barriers that have been placed, but it is my hope that this committee can see around them and find a way to have the developer demonstrate that the remaining lands can accommodate Council's Resolution and the pertinent conditions, BEFORE approving this application.

My apologies for being so long winded, but I'm short of time to clean up my comments and I truly hope grasp and agree with my views.

Respectfully submitted

Denis de Laplante, 872 Grandview Blvd, Sudbury.
CARB3

VILLAGE OF MONTROSE

CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN



Maria Gonzalez Santos

From: nsnajdr <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 7:20 PM
To: Wendy Kaufman; clerks; Joscelyne Landry-Altmann
Cc: Pauline Fortin; Fern Cormier; Rene Lapierre; Bill Leduc
Subject: URGENT - LETTER OF OBJECTION TO BE REGISTERED- Dalron Royal Oaks Nickledale Subdivision File 751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023 Objections and Concerns
Attachments: Letter of Opposition to Regarding - Dalron Royal Oaks Nickeldale Subsivision File 751-621-19 & 780-689023 2.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Wendy Kauffman, Councillor Landry-Altman and the City Clerk

Please see below my letter of concern and opposition to the Subject relating to Dalron Royal Oaks Nickledale Subdivision File 751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023

My letter is both in the content of the e-mail and PDF form. Please see below:

Thank you and kind regards,

To: Wendy Kaufman, Council Members, the City Clerk and the Planning Committee,

CC: Pauline Fortin, Fern Cormier, Rene Lapierre, Bill Leduc, Jocelyn Landry-Altman

Dear Wendy Kaufman, Council Members, the City Clerk and the Planning Committee,

RE: Objections and Concerns regarding Dalron Royal Oaks Nickledale Subdivision File 751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023

Date: March 13, 2024

Dear Council Members and Staff,

As a 30 year + resident of Forestdale Dr, I am writing to join in with my fellow neighbours and surrounding community neighbours to voice my concerns with the proposed development. My concerns as listed below lead me to register my opposition to the proposed development as there are significant safety hazards and potential liabilities relating to the proposed changes as presented in the March 2024 application.

Please register my objection to the currently proposed development due to: **Safety concerns for all the residents of Forestdale Dr. and others in regards to the existing limitations of Forestdale Drive**

- A. There is a tremendous increase in potential safety hazards that could arise from the proposed extension and conversion of the Forestdale Dr cul-de-sac to becoming a thorough-fare street to either the proposed new neighborhood development, and or Maley Dr. extension
- As a 30 + year resident of Forestdale Dr., I am writing to provide my lived experience that there are already some challenges with roadway safety due to the precarious combination of the steepness/pitch of the hill, especially as you approach the top of the hill with poor direct sight lines to car coming from the opposing direction. However, it's currently manageable because there is only low local vehicle traffic flow, but could become very hazardous if the roadway were to become open to more traffic/ or any throughway traffic.
 - When the steepness of the hill combined with the lack of clear straight sight-lines it leads to having poor visibility over the top of the hill from the opposing direction - it is challenging to see cars coming from the opposite direction (Westward to Eastwards down the hill)
 - Adding into that, our Winters or freeze-thaw-freeze cycle of flash freezing (which from observations looks like that weather pattern is/will become more and more frequent in nature) - **The roads are extremely slippery**, even with the City's road maintenance. Because of the nature of the icy conditions or black ice; **to make it up the hill, most drivers have to accelerate to make it up the steepness of the hill without sliding back down;**
 - I myself and my family have actually not been able to make it up the hill with our car and even slid down and sideways partially fishtailing. We've had to resort to leaving our car at the bottom of Montrose and Forestdale.
 - Furthermore to add to that, in the wintery icy conditions, it is normal in those kinds of driving conditions **for cars to spin out a little bit/ or skid when we have to break quickly on ice, or accelerate, therefore drivers don't have full control of the response of their vehicle** and end up slightly swerving or fishtailing. We all know that this is true and a reality of winter driving conditions **but when you add the need to accelerate to make it up the hill or having to use breaks to slow oneself down the hill because the pitch of the street, I can easily see this combination becoming a potential very serious safety hazard.**
 - And finally adding to that, when most residents are coming home from work - it's Sunset - **Driving up hill in the Westward direction is right into the setting sun.** Its beautiful indeed, and we often go enjoy the sunset at the end of the cul-de-sac to enjoy it's splendour but not great for visibility as you drive up the hill as it's right in you eyes, your direct line of sight, its slightly blinding. It's already hard to see what cars might be coming from the Westward direction down the hill. So yet another peril.
 - These concerns don't even include if you have either pedestrians walking or walking their dogs, kids playing on the street; of which there are many in the neighbourhood

Currently, we as the residents have found ways to deal with the situation due mostly to the fact:

- that there is only a small flow of closed off local neighbourhood traffic and there aren't many cars coming from the Westward direction down the hill
- and furthermore, now we can hear cars coming but with electric cars becoming more and more of the norm, they are so quiet we won't be able to use that as a tool to help us navigate the situation.

In addition, I am in agreement with other areas of concerns that my fellow neighbours have raised, such as:

- At the top of Forestdale, past the peak, the street isn't built on bedrock, only boulder backfill and slag which leads to instability in the street. Many of the residents of the area have mentioned that even when the dump trucks go around for collection, the weight of the trucks have actually led for the roadway to give way and create little sink holes, due to the naturally occurring movements and shifts in the ground. Furthermore, not to mention if there were to be any significant potential "Forces of Nature" such as even a small earthquake or trembles. The road is not suitable for any additional traffic, weight or frequency of traffic.

As I have stated above, these are some of the additional concerns that are very worrisome from a resident who has **lived experience** of what it is actually like to live on the street not from a computer generated modelling tool that fits criteria of what constitutes and meets safety or other requirements needed for approval.

Please accept and register my opposition to the opening-up of the end of the Forestdale Drive cul-de-sac or any other part of Forestdale Drive to either the new proposed neighbourhood and or a connection to the Maley Drive Ext. Forestdale Dr. is not suitable to safely manage an increase in the flow of traffic from what it currently deals with. There could be serious perilous conditions being created if the City and the plan as it stand is permitted. Forestdale Drive, should be left closed to any new traffic allowances or connections. The top of Forestdale at the proposed extension site should be finished off with a single new cul-de-sac enclosure to cap the street.

I hope you heed the voices of us, the residents of Forestdale and our surrounding neighbourhood. We are concerned citizens voicing our knowledge and experience to well inform the City.

Thank you and kind regards,

NVKS
Longtime Resident of Forestdale Drive

To: Wendy Kaufman, Council Members, the City Clerk and the Planning Committee

CC: Pauline Fortin, Fern Cormier, Rene Lapierre, Bill Leduc, Jocelyn Landry-Altman, City Clerk

Date: March 13, 2024

Dear Wendy Kaufman, Council Members, the City Clerk and the Planning Committee,

**RE: Objections and Concerns regarding Dalron Royal Oaks Nickledale
Subdivision File 751-6/21-19 & 780-6/89023**

Dear Council Members and Staff,

As a 35 year + resident of Forestdale Dr, I am writing to join in with my fellow neighbours and surrounding community neighbours to voice my concerns with the proposed development. My concerns as listed below lead me to register my opposition to the proposed development as there are significant safety hazards and potential liabilities relating to the proposed changes as presented in the March 2024 application.

Please register my objection to the currently proposed development due to: **Safety concerns for all the residents of Forestdale Dr. and others in regards to the existing limitations of Forestdale Drive**

- There is a tremendous increase in potential safety hazards that could arise from the proposed extension and conversion of the Forestdale Dr cul-de-sac to becoming a thorough-fare street to either the proposed new neighborhood development, and or Maley Dr. extension
- As a 35 + year resident of Forestdale Dr., I am writing to provide my lived experience that there are already some challenges with roadway safety due to the precarious combination of the steepness/pitch of the hill, especially as you approach the top of the hill with poor direct sight lines to car coming from the opposing direction. However, it's currently manageable because there is only low local vehicle traffic flow, but could become very hazardous if the roadway were to become open to more traffic/ or any throughway traffic.
- When the steepness of the hill combined with the lack of clear straight sight-lines it leads to having poor visibility over the top of the hill from the opposing direction - it is challenging to see cars coming from the opposite direction (Westward to Eastwards down the hill)
 - Adding into that, our Winters or freeze-thaw-freeze cycle of flash freezing (which from observations looks like that weather pattern is/will become more and more frequent in nature) - The **roads are extremely slippery**, even with the City's road maintenance. Because of the nature of the icy conditions or black ice; **to make it up the hill, most drivers have to accelerate to make it up the steepness of the hill without sliding back down;**

- I myself and my family have actually not been able to make it up the hill with our car and even slid down and sideways partially. We've had to resort to leaving our car at the bottom of Montrose and Forestdale.
- Furthermore to add to that, in the wintery icy conditions, it is normal in those kinds of driving conditions **for cars to spin out a little bit/ or skid when we have to break quickly on ice, or accelerate, therefore drivers don't have full control of the response of their vehicle** and end up slightly swerving or fishtailing. We all know that this is true and a reality of winter driving conditions **but when you add the need to accelerate to make it up the hill or having to use breaks to slow oneself down the hill because the pitch of the street, I can easily see this combination becoming a potential very serious safety hazard.**
- And finally adding to that, when most residents are coming home from work - it's Sunset - **Driving up hill in the Westward direction is right into the setting sun.** Its beautiful indeed, and we often go enjoy the sunset at the end of the cul-de-sac to enjoy it's splendour but not great for visibility as you drive up the hill as it's right in you eyes, your direct line of sight, its slightly blinding. It's already hard to see what cars might be coming from the Westward direction down the hill. So yet another peril.
- These concerns don't even include if you have either pedestrians walking or walking their dogs, kids playing on the street; of which there are many in the neighbourhood

Currently, we as the residents have found ways to deal with the situation due mostly to the fact:

- that there is only a small flow of closed off local neighbourhood traffic and there aren't many cars coming from the Westward direction down the hill
- and furthermore, now we can hear cars coming but with electric cars becoming more and more of the norm, they are so quiet we won't be able to use that as a tool to help us navigate the situation.

In addition, I am in agreement with other areas of concerns that my fellow neighbours have raised, such as:

- At the top of Forestdale, past the peak, the street isn't build on bedrock, only boulder backfill and slag which leads to instability in the street. Many of the residents of the area have mentioned that even when the dump trucks go around for collection, the weight of the trucks have actually led for the roadway to give way and create little sink holes, due to the naturally occurring movements and shifts in the ground. Furthermore, not to mention if there were to be any significant potential "Forces of Nature" such as even a small earthquake or trembles. The road is not suitable for any additional traffic, weight or frequency of traffic.

As I have stated above, these are some of the additional concerns that are very worrisome from a resident who has lived experience of what it is actually like to live on

the street not from a computer generated modelling tool that fits criteria of what constitutes and meets safety or other requirements needed for approval.

Please accept and register my opposition to the opening-up of the end of the Forestdale Drive cul-de-sac or any other part of Forestdale Drive to either the new proposed neighbourhood and or a connection to the Maley Drive Ext. Forestdale Dr. is not suitable to safely manage an increase in the flow of traffic from what it currently deals with. There could be serious perilous conditions being created if the City and the plan as it stand is permitted. Forestdale Drive, should be left closed to any new traffic allowances or connections. The top of Forestdale at the proposed extension site should be finished off with a single new cul-de-sac enclosure to cap the street.

I hope you heed the safety concerns of us, the residents of Forestdale and our surrounding neighbourhood. We are concerned citizens voicing our knowledge and experience to best inform the City. As the role of City Council is to protect the well-being of its citizens and manage well the resources of the city to make our City the best place it can be.

Thank you and kind regards,

NVKS
Longtime Resident of Forestdale Drive

I am a member of CARB, CAN12 community residents, Re2021, and New Sudbury Citizens, who are joining together as a community to voice our reservations, concerns and issues has been collected from members