

Srijana Rasaily

From: Wendy Kaufman
Sent: Friday, September 9, 2022 9:29 AM
To: Wendy Kaufman
Subject: FW: Montrose Extension Proposal

From: Peter Varpio <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 8, 2022 7:25 PM
To: Kris Longston <Kris.Longston@greatersudbury.ca>
Cc: Joscelyne Landry-Altmann <Joscelyne.Landry-Altmann@greatersudbury.ca>
Subject: Montrose Extension Proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Kris:

I am writing to object to Montrose as a direct link between Lasalle Boulevard and Maley Drive. That concept simply has no merit.

My reasons follow:

1) Lansing Avenue and Attlee Street clearly show why Montrose should not be a direct link.

Lansing connects Maley and Lasalle. Lansing has modest (50m) meanders. Nevertheless, residents have complained bitterly about the volumes of traffic and speeding. The city's response? "Traffic calming measures".

Attlee connects Lasalle and Barrydowne. Part of Attlee is direct and part has significant meanders. The city has tried various "traffic calming measures" on the direct section. Currently, there are two speed bumps. Do they work? Not really: speeding is still a problem. Contrast that to the section of Attlee that has major meanders, i.e., more than 50 yards. There are no calming measures in place, but traffic moves along at a moderate and manageable pace. The lesson? Significant meanders force drivers to slow down.

Why would the city contemplate making the Montrose extension direct, knowing that this will be a problem requiring attention in the future? Why not put in significant meanders in place now and avoid the problem altogether?

2) The consultant report argues that altering the existing road allowance will require negotiations between the developer and the city. This argument is nonsensical. Negotiations between the developer and the city are a fact of life. Proper meanders will achieve the desired effect on traffic and will cost the developer very few, if any, lots.

3) Finally, The report argues that meandering results in "slower travel times for local residents compared to direct connection". Isn't slower traffic a desired goal? Is moving traffic quickly more important than ensuring the safety of all?

None of the above should be construed as an objection to the development of this subdivision. I believe that Sudbury needs all the development it can get. I also believe that a properly meandered Montrose can be achieved to permit both development and "liveability" for all. Let's put proper meanders on Montrose.

I would appreciate your sharing this email with Eric Labelle and the members of the Planning Committee in time for the meeting on the 12th. Thank you.

Peter Varpio