



From: Peter B Bean <Peter.B.Bean@aexp.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2016 8:55 PM

To: Abrams, Jeffrey

Cc: Bevilacqua, Maurizio; Di Biase, Michael; Rosati, Gino; Ferri, Mario; DeFrancesca, Rosanna;
contact@westondownsra.com

Subject: Weston Downs Traffic Study Recommendation- Council meeting Tuesday Nov 1 @ 1pm

Vaughan, October 30, 2016

Dear Mr. Clerk and Members of Council,

I am in receipt of the staff report coming before Council on November 1st, 2016 at 1pm. I am writing to express my dissatisfaction with many of the recommendations and my distrust of the public consultation process by the City of Vaughan with regards to the Weston Downs Traffic Study community consultation.

My first concern has to do with why this meeting is taking place during the day when all other consultations took place in the evenings when people could attend outside of working hours. I for one, have attended several meetings before (including one where hundreds of Weston Downs resident concerned with traffic issues attended) and will be unable to attend this one as I have to be at work. I assume others are in the same boat so low attendance should not be misinterpreted as apathy or a lack of support for a viable traffic solution.

Secondly, the staff report indicates that there was "no short-term preferred technical solution and a lack of consensus within the community" and therefore none of the solutions considered by the community would be implemented. This is factually incorrect and a disrespect of the public consultation process. Table 4 in the staff report indicates that 30% of respondents preferred the Regional Road Turning Restrictions and an additional 22% of respondents preferred Regional Road Turning Restrictions with a permit. This indicates that at least **52% of the community prefer Regional Road Turning Restrictions**. We live in a democracy where majority rules. In addition to 52% of respondents choosing some form of turn restrictions, it is also clear that **70% of residents feel there is a need to do something to address traffic inside the community**. I would suggest that if the question was narrowed to a choice between turning restrictions vs doing nothing, the results would be a clear mandate for turning restrictions.

I appeal to you to consider the community's input and demand that you implement Regional Road Turning Restrictions. Should you choose to move forward with the staff recommendation and not implement the Regional Road Turning Restrictions (and essentially retain the status quo), this means you would be doing what 70% of the community doesn't want you to do!

I can tell you without a doubt, that come the next municipal election, this issue will be of primary concern and at the forefront of the campaign and I will be sure to support any candidate that respects the wishes of the majority of the community which is to implement Regional Road Turning Restrictions. Make a wise choice and vote to support the

implementation of Regional Road Turning Restrictions to address the traffic infiltration problem in Weston Downs.

Note also:

- 1) We need another speed bump on Village Green. The stretch near my house is treated as a speedway as it is strategically between stop signs and speed bumps, allowing people to accelerate to well over 100-120kph regularly. It's a 40 zone!
- 2) A lot of these issues are caused because of structural deficiencies in the traffic infrastructure, the most obvious of which is the fact that Pine Valley Drive has a gap of approx. 800m between the golf course north of Langstaff and Rutherford. The continued failure to connect this vital arterial road will only, as building intensifies, become a more obvious problem. If this is not to be done, there should be a clear and transparent reason that is made public. As far as I know, there are many myths surrounding this matter but little hard evidence.

Respectfully,

Peter Bean and Nikki Corsaro
Village Green Drive, Weston Downs