

## Denise Holmes

---

**From:** Sarah Culshaw  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:45 AM  
**To:** Denise Holmes  
**Subject:** FW: speed limit

---

**From:** Kristine Pedicone  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:44 AM  
**To:** Sarah Culshaw <sculshaw@melancthontownship.ca>  
**Subject:** speed limit

Good Morning,

I plan to listen to the meeting on Thursday but wanted to send my comments in advance.

Regarding 4th/5th line of Melancthon I agree that the speed limits should be adjusted to at least 60 km if not less. The only problem I foresee is that they will need to be monitored or people will continue to drive above 80 km.

If they are adjusted, how does the township plan to monitor?

Good Luck!

--

\*Kristine Pedicone

## Denise Holmes

---

**From:** David Thwaites >  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 17, 2022 7:28 PM  
**To:** Denise Holmes; Darren White; David Besley; James McLean; Bill Neilson; Margaret Mercer  
**Subject:** 4th Line "speed limit" consultation.

### Members of Council:

I am not certain as to my availability on Thursday evening, 7 pm, so please consider this email as my thoughts and input on the "community engagement" on the topic of a possible speed limit reduction on 4th Line NE.

First, I firmly believe that speed limits should be honoured and more importantly that all drivers should respect the law and be considerate. Unfortunately that basic philosophy is not honoured by some who apparently believe their self interest is more important.

Second, the Township needs to be careful of having a piecemeal approach that can create any number of collateral related issues ( eg. Drivers may use 2nd Line NE as the alternate route with a potential different speed limit) thus creating more challenges.

Third, the Township needs to be very careful in adopting a reduced speed limit unless it is clear that such a reduction will have the desired impact on its own. A reduction based upon the assumption of enforcement by the police is not a good rationale. The evidence throughout the Township and for that matter across the Province clearly indicates that enforcement, the threat of sanctions etc does not impact or affect selfish driver behaviour. It must be further accepted that the prospect of enforcement by the police on 4th Line NE being a real option is next to zero. This later comment is in no way a criticism of the Police, it is simply a reality check as is evident on every road in the County.

Fourth, the challenge on 4th Line has been identified, in part, as one of trucks using 4th Line. The trucks, from what I understand of the brief discussion at previous Council, relates to gravel trucks using 4th Line to access the construction on County 21. This is not a reason for a speed reduction. The road is clearly marked as a "no truck road" already and the County has been/is aware of Melancthon's concern about its "contractors/subcontractors" using the 4th rather than designated haul routes. The clear option is for the County to ensure contract compliance and to honour Melancthon laws and to impose penalties on the contractor, including being closed out of future bidding on contract/supplier, for non-compliance.

Fifth, a political response without clear evidence of "the action" plan having a real impact simply creates false hopes and expectations and the potential for finger pointing when the reality is that the fault lies with those who create the challenge, ie the speeders and those who thumb there nose at community safety laws.

As a resident of Third Line OS, with a speed limit/ community safety zone that has had a negligible impact on speeding, and as one who has engaged in regular travel about the Township with similar observations, even on roads less travelled, I trust my thoughts will be considered.

David Thwaites

Sent from my iPad

7 4<sup>th</sup> Line N. E Melancthon,

May 18, 2022

To. Melancthon Council,

Thank you for the invitation to give our input re the possible intent to reduce the speed limit from 5th Line OS to county road 9. However, it seems ironic, in 2018, when we the residents requested our input re the reverting of this road to gravel be considered we were ignored. But now that the road has been reverted to gravel and is in a deplorable state, it seems our input is important.

That being said, we are not opposed to signage reducing the speed limit on this area of the road, but certainly some critical thinking and responsible consideration needs to be in place.

Our thoughts:

1. We would hope the speed limit is not reduced to a limit that is unreasonable, ie 30 or 40km/hr.
2. Who is going to be responsible for monitoring the speed limit? it is not reasonable to think the police are going to be sitting on 4<sup>th</sup> Line NE to catch speeders. There is already signage on this road prohibiting trucks on the road, however there are numerous trucks using this road on an ongoing basis.
3. The bottom line is the condition of the road in general. It doesn't matter if vehicles are driving at 40 km/hr or 70km/hr, the dust, flying stones and potholes make it a disastrous and dangerous mess. Most of the gravel from last summer has now been plowed into the ditches by the snowplows and the centre of the road is numerous potholes.
4. Signage, reducing the speed limit may certainly cause some drivers to be more cautious while driving this stretch of road, but it will not impact many.
5. We would hope that posting signage does not give council the excuse and ploy to not properly repave the road.

Respectfully submitted, Ross and Doreen Lyon