

Jon Paris

[REDACTED]

Mississauga, Ontario, L5N 2T8

eMail: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Attn: Members of Mississauga City Council

Re: Councillor Butt's Proposed Changes to the Plans for the Creditview/
Kenninghall Intersection.

I would like to make it known to the members of the council that there are a number of people who live in the Kenninghall area who wholeheartedly support the current roundabout plans. I count myself in that group.

I live on the corner of Creditview and Kenninghall and am far more directly affected than most in the neighbourhood, as I stand to lose part of my property to the roundabout. And yet I support it. I am tired of living beside a racetrack, and the revised proposal will simply make that situation worse since Kenninghall will be the only section of Creditview where speeding will be practical.

Before I go into more detail - I would like to make one particular point that seems to have escaped notice. If the City goes ahead with the roundabout, and residents' worst fears come true, traffic lights can be ADDED to the roundabout to help regulate flow during peak periods. If you vote for Councillor Butt's amendment, many thousands(millions?) of \$s will be expended in reviewing the plans, and there is a strong possibility that the end result would still be a roundabout.

Other Points:

I understand that part of Councillor Butt's reasons for proposing this change include pedestrian safety. While researching this aspect, we came across this information from Carmel, Indiana. <https://www.carmel.in.gov/government/departments-services/engineering/roundabouts>

If you read the information at that link, you will learn that pedestrian safety in Carmel, has been significantly improved, road maintenance costs have been lowered and vehicular accidents have been significantly reduced. In other words, the exact opposite of what some residents fear.

Some residents have complained that it will be impossible to enter the roundabout from Kenninghall because the traffic on Creditview will be moving too quickly. But it won't be moving at the 60 km/h that people talk about. The actual speed would be closer to that which you need to slow to to (say) make the right turn into Kenninghall from Creditview northbound, i.e. closer to 25 km/h. It is physically impossible to go around a roundabout of the size proposed at 60 km/h. You'd be hard-pressed to manage even 40 km/h, I suspect.

If you have any doubts as to the veracity of my remarks, I'm sure the City's engineers have access to flow simulators that would demonstrate this for you. You could also check out this online simulator <https://traffic-simulation.de/roundabout.html>. I have run this model with a 97% main road flow and 60 km/h with 2,000 vehicles per hour and everything moves very smoothly with little or no backup.

In voting on this amendment, please don't let people's ignorance of how roundabouts actually work in practice cloud your judgment.