

Preventing injury worth the ?nuisance?

I am writing in response to the letter, ?Speed humps a nuisance.?

I am a resident of Kettleby and have been a reluctant if vocal advocate for the speed humps.

As a point of clarification, the speed humps in question will cost a tiny fraction of the \$500,000 claimed in the letter and in my view the cost is something of a red herring. In the staff report, noted the total cost for the 4 humps east of the village to Keele is \$10,000.

The speed humps are being installed as a result of a careful study and analysis carried out by the experts at King Township, following up on concerns voiced by many residents of Kettleby. So dismayed by the discourtesy and danger posed by speeding motorists, the Kettleby Village Association put together a petition that was signed by a large majority of residents along Kettleby Road. This was submitted to the Township and resulted in exactly the type of study Ms Carpenter advocates in her letter.

The data are a matter of public record: in both directions, 85% of cars passed through the village at speeds more than 15 km/h greater than the posted speed limit of 50 km/h.

The Township has been proactive, and has attempted improved signage, speed limit reductions and other measures to deal with the problem, to no avail. No one disputes the claim that people have ?legitimate? reasons to drive through the village. It is picturesque and convenient, and clearly preferable to many drivers who, for their own reasons, eschew the Lloydtown Aurora Road and other alternatives with higher posted limits. The speed humps are a last resort recommended to, and approved by council to ensure the safety of children, pedestrians and pets living in the hamlet.

Surely preventing the tragedy of injury or death is worth a little expense and ?nuisance.?

Aladin Jarrah

Kettleby