

Feb. 13, 2025

Re: New Safety Issues created on Lobsinger Line

We are writing to express concerns regarding the unsafe conditions that have been created on **Lobsinger Line** near King Alfred Academy with the addition of a new 40 km/hr zone and automated speed camera.

We request the immediate:

- **Removal** of the speed camera
- **Restoration** of the previous speed limit configuration

to restore safety to the area until a comprehensive analysis can be conducted with independent oversight.

After reviewing [TES-TRP-22-06 Attachment B](#), [TSD-TRP-23-14](#), and [TSD-TRP-24-020](#), we are troubled by **inconsistencies** and **omissions** in these reports.

Issue #1: What problem is being solved?

Zero accident data was provided in these reports for Lobsinger Line in front of the King Alfred Academy school, yet changes are being implemented without evidence that a localized safety issue exists. How many students have been seriously injured or killed by passing vehicles in front of the school in recent years? Is it zero? This is a key piece of information that is missing.

From [Attachment B: TES-TRP-22-06](#) [2022], "*Staff assessed the Region's most recent 5-year collision history (2014 to 2018) involving pedestrians, cyclists and motorists within all school zones and Regional roads abutting schools. **Staff concluded again that there were no unusual collision patterns involving pedestrians and or cyclists within school zones or abutting Regional roads.***"

From [TSD-TRP-24-020](#) [2024]: "*For the King Alfred Academy (Lobsinger Line) ... staff from the Region and Township of Woolwich have identified the **need for a municipal speed camera ... staff recommend a speed limit reduction from 80 km/h to 40 km/h in these new school zones***"

These findings are contradictory.

Pertinent questions have not been asked: how many students are crossing Lobsinger each day? What percentage of students travelling to the school are using vulnerable means (such as walking, cycling, etc.)? Are vulnerable means students successfully navigating the 80 km/h outside of the new safety zone? Knowing these answers is fundamental in selecting appropriate safety measures, yet absent in the report.

The report does not state success criteria for the proposed change. Without baseline data, it is not possible to assert if the changes are an improvement.

Issue #2: A dangerous situation has been created

From [Attachment B: TES-TRP-22-06](#): *"Existing speed limits are appropriate as outlined in Report TES-TRP-15-03.2 [2015]. Research and local experience indicates that posting an **artificially low speed limit ... may cause an increase in collisions due to increased variability of driver speed causing tailgating and unsafe passing.**"*

From [Attachment B: TES-TRP-22-06](#): *"Current Regional practice is to **set speed limits at or about the average travel speed** of traffic because this is most likely to produce a uniformly moving traffic stream. **Traffic flowing at a uniform speed generally results in fewer collisions.** With uniform speed, **drivers are less impatient, pass less often, and are less likely to tailgate, which reduces both head-on and rear-end collisions.**"*

Yet, the region has moved from a straight 80 km/hr zone to an 80/60/40/60/80 configuration recently, **knowing full well** this is a less safe arrangement for motorists.

What motivates us to write this letter is our own *local experience* of two near-miss incidents in a single day driving from Heidelberg to Wagner's corners this past week. The lone 60 km/h speed limit sign before the speed camera was partially snow-covered, making it hard to read. We slowed down to 40 km/h for the upcoming speed camera, however a large truck approached from behind with a closing speed differential of ≥ 40 km/h who may have missed the 60 km/h sign. The fast-approaching vehicle narrowly avoided a rear-end collision with us. Later in the day, the same scenario unfolded. This is alarming.

I genuinely **fear for my safety** and that of smaller vehicles, like motorcycles, traversing this new "safety zone".

Issue #3: Alternative solutions not considered

What alternative solutions were considered? None are mentioned in the reports.

School hours are specified as 7am-5pm M-F, 10 hours a day, 5 days a week = 50 hours. A week has 168 hours. Leaving a camera operating 24/7 means $(1 - 50/168) = 70.2\%$ **of the time the camera is not improving safety for students.** This degree of **inefficacy** is concerning from an engineering perspective. This suggests the cameras are installed in a manner to maximize revenue, not safety.

[From Attachment B: TES-TRP-22-06](#): *"The **motoring public would likely respect variable speed limits by time-of-day more than full time speed limit reductions because lower speed limits during school hours is both meaningful and logical.** Additionally, Regional staff speed studies in school zones already indicate that drivers are slowing down during school hours."*

Issue #4: A conflict of interest

In the reports, there is mention of various costs for signage changes yet no mention of the positive cash flow this new revenue "safety" zone will generate. Why was a balance sheet showing both cost and projected revenue not included?

The region has "voted" for a blanket solution the region will economically benefit from, in a material way, in perpetuity, at the expense of its residents. This is **a clear conflict of interest**. An independent, and non-financially motivated technical authority should have executed these studies and presented unbiased recommendations.

It is also not clear how the revenue is divided after it is collected; this is a key omission that residents deserve to know.

Issue #5: A botched rollout

There was zero direct communication, either written or electronic, (i.e. email), sent to residents affected by this change. There was zero community consultation at a local venue or public forum to share feedback. How many local residents were in favour of and against this change? Please share your data.

Most residents learned about the changes for the first time after seeing the new camera/speed limits. Based on the current online discourse, petitions, and the letters you are now receiving, it is clear the changes do not reflect the community view.

Driving towards Heidelberg, from Wagner's corners, we see 80/60/40/60/60 ends (80 starts is missing) This is confusing. Why was this rollout approved when all necessary parties and signage implements were not ready?

To recap, we have seen:

- *No data showing a local safety problem exists*
- *Opaque staff recommendations without technical justification*
- *Changes directly contradicting prior safety conclusions*
- *A predetermined solution without alternatives assessed*
- *A solution which does not serve its intended purpose 70% of the time*
- *Incomplete financial reporting with a clear conflict of interest*
- *Insufficient public consultation or notification of a wide-reaching change*
- *A speed limit (40 km/h) that does not match road design or motorist expectations*
- *Multiple accounts of an observed decrease in safety*

Sincerely,

Randy Spruyt, P.Eng
Saara Spruyt, OCT