
Letters to the Editor

Riverside Drive Extension.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

I noticed in THE TIMES the controversies in regard to the route of the proposed Riverside Drive extension. In my opinion as resident of the section the route chosen is most impractical.

The Riverdale and Spuyten Duyvil sections are residential, with many cross streets and quite a deal of commercial traffic. It is beyond me to see how it is possible to have a Riverside Drive through that section. The best part of the Inwood Hill would be destroyed, valuable land in the Bronx taken at a high price and the beauty of the present Spuyten Duyvil Hill badly marred to no advantage.

By using the eastern fringe of Inwood Park the river could be crossed at a sufficient height to cause no damage to surrounding property, then follow the old Spuyten Duyvil Road to 240th Street, cross Broadway at that point and along the Putnam Railroad to the Saw Mill River Parkway. This route would not have a single crossing and would fit in with the proposed extension of the Grand Concourse. The only land required would be the cheap section east of Riverdale Avenue between 230th and 240th Streets.

JOHN LIVA.

New York, March 23, 1935.