Miramar Drive Recommendations

By the Editor of The New York Times

I noticed in The Times the controversy in regard to the route of the proposed Miramar Drive extension. The Times editorial on March 29, 1935, expressed the opinion that the route chosen is most impractical.

The Riverwalk 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 Miramar Drive through that section.

The northern section of the Miramar Drive would be destroyed. The Riverwalk section would be the loss of a high bridge and the beauty of the present Spuyten Duyvil 200 bulk seemed to be an advantage.

By using the eastern fringe of Inwood Park the river could be crossed at a sufficient height to ease an amount of traffic, but it is a question of whether the money spent on a bridge over Spuyten Duyvil Road to 248th Street, from Broadway at that point and along the Putnam Railroad to the new 200 River Parkway. This route would not have a single crossing and would fit in with the proposed extension of the Grand Concourse. The only thing lost would be the traffic on 200

JACK LVA
New York, March 26, 1935.