

Subject: Council Workshop - 10 Dec/2007- Alarm over proposed alarm bylaw
From: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>
Date: Mon, 10 Dec 2007 21:04:42 -0800
To: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>
CC: 'FONVCA' <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Your Worship & Members of Council,

Let me get this straight. Although alarm owners pay some \$200/yr (after insurance discount) it is proposed that DNV rid itself of the "subsidy" of about 1% of this ie. taxes of \$2/resident/year. But on the other hand we are willing to subsidize recreational users, to the tune of \$millions/year - almost 40% of their user fees. How is this fair and equitable? Arguably the former subsidy is for safety, while the latter is for health reasons. But are they not both improving the quality of our lives?

Although at first blush the required "call back" issue seems reasonable, the charging of high penalties for even the first "mistake", and "profiteering" rates for subsequent false alarms is miserly and unjust - especially to our seniors. Please leave the "no charge" for one "mistake" in place. Even ICBC allows that for its good customers.

The emphasis should be on educating people, and encouraging community involvement such as BlockWatch.

I trust that when the public has been appropriately consulted, a just, and properly proportioned bylaw, is put on the table.

Corrie Kost
2851 Colwood Dr.
N. Vancouver, V7R2R3
Tel: 604-988-6615