

**Subject:** New Security Alarm Systems Bylaw  
**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>  
**Date:** Mon, 08 Sep 2008 15:58:17 -0700  
**To:** NVD Council <dnvcouncil@dnv.org>  
**CC:** FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Mayor & Council:

For the record my home does not have a security alarm system but I am definitely opposed to this heavy-handed bylaw that targets those who do. Corrie Kost has already shown that the proposed bylaw is out-of-line with all but one other municipality in the region.. Residents should be encouraged to have a home security system because having one helps to prevent break-ins.

Fining residents for one false alarm is unnecessarily punitive. What about other false alarms, where people have phoned for the police because they believed an emergency existed when in reality there wasn't one? Will they be fined too? The arguments in favor are bogus. What exactly is the so-called cost recovery? Where is the extra expense for an on-duty constable responding to a call either legitimate or false? Fine those who are irresponsible with multiple false alarms, but allowing for one mistake a year is only fair and then, after that, look at imposing a limited fine after two. A \$150 fine for a first-time offense is excessive, however. Any initial fine should be more in-line with a parking ticket.

But what really annoys me is that this item is back in front of Council yet again but just reworked. When you wonder why citizens can't be bothered to get involved in the municipal decision-making process, might I suggest that it is because they think, "why bother?" Just when one believes an item has disappeared it comes back, again and again. This alarm bylaw is one example. The garbage bylaw, tree bylaw, bus lane on Marine Drive are other examples that are like a bad odor -- they never really go away.

Brian Platts