

Subject: Fwd: Fees and Charges and Fireworks Regulation Bylaw Amendments

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

Date: 06/07/2014 7:40 PM

To: Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>

No Post. FONVCA review.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Fees and Charges and Fireworks Regulation Bylaw Amendments

Date: Sun, 06 Jul 2014 19:39:47 -0700

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

To: NVD Council <dnvcouncil@dnv.org>

CC: FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Mayor & Council:

I am not surprised that increased regulation and fees are being proposed for the Fireworks Regulation Bylaw. The very nature of these types of Bylaws is that they are progressive to the point whereby the regulations eventually become onerous enough that the activity being controlled disappears, and along with it, another small personal freedom. In the nanny state, adults just can't be trusted to act responsibly and safely.

The current permitting system for the purchase and use of fireworks on Halloween is convenient for consumers and ensures that only adults are buying them. The Fire Dept's report states that this system is "*unreliable and disadvantaged*" because the vendor is charged with issuing the permits for every fireworks purchase. The underlying implication is that the vendors cannot be trusted to sell fireworks in accordance with the permitting system, but if that is true, it's not made clear why those sales would be any more reliable by obtaining permits on-line through the District.

Another reason for the proposed Bylaw amendment is the Fire Dept's concern about the "*protection of personal information*" collected on the permit by fireworks vendors. I have purchased Halloween fireworks in the past and have never had any privacy concerns over providing my name and address on the permit application provided by the vendor. In my view the privacy argument is a red-herring, especially considering the Bylaw amendment would still require consumers "*to show permit and proof of identification to purchase fireworks from vendors.*"

The proposed amendments would also require an applicant to complete and pass a competency test before a permit will be issued. Quite frankly, this is insulting. I can purchase a potentially explosive propane tank and operate a barbecue, purchase alcohol, even buy cigarettes all without writing a test. But legal, safe, family fireworks for Halloween requires municipal oversight and a competency test before I am allowed to buy them? Even a driver's license requires passing a test just once. In contrast, if you choose to buy fireworks, this Bylaw amendment would require taking the test every year.

Finally, there is the proposed change in permit fees. It is unfortunate that the Fire Dept's report did not provide some examples of Low and High Hazard fireworks. We are left to guess. I have a suspicion, however, that the Low-Hazard type of fireworks are those such as sparklers and fountains which have very little "Ooh" and "Ahh" effect. The High Hazard type are probably the popular fireworks that most people buy on Halloween, and will now require a permit fee of \$150.00!!! I would hope this is not the case, and that all consumer class fireworks will be considered Low-Hazard, while only the professional display fireworks (that require a license) will fall under the High Hazard category.

The current fireworks permitting system works well. The proposed amendments are going to result in confusion as consumers will be turned away by fireworks vendors to go home, complete an on-line permit application and competency test, print out the permit (or go to the DNV Hall or Lynn Valley Fire Station) and then return to the vendor. It's cumbersome and unnecessary while the proposed \$150 fee for the High Hazard class fireworks is punitive.

Sincerely,

Brian Platts

Ph. 604-988-5594