

Subject: Re: Street & Traffic Bylaw

Date: Wed, 10 Nov 2004 18:31:33 +0000 (GMT)

From: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>

To: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, James Ridge <James_Ridge@dnv.org>

CC: NVD Council <dnvcouncil@dnv.org>, Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>, Brian Albinson <brianalbinson@shaw.ca>, "Cathy Adams" <cathyadams@canada.com>, FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>, cagebc@yahoo.com, Peter Thompson <bedeconsulting@shaw.ca>, Donna Howes <donna_howes@dnv.org>

10 November 2004

Brian:

Agreed - even though I also have sympathy with Mair's Axiom #1, "Let's not make perfection the enemy of some progress." [Rafe Mair has many Axiom #1s !]

In this instance, the telling comment for me was the one made, I think, by the RCMP officer, when he suggested that trying to marry the wording of a new bylaw with the, rather convoluted, wording of the 20-year old Motor Vehicle Act was not necessarily the right way to go.

So, yes, I heartily agree that the format of a "Special Meeting" on this topic might well have elicited broader support for a more straightforward and updated bylaw.

Above all else, the question has to be considered: If we cannot enforce the bylaws we have on the books already, why are we trying to add more?

In this instance, the police already have too much on their plate to be bothered trying to penalize someone dashing across the road to get a latte from Delaneys - and how many by-law officers work outside the hours Mon-Fri 8-4:30 - or thereabouts.

We have to start injecting some common sense and practicality into these issues - and education and encouragement will get us closer to where we want to be, not more sticks over our heads.

Cheers,
Liz

Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca> wrote:

Dear Mr. Ridge:

I was disappointed with a comment you made at last evening's Council meeting with respect to approving the new Street & Traffic Bylaw. You advised Council that it was better to approve the Bylaw now even though it might be only 80 percent right, rather than forever trying to make it perfect. While District staff and the relevant advisory committees have indeed spent time on the new Bylaw, this was Council's first chance to consider it and hear directly from members of the public and representatives from certain community associations. Clearly there are elements of the new Bylaw that are, and remain, problematic. Considering the previous Bylaw has existed for 20 years (and presumably the new one will last just as long) there was really no pressing hurry to approve the new Bylaw. It's not like the old one was about to expire. It is too bad that such a comprehensive Bylaw wasn't the subject of a Special Council meeting with extended public input and opportunity for questions and answers. In this instance, I see no downside to taking additional time in the attempt to resolve the contentious issues.

Sincerely,
Brian Platts