

**Hau, Lucy**

**Subject:** FW: Extended Driveways - amended By-Law 2006-96

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

**From:** Hjeagle@aol.com [mailto:Hjeagle@aol.com]

**Sent:** June 27, 2006 11:24 AM

**To:** don@deersbrook.org; dcousens@markham.ca; fscarpitti@markham.ca; jheath@markham.ca; jjones@markham.ca; bodonnell@markham.ca; sdaurio@markham.ca; eshapero@markham.ca; jvirgilio@markham.ca; gmckelvey@markham.ca; jwebster@markham.ca; dhorchik@markham.ca; kusman@markham.ca; achiu@markham.ca

**Cc:** vshuttleworth@markham.ca; sbirrell@markham.ca; bwiles@markham.ca; nick@meridianplan.ca; dhinde@planpart.ca; ataylor@markham.ca; CConrad@markham.ca; jbaird@markham.ca; Paul.Fink@cbre.com; dgg.hutch@sympatico.ca; dmiller@markham.ca; sharonfortis@hotmail.com; CnKll@aol.com; jeanettea@look.ca; ranveerpersaud@hotmail.com; nrwatters@sympatico.ca; ksleung018@hotmail.com

**Subject:** Re: Extended Driveways - amended By-Law 2006-96

As a member of the Working Group, I would also like to add my personal endorsement to the Bylaw as currently proposed by Staff. I believe they have further improved the Working Group's recommendations. A good example of 1+1=3.

The proposed Bylaw (like most bylaws) is probably still imperfect. It is very difficult to construct one that deals with every current and future driveway issue. However, the planned education, communications and sensitive enforcement policy for an extended time period will allow ample opportunity for further refinements.

So the ramifications of moving forward (particularly with the amnesty) are far from onerous. **I do believe it is far more onerous to leave your constituents in the current state of ambiguity, unawareness and zero enforcement.**

**I strongly urge you to endorse the currently proposed Bylaw and lift the uncertainty.**

regards  
Harry Eaglesham