

1. What are your three main reasons for running for Mayor or Council?

First, I love Kelowna. I grew up here, these are the streets I biked as a kid, and I care deeply about what this city becomes as it grows. Second, I think government has an important responsibility to protect public interests. As Kelowna grows and becomes more valuable, I want to make sure that growth actually improves life for the people who live here rather than simply making the city bigger and more expensive. Third, I'm curious. My background is in engineering, and I've spent the last seven years building a small business here. Both have taught me that good solutions usually start with understanding how a system actually works and asking good questions. I'm not running because I think I already have all the answers. I'm running because I want to understand our city better, ask who our systems are working for, and help make them work better for all of us.

2. Are you in favour of limiting the number of years an individual can sit as Mayor or as a city Councillor?

I don't have a strong position on term limits at this point. I can see arguments in both directions. Long-serving councillors can accumulate valuable institutional knowledge, while regular turnover can bring new perspectives and prevent political positions from becoming careers unto themselves. I'd want to look at the evidence from other municipalities before supporting a particular limit.

3. Should major city projects be done using public/private contracting?

I don't think there's a universal answer. I'd want the City to choose whichever delivery model provides the best combination of value, accountability, quality and risk for the particular project. I'm less concerned with whether something is labelled public or private than I am with whether taxpayers are getting good value for their money, whether responsibilities and risks are clearly assigned, and whether the City can demonstrate why it chose that model.

4. Are there too many staff at City Hall? Are there too many upper level managers and directors at City Hall which taxpayers have to fund?

I don't know yet, and I don't think it would be responsible for me to claim there are too many or too few without actually looking at the organization and the work being performed. What I do strongly support is much greater visibility into what taxpayers are getting for their money. I'd like Council and the public to be able to look at departments, projects and services and ask: what are we spending, what are we getting for it, and how do we know we're getting good value? If that process reveals unnecessary management or administrative overhead, I'd absolutely support addressing it. But I'd rather find inefficiency than assume where it is.

5. Should taxpayers have more say in the development of their neighbourhoods? Has the current development process gone too far in eliminating residents' voices and concerns?

I think residents should have a meaningful voice in decisions that materially change their neighbourhoods, although that doesn't necessarily mean every development should be decided by the immediate neighbours. Kelowna has to accommodate growth and build substantially more housing, and sometimes the interests of the city as a whole will differ from the preferences of individual neighbourhoods. At the same time, consultation shouldn't just mean informing residents of a decision after all of the meaningful choices have already been made. I'd like residents to have clear opportunities to raise concerns, understand the reasoning behind decisions, and influence things like design, infrastructure, traffic, public space and how development integrates into an existing neighbourhood.

6. What are you prepared to do about visible drug use, street dysfunction, crime and feelings of personal safety?

I think we need to separate two problems that are often bundled together. Homelessness and addiction are complex long-term problems. We need housing, treatment, mental-health care, supportive services and a much better functioning system for helping people move from homelessness into stability. But residents and businesses also need to feel safe now. They shouldn't have to wait for us to solve homelessness before we address theft, vandalism, open drug use and other behaviour that harms the people around it. One immediate issue I'm particularly interested in is open drug use. I don't think addiction can be solved through enforcement, but I also don't think that means there should be no meaningful consequence for using illegal drugs openly outside businesses and in public spaces. Police already have tools available to them, including directing people to leave and, where appropriate, seizing illegal drugs. I'd like to understand how consistently those tools are being used in Kelowna and whether greater use of them could create a meaningful deterrent to open public consumption. More broadly, I want to understand where our existing system is failing. We already have RCMP, Bylaw, outreach, shelters, supportive housing and health services. If residents and businesses are still experiencing serious problems, my question is: where exactly is the machine jamming? I think compassion for vulnerable people and protecting everyone else's right to safely enjoy their neighbourhood are entirely compatible goals. We need to do both.

7. Are you in favour of the increasing elimination of single family dwellings in previously single detached housing neighbourhoods?

I wouldn't describe my position as wanting to eliminate single-family homes. I do support allowing more housing choices within existing neighbourhoods, including gentle forms of density like secondary suites, duplexes, townhomes and small multi-unit buildings where appropriate. Kelowna is growing, housing is expensive, and continuing to push most new growth farther outward creates its own infrastructure, traffic and environmental costs. I think allowing neighbourhoods to gradually accommodate more people is part of the solution. At the same time, good infill should pay attention to the existing neighbourhood, trees, infrastructure, privacy, public space and how new buildings interact with the street.

8. Do developers get too many breaks at the expense of taxpayers?

I'm very interested in this question, although I'd frame it a little differently: when development creates costs and creates value, who pays the costs and who receives the value. My general principle is that growth should pay for growth. New development creates demand for roads, water, sewer, parks, transit and other services, and I don't think those costs should simply be shifted onto existing taxpayers. I'm also interested in how much land value can be created by public decisions like rezoning and infrastructure investment, and how much of that value the public captures in return. I don't think every incentive for development is inherently a bad deal. Sometimes there may be a strong public reason to encourage a particular type of housing or development. But we should be able to clearly explain what we're giving up, what we're receiving in return, and why it's a good deal for the public.

9. Should infrastructure be a priority pre-development instead of constantly playing catch-up?

I think infrastructure and growth need to be planned together, and wherever reasonably possible infrastructure should anticipate growth rather than perpetually react to it. The City does already plan growth-related infrastructure through tools like its Official Community Plan, servicing plans and Development Cost Charges, so I don't think it's quite accurate to say there is no planning happening in advance. My broader principle is that as Kelowna grows, it should become better equipped to support the people living here. Growth should help pay for the roads, transit, water, sewer, parks and other infrastructure it requires rather than leaving existing residents perpetually paying to catch up.

10. Questions regarding 15-minute neighbourhoods, parking requirements and green space

I don't think good urban planning should be about forcing everyone to live the same way. I'd love to live in a Kelowna where many more people can walk, bike or take transit for ordinary trips, because that gives people more choices and can dramatically reduce household transportation costs. But I also own a manufacturing business. I understand perfectly well that some people carry tools, equipment or products and genuinely need vehicles. My goal isn't to eliminate cars. It's to make owning and driving one less mandatory. On parking requirements specifically, I'd want to look more closely at the evidence before advocating for a citywide increase. Different neighbourhoods and developments have very different transportation needs, and some parking requirements are now affected by provincial legislation as well. I do strongly believe green space is an essential part of building good neighbourhoods. As we add density, access to trees, parks and usable outdoor space becomes more important, not less.

11. Should the City prioritize purchasing new park land and protect City-owned land for green space?

Generally, yes. In fact, one of the ideas I'm most interested in is the City becoming more aggressive about acquiring land as Kelowna grows. Land is one of the things we're not making more of, and as Kelowna grows it becomes increasingly valuable and increasingly expensive for the public to acquire later. I'd rather see us strategically acquire important land before we desperately need it. That doesn't mean every piece of City-owned land should automatically become a park. Some may be better suited to housing, infrastructure or other public uses. But I strongly support expanding our inventory of public land and ensuring that growth comes with excellent parks, public spaces and recreational amenities that everyone can enjoy.

12. Should cultural infrastructure only be downtown, and would you change bylaws restricting cultural development to downtown?

I'd need to look into the specific bylaws and restrictions you're referring to before taking a position on changing them. In principle, though, I see no reason arts and cultural opportunities should exist exclusively downtown. As Kelowna grows, I think having interesting things to do and places to gather throughout the city is part of building great neighbourhoods.

13. Should more parking be made available so all Kelowna residents can enjoy Okanagan Lake shoreline and beaches?

I understand the concern, but I'd need to look more closely at the specific parking situation in Pandosy-Lakeshore before proposing a solution. I strongly believe the lake and our public beaches should remain genuinely accessible to the public.

Whether additional parking is the best way to accomplish that, or whether there are better combinations of parking, transit, cycling and other access improvements, is something I'd want to understand before taking a firm position.

14. What are your thoughts regarding Resident Associations and Affiliate Agreements? Should Resident Associations be restricted from speaking against City decisions or plans?

I would need to look more closely at the Affiliate Agreements and the specific restrictions you're referring to before commenting on the current policy. As a general principle, though, I would be very uncomfortable with the City providing support to a neighbourhood association on the condition that the association not criticize City decisions. If an association is representing legitimate concerns from residents, disagreement with City Hall should not by itself disqualify those concerns from being heard.

15. What efforts will you make to include all Resident Associations in consultation affecting residents within their boundaries?

I think neighbourhood associations can be a valuable part of consultation because they often have detailed knowledge of issues affecting the people who actually live there. I'd support making sure relevant associations are notified and given a meaningful opportunity to participate when major City plans or decisions directly affect their neighbourhoods. At the same time, I'd be careful not to treat an association as automatically representing every resident within its boundaries. They should be an important voice in consultation, but not the only voice.

Thanks - Brady