

2026 Municipal Candidate Questionnaire

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

1. Experience with a fresh perspective.

I'm young, but I'm not new to leadership. My experience in local government, agriculture, business, education, and community service gives me a practical understanding of the issues facing Kelowna, while my generation brings a fresh perspective to the council table.

2. A stronger voice for families.

Families deserve to see themselves reflected in local government. As a husband and father of three young children, I understand the pressures families face—from housing and affordability to recreation, transportation and community safety.

3. Building the Kelowna our kids can afford to call home.

I grew up here, and now I'm raising my family here. I'm running because I want my children—and the next generation—to have the opportunity to stay, build careers, raise families and call Kelowna home.

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

I would support Council developing and considering a policy around a 12-year term limit for elected members. As part of a broader approach to council transparency, accountability and expectations, I believe it is healthy to have regular conversations about leadership renewal and ensuring elected positions remain connected to the community. Experience matters, but so does bringing new perspectives to the council table. Any term-limit policy would need to be carefully considered within the legal framework governing municipal elections, with clear and consistent expectations for all elected officials.

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

I'd support a case-by-case approach to public-private contracting. The priority should be fiscal responsibility, clear accountability and delivering projects on the best possible timeline and at the best value for taxpayers. Public-private partnerships can make sense where they provide demonstrated efficiencies, specialized expertise or better value, but they should not be used simply because they are an alternative to traditional procurement. Each major project should be evaluated on its costs, risks, timelines, long-term obligations and expected public benefit. The goal should be straightforward: choose the approach that delivers the project responsibly, efficiently and with the strongest value for Kelowna taxpayers.

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?

Rather than assuming there are too many staff or managers, I would support an independent external core review of City Hall. Taxpayers deserve to know that the City is operating efficiently while still delivering the service levels residents expect. The review should examine staffing levels, management structure, duplication of services, administrative costs and opportunities to improve efficiency. The goal should not simply be reducing positions—it should be ensuring we have the right people, in the

right roles, delivering the right services at the right cost. We need an effective City Hall that provides strong value for taxpayers while maintaining the services our community depends on.

5. Should Taxpayers have more say in the development of their neighbourhoods? Has the current development process gone too far in eliminating resident's voices and concerns about developments in their neighbourhoods?

I believe the current development process has moved too far away from meaningful resident input, particularly through the increased use of the Alternative Approval Process (AAP). Residents should have a meaningful opportunity to understand and provide input on significant changes happening in their neighbourhoods. Growth is necessary, but it needs to be balanced with community engagement, infrastructure capacity and neighbourhood context. I would support stronger and earlier public engagement so residents have a chance to be heard before major decisions are finalized. Public input should not mean every project gets stopped, but residents should feel their concerns are genuinely considered as Kelowna grows.

6. Many people are disillusioned and have lost pride in our community with the current state of street dysfunction and open drug use seen in many areas of our city. What are mayoral and council candidates prepared to do about visible drug use, comatose substance users, increased crime rates, feelings of lack of personal safety especially around low-barrier and transitional housing as well as in our public parks? How do you, the candidate, propose to mitigate the negative affects in neighbourhoods where there is daily dysfunction? This is not just a Downtown problem or a business person's problem. How will you restore our resident's feelings of personal safety, enjoyment of life in their homes and neighbourhoods, and renew resident's pride in our city?

This is one of the biggest and most complicated issues facing Kelowna, with municipal, provincial and health-authority responsibilities overlapping. Locally, we need to focus on the services we can directly support: ensuring the RCMP, bylaw, fire and emergency services have the resources to respond effectively and enforce existing laws and bylaws.

We also need residents to continue reporting incidents so we have accurate data to identify patterns and advocate for action from Council and senior governments. I believe core services should be centralized where possible, connecting people with appropriate supports rather than allowing services and resources to become dispersed throughout neighbourhoods. Restoring safety requires enforcement, accountability, prevention and cooperation across all levels of government and community partners.

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

No. I want to see Kelowna continue to have strong communities, neighbourhoods and opportunities for families to own homes. Single-family housing should remain an important part of our housing mix, particularly in established neighbourhoods where there is pride of ownership and a strong sense of community and accountability. I support thoughtful housing options and responsible infill, but I don't believe growth should mean eliminating the character and stability of existing neighbourhoods. We can create more housing while still protecting the qualities that make communities desirable places to live, raise families and put down roots.

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

I believe there are times when accommodations are made for developers that may not make sense from a taxpayer perspective. At the same time, development brings capital investment, housing and economic activity to our community, and we need that investment to help move projects forward. It is a balance that should be considered on a project-by-project basis. Council should be asking what the public benefit is, what costs or risks are being shifted to taxpayers, and whether the accommodation is necessary to achieve the desired outcome. We need a transparent process that encourages responsible investment while protecting taxpayers and ensuring the community receives fair value.

9. Should infrastructure be a priority pre-development instead constantly tearing up streets and playing catch up, which seems the current protocol, considering the amount of growth that is expected in the future?

Yes. Infrastructure needs to be a priority in planning for growth, rather than constantly building first and trying to catch up afterward. Our OCPs and community plans should be viewed through an infrastructure and long-term planning lens, including roads, traffic flow, water, utilities and other essential services. Before approving significant growth, we should have a clear understanding of the infrastructure required to support it and who will ultimately pay for it. Continually tearing up streets and addressing capacity issues after development has occurred is not a sustainable path. Thoughtful planning today can reduce future costs, disruptions and pressure on taxpayers while supporting responsible growth.

10. **The 15 minute walkable urban planning concept** works well in communities which have enough employment within that community. There are many neighbourhoods in Kelowna which do not have an abundance of employment opportunities in the 15 minute bubble so workers have to travel a distance to be gainfully employed. These same workers require vehicles to travel to work with equipment and/or supplies.

- Would you prioritize making our neighbourhoods livable and enjoyable rather than building to an ideal that forces a 15 minute walkable bubble on communities?

Yes. I would prioritize livable, enjoyable neighbourhoods rather than forcing every community into a 15-minute model. Some areas need to support industrial, commercial and business functions, and that should be reflected in planning. I do see opportunities for thoughtful mixed-use development that brings small businesses and services closer to residential areas. The goal should be flexible planning that reflects the unique needs of each neighbourhood and supports both residents and local businesses.

- Would you increase the amount of vehicle parking required per development back to what it was several years ago?

I would support reviewing parking requirements as part of broader infrastructure planning. We are building for a community where many residents still rely on vehicles, without always building enough parking to match. Parking needs to be considered alongside roads, transportation capacity and future growth so we are planning for how people actually live and move through Kelowna.

- Should green space be essential within a development's foot print rather than a 15 minute walk?

Yes. Green space should be an important part of development footprints. It needs to be protected and enhanced because accessible parks and green spaces benefit communities and families and contribute to livable neighbourhoods.

11. Should the city prioritize the purchase of new park land available to all citizens, and in so doing protect vulnerable green space from being paved over and developed? Should land which is currently city owned be prioritized for green space instead of being sold to developers?

Yes. Land intended for parks and community space should be protected and used for those purposes. Where appropriate, the City should also consider acquiring vulnerable green space to preserve it for future generations. At the same time, ALR lands should be protected for agricultural use and kept productive rather than converted to other purposes.

12. Do you believe that all Cultural infrastructure should only be in the downtown core instead of shared throughout the city. Are you prepared to change the bylaws that restrict Cultural development to ONLY downtown?

No. Cultural infrastructure should be planned around where people live, work and gather—not restricted to the downtown core. I support a planning approach that recognizes the needs of individual communities and allows cultural spaces to be located where they are accessible and can best serve residents. Good planning should bring opportunities closer to people while strengthening neighbourhoods across Kelowna.

13. As things are developing more in the Pandosy–Lakeshore area, parking lots are being turned into housing developments and parking is harder to find. Residents who do not live within a few blocks of Okanagan Lake can not easily enjoy their own beaches because of lack of parking. Yet these beaches are readily available to tourists and those who can afford to live within walking distance of the lake. Should more parking be made available so *all* residents of Kelowna are able enjoy the Okanagan Lake shoreline and beaches?

Yes. Parking needs to be better accommodated in planning, particularly as we see more density along the Pandosy–Lakeshore corridor. We are building for cars while not always planning for where those cars will go. Residents should be able to access and enjoy Kelowna’s shoreline, and parking capacity needs to be considered alongside densification and infrastructure planning.

14. What are your thoughts regarding Resident Associations and Affiliate Agreements? Do you think Resident Associations should be restricted from speaking against City decisions / plans which may adversely affect a Neighbourhood?

I believe community groups and resident associations play a vital role in identifying and addressing neighbourhood concerns. They should be able to provide feedback and speak openly about City decisions that may affect their communities. Affiliate Agreements should not limit an association’s ability to raise legitimate concerns or respectfully disagree with City planning decisions. Constructive engagement and differing perspectives strengthen the planning process and help Council make better-informed decisions.

15. What efforts will you make to include all Resident Associations in any consultation process where it relates to matters affecting the health, safety and well-being of residents within their boundaries?

I aim to be an accessible councillor who actively engages with community groups and resident associations. Where decisions affect the health, safety and well-being of a neighbourhood, those voices should be part of the consultation process. Community, families and neighbourhood well-being should be core considerations in Council decision-making.