

2026 Municipal Candidate Questionnaire

Todd Daniels | Candidate for Kelowna City Council

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

My first reason is public safety. People should feel safe in their neighbourhoods, parks and businesses. At the same time, people in crisis need real paths to treatment, recovery, housing and appropriate help. Safety and compassion are not opposites. We need both.

My second reason is responsible growth. Kelowna needs different kinds of housing at different prices, but housing cannot be planned separately from roads, water, parking, transit, schools, parks and other services. We need to build what people need - and what the city can actually support.

My third reason is accountability for public money and public decisions. Before Council spends money or approves a major project, residents deserve to know the actual problem, the full cost, the alternatives, the trade-offs and how success will be measured.

These issues are all connected. I am running because Council needs more people who understand the real-life consequences of its decisions and are willing to ask better questions before those decisions are made.

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

Yes. I believe two consecutive four-year terms should normally be enough, with three terms as the absolute lifetime maximum. Once someone has served three terms, they should not be allowed to run for that office again later.

Experience matters, but elected office should never become a permanent career. Local government needs new people, new ideas and different life experiences. Regular change helps prevent complacency and keeps elected officials accountable to the people they serve.

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

Sometimes - but it should never be the automatic choice.

Before entering any public-private partnership, residents should be able to see the real cost, who owns the asset, who carries the risk and why it is better than having the City deliver the project itself.

I am not against working with the private sector. I am against deals where a private company keeps the profit while taxpayers are left carrying the risk or covering the losses.

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 cannot honestly answer that without seeing the complete picture. Anyone who claims to know just by looking from the outside is guessing.

I would support an independent review of staffing levels, management layers, compensation and results. That does not mean blindly cutting jobs. It means making sure frontline services are properly supported, unnecessary layers are removed and taxpayers are receiving real value for their money.

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?

Yes. Residents should be involved early enough that their input can still make a difference - not after most of the decisions have already been made.

That does not mean every neighbourhood automatically gets to stop every development. It means the City listens, explains what it heard and shows what changed because of that input. If the City decides not to accept a concern, it should explain why.

Consultation should be a real conversation, not a box the City checks after the fact.

6. What are you prepared to do about open drug use, street dysfunction, crime and the loss of safety in our parks and neighbourhoods?

People should not be expected to accept open drug use, violence or severely impaired people lying unconscious in public spaces as normal. That is not compassionate for the person in crisis, and it is not fair to everyone who lives, works or raises a family nearby.

We need consistent enforcement in public spaces, but enforcement alone will not solve this. We also need stronger outreach, treatment, recovery and properly operated supportive housing with clear rules and accountability.

Housing and service providers must also be responsible for their effects on the surrounding neighbourhood. The City must keep pushing the Province for proper mental-health and addiction treatment because municipal bylaws cannot solve a health crisis by themselves.

To me, compassion means helping people who are in crisis while also protecting the safety of everyone around them. We have to do both.

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

No. I do not think every neighbourhood should be treated exactly the same.

Kelowna needs more housing choices, but the right kind of housing depends on the location, roads, infrastructure, services and character of the neighbourhood.

There are many ways to add housing, including suites, townhomes and family-friendly options. We can create more homes without automatically eliminating every detached-home neighbourhood.

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

In some cases, yes.

There can be good reasons to offer an incentive, especially if it produces something the community genuinely needs, such as attainable housing or important infrastructure. But the public should always know what is being given away and what it is receiving in return.

Developers should pay a fair share of the infrastructure their projects require. Taxpayers should not be expected to cover private development costs unless there is a clear and measurable public benefit.

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

Yes. Infrastructure should be planned and funded before - or at least alongside - major development.

We should not keep approving growth and then acting surprised when the roads, water systems, sewers and other services cannot handle it. Residents should not be left dealing with constant construction, congestion and expensive emergency upgrades because the planning was done backwards.

Before approving a major project, we should know how the necessary roads, water, sewer, emergency access, transit and other services will be provided and who will pay for them.

10. What is your position on 15-minute neighbourhoods, parking requirements and green space within developments?

Walkable neighbourhoods can be a very good thing. But we also have to deal with how people actually live - not how a planning document imagines they live.

Tradespeople carry tools. Restaurant and retail workers often work outside normal transit hours. Parents drive children. People care for family members. Seniors and people with mobility challenges may need vehicles.

I would review parking requirements based on the actual location and need. Where reliable transit and nearby employment do not exist, reducing parking and simply hoping people stop driving does not solve the problem.

Larger developments should also include useful green space wherever possible. Residents should not always be told that a park somewhere else is good enough.

The goal should be genuinely livable neighbourhoods - not forcing every neighbourhood into the same planning idea.

11. Should the City prioritize purchasing new parkland and protecting City-owned land?

Yes. As Kelowna grows, available land becomes harder to find and more expensive. If we wait until every piece of land is developed, we cannot suddenly create the parks and public spaces a growing population needs.

Before selling City-owned land, Council should consider whether it is needed for parks, housing, public facilities or another community purpose.

Not every City-owned property needs to become a park. But public land belongs to the public, and it should not be sold without a clear explanation of why that decision is in the public interest.

12. Should cultural infrastructure be concentrated downtown?

No. Downtown is important, but it is not the entire city.

People in Rutland, Glenmore, the Mission and other parts of Kelowna should also have access to music, arts, performances and community events.

I would support reviewing bylaws that unnecessarily prevent appropriate cultural spaces outside downtown. We still need to consider noise, traffic and the surrounding neighbourhood, but culture should be available throughout Kelowna.

13. Should more parking be available so all Kelowna residents can enjoy the lake and beaches?

Yes. Okanagan Lake belongs to the whole community. Access should not depend on living within walking distance or being able to afford waterfront property.

We need to protect public access and use a practical combination of parking, accessible stalls, transit, safe cycling routes and possibly seasonal shuttles.

We should improve access without paving over the beaches and green space people are trying to enjoy. It is about finding a balance that works in real life.

14. What are your thoughts regarding Resident Associations and Affiliate Agreements?

Resident Associations should be independent voices for their neighbourhoods.

An agreement with the City can establish fair rules for communication or support, but it should never be used to prevent an association from criticizing a City decision.

I do not believe people should lose their voice simply because they disagree with City Hall. Respectful disagreement is part of a healthy democracy.

15. How will you include Resident Associations in consultations affecting their communities?

Every affected Resident Association should receive early notice and access to the information in plain language. Representatives should be able to meet with the City before a plan is finalized, while there is still time to influence it.

Afterward, the City should publish what it heard, what changed and why.

People do not expect to win every argument. They do expect to be treated honestly and to know that their participation was taken seriously. Consultation only means something when the decision has not already been made.