

Rutland Resident's Association Questionnaire

Answers

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

My three main reasons for running for Kelowna City Council are:

First, I want to help rebuild transparency and public trust. Residents deserve meaningful consultation, clear explanations of Council's decisions, and confidence that their concerns are being heard and considered.

Second, I want to strengthen financial accountability at City Hall. As a CPA, CA with more than 35 years of professional experience, I understand the importance of examining the facts, questioning assumptions, assessing long-term financial consequences, and ensuring taxpayers receive **value for their money**.

Third, I want to support responsible growth that protects the qualities that make Kelowna a desirable place to live. Growth must be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure, housing choices, transportation planning, parks, public amenities, and genuine consideration for established neighbourhoods.

I am running to bring an independent and constructive voice to Council—one that listens respectfully, asks difficult questions, works collaboratively, and focuses on practical solutions for the whole community.

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

Yes, I support reasonable term limits for both the Mayor and City Councillors. Term limits can encourage new perspectives, create opportunities for broader community participation, and help prevent elected positions from becoming overly entrenched.

A limit of three terms appears reasonable to me; however, I would prefer an open public discussion before determining the appropriate length. Any change should be developed transparently, informed by residents, and applied fairly to both the Mayor and Council.

3. Should major city projects be undertaken through public-private partnerships?

Public-private partnerships can be very effective when they are properly structured and serve the broader public interest.

I served on the Mayor's committee responsible for selecting an appropriate developer for what is now Prospera Place. I believe that project is a strong local example of how a public-private partnership can help meet an important community need by bringing together municipal leadership and private-sector expertise.

However, this model should not be applied automatically to every major project. Each proposal should be evaluated on its own merits, including its full lifecycle costs, allocation of risk, service quality, public accessibility, and long-term financial obligations.

I would support a public-private partnership when a transparent and competitive process demonstrates that it provides good value for taxpayers while protecting the public interest. The City must retain appropriate oversight, and the financial commitments and expected community benefits should be clearly explained to residents.

4. Are there too many staff, upper-level managers and directors at City Hall?

I understand why residents are asking whether the growth and structure of City Hall are providing good value for taxpayers. However, I do not believe it would be responsible to declare that there are either too many or too few employees without first examining the evidence.

Having served for five years on the City's audit committee, I recognize that staffing decisions should be evaluated according to the services residents require, the results being achieved, and the cost of delivering those services. Employee numbers alone do not tell us whether an organization is operating efficiently.

I would support a thorough review of the City's organizational structure, including management layers, spans of responsibility, administrative duplication, use of outside consultants, and whether staffing growth has been matched by measurable improvements in service. Kelowna's staffing levels and costs should also be compared with those of similar municipalities.

Where positions or layers of management cannot be justified, changes should be considered. At the same time, I would not support arbitrary staffing cuts that weaken essential frontline services. The objective should be a City administration that is efficient, accountable, appropriately staffed, and able to demonstrate clear value to taxpayers.

5. Should taxpayers have more say in neighbourhood development? Has the current process gone too far in eliminating residents' voices?

Yes, residents should have a meaningful voice in development decisions affecting their neighbourhoods. Consultation must begin early enough for public input to influence a proposal—not after the major decisions have effectively been made.

At the same time, consultation does not mean that every resident will agree or that neighbourhoods should have an absolute veto over change. Council must balance neighbourhood concerns with housing needs, property rights, infrastructure capacity, affordability, environmental impacts, and the interests of the city as a whole.

I am concerned whenever residents feel that consultation is simply a procedural exercise or that their participation will not affect the outcome. The City should provide clear and accessible information, explain how public feedback influenced a decision, and give reasons when Council chooses a different direction.

Responsible growth requires more than approving additional housing units. It must also consider traffic, parking, utilities, parks, schools, public safety, neighbourhood character, and quality of life. Residents often understand these local impacts better than anyone, and their knowledge should be treated as valuable evidence in the planning process. Even where provincial legislation limits the City's options, Council should pursue every reasonable opportunity for early, respectful and transparent community engagement.

6. How would you address visible drug use, street disorder, crime, neighbourhood impacts and residents' loss of safety and community pride?

The concern expressed in this question is real. Residents should be able to use parks, sidewalks, transit areas and other public spaces without encountering open drug use, threatening behaviour or persistent disorder. Compassion for people experiencing addiction or homelessness does not require us to accept unsafe public spaces or disregard the effects on surrounding residents and businesses.

As a Downtown resident, I see these challenges firsthand. However, as a former Rutland resident and business owner, I also understand that this is not simply a Downtown problem. Street disorder, addiction, crime and their effects on quality of life are being experienced in neighbourhoods throughout Kelowna.

We need a balanced response that combines compassion and access to treatment with clear expectations and effective enforcement. Open drug use, violence, theft and threatening behaviour must be addressed consistently. Police, bylaw officers and other frontline personnel need appropriate resources, coordination and clear direction, with public safety remaining a core municipal responsibility.

Enforcement alone will not resolve addiction, mental illness or homelessness. The City must work more assertively with the Province to expand timely access to detoxification, treatment, recovery-oriented programs and appropriate mental-health care. In serious situations where individuals present a danger to themselves or others and are incapable of making safe decisions, I support carefully regulated involuntary care with proper medical oversight and legal safeguards.

I do not support “wet facilities” as the basis for low-barrier or transitional housing. Housing should be connected to treatment, recovery, personal responsibility and a realistic path toward greater stability and independence. Facilities must also be responsibly located and operated, with service providers accountable for security, property management, neighbourhood impacts and prompt responses to concerns. We should avoid concentrating too many facilities and services in any one neighbourhood.

I would support neighbourhood-specific safety plans, regular communication with residents and businesses, and public reporting on outcomes such as crime, emergency calls and recurring complaints. Restoring public confidence will require coordinated action, measurable results and a willingness to acknowledge when current approaches are not working. Every Kelowna neighbourhood deserves to be safe, welcoming and treated with respect.

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

No, I do not support the blanket elimination of single-family homes or the assumption that every established neighbourhood should be transformed in the same way.

Kelowna needs more housing choices, including townhouses, secondary suites, carriage homes and other forms of appropriately scaled housing. However, increasing density must be done thoughtfully. Neighbourhood character, infrastructure capacity, traffic, parking, mature trees, green space and the concerns of affected residents must all be considered.

Single-family homes remain an important option for families, seniors and others who prefer that form of living. Responsible growth should expand people’s housing choices, not simply remove one option in favour of another.

Proposed changes affecting established areas, such as the Abbott Street corridor, require far more meaningful consultation with the people who live there. Consultation must occur early enough for residents’ knowledge and concerns to influence the outcome—not after the direction has effectively been decided.

Where additional density is appropriate, it should be planned primarily around urban centres, major transportation corridors and areas with sufficient existing or funded infrastructure. Changes within established neighbourhoods should be gradual, well-designed and supported by genuine public engagement.

The City must comply with provincial requirements, but Council should still use the authority available to protect livability, encourage good design and ensure infrastructure and neighbourhood amenities keep pace with growth. Housing supply is important, but the number of units approved cannot be the only measure of success.

8. Do developers receive too many breaks at taxpayers’ expense?

I do not believe it is fair to make a blanket statement that developers receive too many breaks. Development is necessary to provide housing and commercial space, and there may be circumstances where targeted incentives help achieve an important public objective.

However, any financial incentive, fee reduction, density benefit or other concession should produce a clear and measurable benefit for the community. Where an incentive is intended to improve housing affordability, the resulting savings should be tied directly to genuinely affordable units—not simply increase the profitability of the development. These commitments should be transparent, enforceable and monitored over time.

I am also concerned that Council has approved too many variances allowing developments to provide less parking than would otherwise be required. While lower parking requirements may be appropriate in limited circumstances—particularly where reliable transportation alternatives exist—the practical needs of residents and surrounding neighbourhoods must be recognized. Many people still require vehicles for employment, family responsibilities or mobility.

When developments do not provide adequate parking, the problem does not disappear; it is transferred to nearby streets, businesses and existing residents. Parking reductions should therefore be supported by credible evidence and considered alongside transit availability, neighbourhood conditions and the cumulative effects of nearby developments.

9. Should infrastructure be in place before development rather than continually playing catch-up?

Yes. Infrastructure planning must be a fundamental part of responsible growth. The City estimates that Kelowna will require approximately 45,000 new housing units between 2021 and 2041 to accommodate population growth and existing unmet need. With 2041 now only 15 years away, infrastructure planning must be proactive, coordinated and adequately funded.

Development should not be approved without a clear understanding of whether roads, water, sewer, drainage, transit, emergency services, parks and other public amenities can support it. This does not mean every infrastructure project must be completed before the first building permit is issued. However, the required improvements should be identified, funded and scheduled, with clear triggers connecting each phase of development to the infrastructure it requires.

The City should also coordinate road, utility and development work more effectively so that the same streets are not repeatedly torn up for projects that could have been planned together. Better long-term coordination would reduce disruption and protect taxpayers from avoidable costs.

New development should pay a fair share of the infrastructure costs it creates. At the same time, existing infrastructure deficiencies should not be placed entirely on new homebuyers. The City must distinguish between costs generated by new growth and the cost of replacing or upgrading infrastructure that already serves the broader community.

Kelowna will continue to grow. The question is whether that growth will be planned responsibly. I support directing more development toward areas with sufficient existing infrastructure and ensuring that additional capacity is properly planned and financed before substantial new growth is approved.

10. How should the City balance walkable-neighbourhood planning with employment realities, parking needs and green space?

I support creating neighbourhoods where residents can conveniently reach shops, services, parks and other daily needs. However, the 15-minute-neighbourhood concept should be a planning objective, not a rigid formula imposed on every part of Kelowna.

Many residents cannot work within walking or cycling distance of their homes. Tradespeople, healthcare workers, service employees and others may travel across the city, work outside regular transit hours, or carry tools, equipment and supplies. Vehicles will remain necessary for many households, and planning decisions must reflect that reality.

I would prioritize making neighbourhoods complete, livable and enjoyable while improving walking, cycling and transit options wherever practical. The objective should be to give residents more transportation choices—not to design communities around an assumption that most people can give up their vehicles.

I am concerned that Council has approved too many reductions in parking requirements. I would support reviewing the City's current standards and restoring higher parking requirements where experience shows that reductions have pushed vehicles onto nearby streets. Parking needs should be assessed according to the location, housing type, household composition, transit service and actual conditions in the surrounding neighbourhood. A single standard may not suit every development, but reductions should require credible evidence rather than optimistic assumptions about future behaviour.

Green space should also be an essential consideration within larger developments. Access to a park within a 15-minute walk is valuable, but it is not always an adequate substitute for usable green space, trees and outdoor gathering areas within or immediately adjacent to a development. As density increases, the need for accessible green space becomes more—not less—important.

Good planning should respond to how people actually live and work. It should improve transportation choices, provide realistic parking, protect green space and create neighbourhoods that remain livable as Kelowna grows.

11. Should the City prioritize acquiring new parkland and protect City-owned green space from development?

Yes. As Kelowna grows and becomes more densely populated, the City must make the acquisition and protection of parkland a higher priority. Parks, natural areas, mature trees and

public green spaces are essential infrastructure. They support recreation, health, climate resilience and the overall livability of our neighbourhoods.

The City should identify areas where population growth will create shortages of parks and public gathering spaces, then acquire land before rising property values make those opportunities unaffordable. Particular attention should be given to protecting environmentally sensitive areas, wildlife corridors, mature tree canopies and public access to the lake.

However, I would not adopt an absolute rule that no City-owned land should ever be sold or used for another public purpose. Some properties may be poorly located or unsuitable for parks, while others could help provide affordable housing, community facilities or essential infrastructure.

Before selling or developing City-owned land, Council should undertake a transparent evaluation of its environmental, recreational, financial and community value. Residents should be consulted when the property serves, or could potentially serve, an important neighbourhood purpose. Any sale should produce a clear and demonstrable public benefit.

City-owned green space should not be treated simply as surplus real estate. Once a valuable natural area or potential park site is lost to development, it may be impossible or prohibitively expensive to replace. Protecting and expanding public green space must therefore be part of Kelowna's long-term growth strategy.

12. Should cultural infrastructure be concentrated in Downtown, and should the bylaws restricting cultural development be changed?

No. I do not believe cultural infrastructure should be limited exclusively to Downtown. Downtown will remain an important cultural centre, but residents throughout Kelowna should have reasonable access to arts, cultural and community spaces.

I support locating additional cultural facilities within Kelowna's recognized town and urban-centre business districts, including Rutland and other growing areas. These locations already serve as community gathering places and are generally better positioned to support restaurants, shops, transit and other complementary activity. Cultural facilities can strengthen these business districts, create more vibrant public spaces and bring economic benefits to different parts of the city.

I would support reviewing any bylaws or policies that unnecessarily prevent appropriate cultural development outside the Downtown core. However, cultural facilities should be located strategically rather than dispersed without a broader plan. Decisions should consider accessibility, transportation, parking, surrounding land uses, financial sustainability and the needs of local residents and cultural organizations.

Kelowna should maintain a strong Downtown cultural district while also encouraging well-planned cultural hubs in other town centres. Culture belongs to the entire community, and our planning framework should reflect that.

13. Should more parking be provided so all Kelowna residents can access the shoreline and public beaches?

Public beaches and the Okanagan Lake shoreline should be accessible to residents from every part of Kelowna—not only those who live within walking distance. As parking lots in the Pandosy–Lakeshore area are redeveloped, the City must consider the cumulative effect on public access.

I support maintaining an appropriate amount of public parking near beaches and exploring opportunities to add parking where it can be done responsibly. This is particularly important for seniors, families with young children, people with disabilities and residents carrying recreational equipment. Accessible parking spaces must be protected and conveniently located.

However, increasing access should not mean paving over parks or valuable waterfront green space. The City should use a combination of measures, including better use of existing parking, shared-parking arrangements, improved signage, time limits that encourage turnover, seasonal transit or shuttle service, and safe walking and cycling connections.

New developments in the area should provide sufficient parking for their own residents and visitors so their needs are not transferred onto nearby streets or public beach parking.

Okanagan Lake is one of Kelowna's greatest public assets. Planning decisions should protect fair and practical access to the shoreline for all residents while preserving the parks and natural spaces people come to enjoy.

14. What are your thoughts regarding resident associations and affiliate agreements? Should resident associations be restricted from speaking against City decisions or plans?

Resident associations are essential partners in building strong, informed and engaged communities. Much like Business Improvement Areas, they provide an organized forum through which residents can identify concerns, share local knowledge and communicate constructively with City Council and staff.

I do not believe resident associations should be restricted from respectfully speaking against City decisions or plans that they believe may adversely affect their neighbourhoods. An affiliate agreement should establish expectations for responsible governance, accountability and respectful conduct—not require agreement with the City.

Constructive criticism is part of a healthy democratic process. Resident associations should be free to question proposals, recommend alternatives and advocate for their communities without

fearing that their relationship with the City will be jeopardized. The City should respond to their concerns openly and explain how their input was considered, even when Council ultimately makes a different decision.

Resident associations do not speak for every individual within a neighbourhood, so the City should continue to consult the broader public as well. However, these associations provide valuable local knowledge and continuity that should be respected.

I would support affiliate agreements that strengthen communication, clarify responsibilities and encourage meaningful engagement while fully protecting each association's independence and right to advocate for its neighbourhood.

15. What efforts will you make to include all resident associations in consultations affecting residents' health, safety and well-being?

I would support a formal and consistent process requiring the City to notify and engage all affected resident associations early in any proposal that may materially affect neighbourhood health, safety or well-being. Consultation must begin while options are still open and public input can genuinely influence the outcome.

The City should maintain an up-to-date contact list for resident associations and provide clear, timely information about proposed developments, infrastructure projects, public-safety initiatives, housing facilities and changes to parks or community services. Information should be written in plain language and include the potential neighbourhood impacts, relevant supporting reports and opportunities to participate.

I would also support:

- Regular meetings between City representatives and resident associations.
- A designated City contact to help associations navigate municipal processes.
- Reasonable response periods before major decisions are made.
- Opportunities for both written submissions and direct presentations.
- Public summaries explaining the feedback received and how it influenced the decision.
- Follow-up communication after implementation to identify and address unintended consequences.

Consultation does not mean that every association will receive its preferred outcome, but it does mean that its concerns must be heard, carefully considered and respectfully answered.

Resident associations possess valuable knowledge about the communities they serve. Including them consistently will lead to better decisions, identify problems earlier and help rebuild trust between residents and City Hall.

