

How do you “weight” public input? What would be other factors when deciding on an issue and how would you communicate this when announcing your decision? For example: Changes were made in 2021 to the Ladner Village Town Centre Plan to potentially allow buildings up to 6 stories in this heritage-themed village. According to City records: 684 Delta residents spoke against this change & only 80 residents were in favor.

In general, truly weighing public input is difficult because surveys and the sample of people in those surveys can be biased. That's why it's important to vote for representatives who hold similar values as yourself. However, it's important to discuss with the community, and hear all sides of an argument.

In this specific example, I would have voted in a way that would keep the charm and feel of Ladner village. I feel strongly that Ladner continues to keep its village vibe. What drew me to Ladner was the feel that this is a town, not a city. It's a village, not a suburban sprawl, cookie cutter area where you do not interact with your neighbours.

Many residential properties in North Delta have been re-developed to become “monster homes” which extend to property lines, including below ground level basement suites, the cutting down of a substantial number of mature trees, and the paving over of the vegetation around a property. All of this negatively impacts the environmental integrity of the surrounding habitats. Please comment on how you feel this does, or does not, reconcile with the City of Delta Foundation for the Future 'Ours to Preserve - the Environment'.

My understanding is that these monster homes in fact fall within the bylaws and follow set back rules etc. I believe in strong property rights. If somebody wants to build a big house, as long as we are balancing the amount of greenery, trees, natural landscaping features, I am okay with it. I'd like to provide more property rights to owners. The opposite should be true as well, property owners should be able to build tiny homes if they'd like, and subdivide their lots, and build smaller homes. I'd be more keen on exploring striking a balance to allow property owners to utilize their lots, while diminishing their environmental footprint. Think, white roofs, instead of black ones, to reduce the risk of heat domes. Or, natural vegetation landscaping to create habitats for birds and bees, instead of maintained green grass.

Since affordable home ownership is more and more difficult for the ordinary citizens of Delta, will the candidates commit to pre-zoning, pre-approved plans, and reduced or deferred fees and deposits for homeowners who want to replace their older homes with smaller homes on smaller lots, like the Higgins' project?

Yes. I think that there are other solutions to housing affordability that we are not exploring. My goal, if elected, is to turn renters into owners. If elected, I'd be pushing for our municipality to adopt a framework that would to extend property owners' property rights. Specifically around allowing for the tokenization of real estate and/or fractional ownership. This would allow for property owners to sell part of their equity for cash, while retaining the rights to their property.

My position is that we need to be creating solutions that allow for everyone to get onto the equity ladder, and build financial stability for themselves and their families.

Considering that Canada is wanting to reduce greenhouse emissions, what is your opinion about the Liquid Natural Gas expansion at Tilbury? Also, are you comfortable with the possible fire and safety issues of the plant, considering its location in Burns Bog?

I do not know enough at this point to have a well-educated opinion on this. I am not one to demonize the hydrocarbon industry. However, it is clear that we must take actions to reduce our carbon footprint. My understanding as of today, is that liquefied natural gas has been instrumental in being a short term solution for minimizing our carbon footprint, as it has a lesser carbon footprint than other sources of gas. It also has helped in making North America's energy demands independent of other nation states, which is important in a geopolitical context. Imagine being Europe right now? And being dependent on others who do not have our best interest at heart.

My current position is that I value the public safety of our residents and the framing of my decision would be based on: Is it reasonably safe? What is the likelihood and the potential impact of a leak to our environment, our watersheds and our rivers? And at the very bottom of my decision tree, is whether or not it'll be good for "business".

I am willing to change my mind on this issue.

What are your thoughts on Delta's ICLEI membership, the UN and the World Economic Forum?

I do not have strong thoughts for or against any of these institutions. However, I do think that many institutions like these ones, are inherently centralizing. It is of their nature to attempt to centralize influence, power, and control. This type of centralization is often at odds with the interest of the individual. I believe that decentralization of control, power, and influence allows for democracy to thrive.

If a person would write to you with a concern in a handwritten letter, would you give them the courtesy of a reply?

Yes. I'd try to give them a call. It'd be a bit quicker that way.

Julien Jacques