VILLAGE OF PORT ALICE
COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA
TO BE HELD WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 10, 2025, at 6:00 pm
AT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, VILLAGE OFFICE

Port Alice
Gateway to the Wild West Coast

(1) CALL TO ORDER

We are privileged to acknowledge that this meeting is being held on the traditional territory of the Quatsino First Nations.

(3) ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

THAT the Agenda for the Meeting of the Village of Port Alice for December 10, 2025, be approved; AND THAT all delegations, reports, correspondence, and other information set to the agenda be received.

(4) DELEGATIONS:

a.) Kerry Ansel re Kayak Dock concerns

(5) MINUTES:

Pg 3-4 **a.)** ***THAT*** *the Minutes from the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 26, 2025, be approved.*

(6) COMMUNICATIONS:

Pg 5-9 **a.)** MIABC Feedback on Bill M216 – 2025 Professional Reliance Act
November 27, 2025, Response Letter re Bill M216

(7) REPORTS:

(8) BYLAWS:

Pg 11-12 **a.)** Borrowing Bylaw 694

Recommendation:
THAT Borrowing Bylaw 700 be given fourth reading and adoption.

(9) QUESTION PERIOD:

(10) ADJOURNMENT:

THAT the meeting of the Village of Port Alice Council held December 10, 2025, be adjourned

INFORMATION ITEMS:

a.) November 25, 2025, Letter re Draft Professional Reliance Act Bill - Radium Hot Springs

b.) November 29, 2025, Letter re Bill M216 Professional Reliance Act – District of Central

c.) December 3, 2025, Letter re Bill M216 – 2025 Professional Reliance Act – City of Quesnel

d.) December 4, 2025, Letter re Judicial Review of Provincial Housing Laws – Bills 44, 47, 13, 15, and M216 – Town of View Royal

VILLAGE OF PORT ALICE COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2025
AT COUNCIL CHAMBERS, VILLAGE OFFICE

Port Alice
Gateway to the Wild West Coast

Present
Mayor Kevin Cameron
Councillor Holly Aldis
Councillor David Stewart
Councillor Russell Murray
Councillor Sean Watson

Absent

Staff
Bonnie Danyk, CAO/CFO
Ryan Nicholson, Economic Development Officer
Tanya Spafford, Admin Assistant

Call to order 6:00pm

94/25 Adoption of Agenda

ADOPTION OF AGENDA:
Moved, Seconded and CARRIED
THAT the Agenda for the Meeting of the Village of Port Alice for November 26, 2025, be approved with the moving of the Arena Condition Assessment being moved to Delegations to invite the author to answer questions, AND THAT all delegations, reports, correspondence, and other information set to the agenda be received.

DELEGATION:
Doug Bondue Arena Condition Assessment – *on Table and online*
November 5, 2025, Report from Michael Lemon

95/25 Minutes of November 12, 2025, Regular Meeting

MINUTES:

Moved, Seconded and CARRIED
THAT *the Minutes from the Council Meeting of November 12, 2025, be approved.*

COMMUNICATIONS:
Acknowledgement of Donation Letter
November 6, 2025, Letter from Jay Hartling, BHP Group

Trees on Crown Land near Port Alice Clinic follow-up
November 13, 2025, Letter from Lesly Deuchar, Island Health

96/25 PA Clinic Trees

THAT a letter be sent requesting that the Danger Tree Assessment be forwarded to the Village.

REPORTS:
Link River Review
November 14, 2025, Report from Ryan Nicholson, Economic Development Officer

97/25 Resolution for RDMW and RD Hospital Boards

Summary of Revenue & Expenses for September & October 2025
November 20, 2025, Report from Bonnie Danyk, CAO/CFO

Accounts Payable Listing for September & October 2025
November 20, 2025, Report from Bonnie Danyk, CAO/CFO

98/25 2026 Committee and Bard Appt

2026 Committee and Board Appointments

November 22, 2025, Report from Mayor Kevin Cameron

Moved, Seconded and CARRIED

THAT Committee and Board appointments be accepted as presented

99/25 2026 Regular Mtg Dates

2026 Council Regular Meeting Dates

Moved, Seconded and CARRIED

THAT Regular Council Meeting Dates be accepted as presented

100/25 2026 Committee Mtg dates

2026 Committee Meeting Dates

Moved, Seconded and CARRIED

THAT Committee Meeting Dates be accepted as presented

BYLAWS:

Borrowing Bylaw 700

101/25 Bylaw 700 Borrowing Bylaw

Moved, Seconded and CARRIED

THAT Borrowing Bylaw 700 be given first, second, and third reading

QUESTION PERIOD:

102/25 Resolution to Proceed to Closed Mtg

RESOLUTION TO PROCEED TO CLOSED MEETING - 6:58pm

THAT the meeting be closed to the public to consider matters pursuant to the following sections of the Community Charter:

Section 90 (k)negotiations and related discussions respecting the proposed provision of a municipal service that are at their preliminary stages and that, in the view of the council, could reasonably be expected to harm the interests of the municipality if they were held in public;

RECONVENE 7:10pm

ADJOURNMENT: 7:11 pm

103/25 Adjournment

Moved, Seconded and CARRIED

THAT *the Regular meeting of the Village of Port Alice held November 26, 2025, be adjourned at 7:11 pm.*

I hereby certify the preceding to be a true and correct account of the Regular meeting of the Village of Port Alice Council held November 26, 2025.

Mayor

Chief Administrative Officer

Municipal Insurance
Association of British Columbia

200 - 429 West 2nd Ave.
Vancouver, BC V5Y 1E3
Toll-Free: 1-855-683-6266
E-mail: AskUsAnything@miabc.org

miabc.org

MUNICIPAL INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

November 27, 2025

The Honourable David Eby
The Honourable Christine Boyle, Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs
MLA George Anderson
Amna Shah, Chair, Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills
Trevor Halford, Deputy Chair, Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills

Dear Premier Eby, Minister Boyle, Mr. Anderson, Ms. Shah, and Mr. Halford:

Re: Feedback on Bill M 216 – 2025 Professional Reliance Act

We write on behalf of the Board of Directors and executive leadership of the Municipal Insurance Association of British Columbia (the "MIABC") in response to your invitation to provide feedback on Bill M 216 - 2025 Professional Reliance Act ("Bill M 216"). While the MIABC does not typically engage in lobbying on behalf of local governments, we do hold a unique vantage point from which we provide the following feedback. We insure 90% of the municipalities and regional districts in British Columbia, and we have extensive experience assessing how legislative changes affect local governments' civil liability, risk exposure, and insurance outcomes. It is in that context that we offer the following observations and concerns.

Scope and Intent of the Bill

Bill M 216 appears to pursue a narrow objective of reducing perceived duplication in local government oversight of new construction. Based on MLA Anderson's first reading remarks, the Bill aims to prevent local governments from conducting second reviews of submissions prepared by professionals regulated under the *Professional Governance Act*, SBC 2018, c. 47 ("PGA professionals"). The intended effect is to give precedence to PGA professionals' submissions over local government review.

However, Bill M 216 contains significant ambiguity. The legislation does not clearly define its scope, and the only direction provided relates to the definition of "submission." It is unclear whether Bill M 216 is intended to apply solely to development permits or also to building

permits. MLA Anderson's briefing materials suggest an intent to include building permit approvals, yet the statutory language does not make this explicit.

Local government review of new construction is discretionary. If a local government chooses to undertake a review, Bill M 216 would render that review largely meaningless. Under the Bill, a local government could only reject a certified submission by filing a complaint with the Superintendent of Professional Governance. This shifts local governments into an unsuitable role. They would be expected to act as *de facto* competency assessors of PGA professionals, despite not being mandated or equipped to carry out such a function.

Bylaw Compliance and Practical Consequences

Section 2 of Bill M 216 requires that a local government must accept as meeting permit or bylaw requirements any submission certified by a PGA professional. This requirement assumes that PGA professionals possess detailed knowledge of the local bylaws that apply to land use and construction. Local government bylaws are complex, extensive, and unique to each jurisdiction. Proficiency in municipal bylaw interpretation is not a competency promoted or required under the *Professional Governance Act*.

A PGA professional working in a new jurisdiction will rarely be familiar with the full range of relevant bylaws. Many local governments have dozens of bylaws, each with provisions that affect land use, servicing, parking, subdivision, and building matters. Even experienced municipal staff require time and training to develop adequate bylaw fluency.

Local governments routinely receive submissions that are not fully compliant. Municipal approval is often an iterative process supported by pre-application meetings that reduce delays and improve the quality of submissions. If Bill M 216 prevents local governments from rejecting non-compliant plans at the permit stage, the consequence will be the construction of buildings and infrastructure that do not comply with municipal bylaws.

The implications of the above noted issues are substantial. If a building official identifies non-compliant elements in a certified set of plans, Bill M 216 would prevent the municipality from refusing the permit. Months later, during final inspection, the building official must reject the completed work if it violates bylaw requirements. The builder would then face significant costs to remove and redo the work which costs could have been avoided had the initial review been allowed to proceed as intended.

Peer Reviews and Public Safety

It is also important to address the matter of peer reviews. It is rare for a local government to request a peer review based solely on submissions from an engineer. In our experience, peer reviews are almost always mandated only when a project has gone seriously off-track during construction and significant public safety concerns have emerged. Two of the largest claims ever handled by the MIABC involved construction based on designs of PGA professionals which led to disastrous stability issues. In both cases, the local government required a peer review to restore confidence from a life and safety perspective. One claim resulted in several property owners being required to abandon their one-million-dollar homes. The other resulted in the abandonment and projected demolition of a recently constructed social housing building that had been home to many vulnerable residents.

In our experience, local governments do not order a peer review in the absence of clear and serious safety concerns. A mandated peer review is a significant and unusual step that local governments do not take lightly. It is typically taken only after the local government has obtained legal advice. We also cannot recall a situation where a mandated peer review did not result in significant changes to the project design.

We agree that any order for a peer review should be accompanied by a report to the superintendent appointed under the *Professional Governance Act*. However, neither the public nor the developer is well served by delaying the peer review until after the superintendent has completed a review and made a determination. Local governments need the ability to require a peer review promptly when safety issues surface, to protect residents, mitigate risk, and prevent further harm.

Civil Liability and Insurance Considerations

Section 8 of Bill M 216 appears to limit local government liability, but the protection is narrow and ambiguous. British Columbia courts have consistently expanded local governments' duties and standards of care in matters relating to building safety, inspections, and approvals. It is unclear whether section 8 would apply to duties to warn, to building inspections, or to other operational decisions. This ambiguity leaves room for litigation to proceed in circumstances the legislature may not have intended.

Shifting liability to PGA professionals offers limited protection for additional reasons. Most carry modest limits of liability insurance written on a "claims made" basis. This type of policy provides coverage only if the professional has an active policy when the claim is discovered and reported, which could be many years after the error was made. This structure differs from

"occurrence based" insurance, which responds as long as the policy was in place at the time the work was performed. Claims made coverage is significantly more restrictive for long-tail risks such as construction defects. Many building deficiencies, especially those involving foundations, structural elements, or building envelopes, develop slowly and may not become evident for five, ten, or even fifteen years.

By the time the defect becomes known, several things may have occurred. The professional may have changed insurers, reduced the scope of their insurance, retired or left practice, or allowed their coverage to lapse entirely. They may no longer carry insurance at all. Even if they remain insured, the policy terms might not respond to a claim arising from work completed many years earlier. Once the insurance has lapsed or changed, the original project is no longer protected.

In these situations, injured parties will often seek recovery from local governments, which are viewed by courts as stable, well-resourced defendants with ongoing duties related to building safety. Given the ambiguity in section 8, courts may be inclined to allow claims to proceed against local governments, especially where evidence shows the local government became aware of a deficiency but was prevented from acting by statute.

Conclusion

Our overarching concern is that Bill M 216 restricts local governments from addressing bylaw compliance issues at the start of a project while leaving open the possibility of local government liability for deficiencies discovered after construction. Many of the bylaws at issue relate to life and safety matters. Following a serious incident, neither the courts nor the public will be comforted by an explanation that the local government knew of a deficiency but was prevented from acting by the proposed legislation.

We respectfully submit that Bill M 216 as currently drafted, is too broad, too vague, and too likely to create unintended consequences for builders, local governments, and the public they serve. We encourage further consultation with local governments, building officials, and professional regulatory bodies to ensure a legislative approach that reduces duplication while preserving essential safeguards.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We would be pleased to discuss these concerns further.

Sincerely,

Stuart Horn
Chair, Board of Directors
Municipal Insurance Association of British Columbia

Megan Chorlton
Chief Executive Officer
Municipal Insurance Association of British Columbia

VILLAGE OF PORT ALICE
BYLAW NO. 700

BORROWING BYLAW

WHEREAS the Council for the Village of Port Alice deems it necessary to borrow the sum of Thirty Thousand Dollars ($30,000.00).

The Council of the Village of Port Alice enacts as follows:

BE IT THEREFORE ENACTED as a Bylaw of the Village of Port Alice as follows:

1. The Mayor, Councillors, CAO, CFO, and the Administrative Assistant are hereby authorized to borrow on behalf of the Village of Port Alice from the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (the "Bank") from time to time by way of promissory note a sum or sums not exceeding at any one time Thirty Thousand Dollars ($30,000.00).

2. The Mayor, Councillors, CAO, CFO, and the Administrative Assistant are hereby authorized to sign on behalf of the Village of Port Alice and to furnish to the Bank from time to time a promissory note or notes sealed with the corporate seal for the sum or sums so borrowed with interest at such rate as the Bank may from time to time determine.

3. The Mayor, Councillors, CAO , CFO, and the Administrative Assistant are hereby authorized to sign on behalf of the Village of Port Alice and to furnish to the Bank an Agreement or Agreements under the seal of the Village of Port Alice providing for payment to the Bank of all amount required to be paid by the Bank pursuant to each promissory note of the Village of Port Alice guaranteed by the Bank with interest at such rate as the Bank may from time to time determine and of a guarantee fee in respect of each such promissory note at such rate as the Bank may from time to time determine.

4. The Mayor, Councillors, CAO , CFO, and the Administrative Assistant are hereby authorized and directed to furnish to the Bank at the time of each borrowing and at such other times as the Bank may from time to time request, a statement showing the nature and amount of the estimated revenues of the current year not yet collected or where the estimates for the year have not been adopted, a statement showing the nature and amount of the estimated revenues of the Village of Port Alice as set forth in the estimates adopted for the next preceding year and also showing the total of any amounts borrowed in the current year and in any preceding year that have not been repaid.

5. The Mayor, Councillors, CAO, CFO, and the Administrative Assistant are hereby authorized and directed to apply in payment of all sums borrowed from the Bank, with interest thereon, all of the moneys hereafter collected or received on account or realized in respect of the taxes levied for the current year and for any preceding years and all of the moneys collected or received from any other source.

Read a first time on the 26th day of November 2025.
Read a second time on the 26th day of November 2025.
Read a third time on the 26th day of November 2025.

Adopted on the 10th day of December 2025.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

MAYOR

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of Bylaw No.700, 2026 of the Village of Port Alice in the Province of British Columbia duly passed at a meeting of Council of the said Village of Port Alice duly held on the 10th day of December, 2025, that the said By-Law is under the seal of the Village of Port Alice and signed by its proper officers as required by law and that the said By-Law is in full force and effect.

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

Port Alice

Gateway to the Wild West Coast

INFORMATION ITEMS

VILLAGE OF radium hot springs

November 25th, 2025

At the November 24th, 2025 Regular Council Meeting, the following resolution was adopted by Council:

Resolution #2025-175

THAT the Village of Radium Hot Springs Council resolve to oppose the provincial draft Professional Reliance Act bill (M216).

Certified a true copy of Resolution #2025-175 this 25th day of November, 2025.

Jill Logan
Corporate Officer
Village of Radium Hot Springs

VILLAGE OF radium hot springs

The Village of Radium Hot Springs

Report to Council

Meeting Type and Date:	**Regular Council Meeting – November 24, 2025**
Written by:	**Adrian Bergles, CAO**
Reviewed and Approved by CAO:	**N/A**
Subject:	**Suggested Village of Radium Hot Springs opposition to draft *Professional Reliance Act* bill (M216) and consultation period response**
Recommendation:	**That the Village of Radium Hot Springs Council resolve to oppose the provincial draft *Professional Reliance Act* bill (M216)**

Request for Decision X **Department Report** ☐ **Information Report** ☐

Implications of Recommendation:

Asset Management:	**Y**
Financial:	**Y**
OCP:	**Y**
Policy:	**Y**
Strategic Plan:	**Y**

SUMMARY INFORMATION

Recently the provincial NDP government has tabled a draft *Professional Reliance Act* bill (M216).

The draft legislation, which has received two readings and is open for public comment is intended to streamline development approvals in BC. Fundamentally it would end municipalities' – like the Village of Radium Hot Springs – ability to have planning documents prepared by licensed professionals undergo third party, peer review, which is fundamental to current processes.

This is seen as a method of speeding up development approvals, but it may have the opposite effect.

Groups like the Union of BC Municipalities, the Planning Institute of BC, and other professional organizations are either coming out in opposition to this proposed legislation, or are stating serious concerns with it.

Some of those concerns are:

- Deregulation of local government approvals via inability to provide peer review which routinely identifies deficiencies, leaving municipalities and taxpayers potentially on the hook to pay for reconstruction of something that could have been easily caught

- Slowing of development approvals, and introduction of uncertainties, as any deficiencies noted would have to be reported to the Office of the Superintendent for Professional Guidance

- Lack of innovation – local governments are currently empowered to employ professional reliance in instances that support community goals

- Creation of the draft bill in a vacuum – the bill lacks real-world ground truthing and nuance, unintended consequences are likely

- Part of a broader pattern of provincial overreach, building on provincial housing legislation that removes planning approval from municipalities

- Institutionalizing conflict of interest by which professionals hired by developers approve the projects by which they earn their income

- Erosion of municipal self-determination

- Centralization without affordability – removal of democratic checks does not guarantee affordability. On the contrary, it risks handing over unprecedented control to private actors and provincially appointed officials

- Inconsistency with professional programs already being implemented by local governments to streamline development processes

- The scope of bill (M216) is unnecessarily broad

At the very least, many of these groups request that the public comment period be extended beyond the beginning of December.

This is a significant piece of draft legislation, with far reaching and likely unintended consequences, some of which are likely to be negative.

Staff of the Village of Radium Hot Springs asks Council to consider the resolution to oppose this legislation. If this resolution is adopted, staff will forward this information and a corresponding letter to the provincial consultation portal which has been created to receive comments on the draft legislation.

Options for Council:

1) Adopt the resolution as presented (recommended)
2) Suggest changes to the resolution
3) Table and do not adopt the resolution

Respectfully submitted:

Adrian Bergles,

Chief Administrative Officer

The Corporation of the
District of Central Saanich

November 28th, 2025

Honourable David Eby
Premier of British Columbia

Honourable Christine Boyle
Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs

Honourable Lana Popham
Member of the Legislative Assembly, Saanich South

Honourable Rob Botterell
Member of the Legislative Assembly, Saanich North & the Islands

Subject: Bill M216 *Professional Reliance Act* – District of Central Saanich Comments

On behalf of the District of Central Saanich, following a motion passed by Council on November 24th, 2025, I am writing to express our strong opposition to Bill M216, the *Professional Reliance Act*. While we recognize the Province's commitment to addressing housing supply challenges, this legislation represents a significant overreach into municipal jurisdiction and undermines the democratic principles that guide local governance.

It appears to us that Bill M216 would erode the decision-making authority of locally elected councils, who are directly accountable to their communities and best positioned to address local needs. It also threatens to bypass the professional expertise of municipal planners and staff, whose knowledge of local context is essential for responsible and sustainable development.

Central Saanich has already met both provincially mandated and locally established housing targets, demonstrating that municipalities can effectively deliver housing solutions without sweeping provincial intervention. A one-size-fits-all approach disregards community diversity and penalizes municipalities that have acted responsibly.

Further, Bill M216 introduces risks to public interest by limiting municipal oversight of technical submissions and creating uncertainty through a dispute resolution process that relies on the Office of the Superintendent of Professional Governance—an entity without the mandate or capacity to adjudicate local planning matters.

We urge the Province to pause Bill M216 and engage in meaningful consultation with local governments and professional organizations before proceeding. Respecting municipal authority and democratic processes is critical to achieving housing goals while safeguarding public trust.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to working collaboratively to advance housing solutions that respect local autonomy.

Sincerely,

Mayor Ryan Windsor

cc: Christine Culham, Chief Administrative Officer
Jarret Matanowitsch, Director of Planning, Building and Bylaw Services
BC Municipalities & Regional Districts

CITY OF Quesnel

Office of Mayor Ron Paull

December 3, 2025

Via email: HMA.Minister@gov.bc.ca

The Honourable Christine Boyle
Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C. V8V 1X4

Re: Bill M 216 – 2025 Professional Reliance Act

Dear Minister Boyle;

I am writing to reinforce concerns other municipalities have raised about Bill M 216 – 2025 *Professional Reliance Act,* and to add additional ones that are contextual to rural and northern communities.

Allow me to express our ongoing support for the Province of B.C.'s efforts to modernize legislation that facilitates the timely development of housing in communities throughout British Columbia. The City of Quesnel has been a proactive collaborator to enable new housing development to occur throughout the city. In addition to the timely completion of our Housing Needs Assessment, the City was also the first municipality in the province to adopt policy to enable the construction of accessory dwelling units, including making available design plans, and has effectively utilized its Revitalization Tax Exemption bylaw and accessed Northern Development Initiative Trust's Northern Housing Incentive to spur the development of new units in the City.

Additionally, we want to thank the Province of B.C. for its continued partnership and investment in Quesnel, whether it be through Providence Living's proposed 288-bed long term care facility for West Quesnel, or support through BC Housing for women's transition housing, supportive housing at the Grace Inn site and shelter space. These investments are making a meaningful difference in our community.

Regarding Bill M 216 – 2025, our concerns fit within several broad categories as outlined below.

Misunderstanding of Municipal Review

There appears to be confusion in the province's supporting documents between the proposed Professional Reliance Act, the Certified Professional Program and the common practice of professional reliance.

To a large extent, smaller municipalities already rely on professionals as we do not complete a detailed review of an engineer's plans due to the lack of internal capacity. As such, municipal staff conduct only a high-level review that notes such things as whether a professional's plans meet the municipality's bylaw requirements, whether there is planned use of infrastructure materials the city does not prefer or if there is insufficient information or a lack of important

410 Kinchant Street, Quesnel, BC V2J 7J5 · Phone: 250-991-7477 · Fax: 250-991-7496 · quesnel.ca

Executive Assistant: Laura Long

local information, among other things. It needs to be emphasized that these actions on the part of the municipality do not constitute a detailed technical review.

The Certified Professional Program refers to additional training professionals must obtain to ensure they are competent in the BC Building Code and can replace the building permit process under the Authority Having Jurisdiction. There is a significant lack of these certified professionals available in the north. The supporting documentation for the Bill lists the City of Prince George as a user of the Certified Professional Program. As far as we are aware, Prince George does not currently use this program and does not seem to be listed as a municipality under this program with the Architecture Institute of British Columbia, although it likely applies a high level of professional reliance.

Liability

It remains unclear at this time how the language within the Bill would limit or eliminate municipal liability. For example, if a professional organization ceases to operate, where would the liability for their decisions rest? As it is, municipalities are generally named as co-defendants in legal actions regarding liability. As it is, professional reports always contain a section that limits their own liability while still providing approvals, which necessitates an additional effort on the part of the municipality to ensure the organization does not completely erase accountability for its own work and approvals.

Limited Access to Professionals in the North

Quesnel, similar many other rural and remote municipalities, is experiencing an ongoing shortage of professionals located in or who are familiar with the community and its climate. We tend to see many professionals who provide reviews, approvals and reports in the community without ever being on site.

Related, this Bill would place additional pressure on professionals to take on competencies for which they do not have a scope of practice, which would necessitate further investment by the province in independent, professional regulatory oversight beyond what municipalities already do, which would result in additional costs, time and confusion.

Also, our experience has been that the quality of reports varies widely between professionals. Should this legislation proceed, we would urge the province to define the specific types of reports required for various levels of assurance. For example, the City was recently provided a technical memorandum instead of a geotechnical report for development – these are not the same and should not be relied upon as such to inform investment decisions.

An example of concern to our community is the West Quesnel Land Stability Area. In the past, municipal staff have engaged with several professionals willing to provide approved reports to support development in that area, which is fundamentally unsafe, and their reports frequently contain errors and omissions that would place undue burden on local taxpayers if the city were no longer able to intervene in the development process.

Infrastructure

The language the province has provided to support the Bill is not clear on how these changes would impact municipal discretion regarding infrastructure the municipality will or may eventually own, nor is it clear how professionals will review their reports with consideration to the municipality's growth and development goals, many of which are regulatory requirements set out by the province.

Conclusion

Finally, we are concerned that the use of registered professionals hired and paid for by a development applicant and working on their behalf creates a serious conflict of interest. While professional reliance can be a useful tool, we would remind you of the lessons learned in B.C.'s forestry sector that ultimately led to that structure being repealed to reinforce sustainable management of B.C.'s crown timber resources.

While we appreciate the haste with which the province wishes to move, notably in urban areas, we advise you to apply patience and due diligence when making changes that largely affect another order of government. The City of Quesnel was unaware of the Bill's introduction and has not had meaningful discussions with your ministry regarding it. At the same time, the market for multi-family developments, notably in urban areas, has softened, which suggests other more fundamental economic issues that need to be resolved to spur development, which should take priority over this bill.

We expect respectful treatment from the province regarding legislative changes that fit entirely within the scope of local government. We encourage you to engage with municipalities to create a more meaningful change that achieves provincial goals while safeguarding the liability placed upon local taxpayers.

Thank you for your time.

Mayor Ron Paull
City of Quesnel

Cc:

MLA Sheldon Clare
Cori Ramsay, President, Union of B.C. Municipalities
BC Municipalities

TOWN OF VIEW ROYAL

45 View Royal Avenue, Victoria, BC, Canada V9B 1A6
Ph. 250-479-6800 · E. info@viewroyal.ca · www.viewroyal.ca

December 4, 2025 Sent via Email

LETTER TO ALL BC MUNICIPAL COUNCILS

Dear Mayor and Council,

RE: Judicial Review of Provincial Housing Laws — Bills 44, 47, 13, 15, and M216

Municipalities across British Columbia are now subject to a suite of provincial housing laws — Bills 44, 47, 13, 15, and M216 — introduced and passed at remarkable speed, with limited consultation and, in some cases, under non-disclosure agreements that prevented open discussion. The timing of these Bills, released after the UBCM resolution deadline, removed the only coordinated opportunity for local governments to provide input or seek policy direction. As a result, councils were left without a meaningful role in shaping legislation that fundamentally alters their authority.

These Bills are not simply about housing supply. Individually and collectively, they alter how local democracy functions. Powers traditionally exercised by elected councils have shifted to prescriptive provincial requirements and external decision-makers. The cancellation of public hearings for many zoning decisions has further limited residents' ability to participate in community planning. Taken together, these changes raise serious questions about whether local governments can continue to operate as accountable democratic institutions.

View Royal Council has authorized the Mayor and CAO to explore a coordinated Judicial Review and to invite other municipalities to consider joining. The purpose of such a review is not to oppose housing, but to obtain clarity on whether the Province acted within lawful limits and whether proper democratic and procedural safeguards were respected.

A Judicial Review would seek answers to key questions:

- Whether these Bills, individually or combined, have eroded councils' capacity to govern and consult their residents.
- Whether eliminating public hearings is consistent with procedural fairness.
- Whether the Province exceeded its authority in reshaping core municipal land use powers.
- Whether the speed, secrecy, and timing of the legislative process met principles of responsible governance.
- What limits exist on unilateral changes to local democratic authority.

Without clarity, municipalities are left uncertain about their future role and accountability to their communities.

We invite your council to consider joining a coalition of municipalities to examine these issues together and to share the associated work and costs.

Sincerely,

Mayor Sid Tobias
Town of View Royal

Email: mayortobias@viewroyal.ca

or

c/o View Royal Town Hall
45 View Royal Avenue, Victoria BC V9B 1A6
Email: mayorandcouncil@viewroyal.ca

Attached: **Appendix with Sample Resolutions**

APPENDIX: **SAMPLE RESOLUTION FOR COUNCILS**

RE: Judicial Review of Provincial Housing Laws — Bills 44, 47, 13, 15, and M216

- THAT Council express its interest in joining a coalition of British Columbia municipalities and regional districts to evaluate and potentially pursue a coordinated Judicial Review of provincial housing legislation, including Bills 44, 47, 13, 15, and M216;
- AND THAT Council note concerns regarding the lack of consultation, the use of non-disclosure agreements, the timing of legislative release after the UBCM resolution deadline, the removal of public hearings, and the cumulative erosion of local democratic authority;
- AND THAT Council support the creation of a joint municipal working group to identify shared legal issues, coordinate information, and explore cost-sharing;
- AND THAT Council authorize the Mayor or designate to engage with participating municipalities and report back on legal options, partnership structures, and financial implications.