



CITY OF LANGLEY

MOTION

Proposed Legislation: *Bill M216 – Professional Governance Act – Mayor Pachal*

WHEREAS *Bill M216* was introduced as a Private Member's Bill on October 21, 2025, by George Anderson, the Nanaimo-Lantzville Member of the Legislative Assembly, for first reading; and

WHEREAS *Bill M216* passed second reading on November 17, 2025 in the B.C. Legislative Assembly; and

WHEREAS the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills is now considering the proposed legislation and is inviting input on *Bill M216* until December 2, 2025;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Langley submit input to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Bills requesting the Province of BC withdraw *Bill M216*.

BACKGROUND

Bill M216 would remove the ability of local governments to require a standard technical peer review of development proposals, and instead, would require local governments to accept certified submissions by professionals hired by developers for their projects. If disputes on a submission arise, a local government must appeal to the Office of the Superintendent for Professional Guidance.

The Union of British Columbia Municipalities has identified the following concerns with *Bill M216*:

- **Deregulation:** The bill would deregulate a core element of the development approval process, increasing the risk of missed deficiencies in certified applications.
- **Slower Approvals:** The appeal process could create bottlenecks, slowing down approvals and increasing bureaucracy.
- **Liability Issues:** There are concerns about who bears the cost if defects emerge, especially if the certified professional is unavailable or underinsured. Local governments and taxpayers may face increased liability.
- **Loss of Peer Review:** Removing peer review could put homeowners at risk of unexpected costs and safety issues.

- **Lack of Innovation:** The bill mandates a professional reliance model province-wide, removing local context and critical checks and balances.
- **Development in a Vacuum:** The bill appears to lack consultation and real-world grounding, raising the risk of unintended consequences.
- **Implications to Taxpayers:** If defects arise in buildings or infrastructure, it is unclear who would be responsible for costs. Local governments may still be named in claims, and the bill does not clarify whether they would owe a duty of care. This creates uncertainty and potential liability for local governments and taxpayers. In addition, the City could inherit infrastructure requiring additional annual maintenance and potentially compromised asset lifecycles.