

Productivity Commission's Review of Legislation Regulating the Architectural Profession

Outline for Public Hearing Submission by Kent Lyon

- Introduction – quite shocked and appalled by the Draft Report Recommendation.
- What brings us to this point?

Why has this matter come about? There is discussion regarding the review of legislation in the "ISSUES PAPER" under the Section 1.

I find it hard to believe that throwing away the Architects Acts in their entirety achieves the above. Surely a cohesive piece of legislation would achieve the above points. Both for the 'consumers' understanding of the level of qualifications and achievement to a higher standing for each individual architect.

Furthermore there is some very vague and flowery terms regarding the economy, social goals, employment, regional development (I love this term) and then ecologically sustainable industry development! I could not find any mention.

- Overview and discussions on page XVI about the term 'architect' this is not uncommon on a world stage to have restrictions on the use of the term, why is it so restrictive (or is the practice of designing the built environment a "let 'er rip" mentality?
- Terms of Reference?
- Misrepresentation – Supervision?, Building Designers as professionals?
- 'Competition Principles Agreement'? All governments in review – what is the deal with Victoria? Why are they excluded?
- Builders are registered but the Person who carries out the design, documentation and contract administration for the same project is not?
- Professional Indemnity.
- Is government looking for a way to debase the values system and encourage mediocrity in our society, by basically punishing a person for having the ability to embark and achieve a higher education (at his or her own expense)? To have put in 5 1/2 years of work towards a professional degree, gain experience in the workforce and then sit a series of registration exams, then be told it has all been for not! (oh maybe that is what is desired by those controlling the politics surrounding this review – lessen the time spent to become an architect and therefore reduce spending on universities.

- I thought architects were the only persons who could administer a building contract?
- What about the acknowledgment by the ATO regarding Architects (Engineers, Quantity Surveyors, Valuers and the like) who have achieved a higher standing not just by calling themselves an architect but possibly because of the qualifications achieved.
- Self-regulating body – yeah like prostitutes, they aren't they? Hairdressers they are also have an act governing regulation. In the building industry there are Painters, Electricians, Plumbers, Builders, etc. that all have to be registered to construct. Costs that would have to be incurred by individuals to be mainly self fulfilling and a direct benefit to those who 'pay up' but many architects are not a part of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects for whatever reasons.
- My own personal/professional situation suits the following areas which can be expanded on:
Commission seeks immigrants (pg.86) regarding registration and also call for alternative mixes of qualifications and practical experience. (pg. 89).
- Beneficial to have consumers or members of the community better represented on the Boards of Architects for registration, however to have someone without an understanding or background of architecture, design & construction to control or administer the registration of architects would be ridiculous.
- Semantics – the term 'architect' is understood by members in the community the provision of a certain standard or understanding of the building industry, from preliminary drawings through to final construction. Any type of two-tiered or otherwise tiered system of registration would only add to 'consumer' confusion as to titles within the building industry. Where have you received the information regarding Transition on page XXXIII of the Overview?