**Reform to the building approval process for single residential buildings in Western Australia**

**CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Are you responding as a:** | [ ]  Home owner[ ]  Builder [ ]  Industry association  | [ ]  Private building surveyor[ ]  Industry member[ ]  Local government  | [ ]  Tradesperson[ ]  General public[ ]  Other       |
| **Name (optional)** |       Leave blank if you would like your submission to remain anonymous |
| **Organisation and job title** |       |
| **Postal address** |       |
| **Email address** |       | **Phone number** |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal one: Efficiency of the building approvals process in WA** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you consider that the current approvals process under the Building Act creates unnecessary delays? If yes, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. If you answered yes, what do you consider to be the primary cause of delays (e.g. planning requirements, inconsistent policies, lack of clear forms and guidance)?
 |       |
| 1. Regardless of the reform options outlined in Chapter 5 of this CRIS, should it be mandatory to submit evidence of planning compliance from the relevant LGA (i.e. development approval, or a ‘deemed to comply’ check single houses) with a building permit application? Please provide reasons for your view.
 |       |
| 1. What (if anything) could be done to ensure building permit applications contain all required information?
 |       |
| **Proposal two: Effectiveness of the building approvals process in WA** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you consider that the current approvals process under the Building Act ensures adequate levels of compliance with the NCC?? If yes, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. If you answered no, what do you consider to be the causes for inadequate compliance with the NCC?
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal three: Proposal for reform Option 1 – Business as usual** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you support the business as usual option? Please provide reasons for your view.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal four: Proposal for reform Option 2 – Introduce full private certification** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you support Option 2? Please explain your answer
 |       |
| 1. Are there elements of Option 2 that you do not support? If yes, please tell us which elements you do not support, and why?
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal five: Option 2 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 2: Design compliance and documentation** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. What specific information do you think should be required in order for design documentation to sufficiently detail compliance with the NCC and thus ensure that builders can more easily build in accordance with the building standards?
 |       |
| 1. Do you agree that the minimum standard of design documentation requirements set out in the Director’s Specified List under section 20(1)(d) of the *Building Act 2016* (Tas) are a suitable model? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. Do you support the proposal that the Building Act should require compliance with the minimum standard for design documentation prior to the granting of a building permit? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. Should the building surveyor be required to make a written statement about how each performance solution meets applicable building standards and what assessment methods have been used to make this determination? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. Do you agree with the identified costs, benefits and assumptions used in the above cost benefit analysis? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal six: Option 2 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 4: Mandatory inspections** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Should mandatory inspections apply to every single residential dwelling build in WA if Option 2 is progressed? If no, please tell us what alternative system could be implemented to ensure adequate assessment of compliance with building standards during the build?
 |       |
| 1. Should mandatory inspections for single residential dwellings include all of the four stages proposed? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. Should there be alternative or additional mandatory inspections to the four proposed stages? If yes, please provide details.
 |       |
| 1. Should the Building Act prescribe inspection elements that must be covered in the final inspection? If yes, please outline.
 |       |
| 1. Do you agree with the identified costs, benefits and assumptions used in the cost benefit analysis for this Key element of Option 2? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal seven: Option 2 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 5: Formal process for variations** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you support a requirement to apply to the certifier for formal approval of variations to the design made during the build? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |
| 1. Should the requirement to apply to all variations made, or only those that are identified as involving a material change? Please provide reasons for your answer.
 |       |
| 1. Do you agree with the identified costs, benefits and assumptions in the cost benefit analysis for this Key element of Option2? If not, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal eight: Option 2 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 6: Record keeping** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you agree with the identified costs and benefits for this Key element of Option 2? If not, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal nine: Cost benefit analysis for Key element 7: Enforcement** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. How should LGAs be funded to carry out enforcement functions? Please explain your answer.
 |       |
| 1. Do you agree with the identified costs, benefits and assumptions for this Key element of Option 2? If not, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal ten: Option 3 – Improvements to the current building approvals process** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Question 3 of this CRIS seeks comment on verifying planning compliance. Please tell us if you support a requirement to submit evidence of planning compliance with a building permit application as part of Option 3, and why?
 |       |
| 1. Is there merit in exploring a fast-track approval process such as that described above?
 |       |
| 1. If you answered yes to Question 27, what do you consider to be the key conditions that would need to be met in order to allow construction to commence? Are these key conditions able to be clearly defined?
 |       |
| 1. Please provide any suggestions for an alternative fast-track process that could be considered.
 |       |
| 1. Do you support Option 3? Please give reasons for your answer.
 |       |
| 1. Are there elements of Option 3 that you do not support? If so, which elements and why?
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal eleven: Option 3 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 2: Design compliance and documentation** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Under Option 3, do you support the proposal that compliance with minimum standards for design documentation should be required prior to the granting of a building permit? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal twelve: Option 3 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 4: Mandatory inspections** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. If Option 3 is adopted, should mandatory inspections apply to every single residential dwelling build in WA, or a sample of builds? Please provide reasons for your answer.
 |       |
| 1. If a sample of builds is preferred, how should the sample be selected?
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal thirteen: Option 3 – Cost benefit analysis for Key element 5: Formal process for variations** |
| **Questions for consultation** | **Your comments** |
| 1. Do you support a requirement that variations to the design made during the build must be submitted to the permit authority for formal approval? If no, please tell us why.
 |       |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other comments or concerns** |
|       |