Our submission is very brief and we will probably cover a lot of ground noted in other submissions

The topics we wish to touch on are

- 1. Protection of Architects
- 2. Increased Competition and Reduced Costs to the Public
- 3. Built Environment
- 4. Protection of the Public

## 1. PROTECTION OF ARCHITECTS

Architects are not a protected species and we are not trying to create or maintain any form of protection

Under the current situation no work is reserved for architects (as is the case in many countries) and non architects are free to undertake all forms of building design and any of the services that architects provide

As it is architects only design a small percentage (how much ??) of the total construction work undertaken.

## INCREASED COMPETITION AND REDUCED COSTS TO THE PUBLIC

To state that deregulation will increase competition and reduce costs to the public is a nonsense. Competition between architects is extremely fierce and the market forces in play ensure that our fees are kept at an absolute minimum. In fact the erosion of fees has been so great over the past 20 years that we believe there has been a drop in the standard and level of service offered by the profession simply to ensure survival.

In addition to this architects are in competition with non-architects for work which further controls the levels of fees.

The costs of registration of architects is less than negligible in a construction industry that turns over \$35 billion annually and is the largest single industry in our economy, and therefore there would be no savings to the public if deregulation eventuates

H: GAVIN Productivity Comm Submission due

Page 1 of 3

## **BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

The importance of the quality of our built environment cannot be understated. It is well recognised that the built environment has a huge impact on our lifestyle and society as a whole and buildings are one of the dominant forms in this environment. One only has to consider the impact of singular buildings such as the Sydney opera house or groups of buildings forming famous civic precincts all around the world to recognise this.

Buildings are fairly permanent elements and if not designed correctly can leave a disastrous legacy for generations to come.

If the incentive to study to become an architect is removed, why would anyone bother spending the 5 years at university plus 2 years practical experience in order to become a registered architect when any person could hang up a shingle and profess to be an architect.

If deregulation comes about we believe that there would be a major drop in the quality of design in the environment which would adversely affect everyone.

One only has to drive through the morass we call the outer suburbs to see an example of unchecked design by non-architects.

## PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC

The public is already confused regarding the difference between architects and non architects and we often encounter references to designers as being architects. We as a profession have a public education program which is addressing this problem.

Would it be in the interest of the public if a back yard abortionist set up flashy offices and called him/herself a gynaecologist?? We would say not!!

Why is our built environment any less important than our physical health??

Only a licensed plumber may carry out most plumbing work

Only a licensed electrician may carry out most electrical work

Only a licensed builder may build anything other the simplest structure

Why?? In order to protect the best interests of the public

61 8 9388 7755

The public is free to chose either a qualified or unqualified persons to design their buildings but they deserve to know the difference. Deregulation would destroy the means of differentiating between qualified registered architects and designers

Registered architects not only have to undergo the formal training and practical experience but are bound by codes of conduct and participate in ongoing professional development training to keep them abreast of changes in their industry.

None of this is required of non architects and to say that destroying the only means of identifying the difference is in the interest of the public, is a disgraceful nonsense

Sure we could adopt other means of differentiation and call ourselves Practicing Registered Architects but while we are about it why don't we just deregulate the medical profession, electricians, plumbers, engineers and every other profession and allow them all to regulate themselves.