

**INQUIRY INTO REVIEW INTO THE DESIGN AND
BUILDING PRACTITIONERS ACT 2020 AND THE
RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT BUILDINGS (COMPLIANCE
AND ENFORCEMENT POWERS) ACT 2020**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 1 July 2024

Partially
Confidential

Thank you for reviewing my submission regarding the review of the Design and Building Practitioners Act 2020 (DBPA).

As an interior designer with well over a decade of experience, I am astounded and frustrated at the DBPA's complete omission of the entire interior design profession from being recognised and able to register as interior design practitioners, particularly for Class 2 and above buildings.

After attending a recent meeting with my design colleagues and the policy team at the Building Commission, it has become apparent that there needs to be more understanding of what interior designers actually do! I also am increasingly concerned about the potential impact on my profession in obtaining work in the future if we are to be excluded once again from registration as design professionals working on Class 1 buildings if further regulations are implemented.

The decision to exclude our profession from the DBPA was made without proper consultation with our industry body and seemingly without consideration for the impact on our ability to trade and earn an income. This indifference also disregards the needs of our clients, who rely on our expertise in designing their interior spaces.

Potential clients are now financially disadvantaged when choosing an interior designer instead of a building designer or architect to complete the work. We now require all our drawings to be submitted to and stamped by a registered design practitioner/ architect, resulting in a double-up of fees.

A massive cost burden is now forced upon homeowners and clients to complete even minor interior works in Class 2 buildings. This is due to the thousands of dollars worth of additional insurance costs and consultant fees required to complete a CDC, a burden that should not be theirs to bear and is not currently applicable to owners of Class 1 buildings.

Given the lack of affordable housing in this state and the push by governments towards increasing higher-density living, it seems counterintuitive to disadvantage owners of homes contained within Class 2 buildings. This could potentially discourage many prospective buyers.

I believe the original intentions of the Act were well-founded and well-meaning. It was intended to respond to unscrupulous developers and shoddy building practices.

However, onerous costs and submission requirements, including the process for submitting construction drawing revisions into a poorly designed Planning Portal, mean that homeowners sometimes choose to undergo renovations without proper approval. I believe this may make them more vulnerable to the very practices and unscrupulous building companies the DBPA was attempting to prevent.