

5 April 2017

Dale Webster
Director of Building Control
Consumer, Building and Occupational Services
PO Box 56
Rosny Park Tas 7018

Dear Dale,

The Tasmanian Chapter of the Australian Institute of Architects (the Institute) generally supports the introduction of the Director's Specified List Schedule 1, Part II, Class 2–9 Buildings. We believe this will help the industry to provide a consistent level of documentation for builders and demonstrate compliance with the Building Act and Regulations.

We believe the value in the final document will be as a guide to the level of documentation suitable for Class 2 to 9 structures. We agree with your representative, Anthony Livingstone in our meeting with him last year, that transforming the final document into a checklist is not appropriate due to the complexity of individual developments and the variety of structures represented across Class 2 to 9 structures.

While not directly under your authority we would also like to express our firm desire for you to clarify in the final documentation that this schedule is meant to address issues at the construction stage of a project and should not be used by statutory planning authorities as a checklist for planning approval.

The vast majority of items detailed in the proposed document appear to be reasonable to us and, in most cases, are already done as standard and could continue to be applied where appropriate to the type and nature of the project where that information is not already detailed in either a specification or a schedule.

In reference to the individual listed items a detailed review of the schedule has been undertaken and we make the following comments:

Concern	Possible solution
Document becoming a prescriptive checklist for Building Surveyors.	Create a user-guide document to accompany the Director's Specified List Schedule 1, Part II, Class 2–9 Buildings, which clearly outlines the intent behind its formation. We would like to see the Director's Specified List Schedule 1, Part II, Class 2–9 Buildings established as a guide to the level of documentation required to ensure there is uniform professionalism across the industry.
Diverse range of building types	Director's Specified List Schedule 1, Part II, Class 2–9 Buildings be adopted as a guide to the level of suitable documentation.
Impact upon fees	To ensure a level playing field between building designers and architects, they should be subject to the same assessment criteria to ensure compliance. There are some building types that are

	<p>difficult for architects to bid for work on; an obvious example is residential as there are vastly different levels of documentation standards being provided by architects, building designers and draftspersons.</p>
<p>Specification information to be placed on drawings (duplication of information)</p>	<p>Repeating information between drawings and specifications is an area that leads to mistakes and errors. It can also result in additional costs during construction as the intent becomes unclear due to conflict between the documents. We feel this would be inconsistent with the intent of the Director's Specified List Schedule 1, Part II, Class 2–9 Buildings.</p> <p>Our suggestion is to only include information on the cover page in instances where a separate bound specification and schedules are not provided.</p>
<p>Name of client on drawings</p>	<p>While this is a reasonable requirement in the vast majority of cases, there are some unique projects where the client may request that information be withheld. Our proposal is that the inclusion of the name of the client on the drawings should be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p>Cover Page</p>	<p>We feel the information placed on the cover page should be decided by the designer on a case-by-case basis, while noting that some standard information could be included such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name of project • Project reference • Client and consultant details • List of drawings • Graphic image of the project <p>As architects mostly treat the cover page as a graphic presentation sheet to the drawing set (each firm has a professional image it likes to convey with how drawings are set out) we suggest that where a bound specification is not provided the designer should include a separate specification sheet within the set of drawings. This might be the first sheet following the cover page.</p>
<p>Title Block Information</p>	<p>Number of drawings in a set:</p> <p>As building works are live projects, there is always a possibility for drawing sheets to be added or deleted from a set during tendering or construction. This means the number of drawings in a set would need to be changed to suit. For a small project this is unlikely to be an issue, but for a large project with hundreds of drawing sheets this is a much bigger issue. Where drawings are</p>

	<p>still printed off for contractors this would be seen as an unnecessary use of resources. There are also time and money factors involved in renumbering sheets in large drawing sets.</p> <p>We consider it more appropriate for all drawings included in the building permit or contract set to be listed in a schedule in the specification or on the cover page sheet</p>
Floor Plans	<p>For renovations and additions, the list mentions having documented how fire precautions will be managed during construction. As the management of the site during construction is the responsibility of the builder we don't think it is appropriate for designers to be telling builders how they manage the site.</p> <p>We recommend not including this in the list.</p>
Sections	<p>Sections through the building are best decided by the designer in order to suitably describe the scope of works or nature of the project. An ill-considered cutting plane for a section is likely to mean it misses critical junctions or details or does not adequately explain the nature of the project or the spatial qualities. Equally, being overly prescriptive of where a cutting plane should be taken through can also mean the most appropriate junctions and details are missed.</p> <p>We agree with the proposal for sections to be included in the drawing set; however, we consider the proposed wording should leave it to the designer to best decide the cutting plane.</p>
Authority 'creep'	<p>Over the years, the industry has seen increasing requests for detailed and technical building solutions by local planning authorities associated with planning/development approval documents. We agree with your representative Anthony Livingston's suggestion that this document should not be allowed to become part of this 'creep'.</p> <p>We suggest that the items in the Director's Specified List Schedule 1 – Part II be assessed solely at the building and plumbing permit approval stages.</p>

We appreciate the opportunity to work through these issues to help achieve the most appropriate document for the whole industry.

We understand that the departure of Anthony Livingston affects the progress of this schedule but we would like to continue talks with Anthony's replacement to ensure it moves forward smoothly. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide any further information or amplification of the above.

Kind regards,

Yvette Breytenbach RAIA
President, Tasmanian Chapter,
Australian Institute of Architects