Australian Institute of Architects

PRODUCTIVITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION SECTOR

Submission by the Australian Institute of Architects (Queensland Chapter) on the Queensland Productivity Commission Interim Report

QUEENSLAND CHAPTER

Submission: August 2025

CONTENTS

Australian Institute of Architects

27 August 2025

Ms Angela Moody
Queensland Productivity Commissioner
Queensland Productivity Commission
E: enquiry@qpc.qld.gov.au

Dear Commissioner,

On behalf of the Australian Institute of Architects (the Institute), Queensland Chapter, I am pleased to provide our submission in response to the Queensland Productivity Commission's (QPC) Interim Report: Productivity in the Construction Sector.

The Institute welcomes the Commission's focus on lifting productivity and project outcomes across Queensland's construction industry. We emphasise that productivity cannot be defined only by speed or cost reduction. True productivity is realised when housing and infrastructure are delivered efficiently, but also with enduring quality, resilience, and liveability—outcomes that support Queenslanders today and for generations to come.

Our submission responds to each of the Commission's preliminary recommendations and reform directions. It highlights the importance of:

- Stable project pipelines and well-aligned procurement processes that reduce waste and strengthen industry confidence.
- Contractual and regulatory frameworks that prioritise quality, reduce adversarial practices, and embed design expertise.
- Planning and approval reforms that streamline delivery while safeguarding housing design quality, community trust, and long-term sustainability.
- Labour market and skills development pathways that expand local and international talent pipelines, especially in regional areas.

Decisions made in early project phases determine the majority of whole-of-life outcomes. Ensuring design leadership, continuity, and oversight across government and industry is therefore central to improving productivity, reducing rework, and securing better value for public and private investment.

We commend the QPC for undertaking this important review and look forward to ongoing engagement as the Commission finalises its recommendations.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Stalker, FRAIA

PRESIDENT, QUEENSLAND CHAPTER

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

QPC Theme / Recommendation	The Institute's Position	Rationale	The Institute's Recommendation
Project Sequencing (Rec 1)	Support	Stop–start projects destabilise firms, inflate costs, and reduce confidence. Stable, predictable pipelines enable workforce retention and efficiency.	Confirm planning and align budgets before market release; maintain pipeline stability as a core productivity enabler.
Procurement Policies (Rec 3 & Reform Direction 2)	Support (with improved processes)	Lowest-cost procurement leads to rework, delays, and poor quality. Early collaboration and continuity improve outcomes. Current processes burden architects with inefficiencies and inconsistent oversight.	Standardise templates and terminology; broaden evaluation criteria; embed design continuity; establish government-side design review panels; provide procurement training; ensure realistic briefs and budgets.
Tendering & Contracting (Reform Direction 4)	Support (with stronger in-house expertise)	Poorly managed briefs, misallocated risk, and lowest-cost tendering reduce quality and increase disputes. Limited government capability undermines collaborative models and digital adoption.	Rebuild government design capability; allocate risk to appropriate parties; move to value-based procurement; invest in BIM/digital skills; review PQC and bundling to allow SME participation.
Planning Regulation (Rec 5)	Support rationalisation with safeguards	Streamlining provides opportunity to improve on poor housing outcomes (e.g. privacy, ventilation, liveability). Overlaps in state and local laws create delays and uncertainty.	Create statewide good design guides; embed design expertise in councils; develop pre-approved climate-smart housing types; clarify legislative hierarchy between Planning Act, Building Act, and local laws.
Approval Processes (Rec 7–8, Reform Direction 5)	Support targeted streamlining with safeguards	Faster approvals without design safeguards risk poor liveability. Reliance on private certifiers without design expertise leaves flaws unresolved. Speculative approvals inflate land values.	Embed architectural expertise in approvals; pre-approve exemplar housing types; support certifiers with design input; introduce expiry dates for approvals (e.g., 2 years).

Zoning & Land Supply (Rec 9)	Support rationalisation with safeguards	Density is necessary but must align with infrastructure and design quality. Poor design drives community resistance.	Focus density in well-serviced areas; link to infrastructure planning; retain local variation; engage design experts to improve amenity, resilience, and community trust.
Community Support for Zoning Reforms (Reform Direction 6)	Support (with design expertise)	Community resistance stems from poor outcomes and mistrust in engagement. Design-led, visual engagement builds understanding and support.	Fund design-based engagement; develop pre-approved typologies; ensure zoning reforms include design safeguards; strengthen local capacity for genuine participation.
Building Regulations (Rec 11–12)	Support improved national consistency; oppose opting out of accessibility or energy standards	Accessibility standards provide major benefits at minimal cost. Opting out of NCC 2022 creates inconsistency, undermines productivity, and locks in poor outcomes. Energy efficiency must be climate-appropriate for subtropical and tropical zones.	Retain mandatory accessibility standards; adopt NCC 2022 energy standards with local climate adaptations; improve codes for resilience and net zero; invest in industry and community education on energy efficiency.
Labour Market (Reform Directions 10–11)	Support	Workforce shortages limit productivity, especially in regions. Skilled migrants are underutilised due to recognition and employment barriers.	Expand regional training pathways; accelerate overseas qualification recognition; support skilled female migrants; match migrants to regional needs; leverage visas to retain talent.
Modern Methods of Construction (Rec 15)	Support	MMC can improve quality, speed, and sustainability, but faces regulatory, financial, and perception barriers. Build-to-rent and community housing sectors are well aligned with MMC uptake.	Enable MMC through planning/building regulation; support finance/insurance innovation; target long-term housing models; invest in research and industry collaboration; build MMC workforce capacity.

INTRODUCTION

The Australian Institute of Architects (the Institute) represents 2,400 architects statewide, and 14,000 nationally. Our members work on large scale projects around Australia and the world. We are made up of businesses that are solutions focused, and as a body have deep expertise in complex projects delivery.

The Australian Institute of Architects (Queensland Chapter) welcomes the QPC's focus on lifting construction sector productivity and improving project outcomes. Our response to the Interim Report addresses each theme and recommendation, with rationale and recommendations outlined.

IMPROVING PROJECT SELECTION AND SEQUENCING

Preliminary Recommendation 1 – Project Sequencing

The Institute's Position: Support

Rationale: Frequent project cancellations, shifting priorities, and poorly aligned budgets undermine the stability of Queensland's construction sector and our profession. The Institute's Members report significant disruption due to poor pipeline management, including tenders prepared but not awarded, projects awarded but cancelled midstream (notably within the Hospital program), and Olympic projects delayed or retendered. These stop–start processes destabilise staffing, increase costs, and reduce confidence across the supply chain. Productivity is further undermined when firms allocate significant resources to bids that do not proceed, or reconfigure staffing for projects that collapse part-way through delivery.

To ensure greater certainty and efficiency, government must confirm project planning and align budgets before going to market, while avoiding stop–start delivery patterns. By providing a stable and predictable pipeline of work, our sector will be able to retain skilled professionals, plan effectively, and reduce cost inflation. This will ultimately lead to projects being delivered more reliably and at better value for the community.

The Institute's Recommendations: Government must confirm project planning and align budgets before market release. Pipeline stability is a fundamental productivity enabler.

GENERAL PROCUREMENT POLICIES

Preliminary Recommendation 3 and reform direction 2, and request for information Queensland Government procurement policy

The Institute's Position: Support, contingent on improved processes

Rationale: Procurement processes that prioritise the lowest upfront cost often drive inefficiencies, rework, and project risk. Evidence from both practice and research shows that early involvement of contractors and design teams significantly improves project performance, with studies demonstrating average cost savings of around seven per cent

and time reductions of ten per cent when collaboration is embedded early.[1] A more balanced approach to procurement—one that simplifies templates, broadens evaluation criteria, and embeds design continuity across delivery—would reduce risk and improve outcomes.

Maintaining continuity of design teams throughout the project lifecycle, and routinely engaging the State Government Architect and design review panels, is particularly important for major public projects such as Olympic venues, hospitals, and infrastructure. Embedding this expertise throughout the process will ensure that procurement drives efficiency, minimises rework and delays, and results in higher-quality outcomes that provide enduring value to Queenslanders.

Administrative burden for architects is often a result of procurement process designed to reduce risk for administrators with good management capability but limited knowledge of well-established design and construction processes that have proven efficiency. Our members report procurement inconsistency and poor briefing, as well as recurrent issues include misuse of terminology (such as confusing "Preliminary Design" with "Schematic Design"), which leads to scope confusion, misaligned expectations, and time-consuming clarifications. Uncoordinated review processes also create delays and rework when agencies provide multiple, contradictory inputs.

Two-stage procurement is another common issue: requiring consultant teams to retender for design-and-construct delivery disrupts continuity, misaligns outcomes with original project intent, and forces architects to retain liability for reports despite being excluded from delivery.

Finally, on large projects, architectural technical and design review by qualified peers is inconsistent or absent, despite international and interstate best practice showing that consistent government-side design oversight by highly experienced and qualified professionals secures better value-for-money and protects the public interest.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Build consistent, regular, qualified design and technical review central architectural/design review panel through the State Government Architect for all major public projects.
- Standardise procurement templates and terminology to align with recognised architectural service definitions (e.g. ACA/The Institute).
- Set realistic design timeframes that reflect project complexity.
- Broaden evaluation criteria to include design quality, experience, and project understanding.

[1] [1] Innocent Chigozie Osuizugbo, Mazen M. Omer, Rahimi A. Rahman, Olalekan Shamsideen Oshodi; A systematic search and review of early contractor involvement in construction project development. Built Environment Project and Asset Management 1 October 2024; 14 (6): 835–857. https://doi.org/10.1108/BEPAM-01-2024-0012

- Provide procurement training for government staff, focused on architectural workflows and design risk.
- Require realistic briefs and budgets, confirmed through a structured return-brief process with design teams.

CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

Reform Direction 4 – Improving Tendering and Contracting and request for information

The Institute's Position: Support, with increased in-house expertise

Rationale: Limited in-house design and technical capability within government agencies and a limited understanding of the value of investing in upfront technically informed design can cause time delays and cost escalation. Investing in properly managed technical design upfront reduces rework and enhances performance during construction[2], however the experience of many of our members is that this is not a consistent approach on government projects, and our members and their builder clients can find themselves dealing with poorly written technical briefs and unrealistic time frames for proper up front technical design.

Collaborative procurement models such as alliancing and Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) deliver benefits only when government has sufficient in-house architectural, technical, and design expertise to manage them effectively, and when the overall value to the project of properly managed upfront design is understood.

Current practices often misallocate risk, with excessive responsibility pushed to builders, who in turn cascade it to architects for factors beyond their control, such as site safety. This approach discourages innovation and fosters adversarial project cultures. Similarly, lowest-cost tendering undermines value: projects awarded on price alone typically face higher variation costs, reduced quality, and weaker long-term performance.

It should be noted that digital transformation, including Building Information Modelling (BIM) and "digital by default" approaches, offers significant potential, but only if agencies have the expertise to interpret and leverage digital outputs effectively.

Project bundling practices resulting in higher PQC rating requirements can exclude smaller local firms, reducing diversity and opportunities for innovation, diminishing the breadth of expertise available to government.

Strengthening architectural and technical expertise within government is therefore critical. Decisions made in the early phases of a project—where architects have the strongest influence—disproportionately determine whole-of-life performance. By rebuilding internal capability, government will improve procurement, oversight, and delivery, ultimately securing better outcomes, stronger accountability, and greater long-term value for money.

---

[2] Lu, W., Fung, A., Peng, Y., Liang, C. and Rowlinson, S. (2015) Demystifying construction project time-effort distribution curves: A BIM and non-BIM comparison. Available at: https://hub.hku.hk/bitstream/10722/231258/1/Content.pdf?accept=1 (Accessed: 19 August 2025).

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Rebuild architectural and design capability within government to strengthen procurement oversight and project decision-making.
- Limit risk misallocation to parties best placed to manage it, reducing adversarial practices and encouraging innovation.
- Move away from lowest-cost tendering towards value-based procurement models that reward quality, expertise, and whole-of-life performance.
- Invest in training and digital capability within agencies to ensure BIM and digital processes are used effectively.
- Review PQC and bundling practices to ensure smaller, local firms remain able to contribute, supporting diversity and regional capability.

DESIGN OF PLANNING REGULATION

Preliminary recommendation 5 – Design of Planning Regulation and request for information

The Institute's Position: Support rationalisation, but only with design safeguards

Rationale: Queensland urgently needs more housing, but in pursuing rationalisation, we need to be careful not to 'throw the baby out with the bathwater' and create a whole generation of housing with fundamental design flaws that increase energy costs and create unliveable communities.

Inconsistencies between the planning requirements of the three levels of government already create inefficiency and uncertainty, however removing regulation without strengthening design benchmarks risks worsening quality, particularly in infill and medium-density housing.

Reviews of development applications and newer housing applications demonstrate recurring design failures: poor orientation, lack of cross-ventilation, garage-dominated streetscapes, minimal or unusable private open space, and bedrooms without natural light. These are not aesthetic concerns—they directly affect household energy use, liveability, development of communities and community support for density. Many smaller housing projects are prepared without qualified design expertise, while planning schemes often reduce assessment to compliance with setbacks and heights. This allows fundamental design flaws to persist, despite high levels of regulation in the system.

If regulation is simply reduced without measures that safeguard decent design outcomes for our homes, shortcomings will become entrenched, leading to hotter and colder, less efficient homes and diminished long-term value for households and communities. Instead, regulatory streamlining should be coupled with measures to improve design outcomes. Access to design expertise—whether through in-house council architects, state-level design review, or clear statewide design guidance—consistently delivers better outcomes.

The Institute also strongly supports the QPC to further investigate actions to resolve conflicting regulatory frameworks that impact on productivity. One clear example of this is planning in bushfire zones. Development productivity is affected by overlapping and sometimes inconsistent application of legislation and guidelines in this area. While the

Planning Act is intended to be the principal instrument guiding development in Queensland, working in tandem with the Building Act, uncertainty arises where the hierarchy between these instruments and local laws is not clearly defined.

In practice, this has led to:

- Variation in how bushfire construction standards (AS3959) are applied, with requirements sometimes extending beyond the scope of the Building Code and creating additional costs or delays.
- Differences in approach to vegetation management, where local laws are interpreted as overriding provisions of the Planning Act and Planning Regulation, reducing housing capacity in some rural areas.
- State-issued guidelines (e.g., Bushfire Prepared Communities 2017; Integrated Building Work in Planning Provisions 2019) that, while intended to assist, have contributed to differing interpretations across councils.

These inconsistencies can create delays, increase costs, and reduce certainty for industry, impacting both productivity and housing supply.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Create a simple, statewide "good design" guide for infill housing and apartments—visual, practical, and usable by everyone, not just trained designers.
- Give smaller councils access to real design expertise through in-house architects or independent review panels, so planners and developers can solve issues early.
- Support local governments to create pre-approved, locally relevant climate-smart designs for duplexes, triplexes and low-rise apartments, streamlining approvals while protecting quality.
- Identify, gather and provide locally relevant climate-smart designs for duplexes, triplexes and low-rise apartments.
- Clarify and reinforce the legislative hierarchy between the Planning Act, Building Act, and local laws, and streamline state guidelines to support consistent and efficient implementation across councils.

APPROVAL PROCESSES

Preliminary Recommendations 7–8; Reform Direction 5

The Institute's Position: Support targeted streamlining, with design safeguards to ensure housing meets community needs

Rationale: Faster approvals that ignore design quality will ultimately undermine liveability, sustainability, and public trust. While streamlining processes is important, as described previously, design safeguards are vitally important.

Currently, there are significant gaps in the system. Planners are often asked to assess more complex housing types without access to the design expertise they need. The QPC proposal to shifting the workload to private certifiers, who also lack residential design training, leaves the fundamental issues such as poor orientation, lack of cross-ventilation, garage-dominated streetscapes, minimal or unusable private open space, and bedrooms without natural light. unaddressed, even where developments technically comply with regulations.

Our members working in local government report instances where development approvals are sought to facilitate speculative land trading. This creates inflated land values and locks up land that should be used for housing for many years. A remedy for this could be to introduce expiry dates for all development approvals, creating urgency to build and ensuring projects align with current planning frameworks and community needs. A suggested time frame could be 2 years for building approvals to expire.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Support consolidation of approvals where possible, but ensure expert residential design advice is embedded in the process.
- Where third parties are used, such as certifiers on planning issues they should be supported by architectural expertise.
- Support local governments to develop pre-approve exemplar housing typologies (developed with architects and the construction industry) to speed up small-scale infill and medium-density projects – as previously noted.
- Introduce expiry dates for all development approval

ZONING REGULATIONS AND LAND SUPPLY

Preliminary recommendation 9 – Zoning Regulation and Land Supply

The Institute's position: Support rationalisation, but only with design safeguards

Rationale: Higher densities are essential to meet housing demand, but they must be located in well-serviced areas and supported by design standards that protect liveability, open space, and resilience. Current weaknesses include council planning frameworks that lack in-house design expertise, and housing supply targets that are not consistently aligned with infrastructure sequencing. Without clear design guidance, changing zoning rules to increase density risks producing poor amenity, inadequate green space, and reduced long-term value for communities.

Queensland's housing density goals are often met with community resistance when design and amenity standards are low. The key to overcoming this challenge lies in pairing higher density with quality design and meaningful engagement. When density is delivered without these safeguards, opposition hardens and trust in the planning system erodes.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Focus increased densities in well-located areas — near public transport, activity centres, and employment hubs.
- Retain flexibility for regional climatic and character variations.
- Ensure any statewide provisions are complemented by design standards to maintain amenity, privacy, green space, and environmental performance.
- Link targets to infrastructure planning to ensure growth is supported by transport, schools, open space, and utilities.
- Engage architects, landscape architects and urban designers to collaborate with planners to formulate how higher density can improve neighbourhoods through better public space, landscaping, and building quality.

INCREASING SUPPORT FOR ZONING REFORMS

Reform Direction 6 – Community Support for Housing Development and Reform

The Institute's Position: Support, contingent on involvement of appropriate design expertise

Rationale: Community acceptance of higher-density housing is closely tied to the quality of outcomes. Where housing is poorly designed, residents resist development, slowing delivery and reducing trust in planning processes. Genuine, design-led engagement is critical to build understanding and support for necessary up zoning.

A further barrier is the community trust deficit. Engagement processes have too often been stage-managed, leaving residents feeling excluded from shaping the future of their neighbourhoods. This creates resistance to higher density, even where housing need is clear. At the same time, uneven capacity across local governments means many councils lack the resources and expertise to guide density increases in ways that reflect both community needs and local character.

State investment in visual, practical, and accessible engagement tools allows communities to see how density can coexist with liveable neighbourhoods. Pre-approved housing typologies, prepared with local architects and responsive to climate and character, can further streamline approvals while maintaining quality. Combining these approaches with well-targeted zoning reforms ensures housing supply is delivered efficiently, sustainably, and in ways that communities endorse.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Fund design-based engagement processes to help communities visualise higher-density development outcomes.
- Support pre-approved housing typologies for infill and medium-density formats that reflect local climate, character, and liveability standards.
- Ensure all zoning reforms are accompanied by clear design standards that safeguard amenity, privacy, green space, and environmental performance.
- Foster genuine community participation in the planning process, moving beyond abstract policy discussions to tangible, place-based design conversations.
- Provide state funding for design-based engagement processes at the local level — using visual tools, models, and site-specific scenarios that help communities understand what density will look and feel like.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

Preliminary Recommendation 11 – Impacts Arising from NCC 2022

Preliminary recommendation 12 – Future Regulatory Changes to Building Codes

The Institute's Position:

Do not support: Removal or opting out of accessibility standards

Do not support: Removal or opting out of energy efficiency standards without other energy efficient safeguards being in place

Support: advocating for improved regulatory processes at the national level to ensure consistency and improved standards for climate risk resilience

Rationale:

Accessibility standards: the Institute stands firm in support of maintaining the currently Livable Housing Design Standards as mandatory. This is because the cost imposts are very minimal, compared to the rising costs of materials and labour, and so do not significantly account for cost escalation in the construction of new homes. However these standards provide enormous benefits for our ageing population, supporting people living with a disability as well as supporting all people who might be temporarily disabled through surgery, injury etc. Additionally, retrofitting housing to be more accessible is considerably more expensive than embedding key provisions through adjustment to bathroom sizes, corridor widths, door thresholds and the like in the new building.

Energy efficiency standards: the Institute maintains a strong national stance that there are important community, industry and productivity benefits to consistency across the nation in adopting NCC updates. By opting out of some elements of NCC 2022, national consistency is reduced, regulatory uncertainty increased, and housing consumers in some states can be disadvantaged. Evidence shows voluntary uptake fails — opting out increases inconsistency and undermines productivity. Weak standards lock in poor housing, imposing higher long-term costs on households and government.

In Queensland's subtropical and tropical zones, we are experiencing increasing instances of heat waves. Not everyone can afford the costs of continuous air conditioning. Being able to ensure a dwelling is energy efficient is vital. But how this is achieved does need to vary from climate to climate.

There is a commonly held view amongst our practicing members that aspects of the energy efficiency standards are not suited to low energy design in subtropical and tropical climates, where shade, ventilation and orientation are often the strongest design measures for humid heat. Double glazing can actually intensify heat in certain circumstances.

We therefore support adherence to a nationally consistent approach to regulation, but a locally relevant set of provisions regarding energy efficiency.

In addition, given the disaster-prone nature of our state, we strongly support strengthen regulatory provisions to ensure buildings are climate risk adaptive.

The Australian Institute of Architects has developed an Architecture Industry Decarbonisation Plan 2025–2050 which targets national Zero Carbon Buildings by 2040. The plan urges government to update the NCC to include these mandatory requirements, promote government leadership in green procurement, and ensure grid-responsive all-electric buildings are the standard.

It is important to understand that the size of houses is a key driver of energy consumption. It is also important to note that energy consumption is as much, if not more, driven by consumer choice and ability to pay than by the "energy rating" of residences. Regulation should be amended to provide a more integrated focus on overall energy use. This again, adds pressure to provide locally relevant, climate-based regulation.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Maintain mandatory accessibility standards (Livable Housing Design Standards) for all new dwellings.
- Retain energy efficiency standards consistent with NCC 2022 nationally, while supporting adaptation to local climate conditions to support low-energy design in subtropical and tropical zones.
- Advocate for continuous improvement of national building codes through regulatory processes that engage industry and design professionals, particularly focussing on net zero and climate resilience provisions
- Support education and guidance for industry on climate-responsive energy efficiency measures to ensure practical implementation without compromising occupant comfort.
- Encourage monitoring and evaluation of NCC provisions to ensure they deliver measurable benefits in cost, liveability, and environmental performance.
- Support education and guidance for community on climate-responsive energy efficiency measures to ensure practical implementation.

LABOUR MARKET

Reform direction 10 – Training and Apprenticeships

Reform direction 11 – Opportunities to Better Utilise Skilled Overseas Migration

The Institute's Position: Support

Rationale: Queensland faces workforce shortages and productivity bottlenecks, particularly in regional areas where architectural businesses struggle to attract and retain staff. Currently, students of architecture can only complete accredited training in Brisbane, which limits opportunities for regional training and reduces the likelihood that students will remain in regional centres after graduation. Expanding regional training pathways would build local capacity and improve retention.

At the same time, skilled migration is an underutilised opportunity. Between 2008 and 2018, around 49 out of every 100 skilled migrants in Queensland were not employed in fields matching their qualifications—representing a $250 million lost opportunity over a decade. Only 2.94% of permanent migrants since 2000 work in construction trades, compared to 4.62% of the general workforce, and skilled migrants are 64.3% less likely to enter construction roles. High barriers to entry—such as slow recognition of overseas qualifications, lack of local experience, and limited professional networks—mean that migrants with construction and architectural expertise are not contributing fully to the workforce. For women, the disadvantage is compounded by gender-based underemployment and wage gaps.

Together, these constraints mean Queensland is failing to unlock the full potential of both local and international talent, which directly impacts housing supply, design quality, and productivity.

The Institute's Recommendations:

- Expand regional training pathways in architecture through collaboration between industry, government, and the tertiary sector, to improve retention of students and graduates in regional centres.
- Accelerate recognition of overseas architectural qualifications, supported by bridging and upskilling programs, so that skilled migrants can enter the workforce more quickly.
- Develop targeted support for skilled female migrants, addressing barriers of underemployment, wage disparity, and access to professional networks.
- Strengthen collaboration between government, industry, and professional bodies to match skilled migrants with regional workforce needs, ensuring local experience and references can be built quickly.
- Leverage visa pathways to improve the appeal and retention of skilled migrant candidates in the construction and design sectors.

MODERN METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION

Preliminary recommendation 15 – Modern Methods of Construction

The Institute's Position: Support

Rationale: The Building 4.0 CRC Project 23: When Prefab Hits the Ground final report3 provides an excellent overview of the opportunities and current barriers for the development of MMC.

The Institute is highly supportive of the development of MMC as part of our housing mix, whilst acknowledging that it there is still some ground to cover, including in the area of regulatory frameworks, before it matures as a product that can take a significant place in our housing market. Modern Methods of Construction represent a critical opportunity for Queensland to improve construction productivity, expand housing supply, and deliver higher-quality, more sustainable outcomes. By aligning policy, finance, and regulatory frameworks with long-term housing models, Queensland can foster an MMC sector that not only addresses current housing pressures but also builds resilience and competitiveness in the construction industry.

The Institute welcomes efforts to incorporate MMC within building and planning frameworks, as well as supporting ongoing investment in research and industry collaboration.

The Institute's Recommendations

- Enable MMC through regulation: Incorporate prefabrication and volumetric systems explicitly within building and planning frameworks to provide certainty.

[3] https://building4pointzero.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/220122-CRC-23-FINAL-for-website.pdf