

The Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB)

submission to

The Industry & Regulators Committee

on the inquiry

Building Safety Regulator Inquiry

31 August 2025

David Parry
Senior Parliamentary & Public Affairs Officer
e: dparry@ciob.org.uk
t: +44 (0)1344 630875

Building Safety Regulator Inquiry

Introduction

1. The Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB) is the world's largest and most influential professional body for construction management and leadership. We have a Royal Charter to promote the science and practice of building and construction for the benefit of society, and we have been doing that since 1834.
2. Our members work worldwide in the development, conservation and improvement of the built environment. We accredit university degrees, educational courses and training. Our professional and vocational qualifications are a mark of the highest levels of competence and professionalism, providing assurance to clients and other professionals procuring built assets.

Background

3. CIOB's work in improving building safety dates to February 2017, where Professor John Cole published a [report](#) into the defects that led to the closure of 17 schools in Edinburgh. Just a few months later, in June 2017, the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower claimed the lives of 72 people.
4. Both incidents were followed by official inquiries, and their subsequent reports rightly made for uncomfortable reading for all those in the industry.
5. CIOB has been active in driving building safety reform, particularly following the draft publication of the Building Safety Bill – which became the [Building Safety Act 2022](#) on 28 April 2022 and then came into force on 1 October 2023.
6. Our views are shaped by the work of our Quality Implementation Group (QIG), which exists to help CIOB respond to the changing regulatory environment and provide education and support to our members and the wider industry. The QIG also plays a key role in raising standards and promoting best practice in construction quality, providing resources to help further education in the field where appropriate.
7. The QIG is Chaired by CIOB past president, Paul Nash, who is also a member of the Industry Safety Steering Group (ISSG), which reports to Secretary of State and the Minister for Building Safety.
8. Alongside this, CIOB has developed an extensive learning and assessment portfolio, recognising the need for quality and safety to be enshrined as part of the culture change that Dame Judith Hackitt DBE and others have discussed extensively since the Grenfell Tower tragedy. We will highlight some of the CIOB offering throughout this inquiry response.
9. To assist in gathering information for this response, CIOB convened a roundtable of our members, many of whom are involved in submissions to the Building Safety Regulator (BSR) in their roles in the construction industry. Therefore, the views in this response are informed by those with actual experience in submitting applications for new or existing higher-risk buildings (HRBs).
10. Should the Committee be interested in hearing more from CIOB members who have experience submitting applications to the BSR, we would be more than happy to facilitate.

Full response

Question One: What is your experience of the Building Safety Regulator's regulatory framework? Has the introduction of the BSR improved the safety of the buildings it is responsible for, and can any examples be given to illustrate this?

11. As we have briefly outlined above, CIOB has been involved in the development and establishment of the BSR framework from the beginning of the process. This includes our participation in various consultations both on the principal of the BSR and the rules and regulations governing its role in the built environment. CIOB has also participated in numerous working groups related to the BSR including the ISSG and Building Advisory Committee (BAC).
12. CIOB's membership is comprised of professionals across the breadth of the construction industry including many who will have firsthand experience preparing and submitting applications to the BSR such as developers, designers, contractors and building control professionals.
13. With that in mind, we are confident in suggesting that the introduction of the BSR as part of the Building Safety Act 2022 (BSA) has improved the safety of buildings. Whilst we understand that there are several concerns with the BSR, the implementation of a regulatory framework to hold those working in the built environment to account for compliance with building regulations is a positive step towards ensuring that tragedies, such as the one that occurred at Grenfell Tower, are not repeated.
14. Whilst this response will go on to highlight some of the negative aspects of the relationship between applicants and the BSR as the building control authority for HRBs, it must be acknowledged that many positives have arisen as a result of the new regulatory powers granted in the BSA, notably in respect of the new regime for occupied HRBs.
15. A key aspect of the role of the BSR, alongside its building control duties, is to enforce actions against building owners where proper account is not being taken on fire and building safety. The example of Arlington House in Margate shows that processes are working well to protect residents of existing buildings.
16. Arlington House is an existing 18-storey HRB located within Thanet District Council's local authority boundary. As a result of new building safety legislation, the owner of Arlington House submitted a safety case report. These reports must outline the safety risks and strategies for managing these risks as well as details on how the Principal Accountable Person will ensure compliance with fire safety regulations.¹ Upon review of the submitted safety case report, the BSR raised concerns, resulting in a joint investigation. The resulting actions included mandating a full structural survey of the building and erecting scaffolding around the building, both taken with the aim of mitigating some of the existing safety risks.
17. Whilst we are keen to give credit to the work that has been done to date to ensure building safety through the BSR, it is equally important to highlight the cases where the BSR is not operating to the best of its ability.
18. During the roundtable we hosted with our members, we heard from one about an application submitted at Gateway 2 for a new HRB. The applicant submitted around 1,500

¹ Health & Safety Executive, [Preparing a safety case report – guidance](#), 19 September 2023

documents as part of their submission pack and had gone above and beyond, submitting 92 design packs and advancing the design of the scheme further than necessary. The applicant was positive about the process, having the scheme validated in seven days, but then did not hear any news on their application from the BSR for 12 and a half weeks before receiving a request for an extension on the determination. The stated reason for the extension was due to the complex nature of the application. The applicant subsequently received an invoice for two hours of work from the BSR. This is clearly not good enough and we will touch on why these delays are being experienced throughout this submission, but we must acknowledge the potential impact that delays are having on the industry. It also appears that this is a typical case with many more experiencing frustrating, protracted application processes.

19. Ultimately, there are numerous knock-on effects to these delays, not only to individual projects, but to the built environment as a whole. There is evidence that investment in new projects has faltered as a result of additional uncertainty, damaging economic growth and housing delivery.²

Question Two: How has the Building Safety Regulator's (BSR's) regulatory framework impacted the delivery of new homes and the maintenance and improvement of existing high-rise buildings?

20. In short, yes, it has had an impact on the delivery of new homes and the maintenance and improvement of existing HRBs. However, some delays and more complex processes that those building new HRBs and those refurbishing existing HRBs are having to go through are completely necessary to ensure contractors are adequately complying with the new regulations and ways of working.
21. Ultimately, the BSR and BSA has raised the bar for competence, accountability, and safety, making it harder and more complicated to build HRBs. Similarly, it has made the repair, refurbishment and maintenance of existing HRBs more complex for the same reasons, to raise the bar on competence and provide an extra level of assurance and oversight that was lacking prior to the Grenfell Tower Fire.
22. The establishment of the BSR has been a crucial step in addressing long-standing gaps in building safety oversight and to suggest the formation of this has negatively impacted the delivery of new homes is narrowly looking at one aspect.
23. Anecdotally, there has been a significant concern from developers about the delays caused by the new approval gateways. However, this is supported by data from the Health & Safety Executive (HSE), which highlights only 338 of 2,108 total applications gaining approval with an average of 36 weeks to secure gateway approval on new build projects. This is three times longer than the original 12-week target, as well as a marked increase on the 19-week average reported at the end of 2024.³
24. Major cladding remediation schemes for existing buildings have not fared much better, with only 28 (12%) of 236 jobs cleared. It must be noted that projects falling into the 'other fire safety works' category have fared better with an 18% success rate, with 295 jobs approved from 1,679 submissions. This perhaps justifiably points to prioritisation of remediation projects above new-build work.

² Property Week, [Tall order: meeting BSA compliance challenges](#), 30 April 2025

³ Health and Safety Executive (HSE), [Building Safety Regulator building control approval application data October 2023 to March 2025](#), 9 July 2025

25. We understand the principal reason for potential delays, in ensuring the project has been fully designed prior to construction. However, the commencement of Gateway 2 and Gateway 3 checks are causing project delays and costing developers additional money, due to the inability to make formal decisions within the timeframe.
26. **Clearly some delays, when applications submitted to the BSR are incomplete or not up to standard, are justified. However, delays that are as a result of a lack of BSR capacity or competence, should be deemed as unacceptable.**
27. For developers considering building HRBs, they might call into question the viability of such a project, given the additional financial costs and potential delays.
28. We understand the BSR would take time to build capacity and capability to deal with applications. However, it appears the Government, understandably, wants to see progress and on 30 June a package of reforms to the BSR to bring new leadership, investment and process to accelerate housebuilding was introduced. This includes a new 'fast track process' to enhance the review of new HRB applications and unblock delays, as well as reforms to pave the way for the creation of a single construction regulator. The BSR will also be moved from the HSE to the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) and plans to recruit 100 new staff members to help clear the approvals backlog, although we understand this will take several years to come to fruition.⁴
29. It is currently too early to know how much of an impact these changes will make; however, we are pleased to see the Government understand the importance of getting the process right. To ensure that the transition between the HSE and MHCLG is a successful one we recommend the following:
- **Listen to the industry** – To ensure that the same mistakes are not made, we are keen to see MHCLG listen to the many concerns that have been raised by the industry when it comes to the BSR's regulation of new and existing HRBs. It is also important that this is a continuous process and does not stop at the point in which the BSR is up and running in MHCLG. The results of this inquiry will no doubt be a good starting point to understand the concerns from the built environment.
 - **Industry roundtables** – To aid in engagement with the industry we recommend industry roundtables are set with built environment professionals to hear feedback directly and inform future changes.
 - **Communicate change** – One of the consistent frustrations from those working in the built environment is that government departments and bodies are not consistent in communicating current and upcoming changes in regulation. Given the clear evidence that some of the processes of the BSR will need to change, it is vitally important that MHCLG communicates what these are going to be as early as possible to give the industry time to anticipate and adapt. We recommend the establishment of a permanent Working Group consisting of representatives from BSR and industry bodies that could assist with streamlining communication of new changes, gather feedback on processes and systems, and provide a direct link into the built environment.
 - **Adequate resourcing** – While we will make clear throughout this submission that we do not feel that poor resourcing is the sole or primary reason for delays within the BSR, it is clearly one of the contributing factors. With that in mind, and with acceptance that the current outsourcing model within the BSR has not functioned

⁴ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, [Reforms to Building Safety Regulator to accelerate housebuilding](#), 30 June 2025

well, it is clear that adequate resourcing must be sought prior to the BSR formally moving into and operating within MHCLG.

- **Bringing knowledge across** – Where possible, MHCLG should seek to bring people over from HSE who have worked on establishing and operating the BSR function. In doing this, MHCLG will be bringing over crucial knowledge about its operation rather than ‘starting from scratch’ with a roster of staff who have not had experience operating the BSR function.
- **Take time** – We understand that transferring of functions from the HSE to MHCLG will take time and significant resource. We urge that MHCLG takes the time necessary to ensure that the process of transition is done correctly before fully activating the BSR role within the department. Any uncertainty and confusion will only serve to further damage the role.
- **Stock check** – It is important to acknowledge that adopting the BSR within MHCLG and eventually the future construction regulator will take time. There will be a need to implement stock checking points where MHCLG consults with the industry to ensure the process is working smoothly and as intended. At first, we recommend that these are completed every 6 months through either roundtables or more formal consultation processes. These could also be done through the permanent Working Group as mentioned above.

Question Three: What impacts could the BSR’s regulatory framework have on the delivery of the Government’s housing targets? How significant are high-rise buildings to meeting these housing targets? As an obstacle to meeting these targets, how does building safety regulation compare with other potential obstacles such as skills, supply chains and the planning system?

30. The Government has set itself lofty ambitions to deliver 1.5 million new homes within this parliament. Regardless of whether the general consensus is that these are deliverable or not, it should be acknowledged that within built up cities, a decent proportion of new homes will need to be delivered using HRBs.
31. According to some estimates, around 490 new HRBs will be constructed each year, which will be subject to BSR approval processes. At present it is uncertain how many of these will be purely residential buildings and how many could be other use classes such as hotels (that contain serviced apartments) or hospitals.⁵ Whether or not this number matches the reality of delivery will be hard to tell - in an article from January 2025 it was noted that construction had started on only two of the applications that had been submitted to the BSR since its formation.⁶
32. With current housing targets of 52,000 new homes per year, London and other areas highly constrained by land availability will struggle to deliver the homes they need to without action taken to ease the BSR approval bottlenecks. This will not help the already persistent under delivery of new homes in major cities, highlighted by the fact that in the years 2022-23 a net total of 35,000 new homes were delivered against the already stated target, representing a 10% fall on the previous year.⁷
33. It should not be considered that delays in approvals from the BSR will be the major roadblock or primary influencing factor to a significant proportion of new homes not being delivered in England, as most will be delivered through high-density, low-rise developments in more rural areas. However, it should still be acknowledged that delays

⁵ Muckle LLP, [What you need to know about registering higher risk buildings](#), 26 May 2023

⁶ Construction News, [Just two new HRBs approved under new building safety regime](#), 29 January 2025

⁷ London Assembly, [Unlocking housing development in London](#)

in BSR approvals will be one of the factors preventing cities from meeting their own individual targets.

34. In terms of barriers to delivery, the planning system should still be seen as the major roadblock, closely followed by the skills needed to deliver the homes once planning permission is granted.

Question Four: Does the Building Safety Regulator's regulatory framework strike the right balance between providing a holistic, outcomes-based view of safety and ensuring that developers and building owners understand what they are required to do?

35. CIOB is not best placed to answer this question, we recommend consulting with a variety of stakeholders who currently submit applications to the BSR for more information.

Question Five: To what extent are delays in approvals for high-rise buildings down to the regulatory processes used by the BSR? Could these processes be made more proportionate, particularly for smaller works, without impacting the safety of high-rise buildings? If so, how?

36. Throughout this response we want to highlight that the delays in approvals for HRBs, both new and existing, are a result of a multitude of factors and cannot be attributed to a single issue.
37. This is why we do not believe the regulatory process should be focused on in isolation. There is a much wider, holistic and whole system assessment that should be done on some of the issues and concerns that the industry has had so far in dealing with the new building safety regime. This links with our answer to Question 2, which highlights some of the actions that should be taken by MHCLG prior to the establishment of the BSR within the department and eventually the construction regulator.
38. We understand the role of the BSR is not necessarily to educate applicants and the duty of upskilling and understanding the new regulatory framework lies on the shoulders of those submitting applications. However, what we have found is that a more collaborative approach to regulation may lead to a better understanding and, therefore, quality of application.
39. Regardless, for the purpose of this question, it is worth noting the results of a Freedom of Information (FOI) request submitted to the HSE by Cast Consultancy in June 2025. The FOI in question asked, in part, about the split of applications submitted to the HSE in its role as the BSR from October 2023 (when the BSR came into force) and May 2025.
40. The FOI produced data showing that, in the period mentioned above, 187 applications for new HRBs had been submitted for Gateway 2 approval. During the same period however, 2,049 applications for existing HRBs had been submitted for Gateway 2 approval. This shows that the split of applications is very much in favour of existing HRBs.
41. Of the applications for existing HRBs, the status, approved or refused, was known for only 19% with 1,465 still awaiting decisions.⁸ Whilst we understand that the process for deciding on these applications will be complex and needs to be weighed against decision

⁸ Building, [Barely 10% of building safety gateway 2 submissions for new builds have been approved, latest figures say](#), 23 June 2025

making on new HRBs, many of these works will be on buildings which have occupants in situ, leaving them without the certainty that the building they occupy is safe.

42. We have also heard from our members that the delays in making decisions on Category A and B works for existing HRBs is having a negative impact on those buildings that could be considered non-traditional HRBs, i.e. those that are not purely residential dwellings, such as hospitals.
43. Whilst we cannot be clear on the nature of many of the applications submitted and whether they fall under the definition of Category A works (structural or fire safety) or Category B works (other works apart from those deemed to be emergency works), it may be worth considering that more minor works, those categorised under Category B, could be outsourced to local building control authorities or private sector building control to ease the burden on the BSR.⁹

Question Six: Are the BSR's approval processes sufficiently clear and understandable to developers? What level of guidance or feedback is necessary for those making applications to the BSR to understand its requirements? Could this situation be improved through the BSR's review of Approved Documents?

44. The feedback we have consistently received from industry is that the BSR approval process is not sufficiently clear and does not provide feedback that will help to improve the submission quality of applications.
45. Ultimately, one of the major complaints that the BSR is receiving is that applicants do not know what 'good' looks like when submitting an application at Gateway 2. Partly, the responsibility here is for applicants to upskill themselves to a degree in which they know what information needs to be contained within an application. However, the BSR could spend more time on guidance for applications as well as by sitting down with applicants prior to submission to ensure that they understand what the BSR needs to see from an application.
46. While some of the guidance that could be developed will take time and require technical expertise to inform, there are some 'quick wins' that could be addressed to lessen some of the relatively minor reasons that applications are being refused. One example which was provided by members, was in the signposting of information within applications to the BSR.
47. According to our members, refusals based on information not being included within applications is becoming a major stumbling block for the industry. This is supported by feedback from Neil Hope-Collins, Operational Policy Lead at the HSE who claimed that "They [applications] are not valid because applicants are not giving us the basic information that shows they understand the work they are doing."¹⁰ Whilst it is undoubtedly the case many applications will have been submitted with missing or incomplete information, it is also the case, according to our members, that information is being included within submissions but the signposting to it is not sufficient enough for case officers to pick it up when deciding on an application.
48. Guidance on how to best signpost information within applications at Gateway 2 should be relatively simple to produce and simple to understand and would help eliminate one of the persistent issues that is proving a barrier for successful applications.

⁹ Harris Associates, [Masting the Building Control Regulations: A Guide to Achieving Cat A & B Approval with the BSR](#), 20 February 2025

¹⁰ Fire Protection Association, [Many building applications to new regulator missing basic information](#), 13 April 2024

49. We are aware that in July 2025, the Construction Leadership Council (CLC) [published guidance relating to the Building Control Approval application process](#) for new HRBs in collaboration with the BSR. This is a positive step forward and has been welcomed by industry. There is now a need to ensure that this guidance is publicised as widely as possible across industry to ensure that it is read by those submitting applications at Gateway 2.
50. A practical solution to some of the issues highlighted above would be for the BSR to publish a definitive checklist or guidance document, similar in style of the CLC guidance, that outlines the required documentation and quality expectations for submissions at each gateway. It is important that any guidance does not set out the minimum requirement but sets out 'best practice' for the industry to meet.
51. On the BSR's fundamental review of building regulations guidance, while we are sure this will help provide clarity on the approved documents, it is too early to tell if this process will provide a positive outcome. We are supportive of the panel that has been approved to undertake this review and urge the panel to consult with industry as widely as possible throughout the process.
52. Our primary recommendation around ensuring that the approval process is sufficiently clear is to focus on generating better routes of communication between applicants and the BSR. One consistent piece of feedback from our members is that it is often difficult to communicate with the BSR as officers are unresponsive to requests for updates on in-progress applications. We have also heard consistently that not enough guidance is being provided ahead of submission to ensure that applications are sufficient.
53. To aid this, we recommend implementing two new communication points for applicants.
1. In April 2025, the Director of Building Safety at HSE, Philip White, stated he was not in opposition to pre-application style meetings. We strongly urge these meetings are sought as an option to streamline communication between applicants and the BSR. Whilst we understand that the BSR performs a regulatory role and that changes to the guiding regulations would need to be made to allow for pre-application style meetings, we think a compromise here would be beneficial for the sake of better applications, and more guidance on what the BSR does and does not want to see.

Not only would this enable for better applications but would also save the BSR time in determining applications that are fundamentally flawed due to a lack of information. These meetings do not need to be indications of whether a scheme will or will not pass through Gateway 2 but instead should be geared towards providing applications with strategic advice on strengths and weaknesses in future applications and focus on what important information that must be included in submissions. To recoup for time spent we recommend that these meetings are chargeable, in the same vein as pre-application meetings for traditional planning applications.

While pre-application meetings as well as additional guidance on applications might help provide the industry with more guidance on what 'good' looks like, there are still issues with the lack of communication whilst applications are being decided on. We recommend that the option for 'hard-stop' points are explored. Essentially these would be points in which applicants can speak to case officers while their applications are being determined to understand if there are any minor (the definition of 'minor' would need to be explored in this context) amendments that can be made to an application to ensure that it is not refused. In our mind, this refers to issues such as file size, file location, signposting or labelling.

On a separate note, clarity is needed on who will perform the role of a case officer, what the competency requirements are for the role and whether this is an advisory or administrative function. If advisory, it is crucial that officers have the skills and knowledge to make decisions and training to ensure they are competent is undertaken.

Question Seven: To what extent are delays caused by a poor understanding of building safety on the part of developers, leading to unsuitable applications? Should the solution to delays be a greater awareness of how to take a holistic approach to safety on the part of developers, rather than more prescriptive guidance on regulatory requirements?

54. It is widely acknowledged that the industry has not done enough to upskill itself in the wake of the new rules and regulations governing building safety for new and existing buildings.
55. There have been numerous publications that have highlighted either the lack of preparation from the industry for new building safety legislation or the lack of understanding of the legislation, despite it being in force for two years. For example, construction consultancy RLB UK published results from a survey in July 2024 which highlighted over a quarter of the construction industry was unprepared for the BSA and its consequences.¹¹ At the same time, results of research published by construction technology firm NBS found around half of construction industry professionals surveyed were unclear about their responsibilities under the BSA.¹² This lack of preparedness has been called out and highlighted by Dame Judith Hackitt who, in recent publications, has claimed that the industry response and understanding has been too slow to materialise and has not matched the pace of government policy change.¹³
56. As with our answers to questions 3, 9 and 12, it is ultimately a mixture of elements including a lack of understanding in the industry, that are causing the delays with the BSR approval process.
57. CIOB has been at the forefront of efforts to develop the understanding of the BSA amongst both our members and the wider construction industry. We regularly host Continuous Professional Developments (CPD) and events on the subject and have developed codes of practice, information sheets, qualifications and training courses specifically tailored to building safety. In January 2025, we also introduced mandatory building safety CPD for CIOB members to ensure they remain competent with the latest building safety regulations and developments.¹⁴
58. A comprehensive list of the actions that CIOB has taken to develop our learning and assessment portfolio as it relates to building safety can be found on our dedicated [Building Safety Resource page](#) on the CIOB website within [our response](#) to the Grenfell Tower Inquiry reports.¹⁵
59. It is worth noting separately that we have also launched a [Principal Contractor Competency Certification Scheme \(PCCCS\)](#) to provide a route to proving competency as

¹¹ PBC Today, [One in four in construction is unprepared for Building Safety Act](#), 31 July 2024

¹² NBS, [Constructing a Safer Future: Building Safety Act White Paper](#), 14 May 2024

¹³ Property Week, [Building sector 'too slow to be part of post-Grenfell solution'](#), Dame Hackitt tells Lords, 15 July 2025

¹⁴ Chartered Institute of Building (CIOB), [Introducing mandatory building safety CPD for CIOB members](#), January 2025

¹⁵ CIOB, [Grenfell Tower Inquiry Response – Version One](#), April 2025

a Principal Contractor, as required by the BSR. We will soon be launching a similar scheme relating to Principal Designers.

60. However, while CIOB can generate a level of interest and uptake of these courses, there will always be a barrier in reaching the number of construction professionals necessary to provide widescale upskilling in the industry. This does not just apply to CIOB courses, but to all voluntary schemes generated by professional or trade bodies, as well as educational institutions.
61. Given the need to widely upskill the industry, we recommend that the government and BSR provides a list of endorsed schemes, qualifications and certificates in building safety related matters. A centralised list of resources will help generate more uptake of courses and latterly a better understanding of the BSA and its implications.

Question Eight: The BSR has suggested that it would like to carry out its work on an organisation-by-organisation basis, rather than the current system of looking at things building-by-building. Would you support a move to the BSR focusing on organisations, or would this lessen their focus on the safety of individual buildings?

62. CIOB's understanding is that the proposals to create a streamlined system (referred to as account management) for having a single case officer decide multiple applications submitted by the same applicant relates to deciding on higher-risk buildings on the same site, rather than submitted by the same applicant across a variety of projects. It is worth noting that this point was echoed during the roundtable that we hosted of CIOB members with experience in submitting to the BSR.
63. It is worth seeking clarity on this point, as there appears to be a misunderstanding amongst the industry.
64. Regardless, CIOB supports the intention behind the proposals to introduce an account management style system in both potential forms.
65. If the proposals relate to a single officer deciding on multiple buildings on the same site, then the proposals will likely lead to greater clarity and consistency in decision making by ensuring that knowledge and understanding developed on one building is retained for others, and the creation of a single point of contact for an applicant across a site could streamline communications.
66. If the proposals relate to an 'organisation-by-organisation' approach, as suggested in this inquiry, CIOB would also be supportive. Such approach could result in greater consistency of decision making as many applicants will likely be submitting similar types of application. It would also help foster a more collaborative and positive approach between applicants and officers at the BSR as they would have more time to develop a positive working relationship.

Question Nine: To what extent are delays in approvals caused by the resources available to the regulator? Is there a need to give the BSR more funding, and if so, would developers accept an increase in regulatory fees to allow for this? Would more funding allow the BSR to deal with applications more swiftly, or is there a need to consider alternative financial models for delivering building safety approvals?

67. There has been ample evidence pointing towards the difficulties that the BSR has experienced in recruiting staff, including criticism from industry that delays in deciding

applications at the Gateway 2 approval process is partly a result of a lack of resourcing within the BSR.^{16 17}

68. Whilst we understand that there is an acute focus on resourcing issues within the BSR given its immediate impact on project timelines and delivery, it must be noted that the skills gap, or lack of access to the 'right' skills is something that the construction industry is experiencing across the board.
69. As noted in the most recent Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) Construction Workforce Outlook 2025-2029, the construction industry workforce contracted by 2.7% in England between 2023 and 2024 (representing around 62,000 workers leaving the industry).¹⁸ The skills gap in construction is being felt across all roles, skill levels and, more acutely, across different geographic locations. Its solutions will take coordinated, cross-policy, and cross-departmental actions to address.
70. We understand that targeted efforts to drive skills both into the construction sector and directly into the BSR are being undertaken, however, there are a number of challenges that may hamper this effort. The first and most prominent challenge will be competing with the private sector for the skills necessary to provide more resourcing for the BSR.
71. As noted in a publication from January 2025, building control professionals salaries have hit an all-time high in the wake of the increased responsibilities for the role, the greater emphasis and importance on building control and the competition within the employment market that has been created as a result of changes to the building safety landscape.¹⁹ **There will be a need for the BSR to compete for talent in a highly competitive market for skills which will be challenging given the lack of flexibility in public sector salary banding.** As an example of this, the HSE recruited for four new registered building inspectors to join the BSR in May 2025. The average salary of the roles sat between £60,000 and £65,000.²⁰ These roles were advertised at a senior level and applicants were expected to be qualified building control professionals with demonstratable competence to work on HRBs and be registered as a Class 3 Category H Registered Building Inspector. Many private sector advertisements see the ceiling of the role being closer to £70,000 and upwards.
72. The second challenge will be in ensuring that those within the BSR and those joining are equipped with the right set of skills and competencies to correctly carry out the role. It would be worth understanding and exploring the competencies required during the recruitment process within the BSR as well as the CPD and upskilling offering for those within the BSR.
73. In terms of solutions, increasing the funding for the BSR may allow them to compete with private-sector organisations in terms of a salary offering, however, we are concerned that this will become the primary focus instead of looking at whether recruitment and resourcing is the primary cause of the delays the industry has experienced with the BSR.
74. It is important to view the delays as a result of a much wider series of issues to avoid targeting 'quick fixes' during the transitional process between the BSR role sitting within the HSE and moving within MHCLG.

¹⁶ Building, [Industry leaders criticise lack of resource and competence at Building Safety Regulator](#), 18 September 2024

¹⁷ Inside Housing, [Capacity must increase at Building Safety Regulator as sign-off delays 'causing real problems', lawyer says](#), 26 September 2026

¹⁸ Construction Industry Training Board (CITB), [Construction Workforce Outlook: Labour Market Intelligence 2025-2029](#), 2025

¹⁹ PBC Today, [Building control salaries driven to historic highs by skills shortage](#), 8 January 2025

²⁰ Construction Management, [HSE ramps up registered building inspectors recruitment](#), 14 May 2025

Question Ten: Does the BSR have access to the skilled staff necessary to carry out multidisciplinary assessments of safety? If the BSR is struggling to access the skills it needs, what changes could resolve this issue? For instance, is there a need for higher pay for those carrying out assessments, or for further changes to enable secondments?

75. Whilst much of the information we want to convey on the skills issues faced within the BSR is contained within our response to Question 9 there is an additional point to highlight.
76. It has been acknowledged by the BSR that their current outsourcing model is unsuitable. In an article in Housing Today, published in February 2025, Andrew Moore, Head of Operations, Planning and Building Control at the BSR stated that the delays at Gateway 2 approval were in part due to the fact that the “outsourced delivery model for processing applications run by the BSR was not working as well as anticipated.”²¹
77. We understand that the intention is to change this model and insource individuals necessary to carry out the function of the BSR, which is positive. There will need to be more detail provided about how these new teams will be managed.
78. However, given that the function of the BSR is going to be transferred over to MHCLG, we are concerned that the process of insourcing will not take place, leaving the HSE without the resources to process applications within agreed timeframes and still subject to a dysfunctional outsourcing model.
79. If the insourcing does take place, it may be advisable to carry these individuals over to MHCLG when the BSR function moves to ensure some consistency.

Question Eleven: How is the BSR progressing in improving the safety of all buildings, including low-rise buildings? Is the relationship between the BSR and building control authorities and inspectors working well?

80. The consistent feedback that we received from our members who have worked in some capacity with the BSR is that it has had an overall positive impact on improving the safety of buildings.
81. Whilst it must be acknowledged there have been some issues in the relationship between the BSR and the construction industry, its overall impact has been a positive one, introducing a new framework to ensure that safety is held as a primary concern in the construction and refurbishment of buildings.
82. In terms of feedback on the relationship between the BSR and building control authorities, we recommend consulting organisations like [Local Authority Building Control \(LABC\)](#).

Question Twelve: To what extent are delays a result of growing pains that will ease over time, or a structural problem that requires more significant changes? What improvements to the BSR's regulatory framework are needed?

²¹ Housing Today, [Gateway 2 processing delays caused by outsourced delivery model, admits Building Safety Regulator](#), 4 February 2025

83. It is likely that 'growing pains' are partly responsible for some of the issues the HSE is experiencing in their role as the BSR.
84. The role and function of the BSR is extremely complicated, therefore it should not be surprising that it is taking time to function as expected. It must also be acknowledged the HSE already has significant responsibilities for health and safety across the construction sector which may divert from their ability to focus resources entirely on the BSR role.
85. Whilst we understand the frustration that may be felt with the HSE at present, they have only had a few years to acclimate the role within the organisation. CIOB does not feel the logical next step after a period of concerns, many of which are being worked on, is to take away the function entirely and embed it within a wholly new organisation that will ultimately come up against some of the same challenges as the HSE. It should also be noted that while the HSE does not have experience as a building control authority (a key part of the BSR role), it does have experience with powers of enforcement (another key part of the BSR role). It may be worth considering separating out these two roles so that the enforcement aspect remains within HSE and the building control role is positioned within MHCLG.

Question Thirteen: How does the Building Safety Regulator's work relate to the regulation of construction products? How does the BSR cooperate with the Office for Product and Safety Standards, and how might this relationship change with the introduction of a single construction regulator?

86. Our understanding remains that the regulation of construction products falls under the remit of the National Regulator for Construction Products (NRCP), established in 2021, which currently sits within the Office for Product Safety Standards (OPSS).
87. Both bodies are separate to the BSR. Whilst we understand the intention from the recommendations made by Sir Martin Moore-Bick in the [Grenfell Tower Inquiry Phase 2 Report](#) are to form a single regulator for the construction industry, we are not yet clear how any changes made will relate to construction products. Until this is made clear it is difficult to define how the regulation of construction products will work in tandem or change with the BSR.
88. In terms of the cooperation between the BSR and the OPSS, this is not for us to say, it would be wise to gather this information from both bodies in question. Similarly, it would be wise to explore evidence submitted as part of the recent MHCLG consultation on the Construction Products Reform Green Paper to understand industry views on this matter.

Question Fourteen: How does the Building Safety Regulator's regulatory framework compare to how building safety is assured in other countries and jurisdictions? Are there good examples of how to ensure building safety elsewhere, and what lessons can the BSR learn from them?

89. We are aware that the Chartered Institute of Housing (CIH) has provided a comprehensive list of examples of best practice from other countries. We recommend examining their response to this question.