



*Republic of the Philippines*  
*Professional Regulation Commission*  
*Manila*

*The Professional Regulatory*

*Board of Architecture*  
*(PRBoA)*

*Office of the PRBoA Chair*



Your Ref:

Our Ref: 07\_BoA-003

16 February 2007

**HON. LEONOR TRIPON-ROSE**

**Chairperson**

Professional Regulation Commission  
Manila

**SUBJECT : THE PRBoCE REQUEST FOR A PRC MEETING ON THE  
MATTER OF THE SIGNATORY TO THE "SUBDIVISION PLAN"**

**REFERENCE :** 01 February 2007 Letter of the PRC Chair to the  
Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) Chair on  
the matter of the Signatory to the "Subdivision Plan"  
and the Response of the Professional Regulatory Board  
of Civil Engineering (PRBoCE)

Dear Madam Chair,

Greetings!

Upon reading the letter coming from the PRBoCE, the undersigned's initial thought was that of continuing need for the PRC to somehow restrain the PRBoCE from its present practice of **unilaterally and liberally interpreting** its regulatory laws (RA 544 of 1950, as amended by RA 1582 of 1956) to the total exclusion of other regulatory laws, particularly those with respect to the practice of architecture and environmental planning. A separate but related issue is the preparation, signing and dry-sealing of **architectural** plans/ drawings and documents which must soon be **separately addressed** by the PRBoA and the PRBoCE within the PRC.

What is clear from the position paper of the Philippine Institute of Environmental Planners (PIEP) is that Civil Engineers (CEs) and Geodetic Engineers (GEs) are only required to prepare certain **components** of the "Subdivision Plan" i.e. a misnomer that actually refers to the Master Development Plan, and **not** the "Subdivision Plan" itself, which is a higher and more **complex** undertaking by a **team of expert professionals** (and not just CEs or GEs), each of whom is required to have special training and experience in **site/ physical planning** and/or **environmental planning**.

The regulatory laws of environmental planning and architecture allow both professions to prepare "Subdivision Plans" i.e. a form of **site/ physical plan**, but with the requisite limitation of 3.0 hectares (has.) applicable only to architects by virtue of the 1979 IRR of RA 545, as amended by RA 1581. The same accommodation does **not** apply to CEs and GEs under their respective regulatory laws and therefore bars them from preparing, signing or dry-sealing "Subdivision Plans".

Due to the very sensitive nature of subdivision planning, it may therefore be best for the HLURB to return to the implementation of its 2001 implementing rules and regulations (IRRs) for both PD 957 and BP 220 that require the **collective signatures** of environmental planners **with** either an architect, CE or GE to ensure that environmental (including social) concerns and prevailing public interests are **not** needlessly sacrificed in the name of progress and profit.

Should a meeting among the PRC and the Professional Regulatory Boards (PRBs) of Environmental Planning, Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodetic Engineering be called by the PRC, it should hopefully **not** be about a discussion of the applicability of the concerned regulatory laws (which was already clearly settled by the 01 February 2007 PRC letter to the HLURB and which should hopefully not be retracted by the PRC). Instead, such a meeting should be about the **delineation** of the roles of each profession in the process of subdivision planning and the collective **re-definition** of the applicable **site/ physical planning** terms, concepts and documents for the proper guidance not only of the HLURB, but of all agencies under the Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC).

This matter of delineating the roles of the professionals involved and the re-definition of terms applicable to subdivision planning should have taken place in late 2005 (or early 2006) under a collaborative arrangement between the HLURB and the PRC but appeared to have been somehow blocked and derailed by certain interests.

The foregoing matters were also the subject of the scathing exchanges between the PRBOCE Chair and architectural organizations such as the Philippine Institute of Architects (PIA) and the Architecture Advocacy International Foundation (AAIF) in late 2005, copies of which were officially furnished the PRC. Neither the PIA nor the AAIF were invited by the HLURB to any public consultation prior to the issuance of the HLURB Memo in late 2006, the subject of the PIEP position paper.

It is now time to put matters in the proper perspective and order. **The rule of law must prevail** and the preeminent/ unchallenged **authority of the PRC** on matters of professional practice, particularly in the preparation, signing and dry-sealing of "Subdivision Plans" must be **upheld over** the continuing tyranny and malpractices spawned/ inflicted by selfish and misguided interests, be these from the public or private sector.

Thank You very much.

Yours sincerely,

**ORIGINAL SIGNED**  
**Armando N. ALLÍ**  
**Chair, PRBoA**

file:07\_BoA-003