

Examining The Factors Influencing the Building Permit Application Process in Cabanatuan City: An Exploratory Study

DONATO L. ESTRELLA JR.¹, JOHN MANUEL M. ESCUETA², MARVIN O. MALLARI³

^{1,2}Student, Masters of Engineering Management, Graduate School, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City, Philippines

³Professor, Masters of Engineering Management, Graduate School, Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology, Cabanatuan City, Philippines

Abstract- This exploratory descriptive study examines the influence of administrative design and socio-economic status on the building permit application process in Cabanatuan City, Central Luzon, Philippines. Using survey data from 66 applicants who interacted with the Office of the Building Official (OBO), the research employs a structured questionnaire featuring Likert-scale items and open-ended responses to investigate process challenges, equity of access, and perceptions of fairness within the framework of Republic Act No. 11032, the Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018[1]. The results show that there are four related systemic bottlenecks: unclear and inconsistent documentation requirements, poor coordination between agencies, limited and reactive information sharing, and a heavy reliance on expensive professional services that act as de facto gatekeepers to compliance. Income is the most important factor in accessibility. People who make less than 25,000 pesos a month report lower satisfaction and perceive professional fees as too high. Conversely, individuals earning more than 100,000 pesos a month express higher satisfaction and report fewer concerns. These dynamics create a two-tiered system in which higher-income citizens can more easily get professional assistance, which goes against the goal of RA 11032 to make the law fair for everyone. The study concludes by recommending evidence-based reforms, such as clearer integrated documentation, digital information and tracking tools, authentic single-window processing, and specialized technical assistance for low-income applicants, to realign the permit system with the principles of efficiency, transparency, and social equity.

Keywords: Building Permit, Cabanatuan City, Ease of Doing Business, two-tiered system, Social Equity

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

The construction industry is a key driver of economic

growth in the Philippines, but getting building permits is still a big problem for many people. In Cabanatuan City, like in many other places that are quickly becoming cities, the Office of the Building Official (OBO) is the main place where people can legally build. However, anecdotal evidence and prior research suggest that the complexity of requirements, processing delays, and associated costs can disproportionately affect applicants depending on their socio-economic status [2].

In response to these challenges, the Philippine government enacted Republic Act No. 11032, or the "Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018"[1]. This law mandates local government units (LGUs) to streamline procedures, establish "Business One-Stop Shops" (BOSS), and adhere to strict processing timelines (e.g., the Citizen's Charter). Despite these legal mandates, the on-the-ground experience of applicants often varies.

B. Research Objectives

This study aims to bridge the gap between policy and practice by conducting an in-depth examination of the real-world experiences of building permit applicants in Cabanatuan City. The research is guided by four specific, measurable objectives:

Objective 1: Determine specific challenges that the applicant experienced during every part of the building permit application, such as paperwork, cross-agency coordination, processing timelines and cost structures.

Objective 2: Analyze How Socio-Economic Factors Influence the Ease of Compliance Examine the relationship between applicant socio-economic characteristics (monthly household income, education level, and housing status) and their ability to navigate the building permit process successfully.

Objective 3: Assess Perceptions of Fairness and Equity in the Process Evaluate whether applicants perceive the building permit application process to be fair, transparent, and equitably administered.

Objective 4: Propose Inclusive Improvements to the System Synthesize findings from Objectives 1-3 to propose evidence-based, inclusive recommendations that would enhance the building permit application process, prioritizing improvements that would benefit low-income and less-educated applicants.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Objectives

This study employs mixed-methods exploratory descriptive design with a primary emphasis on quantitative analysis. The quantitative component (structured survey with Likert scale responses) provides breadth and allows for statistical analysis and cross-tabulation. The qualitative component (open-ended questions) provides contextualization.

B. Research Instrument and Validation

Before proceeding with the full-scale survey, a pilot test was conducted to ensure the reliability and consistency of the survey tool. We used a pilot sample of 25 building permit applicants. There were 29 questions in the survey, which were divided into six sections to obtain a full picture of the respondents' experiences and thoughts.

The Demographic Profile (4 items) in Section A included things like education, income, housing status, and type of permit. Section B, Building Permit Application Experience (6 Likert items), looked at things like how well the requirements were understood at first, how clear they were, how easy it was to collect the documents, how helpful the staff were, how long it took to process the application, and how much it cost. Section C, Application Process Experience (8 Likert items), looked at things like how clear the requirements were, how well different agencies worked together, how much it cost to get professional services, how much it cost to get a permit, and how easy it was to find information. Section D, Factors Affecting the Process (5 Likert items), looked at how income, finances, education, employment status, and professional networks affect the process. Section E, Overall Satisfaction and Fairness (4 Likert items),

looked at how fairly people were treated, how clear the fees were, how professional the staff were, and how satisfied people were overall. Finally, Section F, Suggestions for Improvement (2 items), had a checklist with multiple choices and an open-ended question to get participants' helpful feedback. The Likert scale items were rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning "Strongly Disagree" and 5 meaning "Strongly Agree."

C. Data Collection

Target Population: All building permit applicants who have engaged with the Cabanatuan City Office of the Building Official.

Sample Size: 66 respondents collected via Google Form and survey questionnaire.

Sampling Method: Purposive sampling through:

- Direct contact at the Office of the Building Official
- Recruitment at active construction sites
- Snowball sampling (respondent referrals)

D. Data Analysis

The data were examined using descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Then we used clear thresholds to interpret the results. For example, a mean of at least 3.5 meant strong agreement or a positive perception, a mean between 2.5 and 3.5 meant moderate agreement or mixed perceptions, and a mean below 2.5 meant disagreement or areas of concern. The analysis also included cross-tabulations by demographic groups and average scores for each survey section to show patterns and main ideas in the answers of participants.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data were examined using descriptive statistics like frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Then we used clear thresholds to interpret the results. For example, a mean of at least 3.5 meant

A. Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=66)

Demographic Variable	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Education Level		
High School or Below	15	22.8
Vocational/Technical Training	9	13.6
College (Undergraduate)	29	43.9
Post-Graduate Degree	13	19.7
Total	66	100.0
Monthly Household Income		
Below ₱25,000	23	34.8
₱25,001 - ₱50,000	23	34.8
₱50,001 - ₱100,000	12	18.2
Above ₱100,000	8	12.2
Total	66	100.0
Housing Status		
Own a House (Fully Paid)	11	16.7
Own a House (With Loan)	19	28.8
Renting	24	36.4
Living with Family/Relatives	12	18.1
Total	66	100.0
Type of Permit Applied For		
Residential (Single-Family)	32	48.5
Residential (Multi-Family)	14	21.2
Commercial	15	22.7
Other	5	7.6
Total	66	100.0

Education Level

Analysis: The respondent sample shows that 22.8% have high school education or below, representing a meaningful portion of the population with potentially limited comfort in navigating complex bureaucratic processes. A larger group of 43.9% have completed college (undergraduate), and 19.7% have a post-graduate degree. Overall, 66.7% of the respondents have some form of post-secondary education, suggesting a relatively educated sample, though there is still a notable percentage with lower educational attainment, which provides a diverse range of educational backgrounds.

Monthly Household Income

Analysis: The respondent sample shows that 22.8% have high school education or below, representing a meaningful portion of the population with potentially limited comfort in navigating complex bureaucratic processes. A larger group of 43.9% have completed college (undergraduate), and 19.7% have a post-graduate degree. Overall, 66.7% of the respondents have some form of post-secondary education, suggesting a relatively educated sample, though there is still a notable percentage with lower educational

attainment, which provides a diverse range of educational backgrounds.

Housing Status

Analysis: The housing status data reveals that 36.4% of respondents are renting, while 28.8% own a house with a loan, and 16.7% own a house fully paid. Only 18.1% live with family or relatives. The majority (65.2%) either rent or live with family/relatives, indicating a substantial number of housing-insecure individuals. This suggests a higher reliance on rental properties or shared living arrangements compared to homeownership. Renters may have fewer financial resources for professional services and face greater time constraints, which could affect their capacity to manage bureaucratic processes. Only 33.3% own homes, which reflects that most permit applicants are economically marginal, potentially facing financial difficulties compared to homeowners.

Type of Permit Applied For

Analysis: The data on the type of permits applied for shows that 48.5% of respondents are seeking residential single-family permits, while 21.2% are applying for multi-family residential permits. This suggests that a significant portion of respondents are focused on individual housing developments, indicating a preference for single-family homes. Additionally, 22.7% of applicants are seeking commercial permits, and 7.6% are applying for other types of permits. The relatively high proportion of single-family residential permit applications highlights a strong interest in individual homeownership, while the smaller proportion of multi-family applications suggests a preference for more independent or less communal living spaces. This distribution may also reflect the economic constraints of the applicants, as single-family homes could be more attainable or desired in the long term compared to multi-family housing developments.

B. Challenges in the Building Permit Application Process (Objective 1)

Item	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Section B: Building Permit Application Experience			
Q5: Clear understanding of process at start	2.76	0.96	Moderate agreement
Q6: Required documents clearly communicated	2.79	1.0	Moderate agreement
Q7: Easy to obtain all necessary documents	2.77	1.0	Moderate agreement
Q8: Staff at OBO helpful and responsive	2.77	0.97	Moderate agreement
Q9: Application processed within expected timeframe	2.74	0.95	Moderate agreement
Q10: Total cost of obtaining permit reasonable	2.8	1.0	Moderate agreement

Section C: Application Process Experience			
Q11: Completing documents was straightforward	2.3	0.61	Disagreement
Q12: Requirements clearly specified	2.03	0.66	Disagreement
Q13: Obtaining inter-agency certificates manageable	2.82	1.0	Moderate agreement
Q14: Processing time met expectations	2.77	0.99	Moderate agreement
Q15: All documents accepted on initial submission	2.2	0.93	Disagreement
Q16: Cost of professional services reasonable	2.89	0.60	Moderate agreement
Q17: Permit fees and charges affordable	3.60	0.58	Strong agreement
Q18: Information readily available when needed	2.27	0.60	Moderate agreement

Legend: Mean ≥ 3.5 : Strong agreement (positive perception); Mean 2.5 - 3.5: Moderate agreement (mixed perception); Mean < 2.5 : Disagreement (negative perception or challenge identified)

1. Documentation and Communication Deficiencies

The survey data reveals significant difficulties in the documentation phase, with three items scoring notably low:

- Q15 ("All documents accepted on initial submission"): Mean = 2.20 (SD = 0.93)
- Q12 ("Requirements clearly specified"): Mean = 2.03 (SD = 0.66)
- Q11 ("Completing documents was straightforward"): Mean = 2.30 (SD = 0.61)

These results indicate that applicants frequently encounter document rejection or requests for resubmission, a primary source of frustration and procedural delays. The high standard deviations suggest considerable variability in respondents' experiences, likely reflecting inconsistent application of standards or different project types handled by the OBO.

The fragmentation across multiple government agencies—barangay office, Bureau of Fire Protection (BFP), City Zoning Office—creates a situation where applicants must piece together requirements from disparate sources, leading to incomplete submissions or misunderstandings. Moreover, the inconsistency in document acceptance suggests that the OBO lacks standardized checklists or that pre-submission guidance is inadequate. This administrative friction is particularly burdensome for lower-educated applicants (22.8% have high school education or below) who may struggle to navigate multi-agency requirements independently.

2. Information Accessibility

Items related to clarity and information availability scored below 2.5 in your original framework analysis, though the updated data shows:

- Q18 ("Information readily available when needed"): Mean = 2.27 (SD = 0.60)
- Q6 ("Required documents clearly communicated"): Mean = 2.79 (SD = 1.0)
- Q5 ("Clear understanding of process at start"): Mean = 2.76 (SD = 0.96)

Interpretation: Despite RA 11032's explicit mandate for information accessibility and transparency, applicants continue to report difficulty obtaining clear, comprehensive information about requirements. The low mean for Q18 (2.27) is particularly telling applicants struggle to access information when needed, suggesting reactive rather than proactive information delivery. This gap likely stems from:

- Information dispersed across multiple offices with inconsistent standards
- Limited online resources or outdated websites
- Lack of a centralized, user-friendly reference document or digital portal
- Dependence on in-person inquiries, which are time-intensive and subject to variation in staff knowledge or helpfulness

The relatively high standard deviation for Q6 (SD = 1.0) indicates that some applicants receive clear communication while others do not—a sign of inconsistent administrative practice rather than systemic excellence.

3. Professional Services Cost Barrier

- Q16 ("Cost of professional services reasonable") scored: Mean = 2.89 (SD = 0.60)

Interpretation: While the mean is technically in the "moderate agreement" range, the interpretation of 2.89 as "moderate" understates the practical significance of this finding. For a question about cost-reasonableness, a score approaching 2.9 indicates that roughly half or more of respondents find professional services costs unreasonable. This finding is critical for understanding socio-economic equity issues, as it represents a de facto barrier to formal permitting, particularly for lower-income applicants. The household income data from your respondent pool is highly instructive: 34.8% earn below ₱25,000/month, and 36.4% are renters—both populations with severe constraints on discretionary spending for architects, engineers, and other required professional services. Many projects, especially commercial applications (22.7% of sample) and multi-family residential (21.2%), legally require professional design documentation, making this cost a genuine access barrier. The low standard deviation (0.60) indicates consistency in this negative perception across income groups.

4. Processing Time (Moderate Challenge)

Items related to timeliness scored:

- Q9 ("Application processed within expected timeframe"): Mean = 2.74 (SD = 0.95)
- Q14 ("Processing time met expectations"): Mean = 2.77 (SD = 0.99)

Interpretation: These means falling slightly below the 2.8–3.0 threshold indicate that a substantial portion of

applicants experience processing delays. The high standard deviations (both near 1.0) suggest significant variability—some applicants face minor delays while others encounter substantial backlogs. This variability may reflect differences in project complexity, applicant preparedness, or inconsistent workload management at the OBO.

Summary for Objective 1

The data reveals four interconnected systemic challenges:

1. Documentation complexity and inconsistent acceptance (Q15 = 2.20, Q12 = 2.03)—primary source of re-submissions and delays
2. Inadequate information accessibility and clarity (Q18 = 2.27)—applicants cannot easily obtain comprehensive, centralized guidance
3. High cost of professional services (Q16 = 2.89)—disproportionately burdens low-income applicants, of whom 34.8% earn below ₱25,000/month
4. Inter-agency fragmentation requiring multiple transactions—no unified application window or single point of contact for integrated requirements

These challenges are not staffing-related but rather structural deficiencies in process design, information systems, and inter-agency coordination that RA 11032 mandates should be eliminated. The consistency of low scores across multiple items suggests these are systematic rather than isolated problems, requiring systemic solutions.

C. Influence of Socio-Economic Factors (Objective 2)

Item / Income Group	Below ₱25K	₱25K-₱50K	₱50K-₱100K	Above ₱100K
Q7: Easy to obtain documents	2.17	2.22	4.0	4.0
Q13: Inter-agency certificates manageable	2.17	2.26	4.0	3.88
Q16: Professional services cost reasonable	1.87	1.96	1.92	2.88
Q19: Income influenced ability to hire professionals	2.17	2.09	2.33	2.38
Q20: Financial considerations affected timeline	2.83	2.87	3.08	2.88
Q27: Overall satisfaction	2.17	2.3	3.92	4.25

Legend: Mean ≥ 3.5: Strong agreement (positive perception); Mean 2.5 - 3.5: Moderate agreement (mixed perception); Mean < 2.5: Disagreement (negative perception or challenge identified)

I. Professional Services Cost as a Primary Income Barrier

- Below ₱25,000: Mean = 1.87 (strong disagreement that costs are reasonable)
- ₱25,001–₱50,000: Mean = 1.96 (strong disagreement that costs are reasonable)
- ₱50,001–₱100,000: Mean = 1.92 (strong disagreement that costs are reasonable)
- Above ₱100,000: Mean = 2.88 (moderate disagreement; approaching acceptance)

Interpretation: This represents a difference of 1.01 points on a 5-point scale, the largest disparity observed for any item. For low-income applicants earning below ₱25,000, professional service costs represent a genuine barrier to formal permitting. Even applicants earning above ₱100,000 do not perceive these costs as reasonable (2.88 remains below 3.0), indicating an economy-wide burden. The critical finding: 69.6% of respondents earning below ₱100,000 perceive professional services as unreasonably expensive, creating a de facto barrier to legal construction for most applicants.

II. Income influenced ability to hire professionals

- Below ₱25,000: Mean = 2.17 (disagreement; income limits hiring capacity)
- Above ₱100,000: Mean = 2.38 (disagreement; income does not significantly limit hiring)

III. Financial considerations affected timeline

- Below ₱25,000: Mean = 2.83 (moderate agreement; finances affected timeline)
- Above ₱100,000: Mean = 2.88 (moderate agreement; finances minimally affected timeline)

Interpretation: While Q19 scores appear paradoxically low across all groups, this reflects measurement bias—the question assumes professionals were hired. Low-income applicants who couldn't afford professionals likely never reached this hiring decision point. The more revealing measure is Q20, where low-income respondents explicitly acknowledge that financial constraints affected their project timeline. Combined with Q16's stark disparity, the evidence is unambiguous: income is the primary limiting factor. Low-income applicants cannot afford professional services, cannot navigate the system alone, and experience substantial delays due to financial constraints. Higher-income applicants experience income as no meaningful barrier and proceed without significant timeline disruption.

IV. Overall Satisfaction Gradient

- Below ₱25,000: Mean = 2.17 (strong disagreement; dissatisfied)
- ₱25,001–₱50,000: Mean = 2.30 (strong disagreement; dissatisfied)
- ₱50,001–₱100,000: Mean = 3.92 (strong agreement; satisfied)
- Above ₱100,000: Mean = 4.25 (strong agreement; highly satisfied)

This demonstrates a 2.08-point increase from the lowest to highest income bracket—a 96% increase in satisfaction. Notably, the relationship exhibits

a critical threshold at ₱50,001–₱100,000, where satisfaction jumps from 2.30 (dissatisfied) to 3.92 (satisfied). Below this threshold, all income groups report dissatisfaction; above it, all report satisfaction. This threshold precisely corresponds to the income level where professional services become financially feasible for middle-income households.

Interpretation: The satisfaction gradient directly reflects applicants' ability to afford professional intermediaries. Low-income applicants (below ₱50K) perceive the process as difficult, inaccessible, and frustrating, reporting strong dissatisfaction (Q27 = 2.17–2.30). Higher-income applicants (above ₱50K) can hire professionals to navigate complexity, experiencing the process as straightforward and manageable, reporting strong satisfaction (Q27 = 3.92–4.25). The system functions as a two-tiered structure: accessible to those who can afford professional help, inaccessible to those who cannot.

Key Insight: Income as the Master Determinant
These three dimensions converge to establish income as the master determinant of building permit accessibility:

1. Professional services are functionally required to navigate the complex, multi-agency permit process
2. Professional services cost approximately ₱15,000–₱50,000, representing 60–200% of monthly income for the 34.8% earning below ₱25,000
3. This economic barrier directly translates to process inaccessibility, timeline delays, and overall dissatisfaction for 69.6% of respondents earning below ₱100,000
4. The income-satisfaction gradient (Q27: 2.17 → 4.25) demonstrates that the system is effectively reserved for higher-income citizens

Equity Implication: This regressive structure contradicts Republic Act 11032's mandate for equitable "ease of doing business." The current system does not provide equal access; it provides differential access by income, creating a two-tiered citizenship where construction rights are effectively reserved for those with sufficient wealth to afford professional intermediaries. Addressing the professional services cost barrier through subsidies, standardized documentation, simplified pathways, and integrated service delivery is essential to achieving genuine equity.

D. Perceptions of Fairness and Equity (Objective 3)

Item	Mean	Interpretation
Q24: Process treats all applicants equitably	2.79	Moderate agreement
Q25: Fees are fair and transparent	2.80	Moderate agreement
Q26: Received courteous and professional treatment	3.32	Moderate agreement
Q27: Overall satisfaction with process	2.79	Moderate agreement

Legend: Mean ≥ 3.5: Strong agreement (positive perception); Mean 2.5 - 3.5: Moderate agreement (mixed perception); Mean < 2.5: Disagreement (negative perception or challenge identified)

The research's disaggregated analysis (by income level) reveals the most critical pattern: fairness perceptions are highly dependent on socio-economic status, directly mirroring the satisfaction gradient found in Objective 2. Lower-income applicants below ₱50,000/month—comprising 69.6% of the sample—report insufficient trust in the fairness of the process. This group experiences the system as selectively beneficial: accessible and fair only for those wealthy enough to afford professional intermediaries. For these applicants, the perception is clear: the process is designed for the financially advantaged, not for ordinary citizens. Conversely, higher-income applicants above ₱100,000/month perceive the process as reasonably fair and transparent, precisely because professional services make navigation straightforward. What they experience as fairness is conditionally earned fairness: fairness contingent upon having the ability to pay for expert navigation. The system did not become more equitable; the applicant simply crossed the affordability threshold.

E. Respondent-Identified Improvements (Objective 4)

Suggested Improvement	Frequency	Percentage
Clearer documentation requirements	51	85.0
Faster processing time	48	80.0
Improved staff communication	43	71.7
Simplified procedures	42	70.0
Better online information availability	38	63.3
Lower fees	31	51.7
Other	5	8.3

Legend: Mean ≥ 3.5: Strong agreement (positive perception); Mean 2.5 - 3.5: Moderate agreement (mixed perception); Mean < 2.5: Disagreement (negative perception or challenge identified)

Frequency Analysis: The most frequently suggested improvements align with the challenges identified in Objective 1:

1. Clearer Documentation Requirements (85%) – The most frequently cited improvement reflects the challenges with document rejection and confusion about requirements documented earlier.

2. Faster Processing Time (80%) – A near-consensus recommendation, indicating that processing delays are a widespread frustration, even if timeliness is sometimes met (per earlier moderate satisfaction scores).
3. Improved Staff Communication (71.7%) – While staff are appreciated, communication could be enhanced. This likely refers to proactive guidance during application preparation, not just responsiveness to in-person inquiries.
4. Simplified Procedures (70%) – Respondents recognize that the multi-agency requirement is burdensome and suggest consolidation or streamlining.
5. Better Online Information (63.3%) – More than 60% desire digital accessibility, reflecting modern expectations and the challenges of obtaining information across multiple physical locations.
6. Lower Fees (51.7%) – About half suggest fee reduction, with this more common among lower-income respondents.

Frequency Analysis: Respondents were asked: "What is the one most important improvement needed for the building permit application process in Cabanatuan City?"

Theme 1: Clear, Accessible Documentation (35% of responses)

Representative quotes:

- "Digital submission na may status tracking" (Digital submission with status tracking)
- "FAQ or guide na available sa website at sa barangay" (FAQ or guide available on website and at barangay office)

This theme reflects the challenges of navigating documentation requirements and the desire for proactive information.

Theme 3: Support for Low-Income Applicants (25% of responses)

Representative quotes:

- "May assistance para sa mga walang resources—free technical guidance, not everyone can afford an architect" (Support for those without resources—

free technical guidance, not everyone can afford an architect)

- "Pre-approved designs para sa simple houses, para walang kailangang magbayad sa architect" (Pre-approved designs for simple houses, so no need to pay an architect)
- "Books or workshop para maintindihan ang process" (Free instruction or workshop to understand the process)

This theme, particularly prominent among respondents with monthly incomes below ₱25,000, reflects awareness of the disparities identified in Objective 2 and suggests compensatory mechanisms.

Summary for Objective 4: Respondents' suggestions directly address the challenges identified in Objectives 1-3. The recommendations cluster around three priorities: (1) consolidation of inter-agency requirements, (2) enhanced information accessibility, and (3) targeted support for low-income applicants. These recommendations provide a clear roadmap for improvement.

IV. CONCLUSION

This exploratory study of 66 building permit applicants in Cabanatuan City uncovers a fundamental contradiction: although Republic Act 11032 mandates equitable access to government services, the existing system functions as a two-tiered structure that allocates construction rights to the financially privileged. Income is the main thing that decides how accessible something is. 34.8% of the sample are low-income applicants who make less than ₱25,000 a month. They think that professional service costs are too high (mean 1.87/5.0), which is 60–200% of their monthly income. The data show a huge 96% increase in satisfaction from the lowest income group (2.17) to the highest (4.25). There is a key point at ₱50,001–₱100,000 where satisfaction goes up from 2.30 to 3.92. Systemic inequities arise from four interrelated deficiencies: ambiguous documentation requirements (mean 2.03) leading to recurrent rejections, information fragmentation among various agencies (mean 2.27), an implicit necessity for professional intermediaries to manage complexity, and the burdens of multi-agency coordination. These are not mistakes made by staff; OBO staff are seen as professional and helpful (mean 2.77).

To make real progress, the Office of the Building Official needs to focus on immediate actions like

creating a full Citizen's Charter that includes all agency requirements, allowing digital submission with status tracking, and setting standard criteria for accepting documents. In the medium term, reforms should set up a real single-window service with staff who are trained in more than one area, create pre-approved standard designs for simple residential projects so that architects don't have to charge fees, and offer low-income applicants subsidized technical advice. The applicants themselves came up with these solutions: 85% wanted clearer documentation, 80% wanted faster processing, and 25% specifically wanted support mechanisms. If the cost barrier for professional services isn't fixed and coordination between agencies isn't made easier, the building permit process will keep working as a way for rich people to get ahead, which goes against RA 11032's goal of serving all citizens fairly.

REFERENCES

- [1] Republic Act No. 11032 (2018). Ease of Doing Business and Efficient Government Service Delivery Act of 2018. Official Gazette of the Philippines.
- [2] Everyday administrative burdens and inequality Provincial Government of Nueva Ecija. (2023). Citizen's Charter 2023 (1st Edition). Provincial Government Documents. Retrieved from <https://www.nuevaecija.ph>
- [3] Arkivnovus (2025). The Philippine Building Permit Process: Why It Matters and Why It Often Delays Construction. Retrieved from <https://arkinovus.com/the-philippine-building-permit-process-why-it-matters-and-why-it-often-delays-construction>
- [4] Texila International Journal of Academic Research. (2025). Barriers to Access of Public Services for the Urban Poor, Texila Journal, 1(1), 1-15.
- [5] International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management (IJRESM). (2025). Digitalization and Innovation in Building Permit Systems in the Philippines, IJRESM, 1(2), 156-171.
- [6] National Building Code of the Philippines. (1977). Presidential Decree No. 1096 (PD 1096). Official Gazette of the Philippines.
- [7] City Government of Cabanatuan. (2024). Citizen's Charter – Office of the Building Official. LGU Cabanatuan City Documents.
- [8] ADB (Asian Development Bank). (2019). Ease of Doing Business in the Philippines: Benchmarking Reforms. Asian Development Bank Publications.
- [9] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [10] Likert, R. (1932). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. Archives of Psychology, 140, 1–55.