





Building Negligence Claims and the Expanded Jurisdiction of NCAT: A Focus on the Design and Building Practitioners Act

Building negligence claims are a crucial aspect of the construction industry, as they provide a legal avenue for property owners to seek redress for defects caused by poor construction practices. The New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal (NCAT) plays a vital role in resolving such disputes, helping parties find fair and just outcomes. This article examines the recent case of a townhouse dispute in Emu Plains, Sydney, which provides valuable insights into building negligence claims and the jurisdiction of NCAT in resolving these matters, particularly in light of the Design and Building Practitioners Act 2020 (DBPA).

Case Background

The Emu Plains case involved a townhouse purchased by the appellants within a strata scheme property. The appellants alleged deficiencies in the construction, amounting to breaches of the *Home Building Act 1989* (HBA) warranties. They also claimed that both the developer and builder carried out construction work within the meaning of Section 37(1) of the DBPA and owed a duty of care to the appellants, which they breached, causing them economic loss.

Legal Issues in the Case

The case revolved around three primary legal issues:

- a. The application of statutory warranties under the HBA
- b. The duty of care under Section 37 of the DBPA
- c. The jurisdiction of NCAT in determining claims under the DBPA

Tribunal Decision

The Tribunal found that the appellants failed to show that the issues concerning the internal floor space, attic, water tank, and rear courtyard deck fell within the ambit of the HBA statutory warranties. The Tribunal also asserted that it could only operate within the powers specifically extended to it under statute and that the appellants failed to establish any specific jurisdiction bestowed upon the Tribunal under the DBPA.

Grounds of Appeal







The appellants raised several grounds of appeal, including the Tribunal's conclusions regarding the statutory warranties and the Tribunal's lack of jurisdiction to determine the appellants' claim with respect to the DBPA. They argued that the Tribunal wrongly relied on the conveyance contract to restrict or remove their rights concerning statutory warranties and submitted that a claim for economic loss under Section 37 of the DBPA falls within the definition of a building claim under Section 48K of the HBA.

Legal Findings and Outcome

The Appeal Panel found that NCAT has jurisdiction to determine claims under Section 37 of the DBPA, as the claims fall within the provisions of "building claim" in Section 48A(1) of the HBA. Due to the important disputed questions of fact in which the Tribunal made no findings, the case was remitted to the Tribunal for redetermination.

Implications of the Decision

This case has significant implications for building negligence claims and the jurisdiction of NCAT. It highlights the importance of understanding statutory warranties under the HBA and the role of Section 37 of the DBPA in determining liability for building negligence claims. The decision also showcases the expanding jurisdiction of NCAT in handling such <u>disputes</u>.

Key Takeaways

Adhering to statutory warranty obligations is crucial for builders and developers. Section 37 of the DBPA plays a significant role in determining liability for building negligence claims The expanding jurisdiction of NCAT demonstrates its importance in resolving building negligence disputes.

Conclusion

The Emu Plains case offers valuable insights into building negligence claims, the Design and Building Practitioners Act, and the evolving jurisdiction of NCAT in handling such <u>disputes</u>. As the construction industry continues to develop, understanding the nuances of building negligence claims and the role of NC.