

This Grounds of Decision is subject to final editorial corrections approved by this Strata Titles Board and/or redaction in compliance with prevailing government regulations/rules, for publication in LawNet and/or on the Strata Titles Boards' website.

**BUILDING (STRATA MANAGEMENT) ACT 2004
BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND STRATA MANAGEMENT
(STRATA TITLES BOARDS) REGULATIONS 2005**

STB No. 122 of 2025

In the matter of an application under **section 101(8)** of the Building (Strata Management) Act 2004 in respect of the development known as **Pandan Valley Condominium** (MCST Plan No. 581)

Between

Ismail Hadi Sadek

Nayera Fouad Abdel Moati Selim

... Applicant(s)

And

Goh Oon San @ Wu Un San

... Respondent(s)

GROUND OF DECISION

BUILDING (STRATA MANAGEMENT) ACT 2004
BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND STRATA MANAGEMENT
(STRATA TITLES BOARDS) REGULATIONS 2005

STB No. 122 of 2025

In the matter of an application under **section 101(8)** of the Building (Strata Management) Act 2004 in respect of the development known as **Pandan Valley Condominium** (MCST Plan No. 581)

Between

Ismail Hadi Sadek

Nayera Fouad Abdel Moati Selim

... Applicant(s)

And

Goh Oon San @ Wu Un San

... Respondent(s)

8 May 2026

11 June 2026

Coram:

Ms Kan Shuk Weng

Deputy President

Mdm Siti Habibah Siraj

Member

Mr Winston Hauw

Member

INTRODUCTION

1. This case involved two residential units located at 2 Pandan Valley, Singapore 597626 (the “Development”). The Development was completed in 1979.
2. The Applicants, Ismail Hadi Sadek (“Mr Ismail”) and Nayera Fouad Abdel Moati Selim (“Mdm Nayera”), were the sole subsidiary proprietors (the “Applicants”) of unit #XX-XXX while the Respondent, Goh Oon San @ Wu Un San, was the subsidiary proprietor of unit #XX-XXX (the “Respondent”). The Respondent’s unit was situated immediately above the Applicants’ unit.
3. Mr Ismail was authorised by Mdm Nayera to attend the hearing on her behalf, while the Respondent had authorised her daughter, Adelene Chow (“Miss Chow”) to represent her although the Respondent was present at the hearing.

BACKGROUND

4. In December 2025, the Applicants filed an application before the Strata Titles Boards (the “STB”). The orders sought by the Applicants could be classified into seven broad categories:
 - (i) General rectification and reinstatement, at the Respondent’s cost, of all defects arising from water ingress from the Respondent’s unit into the Applicants’ unit.
 - (ii) Replacement, by a licensed electrical contractor, of electrical systems (including the circuit breaker board) affected by the water ingress which replacement shall be jointly verified by the MCST and the Applicants.
 - (iii) Repair and replacement of structural and finishing works in the Applicants’ unit which were damaged by water ingress.
 - (iv) Replacement of all corroded plumbing and sanitary systems.
 - (v) Repair or replacement of all appliances and fixtures in the Applicants’ unit damaged by water ingress from the Respondent’s unit into the Applicants’ unit.
 - (vi) Reimbursements for various expenses incurred by the Applicants including depreciation in property value, alternative accommodation, cleaning, alternative storage for food, the STB filing fees, legal fees, *etc.*
 - (vii) Payment of future legal fees and other incidental fees should the Respondent fail to comply with the Board’s orders.

5. On 2 February 2026, Mr Ismail and Miss Chow (the “Parties”) signed an agreement (the “Agreement”) pursuant to a mediation session. However, the dispute was unresolved despite the Agreement.
6. On 2 April 2026, directions were given to the Parties to file Affidavits of Evidence-in-Chief (“AEIC”) for the witnesses they wish to call for the hearing.

THE HEARING

7. At the hearing, Mr Ismail was the only witness who gave evidence for the Applicants. In relation to the water seepage, it was his evidence that the Applicants’ unit had started experiencing water leakage from the Respondent’s unit since 2018¹ and a formal notice was sent to the Respondent on 20 March 2018².
8. The water seepage persisted, and in November and December 2022³, the MCST sent two letters to the Respondent informing her of the same and urging her to rectify the issue. In addition, in a letter dated 12 December 2022, the MCST informed the Respondent of the presumption under section 101(8) of the Building Maintenance and Strata Management Act 2005 (as it then was) (the “BMSMA”). Under the presumption, in the absence of proof to the contrary, “if there is any evidence of dampness, moisture or water penetration” in the Applicants’ unit, it is presumed that the defect is within the Respondent’s unit which is situated immediately above the Applicants’ unit.
9. The Applicants also included a report by IGM Maintenance Pte Ltd (the “IGM Report”) dated 5 November 2022 and a report by Allstar Waterproofing & Services Pte Ltd (the “Allstar Report”) dated 28 July 2023⁴. The IGM Report stated that there was water ingress from the Respondent’s unit into the Applicants’ kitchen toilet due to “waterproofing deficiency⁵”, while the Allstar Report stated that there were signs of water seepage on both the Applicants’ kitchen ceiling and kitchen toilet⁶ due to corrosion of the Respondent’s “cast iron discharge pipe”.

¹ [2(b)], Mr Ismail’s AEIC (“A1”).

² [3(a)], A1 and HSI-0, A1.

³ HSI-1, collectively and pgs 15-17 of the Applicants’ Form 8 Application (“Form 8 Application”).

⁴ HSI-4, collectively.

⁵ Specifically, the IGM report states: Existing Floor Slab Water Table And Waterproofing Deficiency Causing Water Ingress To #XX-XXX.

⁶ Floor plan of the Applicants’ unit, pg 55, Form 8 Application.

10. In the course of the hearing, Mr Ismail confirmed that there were four areas in the Applicants' unit which were experiencing dampness and/or water seepage:
 - a. the master bedroom and the master bedroom toilet area;
 - b. the kitchen and the kitchen toilet;
 - c. the common toilet, and
 - d. the laundry area and the helper's room.
11. Apart from the exhibits referred to in Mr Ismail's AEIC, Mr Ismail sought to admit three videos (marked A3 to A5) which showed active water seepage/discharge in the Applicants' unit.
12. Pursuant to the alleged water leakage from the Respondent's unit to the Applicants' unit, the Applicants sought orders, *inter alia*, relating to the rectification of defects causing the water ingress and reinstatement of damaged areas within their unit, including replacement of damaged appliances. In addition, the Applicants made the following claims for damages and costs against the Respondent⁷:

S/N	Item	(S\$) Sum
1.	Ad-hoc cleaning and consumables	S\$390
2.	Accommodation and incidental living expenses	S\$5,000
3.	Replacement of damaged light fixtures and lighting	S\$350
4.	Cold storage containers/bags due to power outages	S\$375
5.	Legal costs for Letter of Demand	S\$400
6.	STB filing fees, printing fees and hearing fees	S\$1,176
7.	Food spoilage and perishables	S\$1,000
8.	Electrical rectification works	S\$450
9.	Hacking of area in master bedroom toilet	S\$708.50
10.	Notary Public for AEIC	S\$62.50
	Total	S\$9,912

⁷ Pg 8, Applicants' Closing Submissions.

13. The Respondent was represented by Miss Chow at the hearing. Miss Chow was also a witness for the Respondent who was physically present throughout the hearing. From the start of the STB proceedings, it was the position of the Respondent and Miss Chow that since Miss Chow had been assisting the Respondent in managing the Respondent's unit, Miss Chow would speak on behalf of the Respondent and would testify on her behalf, if necessary.
14. The Respondent adduced the report prepared by Building Appraisal Pte Ltd (the "BA Report") dated 4 May 2026 which was signed off by Chin Cheong ("Mr Chin"), and informed the Board that she would rely on the BA Report as presented to the Board. Building Appraisal Pte Ltd was engaged by Miss Chow pursuant to the Agreement. Miss Chow further informed the Board at the hearing that she would not be calling Mr Chin as a witness for the Respondent.
15. In summary, Mr Chin opined as follows:

- a. Master bedroom and master bedroom toilet

The water seepage in the master bedroom and the master bedroom toilet was caused by the water seepage in the common duct area. A water ponding test was conducted in the master bedroom toilet of the Respondent's unit and there was no sign of seepage from the Respondent's master bedroom toilet⁸.

- b. Kitchen and kitchen toilet

A water ponding test was conducted in the kitchen toilet of the Respondent's unit and there was no sign of seepage from the Respondent's kitchen toilet. However, the cast iron pipe in the kitchen and kitchen toilet serving the Respondent's unit were observed to be severely/heavily corroded⁹. Mr Chin did not conduct a water ponding test in the kitchen of the Respondent's unit "due to site constraints of not being able to pond to a localized area without flowing into corridor"¹⁰.

- c. Common toilet

No water ponding test was conducted in the common toilet of the Respondent's unit. However, there were signs of water seepage from the heavily corroded cast iron pipe serving the Respondent's unit exclusively¹¹.

⁸ Pgs 8, 16, 19 and 20, BA Report.

⁹ Pgs 8 and 18 to 20, BA Report.

¹⁰ Pg 7, BA Report.

¹¹ Pgs 8 and 17 and 19, BA Report.

d. Laundry area and helper's room

No water ponding test was conducted in the laundry area of the Respondent's unit "due to site constraints"¹². However, the moisture level in the ceiling of the Applicants' laundry area was found to be high¹³. Mr Chin concluded that there was no evidence that the damage in the laundry area was due to water seepage from the Respondent's kitchen toilet and that the blistering ceiling in the Applicants' laundry area and helper's room were due to "fair wear and tear and driving rain"¹⁴. He further recommended that the Respondent's "kitchen and laundry area be mopped dry rather than hosing with water when washing is carried out"¹⁵.

THE BOARD'S DECISION

A. The source of water seepage in the Applicant's unit

The presumption

16. Section 101(8) of the Building (Strata Management) Act 2004 (the "BSMA") states:

(8) In any proceedings under this section with respect to any alleged defect in a lot or in any common property or limited common property situated immediately (whether wholly or partly) above another lot or any common property or limited common property, it is presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the defect is within that lot or common property or limited common property (as the case may be) above if there is any evidence of dampness, moisture or water penetration —

(a) on the ceiling that forms part of the interior of the lot, common property or limited common property (as the case may be) immediately below; or

(b) on any finishing material (including plaster, panel or gypsum board) attached, glued, laid or applied to the ceiling that forms part of the interior of the lot, common property or limited common property (as the case may be) immediately below.

17. In the present case, it was not disputed that the Respondent's unit was immediately above the Applicants' unit. It was also clear from Mr Ismail's evidence that there was water penetration in the ceilings of the Applicants' kitchen, kitchen toilet, common toilet, laundry area and the helper's room, and his assertions were supported by photographs submitted by the Applicants in their Form 8 Application, the videos submitted by Mr Ismail at the hearing, and the photographs taken by Mr Chin.

18. In addition, Mr Chin pointed out in the BA Report that the ceiling of the kitchen had medium moisture content, while the ceiling in the laundry area was found to be high in moisture content¹⁶. As for the common toilet, "the water leakage has punctured through

¹² Pgs 18 and 19, BA Report.

¹³ Pgs 5 and A27 to A30, BA Report.

¹⁴ Pg 18, BA Report.

¹⁵ Pg 19, BA Report.

¹⁶ Pg 5, BA Report.

the false ceiling”¹⁷. With respect to the master bedroom and the master bedroom toilet, although Mr Chin found “the most pronounced signs of the water seepage”¹⁸ on the master bedroom wall, it was clear from the photographs (A8 to A10) in the BA Report that blisters and water stains were observed in the ceiling of the master bedroom toilet.

19. This being the case, the presumption in the BSMA applied to the present case in respect of the Applicants’ master bedroom toilet, kitchen, kitchen toilet, common toilet, laundry area and the helper’s room. However, the presumption was not applicable to the Applicants’ master bedroom as there was no evidence before the Board that there was moisture/dampness/water dampness in the ceiling of the master bedroom.

Had the Respondent rebutted the presumption on a balance of probabilities?

(i) The master bedroom and the master bedroom toilet

20. As stated above, the presumption in section 101(8) of the BSMA did not apply to the Applicants’ master bedroom and the Applicants therefore had to prove, on a balance of probabilities, that the water seepage in the master bedroom emanated from the Respondent’s unit.
21. In relation to the master bedroom toilet, while the presumption applied, it was the evidence of Mr Chin that he did not find any “water leakage on the soffit or pipes”¹⁹ when he opened the inspection hatch in the Applicants’ master bedroom toilet. Mr Chin also inspected the area corresponding to the water stain in the ceiling of the master bedroom toilet and “found no evidence of water seepage from the concrete slab of the upper unit’s bathroom”²⁰.
22. Mr Chin therefore concluded that the water stain was likely “an old water-stained mark associated with most likely from previous leakage”. As for the blisters in the paintwork on the ceiling, he opined that they were “likely associated with condensation within the toilet” since the concrete slab above was dry and there was no sign of water seepage²¹.
23. The Board did not disagree with Mr Chin’s observation in relation to the master bedroom toilet and found that the Respondent had rebutted the presumption.

(ii) The kitchen and the kitchen toilet

24. In relation to the kitchen and the kitchen toilet, it was clear from the BA Report by the Respondent’s expert that “the cast iron waste pipe was heavily corroded” and that there was past water seepage. The findings by Mr Chin were also consistent with the findings

¹⁷ Pg 6, BA Report.

¹⁸ Pg 4 and A2, BA Report.

¹⁹ Pg 3, BA Report.

²⁰ Pg 3, BA Report.

²¹ Pg 3, BA Report.

in the Allstar Report which stated that water seepage was found in the Applicants' kitchen ceiling and that was due to "cast iron discharge pipe corrosion"²².

25. Consequently, the Board found that the Respondent had not rebutted the presumption relating to the water penetration in the Applicants' kitchen and kitchen toilet.

(iii) The common toilet

26. As for the common toilet, while Mr Chin did not conduct any water ponding test, he found active water leakage from the "heavily corroded cast iron waste pipe". This supported the Applicants' claim that the water seepage in their common toilet originated from the Respondent's unit.
27. In the event, the Board found that the Respondent had not rebutted the presumption in relation to the water seepage in the Applicants' common toilet.

(iv) The laundry area and the helper's room

28. In respect of the laundry area and the helper's room (which was right next to the laundry area), Mr Chin found a high moisture content where the blisters in the paintwork were, and concluded that the "blister paintwork would be attributable to fair wear and tear and driving rain"²³. Mr Chin did not provide any basis for his conclusion which did not appear to be supported by his findings that there was high moisture content in the affected areas.
29. Further, Mr Chin did not conduct any water ponding test nor was it apparent from the BA Report that there was any thorough investigation done in trying to trace the source of the dampness in the ceiling.
30. The Board was not convinced that the blisters in the ceiling were caused by fair wear and tear and driving rain. Mr Ismail testified that the windows in the laundry area were closed when the Applicants/occupants were not in, and in addition, that part of the ceiling where the blisters were found was not right next to the windows. If the blisters were indeed due to driving rain, the part of the ceiling nearest the windows should be affected most, yet there was no evidence that that was the case. As for fair wear and tear, the Board was doubtful as that would not explain the high moisture content in that part of the ceiling²⁴. The Board was therefore not persuaded by Mr Chin's opinion regarding the cause of the high moisture content in the ceiling and found that the Respondent had not rebutted the presumption.

²² Pg 14, A1.

²³ Pg 18, BA Report.

²⁴ See A28 to A 30, BA Report.

The source of water penetration within the Applicants' unit

31. Based on the presumption, the BA Report and the Allstar Report, the Board found as follows:
- a. The Applicants failed to prove, on a balance of probabilities that the water penetration in the master bedroom and the master bedroom toilet originated from the Respondent's unit.
 - b. The water penetration in the Applicants' kitchen and kitchen toilet was due to the corroded waste pipe serving the Respondent's unit.
 - c. The water penetration in the Applicants' common toilet was due to the corroded waste pipe serving the Respondent's unit.
 - d. The Respondent failed to rebut the presumption, on a balance of probabilities, that the water penetration in the Applicants' laundry area and helper's room originated from her unit.

B. The orders sought by the Applicants

General rectification and reinstatement

32. The Applicants sought general rectification and reinstatement of all defects arising from water ingress from the Respondent's unit, including the replacement of their unit's electrical system affected by the ingress.
33. In the BA Report, Mr Chin gave recommendations on the necessary works to be done. For the common toilet, kitchen and kitchen toilet, the Respondent's cast iron waste pipes were found to be heavily corroded and Mr Chin recommended that a licensed plumber be engaged to "replace the affected cast iron pipes with uPVC pipes in compliance with SS 213:2022 along with replacing the cast iron pipe in the kitchen toilet which is connected to the long continuous cast iron pipe in the kitchen"²⁵. Mr Chin further recommended that, upon completion of the replacement of the cast iron pipes, the affected false ceiling in the common toilet, kitchen and kitchen toilet "be repaired and/or replaced, and repainted to match existing finishes". In addition, the Applicants' cabinets, glass racks and flooring were recommended to be cleaned to remove stains²⁶. The Board agreed with the recommendations of Mr Chin in relation to the common toilet, kitchen and kitchen toilet.
34. With respect to the cleaning of the common toilet, kitchen and kitchen toilet, the Board noted that the seepage arose due to corrosion of the waste pipes. While Mr Chin gave his opinion on the habitability of the Applicants' unit, the Board did not think that this was

²⁵ Pg 19, BA Report.

²⁶ Pg 19, BA Report.

within his scope of work to do so. The Board therefore did not place any weight in his opinion with regard to the habitability of the Applicants' unit. What the Board did take note of was that the water ingress in these areas of the Applicants' unit was discharged from the Respondent's waste pipes and that the Applicants' had found human waste in the past in the discharge. Furthermore, Mr Chin found active leak in the Respondent's common toilet cast iron waste pipe. This being the case, the Board opined that professional cleaners be engaged by the Respondent to clean and disinfect the Applicants' cabinets, glass racks and flooring.

35. As for the laundry area and helper's room, the Board found that the Respondent had not rebutted the presumption. The moisture content in the affected ceiling in the laundry area and helper's room was high, suggesting possible on-going seepage from the Respondent's unit. While no water ponding test was conducted in the Respondent's laundry area, Mr Chin nonetheless recommended that the floor of the Respondent's laundry area "be mopped dry rather than hosing with water when washing is carried out"²⁷. This was not a satisfactory solution and the Board was of the view that the Respondent should waterproof her laundry area and thereafter conduct a water ponding test to ensure water tightness.
36. In relation to the electrical system, there was no concrete proof before the Board that the tripping could be attributed to the water ingress from the Respondent's unit. This is especially so as the Development was about 50 years old. The Board therefore agreed with Mr Chin that the actual cause for the tripping could not be determined without the report of a licensed electrical worker or a professional electrical engineer.
37. As for the master bedroom and the master bedroom toilet, the Board found that the Applicants failed to prove that the water ingress was from the Respondent's unit. The Respondent was therefore not responsible for the defects caused by water ingress in these two areas.

Ad-hoc cleaning and consumables, accommodation and incidental living expenses

38. The Applicants claimed ad-hoc cleaning, consumables, alternative accommodation and incidental living expenses. Mr Ismail did not provide any details for these claims in his AEIC or in the Applicants' Closing Submissions.
39. Minimally, the Applicants should provide a breakdown for the amounts claimed (\$390 for ad-hoc cleaning and consumables, and \$5,000 for accommodation and incidental living expenses) or provide receipts for these expenses. As none of these were made available before the Board, the Board was unable to allow the Applicants' claims for these items.

²⁷ Pg 19, BA Report.

Electrical rectification works including light fixtures, cold storage bags, food spoilage

40. The Applicants claimed the following, alleging that the water ingress from the Respondent’s unit had caused the electricity in their unit to trip multiple times:

Item	(S\$) Sum
Replacement of damaged light fixtures and lighting	S\$350
Cold storage containers/bags due to power outages	S\$375
Food spoilage and perishables	S\$1,000
Electrical rectification works	S\$450

41. As stated in [36] above, the Applicants did not adduce evidence from a licensed electrical worker or a professional electrical engineer that the tripping was due to water ingress from the Respondent’s unit. Given the age of the Development and Mr Ismail’s evidence at the hearing that the other units in the Development also experienced electrical tripping (albeit to a lesser extent), the possibility that the electrical system in the Applicants’ unit was due to fair wear and tear could not be ruled out. Consequently, without the report of a licensed electrical worker or a professional electrical engineer certifying the cause for the electrical tripping in the Applicants’ unit, the Board was not convinced that the Respondent was responsible for these items in the Applicants’ claims.

Hacking of area in master bedroom toilet

42. The Applicants made a claim of \$708.50 against the Respondent for the hacking of the master bedroom toilet. The hacking was done pursuant to the request of Mr Chin and was necessary for him to examine the common duct to ascertain if there was a leak in the common duct.
43. Mr Chin examined the common duct on 16 April 2026²⁸ and “observed that there were signs of water seepage in the common duct area”²⁹. The water seepage from the common duct had further caused the blisters in the paintwork on the walls of the master bedroom³⁰.
44. Since the water seepage in the master bedroom could not be attributed to the Respondent’s unit, the Board took the view that the Respondent should not be ordered to pay for the hacking of the wall, and the Applicants should claim from the party responsible for the seepage from the common duct area instead.

²⁸ Pg 9, BA Report.

²⁹ Pg 16, BA Report.

³⁰ Pg 16, BA Report.

Legal costs and other fees relating to the STB proceedings

45. The Applicants incurred the following expenses comprising legal fees and fees relating to the STB proceedings:

Item	(S\$) Sum
Legal costs for Letter of Demand	S\$400
STB filing fees	S\$500
Printing fees	S\$76
Hearing fees (8 May and 11 June 2026)	S\$600
Notary Public for AEIC	S\$62.50

46. In general, water leakage issues in developments are not uncommon, especially in older developments. In the present case, the Applicants had experienced water ingress since 2018, and had attempted to reach out to the Respondent. As the issue remained unresolved despite Mr Ismail’s and the MCST’s various attempts to reach out to the Respondent, the Applicants incurred \$400 in legal costs for engaging Triangle Legal LLC to send a Letter of Demand dated 7 August 2025 to the Respondent.
47. One of the reasons which the issue could not be resolved appeared to be because the Respondent had insisted that the Applicants provide her with a report from a “professional body” proving that the water ingress had emanated from her unit even though she was made aware of the presumption in section 101(8) of the BMSMA (as it then was) as early as 12 December 2022³¹ and already had sight of the IGM Report by 16 November 2022³². Post the Letter of Demand, the Respondent continued to insist on a “certified building surveyor”³³ being engaged by the Applicants.
48. Subsequently, the Applicants filed the present application which the STB received on 3 December 2025. In the present case, Mr Chin found four main areas of water penetration. Out of these four main areas, the Board found in favour of the Applicants in three of them.
49. In the present case, there was considerable delay by the Respondent in dealing with the water ingress in the Applicants’ unit which first started in the kitchen. Miss Chow claimed during the proceedings that she was not aware of the presumption and claimed that she had no knowledge of the IGM Report. It did not lie in Miss Chow’s mouth to say so as the Respondent, whom Miss Chow represented fully and whose unit she was managing,

³¹ Pg 7, A1

³² Annex G, Form 8 Application.

³³ Annex J, Form 8 Application.

had been so informed and it was Miss Chow’s duty to appraise herself of the correspondence and/or communications between the Applicants, the MCST and the Respondent – it was not for her to pick and choose what she wished to acknowledge and what she wished to ignore.

50. Therefore, taking into consideration the undue delay by the Respondent in responding to the Applicants’ request to resolve the water ingress issue from 2022 despite being informed of the presumption and the IGM report, the Board was of the view that it would be fair and equitable for the Applicants to claim the items in [45].

C. The orders sought by the Respondent

51. In relation to costs and disbursements, the Respondent claimed “costs and disbursements of and incidental to” the STB proceedings and “further orders or costs payable”³⁴.
52. If the Respondent was claiming for the costs of the BA Report, the claim is disallowed. As observed in [46] to [50], considerably delay was caused by the Respondent in resolving the issue. In view of this and the fact that the Applicants were successful in their claim in three out of four main areas of water ingress in their unit, the Board was not inclined to order the Applicants to share the costs of the BA Report.
53. It was not clear from the Respondent’s Closing Submissions what other costs and disbursements she was referring to as she did not particularise them. If the Respondent had incurred other costs that she was seeking to claim from the Applicants, it was for her to state exactly what they were and not expect the Board to make inferences.

THE BOARD’S ORDERS

54. Having decided on the source of water leakage, and the damages and reliefs sought, the Board made the following orders:
- (i) The Respondent shall, at her own cost, arrange for a licensed plumber to replace (by 14 August 2026) the corroded cast iron waste pipes in the common toilet and kitchen serving her unit with uPVC pipes in compliance with SS 213:2022 including replacing the cast iron pipe in the kitchen toilet which is connected to the long continuous cast iron pipe in the kitchen.
 - (ii) If no water leakage/seepage is found upon the replacement of the corroded cast iron waste pipes, the Respondent shall, at her own cost, carry out repair works to and cleaning of the Applicants’ common toilet, kitchen and kitchen toilet as set down in [10.3] at page 19 of the BA Report by 28 August 2026. For the avoidance of doubt, the cleaning is to be carried out by a professional cleaner, at the

³⁴ Pg 6, Respondent’s Closing Submissions.

Respondent's cost, and shall include the disinfection of the affected cabinets, glass racks and flooring.

- (iii) The Respondent shall, at her own cost, engage a licensed waterproofing expert to waterproof her laundry area and thereafter arrange for a water ponding test to be carried out (by 14 August 2026) by a licensed waterproofing contractor to ensure that the inter-floor water leakage/seepage is properly rectified.
- (iv) If no water leakage/seepage is found upon the conclusion of the water ponding test in [54(iii)], the Respondent shall, at her own cost, carry out repair works to the ceiling and to repaint the affected portion to match the existing finishes in the Applicants' laundry area and helper's room by 14 August 2026.
- (v) Upon the completion of the works in [54(i)] to [54(iv)], the Respondent shall, at her own cost, arrange for Mr Chin to re-inspect the above works to confirm that the rectification works (including repair works to the Applicants' common toilet, kitchen, kitchen toilet, laundry area and helper's room) have been done satisfactorily and properly. For the avoidance of doubt, the re-inspection shall be carried out and completed within two weeks upon the completion of the works in [54(i)] to [54(iv)].

55. The Board further orders the following to be paid by the Respondent to the Applicants by 18 June 2026:

Item	(S\$) Sum
Legal costs for Letter of Demand	S\$400
STB filing fees	S\$500
Printing fees	S\$76
Hearing fees (8 May and 11 June 2026)	S\$600
Notary Public for AEIC	S\$62.50
Total:	S\$1,638.50

Dated this 11th day of June 2026

Ms Kan Shuk Weng
Deputy President

Mdm Siti Habibah Siraj
Member

Mr Winston Hauw
Member

Mr Ismail Hadi Sadek (in person) for the Applicants.
Miss Adelene Chow (in person) for the Respondent.