

HOUSE AND PROPERTY INSPECTION CASE SUMMARIES 2015

CASE #13-17

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Certified House Inspector (CHI), conducted a house inspection but failed to report on potentially major deficiencies.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegations, if found to be true, would be contrary to the ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection.

The PRB investigation included a thorough review of all documentation and photographs pertaining to the inspection, as well as a site visit and interviews with all parties related to this complaint. The site visit confirmed that certain deficiencies present were missing in the inspection report, and these features would have been visible on the day of the inspection. As such, the investigation findings confirmed the allegations.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB concluded that the Respondent had violated the Code of Ethics and ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection requirements and required that the Respondent assure the PRB that they understand the requirements of the ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection and the Code of Ethics, by submitting a written explanation acceptable to the Registrar, as to how they intended to improve their house inspections and report writing practices. The Respondent was also levied a fine of \$250.00, as a deterrent to future violations of the Code of Ethics and Practice Guidelines.

Upon receipt of the PRB recommendations, the Respondent's request that the complaint be held in abeyance as the matter was before the courts was granted by the PRB; however, when the matter had still not settled a few months later, the PRB required that the case file no longer be held in abeyance, and that their earlier censure requirements still stand. The deadline for completion was adjusted accordingly.

Subsequently, ASTTBC was advised by the Respondent's legal counsel that the civil claim between the Respondent and the Complainant had been settled. Regardless of the outcome, the PRB determined that the civil claim and settlement between the Respondent and the Complainant had no bearing on ASTTBC's investigation into the Respondent's practice as a Property Inspector. Therefore, the PRB required that the original censure conditions still stand.

OUTCOME:

The Respondent submitted the required letter to the Registrar outlining the measures taken and that would continue to be followed to improve their practice as a Certified House Inspector. The Respondent also paid the fine.

No further action was required and the file was closed.

CASE #15-03

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Certified House Inspector (CHI), conducted a house inspection but failed to report on a damaged living room floor and leaking water faucets in the bathtubs.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegations, if found to be true, would be contrary to the ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection.

The PRB investigation included a thorough review of all documentation pertaining to the inspection, as well as site visits and interviews with all parties related to this complaint. The Respondent's photographs indicating the condition of the apartment at the time of inspection showed that one of the bathtubs was used to store boxes in preparation for moving, and these boxes were stacked to the ceiling. Two other photographs showed that the area of the living room floor which was damaged was concealed by a bed, some chairs and a rug. The ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection in effect during the timeframe of this complaint clearly stated that the Inspector was required to inspect areas of the home which were "readily accessible". The living room flooring and one bathtub were not readily accessible at the time of the inspection. Further, the second bathtub faucet was not dripping at the time of inspection, and the photograph provided supported this statement.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB determined that there was no conclusive evidence to substantiate a violation of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics or ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection on the part of the Respondent.

OUTCOME:

No further action was required and the file was closed.

CASE #15-04

STATEMENT OF COMPLAINT:

That the Respondent, a Certified House Inspector (CHI), conducted a house inspection but failed to report on water leakage found within the interior of the house and on the rooftop.

INVESTIGATION:

The above allegations, if found to be true, would be contrary to the ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection.

The PRB investigation included a thorough review of all documentation pertaining to the inspection, as well as site visits and interviews with all parties related to this complaint. The investigation determined that the Respondent had not accessed the roof during the inspection, since walking on a concrete tile roof was not recommended for reasons of safety and potential damage to the roof tiles. The Respondent had informed the Complainant regarding limitations with respect to the roofing inspection. This was in compliance with the ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection in effect during the time of the inspection which specified that the Inspector was not required to perform any task which may cause a safety risk for the Inspector or cause any damage to any part of the home. The investigation also determined that the inspection conducted by the Respondent was carried out correctly and in compliance with the ASTTBC-PI Standards of Inspection. With respect to the other allegations of leakage in the interior of the house, the area had been repaired and repainted, leaving no substantiated evidence of existing moisture issues.

PRACTICE REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS:

The PRB determined that there was no conclusive evidence to substantiate a violation of the ASTTBC Code of Ethics or Standards of Inspection on the part of the Respondent.

OUTCOME:

No further action was required and the file was closed.