

**STATE-WIDE CLADDING AUDIT FINDINGS
MINISTER'S SPEAKING POINTS – 24 OCTOBER 2019**

Private building results – at a glance

- An initial **1795** private buildings were included in the audit.
- From this, **52** buildings require further action:

Building class	Building type	Extreme risk	High risk	Moderate risk	Total in each building class
Class 2	Apartment buildings	NIL IN ALL CLASSES	7	19	26
Class 2	Apartment and mixed-use buildings		1	6	7
Class 3	Hotel/motel buildings		2	4	6
Class 4	Caretaker residences within a different building class		Nil	1	1
Class 9a	Healthcare buildings		2	3	5
Class 9b	Private school		1	Nil	1
Class 9b	Assembly/civic building		1	5	6
Total in each risk category		Extreme risk: 0	High risk: 14	Moderate risk: 38	52

Public building results – at a glance

- An initial **1914** public (government and university) buildings were included in the audit.
- From this, **26** buildings require further action:

Government dept or university	No. buildings	Total government	Total universities
Communities	1	14	
Education	3		
Fire and Emergency Services	1		
Health	6		
Local Govt, Sport and Cultural Ind.	1		
VenuesWest	2		
Murdoch University	3		12
UWA	7		
Curtin University	2		
TOTAL (PUBLIC)		26	

Is it alarming that more than 50 private buildings have combustible cladding?

- People can be reassured that only 52 private buildings require further action out of almost 1,800 included in the audit scope.
- The findings show the audit has achieved its aim of enhancing fire safety by closely checking cladding materials on relevant buildings, and taking action when necessary.
- The type and scale of remediation work required for buildings that have progressed to this stage will vary from building to building. In some cases, only minor action may be needed.

How is the work progressing to fix these buildings?

- Local governments are the legislated authorities for deciding whether buildings in their area comply with the Building Code of Australia and whether the buildings present any dangers.
- I have written to every local government and received assurances from all of them that they are committed to the process of making buildings with cladding concerns safe.
 - Local governments have already issued 44 building orders-
 - 2 buildings had progressed to remediation prior to any enforcement (2 x Karratha FIFI Acc.)
 - 4 buildings are owned by permit authorities (no enforcement action necessary)
 - 2 buildings have not been issued with a building order but have been notified and are in contact with the permit authority.
- Once a building order is issued, the building owner must comply with this.
- The timeframe for remedial works will vary from building to building.
- The State Government, through DMIRS, is monitoring the progress of the works while working closely with local governments and providing guidance to building owners.

What should affected building owners do? Who has to pay to fix the cladding?

- The cost of remediation work is the responsibility of the building owner. Once a building order is issued, the building owner must comply with this.
- More than half of the 52 buildings are within the six-year statutory warrant period. This means the owners can lodge a building service complaint against the builder and/or building surveyor involved.
- Civil matters may be pursued through the courts for buildings more than six years old.

Will the Government fund a scheme to help cover the costs, such as in Victoria?

- Now that the audit results are available, we can have a closer look at different options.

Why was this combustible material allowed to be installed in the first place?

- There appeared to be ambiguity in interpretations of the Building Code of Australia in regard to cladding. The Code has since been amended to provide greater clarity.
- Last year, our government introduced complementary building regulations to restrict the use of combustible material on facades of high-risk buildings.

Why won't you name the buildings?

- Building owners, strata managers and any other parties with a genuine interest in a particular site have been kept informed throughout the audit process.
- Consistent with other jurisdictions, DMIRS has not publicly identified the location of privately-owned buildings to protect these sites from arson attacks.

Will the audit continue with a wider scope so other types of buildings can be checked?

- The WA audit scope is consistent with the approach being taken nationally.
- Once the current audit and outcomes are completed, consideration will be given to whether further assessments on other building types are required.