PUSHING THE LIMIT: HOW TO OPPOSE SAT APPLICATIONS BEING MADE OUT OF TIME

PETER LOCHORE, BARRISTER
FRANCIS BURT CHAMBERS

Liability limited by a scheme approved under the Professional Standards Legislation

Basic position

- Applicants for review in SAT must lodge within 28 days of the day notice of the decision is given: rule 9 of the State Administrative Tribunal Rules.
- Time can be extended by the Tribunal: rule 10.

- When does the 28-day time run from?
 - Date of decision?
 - No
 - When notice is given.
 - SAT determined that the 28-day period begins when the notice is given not just of the decision, but also of the right of review.

Bocol Constructions Pty Ltd and Keslake Group Pty Ltd [2017] WASAT 15

Murrin and City of Wanneroo [2016] WASAT 87 (and 88)

Story:

Owner-builder, piecemeal applications. Compliance concerns arose.

(iii) Applicant complained about decisions, sought meetings.

 Relevance: LG, as model litigant, was prepared to concede that good faith efforts to negotiate (even if on a flawed logic) should not count against the applicant in calculating delay.

(iv) Christmas & NY break

 Relevance: LG, as model litigant, was prepared to allow a small extra period as explained delay.

Murrin and City of Wanneroo [2016] WASAT 87 (and 88)

Story:

Owner-builder, piecemeal applications. Compliance concerns arose.

Notes:

- (i) Applicant took certain comments by LG officers, and notes on an approved plan, to expand the scope of what he took to be approved, beyond what was sought.
- (ii) LG responded to application for building permit by stopping clock: other approvals required & missing info should be supplied.
- Relevance: In both instance no decision on the merits. A fresh application, with supporting information required, can allow a decision.

- 1. Discretionary
- 2. Only exercisable if strict compliance works an injustice upon the applicant

- 3. 4 core factors
 - i. Length of the delay
 - ii. Reasons for the delay
 - iii. Whether there is an arguable case
 - iv. The extent of any prejudice to the respondent
- 4. Indulgence

The 4 factors

Delay

Consider conceding any delay that *is* explained, focusing your objections on the period that is unexplained.

The 4 factors:

<u>Arguable</u>

Don't concede out of hand - some applications are genuinely unarguable.

The 4 factors:

- Prejudice
 - (a) If there is prejudice, take the point (but don't oversell it).
 - (b) Be specific.

- Many respondents move straight to 4 factors.
- Don't forget:
 - The discretion can <u>only</u> be exercised in <u>the applicant shows injustice</u>
 - Note the <u>onus</u>.
 - Cross-examine the applicant's witnesses

Murrin

• Strategy: put the applicant (who bears the onus) to proof.

Murrin 1

For the grant of leave:

- The applicant's argument was arguable (not hopeless, unarguable or bound to fail);
- There would not be any significant prejudice to the LG.

Against the grant of leave:

- "considerable" delay (55 days);
- no adequate reason for that delay; and
- the applicant can make a further DA.
- → Refusal to grant, as it will not work an injustice to the applicant.

Murrin 2

For the grant of leave:

There would not be any significant prejudice to the LG

Against the grant of leave:

- "considerable" delay (55 days);
- no adequate reason for that delay;
- No arguable case; and
- applicant can make a further application for a building permit.
- → Refusal to grant, as it will not work an injustice to the applicant.

Take home points ...

All correspondence re decisions, must advise of right of SAT review.

When responding to an application for an extension of time ...

- As the discretion can <u>only</u> be exercised in <u>the applicant shows injustice</u>
 - Don't move straight to 4 factors.
 - Make the applicant meet their onus to show injustice.

Questions?

www.peterlochore.com.au