

Practitioner Surname	Practitioner's First Name	Registration	Determination Date	Board Decision	Project Site Suburb	Allegation Summary
Simonds	Vallence	DB-U 5403	19/11/2018	Reprimand, Fine of \$3,464.64 & Costs of \$14,429	Wallan	Vallence Simonds - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of seven allegations in relation to a site in Wallan. The practitioner had failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 (the Regulations) in that, the practitioner did not perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard on seven occasions, in that, he entered into a major domestic building contract that was not compliant because it omitted important consumer protections; breached section 8(c) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 (DBCA) and the contract by demanding and subsequently receiving a deposit prior to obtaining the requisite warranty insurance; breached section 8(c) of the DBCA, that is, the warranty that all work will be carried out in accordance with and will comply with all legal requirements by permitting building work to be constructed that did not comply with Australian Standards; breached section 31(1)(c) (or, alternatively (1)(d)) of the DBCA by failing to provide a complete copy of the plans and specifications for the building work; breached section 31(1)(c) (or, alternatively (1)(d)) of the DBCA by failing to provide all required information on the plans and specifications for the building work; and breached section 37 of the DBCA and the contract on two occasions by failing to provide the proper notice in respect of a variation to the Contract.
Moschoyiannis	Jim	CB-U 2264 DB-U 11351	14/11/2018	Reprimand & Costs of \$54,000	Docklands	Jim Moschoyiannis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of failing to comply with section 16 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (the Act) in that, he carried out building work in relation to the construction of a building (the Building Work) which did not comply with the Building Regulations 2006 (the Regulations) in that the builder had installed Alucobest aluminium composite cladding on the external walls to the apartments which did not comply with the performance requirements of Building Code of Australia (BCA) and pursuant to Regulation 109 of the Regulations, the BCA is adopted by and forms part of the Regulations. As the practitioner was a director of the company that carried out the Building Work and as the registered builder named on the Building Permit, that failure was taken to be the practitioner's conduct and his failure to comply with section 16 of the Act.
Prince	Arnold	BS-U 1022	10/04/2018	Reprimand & Costs \$5,000	Brighton East	Arnold Prince - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a single site in Brighton East. The practitioner had failed to identify three sections of freestanding, laterally unrestrained masonry (brickwork) wall for the construction of one of the two units and garages at the site, and hence failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard in breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Goodman	John	DB-U 23211	28/11/2017	Suspension of Registration (DB-U 23211) for 1 year & 50% of Costs \$9,379.86	Dandenong	John Goodman - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to a site in Dandenong. The practitioner had failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations for not carrying building work as a registered building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard for four of the breaches. The first for entering into a major domestic building contract which did not make reasonable allowance for inclement weather as required by s32 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act. The other three were for demanding lockup stage payments prior to that work being complete, failing to complete the building work by the date for completion under the DBCA, and having completed some defective work. The practitioner had also been found to have breached s246 of the Building Act by knowingly providing false / altered information intended for the building surveyor being a certificate of insurance having a different name to the building company that the insurance policy was for.
Goddard	Ronald	BS-U 22544	21/11/2017	Reprimand & Fine \$1927.34 and costs of \$2651.00	Mount Evelyn	Ronald Goddard - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations in relation to 1 site in Mount Evelyn. Four allegations related to failing to adhere to s30 of the Building Act 1993 in providing relevant documentation including the proposed building work (form 4) and determinations to council within the timeframes. Also the practitioner had failed to provide the adjoining owner a copy of his determination as required by s87(4) of the Building Act 1993.
Haefele	Werner	DB-U 13078	20/10/2017	Reprimand & Fine of \$1,791.75 & Costs of \$2,801.00	Morwell	Werner Haefele - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a single site in Morwell. The ground for the allegation was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. This allegation involved the practitioner failing to comply with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 (Vic) in that he carried out building work which was not in accordance with the issued building permit.
Mitsopoulos	Jim	BS-U 1126	20/10/2017	Reprimand, Fine of \$1000.00 and Costs of \$5010.00	Ocean Grove, Barwon Heads, Highton & Sunshine West	Jim Mitsopoulos - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of Five allegations in relation to 4 sites in Ocean Grove, Barwon Heads, Highton and Sunshine West. Three allegations for each of the Ocean Grove, Barwon Heads and Highton sites incorporated s24(1)(a) Building Act 1993 breaches for the practitioner having issued a building permit where he could not have been satisfied that the Building Permit would comply with the Act or the Regulations in that the permit documents did not contain sufficiently detailed drawings to demonstrate how compliance with AS 1926 (Swimming pool safety barriers) would be achieved. In relation to the Sunshine West site, the practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 for issuing a building permit and not being satisfied it would comply with the Act or the Regulations in that the dimensioned site plans and bearer stump layout were not included. The practitioner had also breached Regulation 1502 of the Building Regulations for approving a footing stump hole inspection at the Sunshine West site which did not comply with the building permit or the endorsed plan.
Crespin	Kitchener	DB-M 30965 DB-L 30966	18/10/2017	Cancellation of the DB-L and DB-M registrations, disqualify the practitioner from being registered for 3 years, Fine \$35,835.00 & Costs \$22,704.00	Glen Iris, Cheltenham & Hughesdale	Kitchener Crespin - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of thirty two allegations in relation to three sites at Glen Iris, Cheltenham and Hughesdale. There were eight allegations relating to the Cheltenham site and were for breaching s16 for carrying out internal alterations for the removal of a wall and installation of structural beams for support prior to the building permit being issued. The practitioner also breached s31(1), s13(1) & (2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 for having a non compliant contract, entering into a cost plus contract and not meeting the exceptions to do so nor containing a fair and reasonable estimate of the likely total money to be received under the contract respectively. The practitioner had also failed to comply with s221D(1) of the Building Act 1993 for carrying out plumbing work when not registered as a plumber. The practitioner was also found guilty of unprofessional conduct in breach of s179(1)(a) of the Act at the Cheltenham site for various actions including the removal of pool equipment the owner had purchased and offering to supply the same equipment to the owner at the Glen Iris site. There were another eight allegations that the practitioner had breached at the Hughesdale site including breaches of s16(1) and s136 (2) of the Act for carrying out building work when no building permit had been issued for the work, carrying out work which did not comply with the BCA 3.8.1 & 3.6.4.5 for shower base and shower screen installation and window above the bath, and carrying out domestic building work when not covered by the required insurance respectively. The contract was also found not to be compliant as required by s31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act. The practitioner has also failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in contravention of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 for defective work, not rectifying the defective works, and failing to ensure that the company demanded and received the deposit and progress payments under the contract at the appropriate times. The practitioner was found guilty of fifteen allegations in relation to the Glen Iris site which included breaches of s16(1), s136(2), s221D(1) of the Act for commencing demolition works prior to the permit being issued, building not in accordance with the permit, and carrying out plumbing work when not licensed or registered as a plumber respectively. The practitioner also breached s31(1), s16(1), and s19 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 for having a non compliant contract, seeking more money than the contract price when not authorised to do so, and not permitting the owner to have reasonable access to the building site and view any part of the building works respectively. The practitioner had breached Regulation 1502 of the Building Regulations for removing roof sheeting and failing to protect from water ingress, demanding and receiving payments under the contract prior to the stages being completed, and receiving a payment from the owner in respect of an invoice from a subcontract plumber and failing to pass onto the subcontractor. The practitioner was also found guilty of five allegations for unprofessional conduct at the Glen Iris site for inappropriate behaviour towards the owner, spray painting the site and damaging the building work resulting in serious occupational health and safety risks for anyone attending the site, cutting a suspended concrete slab above the entrance to the building with a demolition saw and two counts of creating false documents and forging the owners signature for a false claim in legal proceedings and creating a false contract document. The Board also found a further allegation for all 3 sites finding the practitioner guilty of s179(1)(d) of the Act of conduct constituted by a pattern of conduct or by gross negligence or gross incompetence which shows the practitioner not fit and proper person to practice.
Tsantis	Anastasios	BS-U 18514	4/10/2017	Reprimand & Fine of \$4,500.00 & Costs of \$3,891.00	Southbank	Anastasios Tsantis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of seven allegations in relation to one site in Southbank. The ground for all seven allegations was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. The first three allegations involved the practitioner failing to comply with section 30(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he did not give the relevant Council the Stage 1, 2 or 3 Building Permit and other documents within seven days of those permits being issued. The fourth allegation involved a breach of section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued the Stage 2 Building Permit when he could not have been satisfied that the Building Work and the Stage 2 Building Permit complied with the Act, the Building (Interim) Regulations 2005 and the Building Code of Australia by operation of regulation 109 of the Regulations. The fifth allegation involved a breach of section 44(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued an occupancy permit when the building was not suitable for occupation. The sixth allegation involved a breach of regulation 1203 of the Building (Interim) Regulations 2005, in that the practitioner failed to sufficiently list the Essential Safety Measures in the occupancy permit. The seventh allegation involved a breach of section 38 of the Building Act in that the practitioner failed to issue a Certificate of Final Inspection upon completion of an inspection of the Building Work associated with the Stage 1 Building Permit.

Napoletano	Sam	CB-U 4605	27/09/2017	Costs of \$4,000.00	Toorak	Sam Napoletano - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to one site in Toorak. The ground for all five allegations was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. The first allegation involved a breach of section 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner engaged in domestic building work under a major domestic building contract when he was not registered to carry out Domestic Building Work. The second allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by entering into a major domestic building contract for the Domestic Building Work on behalf of a company (of which he was the sole director) when he was not registered to carry out Domestic Building Work under the Building Act 1993, contrary to section 29 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 (Vic). The third allegation related to the practitioner failing to comply with section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993, as he engaged in Domestic Building Work as a building practitioner without the required insurance. The fourth allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by receiving, on behalf of the Company (of which he was the sole director), a deposit of more than 5% of the contract price, contrary to section 11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The fifth allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006, in that the practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by the practitioner, on behalf of the Company (of which he was the sole director), entering into a major domestic building contract for Domestic Building Work, which did not include the requirements outlined in section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
George	Steven	DB-U 12979	26/09/2017	Costs of \$4,305.00	Ashburton	Steven George - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Ashburton. The ground for the first allegation was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. This allegation involved the practitioner failing to carry out and/or failing to ensure that the company (of which the practitioner was a director), carried out the recommendations contained in an inspector's report issued under section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in relation to the building work at the site. The ground for the second allegation was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. This allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner, as a director of the company which carried out the building work at the site and as the registered building practitioner responsible, failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by carrying out defective building work as detailed in the inspection report.
Bruno	Anthony	DB-U 12982	25/09/2017	Reprimand & fine of \$4,274.90 & Costs of \$3,229.00	Ormond	Anthony Bruno - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Ormond. The grounds for the two allegations was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. The first allegation involved the practitioner failing to comply with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work that was not in accordance with the issued building permit. The second allegation involved a breach of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to perform his work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the company (of which the practitioner was the sole director) provided planning documents that had not been endorsed by the relevant Council to the RBS as part of the building permit application and the company performed building work that did not comply with Town Planning Permit Number GE/PP-20495/2008.
Brewer	Clay	DB-U 24502	20/09/2017	Suspend the Practitioner's registration DB-U 24502 for a period of 1 year & Reprimand & costs of \$4,451.00	Cowes	Clay Brewer - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to one site in Cowes. The ground for all three allegations was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. The first allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to adequately supervise the business functions of the company (of which he was the sole director and the only registered building practitioner), which resulted in demands for payment being made, and payments being received, prior to the completion of the relevant building stages. The second allegation involved a breach of section 136(1) and/or (2) of the Act, in that the practitioner carried out work as a building practitioner without the required insurance. The third allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to adequately supervise and control the company's contractual procedures.
Ivkovic	Dragan	DB-U 33965	13/09/2017	Fine of \$4,500.00 & costs of \$1,408.00	Malvern East	Dragan Ivkovic - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Malvern East. The ground for inquiry in relation to the first allegation was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. This allegation involved the practitioner failing to comply with section 16 of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work that was not in accordance with the building permit that was issued and in force. The ground for the second allegation was section 179(1)(fc) of the Building Act 1993. This allegation involved a failure of the practitioner to comply with section 37(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act in that he did not receive a signed consent from the building owners to vary the contract in relation to the building works.
Cerra	Tullio	DB-U 12732	13/09/2017	Cancel Practitioner's registration DB-U 12732 & disqualify the Practitioner from being registered for a period of 3 years & costs of \$2,816.00	Cranbourne North	Tullio Cerra - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Cranbourne North. The grounds for both allegations was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. The first allegation involved failing to comply with section 16(1) of the Act, in that as the relevant building practitioner for the building work, the practitioner carried out building work which was not in accordance with the building permit that was issued. The second allegation involved a breach of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 (Vic.) in that the practitioner failed to carry out his work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the building work was defective.
Busuttill	Geoff	DB-U 15473	6/09/2017	Reprimand & fine of \$12,214.00 & Practitioner is to undertake and complete a specified course of training consisting of 3 units/modules of the Contracts and Legal Obligations Course by 30 March 2018 & Costs of \$10,102.00	Craigieburn	Geoff Busuttill - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations relating to two different sites in Craigieburn. The grounds for both allegations was section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993. Both allegations involved failing to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 (Vic.) in that the practitioner failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he applied for, or facilitated the application for, insurance on behalf of a company which was not the company named under the relevant major domestic building contracts. In doing this, the site owners were not covered by the required insurance because the company was not the builder under the relevant major domestic building contracts.
Potenza	Michael	DB-U 16147	31/08/2017	Fine \$3,000 & Costs \$3,051	Bendigo	Michael Potenza - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 by failing to comply with section 16(1) of the Act, in that as the relevant building practitioner for the building work, the practitioner carried out building work which was not in accordance with the building permit that was issued, specifically an eave line and gutter had been built across the property boundary and a fire rated brick gable wall needed a compliant fire rated design. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that as the relevant building practitioner for the building work, failed to apply for an extension to a building permit resulting in the lapse of that permit prior to the building work reaching completion.
Dimitrovici	Stefan	DB-U 23979	23/08/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$3,500.00 & Costs \$2,541.00	North Dandenong	Stefan Dimitrovici - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations. This first was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner did not comply with the requirements of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993, in that the practitioner carried out building work at the site not in accordance with the Building Permit, specifically with respect to the finished floor levels. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, specifically with respect to causing or were responsible for causing, damage to the adjoining property. The third was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner did not comply with the requirements of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993, in that the practitioner carried out building work at the site not in accordance with the Building Permit, specifically with respect to window installation, window sill height and front fence height.
Panuccio	Paul	DB-U 13602	23/08/2017	Fine \$2,500.00 & Costs \$ 2,541.00	Irymple	Paul Panuccio - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993, by failing to comply with section 221(d) of the Act in that the practitioner carried out plumbing work, namely roofing (stormwater) work for which the practitioner is not licensed or registered by the Authority to carry out. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner made inconsistent and contradictory statements to investigators regarding the works, displaying an unwillingness to assist investigators with their inquiries.
Al Mosawi	Hussein	DB-M 27833	16/08/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$10,332.70 & Costs \$3,102.00	Hawthorn	Hussein Al Mosawi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993, by failing to comply with section 246 of the Act in that the practitioner knowingly provided false or misleading information to the Relevant Building Surveyor, being a person carrying out a function under the Act, in response to a previous request from a frame inspection and a building notice in relation to building work at the site. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner continued to complete building works without the frame inspection approval.

Dunne	Alan	DB-U 3560	03/08/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$15,698.43, Costs \$4,140.00 & provide the VBA with evidence formally demonstrating satisfactory completion of the accredited course in "Contracts & Legal Obligation" by 31st December 2017	Heatherton	Alan Dunne - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations. This first was in contravention with section 179(1)(fc) of the Building Act 1993 in that, as a relevant building practitioner for the renovation of an existing dwelling, the practitioner entered into a major domestic building contract that did not comply with the requirements of section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The second was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner did not comply with the requirements of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993, in that as a relevant building practitioner for the renovation of an existing dwelling, the practitioner carried out building work at the site when a Building Permit in respect of that work had not been issued. The third was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner did not comply with the requirements of section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993, in that as a relevant building practitioner for the renovation of an existing dwelling, the practitioner carried out building work at the site under a major domestic building contract without the required insurance.
Chatah	Frank	DB-U 29013	02/08/2017	Fine \$ 15,857.00, Costs \$7151.00, Cancel Registration DB-U 29013 & Disqualify the Practitioner from being registered in any category for 3 years	Meadow Heights	Frank Chatah - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with section 179(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993, by failing to comply with section 246 of the Act in that the practitioner knowingly provided false or misleading information to the Victorian Building Authority, being a body carrying out a function under the Act. On the second allegation the practitioner has been found guilty of unprofessional conduct under section 179(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner fraudulently created a document purporting to appoint another practitioner as the relevant building surveyor.
Cachia	Leslie	DP-AD 1044	28/07/2017	Reprimand, Fine of \$2000, Costs \$5,340.00, Undertaking confirming the practitioner will produce a Certificate of Attendance (for the BDAV training course: "Improving Building Permit Documentation") within 14 days, as requested in the Board's previous Notice of Decision, otherwise attend the course (providing the VBA with formal attendance documentation) within three months (by October 28, 2017)	Chirnside Park, Mooroolbark, Mt.Eliza	Leslie Cachia - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations. The allegations were in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the architectural drawings prepared by the practitioner for the building permit applications were deficient.
Leonard	Damian	CB-U 3432, DB-U 14357	29/06/2017	Reprimand, Cancel Registrations CB-U 3432 & DB-U 14357, Disqualify the practitioner for 3 years & Costs \$3,675.00	Cranbourne East & Hampton Park	Damian Leonard - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner permitted the use of his building registration for the construction of dwellings when he had no intention of being responsible for the building work. The second was in contravention with section 179(1)(d) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner had engaged in a pattern of conduct that shows he is not a fit and proper person to practice as a building practitioner in that the practitioner permitted the use of their building registration for the construction of dwellings when he had no intention of being responsible for the building work.
Rechichi	Mark	BS-U 21569, IN-L 21795, IN-U 25860	28/06/2017	Costs \$2000	Mount Helen	Mark Rechichi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with regulation 313(3) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner issued a building permit which did not contain the six-month time limit for completion of the building work from the date of commencement of the building work in accordance with Regulation 315. The second was in contravention with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work and the building permit would comply with the Act and the Building Regulations 2006.
Renouf	Norman	DB-U 3636	22/06/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$1,500.00 & Costs \$4,305.00	Balwyn North	Norman Renouf - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner's work was defective and not of a sufficient standard. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner demanded and received payment to which he was not entitled because he had not completed the work to which it related.
Shanmugalingam	Sutharsan	DB-U 33525 & CB-L 31194	20/06/2017	Fine \$2,986.25 & Costs \$4,395.00	Dandenong	Sutharsan Shanmugalingam - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations. This first was in contravention with section 88(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that Vansan Constructions Pty Ltd, a company of which the practitioner was a sole director, carried out building work, being excavation for a basement which gave rise to the requirement to carry out protection work at a time when the adjoining owners had not agreed and were not deemed to have agreed to the protection work. The second was in contravention with section 93(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that Vansan Constructions commenced protection work in respect to adjoining properties in circumstances where no insurance against damage by protection work to adjoining properties had been obtained. The third was in contravention with section 93(3) of the Building Act 1993 in that Vansan Constructions commenced protection work in respect to adjoining properties without lodging with adjoining owners a copy of insurance against damage by the protection work to adjoining properties.
Lennox	Ian	IN-U 26557	20/06/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$1,408.40 & Costs \$10,119.00	Brighton East	Ian Lennox - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation. This was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner approved the mandatory frame stage inspection when it do not comply with the building permit and associated engineer's design.
Cartledge	Neal	BS-U 1350	13/06/2017	Suspension of Registration for 3 months, Imposed condition to stop issuing building permits, and Costs \$8,979.00	Alexandra	Neal Cartledge - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. This first was in contravention with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued a building permit when you could not have been reasonably satisfied that the building work and the building permit would comply with the Act and the Building Regulations 2006. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner failed to require the provision of protection work of the adjoining property under regulation 602 of the Regulations.
Marino	Joe	DB-U 20754	07/06/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$5,000 & Costs \$4,245.00	Seabrook	Joe Marino - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. This first was in contravention with section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that the practitioner failed to carry out a recommendation contained in an inspector's report. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502 of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent and professional manner in that the practitioner failed to properly waterproof an external wall.
Theodorou	Theo	BS-U 1100	25/05/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$433.08 & Costs \$3,983.50	Toorak	Theo Theodorou - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation. This was in contravention with section 24(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the report and consent of the reporting authority had been obtained, as required by the Building Regulations 2006.
Djurovic	Sasa	DB-U 26084	25/09/2017	On appeal, VCAT orders by consent of 25/09/17 confirmed the following penalty following the Board determination of 19/05/2017: Reprimand, Fine \$14,084 & Costs \$4,957.88	Truganina, Cranbourne x 2 and Clyde North x 2	Sasa Djurovic - Practitioner found guilty of thirteen allegations of failure to comply with regulation 1502. The conduct related to the practitioners company not entering into a major domestic building contract and allowing permit applications to be made, in circumstances which put the owners at risk of building work not being covered by the required insurance.
Gurleyen	Abdulkadir	DB-U 13706	11/05/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$2,454.12, Complete three (3) Units of the Certificate IV in Building & Construction (Contracts & Legal Obligation Modules) by 1st January 2018 & Costs \$4,760.00	Doncaster	Abdulkadir Gurleyen - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first was in contravention with section 16 of the Building Act 1993 as the practitioner carried out building work without a building permit. The second was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 as the practitioner failed to ensure that the company he was the sole director for complied with section 40(3) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.

Mimmo	Carmen	DB-U 23924, CB-U 36287	8/05/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$5,375.25 & Costs \$4,881.60	South Yarra	Carmen Mimmo - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation. This was in contravention with section 16 of the Building Act 1993 as the practitioner carried out building work without a building permit.
Younan	Michael	DB-L 19809	3/05/2017	Reprimand, Suspension of Registration (DB-L 19809) for 3 months (from 1/6/17), Fine \$1,476.10, Costs \$7,102.00 & Completion of specific modules of the Cert IV in Building & Construction by 3rd November 2017	Hoppers Crossing	Michael Younan - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations. The first allegation was in contravention with section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner carried out the building work under a major domestic building contract when he was not covered by the required insurance. The second allegation was in contravention of section 25 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that the company that the practitioner was the sole director for carried out domestic building works with a cost greater than \$5,000, without providing the site owner with a major domestic building contract within five days of it being entered into. The third allegation was in contravention of section 30 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that the company that the practitioner was the sole director for entered into a major domestic building contract and carried out domestic building works at the site associated with the alteration of dwelling footings without first obtaining the required site specific foundation data. The fourth allegation was in contravention with section 31 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that the company that the practitioner was the sole director for carried out domestic building works at a dwelling located at the site with a cost of works greater than \$5,000 without providing the site owner with a major domestic building contract containing the details required by section 31 of the DBC Act.
Pyers	Andrew	DB-L 22804, DB-U 12721	2/05/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$2,214.15, Costs \$4,395.00 & Successful completion of three units of study of the Cert. IV in Building & Construction by 1st January 2018.	Carlton North	Andrew Pyers - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of seven allegations. Three of the allegations were in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard. He facilitated parties entering into a major domestic building contract for the building work, which did not include certain information required by section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act. He facilitated a company receiving a deposit of more than 5% of the contract price, contrary to section 11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. He demanded payment before it was due, contrary to the payment terms under the contract for the building works. The other four contravened sections 136(2), 176(2A), 221(1) and 248(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that practitioner engaged in domestic building work as a building practitioner without the required insurance, he engaged in domestic building work of a kind that can only be done by a person registered under the Act when he was not registered in the appropriate category or class, he submitted a building permit application without the written authorisation of the owner of the site, and he engaged in plumbing work of a kind that can only be done by a person registered under the Act when he was not registered in the appropriate category or class.
Burnell	Robert	BS-U 1018, IN-U 1015, EC 1516, QS 1061 & DP-SD 27	1/05/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$14,761.00 & Costs \$20,415.00	Springvale, Noble Park, Black Rock & Hampton Park	Robert Burnell - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of eleven allegations, spreading across eight sites in total, four of which being at Springvale, two at Noble Park, one at Black Rock and one at Hampton Park. Six of the allegations were in contravention with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993, where the practitioner issued a building permit for each of the six sites at Noble Park and Springvale, however he could not have been satisfied that the building work and building permit would comply with the Act and the Building regulations 2006. The other five allegations were in relation to the sites at Black Rock and at Hampton Park. The first three of these allegations was in contravention with section 24(1)(a) in that the practitioner issued a building permit at sites in Black Rock and Hampton Park when he could not be satisfied that the building work and the building permit will comply with the Act and the Building Regulations 2006. The fourth allegation is in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he issued a building permit at the site at Black Rock to an owner-builder inconsistent with the building permit application. The fifth allegation was in contravention of section 24(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued a building permit for the site at Hampton Park when he failed to obtain the report and consent of the council as required by Regulation 610(2) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Bettens	Peter	DB-L 31975	20/04/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$1,500, Costs \$2,910, 5 CPD points required by 20/05/2017, Undertaking to not breach s16(1) of the Act	Malmsbury	Peter Bettens - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation. This was in contravention with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work at a site in Malmsbury without a permit.
Mavridis	Lazarus	BS-U 1588	12/04/2017	Reprimand, Additional 3 months Suspension of registration with existing limiting conditions & Costs \$4,305.00	Preston	Lazarus Mavridis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to a site in Preston. The first allegation was in contravention with section 30(1) of the Building Act 1993, as the practitioner failed to provide copies of the building permit, plans and other documents lodged with the permit application within 7 days of issuing a building permit. The second allegation was in contravention with section 24A(3) of the Building Act 1993 as the practitioner issued a building permit when he could not be satisfied that the owner had been issued with a certificate of consent for the work.
Lehmann	Andrew	BS-U 15013	11/04/2017	Fine \$1,000 & Costs \$1,075	South Yarra	Andrew Lehmann - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation relating to the building work in South Yarra. The allegation was in contravention with section 24(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner issued a building permit when he could not be satisfied that the consent of a reporting authority required under regulation 604 of the Building Regulations 2006 had been obtained.
Infantino	Joseph	DB-U 3685, CB-U 1066	7/04/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$6,218.40 & Costs \$2,910.00	Lilydale	Joseph Infantino - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation relating to the construction of a dwelling in Lilydale. The allegation was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner failed to ensure that Infantino Constructions Pty Ltd, a company of which he was a sole director, rectified defective work identified in an inspector's report to a satisfactory standard and in a timely manner.
Daniel	Isho	DB-U 19762	7/04/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$2,000 & Costs \$2,321.60	Sunshine	Isho Daniel - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations relating to a site in Sunshine. The first allegation was in contravention with section 31(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 (DBCA), in that the Quotation and Contract the practitioner provided did not contain eleven of the required items as stated in the DBCA. The second allegation was in contravention with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner did not carry out his work in a competent manner or to a professional standard following findings in the inspection report in September 2013. The third allegation was in contravention with section 48 of the DBCA in that the practitioner failed to rectify the defects listed in the VBA Inspection Report from September 2013.
Ho	Guang	CB-L 33562	6/04/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$11,659.50 & Costs \$4,852	Melbourne	Guang Ho - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site at Little Collins Street in Melbourne. The allegation was in relation to allowing an unregistered practitioner to use the practitioners registration details to enable that person to obtain a building permit and carry out alterations and additions to a dwelling in exchange for payment. The practitioner was therefore found to be guilty of unprofessional conduct.
Pizzo	Ross	DB-U 15026, CB-L 41166	6/04/2017	Reprimand & Costs \$4258.50	Toorak	Ross Pizzo - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to a site in Toorak. The first allegation was in contravention with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner carried out building work at the site when no building permit had been issued in respect of that work. The second allegation was in contravention with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that the practitioner carried out building work at the site which was not in accordance with the plans approved in a building permit.
Leonard	Shane	BS-U 1076 & IN-U 1066	5/04/2017	Costs \$4,920	Melbourne	Shane Leonard - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site at Queen Street in Melbourne. The allegation contravened section 79(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 when the practitioner accepted an appointment as the relevant building surveyor for the building work at the site yet he had already been engaged by the body which prepared the design of the building work, by giving them written advice and providing a fee proposal.
Hartley	Robert	BS-U 25753	5/04/2017	Fine \$500 & Costs \$2,858	Gladstone Park	Robert Hartley - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Gladstone Park. The practitioner failed to properly inspect the building work at the site prior to issuing a Certificate of Final Inspection in failing to notice the strutting beam had no lateral support and failed to carry out his work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional manner in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.

Zand Basiri	Kamran	BS-U 18530	4/04/2017	Reprimand, Provide specific undertaking that he only accept appointments to act as the RBS, and issue building permits, in relation to buildings in class 1 or class 10 and no others by 30/04/2017, Fine \$9,664.20 & Costs \$19,201.50	Dandenong	Kamran Zand Basiri : Practitioner found guilty of 4 allegations of breach of s 179(1)(b) in relation to a construction of a five storey apartment building of classes 2 and 7a. The first allegation was a breach of s24(1)(a) of the Act for issuing the building permit when being unable to be satisfied that the building work would comply with s109 of the Building Act with reference to the Building Code of Australia requirements such as fire hydrant and fire hose reel installations. The second allegation was a breach of s24(1)(b) of the Act for not being satisfied that a consent of the Chief Fire Officer of the CFA had been obtained prior to the issuing of the building permit. The Board also found the practitioner had failed to perform work in a competent and professional manner in breach of Reg 1502 of the Building Regulations 2006 for supplying the builder a document which falsely represented a fire engineering report as the document had not been prepared by an appropriately qualified person and was not suited to the building work at the subject site. Also the practitioner breached s44(a) of the Act by issuing an occupancy permit when the building was not suitable for occupation.
Zand Basiri	Kamran	BS-U 18530	4/04/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$7,167.00 & Costs \$8,602.00	Dandenong	Kamran Zand Basiri - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations in relation to a site in Dandenong. The practitioner was found to breach section 179 (1) (b) of the Building Act 1993 in that he failed to carry out the work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard, as the relevant building surveyor on the conversion of a hall to a shared accommodation building he failed to correctly classify the structure in accordance to the Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner was also found to fail to have appropriate measures in place to ensure that the building permit and the approved documentation and plans complied with the Building Act 1993 and the Building Regulations 2006, namely that there were no dimensions of the building or internal rooms, no elevations or cross section, no indication of ceiling height and the construction of a ceiling and it had not been stamped as an approved drawing. The practitioner was also found to have breached section 179 (1) (a) in that he failed to comply with regulation 1502 (a) of the Building Regulations 2006 whereby he should not have issued an occupancy permit in circumstances where he could not have been satisfied that all emergency lights and smoke alarms had been installed as required by the approved building permit plans. There were no emergency lights/evacuation lights or smoke alarms in the shared corridor as shown on the floor plan. The practitioner failed to comply with section 73 of the Building Act 1993 in that he failed to provide the council a copy of the amended occupancy permit within 7 days. In relation to the hall conversion, the practitioner failed to comply with regulation 1502 (a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he accepted an estimated cost of building work when he knew or ought to have known that it was significantly less than the actual cost.
Bishara	William	DB-M 26951	7/03/2017	Suspension of Registration for 3 months (1st June to 31st August 2017), Fine \$14,607.00 & Costs \$10,597.00	North Balwyn & Surrey Hills	William Bishara : the practitioner was found guilty of six allegations before the BPB. The allegations related to carrying out building work which was not in accordance with an issued building permit and failure to comply with s 16(1) of the Building Act. Further, he demanded payments to which he was not entitled because the building work to which they related were not completed. His building work was defective and not of a sufficient standard.
Wilkie	Wayne L.	BS-U 1164	3/03/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$8,958.75, Costs \$11,834.00 & Undertaking	Rupanyup	Wayne L. Wilkie : Practitioner was found guilty of two allegations in relation to a site in Rupanyup. The first was a breach of s24(1)(a) of the Act for issuing a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Building Regulations 2006 due to the insufficient information contained within the building permit documentation. Also as the building permit allowed the removal of fire hydrants, the practitioner had breaches s24(1)(b) in that he could not have been satisfied that the report and consent of the Chief Officer of the CFA had been obtained in relation to fire safety matters that did not meet the deemed-to-satisfy provisions of the BCA.
Lewis	Raymond	BS-U 13866 & EC 13867	22/02/2017	Fine \$1,000, Costs \$2,820 & Undertaking to Cease issuing Building Permits from 30/6/2017	Sunbury	Raymond Lewis : Practitioner found guilty of one allegation of failure to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard as required by regulation 1502(a) in that he issued a certificate of final inspection for the alterations when he could not be satisfied that the final inspection was satisfactory as the swimming pool fence did not comply with Australian Standards (AS 1926.1-2007)
Solomou	Peter	DB-U 22673	21/02/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$6,229.14 & Costs \$7,322.40	Truganina, Clyde North & Tarneit	Peter Solomou : Practitioner found guilty of five allegations of failure to comply with regulation 1502. The conduct related to the practitioners company not entering into a major domestic building contract and allowing permit applications to be made, in circumstances which put the owners at risk of building work not being covered by the required insurance.
Wong	Alice	DB-U 15843	16/02/2017	Reprimand & Costs \$4,155.00	Cremorne	Alice Wong : Practitioner found guilty of failure to comply with s 16(1) of the Building Act for carrying out building work that was not in accordance with a building permit that was issued and in force in respect of that work. A pergola was converted into a habitable room with a roof, internal ceiling wall, a window and door.
Princi	Joseph	CB-L 33262	6/02/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$4,885.60 & Costs \$3,426.00	Richmond	Joseph Princi : Practitioner was found guilty of one allegation of failing to ensure safety of persons or property and therefore of failing to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in accordance with Reg 1502(a) in carrying out demolition works of an existing 2 storey brick office building in an unsafe manner. Despite the issue of emergency orders, demolition work was carried out by you without any form of protection in place for adjoining properties.
Askin	Ayhan	CB-L 29450 DB-U 27021	2/02/2017	Reprimand, Fine of \$6,000, Suspension of the practitioner's CB-L & DB-U registrations for a period of 12 months (from 27 November 2015 until 27 November 2016), requirement that the practitioner fully complete all warranty insurance applications for all future building work as a registered practitioner & Costs of \$9,003	Brooklyn	Ayhan Askin : The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations, in that, one two occasions, he sold properties and provided certificates of insurance that were not genuine certificates to the purchasers of those properties without taking reasonable measures to check their accuracy.
Morihovitis	Andrew	BD-L 38185	2/02/2017	Fine \$1,061.69 & Costs \$2,820.00	Rosanna	Andrew Morihovitis : Practitioner found building of one allegation of carrying out building work for which a building permit was required but not held including demolition of an existing dwelling contrary to s 16 of the Building Act.
Harrington	Andrew	DB-U 4817, CB-L 20352, DP-AD 1806	31/01/2017		Horsham	Andrew Harrington : In relation to construction of a new residential dwelling in Horsham, the Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation of failing to carry out a number of recommendations contained in an inspector's report under s 179(fb) of the Building Act. The report had required that defects be rectified within 6 weeks of the date of the inspector's report. Some, but not all, of the defects were addressed.
Panuccio	Vince	BS-U 1566	30/01/2017	Reprimand, Fine \$3,886.50 & Costs \$2,727.00	St. Kilda	Vince Panuccio - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations. The practitioner was found to have breached section 179 (1) (b) of the Building Act 1993, as the relevant surveyor for the construction of a childcare centre in St Kilda. He failed to comply with section 24 (1) (a) of the Building Act 1993 when he could not have been satisfied that the proposed building works and the building permits would comply with the Act. The practitioner also breached s24(1)(b) of the Act in being satisfied that the consent of a reporting authority required under the Act or the Regulations had been obtained. The Board also found that the practitioner failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard contract to reg 1502 (a) of the Regulations, in that he failed to determine that an alternative solution would comply with the performance requirements of the BCA at the time he issued the occupancy permit.
Walpole	Samuel	DB-U 37614	23/12/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$1000, Costs \$2655 & Completion of Contracts & Legal obligation Course by 30/06/2017	Black Rock	Samuel Walpole - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation. The practitioner failed to comply with section 16 (1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out work when a building permit had not been issued.
Sugarevski	Sash	CB-L 38360 & DB-U 19143	23/12/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$3000 & Costs \$2655	Hampton	Sash Sugarevski - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation. The practitioner failed to comply with section 16 (1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out work when a building permit had not been issued.

Neighbour	Michael	BS-U 1232	20/12/2016	Reprimand	Northcote	Michael Neighbour - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Northcote. The practitioner was found guilty of breaching section 179 (1) (b) - failing to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that he issued a building permit to an owner-builder for demolition works without taking appropriate action to ensure that the owner-builder had the necessary knowledge and experience to properly conduct the demolition work.
Caulfield	Gary	CB-U 3052, DB-U 19194	19/12/2016	Costs \$3057	Cranbourne West	Gary Caulfield - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Cranbourne West. The practitioner failed to comply with section 16 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he carried out building work which was not in accordance to the building permit, namely the construction of the garage, namely the gutter, was not constructed within the boundary of the site.
Rontogiannis	Peter	BS-U 20459	19/12/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$16,012.38, Costs \$3,352.50 & Undertaking	Craigieburn, Northcote, Ivanhoe, Doreen & Kilmore	Peter Rontogiannis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations - in relation to sites in Ivanhoe East and Doreen, 3 allegations in relation to a site in Northcote, and two allegations in relation to sites in Craigieburn and Kilmore. With regard to the Ivanhoe East site, the practitioner failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard as he failed to have the required protection work for the building work in place. He was also found to breach reg 1502 (a) of the <i>Building Regulations (Vic) 2006</i> in that he issued a condition to a building permit which could not be complied with given the nature of the proposed work. Regarding the site in Doreen, he was found to breach s 44 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he issued an occupancy permit for a building not suitable for occupation. He also issued a building notice to the relevant builder rather than the owner of the site, contrary to section 106 of the <i>Building Act</i> . In relation to the Northcote site - the practitioner was found to breach s 179 (1) (b) in that he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work and the building permit would comply with the Act and the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . The practitioner was found to have also failed to carry out work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that he failed to respond to the adjoining owner of the site in a timely manner or at all and that he failed to comply with reg 1502 (a) in that he directed the owner builder at the site to carry out building work without a building permit. In relation to the Craigieburn site, the practitioner was found to breach section 179 (1) (b) in that he failed to comply with section 24 (1)(a) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with reg 409 (2) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . For the Kilmore site, the practitioner was also found guilty of failing to carry our work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he issued a Certificate of Final Inspection in circumstances where the building work was not constructed in accordance with the Building Permit and the Regulations, namely in the construction of a veranda.
Merhi	Omar	DB-M 32581 & DB-L 32582	7/12/2016	Fine \$3000 & Costs \$1617	Preston	Omar Merhi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations in relation to a site in Preston. The practitioner was found to breach under section 179 (1) (fb) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he failed to carry out any of the recommendations contained in the inspector's report under section 48 of the DBCA in the allowed timeframe. The practitioner was also found to breach section 31 of the DBCA as the contract failed to contain certain required general contents on the contract, namely it did not contain warranty insurance details as required, owners details were incomplete and the contract was not specific and provided insufficient information in relation to the obtaining of a building permit. The practitioner was also found to breach section 11 (1) (a) of the DBCA in that he requested more than 5% deposit of the contract price. The practitioner also failed to adhere to section 40 (2) of the DBCA as he did not adhere to Method A despite the schedule form 1 warning being signed and instead adopted Method B for progress payments.
Brown	Brendan	DB-U 21498 & CB-L 38810	2/12/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$1500 & Costs \$3228	Settlers Run	Brendan Brown - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 6 allegations in relation to one site in Settlers Run. The practitioner was found to contravene section 11 (a) of the DBCA, in that he requested more than 5% of the contract price to be paid prior to building works commencing. The practitioner was found to breach section 16 (1) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he carried out building work, namely site excavation, before a building permit was issued and in force. The practitioner also breached reg 1502 (a) in that he requested payment for Frame Stage works, fixing stage payment and completion stage payment prior to those stages being completed.
Wagg	Martin	DB-U 9186 & CB-U 3328	25/11/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$1500 & Costs \$2820	Newport	Martin Wagg - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Newport. It was found that the practitioner failed to act on the recommendations made by the inspector's report under section 48 of the DBCA within the required timeframe.
Macleod	Donald	BS-U 1550	22/11/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$5752.02 & Costs \$7557.00	Kalkallo & Fitzroy	Donald Macleod - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations relating to two sites. The practitioner was found to have breached section 24 (1) (a) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work and the building permit would comply, namely the approved height of a boundary wall that exceeded the approved height. The practitioner was also found to have breached section 1502 (a) of the Regulations in that he issued a building permit in relation to inconsistent approved building plans. The practitioner also issued an occupancy permit for the Kalkallo site without approving a location for the display of the building permit contrary to reg 1005 & 1008(1) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Fitzgerald	Peter	DB-U 3651	16/11/2016	Reprimand & Costs \$2077.50	Canterbury	Peter Fitzgerald - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation concerning the construction of a residential dwelling in Canterbury. The practitioner was found to have failed to have performed his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he had undertaken excavation work that encroached onto a neighbouring property, thereby undermining its footings.
Austin	John	BS-U 1116	10/11/2016	Cancel Registration & Costs \$3865.00	Warragul and Drouin	John Austin - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations. Three allegations related to the practitioner issuing a building permit in respect of a site in Drouin. The endorsed plans showed that the retaining walls were to be constructed over an easement, however, the report and consent of the relevant authority as required by regulation 310(1) of the Building Regulations 2006 ('Regulations') had not been obtained. The building permit application also did not show sufficient information in relation to the construction of the retaining walls and the contract price specified in the application was substantially lower than that which was normally payable. The Board also found the practitioner guilty of one allegation relating to a site in Warragul. The practitioner was found to have contravened section 24(1) of the Building Act 1993 ('Act') in that he had issued a building permit in circumstances where he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Act and Regulations in that the approved plans did not show the layout of the stormwater drains to the point of discharge as required by Regulation 302 of the Building Regulations.
Juric	Daniel	BS-U 31016	26/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$2500 & Costs \$3033.50	Gisborne, Clifton Springs and Attwood	Daniel Juric - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations in respect of 3 sites. The practitioner was found to have contravened section 24(1) of the Building Act 1993 ('Act') on two occasions in that he had issued building permits, when he could not have been satisfied that the required report and consent of the authority had been obtained. The Board also found that the practitioner had twice failed to lodge building permit documentation with Council within 7 days in contravention of section 30(1) of the Act and that he had failed to notify Council within 7 days of his appointment in contravention of section 80 of the Act.
Thomson	Ross	BS-U 1290	26/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$3000 & Costs \$4287	Ringwood	Ross Thomson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Ringwood. The practitioner had issued two building permits for the construction of a residential dwelling. The plans that accompanied the building permit application did not comply with the Council's planning scheme setback requirements and regulation 414 of the Building Regulations 2006. As such, the report and consent of the Council was required prior issuing the building permits. The practitioner had failed to obtain the report and consent of Council prior to issuing the building permits and was therefore found to have contravened section 24(1) of the Building Act 1993.
McDonald	Andrew	CB-L 32110	25/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$5000 & Costs \$1914	Brighton East	Andrew McDonald - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation with respect to a site in Brighton East. The practitioner is a director of a company that was engaged to carry out the construction of two townhouses. The Board found that the practitioner had contravened section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that some of the building work performed by the company was not in accordance with the approved plans and specifications forming part of the building permit.

Chadwick	Reginald	BD-M 1065	20/10/2016	Fine \$2000 & Costs 2968.50	Brighton	Reginald Chadwick - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to a site in Brighton. The practitioner was responsible for the demolition of an existing dwelling, swimming pool, sheds and retaining walls and a building permit had been issued for these works. The practitioner had also carried out the demolition of a masonry boundary wall and brick storeroom, for which no building permit had been issued. Accordingly, he was found to have undertaken building works without a permit in contravention of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993. He was also found to have breached regulation 317(2) of the Building Regulations 2006 as although the building permit information was displayed on the site, it was not accessible to the public and it was obscured by foliage.
Shaw	Michael	BS-U 1165	20/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$5320.74 & Costs \$3861	McKinnon and Malvern East	Michael Shaw - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations in respect of two sites. In relation to the Malvern East site, the practitioner was found to have failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 on three occasions in that he had issued a building permit which incorrectly classified the building, he failed to rectify this error when he had opportunities to do so and he failed to consider the Building Code of Australia requirements for fire safety when issuing the permit. The practitioner was also found to have contravened section 30(1) of the Building Act 1993 in relation to a site in McKinnon in that he failed to lodge the building permit documentation with Council within 7 days of issuing the permit.
Lotauro	John	EC- 2075	18/10/2016	Reprimand, Suspension of Registration for three (3) months, Fine \$9327.60 & Costs \$1483.50	Brunswick	John Lotauro - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations concerning a site in Brunswick. The practitioner is an engineer who inspected and issued certificates of compliance in respect of the concrete slab and structural framework, even though the work was non-compliant. The practitioner was therefore found to have failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Hill	Marshall	DB-U 9006	18/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$2954.24, Costs \$1200 & Cert IV in Building & Construction	Sorrento and Prahran	Marshall Hill - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations. The first allegation related to a site in Prahran. The practitioner's company had been engaged to undertake renovations to a residential dwelling. Seven years later, it became apparent that there were defects in the building work, when the property was severely damaged during a storm. The practitioner was found to have contravened section 45 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that he failed to rectify these defects pursuant to the recommendations contained in an inspector's report. The second allegation concerned a site in Sorrento, where the practitioner had been engaged to carry out alterations to a residential dwelling. The practitioner's company had carried out excavation work to the site prior to a building permit being issued and as such, the practitioner was found to have contravened section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993.
D'Aquila	Frank	BS-U 24084	18/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$3418.92 & Costs \$1778.57	Brunswick East	Frank D'Aquila - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations relating to a site in Brunswick East. The practitioner had been appointed as the relevant building surveyor for the construction of a medical centre at the site. He was found to have breached regulation 314(2) of the Building Regulations 2006 on three occasions, in that he failed to provide the site owners with copies of the building permit within seven days. The practitioner had issued a building permit when an appeal was pending in relation to a protection works determination he had made and which did not include documentation that demonstrated how the remaining portion of the brick wall would comply with the Building Act 1993 and Building Regulations 2006 as required by regulation 304(1)(c) of the Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner was therefore found to have also breached section 24(1) of the Building Act 1993 and regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Mackey	Robert	DB-U 12812	23/06/2017	On appeal, VCAT orders by consent of 23/06/17 confirmed the following penalty following the Board determination of 18/10/2016: Reprimand, Fine \$5000 & Costs \$2,155.50	Dandenong	Robert Mackey - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site at Dandenong. The practitioner is a director of a company that was engaged to construct a residential dwelling at the site. The company had engaged a subcontractor to undertake excavation work at the site. The practitioner was found guilty of contravening section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 as the excavation work was performed prior to a building permit being issued.
Rule	Christopher	DB-U 31807	18/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$3504.60 & Costs \$1386.00	Kyneton	Christopher Rule - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in respect of a site in Kyneton. The practitioner is a domestic builder and had been engaged to construct a residential dwelling at the site. During the course of carrying out building works at the site, the practitioner had installed a combustion heater, which under the Building Act 1993, constitutes plumbing work. The practitioner was therefore found to have carried out plumbing work when not registered to do so in contravention of section 221D(1) of the Building Act 1993.
Di Raco	Rocco	BS-U 14813	18/10/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$6,000 & Costs \$2820.00	Caulfield East	Rocco Di Raco - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two contraventions of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in relation to two sites. The findings included that he had issued an occupancy permit when he had not inspected the building works and that he had failed to issue a building notice under section 106 of the Building Act 1993 when building work had been carried out that was not in accordance with the building permit.
Van Huizen	Dean	CB-U 7135	27/09/2016	Fine \$2331.90 & Costs \$866.75	Dandenong South	Dean Van Huizen - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site at Dandenong South. The practitioner is a director of a company that was engaged to undertake building works at the site. The company had engaged two agents to carry out the boring of piers, site clearing, site levelling and preparation of footings. The agents had carried out this work prior to a building permit being issued. The practitioner was therefore found to have contravened section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993.
Pettenuzzo	Mark	DB-U 22067	27/09/2016	Fine \$2331.90 & Costs \$866.75	Dandenong South	Mark Pettenuzzo - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site at Dandenong South. The practitioner is a director of a company that was engaged to undertake building works at the site. The company had engaged two agents to carry out the boring of piers, site clearing, site levelling and preparation of footings. The agents had carried out this work prior to a building permit being issued. The practitioner was therefore found to have contravened section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993.
McGregor	Hamish	DB-U 37420	26/09/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$8,000, Costs \$3,499 & Course of Training	Soldiers Hill	Hamish McGregor - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to a site in Soldiers Hill. The practitioner had entered into a major domestic building contract that was not in writing and did not comply with the requirements of section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner had also carried out work under that contract, when he was not covered by the required warranty insurance, contrary to section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993.
Maginnity	Brian	DB-U 7829	26/09/2016	Fine \$7,773 & Costs \$1,484	West Wodonga	Brian Maginnity - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations concerning a site in West Wodonga. Both allegations related to the practitioner carrying out domestic building work when he was not covered by the required warranty insurance.
Hope-Johnstone	Stephen	CB-U 2576; DBL-1347	26/09/2016	Reprimanded, Fine \$9,383.40, Costs \$3,057.00 & Course of Training	Highton	Stephen Hope-Johnstone - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of six allegations in relation to a site in Highton. The findings included that the practitioner had entered into a non-complying major domestic building contract for the construction of a shed on the site, when he was not registered, thereby breaching sections 29 and 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act. The practitioner was also found to have contravened sections 16(1), 136(2) and 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work when he was not registered and not covered by the required warranty insurance and a building permit had not been issued.
Zaya	Zaya	DB-L 23647	26/09/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$3609.00, Practitioner Undertaking & Costs \$1885.60	Albion	Zaya Zaya - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner of two allegations in relation to a site in Albion. The practitioner is the director of a company, which had been engaged to carry out underpinning works at the site. The practitioner was found to have contravened section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 and regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he had carried out the building work prior to a building permit being issued and when he was aware that the adjoining owner had not agreed to protection works.

Rothman	Saul	DB-L 29091	31/08/2016	Reprimand, fine \$12,000, costs \$968 and to undertake and complete the contracts and legal obligation modules of the certificate IV in Building & Construction.	St Kilda East	Saul Rothman - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to the renovations to an existing dwelling at St Kilda East. The practitioner had not obtained a building permit for the work in breach of s16(1) of the Building Act 1993, not obtained domestic building insurance in breach of s136(2) of the Building Act, not entered into a compliant major domestic building contract as required by s31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995, and demanded and received deposits in excess of 5% of the contract value in breach of s11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Uren	Jeffrey	BS-U 1069	30/08/2016	Reprimand, Suspend registrations for 6 months, Fine \$4,974.72 and Costs \$1,648.50.	Kew, Elsternwick and Fitzroy	Jeffrey Uren - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to alterations and additions to existing dwellings at Kew and Fitzroy sites and also demolition at the Elsternwick site. For the Kew site the Board found the practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act in not being satisfied the building work would comply with the Building Regulations in that the approved drawings showed raised terraces and did not show how it would comply with overlooking provisions at Reg 419 of the Building Regulations. For the Elsternwick site, the Board found the practitioner had breached s24(1)(c) of the Building Act for not being satisfied that a planning permit required for the demolition of the dwelling and outbuildings at the site had been obtained. For the Fitzroy site, the Board also found the practitioner had breached s80 and s30 of the Building Act for failing to notify the council of the practitioners appointment as the relevant building surveyor and provide the council building permit, plans and associated documents within the required 7 days respectively.
Franklin	Robert	DB-U 31756	26/08/2016	Reprimand, fine \$9383.40 and costs \$2827	Aspendale	Robert Franklin - The practitioner was found guilty of one allegation pertaining to the construction of an extension to an existing dwelling at Aspendale. The practitioner had failed to perform work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard and therefore failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 by failing to competently supervise and control the building work carried out. Items of concern included poor installation of the foam cladding, the render to the foam cladding not installed due to incomplete and out of sequence work leaving the dwelling exposed to water ingress and damage, large amount of rubbish left on site and building materials left on the roof causing damage to existing concrete tiled roof.
Onley	Peter	DB-U 1968	22/08/2016	Costs of \$900 and suspend registration (DB-U 1968) for 12 months	Macleod, Beaumaris and Trafalgar	Peter Onley - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in respect of construction of new dwellings at Macleod, Beaumaris and Trafalgar. The Board found the practitioner had failed to complete the work by the end of the building period or at all in relation to the Macleod and the Trafalgar sites. The practitioner was found to have failed to have perform his work as a building surveyor in a competent manner and to a professional stand in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he demanded or received payments not related to the progress of the building work yet to be completed in relation to the Beaumaris and Trafalgar sites.
Psaila	Justin	DB-M 31054	15/08/2016	Fine \$4,352.88, Costs \$2,937 and Disqualification for 18 months	Caroline Springs	Justin Psaila - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to a site in Caroline Springs. The practitioner was found to have contravened section 16(1) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he carried out building work that was contrary to the approved plans and therefore did not comply with the building permit and moreover, included items that were not in accordance with the <i>Building Act 1993</i> and the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . The practitioner was also found to have incurred three breaches of the <i>Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995</i> in that on two occasions he demanded a progress payment for work that was not yet complete and further, he had given effect to a contract variation without obtaining the signed consent of the owner.
Al Badry	Sati	EC 39854	10/08/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$10,882.20, Cancel registration, Disqualification for 3 years and Costs \$1,452	Various Sites	Sati Al Badry - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in having provided false or misleading information to a body carrying out functions under the Building Act 1993 in contravention of section 246 of the Act. In completing an application for registration as a domestic builder unlimited in Victoria, the practitioner falsely stated that he was employed as a site supervisor by a company and nominated four sites at which he had worked. It was subsequently confirmed that the practitioner was not employed by the company and had had no involvement in the projects he had nominated.
Lawrence	Craig	DB-U 10519	1/08/2016	Fine \$500 and Costs \$825	Moe	Craig Lawrence - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in respect of a residential site at Moe. The practitioner was found to have breached section 16(1) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he had constructed an additional veranda at the rear of the property over a spa and safety barrier without obtaining a building permit that was not part of the original building permit. The practitioner gave evidence that he had received advice that the building works were exempted by Schedule 8 of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . Ultimately, the Board was satisfied that the building works were not exempted and that a building permit was not in place at the time of construction.
Reardon	James	BS-U 17998	27/07/2016	Fine \$6,062.94 and Costs \$1538.50	Greenvale	James Reardon - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations concerning the construction of a dependant persons unit in Greenvale. The practitioner was found to have failed to have perform his work as a building surveyor in a competent manner and to a professional stand in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> in that he failed to ensure the cost of the building work reflected the amendments to the building design and failed to issue a building permit form 2 for the significant variation, namely the weatherboard clad structure on stumps to a brick veneer building on concrete slab footing. The practitioner also failed to comply with s24(1)(b) of the Building Act upon issuing an amended building permit and not being satisfied that the consent and report of the reporting authority had been obtained for the front entry porch construction over an easement.
Reardon	James	BS-U 17998	27/07/2016	Fine \$2,953.74 and Costs \$347.63	Thornbury	James Reardon - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation concerning a site in Thornbury. The practitioner was found to have failed to have perform his work as a building surveyor in a competent manner and to a professional stand in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . The practitioner had issued a building permit for stage 1 building works only. He subsequently received an application for an occupancy permit, despite the fact that he had not yet issued the stage 2 building permit and it was not until 11 months later that the practitioner issued a building notice in respect of non-compliant building work. Accordingly, the Board found that the practitioner had failed to inspect the unauthorised building work and take necessary enforcement action within a reasonable time.
Daher	Danny	DB-U 9585	27/07/2016	Cancel registration, Disqualification for 3 years and Costs \$2937	Bentleigh, Brunswick, Caulfield, Coburg and Oakleigh.	Danny Daher - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 34 allegations in total in relation to 5 properties. The building practitioner had been engaged to undertake domestic building projects by the homeowners. He was found to have failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard on 25 occasions, in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . 19 of those breaches related to the practitioner demanding progress payments from the homeowners for work that had not been completed, 3 breaches related to defective work and 3 breaches concerned variations to the contract in the absence of the homeowners' consent. The Board also found the practitioner guilty of 4 contraventions of section 16 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that he failed to perform work in accordance with the building permit and 1 contravention of section 136(2) in that he carried out building work without the required insurance. The remaining 3 allegations concerned the practitioner's failure to facilitate mandatory inspections. The Board held that the practitioner's conduct in relation to repeated poor building practices and contractual matters constituted a significant risk to the public and that this warranted the most severe sanction to the practitioner's ability to practice as a builder.
Pham	Hong	BS-L 39332	27/07/2016	Reprimand and Costs \$1318.50	St Albans	Hong Pham - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in respect of a site in St Albans. The Board found that the practitioner had failed to carry out her work as a building surveyor in a competent manner and to a professional standard on two occasions, in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> as she had issued a Certificate of Final Inspection when the work relating to the carport which did not comply with the building permit and Australian Standards (AS 1684). Also upon subsequently becoming aware that the building work was non-compliant, she failed to take appropriate enforcement action.
Ridolfi	Domenic	DP-AD 249	19/07/2016	Fine \$500 and Costs \$2,967	Ringwood	Domenic Ridolfi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Ringwood. The Board found that he had failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in contravention of regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> in that he failed to ensure that architectural drawings prepared by him complied with the council planning scheme's set back requirements and Regulation 414 of the Building Regulations 2006.
Clonan	Sean	DB-U 17527	15/07/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$8,500 and Costs \$2,967.00	Safety Beach	Sean Clonan - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations concerning the construction of a residential dwelling at Safety Beach. The Board held that there were two contraventions of section 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> (Vic). The first was that the practitioner carried out work on the construction of the internal garage door seal and first floor stairs that did not comply with the Building Code of Australia and was therefore defective. Secondly, the practitioner was found to have breached section 1502(a) on the basis that he understated the construction price when obtaining warranty insurance and therefore did not obtain adequate insurance. The practitioner was also held to have breached section 16(1) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic) in that he carried out construction of a veranda before a permit was issued and section 246 in that he understated the construction price to the building surveyor, thereby providing false and misleading information.

Carvill	Jason	BS-U 1026	13/07/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$2331.90, Costs \$568.99	Preston	Jason Carvill - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to a site in Preston. The practitioner issued a building permit in respect of the construction of an apartment complex. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic) in that he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Act and <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> (Vic). This was because the plans that formed the basis for the permit did not make adequate provision for disabled access as required by the Building Code of Australia (BCA). Moreover, the permit did not adequately justify its application of the 2009 edition of the BCA in lieu of the 2011 edition as required by section 10 of the Act.
Toomey	Ritchie	DB-M 30982	6/07/2016	Costs \$853.50	Pentland Hills and Woodend	Ritchie Toomey - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in respect of two sites. Two of the allegations concerned the construction of a residential dwelling in Pentland Hills and one allegation concerned the construction of a residential dwelling in Woodend. In both cases, the practitioner was the director of a company which had been contractually engaged to complete the work. In relation to the Pentland Hills site, he was found to have contravened section 1502(a) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic) on two occasions as a result of the company making claims for payment for the frame stage and the lock-up stage respectively, contrary to the terms of the contract. In relation to the Woodend site, the practitioner was also found to have contravened section 1502(a) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> (Vic) as a result of the company making a claim for payment for the frame stage, before the frame had been approved.
Bucay	Robert	BD-L 28898	17/06/2016	Fine \$1,000 and Costs \$1,483.50.	Reservoir	Robert Bucay - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the demolition of a garage and rear wall at a site in Reservoir. Although the practitioner had applied for a building permit prior to commencing the building work, one had not in fact been issued when the demolition work was performed. The practitioner had therefore contravened section 16(1) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> by carrying out building work without a building permit.
Hogan	Kevin	DB-U 37057	17/06/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$5,500 and Costs \$1,574.00	Warragul/Drouin	Kevin Hogan - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in total. Two allegations concerned a site in Drouin and the balance related to a site in Warragul. In relation to the Drouin site, the practitioner had constructed a retaining wall that ran diagonally across the full width of the easement and accordingly, not only did the work fail to comply with the building permit, but it was also found to be defective. The practitioner was therefore held to have contravened section 16 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> and regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . In relation to the Warragul site, a building permit had been issued. The building work undertaken by the practitioner manifested significant and numerous discrepancies with what was provided for in the permit and this constituted a contravention of section 16 of the Act. The practitioner had further contravened section 16 in that he had constructed a stormwater drainage system which had not been approved by the building surveyor and therefore, it did not comply with regulation 610(1) of the <i>Regulations</i> . Moreover, issues in relation to the construction of the garage step, driveway slab and stormwater drainage systems evidenced defects which resulted in a further finding that the practitioner had failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in accordance with regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Regulations</i> .
Curtain	Matthew	BS-U 1590	15/06/2016	Costs \$1,468	Yallourn North	Matthew Curtain - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in respect of two sites in Yallourn North. The practitioner had received applications for building permits for each site, which did not contain sufficient information so as to satisfy the requirements of regulation 301 of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . The practitioner had issued building permits nonetheless and as a result, it was held that he had failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in accordance with regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Regulations</i> .
Molinaro	Dino	BS-U 14142	6/06/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$1000, Costs \$1318.50 and Undertaking. The Panel required the practitioner to complete a course of study (BSB ADM 505 - Plan & Administrative Systems or equivalent) and provide a certificate of attainment to the Board no later than 30 June 2017.	Tullamarine	Dino Molinaro - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in respect of a building permit he had issued for a site in Tullamarine. The practitioner had failed to make proper enquiries in relation to the estimated cost of the building works prior to lodging the building permit with the Council. Accordingly, the practitioner was deemed to have failed to carry out his work in competent manner and to a professional standard, thereby contravening section 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> . The practitioner was further found to have contravened section 30(1A) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> by failing to provide the Council with a copy of the Fire Engineering Report upon which he sought to rely within 7 days of issuing the building permit.
Raikes	Kenneth	DB-U 2108 & CB-L 43089	1/06/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$2,200, Costs \$2,852 and Undertaking. The Panel require the practitioner to complete the Building Designers Association of Victoria workshop.	Wy Yung	Kenneth Raikes - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a prefabricated residential dwelling that was to be situated at a site in Wy Yung. The practitioner was found to have breached section 16(1) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> by commencing building works prior to the issuing of a building permit, notwithstanding that the construction had taken place off-site, at the practitioner's company's workshop.
Simmie	Andrew	DB-U 5097	27/05/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$9,000, Costs \$1483.50 and Undertaking. The Panel require the practitioner to complete course subjects 'Apply Legal Requirements to Building and Construction Contracts' and 'Select and Prepare a Construction Contract' and to provide a certificate of attainment before any application is made to become re-registered.	Shepparton	Andrew Simmie - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in respect of a site in Shepparton. The practitioner was found to have incurred three breaches of section 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> by failing to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard. The first breach related to his failure to adequately control, manage or supervise a delegate he had engaged to carry out works on the site, who was not authorised under the Act to carry out such works. The practitioner had also allowed the delegate to enter into a major domestic contract which did not comply with the requirements of section 31(1)(e) and (f) of the <i>Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995</i> and this constituted the second breach. The third breach arose as a result of the delegate demanding and receiving a deposit pursuant to the contract, which exceeded the amount that was permitted under section 11(1)(a) of the <i>Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995</i> .
Van Heuzen	Michael	DB-L 1691	27/05/2016	Fine \$4500, Costs \$741.75 and Undertaking. The Panel require the practitioner to complete course subjects 'Apply Legal Requirements to Building and Construction Contracts' and 'Select and Prepare a Construction Contract' by 31 January 2017 and to provide a Certificate of Attainment to the Board and to provide the BPB Registrar with a Building Contract by 27 August 2016.	Clayton South	Michael Van Heuzen - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations arising from a quotation he had provided for building works at a site in Clayton South. The practitioner's written quotation for the work exceeded \$5000, and accordingly, the agreement constituted a 'major domestic building contract'. The practitioner was found to have contravened section 179(1)(fc) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> by failing to comply with the requirements for major domestic building contracts as stipulated in section 31(1) of the <i>Domestic Building Contracts Act (1995)</i> . The practitioner had also subsequently applied for a building permit, in which he falsely stated that the cost of the respective works was \$4960. This constituted a breach of section 246 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> as the practitioner had knowingly provided false information to the building surveyor.
Calabro	Alessandro	BS-L 34767	27/05/2016	Reprimand and Costs \$1409	Keilor	Alessandro Calabro - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation concerning a site in Keilor. The practitioner had issued a building permit in respect of the construction of a residential dwelling including a garage, pool barrier, pool and retaining walls. It was held that the practitioner had breached regulation 1502(a) of the <i>Building Regulations 2006</i> by failing to require that protection work be undertaken at the property adjoining the site, which had ultimately been impacted by the building works.
Vuu	Chi	DB-U 10279 & CB-U 5541.	19/05/2016	Reprimand, fine \$12,890, Costs \$2,967 & undertaking. The Panel required the Practitioner not to enter into any Domestic Building Contracts until the 3 required Course Modules in contracts and legal obligations are successfully completed by 1 January 2017.	Maribyrnong	Chi Vuu - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in respect of one site in Maribyrnong. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 25A(3) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in that the practitioner failed to give the relevant building surveyor written notice of the engagement of the Company to carry out building work and details of the required insurance. The Practitioner was found to have breached section 136(2) of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> by carrying out, managing or arranging domestic building work under a major domestic building contract without the required insurance. The Company had also entered into a major domestic building contract for building work which did not include information required by section 31(1) of the <i>Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995</i> , and, as a director of the Company and registered building practitioner responsible, the Practitioner is responsible for this failure.

Spence	Garry	BS-U 1238	17/05/2016	Fine \$5000, Costs \$2637	Echuca	Garry Spence - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in respect of one site in Echuca. The practitioner had failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit in circumstances where the practitioner could have been satisfied that the building work would comply with regulations 302(1)(c) & 302(2)(c) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner issued a building permit for the demolition of an existing building in circumstances where the site plan did not identify locations or distances of adjoining properties.
Fogarty	Russell	BS-U 1245	6/05/2016	Reprimand and Costs \$1540	Healesville	Russell Fogarty - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in respect of one site in Healesville. In breach of regulation 1502(a) of the building regulations, the practitioner failed carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he issued a building permit in circumstances where the building work required a planning permit, and no planning permit had been obtained for the erection of the dwelling.
Cassar	Paul	BS-U 22903	29/04/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$4548.30, Costs \$1663.50, completion of Course of Training and provision of Certificate of Attainment from the AIBS for a total of 30 hours/points by 1 May 2017	Craigieburn	Paul Cassar - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to one site in Craigieburn. The practitioner had failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit in circumstances where the practitioner could have been satisfied that the building work would comply with regulation 417 of the Building Regulations relating to the southern boundary set back. The practitioner had also breached s24(1)(b) for not obtaining a report and consent from the council given the non compliance of the design plans with regulation 417.
Mattiske	Simon	BS-L 37806	28/04/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$3000 & Costs \$2000	Mount Waverley	Simon Mattiske - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to two sites in Mount Waverley. For the first site the practitioner had failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit in circumstances where the practitioner could have been satisfied that the building work would comply with regulation 409 of the Building Regulations relating to the minimum street set backs. The practitioner had also breached s24(1)(a) for the second site for issuing a building permit and not being satisfied the works would comply with Regulations 414 and 419 relating to the non complying side setback and overlooking into an adjoining allotment respectively.
Torkkola	Yrjo	CB-U 1042 & DB-U 4013	22/04/2016	Costs \$500	South Melbourne	Yrjo Torkkola - The Building Practitioners Board found the Practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in South Melbourne. In breach of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993, the practitioner caused, permitted, counselled or procured building work to be carried out which was not in accordance with the approved plans forming part of the building permit being a fence constructed to a height in excess of 6 meters in circumstances where the building permit required the fence not to exceed 2.7 meters. The Practitioner also failed to comply with section 33(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he, as a person who is in charge of the carrying out of building work for which a permit has been issued, failed to notify the relevant building surveyor without delay after the completion of the frame stage.
Chiomy	Yuri	DB-M 30997 & 36600	1/04/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$13,650.30, Costs \$8674.00 & Completion of three specified course modules including supervising building works and occupational health and safety in the building and construction workplace by 30/06/2017	Caulfield South	Yuri Chiomy - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to one site in Caulfield South. In breach of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993, the practitioner caused, permitted, counselled or procured building work to be carried out which was not in accordance with the approved plans forming part of the building permit being floor trusses on the second floor not affixed to waling plates in accordance with the Pryda specification in that trusses were affixed by a single nail applied from above with no skew nails into the waling plates. The practitioner also failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard and therefore failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to ensure that the floor framing was completed at the time of delivery and loading of the floor sheeting.
Lam	Wei Min	CB-U 16725 & DB-U 11842	31/03/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$6000, Costs \$1707 & Completion of three specified course modules including applying to structural principles to commercial low rise construction by 30/9/16	Noble Park	Wei Min Lam - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in relation to 1 site in Noble Park. The practitioner failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 (the regulations) in that he failed to identify that documents forming part of the building permit application did not contain sufficient information to show that the building work would comply with the Building Act 1993 and the regulations and he adopted an Alternative Solution in the construction of the building which had not been assessed for compliance with the Performance Requirements of the Building Code of Australia. Finally, in breach of section 16(1) of the Act, the practitioner carried out work that was not in accordance with the Building Permit.
Vosti	John	IN-L 20111	31/03/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$4000 & Costs \$3038.50	Greenvale	John Vosti - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 1 site in Greenvale. The practitioner failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard. The practitioner carried out and approved a final inspection for a swimming pool and associated barriers when the safety barrier did not comply with the relevant Australian Standard (AS 1926.1-1993 Clause 2.6 & 2.9). Further to this, having carried out the inspection, the practitioner failed to notify the relevant building surveyor that the swimming pool safety barrier had not been sighted in accordance with the building permit issued.
Macleod	Donald	BS-U 1550	21/03/2016	Fine \$3000 & Costs \$3730	Echuca	Donald Macleod - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations in relation to 1 site in Echuca. The practitioner was found guilty of a number of breaches of the Building Regulations 2006 (regulations) and the Building Act 1993 (the Act). The practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1) of the Act in that he issued a building permit which did not comply with the regulations, namely, regulation 504. In breach of regulation 1502(a) of the regulations, the practitioner failed carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he issued a building permit without having considered or actioned any fire safety measures as required by the Building Code of Australia and he required only a final inspection as a mandatory notification stage when the permit should have also required a frame inspection. The practitioner also issued certificates of final inspection which were not in the form of Form 7 as required by regulation 1006.
Tamturk	Muammer	DB-U 37221	21/03/2016	Complete specified Contracts & Legal Obligation course within 6 months & Costs \$2417	Craigieburn	Muammer Tamturk -The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to building work carried out at a site in Craigieburn. The practitioner breached section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 by excavating footings when a building permit was not issued in respect of that work.
Shugg	Michael	DB-U 14216	21/03/2016	Reprimand, Fine \$4000 & Costs \$1617	Mildura	Michael Shugg - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to building work carried out at a site in Mildura. The practitioner breached section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 by commencing work including excavation of top soil, levelling , compaction, formwork preparation, and installation of waffle pods and reinforcing steel relating to the construction of a dwelling and garage when a building permit was not issued in respect of that work.
Rechichi	Mark	BS-U 21569	16/03/2016	Reprimand & costs \$3937	Various	Mark Rechichi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of a s24(1)(a) Building Act breach for issuing building permits for various sites for swimming pools without being satisfied the permit would comply with Reg. 302 and Reg 201 Building Regulations. For Reg. 302, the permit application failed to include swimming pool barrier drawings, and specifications of the barriers. For Reg. 201, no contract price for details of the cost of labour and materials for the barrier were included.
Goucher	Dale	DB-U 3132	11/03/2016	Reprimand & costs \$3140	Williamstown	Dale Goucher - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to construction of a veranda at a site in Williamstown and the installation of a structural beam across two existing but widened openings and removal of two structural posts at another site in Williamstown. The practitioner had breached s16(1) of the Building Act for commencing these works prior to a building permit having been issued.
Ebeyer	Clint	DB-U 38797	9/03/2016	Fine \$1516.70 & costs \$1648.50	Bentleigh East	Clint Ebeyer - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of an allegation in relation to building works for an alteration and extension at a Bentleigh East site. The practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to Reg. 1502(a) of the Building Regulations in that inconsistent documentation using similar builder company names were provided on the contract compared to the warranty insurance and various invoices and variations.

Mavridis	Lazarus	BS-U 1588	9/03/2016	Reprimand, fine \$1400, costs \$2093.50 & undertaking not to recommence the issuing of building permits in accordance with VCAT / BPB consent orders until such time as he has completed and lodged 2 annual returns with the AIBS as part of their formal CPD program.	Flemington	Lazarus Mavridis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of an allegation in relation to alteration, addition and renovation building work at a site in Flemington. The practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to Reg. 1502(a) of the Building Regulations for issuing a certificate of final inspection when the building work was defective and a direction under the Act had not been complied with.
Daher	Danny	DB-U 9585	3/03/2016	Reprimand, fine \$2000, costs \$6042.50 & the practitioner is to complete the contracts and legal obligation part of the certificate IV building and construction course and provide attainment of completion within 6 months.	Flemington	Danny Daher - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to alteration, addition and renovation building work at a site in Flemington. The practitioner had carried out building work that was not in accordance with the issued building permit in breach of s16(1) of the Building Act. The practitioner had breached s179(1)(b) for failure to carry out a recommendation containing in an inspectors report under s48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner had also failed to comply with s42(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act by demanding final payment when the work had not been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications set out in the contract such as subfloor columns and drain spools not installed in accordance with the engineering plans and reduced finished floor levels from documented levels by more than 40mm.
Burnell	Robert	BS-U 1018	2/03/2016	Reprimand, fine \$5200 & costs \$3750	Clayton	Robert Burnell - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to the construction of an extension, alteration and change of use at a site in Clayton. The practitioner failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act in issuing a building permit when not being satisfied the works would comply with the Act and the Regulations as the approved plans and permit documentation did not comply with Class 3 building requirements such as fire hazard properties and sprinkler and smoke hazard management. The practitioner had also failed to work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in breach of Reg. 1502 (a) in issuing an occupancy permit when all of the class 3 requirements had not been met, there was non compliance with s45 Building Act relating to not specifying live loads, non compliance of Reg 1203 regarding the listing of the essential safety measures, and non compliance with Reg. 1007 relating to the display of the occupancy permit at an approved location.
Arborea	Vincenzo	BS-U 20113	2/03/2016	Reprimand, costs \$2497.50 and require the practitioner to provide his current work practice checklist	Wallan	Vincenzo Arborea - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a garage/shed at a site in Wallan. The practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Act for issuing a building permit when not being satisfied it would comply with the Regulations or the Act, particularly Reg. 415 of the Building Regulations relating to wall heights on boundaries. The practitioner also breached s24A(2)(a) of the Act in that at the time of issuing the permit, he could not have been satisfied that the building work was being carried out by a builder registered under Part 11 in the appropriate class of domestic builder and was covered by the required insurance.
Singh	Patrick	DB-U 11686	1/03/2016	Reprimand, fine \$4000, costs \$2088 & require the practitioner complete 3 units of contracts and legal obligations course and provide the certificate of attainment by 30 August 2016.	Carnegie	Patrick Singh - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to carrying out alteration and renovations of a dwelling at a site in Carnegie. The practitioner had failed to comply with s31(1) and s11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act for not having the prescribed information in the major domestic building contract and that more than 5% deposit was demanded and received on a contract which was greater than \$20,000 respectively.
Lebdeh	Mahmoud	DB-L 28313 & DB-M 28312	18/02/2016	Reprimand, Suspend both DB-L and DB-M registrations for 6 months effective from 31 March 2016, fine \$15,167, the practitioner be required to successfully complete a contracts and legal obligations course and be provided to the Board by 30 September 2016, and costs incidental to the Inquiry of \$21,024.	Hadfield	Mahmoud Lebdeh - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in relation to construction of a deck and roofing around and existing swimming pool at a site in Hadfield. The practitioner had failed to comply with s16(1) of the Building Act by carrying out works inconsistent with the building permit in that he constructed foundations and framework around the existing pool when the building permit described the works as extension/sunroom deck and the contract and insurance stated the works as construction of veranda and decking around an existing pool. The practitioner had failed to comply with s31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act in that the contract did not specify 9 subsection requirements. The practitioner had also failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard as required by Reg. 1502(a) of the Building Regulations in that the veranda and decking around the existing pool was constructed without a compliant safety barrier.
Brayer	David	DB-U 15369	24/05/2016 Determination on appeal of the 11/02/2016 BPB decision	Cancellation of registration effective from 3/02/2016, disqualification from being registered in any category until 16/08/2018 and fine \$45,501.00.	Diamond Creek	David Brayer - The practitioner was found guilty of 4 allegations in relation to the construction of 69 townhouses in an estate in Diamond Creek. The practitioner had breached s16(1) of the Act by building walls between the townhouses that did not meet fire separation standards in accordance with Part 3.7.1.8 of the Building Code of Australia. The practitioner had also breached Reg. 1502(a) for failing to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard for failing to adhere to performance requirements and Reg 109 in relation to construction of the walls and also carrying out a variety of other defects at the properties including water ingress, poor standard of painting, lack of sound proofing between walls, no awnings over the balconies, and external timber cladding being buckled and warped. The practitioner was also found guilty of s179(1)(d) of the Act for conduct which constituted gross negligence or gross incompetence showing that he is not a fit and proper person to practise as a building practitioner.
Cole-Sinclair	Daryl	BS-U 1354	20/01/2016	Reprimand, fine \$7500 & costs \$5775	Edithvale, Ashburton, Box Hill & Gruyere	Daryl Cole-Sinclair - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations in relation to 3 sites regarding the alterations and additions of an existing dwelling at the Edithvale site, construction of a dwelling, garage and retaining wall at the Ashburton site, and the construction of a farm shed at the Gruyere site. The practitioner had failed to comply with Reg 1502(a) Building Regulations for failing to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in discovering non-complying building works including Reg 414 (side and rear setbacks) and Reg 419 (overlooking) breaches and failing to take appropriate action in a timely manner. The practitioner also failed to comply with Reg 322(b)(ii) by failing to forward the authority details of the lapsed building permit within 7 days for the Edithvale site. For the Ashburton site the practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to take appropriate enforcement action in a timely manner in relation to the steep excavation works damaging the adjoining property due to the erosion under the dividing fence and the concrete driveway. The practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard at the Gruyere site by failing to take appropriate action upon becoming aware that the farm shed was being occupied prior to the issuing of the certificate of final inspection and also issuing the certificate of final inspection where the works did not accord with the approved building permit in that the shed had been fitted with a kitchen, bathroom and toilet.
Austin	John	BS-U 1166	18/01/2016	Reprimand, costs \$5993.50 & undertaking not to issue any new building permits as of 1st June 2014 with no end date.	Warragul, Leongatha & Mount Waverley	John Austin - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of eight allegations in relation to three sites relating to alterations and additions to an office building in Warragul, and the construction of a swimming pool and safety fence at both Leongatha and Mount Waverley sites. The practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in accordance with Reg, 1502(a) Building Regulations in not requiring protection works where it was apparent that the proposed works could damage the adjoining property. Also in accepting a Performance Assessment as an alternative solution for fire resistance levels when it was not a properly formulated solution as required by the Building Code of Australia, and for failing to adequately document decision making process regarding non-compliance of Energy Efficiency provisions of the existing building in Warragul. For the Leongatha site, the practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard for amending the building permit for the additional building work to also include the pool and barrier when a separate permit should have been issued. He had failing to refer the non-compliance with a building order for minor work to the Authority within 14 days after the specified final date for compliance in the order, and he had issued a certificate of final inspection when the mandatory footing inspection for the pool had not been carried out or approved and nominating the incorrect date on the final certificate. For the Mount Waverley site, the practitioner had failed to work in as competent manner and to a professional standard for failing to take appropriate enforcement action in a timely manner in relation to outstanding concerns including the self closing pool gate mechanism not operating effectively.
Talevski	George	DB-M 33753	24/12/2015	Reprimand, fine \$9000, costs \$2857 and require the practitioner to complete 3 subjects/modules of contracts and legal obligation course and provide the certificate of attainment to the Board prior to 30 June 2016.	Ivanhoe	George Talevski - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation relating to excavation and preparation of foundation building works for the construction of three townhouses at the site. The practitioner had failed to work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in non compliance of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations for commencing work on the site prior to the planning permit expiring which had been issued by the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal and prior to a building permit being issued.

Morris	Mark	DB-U 5685 CB-L 36083	22/12/2015	Reprimand, fine \$4000 and costs \$2857	Glen Iris	Mark Morris - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner of two allegations relating to the construction of two double storey dwellings at the site. The practitioner was found guilty of carrying out building work in contravention of s16(1) of the Building Act in not complying with the building permit conditions as the works encroached over the title boundary. These works undertaken were also found to be defective or not of a sufficient standard.
Wilson	Alan	DB-L 1353	16/12/2015	Reprimand, Suspend registration for 12 months effective from determination date, fine \$2400, costs \$2967 and require the practitioner to complete 3 subjects/modules of contracts and legal obligation course and provide the certificate of attainment to the Board by 30 June 2016.	Leongatha & two sites in Korumburra	Alan Wilson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations relating to restumping building works at three sites. The practitioner had breached s16(1) of the Building Act for carrying out building works prior to the building permit being issued for the three sites. The practitioner had also breached s31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act for entering into contracts not containing the required information as per the section for two of the sites.
Zand Basiri	Kamran	BS-U 18530	7/12/2015	Reprimand, fine \$4000 and costs \$3467	Dandenong & Noble Park	Kamran Zand Basiri - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations for works in relation to the construction of multi storey apartments and basement car parks on the two sites. The practitioner had failed to work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in non compliance of Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 for issuing the building permits over the two sites when not or ought not to have been satisfied that the building work would not adversely affect the stability of, or cause damage to the adjoining property.
McDonald	Andrew	DB-U 25867	7/12/2015	Fine \$500, costs \$1058 and require the practitioner to complete 3 subjects/modules of contracts and legal obligation course and provide the certificate of attainment to the Board within 6 months.	Carlton North	Andrew McDonald - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations relating to the alteration, addition and renovation building works at the site. The practitioner had breached s16(1) of the Building Act for carrying out building works prior to a building permit having been issued. The practitioner also failed to comply with s136(2) of the Building Act for carrying out building work and not being covered by the required insurance.
Goddard	Ronald	BS-U 22544	2/12/2015	Reprimand, fine \$10,332 and costs of \$13,557	Mordialloc, Corack East & Crib Point	Ronald Goddard - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 21 allegations in relation to the construction of units with base car park at the Mordialloc site, re-erection of a dwelling and a verandah at the Corack East site, and the relocation of a prefabricated home dwelling at the Crib Point site. With respect to the Mordialloc site, the practitioner was found to have breached s80, s30, s73(1) Building Act and Regulation 1012 (a) & (b) Building Regulation requirements for not notifying council with 7 days in writing of the accepted appointment, the issued building permit and plans, the occupancy certificate, and provide inspection approval dates for mandatory notification stages for building works respectively for the staged building permits. Also the practitioner had breached s24(1)(a), (b) and (d) of the Building Act for issuing staged building permits when not being satisfied they would comply with Regulations and BCA in relation to alternative solutions for fire performance requirements, not obtaining the report and consent from CFA prior to the issuing, and issuing the permit inconsistent with the planning permit respectively. The building permits had also been issued without requiring owners to serve protection work notices on adjoining owners. Regulation 313(1) and of the Building Regulation had been breached as the staged permits had not issued in the prescribed forms identifying performance requirements. In relation to the occupancy permit, the practitioner had breached Regulation 1203 for failing to list all essential safety measures conditions and was found to have breached s44(a) of the Building Act for issuing the occupancy permit when a couple of conditions for the staged permit had not been achieved. In relation to the Corack East site, the practitioner had failed to comply with s30 and s24(1)(a) of the Building Act for not notifying council in writing of the issued building permit and plans, and issuing the permit when not being satisfied it would comply with the Act or Regulations in that the practitioner did not have the engineered footing system as required by AS2870-2011 for that type of soil. For the Crib Point site the practitioner had breached s80 of the Building Act for not notifying council in writing of the accepted appointment as the private building surveyor.
Lindkvist	Anthony	DB-U 5960	30/11/2015	Reprimand, costs \$2904 and impose a condition that prior to renewal of registration, the practitioner must provide the Registrar a certificate of completion of the three units of contracts and legal obligations component of the certificate four in building and construction.	Invermay	Anthony Lindkvist - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling at the site. The practitioner had breached s22(a)(iii) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by the contract not providing any basis for the calculation of additional charges with respect to labour including hourly rates and method of calculation and subsequently demanding the excess labour amounts. The practitioner was also failed to carry out recommendations contained in an inspectors report under s48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act.
Isaacson	Antony	CB-U 1939	30/11/2015	Fine \$4000 and \$1707 costs.	South Geelong	Antony Isaacson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a light tower at the site. The allegations included failing to ensure that the footing for the one light tower did not encroach beyond the title boundary and failing to have adequate systems, practices and procedures in place to identify the location of the title boundary to prevent the footing from encroaching beyond the site title boundary. The second allegation related to failing to ensure that there were sufficient safety precautions, systems and procedures in place at the site to protect members of the public from danger during the construction and erection of one of the light towers hence failing to perform work as a practitioner to a competent manner and to professional standard contrary to Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Lewin	Peter	DB-U 10829 CB-LR 1111	25/09/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$4500 & costs \$1740	Pascoe Vale & Caulfield North	Peter Lewin - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of six allegations in relation to the construction of residential apartments, carpark and shop at the sites. Allegations included failing to rectify defective works at various units, failure to respond in a timely manner to owners concerns, and failing to progress building work without delay thereby failing to carry out work as a practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Mavridis	Lazarus	BS-U 1588	21/12/2015	On appeal, VCAT orders by consent of 21/12/15 confirmed the following penalty following the Board determination of 20/11/2015: Fine \$7380.50, Costs \$3444.00 & that the registration be subject to a conditional limitation for 24 months from 25 January 2016 whereby the practitioner will be unable to be appointed the relevant building surveyor (RBS) for this period however can continue exercising functions where he has already been appointed the RBS prior to 25 January 2016.	Boronia & Bulleen	Lazarus Mavridis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to a construction of a verandah at the rear of the property at the Boronia site and guilty of four allegations relating to the construction of two new dwellings at the Bulleen site. The practitioner had breached s24(1)(c) of the Building Act for not being satisfied that a planning permit or prescribed approval had been obtained prior to the issuing of the Building permit for the verandah and had also breached s188(7) of the Building Act for not having regard to the Ministers Guideline (MG11) in making this determination for the Boronia site. The practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act in not being satisfied the building work would comply with the Building Regulations in that the allotment plan provided with the building permit application did not detail the position and dimensions of the buildings on either side of the adjoining properties at the Bulleen site. The practitioner had also failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard for 3 allegations for the Bulleen site for issuing a building permit prior to receiving a response notice to the form 4 protection work from the adjoining owners, for not being satisfied that the works would not adversely affect the stability of or cause damage to the adjoining properties, and did not ensure the protection work process was followed given the receipt of the inadequate Form 3 protection work notice received which did not comply with s84(2) of the Building Act.
Cachia	Leslie	DP-AD 1044	23/11/2015	Fine \$1500, Costs \$2904 & require completion of a 2 day BDAV course on improving building permit documentation and provide the certificate of attainment by 30 June 2016	Mt Waverley	Leslie Cachia - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to two sites in Mount Waverley relating to the preparation of the drawings of the buildings for construction. The practitioner failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 by failing to comply with regulations 414 and 419 for non complying side setback and direct line sight into a habitable room or secluded adjoining private open space respectively. The practitioner also failed to comply with regulations 302 and 409 as the plans did not show relevant easements and distance to intersecting streets, and did not have the required minimum street setbacks respectively.
Hick	Danny	BS-U 1363	10/11/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1500 & Costs \$1500 & require the practitioner to complete a 35 hour risk course.	Sunbury	Danny Hick - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations for the construction of a swimming pool and safety barrier at a site in Sunbury. The practitioner failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act in issuing a building permit that would not comply with the Act or the Regulations in that the submitted plans did not contain sufficient information to show that the building work would include a compliant barrier in accordance with Parts P2.5.3 and 3.9.9 of the Building Code of Australia. The practitioner had also failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in failing to perform work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the issued building permit did not specify a completion date consistent with regulation 315(1)(b)(i). The practitioner also failed to comply with s201(6)(c) of the Building Act in that the building permit application did not contain sufficient information to enable the practitioner to estimate the cost of the building work as required by s201(4)(b) of the Building Act 1993.

Adami	Justin	IN-U 19363	11/11/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2600 & Costs \$4400	Hadfield	Justin Adami - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to carrying out inspections for an extension and sunroom deck at a site in Hadfield. The practitioner had failed to carry out work in competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 by not consulting with the relevant building surveyor verbally or in writing that there were deficiencies in the building work following a mandatory foundation inspection in that the pool remained on site with no permanent or temporary safety barrier. Also the foundation stage was not complete as not all pads and stump holes were excavated.
Fergusson	David	DB-U 16456	9/11/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$5000 & Costs \$2589	Caulfield South	David Fergusson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of an allegation relating to the construction of a shop and apartments in Caulfield South. The practitioner had been engaged as a subcontractor by another registered building practitioner to erect the frame on this site. The practitioner was found guilty of failing to ensure the temporary stacking of floor sheeting on the second storey floor trusses was carried out in accordance with Pryda specifications in relation to weight limits which led to the collapse of the trusses and hence failed to comply with clause BP1.1 of the Building Code of Australia 2012 which specifies performance requirements for reliability of the building or structure during construction activity including stacking of material. In doing so, the Board found that the practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006.
Wright	Craig	DB-L 13874	4/11/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$3000 & Costs \$4894.50	Williamstown	Craig Wright - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation relating to a construction of a swimming pool regarding excavation works within the immediate proximity of the boundary near the adjoining property. The piers and the wall on the adjoining property had collapsed into the excavated pool area and the practitioner was found guilty of failing to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 for carrying out excavation work in an unsafe and unworkmanlike manner.
Bond	Stephen	BS-L 36361	23/10/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$3557	Traralgon, Briagolong, Coongulla, Flynns Creek, Rosedale & Seaspray	Stephen Bond - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of ten allegations in relation to 6 sites consisting of construction of sheds for most sites, swimming pool and a caretakers residence. Allegations included failing to notify the council of appointment within 7 days and failure to provide council with permit documents within 7 days in breach of s80(1) and s30(1) of the Building Act respectively. The practitioner had failed to correctly classify one of the sites and specified an incorrect completion date in breach of Regulation 112 and 315(1)(b)(iv) of the Building Regulations 2006 respectively. The practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) and s24(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 for issuing a permit when not being satisfied that the building work would comply with the Act or the Regulations in that the plans forming part of the building permit did not contain allotment plans and drawings to suitable scale, and report and consent was not obtained from the council respectively. The practitioner also failed to comply with s205l of the Building Act by failing to properly estimate the cost of the building work having regard to the building permit application.
Al Jobore	Majed	DB-L 37063	26/10/2015	Reprimand, Costs \$1212.00 & completion of 3 specified modules of certificate IV in the Building & Construction Course.	Birchip	Majed Al Jobore - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the restumping and improvement work to a home in Birchip. The practitioner had failed to comply with s31(1) and s37(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 as the major domestic building contract failed to contain certain required information and the practitioner had failed to obtain the owners consent to give effect to a variation respectively. The practitioner had also failed to competently manage or control the work site in a safe or workmanlike manner by leaving behind debris and building material in the rear yard.
Anastasi	David	IN-U 26962	26/10/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$899	Wallan	David Anastasi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the construction of a new dwelling at Wallan. The practitioner had failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 for carrying out and approving the frame inspection subject to conditions when it was not appropriate to do so given the identified and unidentified deficiencies and non-compliances with the frame.
Cooper	Wayne	BS-U 1273	14/10/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2000 and pay \$899 costs incidental to the Inquiry.	Ballarat	Wayne Cooper - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a new café and the upgrade of the existing fire service at the site. The practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 by not being satisfied the building work would comply at the time of issuing the building permit in that the drawings submitted with the application lacked sufficient detail in relation to the fire extinguishers not being on site during construction as required by Building Code of Australia Part E1.9. Also the water storage tanks were not connected to a facility that would permit the tanks to be automatically refilled within 24 hours as required by Australian Standards AS 2419.1. The practitioner had also breached s24(1)(b) of the Building Act in that a report and consent from the Chief Officer was not obtained prior to the issuing of the building permit as the drawings (and subsequently the built location) forming part of the building permit documentation did not have the hydrant booster assembly located within sight of the main entry to the building as required by AS 2419.1. Report and consent is required given that the booster assembly is a prescribed matter at Regulation 309 of the Building Regulations 2006.
Nelson	Shaun	BS-U 23391	9/10/2015	Suspend registration for 6 months effective from 8 December 2015. Fine of \$2500, pay costs \$2994 incidental to the Inquiry and require the practitioner to complete Risk assessment and management for building surveying and performance based compliance graduate diploma of building surveyors subjects with a certificate of attainment if the registration is renewed after the suspension.	Hadfield	Shaun Nelson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of an extension/sunroom deck at the site. The practitioner had failed to comply with s24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that when issuing the building permit, the application did not mention the incorporation of the existing swimming pool despite the accompanying design plans showing the position of the existing pool whilst the structural plans did not. Given the inconsistency, no enquiries were made as to whether the pool would be removed. The practitioner had also breached Regulation 322(b) of the Building Regulations 2006 by failing to forward to the Victorian Building Authority details of the lapsed building permit within 7 days, 2 years after the building permit issue date.
Smith	Maxwell	DP-AD 1831	28/09/2015	Suspend registration for 120 days effective from 1/01/2016. Fine \$2500, pay \$1524 costs and require the practitioner to complete the specified course offered by BDAV being "Improving Building Permit Documentation" with a certificate of attainment to be provided prior to reinstatement of registration after the suspension.	Narre Warren	Maxwell Smith - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner being retained to provide draftsperson services for the site, guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a carport and enclosed verandah. The practitioner had failed to comply with section 246 of the Building Act 1993 by knowingly providing false and misleading information to the relevant building surveyor by providing forged signatures for the purposes of a Form 4 protection work response notices from the adjoining owners on either side of the site property.
Sorgiovanni	Alex	EC 22626	18/09/2015	Reprimand, Fine of \$1,500, pay \$30,000 costs incidental to the Inquiry & an undertaking for the practitioner to complete two parts of the Engineering CPD course pertaining to Design and Due Dilligence with a certificate of attainment to be provided within 12 months of determination.	Caulfield North	Alex Sorgiovanni - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a two double story homes with basement car parking in Caulfield. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that as the design engineer, he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard and prepared structural computations and drawings which were deficient, incomplete, inadequate and inconsistent. This included missing computations for certain design beams and columns, and no computations for the reinforced concrete and Bondek ground floor slab.
Chemih	Vasil	DB-U 2162	8/09/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$5,500, pay \$5354 costs incidental to the Inquiry & an undertaking for the practitioner to complete contract and legal obligation courses with a certificate of attainment to be provided by 30 June 2016.	Leopold & Barwon Heads	Vasil Chemih - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of homes at two sites in Leopold and Barwon Heads. The practitioner failed to comply with section 79(1)(fb) of the Building Act 1993 when he failed to carry out a recommendation contained in the report of an inspector issued pursuant to section 48 of the Domestic Building Contract Act. The report included directions to remove damaged and incomplete floor tiles, ensure waterproof system is achieved, rectify concrete cut and exposed to satisfaction of the design engineer to enable concrete paths to be constructed, rectify colour variation in the brickwork, and adjust door operation and install weather strips to hinged doors.

Basic	Halil	DB-U 4956	28/08/2015	Reprimand, Fine of \$1500 and pay costs of \$1058 incidental to the Inquiry.	Burwood	Halil Basic - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to the construction of a home and garage in Burwood. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he failed to back fill and batter soil where required and failed to erect temporary fencing as directed by the relevant building surveyor via a Building Order for minor work pursuant to section 113 of the Building Act 1993. Further the practitioner failed to comply with regulation 317(2)(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 when he failed to display the registration number/contact details of the building surveyor and the building permit number on the signage at the front of the site. The practitioner had also failed to comply with a 'Stop Work Order' pursuant to section 112 of the Building Act.
Lee	Ian	DB-L 22305	27/08/2015	Cancel registration, Fine of \$15,167 and pay costs of \$1080	Beveridge (x2), Kilmore, Oxley, Wangaratta (x2), Borlma, Killawarra, Everton, Bowmans Forest, Glenrowan, Whittlesea, Boonie Doon and Mansfield (x2)	Ian Lee - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one hundred and three allegations in relation to the construction of swimming pools across thirty different sites over ten different municipal councils in Victoria between November 2008 and September 2012 prompted by a Victorian Building Authority audit across thirteen regional councils. The practitioner was found guilty of not obtaining a building permit for the thirty sites in breach of s16(1) of the Building Act 1993, not obtaining domestic building insurance for twenty nine of the sites in breach of s136(2) of the Building Act, not entering into a compliant major domestic building contract for twenty three of the sites as required by s31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995, and demanding and receiving deposits in excess of 5% of the contract value relating to sixteen sites in breach of s11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. As a result of the breaches over the thirty sites, the practitioner was also found guilty of s179(1)(d) Building Act 1993 for conduct constituted by a pattern of conduct which shows the practitioner is not a fit and proper person to practise as a building practitioner.
Hutchinson	Rodney	DB-U 37906	18/08/2015	Fine \$2700 & Costs of \$1587 & an undertaking for the practitioner to complete three contract and legal obligation courses with a certificate of attainment.	Brunswick	Rodney Hutchinson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to the construction of a new pergola, replacement of the rear boundary fence and rear existing timber deck of a dwelling in Brunswick. The practitioner had failed to provide a major domestic building contract in accordance with section 31 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. Work had been carried out prior to the application for a building permit contrary to section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 and work was carried out without the required insurance as required by section 136 of the Building Act 1993. The value of the works listed on the permit application was listed as \$10,500 which differed from the agreed value of the works being \$15,850 and hence failed to comply with s246 by knowingly providing misleading information to the building surveyor. The practitioner had also failed to obtain written authorisation to apply for a building permit on behalf of the owners as their agent required at section 248 of the Building Act 1993.
Hogben	Rodney	DB-U 2781	31/07/2015	Costs of \$968 & an undertaking for the practitioner to complete three contract and legal obligation courses with a certificate of attainment.	Carrum Downs	Rodney Hogben - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the construction of a new home in Carrum Downs. The practitioner had failed to comply section 40(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 for requesting payment for the frame stage when the frame stage had not been approved by the relevant building surveyor. The practitioner refused the building owner reasonable access to the building site and thereby breaching section 19 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner was also found guilty for failing to progress the building work in a timely manner in that the contract provided for works to be completed by 1 September 2013 and as of this date, the frame work was yet to be approved by the relevant building surveyor.
Shaaya	Robert	DB-M 25304 & DB-L 25305	30/07/2015	Fine \$2000 & Costs \$1058	Craigieburn & Hadfield	Robert Shaaya - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the construction of homes at two sites in Craigieburn and Hadfield. The practitioner had also failed to properly manage, supervise or control the building sites due to the defective nature of the works and also failed to rectify the Hadfield site as per section recommendation from an inspector in accordance with 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Giese	Stuart	DB-L 36279	27/07/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$4100 & Costs \$1542 & complete the certificate IV in Building & Construction with a certificate of attainment.	Whealers Hill	Stuart Giese - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of seven allegations in relation to the alteration and extension of a home in Wheelers Hill. The practitioner had failed to obtain foundations data prior to carrying out building works as required at section 30(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner had also failed to comply with sections 31(1) and 32(1) of that Act as the contract did not contain the required prescribed information required by the subsections. The practitioner had received a deposit greater than 5% contrary to section 11(1)(a) of the same Act. Works had been carried out prior to a building permit having been issued and prior to the practitioner being covered by the required domestic building insurance in breach of sections 16(1) and 136(2) of the Building Act 1993 respectively. The practitioner had also failed to comply with section 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 for carrying out works when not registered in the appropriate class to carry out work of a class or type.
Rustom	Sayed	DB-U 20263	21/07/2015	Fine \$7000 & Costs of \$1542 & an undertaking for the practitioner to complete three contract and legal obligation courses with a certificate of attainment.	Fawkner	Sayed Rustom - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to carrying out alterations and additions to the bathroom, laundry and porch of a dwelling in Fawkner. The practitioner had carried out works prior to the building permit being issued and did not have the required insurance in breach of sections 16(1) and 136(2) of the Building Act 1993 respectively. The major domestic building contract did not contain all the required prescribed information in breach of section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner had also breached section 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 for carrying out work outside of the registered category of the practitioner at the time.
Lawrence	Geoffrey	DB-U 1347	14/07/2015	Fine \$6500 & Costs \$7418.60	Kalimna	Geoffrey Lawrence - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of six allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Kalimna. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16 of the Building Act 1993 where the retaining wall, garage door and chimney were not constructed as specified on the approved building permit and the position of the dwelling was not sited in accordance with the allotment plan. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 302(2)(e) by not specifying the drain layout to a point of discharge on the allotment plan. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the brickwork was not of a competent or professional standard, there was excessive lippage and sharp tile edges in the ensuite shower unit and the paint finish on some of the walls did not exhibit the uniformity of gloss and opacity expected from a 3 coat finish. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 37 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by varying the specifications of a major domestic building contract without first giving a notice of variation to the owner and he failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by demanding and recovering a sum of money in excess of the contract price.
Chai	Christina	BS-U 14426	8/07/2015	Fine \$2800 & Costs \$1038 & an undertaking to complete a minimum of 5 hours of Continued Professional Development (CPD) during the next 12 months.	South Geelong	Christina Chai - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to the construction of four light towers. The practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 on two occasions in that she issued a building permit when she could not have been satisfied that the building work and the building permit would comply with the Building Act and Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that she issued a building permit when she could not have been satisfied that any consent of a reporting authority required under the Act or Regulations had been obtained. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that she failed to carry out her work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that during construction of one of the towers the footpath was completely blocked and she failed to ensure the safety of pedestrians who were forced to walk onto the road to pass the building site.
Stockdale	William	BS-U 1426	3/07/2015	Fine \$500 & Costs \$1542 & an undertaking from the practitioner that if he were to renew his registration within the 3 year voluntary suspension period that he would need to undertake the AIBS required CPD, prior to renewing his registration.	Strathbogie	William Stockdale - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of ten allegations in relation to the construction of a swimming pool, office and staff facilities in Strathbogie. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 313 and 315 of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to include time limits on the building permit for the commencement and completion of the swimming pool. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he failed to include details of domestic building insurance on the building permit, issued a building permit that listed a domestic builder for commercial building work, used an incorrect address and registration number for the builder, approved a mandatory frame inspection failing to note that an office indicated on the plans had not been constructed, failed to direct the builder to cease work until the building permit had been amended, failed to amend the building permit to domestic building work and failed to identify that the building work did not comply with the approved building permit, plans and engineering drawings. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 21 of the Building Act 1993 by nominating that a certificate of final inspection was required rather than an occupancy permit for building work where an occupancy permit was required.
Carapina	Ante	DB-U 14741	24/06/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2000 & Costs \$1542 & Complete a Contracts & Legal Obligations Course	Lara	Ante Carapina - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the renovation of a dwelling in Lara. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that he entered into a major domestic building contract that did not include certain information required under this section. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by receiving a deposit for building work that was greater than 5% of the contract price.

Critelli	Robert	DB-L 36851	24/06/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$1592	Reservoir	Robert Critelli - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a verandah. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he carried out unauthorised building work by constructing the verandah right up to the boundary of the adjoining property rather than in accordance with the specified distance on the approved building permit.
Reardon	James	BS-U 17998	19/06/2015	Reprimand, Suspension of Registration (BS-U 17998) for three (3) months & Costs \$1103	Maidstone	James Reardon - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of seven allegations in relation to the construction of a shopping/office/community complex in Maidstone. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued three staged building permits when he was not or ought to have not been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Building Act and the Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 30(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that, having issued three staged building permits he failed to provide copies of architectural plans lodged with the applications to the relevant council within 7 days. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 44 and 73(1) of the Building Act 1993 by issuing occupancy permits when he could not have been satisfied that the building was suitable for occupancy and failed to give copies of the permits to the relevant council within 7 days. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1003 of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to provide the report and consent of the chief officer with the applications for the occupancy permits. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 125(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that as the relevant building surveyor he failed to give the relevant council a copy of the building notice within 7 days after issuing the building notice. The practitioner was found guilty of unprofessional conduct under Section 179(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that after having become aware of fire safety concerns in the building, he failed to take appropriate action in a timely manner.
Heber	James	DB-U 4373	19/06/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$2056	Hawthorn East	James Heber - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Hawthorn East. The practitioner failed to carry out the recommendations in an inspectors report produced under Section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Farag	Emad	DB-U 10252	17/06/2015 determination on appeal	Reprimand & Costs \$1527	Dandenong	Emad Farag - The practitioner was found guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of two multi-storey residential developments at two sites in Dandenong. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that excavation work was carried out on both sites that was not in accordance with the approved building permit. Both sites were over-excavated and had the potential to cause substantial subsidence or damage to the neighbouring properties. On one site, the site cut was six metres deep, within one metre of the adjoining boundary and had been excavated without the sequential construction of retaining walls and bored piles.
Lynch	Paul	DB-U 18316	12/06/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$3000 & Costs \$3991.33	Mordialloc	Paul Lynch - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of 25 dwelling units and a basement carpark in Mordialloc. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that building work at the site was not in accordance with the building regulations as it did not comply with fire safety and accessibility standards. The practitioner also failed to ensure that the windows on the east and west sides of the development were obscured or screened to address issues of overlooking.
Pendavingh	Johannes	DB-U 1282	10/06/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$7698	Ringwood	Johannes Pendavingh - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the alteration and renovation of a dwelling in Ringwood. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he issued a final progress claim alleging that the building work was complete when the final inspection had not been approved and the defects rectified. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 37(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by varying the contract without first obtaining signed consent from the building owner.
Azzopardi	Ian	DB-U 21864	5/06/2015	Fine \$1000 & Costs \$968	Brown Hill	Ian Azzopardi - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Brown Hill. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he constructed a retaining wall when a building permit had not been issued. The practitioner also failed to act to rectify defective building work that was recommended in an inspectors report produced under Section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Renn	Andrew	DB-L 38760	3/06/2015	Cancel Registration (DB-L 38760), Fine \$10,000 & Costs \$1058	Hawthorn	Andrew Renn - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to the construction of a timber deck, pergola, carport and associated landscaping in Hawthorn. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by failing to include required details in the contract and he also failed to comply with Section 11(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by demanding and receiving a deposit of more than 5% when the contract price was more than \$20,000. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 40(3) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that he demanded and received a payment not directly related to the progress of the building work being carried out. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the building work was not carried out in a timely manner and was abandoned prior to completion.
Hall	Peter	DB-U 21238	3/06/2015	Reprimand, Suspension of Registration (DB-U 21238) for 4 months & Costs \$1058	Craigieburn	Peter Hall - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a new dwelling in Craigieburn. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he demanded and received a payment for the frame stage prior to the completion of that stage. The practitioner also failed to properly manage, supervise and control the building work and to ensure that the work progressed in a timely manner.
Papanastasiou	Thomas	DB-U 10571	3/06/2015	Fine \$3000 & Costs \$1058	Altona	Thomas Papanastasiou - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the renovation of a dwelling in Altona. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he commenced the demolition of a load bearing wall when a building permit had not been issued. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by failing to include required details in the contract and failed to comply with Section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993 by carrying out building work whilst not being covered by the required insurance.
Saad	Boulos	DB-U 22248	2/06/2015	Fine \$1000, Costs \$300 & complete a Contracts and Legal Obligations Course	Essendon	Boulos Saad - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Essendon. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the building work was defective and/or did not comply with accepted industry standards. The defects included; the construction of a boundary wall without reinforced engaged brick piers, construction of a flat roof to the verandah and porch when a pitched roof was required and poor finishing to brickwork. The practitioner also failed to complete the work within the agreed construction period.
Seketa	Stefan	DB-U 26892	2/06/2015	Fine \$1500 & Costs \$948	Mallacoota	Stefan Seketa - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a new modular home in Mallacoota. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he commenced building work when a building permit had not been issued. The practitioner also failed to rectify defective building work within the required timeframe that was identified in an inspectors report produced under Section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Moore	John	DB-U 7851	2/06/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1000 & Costs \$1058	Strathbogie	John Moore - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of an office and staff facilities in Strathbogie. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work other than in accordance with an approved building permit by substituting the specified masonry (brick) walls with weatherboard material.
Theodore	Steve	DB-U 23346	2/06/2015 determination on appeal	Reprimand, Fine \$6684 & Costs \$3304	Doncaster East	Steve Theodore - The practitioner was found guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Doncaster East. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the building work was defective and/or did not comply with accepted industry standards. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work other than in accordance with the approved building permit by constructing internal stairs with inconsistent riser heights and failed to provide sufficient ventilation with sub-floor vents.

Kristof	Robin	DB-U 23948	1/06/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2000, Costs \$3715 & complete a Contracts & Legal Obligations Course	Heidelberg Heights	Robin Kristof - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the additions and alterations to a dwelling in Heidelberg Heights. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work other than in accordance with an approved building permit by constructing a stairwell wall in the incorrect location, using double studs supported on brick piers when triple studs were specified and floor wastes were not located in the specified position. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 25(A)(3) of the Building Act 1993 in that he failed to give the relevant building surveyor written notice of his engagement and details of the required insurance within 14 days of his engagement. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 40 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 in that he demanded and received a payment for the frame stage prior to the completion of that stage.
Kidd	Roger	BS-U 1235	29/05/2015 determination on appeal	Reprimand, Fine \$8000 & Costs \$899	Loch Sport	Roger Kidd - The practitioner was found guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Loch Sport. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that he issued a certificate of compliance for the frame stage of the project when he knew or should have known that the sub floor was not constructed in accordance with the approved building permit.
Tsaganas	Jim	BS-U 1392 & IN-U 1282	12/09/2017	12/09/2017 Court of appeal Supreme Court determined to dismiss BPB appeal in favor of VCAT's decision to suspend both Registrations (BS-U 1392 & IN-U 1282) until 18 November 2017, fine \$30,000, costs \$64,182.30 & reprimand	Various Sites	Jim Tsaganas - VCAT allegation findings TBC.
Paulding	John	DB-U 4264	22/05/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$1542	Yarraville	John Paulding - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of 10 townhouses in Yarraville. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he failed to construct the footings of a wing wall between the townhouses in accordance with the approved building permit. As a result, the wing wall was demolished and rebuilt.
Maloney	Stephen	BS-U 29705	22/05/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1000 & Costs \$3417	Surrey Hills	Stephen Maloney - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a new dwelling and garage in Surrey Hills. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he failed to identify and take appropriate action to rectify defective framing and building work to ensure that it complied with the approved building permit.
Turner	Shane	IN-L 1003	20/05/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1500 & Costs \$450	Leongatha	Shane Turner - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the additions to a dwelling and construction of a swimming pool. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he approved the final inspection when he could not have been satisfied that the mandatory footing inspection for the swimming pool had been conducted.
Stefanovski	Aleksandar	BS-U 33252	20/05/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$10,000 & Costs \$1542	Williamstown	Aleksandar Stefanovski - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to the construction of a swimming pool in Williamstown. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he inspected and approved work that did not comply with the building permit, approved protection work that was not confined within the boundary of the site and failed to provide the adjoining owners with adequate information on a protection work notice. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit where he could not have been satisfied that it would comply with the Act and Regulations and he failed to comply with Section 30 of the Building Act 1993 by failing to provide structural drawings and protection work notices with the building permit.
Shaw	Michael	BS-U 1165	6/05/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2000 & Costs \$2796	Berwick	Michael Shaw - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the construction of a swimming pool, fencing and a pergola in Berwick. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard where he issued a building permit when he was aware that construction had already been commenced on two of the four gate columns. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 24A(2)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a variation to the building permit for the construction of a pergola when the registration for the builder was limited to building swimming pools and retaining walls. The practitioner also issued a final certificate of inspection for the pergola when it had not been inspected during construction in accordance with the approved building permit.
Iksidekas	Peter	DB-U 14642	29/04/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1500 & Costs \$900	Bulleen	Peter Iksidekas - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of an adjoined dwelling in Bulleen. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by failing to carry out rectification work to a sound insulated party wall in accordance with the recommendations identified in an inspectors report.
Alexiou	Theo	DB-U 19706	27/04/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2500 & Costs \$817	South Morang	Theo Alexiou - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a retaining wall in South Morang. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16 of the Building Act 1993 by conducting building work without a building permit. The retaining wall was built during the construction of an apartment block and was not exempt from needing a building permit.
Omarr	Michael	DB-L 23668	27/04/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$8000 & Costs \$680 and complete a Contracts & Legal Obligations Course	Toorak	Michael Omarr - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to conducting underpinning work to the wall of a dwelling in Toorak. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993 by failing to be covered by the required insurance and failed to include the necessary contents of a contract as required by Section 31 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 by carrying out domestic building work outside his registration limitations and failed to comply with Section 246 of the Building Act 1993 by knowingly providing false information by understating the value of the proposed work. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to provide the building owner with an invoice for payments made.
Mathews	James	DB-M 14510	27/04/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1000 & Costs \$817	Craigieburn	James Mathews - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a verandah in Craigieburn. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 by carrying out domestic building work and construction of the verandah that was outside his registration limitations as a domestic building manager. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 16 of the Building Act 1993 by failing to ensure that the building work was properly managed or supervised to ensure compliance with the approved building permit.
Vinton	Travis	DB-U 25292	27/04/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$204	Bundoora	Travis Vinton - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Bundoora. The practitioner failed to rectify defective building work within the required timeframe that was identified in an inspectors report produced under Section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Gillam	Anthony	DB-U 2829	22/04/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$3500 & Costs \$2052	Croydon	Anthony Gillam - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to underpinning and rectification work to a dwelling in Croydon. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that the packing installed between the stumps and bearers was defective or not of a sufficient standard, failed to consult with a structural engineer before installing steel posts between the floor bearers and the strip footing and failed to ensure that the mandatory final inspection of the underpinning was undertaken in a timely manner.

Melchiori	Rudolph	BS-U 1067	20/04/2015 Determination affirmed on appeal at VCAT on 14/10/2016	Cancellation of Registration (BS-U 1067) & Ordered to Pay \$6634 for Costs Incidental to BPB Inquiry were affirmed on appeal. In addition VCAT also ordered the practitioner to pay a portion of the costs of the appeal proceeding of \$5000.	Attwood and various sites in Campbellfield.	Rudolph Melchiori - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 17 allegations in relation to 1 site in Attwood and 9 sites in Campbellfield. In relation to the Attwood site relating to the construction of a dwelling and garage, the Board found that at the time of issuing the building permit, the practitioner could not have been satisfied that the works would comply with the Regulation 302 in that the endorsed documents was insufficient in that it did not clearly show the location, depth and extend of the site cuts. Also the practitioner had failed to require appropriate protection work to protect the adjacent properties at this site. In relation to the Campbellfield sites the Board found the practitioner had failed to perform work as a practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard and not comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 for failure to require protection works to protect adjacent properties, deficiencies of the documentation depended upon in issuing the building permits and deficiencies in the occupancy permits. The Board also found the practitioner guilty in accordance with s179(1)(d) Building Act constituted by a pattern of conduct to show he is not a fit and proper person to practise as a building surveyor.
Vella	Darren	DB-U 20672	20/04/2015	Reprimand, Costs \$1058 and complete a Contracts & Legal Obligations Course	Williamstown	Darren Vella - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a detached dwelling in Williamstown. The practitioner carried out building work in contravention of Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 by changing the layout of a bathroom, ensuite and walk-in wardrobe, adding a powder room in the basement and conducting further site excavations and construction of retaining walls that did not comply with the approved building permit.
Shaw	Peter	BS-U 1283	14/04/2015 determination on appeal	Reprimand, Fine \$2000 & Costs \$8691.73	Hawthorn	Peter Shaw - The practitioner was found guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Hawthorn. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that a building permit was issued where he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with Regulation 419 of the Building Regulations 2006 in respect to overlooking into the habitable rooms and secluded private open spaces of an adjoining property. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 87(1) and 87(4) of the Building Act 1993 in that he failed to make a determination as to the appropriateness or otherwise of protection work and failed to make a determination in writing to the adjoining property owner.
Wilson	Alan	DB-L 1353	14/04/2015	Suspension of Registration (DB-L 1353) for 3 months, Fine \$4000 & Costs \$1422 and complete a Contracts and Legal Obligations Course or Introduction to Low Rise Contract Administration course or approved equivalent	Pheasant Creek	Alan Wilson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to the resiting of a house in Pheasant Creek. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by failing to include required details in the contract. The practitioner also failed to comply with Section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993 by carrying out re-stumping work and building work to roof trusses whilst not being covered by the required insurance. The practitioner failed to carry out the recommendations in an inspectors report produced under Section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to rectify defective building work that resulted in water damage to the interior of the building.
Romas	Arthur	DB-U 14797	9/04/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$4000 & Costs \$899	Oakleigh East	Arthur Romas - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling and retaining walls in Oakleigh East. The practitioner failed to comply with Section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work other than in accordance with a building permit by filling a cavity behind a retaining wall with building debris rather than the stipulated granular material and for failing to install an agricultural pipe. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that he failed to ensure that the building works avoided damaging neighbouring property. During the excavation of the site, the existing footing for the laundry and garage on the neighbouring property was undermined, exposed and left unsupported. Also, along the adjoining boundary at the rear of the property, a retaining wall was not appropriately backfilled, causing the fence and the neighbours clothesline to collapse.
Bulut	Habib	DB-M 29124	1/04/2015	Suspension of Registration (DB-M 29124) for 6 months & Costs \$1313 and complete a Contracts and Legal Obligations Course or Introduction to Low Rise Contract Administration course or approved equivalent	Keilor East & Jacana	Habib Bulut - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of ten allegations in relation to three sites. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that he demanded and received payment for the frame stage of the project when it had not been approved by the relevant building surveyor, failed to properly manage the building work to ensure that it was completed to required timelines, abandoned the project before it was completed, failed to respond to correspondence by the owner, agreed to variations of the building work without first obtaining the signed consent of the owners and for not building in accordance with the building permit.
Pendavingh	Johannes	DB-U 1282	31/03/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$7380 & Costs \$62,419 and complete a Contracts and Legal Obligations Course or Introduction to Low Rise Contract Administration course or approved equivalent	Donvale	Johannes Pendavingh - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Donvale. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, in that he carried out building work in relation to the installation of deck joists and bearers that did not comply with the structural drawings and left natural rock directly against a fibre cement wall, allowing moisture to enter the subfloor space.
Wenck	Garry	EC- 27590	20/03/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$1500 & Costs \$4500	Williamstown	Garry Wenck - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the supervision of engineering plans issued for the underpinning of an adjoining wall and outbuilding as part of the construction of a swimming pool. During excavation of the swimming pool, the underpinning failed and the bored piers collapsed. As a result, the adjoining wall collapsed and fell into the swimming pool excavation. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to sufficiently investigate the site and issued plans that were based on assumptions and misinformation.
Coco	Frank	BS-U 1082	4/03/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$3394	Broadmeadows	Frank Coco - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to the construction of a brick fence and garage wall that exceeded the height restrictions that were on the approved building permit contrary to Regulation 424(2) of the Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by failing to take sufficient action to properly resolve the non-compliant building work after being notified of the non-compliance by a municipal building surveyor.
Wright	Craig	DB-L 13874	3/03/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2000 & Costs \$8052.60	Montrose	Craig Wright - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a swimming pool in Montrose. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard, by failing to take responsibility for the conduct, training and supervision of his employees, leaving an excavation site in an unsafe and open condition and causing the owner to sign a variation order under duress. The practitioner also entered into a major domestic building contract without first obtaining foundations data as required by section 30(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Danic	Zeljko	DB-L 26682	25/02/2015	Cancellation of Registration (DB-L 26682), Fine \$11,882 & Costs \$750.00	Numurkah	Zeljko Danic - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of seven allegations in relation to carrying out re-stumping work and construction of an addition to one site in Numurkah. The practitioner failed to comply with section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by entering into a major domestic building contract that was not in writing and contravened section 16 of the Building Act 1993 by carrying out construction work without a building permit. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by producing defective work and not to a sufficient standard. The practitioner also failed to comply with section 136 of the Building Act 1993 by engaging in work without the required insurance and contravened section 176(2A) of the Building Act 1993 for engaging in roofing works and construction of an additional dwelling outside the registration limitation of subfloor works.
Sumic	Mario	DB-U 7614	18/02/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$2000 & Costs \$3823	Aberfeldie	Mario Sumic - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the construction of a unit in Aberfeldie. The practitioner failed to comply with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work when a building permit had not been issued. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by constructing framework that was defective. The practitioner also applied to amend the building permit without first obtaining the owners consent as required by section 248(1) of the Building Act 1993.

Smith	Allan	DB-U 5614	18/02/2015	Suspension of Registration (DB-U 5614) for 18 months & Costs \$2854.00	Ashwood	Allan Smith - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of two units in Ashwood. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the framing work, wall sarking and pre-plaster preparation was not completed to a sufficient standard. The practitioner also failed to complete the building work within the 300 day period for practical completion as per the contract.
Donaldson	Ian	DB-U 4475	13/02/2015	Suspension of Registration (DB-U 4475) for 2 years & Costs \$6992.00	Montrose	Ian Donaldson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Montrose. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that the building had approximately 140 identified defects and the first floor and ground floor were not constructed in accordance with the contract drawings. The practitioner also replaced a stairwell balustrade with a wall contrary to the contract drawings without first obtaining a variation signed by the owners as required by section 37(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Brown	Colin	DB-U 23917	11/02/2015	Fine \$1500 & Costs \$899	Keilor	Colin Brown - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to the renovation and alteration of a dwelling in Keilor. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he failed to adequately secure the site and maintain adequate weather protection resulting in several thousand dollars worth of plumbing equipment being stolen and the dwelling being damaged. The practitioner also failed to complete the building work within the agreed period for practical completion as per the contract and some works were found to be defective.
Keown	Shane	DB-U 4100	11/02/2015	Reprimand & Costs \$899	Torquay	Shane Keown - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of one allegation in relation to construction of a dwelling in Torquay. The practitioner failed to comply with section 16 of the Building Act 1993 by commencing building work without a building permit.
Tolliday	Neville	DB-U 11200	9/02/2015	Suspension of Registration (DB-U 11200) for 3 months & Costs \$1278.00	South Mandurang	Neville Tolliday - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to a site in South Mandurang and various other sites. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he failed to competently supervise and control the relevant building work. The practitioner allowed his registration to be used repeatedly to obtain building permits for work that he did not control, manage or adequately supervise. The practitioner also failed to maintain adequate weather protection resulting in water damage to the new addition of the building at the South Mandurang site.
Vosti	John	IN-L 20111	05/02/2015 determination on appeal	Reprimand, Fine \$4000 & Costs \$3000	Donvale	John Vosti - The practitioner was found guilty of two allegations in relation to the construction of a dwelling in Donvale. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that in his capacity as an inspector, carried out and approved the frame stage and final inspections when there were defects and deficiencies in the building work which should have been rectified before the inspections were approved. Some of the defects and deficiencies included; inadequate support of the upper floor steel posts supporting the roof, the timber floor joists and bearers used in the deck were not in accordance with the structural drawings, natural rock was left directly against a fibre cement wall allowing moisture to enter the subfloor space and midspan and end blocking of the E-joists of the upper floor were missing.
Hick	Danny	BS-U 1363	4/02/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$7500 & Costs \$1285	Craigieburn and South Melbourne	Danny Hick - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to three sites at Craigieburn and South Melbourne. The practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) and section 24(1)(b) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued building permits in relation to the construction of a detached dwelling, garage, a bike shed and bin enclosure when he could not have been satisfied that the building permit would comply with the Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner also failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he issued an amendment to a building permit when he was aware that the building work to which the amendment related had already been completed.
Fuzaty-Hagh	Faramarz	EC1407	4/02/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$5000 and Costs \$1028	Maribyrnong	Faramarz Fuzaty-Hagh - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Maribyrnong. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to provide adequate engineering computations and design for the construction of the dwellings such as providing a bracing design for wind forces. The practitioner's structural design also presented a risk to structure and people such as concrete panels or various columns not being structurally adequate and the front facade panels having inadequate support.
Rizio	Nino	DB-U 18946	27/01/2015	Reprimand, Complete the Contracts & Legal Obligations Course by 30th June 2015 & Costs \$2904.	Bundoora	Nino Rizio - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Bundoora. The practitioner managed and arranged aspects of the building work related to the renovation and extension of a dwelling. The practitioner failed to comply with section 136(2) of the Building Act 1993, in that he managed or arranged the carrying out of domestic building work under a major domestic building contract when he was not covered by the required insurance. Further, the practitioner entered into a major domestic building contract which did not comply with the requirements of section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Lavados	Rodrigo	BS-U 1567	21/01/2015	Reprimand, Fine \$10,000.00 and costs \$2577.00	St Kilda East and Glen Iris	Rodrigo Lavados - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation two sites at St Kilda and Glen Iris. The practitioner issued a building permit for the Glen Iris site but did not forward the applicant two copies of the plans, specifications and other documents lodged with the application with evidence of approval stamped and endorsed on them contrary to Regulation 314 (1)(b) of the Building Regulations 2006. At the St Kilda site the Board found that the practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 (in relation to alterations and additions) in that the practitioner failed to carry out an enforcement action in an appropriate manner, failed to attend a final inspection and failed to respond to the owner's communication regarding this concern in writing. The practitioner was also found guilty also of being unprofessional for failing to pay outstanding penalties imposed by the Board by the due date as a result of a previous Inquiry.
Cerra	Tullio	DB-U 12732	30/12/2014	Suspension of registration (DB-U 12732) for two (2) months, require the practitioner to undertake and complete the Contracts and Legal Obligation Course by 30 June 2015 and Costs \$899.00	Caroline Springs	Tullio Cerra - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of five allegations in relation to one site at Caroline Springs for the construction of a single storey dwelling including car accommodation. As the registered director of a company, the practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by allowing it to demand and receive payments for lock-up stage, plaster stage and fixing stage which were not directly related to the progress of the building work being carried out under the contract contrary to section 40(3) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995. The practitioner also allowed the company to engage in building work that was defective or incomplete and did not comply with accepted industry standards. The Board further found that the practitioner was guilty of unprofessional conduct in relation to distancing himself from the administrative care and control of the company including taking steps to completing works prior to the expiration of the building permit.
Casaceli	John	DB-U 5629	18/12/2014	Suspension of Registration (DB-U 5629) for six (6) months & Costs \$2370.00	Black Rock	John Casaceli - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of four allegations in relation to one site in Black Rock for the construction of a dwelling. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work that was not in accordance with a building permit that was issued and in force in respect of the building work. Regulation 1502(a) was breached also in that the practitioner in that the practitioner being the registered building practitioner director of JACCS Development P/S trading as Casa Design and Construction failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard and allowed the company to breach section 25(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by not giving to the building owner a copy of the major domestic building contract within five clear days after entering into that contract. The company also breached section 40(2) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by having entered into a major domestic building contract of a type listed in column 1 of the Table then demanding more than the percentage of the contract price listed in column 2 at the completion of the stage referred to in column 3. The practitioner also failed to properly oversee subcontractors involved in the building work who caused the over excavation causing the lower floor level finish.

Van Halen	Geoffrey	IN-U 1179	18/12/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$1000.00 and Costs \$1058.00	Leopold	Geoffrey Van Halen - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of two allegations in relation to one site in Leopold for the construction of a dwelling and garage. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with regulation 1502(2) of the Building Regulations 2006 that he approved the footings system which had not been constructed in accordance with the building permit and stamped approved plans. The practitioner also failed to notify the relevant building surveyor of the existence of a retaining wall despite having reason to suspect that it had been built without a building permit and did not notify the relevant building surveyor that the footing system had been constructed other than in accordance with the building permit and stamped and approved plans.
Van Der Nol	Nicholas	DB-U 28352	15/12/2014	Reprimand, Require the practitioner to undertake and complete the Contracts & Legal Obligation Course by the 30th June 2015 and Costs \$1020.00	North Balwyn	Nicholas Van Der Nol - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of three allegations in relation to one site in Balwyn for the alteration and renovation of a dwelling. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with section 16 of the Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work without a building permit, failed to comply with section 136 of the Building Act 1993 in that he engaged in building work without the required insurance and the practitioner failed to carry out his work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that the practitioner's work was defective and not of a sufficient standard.
Doyle	Adrian	DB-L 21704	11/12/2014	Suspension of Registration (DB-L 21704) for two years and Costs \$1542.00	Thorpdale	Adrian Doyle - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of eight allegations in relation to one site in Thorpdale for the re-erection of a dwelling. The practitioner failed to comply with section 33(1) of the Building Act 1993 by failing to notify the relevant building surveyor without delay of the completion of the mandatory notification stage prior to placing a footing. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard by ensuring the building work relating to the sub-floor was not defective or of a sufficient standard, failing to ensure that adequate temporary weather protection for the building was maintained and failing to ensure that the company completed the building work. Further, the company entered into a major domestic building contract that did not comply with the requirements set out in section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act and failed to provide a signed contract within five business days after entering into a major domestic building contract contrary to section 25 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act. The practitioner received a deposit in relation to the building work that was more than 5% of the contract price contrary to section 11(1)(a) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act. The practitioner also failed to ensure that the company complied with section 37(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act in that the company gave effect to a variation in the major domestic building contract for building work and recovered money in the respect of the variation without first giving the owner a compliant notice and obtaining the owner's consent to the variation.
Donohue	Dennis	BS-U 1065	4/12/2014	Reprimand, an undertaking that the practitioner reform his management and administrative procedures and inform the Board of his continuing professional development and mentoring arrangements and costs \$3917.00	Wonthaggi, Venus Bay, Berry Creek, Korumburra, Leongatha, Kongwak, Pound Creek, Walkerville and Foster	Dennis Donohue - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of various allegations across nine regional areas in Victoria. The practitioner had failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work and the building permit would comply with the Building Regulations 2006 in relation to the construction of the new medical centre (access for people with a disability), the construction of a verandah, construction of a garage, construction of an extension to existing dwellings, restumping of dwellings, construction of a new dwelling, removal of a dwelling, construction of a storage building and construction of a storage building. The practitioner failed to comply with section 24A(2) of the Building Act 1993 in relation to a building permit he when he was not or could not have been satisfied that the work would be carried out by a builder who was registered under Part 11 of the Building Act 1993 in the appropriate class of domestic builder and was covered by the required insurance. The practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he accepted applications for building permits that were unsigned and undated and issued building permits that were contrary to Regulation 315 of the Building Regulations 2006. The practitioner also failed to comply with Clause 4(1) of Schedule 2 of the Building Act 1993 in that he decided an application for a point of discharge from the allotment when that report had not been obtained in relation to the construction of new dwellings, constructions of storage buildings and construction of a garage.
McCammon	Christie	DB-U 12161	12/11/2014	Reprimand, Costs \$1302.25 & practitioner to complete a Contract & Legal Obligation course within 6 months of the expiration of the 60 day appeal period.	Boronia	Christie McCammon - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in relation to the renovation of a bathroom at a property in Boronia. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 136(2) Building Act 1993 in that he carried out the building work without being covered by the required insurance and that he failed to comply with sections 31(1) and 11(1) Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 by failing to put the major domestic building contract in writing and demanding and receiving a deposit of more than 10% of the contract price.
Nascarella	Romando	CB-U 4258	12/11/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$1000.00 & Costs \$3917.00	Tottenham	Romando Nascarella - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 1 site in Tottenham for the building of a car showroom, workshop and carpark. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 16(1) in that as a Director of the Company, he permitted building work to be carried out contrary to the building permit being the deemed agreed protection works requiring the practitioner to expose the footings of the building on the adjoining allotment by excavation of a trench the base of which was to be battered at 45 degrees at a section on the northern boundary and to excavate and pour the retaining wall at a section on the northern boundary in 1200mm lengths in a hit and miss sequence. Instead the section was excavated with vertical walls with no batter and excavation of the trench occurred in one continuous trench. Section 118(1) of the Act was also breached by the practitioner as building work continued to be carried out on the northern boundary that contravened a building order to stop works.
Short	David	BS-L 36489	22/10/2014	Reprimand & Costs \$1058.00	Jacana & Newtown	David Short - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 2 sites in Jacana and Newtown. It was found that the practitioner contravened sections 30(1) and 24(1)(a) Building Act 1993 by failing to provide the council with a copy of the permit, plans and other relevant documents within 7 days of issuing a building permit for a swimming pool and safety barrier at a site in Jacana and issuing a building permit for demolition works when he had not received all relevant information in relation to the boundaries of the allotment and adjoining buildings to meet the requirement of regulation 304(1)(b) of the Building Regulations 2006 for the Newton site.
Walker	Marie	BS-U 1068 & IN-U 1059	22/10/2014	Cancellation of Registrations (BS-U 1068 & IN-U 1059) & Costs \$1058.00	Abbotsford	Marie Walker - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to the modification of a device-deletion of monitoring system (building work) in Abbotsford. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 and regulation 1502(a) Building Regulations 2006 in that she issued a building permit for the building work which lacked of information and that she issued a Certificate of Final Inspection when the sprinkler system had not been decommissioned as required as an essential safety matter.
Molinaro	Dino	BS-U 14142	8/10/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$1000.00 & Costs \$1542.00	Glen Waverley	Dino Molinaro - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to the construction of a new dwelling, garage and ramp in Glen Waverley. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 by issuing a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Building Regulations 2006 (Regulation 419) in relation to windows overlooking into the neighbouring habitable room windows and secluded private open spaces.
Golz	Bernd	BS-U 27630	1/10/2014	Reprimand & Costs \$1058.00	Williamstown	Bernd Golz - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in relation to the construction of a double storey dwelling in Williamstown. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(d) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit without being satisfied that the building permit was consistent with the planning permit including an increased floor area of the roof terrace, northern elevation wall and height of the garage ceiling. He did not comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to take appropriate action on becoming aware that building works did not comply with the relevant plans and approved a frame inspection when relevant building work did not comply with the plans.
Govorcic	Thomas	BS-U 1270	1/10/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$2000.00 & Costs \$1058.00	Craigieburn	Thomas Govorcic - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to the construction of a verandah in Craigieburn. The findings included that the practitioner did not to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 (the Regulations) in that he failed to identify building work which was non-compliant with the building permit being a downpipe in the incorrect location and side set back on the northern boundary was 750mm in lieu of the required 1000mm on the building permit. He also failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) Building Act 1993 in that as the relevant building surveyor, he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the permit would comply with Regulation 302(2) in that the allotment plan contained insufficient details in respect of the levels shown.
Hutchison	Paul	IN-U 39597	1/10/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$2000.00 & Costs \$1058.00	Brown Hill	Paul Hutchinson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to the construction of a retaining wall in Brown Hill. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he purported to approve documents in the relevant building surveyor's name when he was not the relevant building surveyor and that as an inspector for the city of Ballarat he failed to notify the relevant building surveyor that a retaining wall had been constructed without building permit approval.

Mavridis	Lazarus	BS-U 1588	25/09/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$3000.00 & Costs \$2567.50	Berwick	Lazarus Mavridis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to the construction of a new dwelling in Berwick. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) Building Act 1993 (the Act) by issuing a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work complied with the Act and Building Regulations 2006 including that clarification should be sought in relation to location and extent of retaining walls and the proposed protection works on the western garage boundary wall were deficient.
Leeworthy	Ricky	DB-U 19401	10/11/2014 - determination on appeal	Reprimand	Osbornes Flat	Ricky Leeworthy - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to the construction of a home in Osbornes Flat. It was found that the practitioner failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard (Regulation 1502(a) Building Regulations breach) in that defective works were identified were by an inspector appointed by Building Advice and Conciliation Victoria (BACV) and in relation to those defects, the practitioner failed to carry out recommendations contained in the inspectors' report under section 48 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995.
Ross	Lucas	IN-L 22980	17/09/2014	Reprimand & Costs \$1058.00	Rowville	Lucas Ross - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to 1 site in Rowville. It was found that the practitioner failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard (Regulation 1502(a) Building Regulations breach) by failing to identify a non-compliant pool safety barrier in accordance with Australian Standards AS 1926.1-2007 when approving a final inspection.
Martan	Zdenko	DB-U 18824	17/09/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$7000.00 & Costs 1058.00	Avondale Heights	Zdenko Martan - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in relation to 1 site in Avondale Heights. It was found that the practitioner failed to perform his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard (Regulation 1502(a) Building Regulations breach) by failing to ensure that variations were agreed to by written request and signed by the owner and failing to competently supervise and control the alterations and additions to an existing dwelling. Furthermore, he failed to comply with section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 (DBCA) by entering into a major domestic building contract which did not contain required information.
Comer	Paul	BS-U 22784	10/09/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$2000.00 and Costs \$3025.00	Bendigo	Paul Comer - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 3 allegations in relation to 1 site in Bendigo. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1) Building Act 1993 by issuing a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building permit would comply with the Building Regulations 2006 in that it contained insufficient detail in relation to the dimensions of the proposed building work to the boundaries and the layout of the drains to the point of discharge as required by Regulation 302(2) of the Building Regulations 2006. He also failed to carry out work in a competent manner and to a professional standard (Regulation 1502(a) Building Regulations breach) by failing to identify that concrete footings encroached over the allotment boundary in breach of the building permit conditions and allowing works to proceed on the basis of amended plans which did not comply with the planning permit.
Bettens	Peter	DB-L 31975	10/09/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$3000.00, Complete Contract & Legal Obligations Course within 6 months & Costs \$1681.50	Echuca	Peter Bettens - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations in relation to 1 site in Echuca. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with sections 16(1) Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work which was not in accordance with the building permit in that he carried out work beyond restumping of the dwelling including re-erection of a dwelling, new stumps and new infill sections. He failed to comply with s176(2A) when he was not registered in the appropriate class of domestic builder to carry out and failed to comply with s136(2) when he entered into a major domestic building contract when not covered by the required insurance. Furthermore, he failed to comply with section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 (DBCA) by entering into a major domestic building contract which did not contain certain information required by that section.
Priestley	Charles	DB-U 7047	8/09/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$6000.00; limited to the undertaking of works of a contract value of not more than \$16,000.00 for 1 year; Complete three course modules within 1 year and Costs \$968.00	Marlo	Charles Priestley - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 6 allegations in relation to 1 site in Marlo. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with Regulations 414 and 415 Building Regulations 2006 (the Regulations) in that the garage wall exceeded the maximum allowable height specified in the Regulations and he failed to comply with sections 31(1), 16, 40(3), 42(b) and 32 of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 (Vic) (DBCA) in that: he entered into a major domestic building contract and failed to supply a certain information which meant the contract fell considerably short of the DBCA requirements; he demanded, recovered or retained money under the contract in excess of the contract price when it was not authorised; he demanded instalments that were not directly related to the progress of the building work; he demanded final payment when the work had not been completed and he failed to allow for delays and time estimates in the major domestic building contract.
Gibcus	Paul	BS-U 1470	28/08/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$750.00 & Costs \$300.00	Canterbury	Paul Gibcus - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 1 site in Canterbury. It was found that the practitioner issued a building permit and an occupancy permit which did not comply with Regulations 410 and 419 Building Regulations 2006; the building permit application did not contain compliant information regarding overlooking restrictions and the height and set back of the front and rear wing walls and the occupancy permit did not comply in that the front and rear wing walls extending to the western boundary were over height.
Cole-Sinclair	Daryl	BS-U 1345	26/09/2014 - determination on appeal	Reprimand & Fine \$4000.00	Hampton	Daryl Cole-Sinclair - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to 1 site in Hampton. It was found that the practitioner failed to comply with Regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he issued a building permit with a specified cost for the proposed work, being the construction of a carport, Gazebo and front fence, when the cost of the proposed building work was substantially higher than the amount specified in the permit.
McDermott	Arron	BS-L 34264	20/08/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$1000.00 & Costs \$899.00	Dandenong	Arron McDermott - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 3 sites in Dandenong. The findings included that the practitioner, as the director of the Company and the registered building practitioner responsible, failed to comply with section 18A(2) Building Act 1993 (the Act) in that he failed to notify the Urban Renewal Authority in writing of the application and cost estimate of the building work. He also failed to await Urban Renewal Authorities notification relevant to the 3 sites in Dandenong prior issuing the building permits in breach of section 24(3) of the Act.
Cvetkovski	Mick	DB-U 29820	18/08/2014	Suspension of Registration (DB-U) for 2 years & Costs \$9071.00	Maribyrnong	Mick Cvetkovski - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 7 allegations in relation to 1 site in Maribyrnong, in that as the director of the Company and the registered building practitioner responsible, he failed to carry out building work, namely the construction of a new dwelling and garage, in a competent manner and to a professional standard in contravention of Regulation 1502(a) Building Regulations 2006. The findings included that: he demanded and received a deposit in relation to the building work of more than 5% of the contract price before starting any work under the contract; he demanded and received a payment for the frame stage and fixing stage prior to the completion of those stages; he failed to ensure that the Certificate of Insurance identified the correct entity that would carry out the work; he carried out defective building work; and building work in contravention of the Building Code of Australia at the time and section 16 of the Building Act 1993.
Uren	Jeffrey	BS-U 1069	18/08/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$14,436.00 (Max Amount) & Costs \$9276.40	Prahran, Ivanhoe, West Preston and various sites.	Jeffrey Uren - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 17 allegations in relation to various sites. The findings included that: he had breached Regulation 321 of the Building Regulations 2006 by failing to pay into the Building Administration Fund building permit levies for building permits issued within the appropriate timeframe; he failed to forward to the council building permit details for various sites within the timeframe as required by s30(1) of the Building Act and failed to give details of the various occupancy permits and certificates of final inspection issued within the appropriate timeframe to the authority as required by Regulation 322; failed to give Council on 1 occasion details of occupancy permit within the timeframe as required by s73(1) of the Building Act; the practitioner failed to comply with requirements made by a performance auditor in providing information as required at section 227D of the Building Act; approved building work, namely alterations to a dwelling, which did not comply with regulation 419 of the Building Regulations in relation to overlooking on one occasion; failed to issue an amended building permit to reflect a change in builder having become aware of this on one occasion; issued a building permit in circumstances where he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Act and the Building Regulations 2006 in accordance with s24 of the Building Act as the approved plans did not include the details of the truss layout for 1 site; and failed to approve the fire separation methodology in the Fire Engineer report or approve the Alternative Solution set out in that report for 1 site.
Board	Callum	DB-U 24492 & CB-L 29803	15/08/2014	Reprimand & Costs \$3187.00	Leopold	Callum Board - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to a site at Leopold. The findings included that the practitioner, as the director of the Company and the registered building practitioner responsible, failed to comply with section 16(1) Building Act 1993 in that he carried out building work which was not in accordance with the relevant building permit relating to a retaining wall and a deepened edge beam in lieu of bored piers on the western edge of the garage. Also prior to ceasing construction the company had failed to maintain the site in such a way as to protect the adjoining property from the adverse affect of redirected surface water as a result of not attaching downpipes which caused water from the roof surface of the dwelling to flow onto the ground and onto the adjoining property where it would pool.

Nouri	Kenan	DB-U 12791	14/08/2014	Reprimand, Costs \$899.00, suspension of registration (DB-U) for 1 year and completion of six (6) specified course Modules prior to renewing.	Pheasant Creek, Wollert, Craigieburn, Clarkefield and Woodend.	Kenan Nouri - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 5 allegations in relation to various sites. The findings included that the practitioner failed to carry out his work as a building practitioner in a competent manner and to a professional standard contrary to regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he failed to complete the building work, namely the construction of five dwellings at five different locations.
Cassar	Paul	BS-U 22903	30/07/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$2500.00 & Costs \$3729.50	Keilor	Paul Cassar - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 4 allegations in relation to 1 site in Keilor. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit in respect of the building work, namely the alteration and addition to an existing dwelling in circumstances where he could not have been satisfied that the maximum height of the proposed garage wall did not exceed 3.6m as per Regulation 415(3) of the Building Regulations 2006 and that the minimum set back of the proposed garage wall would not contravene the requirements of Regulation 417(2); The practitioner also failed to act in a competent manner and to a professional standard contravening Regulation 1502(a) of the Regulations by not bringing building works into compliance via appropriate enforcement.
Cleveland	Richard	BS-U 1352 & IN-U 1355	30/07/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$1500.00 & Costs \$2278.00	Waratah Bay	Richard Cleveland - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 1 site in Waratah Bay. The findings included that the practitioner failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit in respect of the building work in circumstances where he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Building Regulations 1994 (the Regulations) in that the drawings approved by the practitioner contained sufficient information for him to have determined a smoke detection and alarm system in accordance with Building Code of Australia (specification E2.2a clause 4,6 & 7) as required at the time. He also failed to comply with Regulation 15.2 of the Regulations in that he issued an occupancy permit despite the certification failing to identify compliance with the correct Australian Standards in relation to fire alarm systems as required on the building permit and the approved plans.
Kerr	David	DB-L 34773	23/07/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$3000.00 & Costs \$968.00	Camberwell	David Kerr - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to 1 site in Camberwell for commencing building works having undertaken digging of the hole and steel shell construction of a pool 2 days prior to the building permit being issued in breach of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993.
Sekhon	Manninder	DP-AD 15609	23/07/2014	Reprimand, Completion of BDAV course & Costs \$968.00	Berwick	Manninder Sekhon - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to 1 site in Berwick. The practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he prepared architectural drawings for the purpose of being part of a building permit application and those drawings were deficient and lacking sufficient information for the purposes of obtaining a building permit as set out at Regulation 302 of the Building Regulations 2006.
Stoneman	Maurice	BD-M 1009	16/07/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$2000.00 & Costs \$1542.00	Ascot Vale, Essendon, and two sites in Balwyn North.	Maurice Stoneman - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 8 allegations in relation to 4 sites. The practitioner failed to carry out his work in a competent manner and to a professional standard in that he had commenced demolition works prior to the building permits being obtained despite communication concerns with the relevant building surveyor and failing to notify the relevant building surveyor without delay after the completion of final mandatory stages of the works, contrary to section 33(1) of the Building Act 1993.
Lam	Phat	BS-U 16991	11/07/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$1000.00 & Costs \$1542.00	Two sites in Wallan	Phat Lam - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 2 sites in Wallan. The findings included that he issued a building permit in respect of building work without obtaining the report and consent of the relevant reporting authority under Part 4 of the <i>Building Act 1993</i> in relation to overlooking and solar access to north facing windows of an adjoining property and a 5 meter high wall with a setback of 1 meter. For the other site the practitioner had failed to identify during mandatory inspections that the floor level had been constructed lower than level shown on the approved stamped plans.
Lenon	Rodney	DB-U 8643	24/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$2000.00 & Costs \$849.00	Kialla and Congupna	Rodney Lenon - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 6 allegations in relation to two sites. The findings included commencing the construction of swimming pools prior to the issuing of the building permits in breach of section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 (Act). The major domestic building contracts failed to comply with section 31(1) of the Domestic Building Contracts Act 1995 and the practitioner failed to ensure that company was covered by the required insurance pursuant to section 136(1) of the Act.
Wood	Philip	BS-U 1255	18/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$6000.00 & 75% of Costs \$1542.00	Mount Waverley	Philip Wood - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 1 site in Mount Waverley. The practitioner had failed to comply with section 24(1) (a) of the Building Act 1993, in that he issued a building permit in circumstances where he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Building Regulations 2006 in that the plans did not provide the measurements required to satisfy compliance with Building Regulation 414. Also the report and consent was not obtained from council for the works which did not comply with the building height provisions of the Building Regulations.
Vranjes	Duro	BS-U 20045	18/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$3000.00 & Costs \$1542.00	Craigieburn	Duro Vranjes - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 1 allegation in relation to 1 site in Craigieburn. The practitioner failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 following a complaint from an adjoining owner that the paling fence to the common boundary was retaining fill from the site, the practitioner failed to take appropriate action and had only issued a verbal warning of his intention to commence enforcement action.
Rontogiannis	Peter	BS-U 20459	17/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$14,436.00 (Max Amount) & Costs \$6792	Various Sites	Peter Rontogiannis - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 18 allegations in relation to various sites. The findings included that he: Issued Building Permits in circumstances where works were complete, where he should not have been satisfied that the relevant planning permit had been obtained and when he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the regulations (contravening s24(1)(a) Building Act 1993); failed to comply with regulation 1502(a) of the Building Regulations 2006 in that he did not ensure relevant parties signed the protection notices or that they were served accordingly; failed to take required action under Part 8 Building Act 1993; failed to adequately monitor progress of building works, ensure works were complete and that final inspections were carried out; issued a number of Occupancy Permits for building works without seeing copies relevant Compliance Certificates; failed to respond to requests from the Building Commission (at the time) to provide details of building permits issued in relation to various sites; failed to provide the Building Commission details of the Certificates of Final Inspection and Occupancy Permits issued in relation to a number of sites; failed to pay into the Building Administration Fund building permit levies for building permits issued within the relevant timeframe and he failed to provide the Building Commission/Victorian Building Authority with the required permit and levy information within the relevant timeframe.
Atkinson	Paul	DB-L 24864	12/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$5000.00 & Costs \$1133.00	Frankston South	Paul Atkinson - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 2 allegations in relation to 1 site in Frankston South. The practitioner had failed to comply with section 16(1) of the Building Act 1993 (Act) in that he carried out building work without a building permit and was not covered by the required insurance whilst carrying out the works in accordance with s136(2) of the Building Act 1993.
Zivkovic	Robert	BS-U 15774	12/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$6000.00 & Costs \$1133.00	Yarraville	Robert Zivkovic - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 6 allegations in relation to 1 site in Yarraville. The findings included that he: failed to comply with section 24(1)(a) of the Building Act 1993 in that he issued a building permit when he could not have been satisfied that the building work would comply with the Act and Building Regulations 2006 and he could not have been satisfied that the consent of the relevant Council had been obtained; failed to comply with section 108(2) Building Act 1993 in that he caused a Building Notice to be served that did not contain all the matters required; failed to take appropriate steps under Part 8 of the Building Act 1993; delegated his function as the building surveyor without any statutory authority and that he was he facilitated the protection work process used as an attempt for the builder to gain access to the adjoining property to carry out building work.
Borrack	Matthew	DB-L 20943	4/06/2014	Reprimand, Fine \$10,000.00, Costs \$3558.00 & Complete course in Contracts & Legal Obligations Course (Full)	Various	Matthew Borrack - The Building Practitioners Board found the practitioner guilty of 11 allegations in relation to various sites. The findings included that: in relation to the construction and installation of five swimming pools, the practitioner failed to comply with s16(1) and s136(2) Building Act 1993 by not obtaining a building permits and failing to obtain the required insurance and that he was guilty of unprofessional conduct for failing to pay outstanding penalties imposed by the Building Practitioners Board.