



**THE LAW REFORM COMMISSION
OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Project No 33

The Dividing Fences Act

WORKING PAPER

DECEMBER 1973

INTRODUCTION

The Law Reform Commission has been asked to consider and report on the law relating to dividing fences.

The Commission having completed its first consideration of the matter now issues this working paper. The paper does not necessarily represent the final views of the Commission.

Comments and criticisms are invited. The Commission requests that they be submitted by 1 April 1974.

Copies of the paper are being sent to the -

Chief Justice and Judges of the Supreme Court
Judges of the District Court
Solicitor General
Under Secretary for Law
Law Society
Law School
Magistrates Institute
Secretary for Local Government
Town Planning Commissioner
Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors & Draftsmen
Country Shire Councils Association of W.A.
Developers Institute of Australia (W.A. Division)
Farmers Union of W.A.
Fremantle City Council
Institute of Architects - W.A. Chapter
Local Government Association of W.A.
Master Builders Association of W.A.
Pastoralists & Graziers Association of W.A.
Perth City Council
Stirling City Council
Law Reform Commissions and Committees with which this Commission is in correspondence.

A notice has been placed in *The West Australian* inviting anyone interested to obtain a copy of this paper and submit comments.

The research material on which this paper is based is at the offices of the Commission and will be made available on the request.

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs
TERMS OF REFERENCE	1
THE LAW IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA	2-13
The scheme of the Act	4-13
THE LAW AND SUGGESTIONS FOR REFORM IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS	14-16
BASIS FOR LIABILITY	17-34
Where an owner wishes to construct a dividing fence	18-21
Where an owner wishes to replace an existing dividing fence	22-23
Where an owner wishes to carry out maintenance or repair work on a dividing fence	24
Where a dividing fence has already been constructed by an owner, but no contribution has been received for it	25-29
Extent of contribution for construction, replacement, repair, etc.	30-34
OTHER ISSUES	35-52
Liability of local authorities	35-40
Court having jurisdiction	41-47
Appeals	48-50
Construction “as agreed upon or determined”	51
Neglect or negligence	52
QUESTIONS TO BE DECIDED	53

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. “To consider and report on the law relating to dividing fences.”

THE LAW IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

2. The law relating to dividing fences is basically contained in the *Dividing Fences Act 1961-1969* (referred to in this working paper as “the Act”). This Act, which replaced the *Cattle Trespass, Fencing and Impounding Act 1882* and an Act of 1834 regulating the “Fencing of Town and Suburban Allotments”, was the first attempt to provide the State with comprehensive legislation, suitable to modern conditions, for regulating the rights and responsibilities of adjoining land owners with regard to dividing fences.

3. There have however been criticisms of the legislation. The Commission has dealt in this working paper with all the suggestions for improvement of which it is aware.

The Scheme of the Act

4. The Act, according to the Minister who introduced the Bill, “works on the presumption that it is reasonable that owners of adjoining lands should share in equal proportion the cost of providing and repairing a sufficient dividing fence” (158 *Parl. Deb.*, 591). It imposes a liability on adjoining “owners” (see next paragraph) whose lands are not divided by a sufficient fence, or are divided by one in need of repair, to join in or contribute to the construction (s.7) or repair (s.14) of the fence, as the case may be. Adjoining owners may contract out of the Act (s.6).

5. “Owner” is defined as including a lessee holding under lease the unexpired term of which is not less than five years at the material time, but excluding a trustee or other person in whom land is vested as a public reserve, public park, or other prescribed public purpose or who has the control and management of such land (s.5), and by the *Dividing Fences Regulations 1971* (G.G., 23 Dec. 1971, p.5322) this exclusion is extended to land held “for open spaces, streets, roads, or rights of way that are public.”

6. A “sufficient fence” is also defined (s.5). Briefly, a fence is a sufficient fence if it is -

- (a) prescribed as such by by-law of a local authority; or
- (b) agreed upon by the parties and complies with any such by-law; or,

where there is no such by-law or agreement, if it is a fence -

- (c) ordinarily capable of resisting cattle and sheep trespass; or
- (d) determined by a court to be a sufficient fence.

7. Except in circumstances set out in s.13 of the Act (as to which see paragraph 10 below), before an owner can compel his neighbour to contribute to the construction or repair of a fence, he must serve him with a notice specifying certain matters and containing proposals concerning the fence to be built (s.8), or repaired (s.15(2)). Failing agreement within twenty-one days in the case of a new fence and fourteen days in the case of repairs, either owner may apply to a court of petty sessions for an order determining the type of fence to be constructed or the kind and extent of the repair to be undertaken, and other incidental matters (ss.9(1) and 15(4) & (5)).

8. The court, when making an order as to a new fence, is required to be guided by the kind of fence usually constructed in the locality, the purpose for which the adjoining lands are used and the type of sufficient fence, if any, prescribed by by-law for the locality (s.9(3)).

9. In cases where the owner of the adjoining land cannot be found, the court is expressly empowered to authorise the construction of a dividing fence (s.11).

10. Where an owner of land has, without giving the notice required by s.8 of the Act (see paragraph 7 above), constructed a dividing fence, the owner of the adjoining land may be liable to pay half the amount of the value of the fence (s.13), if he -

- (a) has completed or completes the construction of any substantial building on the adjoining land; or

- (b) has occupied or occupies a building constructed on it; or
- (c) has permitted or permits the lawful occupation by a person of a building erected on it.

Such an adjoining owner may, however, dispute the need for a fence or for a fence of the type built, or the amount of the claim (s.13 (3)).

11. The Act gives jurisdiction to a court of petty sessions constituted by a magistrate to make orders regarding the construction of a new fence (s.9); the construction of a fence where the adjoining owner is not traceable (s.11); and contribution to an existing fence (s.13) or to repairs (s.15). But money payable under the Act is recoverable in a civil court (s.18). The Act does not specify which court is to have jurisdiction under s.16, which deals with liability for use of a fence on the other side of a road. Orders of the court of petty sessions are declared to be final in some cases but not in others. This is discussed in paragraphs 48 to 50 below.

12. Other matters regulated by the Act include: the defining of boundary lines (s.12); the apportionment of fencing costs as between landlord and tenant (s.19); rights of entry on adjoining lands for the purposes of construction and repair (s.21) and the procedure for the service of notices (s.22).

13. The Act does not bind the Crown (s.4).

THE LAW AND SUGGESTIONS FOR REFORM IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

14. With the exception of the Australian Capital Territory, all Australian jurisdictions and New Zealand have enacted legislation relating to dividing fences, as under -

New South Wales : *The Dividing Fences Act 1951*

Victoria : *The Fences Act 1968*

Queensland : *The Dividing Fences Acts of 1953 and 1972*

South Australia : *The Fences Act 1924-1926*

Tasmania : *The Boundary Fences Act 1908*

Northern Territory : *The Fences Ordinance 1972*

New Zealand : The *Fencing Act 1908*

The United Kingdom has no corresponding legislation.

15. In 1972, reports recommending amendment to dividing fences legislation were published in -

New Zealand: The *Fencing Act 1908* - Report of the Property Law and Equity Reform Committee (referred to in this working paper as the “New Zealand Committee” or “New Zealand report”)

South Australia: Twenty-sixth Report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia concerning the amendment of the Law relating to Fences and Fencing (referred to in this working paper as the “South Australian Committee” or “South Australian report”).

16. The enactments listed in paragraph 14 are broadly speaking on the same pattern as the Western Australian Act but they show some differences in approach. Where considered significant, these differences are referred to below.

BASIS FOR LIABILITY

17. The question at issue is what should be the rights and obligations of an owner in relation to a fence dividing his land from the land adjoining. The question arises in a number of situations -

- (1) Where the owner wishes to construct a dividing fence.
- (2) Where an owner wishes to replace an existing dividing fence.
- (3) Where an owner wishes to carry out maintenance or repair work on a dividing fence.

- (4) Where a dividing fence has already been constructed by an owner (whether or not he is the present owner) but no contribution has been received for it.

Paragraphs 18 to 34 below set out alternative suggestions as to the proper basis for liability and the consequences of adopting any of them. The Commission has not at this stage come to any conclusion on the matters raised and invites comments.

Where an owner wishes to construct a dividing fence

18. It can be argued that a dividing fence is normally an improvement to the adjoining owner's land and thereby increases its value, and that it is reasonable that he be required to contribute to the cost of the fence even though he has no use for it. This is apparently the basis of the present law (ss.7, 8 and 9). It is true that under s.9(1) (d) of the Act, the court may make an order as to the need for the fence, but a court of petty sessions in Perth has held that only the need of the owner wishing to construct the fence need be looked at (1966 No. 4019, *A.F. Parker v. L.P. Worsnop*).

19. If liability to contribute is based on ownership alone, a subdivider could be called upon to contribute to the cost of a fence between any lot sold and any lot unsold. In this State subdividers commonly include in contracts of sale a covenant exempting them from such a liability, but a successor in title to the original purchaser of a lot would not be bound by it. In New Zealand legislation exists enabling such covenants to be registered in the Titles Office. One view is that this may have the effect of cluttering up the title. To overcome the problem of spent covenants remaining on the title, the New Zealand Committee has recommended that any such covenants should cease to have effect twelve years from the date of registration (New Zealand Report, paragraph 19).

20. On the other hand it can be argued that use, and not ownership alone, should be the basis of contribution so that an adjoining owner's obligation to contribute to the cost of a fence would be dependant on whether he has a use for the fence. This was in substance the basis of contribution under s.25 of the *Cattle Trespass, Fencing and Impounding Act 1882*, the predecessor of the present legislation.

21. The particular use for the fence would of course depend on the purpose for which the land is used. If the land is used to pasture animals, the fence would be of use to prevent them from straying. If the land is used for agricultural purposes, the fence would be of use to prevent damage to crops from animals entering on the land. If the land is used for the construction of a residence, as a general rule and depending on the nature of the locality, the occupier could be said to be using the fence. If the owner is not using the land for any purpose, he would have no use for the fence.

Where an owner wishes to replace an existing dividing fence

22. An owner might wish to replace a dividing fence by one more suitable to his present needs. If he builds a house on the land, he may wish to replace a wire fence by one providing greater privacy, such as a picket or asbestos fence. If he wishes to use the land for commercial purposes, he may wish to replace a picket fence by one providing greater security, such as a high mesh fence. Apart from changed needs, there may be a general improvement in the standard of the locality, calling for a more appropriate fence.

23. Under the present Act, an owner cannot claim contribution from an adjoining owner if the existing fence “is ordinarily capable of resisting the trespass of cattle and sheep” (see the definition of “sufficient fence” in s.5, no matter how otherwise unsuitable it is. This seems an inappropriate limitation. If the existing fence is inadequate for the adjoining owner a purposes, he should be required to make a contribution to the new fence, though his contribution should be limited to half the cost of a fence that would have been adequate for his purposes, provided it would have conformed to the general standards of fencing in the locality (see paragraphs 30 and 32 below).

Where an owner wishes to carry out maintenance or repair work on a dividing fence

24. The question of the basis for a liability to contribute towards maintenance or repair of a dividing fence should, it is suggested, be resolved in the same manner as that adopted for the construction of a fence whether it be use or ownership alone.

Where a dividing fence has already been constructed by an owner, but no contribution has been received for it

25. The present Act enables the owner who has already constructed the fence to claim contribution from an adjoining owner if the latter completes a substantial building or other structure on his land, or occupies or permits the occupation of a building or structure thereon (s.13). The right to claim contribution can be exercised against an adjoining owner whether or not he was the owner when the fence was constructed, but can be exercised only by the owner who actually constructed the fence.

26. It can be argued that an owner who builds on his land should not be excused from contributing to the cost of a dividing fence merely because the ownership of the adjoining land has changed. It may be more reasonable to provide that the right to claim contribution passes with the land and is vested in the successor in title for the time being of the constructing owner, as an incident of ownership.

27. If the principle that contribution is dependent on use is adopted (see paragraph 20 above) the right to claim contribution should not be limited to cases where the adjoining owner completes or occupies a structure on the land, but should include all cases where he begins to make use of the land, the contribution to be based on the then value of the fence and proportionate to the use being made of it (see paragraph 30 below).

28. A further alternative to the present law (paragraph 25 above) and to the alternative in paragraph 26, which would be simpler than the solutions there proposed and would avoid the difficulties of proof involved in them, would be to permit only the original constructing owner to claim, and only as against the person who was the adjoining owner at the time the fence was constructed.

29. If the concept of use is adopted as the basis for contribution, and the simplicity referred to in the previous paragraph is desired, the constructing owner's right to claim would be extinguished if the adjoining owner disposed of his land before he used it. This may cause difficulty in new subdivisions. A constructing owner would have no claim against the subdivider because any unsold adjoining lot would not be in use, and a sale of that lot would extinguish his right to claim (see paragraph 19 above).

Extent of contribution for construction, replacement, repair, etc.

30. The present Act fixes the extent of contribution at half the cost of the construction or repair of the fence (ss.7 and 14). It can be argued that this is too inflexible. One owner might wish to erect a brick fence, whereas the use to which the adjoining owner puts his land requires only a wire or picket fence. It may be more just to limit an adjoining owner's liability for contribution to half the cost of a fence adequate for his purposes.

31. Section 4 of the Victorian *Fences Act 1968* is to some extent similar to the suggestion made in paragraph 30 above. That section lays down rules for contribution where land is occupied for agricultural or pastoral purposes and the adjoining land is occupied for residential purposes. The word "occupied" in this context seems to be based on the concept of use. If there is no dividing fence, or if the fence is out of repair, the owner of the land occupied for agricultural or pastoral purposes is required to contribute only half the cost of a fence sufficient for those purposes. Where an existing fence not in need of repair is sufficient for the owner of the land occupied for agricultural or pastoral purposes, any new fence must be constructed wholly at the expense of the owner of the residential land. The section also gives a discretion to the court to determine the amount of contribution in other cases, so that presumably contribution could be made proportionate to the purpose for which the adjoining land is used. The dividing fences legislation in Queensland, Tasmania, the Northern Territory and New Zealand also empowers the courts to order contribution in some other proportion than half.

32. The standards of fencing in the locality should also be taken into account, as they are under the present law (see ss.9(3) and 15(5(b))). Even though an adjoining owner's purposes would be met by a cheaper fence, his contribution should be half the cost of a fence which conforms to the general standard of good fencing in the locality.

33. Where a fence has already been constructed, the extent of contribution should likewise be dependant on the purposes for which the adjoining owner uses his land. If, for example, a wire fence would be adequate for his purposes, he should not be required to contribute more than half its cost, provided that such a fence conforms to the general standard of good fencing in the locality.

34. One way of incorporating into the legislation the suggestion that contribution should be based on use is to set the standard of contribution at half the cost of construction, maintenance or repair as the case may be, of an “adequate fence”, to be defined as one that -

- (a) conforms to the general standard of good fencing in the locality; and
- (b) is adequate for the purposes for which the owner from whom contribution is claimed uses his land.

The general standard of good fencing in the locality would be determined as a matter of fact, based on local authority by-laws and the other fences in common use in the locality.

OTHER ISSUES

Liability of local authorities

35. The present Act (s.5) excludes “trustees or other persons in whom land is vested as a public reserve, public park or for such other public purposes as may be prescribed, or a person who has the care, control and management of a public reserve, public park or land used for such other public purposes as may be prescribed” from the liability to contribute towards the cost of dividing fences. This exclusion has been criticised, particularly where the trustees are local authorities in control of public reserves or parks in residential areas.

36. In 1969, at the request of the Minister for Local Government, the Local Government Association asked its members for their views as to whether local authorities should bear a proportionate share of the cost of fencing between private land and land held by them for public reserves and parks. The response was as follows -

for acceptance of liability	13
against acceptance of liability	10
not prepared to comment	2
no reply	8

37. In New South Wales, the Northern Territory and Queensland, local authorities who hold Crown lands as public reserves are exempted from liability to contribute. They are not so exempted in Victoria, Tasmania and New Zealand.

38. In South Australia, the *Fences Act 1924* does not expressly exempt local authorities from liability, but the South Australian Supreme Court has construed this Act (in *District Council of Noarlunga v. Coventry* [1967] S.A.S.R. 71) as not applying to them. In his judgment Walters J. stated that, since the obligation to contribute is proportional to the benefit to be derived from the fence and since the authority held the public reserve not or itself but for the benefit of the inhabitants of the locality, it derived no benefit therefrom and the Act should not be construed so as to extend to it.

39. The South Australian Law Reform Committee has recommended that legislation be introduced to reverse the law as laid down by the court in the *Noarlunga* case. In its report (paragraph 15 above) the Committee says -

“We do not quarrel with His Honour’s decision which followed previous authorities but we think it undesirable that there should not be a fence between reserves and private property. Private owners are entitled to some consideration as well as Councils....[It] would seem to us to be better if, where reserves occur and the adjoining owner asks the Council to contribute to the erection of a common fence between him and the reserve, that the Council should bear its proportion of the fence.”

40. While there have been no claims (as far as the Commission is aware) for contribution from local authorities where fences abut upon roads, there have been claims where parks or reserves are concerned. The Commission’s tentative view is that the exemption from liability enjoyed by local authorities should only continue where roads etc. are concerned (see paragraph 5 above) The Commission would welcome views on this question. If liability is to be imposed, it will also be necessary to decide whether authorities should be made liable for fences already erected.

Court having jurisdiction

41. Disputes under the *Dividing Fences Act* are essentially of a civil nature and the entrusting of jurisdiction over such disputes to courts of petty sessions which are criminal

courts is open to criticism. The Law Society in 1961, when the Bill was being discussed, pointed out -

- (a) that a person involved in a dispute over a fence could find himself the defendant in a Police Court; and
- (b) that this type of dispute can involve substantial amounts of money, but none of the interlocutory steps available to the parties in civil matters would be available.

42. The New South Wales *Dividing Fences Act 1951* and the Victoria *Fences Act 1968* both give jurisdiction in fencing disputes to courts of petty sessions (renamed in Victoria “magistrates’ courts” by a 1969 amendment). But contrary to the position in Western Australia these courts have extensive civil jurisdiction, with developed civil procedures (see, in New South Wales, the *Justices Act 1902*, ss.5(3) and 53 and *Chinchen v. Weiss* [1964] N.S.W.R. 357; and in Victoria, the *Justices Act 1958*, ss.67 and 68).

43. In New Zealand, the *Fencing Act 1908* gives jurisdiction in fencing disputes to magistrates’ courts, which possess civil and criminal jurisdiction pursuant to two different statutes. Section 37 of the *Fencing Act* provides that proceedings under the Act must be in accordance with the *Magistrates’ Courts Act 1947*, which is the statute governing civil matters.

44. The South Australian *Fences Act 1924-1926* makes use of courts of summary jurisdiction for disputes under the Act. The South Australian Committee (paragraph 15 above) at paragraph 14 of its report, when recommending a transfer of jurisdiction to the local courts, says -

“The provision for proceedings in courts of summary jurisdiction is quite inapt to modern fencing disputes most of which are suburban. . . . The procedure of Courts of summary jurisdiction is under the *Justices Act* tailored towards complaints ending in a conviction for some breach of the law rather than to this procedure which has to be quite often varied and supplemented by special directions to make it work under the *Fences Act* as it now stands, whereas the procedure of the Local Court dealing with a claim for a liquidated amount would clearly cover the position.”

45. The Commission is tentatively of the view that jurisdiction to deal with fencing disputes should be removed from the courts of petty sessions.

46. The jurisdiction could be given exclusively to the local courts, on the ground that such disputes should be settled as cheaply and summarily as possible. To avoid delays, the legislation could provide for process to be by way of summons, endorsed with a return date for hearing. On the other hand, it could be argued that fencing disputes should be treated in the same way as any other civil dispute, to be determined by whatever civil court would ordinarily have jurisdiction considering the amount in issue. The Commission has no firm view on this point and would welcome comment.

47. The new fencing Act should provide for power to make rules to regulate procedure, if this is necessary. For example, it would appear to be advantageous to have the issue of the proper cost payable for fencing work determined in the original action, instead of in a second action. Where the court is unable to determine this issue prior to the execution of the work, it would have to be empowered to grant liberty to apply to have the amount assessed at some subsequent date.

Appeals

48. The Act declares final any order made by courts of petty sessions when adjudicating on disputes concerning the following matters -

- (i) the need for the construction of a new dividing fence, the line along which it should be constructed and the kind of fence it should be (s.9(1) and (4));
- (ii) the right to claim contribution for an existing fence under s.13 (see s.13(5) and (6) and paragraph 10 above);
- (iii) the necessity of repairs to a fence and the kind and extent of the repairs (s.15(5) and (6)).

49. The Act does not however contain any provision as to the finality of an order made by a court of petty sessions under s.11(4) or (5) (application to amend an earlier ex parte order

authorising the construction of a fence and the valuation of such fence). There are also no express provisions regulating rights of appeal from whatever court has jurisdiction in disputes as to the liability to contribute for the use of a fence on the other side of a road (s.16(l) and see paragraph 11 above), or in actions under s.18 for recovery of money payable under the Act. Presumably the rights of appeal applicable to the courts concerned would be available in these cases.

50. Victoria, New Zealand, South Australia and the Northern Territory make no declaration of finality for orders made in fencing proceedings and presumably the rights of appeal available in the courts concerned would apply. The Commission tends to favour the stand taken in these jurisdictions and would recommend that rights of appeal in fencing disputes be the same as for other civil matters.

Construction “as agreed upon or determined”

51. Section 10 of the Act provides that where one party fails to carry out his part of an agreement or court order, the other may construct the whole fence “as agreed upon or determined by the order” and claim contribution accordingly. In the Victorian Supreme Court case of *O’Sullivan v. O’Leary* [1955] A.L.R. 359, a fence of 6’ posts had been agreed upon. The evidence established that standard 6’ posts had been ordered and used, which proved to average 5’10”, but that however there was no real advantage in having 6’ posts rather than 5’10” ones. The court accepted that the work done was in substantial compliance with the agreement. It nevertheless held that the words “as agreed upon” made this insufficient to support a claim for contribution. The Commission agrees with the view of the Statute Law Revision Committee of Victoria (see its 1966 Report upon proposals to amend the *Fences Act 1958*, paragraphs 23 and 24) that this result is undesirable. The Committee suggested that the legislation should be so drawn as to ensure that substantial compliance with an agreement or order suffices. This recommendation has now been embodied in s.8(2) of the *Fences Act 1968* of that State.

Neglect or negligence

52. Section 15(7) (c) of the Act provides that, where a fence is damaged by fire or the falling of a tree, the owner through whose neglect the fire or the falling tree caused damage is

bound to repair or renew the fence as soon as practicable. Section 15(8) goes on to say that if he does not, the owner of the adjoining land may do the repairs himself and recover from the owner at fault the whole cost of the repairs. The question arises whether or not s.15(7) (c) should be reframed more widely so as to include all cases where a negligent owner would be liable at law. Such an amendment would permit of immediate repair and make available a simpler remedy under the Act, as compared to an action for negligence at law. If the suggestion is adopted, it may be necessary to preserve the common law rights of action.

QUESTIONS TO BE DECIDED

53. The Commission would welcome comments on the questions discussed in this paper, and in particular on the following -

Basis for liability

(1) Should the liability of an adjoining owner to contribute to the cost of constructing a dividing fence be based on ownership alone, or on use, or on some other basis?

(paragraphs 17 to 21)

(2) In what circumstances should an adjoining owner be liable to contribute to the cost of replacing a dividing fence?

(paragraphs 22 to 23)

(3) Should the basis for contribution for maintenance or repair of a dividing fence be the same as that for the cost of the construction of the fence, or should it be on some other basis?

(paragraph 24)

(4) In cases where a fence has already been constructed, but no contribution paid -

(a) should the right to claim contribution be confined to the constructing owner, or should any of his successors in title be able to claim?

- (b) should the liability to contribute be restricted to the person who was the adjoining owner when the fence was erected, or should any of his successors in title be liable to contribute?

(paragraphs 25 to 29)

- (5) Should the extent of an adjoining owner's contribution be limited to half the cost of the construction, replacement, maintenance or repair, as the case may be, of a fence which conforms to the general standard of good fencing in the locality and which would be adequate for his purposes?

(paragraphs 30 to 34)

Liability of local authorities

- (6) Should local authorities be liable to contribute to fences dividing private land from public reserves under their control?

(paragraphs 35 to 40)

- (7) If the answer to (6) is yes, should local authorities be liable to contribute to the cost of fences erected before the coming into force of the legislation imposing such liability on them?

(paragraph 40)

Court having jurisdiction

- (8) Should jurisdiction to determine disputes under the Act be given to a civil court instead of to the court of petty sessions? If so, should the local court be given jurisdiction, irrespective of the amount involved?

(paragraphs 41 to 47)

Right of appeal

- (9) Should there be a right of appeal against all decisions under the *Fencing Act*?

(paragraphs 48 to 50)

Substantial compliance

(10) Should the legislation be amended to ensure that substantial even though not strict, compliance with an agreement or order suffices?

(paragraph 51)

Right of repair in cases of negligence

(11) Under the existing Act, if a dividing fence is damaged by fire or a falling tree due to an owner a neglect and that owner fails to repair the fence as soon as practicable, the adjoining owner can repair the damage and claim the cost from him. Should this provision be extended to all cases where the fence is damaged or destroyed due to an owner's negligence?

(paragraph 52)

APPENDIX III

List of persons and bodies who commented on the working paper

Atkins, P.H.
Baker, H.A.
Brown, D.L.
Burton, R.H., S.M.
Butement, T.
Citizens Advice Bureau of W.A. Inc.
City of Nedlands
City of Stirling
Conveyancer, Crown Law Department
Country Shire Councils' Association of W.A.
Department of Local Government
Department of Services and Property (Western Australia Branch)
Dilworth, M.J.
Duffield, M.
Enright, M.
Firth, J. & E.
Iddison, R., S.M.
Institute of Legal Executives (Western Australia) (Incorporated)
Jackson, H.H.
Jervis, S.
Kott Wallace & Gunning
Law Society of Western Australia
Local Government Association of Western Australia (Inc.)
Master Builders' Association of Western Australia
McManus, I.M.
Pastoralists & Graziers Association of Western Australia (Inc.)
Patterson, B.J.
Shire of Rockingham
Shire of Swan
Shire of Wanneroo
State Housing Commission
Steere & Clarke
Town of East Fremantle
Under Secretary for Lands
Warwick, C.
Western Australian Federation of Ratepayers and Progress Associations (Inc.)