Porter v. Beck, 2017 NWTSC 12

S-1-CV-2013-000043

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

BETWEEN:

BLAIR PORTER

Plaintiff(s)

- and -

(1) RODNEY R. BECK and (2) JANELLE D. BECK  $\label{eq:definition} \mbox{Defendant(s)}$ 

Transcript of the Decision by The Honourable Justice

A. M. Mahar, sitting in Hay River, in the Northwest

Territories, on the 27th day of January, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_

## APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. Porter: Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff
Mr. R. Beck: Appearing on behalf of the Defendants
Ms. J. Beck: Appearing on behalf of the Defendants

Official Court Reporters

1	THE	COURT: We held a trial this week
2		between Blair Porter, the plaintiff and defendant
3		on the counterclaim, and Rodney and Jenelle Beck,
4		defendants on the original claim and plaintiffs
5		on the counterclaim.
6		In October of 2012 the Becks entered into
7		a contract with Blair Porter for a complete
8		renovation of their basement. This included
9		a bathroom, a laundry room, two bedrooms,
10		and a total price of \$45,000 was agreed upon.
11		This \$45,000 included all materials, as well
12		as a \$6,300 value set aside for unforeseen
13		costs. Work began. Everything was going
14		well initially. Two progress payments of
15		\$11,000 each were made. The Becks also
16		supplied \$12,000 worth of materials.
17		Around Christmas, while the Becks were
18		having a child, Mr. Porter found himself in
19		fairly desperate circumstances and he asked
20		for a further progress payment; the Becks
21		provided a further \$5,000. Adding the \$12,000,
22		\$22,000 and $$5,000$ together, there was $$6,000$
23		remaining on the contract. The contract was
24		inclusive of tax.
25		In early February, while the work was
26		still incomplete, and I will get into that in

27 more detail soon, Mr. Porter asked, depending

on the evidence, either for full payment or
for a further \$5,000. Whichever it was, \$5,000
was close enough to the final amount remaining
that it could be considered essentially a final
payment. The Becks said no, that they wanted
to wait until the work was done or at least
more substantially complete.

Mere days later they were served with a final bill, which included \$6,000 for the remainder of the contract, \$971 for miscellaneous work relating to the work on the contract, and \$525 for the upstairs demolition. The upstairs demolition was an interesting issue. It may or may not have been agreed to by the parties. In any event, I propose to deal with it by way of an offset against the cost that was required to at least clean up the upstairs and make it habitable. The total value that was claimed by Mr. Porter was \$7,656. The Becks counterclaimed, claiming that there were substantial deficiencies in the work that was done, as well as work that was simply not done, and are asking for a total of \$37,000.

During testimony Mr. Porter originally suggested that the work was complete to the state required under the contract. Over the course of the trial he did agree that there

8

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

2.1

22 23

24

25

were deficiencies and that there were also things that should have been done that were not done.

I make the following findings: I find that Mr. Porter has not met the burden with respect to his claim and there will be no judgement in his favour accordingly. There will be an offset, which I will discuss again shortly. I find that the Becks have succeeded in their claim on a balance of probabilities, but not to the extent of the originally claimed amount, and I will now go into the details of that.

I find that the work was below the minimum acceptable standard in a number of ways, and again, Mr. Porter was candid about this. He was going through a difficult time towards the end of the contract, and work that likely would have been done in a better way by him simply was not. The staircase was 12 inches below code, a substantial amount below code. It was 65 inches, the code mandated 77 inches. The Becks attempted to repair this through another contractor afterwards at a cost of \$5,000, but they were still four inches out of code. So the staircase is going to have to be replaced. There were obvious cracks along

1 stress points basically along the entire length 2 of the staircase. I am not going to make a judicial finding that these cracks were caused only by stress on the staircase, but whether it was caused by stress on the staircase or by 5 cracking due to the heat from the wood stove, 6 all of that was known to Mr. Porter when he 8 constructed the staircase and it should have been better built. So for both of those reasons, 10 one because of the code, and two because of the 11 construction of the staircase, the staircase 12 is going to have to be completely rebuilt. 13

Mr. Beck was candid when he stated that he could not recall whether or not a railing was part of the original discussion. I gave Mr. Porter the benefit of the doubt on that and I accordingly deducted the cost of the railing.

A drop-down ceiling was placed throughout by a subcontractor. It is an extensive piece of work involving plaster work on an existing ceiling. The ceiling apparently was attached to strapping that was not dry. The strapping appears to have shrunk and cracked along the seams in the gyproc. I do not believe Mr. Porter is objecting to that conclusion, it is simply a question of what needs to be done to fix it. But

14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22 23

24

2526

it needs to be fixed. As well, there are visible

deficiencies in the walls, there are deficiencies

in the trim and deficiencies in the electrical

outlets. It is all relatively minor work, but

it is all going to have to be done, and there

is going to have to be some substantial work

done. We have a quote on that, which I will

get to shortly, but that was another deficiency.

In the bathroom the toilet was placed six inches too far from the wall, which is not only unsightly, but is actually a bit of a hazard because it can then crack. The floor was not level, resulting in a one-inch gap at one end, or probably a little greater than a one-inch gap at the one end of the tub, which is also not acceptable. The tile also did not meet the vanity which was eventually put in. As this vanity was supplied by the Becks I am not proposing to give value for the original custom vanity that was agreed upon, but the tile work still needs to be redone. The tile work needs to be redone, the floor needs to be levelled, and the toilet needs to be moved. There is also an open unfinished space that should have been filled in the closet, which needs to be addressed.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

2.1

22 23

24

2526

27

In the laundry room there is an open

1	unfinished space which needs to be at the
2	very least drywalled and taped and mudded.
3	There also needs to be a shelf in the closet
4	and a vent cover placed on an open heating
5	vent. Both bedrooms require shelves in the
6	closets. There also needs to be some work
7	done in terms of making safer hatches into
8	the plumbing access ports in the flooring.
9	Upstairs there appears to have been a
10	misunderstanding with respect to the demolition
11	of a wall. That said, the upstairs was left is
12	a totally unsatisfactory state for habitation.
13	There were protruding nails, exposed live wire
14	which, while they were maretted off at least,
15	were not in any way left safe. Work had to
16	be done to correct that and we have a number
17	attached to that as well.
18	There was substantial garbage left outside
19	by way of waste. Now, this was not unexpected
20	but given the way the relationship between the
21	parties went that waste was left at the end in
22	the wintertime and had to be dealt with when
23	the weather cleared.
24	There was an issue with respect to the
25	amount of finish that was done in the wood
26	room. It was not clear to me exactly what

27 had been agreed on between the parties in

the contract. Probably something more should

have been done, but I am not proposing to attach

any dollar figure to that, just because it was

unclear exactly what should have been done.

Given the nature of the work that was done, it was entirely reasonable for the Becks to withhold the final payment until a more substantial completion had been reached. Virtually all of the money that was required had already been paid. They were simply left with about 13 to 15 percent of the outstanding bill remaining, and as I said, it was entirely reasonable for them to withhold that final payment until completion of the work.

I take Mr. Porter at his word when he says he would have remedied everything, but given the way the relationship between the parties went after the filing of the lien it would be completely unreasonable to expect that the Becks would have been content with him coming in to do the work. So we are going to have to look at the costs to get other people to remedy the deficiencies in the undone work.

In terms of Mr. Porter's claim, while

I have rejected the basis for the claim, there
was an agreed upon amount of \$45,000 for the
completion of the work. Since I am going to

2.0

2.1

be imposing judgement against Mr. Porter for

the completed work it is only fair that I deduct

the cost to completion that was contemplated by

the contract.

So there will be a \$6,000 credit against the amount that I am going to award, which brings us to the \$45,000. Because of the misunderstanding with respect to the work upstairs there will be a \$525 credit to Mr. Porter as against the roughly \$1,250 that it cost to get the work upstairs put in a condition where you could use the house. The \$971 that was claimed for miscellaneous work should have been included in the \$6,300 that was set aside in the contract. So I do not credit the \$971, I simply reject it. So the total amount of offset will be \$6,525.

In terms of damages, for the cleanup we heard from Chris Betts from Arcan, which is perhaps the premier contracting firm in town. They typically do commercial work, but they also do some residential work. The original quote was quite high, but it involved the use of a dumpster and also the need to remove the materials during the wintertime. Mr. Betts agreed that a reasonable amount or the minimum amount to remove those materials was a thousand dollars. I will impose judgement for a thousand

2.1

1 dollars with respect to the cleanup.

With respect to the bathroom, we received
a very reasonable quote from Mr. Betts in terms
of levelling the floor, moving the plumbing and
fixing the tile work around the vanity that is
currently in place of \$2,500. I see no reason
to deviate from that \$2,500 and that amount is
imposed as well.

With respect to the staircase the quote was \$8,740. There was a 25 percent acknowledged reduction for that work to be done by a more standard contractor here in town. I take that into account, that the contract with Mr. Porter contemplated someone like Mr. Porter doing the work, and it would not be fair to Mr. Porter to impose the cost of having the highest priced contractor in town doing the work. There is also a 25 percent reduction, which I take from that amount, from the 25 percent already reduced amount for the railing, which leaves an amount just shy of \$5,000. I will raise that to \$5,000simply in fairness. There is going to be some additional work that needs to be done and it is only a matter of about \$70, which is the difference between \$5,000 and the amount I came to. So \$5,000 for the staircase.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

22 23

24

25

27

To fix the sealing and do the necessary

1	painting and patch-up, we heard from Andrey
2	Dziewa. To completely redo the paint work
3	and plaster work in the basement up to the
4	standard that Mr. Dziewa, a professional painter,
5	would have done it, and it was quoted at \$5,040.
6	Mr. Dziewa agreed that if he was only going to do
7	what was necessary to bring it up to a reasonable
8	standard that the amount would be roughly half of
9	that at $$2,500$ . Therefore, there will be $$2,500$ .
10	He said between \$2,000 and \$2,500. There is an
11	extensive amount that needs to be done, so we
12	will make it \$2,500.
13	Moving onto the cabinets in the bathroom,
14	we heard from Mr. Lafferty. A cabinet is going
15	to be $$475$ . That seems like a fair amount, I
16	will impose that. Shelves in the two bedrooms
17	and the one shelf in the laundry room came to
18	a further \$400, for a total of \$875.
19	With respect to the open space in the
20	laundry room, I used my own discretion in
21	terms of coming to a number on that, with
22	respect to gyproc and a vent cover, of \$200.
23	So I add \$200 to the amount for that piece
24	of work.
25	Upstairs, a total of \$1,250 was spent,
26	which seems quite reasonable to bring the
27	upstairs to a state that was safe and usable.

- 1 I will apply the \$1,250 as well, for a total
- of \$13,325. I take \$13,325 and subtract \$6,525.
- 3 I am left with an amount of \$6,800. So there
- 4 is judgement against Mr. Porter in the amount
- 5 of \$6,800 even.
- I make the following orders: The lien
- 7 against 5 Mackie Place, Hay River, Northwest
- 8 Territories, legal description lot 905, plan
- 9 380, Hay River, taken out by Mr. Porter, is
- 10 to be removed. The Becks will have judgement
- against Mr. Porter in the amount of \$6,800.
- 12 I will impose costs in favour of the Becks
- on a party and party basis.
- 14 Madam Clerk, is there anything I have
- 15 neglected that you can think of?
- 16 THE CLERK: I don't believe so, Your
- 17 Honour.
- 18 THE COURT: Is there anything from
- 19 either one of the parties in terms of anything
- I have forgotten?
- 21 MR. BECK: The window wells you never
- 22 spoke about, but I don't know if you just threw
- 23 that out.
- 24 THE COURT: With respect to the window
- 25 wells, my understanding was that the work on
- 26 the exterior of the house was to be completed
- 27 as part of another contract, and that was not

1		substantially	devi	ated from in the testimony.				
2		It was sloppy	leav	ing the cracks in them, but				
3		I do not see any reason to impose anything						
4		further for that.						
5	MR.	BECK:		Okay.				
6	THE	COURT:		I did think about it.				
7		Again, I want	to t	hank you all the way this				
8		went this wee	k.					
9	MR.	BECK:		Thank you.				
10	THE	COURT:		And hopefully you can all				
11		put it behind	you.	I wish you all the best.				
12		Close court.						
13			-					
14								
15				ertified to be a true and ccurate transcript, pursuant				
16			t	o Rules 723 and 724 of the upreme Court Rules.				
17			S	apreme court nates.				
18								
19				oel Bowker ourt Reporter				
20			C	oure Reporter				
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								