DAVIES & DAVIES

Davies & Davies Associates Ltd
Solicitors & Chartered Surveyors

31 Pearce Drive Faringdon Oxfordshire SN7 7ND
0800 840 4025 enquiries@dda.law **www.dda.law**

December 13, 2024

Education 4 Ayrshire Limited v South Ayrshire Council [2009] CSOH 146 CA37-09

Education 4 Ayrshire Limited v South Ayrshire Council [2009] CSOH 146 CA37-09

Date: 4 November 2009

Key Words:

Construction Law, Contractual Notice, Conditions Precedent, Strict Compliance, Formal Notice Regime, Time Limits, Works Compensation Event, Public Private Partnership (PPP)

Summary

This judgment addresses a dispute between Education 4 Ayrshire Limited ("the Contractor") and South Ayrshire Council ("the Authority") over delays in constructing Prestwick Academy under the South Ayrshire Schools PPP. The Contractor claimed the discovery of unforeseen asbestos (Type 3 Asbestos) was a "Works Compensation Event" under their Project Agreement, entitling them to an extension of time and compensation. While the court agreed with the Contractor's entitlement, their failure to provide proper notice under Clause 17.6.1 of the Project Agreement barred the claim. This judgment was not referenced in *FES Ltd v HFD Construction Group Ltd* [2024] CSIH 37 (25 October 2024).

Key Themes:

1. ***Contractual Interpretation:*** *Focuses on interpreting notice provisions in a complex construction contract, emphasising adherence to these clauses.*
2. ***Conditions Precedent:*** *Examines whether strict compliance with notice provisions is a condition precedent for relief claims and its implications.*
3. ***Construction Industry Context:*** *Highlights the complexities of large-scale projects and the necessity of clear mechanisms for managing delays and compensation.*

Background

The Contractor agreed to design and construct six schools for the Authority, including Prestwick Academy, under a Project Agreement. The Agreement allowed extensions of time and compensation for "Works Compensation Events," such as unforeseen asbestos discoveries causing delays.

Encountering Type 3 Asbestos during construction led to delays and increased costs. The Contractor sought a 16-week extension and £815,792.00 plus VAT and interest.

Legal Issues and Analysis

The main legal issue was whether the Contractor complied with the notice requirements of Clause 17, particularly Clause 17.6.1.

- **Notice as a Condition Precedent:** Both parties agreed that adherence to Clauses 17.1 and 17.6 was a condition precedent for relief [11].
- **Content of the Notice:** The court analysed a letter dated 2 May 2007, the only timely communication [6,7,12]. While the letter referred to Clause 17.1 and detailed delays, it failed to explicitly claim relief as required under Clause 17.6.1 [12].
- **Strict Compliance:** The court stressed strict compliance with Clause 17.6.1, requiring a clear, formal statement of claim sent to the Chief Executive within the prescribed timeframe [17,18].
- **Rejection of Contextual Arguments:** The court dismissed the argument that the Authority's awareness of delays through informal communications replaced formal notice. It emphasised that Clause 17.6.1 aimed to provide clarity and avoid uncertainty [12,19].

Conclusion

The court ruled that the letter of 2 May 2007 did not meet the requirements of Clause 17.6.1 because it lacked an explicit claim for relief. Consequently, the Contractor's claim for an extension of time and compensation was dismissed.

Key Takeaway:

This judgment underscores the importance of strictly adhering to contractual notice provisions, particularly when they act as conditions precedent for relief. Informal communications or extrinsic evidence cannot substitute for formal compliance. This case serves as a critical reminder for parties in construction and other contractual arrangements to meticulously follow prescribed procedures to safeguard their rights.

Ratio Decidendi & Obiter Dicta:

Ratio

The pursuer's failure to provide a valid notice under Clause 17.6.1 of the Project Agreement, explicitly stating their claim for an extension of time and compensation, barred their claim for relief despite the presence of a "Works Compensation Event." The court's reasoning included:

- ***Clause 17.6.1 as a Condition Precedent:** Both parties agreed it was a condition precedent to entitlement for relief [11].*
- ***Invalid Notice:** The letter of 2 May 2007 referred to potential claims but lacked an explicit statement of claim, rendering it invalid [12].*
- ***Strict Compliance Required:** The court emphasised strict adherence to the clause's clear wording, rejecting reliance on the Authority's awareness of delays. The formal notice regime ensured certainty and avoided disputes from informal communications [18,19].*

Key paragraphs for the ratio: [11, 12, 17–19].

Obiter

The court made the following non-binding observations:

- ***Content of Notice:*** *A notice under Clause 17.6.1 might not need to state that the delay was caused by a Works Compensation Event, as this would be evident from Clause 17.1 [18].*
- ***Waiver or Personal Bar:*** *Strict notice requirements might be mitigated if waiver or personal bar principles apply [19].*

Key paragraphs for obiter dicta: [18, 19].

Bad Weather Delay

The court also addressed a secondary issue regarding bad weather delays, concluding:

- *Parasitic on Asbestos Delay: If linked to the asbestos delay, the bad weather claim failed for the same reasons as the main claim [21].*
- *Independent Delay: If independent, bad weather did not qualify as a Works Compensation Event, so no relief was available [21].*

This discussion in paragraph [21] is considered obiter, as the primary issue was the invalid notice under Clause 17.6.1.

Parting Thoughts - Navigating Legal Technicalities: A Matter of Context

*This case underscores the importance of meticulous attention to contractual details. Even with a legitimate basis for relief, the failure to meet explicit requirements can result in dismissal. Contracts, especially in complex fields like construction, establish formal frameworks with strict rules. While open communication and contextual understanding are helpful, they cannot override contractual terms. Parties must diligently comply with obligations to safeguard their rights and interests***.**

Regarding conditions precedent, it is worth considering the following notable judgments from both the UK and international jurisdictions*:*

1. *Steria Limited v Sigma Wireless Communications Limited [2007] EWHC 3454 (TCC) – December 21, 2007.*
2. *J Murphy & Sons Ltd v Johnston Precast Ltd (Formerly Johnston Pipes Ltd) [2008] EWHC 3024 (TCC) – December 10, 2008.*
3. *Obrascon Huarte Lain SA v Her Majesty's Attorney General for Gibraltar [2014] EWHC 1028 (TCC) – April 29, 2014.*
4. *Nobahar-Cookson & Ors v The Hut Group Ltd [2016] EWCA Civ 128 – March 1, 2016.*
5. *V CSK 449/16 (Poland Supreme Court) – March 23, 2017.*
6. *Yuanda (UK) Company Limited v Multiplex Construction Europe Limited & Others [2020] EWHC 468 – March 6, 2020.*
7. *Maeda Corporation and China State Construction Engineering (Hong Kong) Limited v Bauer Hong Kong Limited [2020] HKCA 830; CACV 301/2019 – September 11, 2020.*
8. *KME Services NZ Pty Ltd v CPB Contractors Pty Ltd [2021] NZHC 212 – February 26, 2021.*
9. *Valmont Interiors Pty Ltd v Giorgio Armani Australia Pty Ltd (No 2) [2021] NSWCA 93.*
10. *Tata Consultancy Services Ltd v Disclosure and Barring Service [2022] EWHC 1185 (TCC) – May 20, 2022.*
11. *Panther Real Estate Development LLC v Modern Executive Systems Contracting LLC [2022] DIFC CA 016 – May 12, 2023.*

12. *FES Ltd against HFD Construction Group Ltd (Court of Session) [2024] CSIH 37 – October 25, 2024.*

#ConstructionLaw #ContractualNotice #ConditionsPrecedent #StrictCompliance #FormalNotice #PPP #ConstructionContracts #LegalPrecedent #ScottishLaw #TimeLimitsInLaw #ContractLaw #CaseLaw #UKLaw #ScotsLaw

Nigel Davies BSc(Hons) (Q.Surv), PGCert.Psych, GDipLaw, PGDipLP, DipArb, MSc (Built Environment), LLM (Construction Law & Practice), MSc (Mechanical & Electrical), MSc (Psychology), FRICS, FCIOB, FCInstCES, FCIArb, CArb, GMBPsS, Panel Registered Adjudicator, Mediator, Mediation Advocate, Chartered Builder & Chartered Construction Manager, Chartered Surveyor & Civil Engineering Surveyor, Chartered Arbitrator, Author, and Solicitor-Advocate

Adjudicator Assessor and Re-Assessor for the ICE and the CIArb
Arbitrator Assessor for the CIArb
ICE DRC Member
ICE DRC CPD Committee Chairman
Adjudicator Exam Question Setter for the ICE
CIArb Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
CIArb Arbitration Panel Member since 2006
CIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2010
Law Society Panel Arbitrator
RIBA Adjudication Panel Member since 2018
RICS Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
TECSA Adjudication Panel Member since 2012
FIDIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
ICE Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
RICS Dispute Board Registered since 2013

The information & opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily comprehensive, nor do they represent the trenchant view of the author; in any event, this article does not purport to offer professional advice. This article has been prepared as a summary and is intended for general guidance only. In the case of a specific problem, it is recommended that professional advice be sought.

© 2024 Davies & Davies Associates Ltd

Back to Legal Updates