



Condo Water Seepage: Build the Presumption Evidence File

Description

In Singapore, an inter-floor water seepage dispute should start with a record of the affected surfaces, dates, weather, use patterns and inspection access before anyone assigns blame. The statutory presumption can guide responsibility, but evidence can rebut it.

The practical task is to preserve the facts needed to test the statutory presumption and choose an inspection, repair or dispute route. A sound decision separates the controlling condition from convenience, then records the evidence before money, travel, work or a deadline makes the choice harder to reverse.

Choose the branch before acting

Situation	Practical next step
Leak appears only during rain	Check facade, roof and common-property routes as well as the upper lot
Leak tracks bathroom or pipe use	Arrange controlled observations and qualified inspection
Access is refused	Keep requests and use the formal MCST or dispute route
Immediate damage is continuing	Mitigate loss without destroying evidence

Map the water path

[BCA Strata Management Guides](#) states the controlling point used here: BCA publishes a dedicated inter-floor water seepage guide covering responsibility, evidence and resolution routes. A stain is an outcome, not proof of the point where water entered. Photograph location and spread over time

For map the water path, this becomes consequential when “Leak appears only during rain” applies. The next move is to check facade, roof and common-property routes as well as the upper lot, but only after the underlying condition has been verified and dated.

Record triggers

Rain, shower use and pipe operation point to different hypotheses. Keep a dated occurrence log

For record triggers, record the result as confirmed, pending or not applicable. If it is still pending, do not let a convenient assumption close the gap; identify the person or service that can resolve it and the last safe time to ask.

Preserve access requests

Inspection cannot be meaningful if relevant lots or common property are excluded. Request access in writing

For preserve access requests, this becomes consequential when “Access is refused” applies. The next move is to keep requests and use the formal MCST or dispute route, but only after the underlying condition has been verified and dated.

Separate common property

[BCA Water Seepage Guide](#) states the controlling point used here: For inter-floor seepage, the law provides a rebuttable presumption concerning the upper and lower lots, while evidence can displace the presumption. Facade, roof and shared pipes may involve the MCST rather than two owners alone. Mark every possible property boundary

For separate common property, record the result as confirmed, pending or not applicable. If it is still pending, do not let a convenient assumption close the gap; identify the person or service that can resolve it and the last safe time to ask.

Use qualified findings

A contractor quotation is not automatically a neutral cause report. Ask for method, observations and limitations

For use qualified findings, this becomes consequential when “Leak appears only during rain” applies. The next move is to check facade, roof and common-property routes as well as the upper lot, but only after the underlying condition has been verified and dated.

Keep remedy separate

The presumption does not decide every repair scope or damage claim. Record cause, repair and compensation as separate issues

For keep remedy separate, record the result as confirmed, pending or not applicable. If it is still pending, do not let a convenient assumption close the gap; identify the person or service that can resolve it and the last safe time to ask.

A leak-trigger matrix distinguishing rain, wet-area use, shared pipes and intermittent condensation

Start with Map the water path, then test Record triggers and Preserve access requests. Show the input, the condition applied and the resulting action in separate columns. If a number is calculated, retain the arithmetic; if a route is selected, retain the branch that ruled out the alternative.

Input or condition	Evidence to keep	Decision it changes
Leak appears only during rain	Photograph location and spread over time	Check facade, roof and common-property routes as well as the upper lot
Leak tracks bathroom or pipe use	Keep a dated occurrence log	Arrange controlled observations and qualified inspection
Access is refused	Request access in writing	Keep requests and use the formal MCST or dispute route

A neutral inspection file with photographs, access requests, findings, repair scope and rebuttal evidence

Use Separate common property, Use qualified findings and Keep remedy separate as the verification pass. Check the live condition, note the time checked and keep the response or document that supports the conclusion. Unknowns remain visible until resolved; they should not be replaced by a guessed price, deadline, eligibility result, service level or operating detail.

Worked example

A ceiling stain grows after heavy rain but not after the upstairs bathroom is used. The lower owner logs both conditions, asks the MCST to inspect the facade and common pipes, and invites access to the upper lot. That file tests the presumption with facts instead of treating the nearest bathroom as automatic proof.

The example is a calculation or decision model, not a guarantee. Change one material input at a time, preserve the original inputs and recheck the live authority or operator page before relying on the result.

Before you commit

1. Check facade, roof and common-property routes as well as the upper lot.

2. Arrange controlled observations and qualified inspection.
3. Keep requests and use the formal MCST or dispute route.
4. Mitigate loss without destroying evidence.
5. Save the date and evidence used for every material condition.
6. Stop and ask the controlling authority, operator or qualified professional if a disputed fact changes the outcome.

Keep the property, party, document, amount and decision date in separate fields. A sales description, managing-agent explanation or remembered conversation should not replace the controlling plan, resolution, contract or regulator record.

Limits

Responsibility depends on the Building Maintenance and Strata Management Act, property boundaries and evidence. Technical or legal advice may be needed for contested cases.

For an adjacent live guide, see [Condo Dispute? Check the Strata Titles Boards Route First](#). If the next decision shifts to a second practical issue, [New Condo Showflat: Check the Mandatory Information First](#) provides the relevant progression without duplicating this primary intent.

Date Created

18/08/2026

Author

nuraisyah