



Dispute Resolution Services

Page: 1

Residential Tenancy Branch
Office of Housing and Construction Standards

A matter regarding Robert A. Ash & Associates Ltd.
and [tenant name suppressed to protect privacy]

DECISION

Dispute Codes ERP

Introduction

This hearing dealt with an application by the tenant for emergency repairs. The tenant and two agents for the landlord participated in the teleconference hearing.

At the outset of the hearing, the landlord confirmed that they had received the tenant's application and the tenant confirmed that he had received the landlord's evidence. Neither party raised any issues regarding service of the application or the evidence. I have reviewed all testimony and other evidence. However, only the evidence relevant to the issues and findings in this matter are described in this decision.

Issue(s) to be Decided

Should I order the landlord to carry out emergency repairs?

Background and Evidence

The tenancy began approximately 14 years ago. The rental unit is an apartment in a multi-unit building. The tenant seeks an order that the landlord install either security cameras in the common areas on his floor of the building or a new lock or security system for his apartment. The tenant believes this is necessary for his safety, as he believes that an intruder seeks to enter his apartment. The tenant cited several instances during the course of his tenancy where he found signs that someone may have entered his apartment and tampered with his possessions, as well as past incidents of theft and vandalism that have occurred in common areas of the building.

The landlord's response to the tenant's application was that the landlord has taken steps on numerous occasions to try to provide the tenant with a sense of safety and security in his rental unit. The landlord has installed a high security dead bolt lock on the tenant's suite door; provided the tenant a latch and padlock as additional security for his

suite door; upgraded the interior latch; and strengthened the door jam and frame of the suite door. The landlord stated that the police attended the rental unit on July 24, 2013 and September 2, 2013, and on both occasions the police found no sign of forced entry or unlawful intrusion. The landlord stated that they are available 24/7 for emergencies, and they have responded to the tenant's calls. The landlord stated that no further safety measures were required for the tenant's suite.

Analysis

I find that no emergency repairs are required. I find that the tenant has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that his unit requires further security measures. I accept the landlord's evidence that they have taken and will continue to take sufficient steps to address the tenant's concerns. If the tenant continues to fear for his safety in his rental unit and he wishes to make alterations to his unit, such as installing a security system, he will have to do so only after receiving the landlord's permission, and at his own expense.

Conclusion

The application of the tenant is dismissed.

This decision is made on authority delegated to me by the Director of the Residential Tenancy Branch under Section 9.1(1) of the *Residential Tenancy Act*.

Dated: October 21, 2013

Residential Tenancy Branch