

Mediation Direction Framework

1. During the pilot in HDB estates in Tampines, four Mediation Directions were issued.
 - a. Two cases resulted in both parties attending mediation and reaching settlement agreements.
 - b. In one case, both parties attended mediation but were unable to reach an agreement. The case was subsequently referred by HDB to CRU, which has engaged the family to be more mindful of noise from their activities at home. The situation has since improved.
 - c. In the remaining case, the feedback provider did not attend the session and was issued a warning for failure to comply with the Mediation Direction. The feedback provider subsequently withdrew the case.

CRU Pilot Experience in Tampines

2. The CRU was piloted in HDB estates in Tampines from April 2025, focusing on severe neighbour noise cases. These cases represent a small proportion of all disputes between neighbours, but can cause significant distress to affected residents. The pilot was intended to test how such cases could be addressed more effectively, while preserving space for neighbours to resolve disputes amicably where possible.
3. Since the start of the pilot, the CRU has managed nine neighbour noise cases. Five of these cases were assessed to involve severe neighbour noise. Following intervention by the CRU and partner agencies, the noise nuisance in most of these cases has reduced or ceased, bringing relief to affected residents; one case remains ongoing. The remaining four cases were found, after further investigation, not to involve severe noise.
4. The cases that the CRU managed showed that severe neighbour noise can involve different underlying factors and require different interventions.
 - a. In four cases that involved persons with mental health conditions, suspected mental health conditions or special needs, the CRU worked closely with healthcare agencies and community partners, including the Agency for Integrated Care, the Institute of Mental Health, and Family Service Centres, to engage the persons concerned and their families. These efforts helped facilitate assessment, treatment, and more consistent follow-up in most cases, addressing the underlying causes of the noise disturbances and reducing disamenities to residents.
 - b. In one case that involved the deliberate use of noise to disturb neighbours, the noise nuisance stopped following joint intervention by the CRU and partner agencies.

- c. In the four cases where further investigations found no evidence of severe noise, the CRU redirected the parties to other avenues to resolve the dispute, where appropriate. In one case, CRU issued Mediation Directions for both parties to attend mediation at the CMC; the parties involved reached a Settlement Agreement.

5. The pilot underscored the complexity of severe neighbour noise disputes. Some cases require close coordination across agencies and community partners to address underlying issues, while others require firmer intervention where noise is used deliberately to disturb neighbours.

6. For cases involving mental health conditions, agencies will continue to work closely with healthcare, social service, and community partners to support the persons concerned and their families. From 1 September 2026, the CDRT can also order a person to undergo mandatory assessment and/or treatment if there is reason to believe that the person suffers from a mental health condition that is contributing to the unreasonable interference caused to their neighbours, and he has refused voluntary assessment/treatment.

7. The CRU is not a substitute for strong community norms, good neighbourly relations and early dispute resolution. The Government will continue to encourage neighbours to resolve disputes early and amicably, including through community mediation.