

BPB Complaint No. C2-01291

IN THE MATTER OF

Under the Building Act 2004 (the Act)

A complaint to the Building Practitioners' Board under section 315 of the Act

AGAINST

Scott Campbell, Licensed Building Practitioner No. BP 119857

DECISION OF THE BUILDING PRACTITIONERS' BOARD

Introduction

- [1] [The Complainant] lodged a complaint with the Building Practitioners' Board (the Board) on 19 October 2015 in respect of Scott Campbell, Licensed Building Practitioner (the Respondent).
- [2] The Complaint alleged the Respondent has, in relation to building work at [omitted]:
- (a) carried out or supervised building work or building inspection work in a negligent or incompetent manner (s 317(1)(b) of the Act); and
 - (b) has failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervise, or has carried out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervised, (as the case may be), to provide the persons specified in section 88(2) with a record of work, on completion of the restricted building work, in accordance with section 88(1) (s 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act).
- [3] The Respondent is a Licensed Building Practitioner with a Carpentry Licence issued 3 August 2012.
- [4] The Board has considered the complaint under the provisions of Part 4 of the Act and the Building Practitioners (Complaints and Disciplinary Procedures) Regulations 2008 (the Regulations).
- [5] The following Board Members were present at the hearing:
- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Chris Preston | Chair (Presiding) |
| Richard Merrifield | Deputy Chair |
| Mel Orange | Board Member |
| Dianne Johnson | Board Member |
- [6] The matter was considered by the Board in Wellington on 28 June 2016 in accordance with the Act, the Regulations and the Board's Complaints Procedures.
- [7] Gemma Lawson and Elizabeth Nicholls from the Board Secretariat were present during the course of the hearing.

C2-01291

- [8] No Board Members declared any conflicts of interest in relation to the matters under consideration.

Board Procedure

- [9] The “form of complaint” provided by the Complainant satisfied the requirements of the Regulations.
- [10] On 2 March 2016 the Registrar of the Board prepared a report in accordance with reg 7 and 8 of the Regulations. The purpose of the report is to assist the Board to decide whether or not it wishes to proceed with the complaint.
- [11] On 31 March 2016 the Board considered the Registrar’s report and in accordance with reg 10 it resolved to proceed with the complaint that the Respondent has failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervise, or has carried out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervised, (as the case may be), to provide the persons specified in section 88(2) with a record of work, on completion of the restricted building work, in accordance with section 88(1) (s 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act).

Function of Disciplinary Action

- [12] The common understanding of the purposes of professional discipline is to uphold the integrity of the profession. The focus is not punishment, but the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence and the enforcement of high standards of propriety and professional conduct. Those purposes were recently reiterated by the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom¹.
- [13] In New Zealand the High Court noted in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* :
- Although, in respect of different professions, the nature of the unprofessional or incompetent conduct which will attract disciplinary charges is variously described, there is a common thread of scope and purpose. Such provisions exist to enforce a high standard of propriety and professional conduct; to ensure that no person unfitted because of his or her conduct should be allowed to practise the profession in question; to protect both the public and the profession itself against persons unfit to practise; and to enable the profession or calling, as a body, to ensure that the conduct of members conforms to the standards generally expected of them.*
- [14] It must also be noted that the Board only has jurisdiction with regard to “the conduct of a licensed building practitioner” and with respect to the grounds for discipline set out in s 317 of the Act. It cannot investigate matters outside of those grounds, does not have any jurisdiction over contractual matters and cannot deal with or resolve disputes between a complainant and the person who is the subject of the complaint.
- [15] On 27 April 2016 the Respondent was sent a Notice of Hearing advising that the matter would be dealt with on the papers and advising him that he could attend by phone or video conference and inviting him to submit any further evidence or submissions he wanted the Board to consider.
- [16] On 17 May 2016 a letter was received from the Respondent which contained further information relating to the hearing.

¹ *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* [2011] UKSC 1, 19 January 2011.

C2-01291

The Hearing

- [17] The hearing commenced at 1.45 p.m. The documents before the Board were admitted into evidence.

Substance of the Complaint

- [18] The complaint was that the Respondent had failed to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work.

Evidence

- [19] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed. The relevant authority is *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee*² where Justice McGrath in the Supreme Court of New Zealand stated:

[102] The civil standard has been flexibly applied in civil proceedings no matter how serious the conduct that is alleged. In New Zealand it has been emphasised that no intermediate standard of proof exists, between the criminal and civil standards, for application in certain types of civil case. The balance of probabilities still simply means more probable than not. Allowing the civil standard to be applied flexibly has not meant that the degree of probability required to meet the standard changes in serious cases. Rather, the civil standard is flexibly applied because it accommodates serious allegations through the natural tendency to require stronger evidence before being satisfied to the balance of probabilities standard.

[105] The natural tendency to require stronger evidence is not a legal proposition and should not be elevated to one. It simply reflects the reality of what judges do when considering the nature and quality of the evidence in deciding whether an issue has been resolved to “the reasonable satisfaction of the Tribunal”. A factual assessment has to be made in each case. That assessment has regard to the consequences of the facts proved. Proof of a Tribunal’s reasonable satisfaction will, however, never call for that degree of certainty which is necessary to prove a matter in issue beyond reasonable doubt.

- [20] The Respondent was engaged by a non-licensed builder to supervise an element of a renovation project that involved restricted building work. The project was undertaken between July and September 2013.
- [21] A record of work was not provided until after a complaint was made in November 2015.
- [22] The Respondent accepted that he supervised restricted building work in or about August 2013 but submitted he was unaware the overall project was complete and that a record of work was required until he was contacted by the non-licensed builder he was supervising in June 2014. He further submitted that due to personal circumstances he inadvertently did not deal with the record of work until the matter was further brought to his attention when notice of the complaint was received. These circumstances were not raised when the Respondent provided his initial

² [2009] 1 NZLR 1

C2-01291

response to the complaint but were submitted in his letter of 17 May 2016. In the original response he stated it *“just came down to a miscommunication”*.

- [23] The Complainant provided details of various communications between him and the non-licensed builder outlining attempts to obtain a record of work.

Boards Conclusion and Reasoning

- [24] There is a statutory requirement under s 88(1) of the Building Act 2004 for a licensed building practitioner to provide a record of work to the owner and the building consent authority on completion of restricted building work.
- [25] Failing to provide a record of work is a ground for discipline under s 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act. In order to find that ground for discipline proven, the Board need only consider whether the Respondent had “good reason” for not providing a record of work on “completion” of the restricted building work.
- [26] The Board discussed issues with regard to records of work in its decision C2-01170³ and gave guidelines to the profession as to who must provide a record of work, what a record of work is for, when it is to be provided, the level of detail that must be provided, who a record of work must be provided to and what might constitute a good reason for not providing a record of work.
- [27] It was clear on the evidence before the Board that the restricted building work supervised by the Respondent was complete in or about August 2013 and that the requirement to provide a record of work arose then. It is to be noted that a record of work is to be provided on the completion of the restricted building work, not on the completion of the project as a whole. It should also be noted that even if the later date is taken then there was still significant delay.
- [28] Section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act provides for a defence of the licensed building practitioner having a “good reason” for failing to provide a record of work. If they can, on the balance of probabilities, prove to the Board that one exists, then it is open to the Board to find that a disciplinary offence has not been committed.
- [29] The Respondent has put forward various personal circumstances. These were raised well after the initial response was provided and do not account for the significant delays involved. They will, however be taken into consideration as mitigation.

Board Decision

- [30] The Board has decided that the Respondent has failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervise, or has carried out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervised, (as the case may be), to provide the persons specified in section 88(2) with a record of work, on completion of the restricted building work, in accordance with section 88(1) (s 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act) and should be disciplined.

³ Licensed Building Practitioners Board Case Decision C2-01170 15 December 2015

C2-01291

Disciplinary Penalties

- [31] The grounds upon which a Licensed Building Practitioner may be disciplined are set out in s 317 of the Act. If one or more of the grounds in s 317 applies, then the Board may apply disciplinary penalties as set out in s 318 of the Act.
- [32] The Board's Complaints Procedures allow the Board to either set out the Board's decision on disciplinary penalty, publication and costs or to invite the Respondent to make submissions on those matters.
- [33] As part of the materials provided to the Board for the Hearing the Respondent provided submissions which were relevant to penalty, publication and costs and the Board has taken these into consideration.
- [34] Given the nature of the disciplinary offending, the mitigation already heard and the level of penalty decided on, the Board has decided to dispense with calling for further submissions. The Respondent will, however, be given an opportunity to comment on the level of penalty, costs and on publication should he consider there a further matters which the Board should take into consideration.
- [35] As stated earlier the purpose of professional discipline is to uphold the integrity of the profession; the focus is not punishment, but the enforcement of a high standard of propriety and professional conduct.
- [36] The Board does note, however, that the High Court in *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee*⁴ has, however, commented on the role of "punishment" in giving penalty orders stating that punitive orders are, at times, necessary to uphold professional standards:
- [27] Such penalties may be appropriate because disciplinary proceedings inevitably involve issues of deterrence. They are designed in part to deter both the offender and others in the profession from offending in a like manner in the future.*
- [28] I therefore propose to proceed on the basis that, although the protection of the public is a very important consideration, nevertheless the issues of punishment and deterrence must also be taken into account in selecting the appropriate penalty to be imposed.*
- [37] In all the circumstances of the case the Board considers a fine of \$1,000 to be appropriate penalty.

Costs

- [38] Under s 318(4) the Board may require the Respondent "to pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board."
- [39] The Respondent should note that the High Court has held that 50% of total reasonable costs should be taken as a starting point in disciplinary proceedings and that the percentage can then be adjusted up or down having regard to the particular circumstances of each case. The judgement in *Cooray v The Preliminary Proceedings Committee*⁵ included the following:

⁴ HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

⁵ HC, Wellington, AP23/94, 14 September 1995

C2-01291

“It would appear from the cases before the Court that the Council in other decisions made by it has in a general way taken 50% of total reasonable costs as a guide to a reasonable order for costs and has in individual cases where it has considered it is justified gone beyond that figure. In other cases, where it has considered that such an order is not justified because of the circumstances of the case, and counsel has referred me to at least two cases where the practitioner pleaded guilty and lesser orders were made, the Council has made a downward adjustment.”

[40] The judgment in *Macdonald v Professional Conduct Committee*⁶ confirmed the approach taken in *Cooray*. This was further confirmed in a complaint to the Plumbers, Gasfitters and Drainlayers’ Board, *Owen v Wynyard*⁷ where the judgment referred with approval to the passages from *Corray* and *Macdonald* in upholding a 24% costs order made by the Board.

[41] In *Collie v Nursing Counsel of New Zealand*⁸ where the order for costs in the tribunal was 50% of actual costs and expenses the High Court noted that:

But for an order for costs made against a practitioner, the profession is left to carry the financial burden of the disciplinary proceedings, and as a matter of policy that is not appropriate. It is not hard to see that the award of costs may have imposed some real burden upon the appellant but it is not fixed at a level which disturbs the Court’s conscience as being excessive. Accordingly it is confirmed.

[42] The Board notes the Respondent was cooperative and that the matter was dealt with on the papers. For these reasons the amount of costs has been reduced. The Board considers that the sum of \$500 is a fair and reasonable contribution toward the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.

Publication of Name

[43] As a consequence of its decision the Respondent’s name and the disciplinary outcomes will be recorded in the public register maintained as part of the Licenced Building Practitioners’ scheme as is required by the Act.

[44] The Board is also able, under s 318(5) of the Act, to order publication over and above the public register:

In addition to requiring the Registrar to notify in the register an action taken by the Board under this section, the Board may publicly notify the action in any other way it thinks fit.

[45] As a general principle such further public notification may be required where the Board perceives a need for the public and/or the profession to know of the findings of a disciplinary hearing. This is in addition to the Respondent being named in this decision.

[46] The Board does not consider further publication is required.

Penalty, Costs and Publication Decision

[47] For the reasons set out above, the Board directs that:

⁶ HC, Auckland, CIV 2009-404-1516, 10 July 2009

⁷ High Court, Auckland, CIV-2009-404-005245, 25 February 2010

⁸ [2001] NZAR 74

C2-01291

- Penalty:** Pursuant to s (1)(f) of the Building Act 2004, the Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000.
- Costs:** Pursuant to s 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$500 (GST included) towards the costs of, and incidental to, the inquiry of the Board.
- Publication:** The Registrar shall record the Board's action in the Register of Licensed Building Practitioners in accordance with s 301(1)(iii) of the Act.
- In terms of section 318(5) of the Act, there will not be action taken to publicly notify the Board's action, except for the note in the register and the Respondent being named in this decision.

Submissions on Penalty Costs and Publication

- [48] The Board invites the Respondent to make written submissions on the matters of disciplinary penalties, costs and publication up until close of business on 1 August 2016.
- [49] If no submissions are received then this decision will become final.
- [50] If submissions are received then the Board will meet and consider those submissions prior to coming to a final decision on penalty, costs and publication.

Right of Appeal

- [51] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in s 330(2) of the Act.

Signed and dated this 11th day of July 2016



Chris Preston
Presiding Member

ⁱ **Section 318 of the Act**

- (1) *In any case to which section 317 applies, the Board may*
- (a) *do both of the following things:*
 - (i) *cancel the person's licensing, and direct the Registrar to remove the person's name from the register; and*
 - (ii) *order that the person may not apply to be relicensed before the expiry of a specified period:*
 - (b) *suspend the person's licensing for a period of no more than 12 months or until the person meets specified conditions relating to the licensing (but, in any case, not for a period of more than 12 months) and direct the Registrar to record the suspension in the register:*

-
- (c) *restrict the type of building work or building inspection work that the person may carry out or supervise under the person's licensing class or classes and direct the Registrar to record the restriction in the register:*
 - (d) *order that the person be censured:*
 - (e) *order that the person undertake training specified in the order:*
 - (f) *order that the person pay a fine not exceeding \$10,000.*
- (2) *The Board may take only one type of action in subsection 1(a) to (d) in relation to a case, except that it may impose a fine under subsection (1)(f) in addition to taking the action under subsection (1)(b) or (d).*
 - (3) *No fine may be imposed under subsection (1)(f) in relation to an act or omission that constitutes an offence for which the person has been convicted by a court.*
 - (4) *In any case to which section 317 applies, the Board may order that the person must pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.*
 - (5) *In addition to requiring the Registrar to notify in the register an action taken by the Board under this section, the Board may publicly notify the action in any other way it thinks fit."*