

Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. CB25677
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Zunlong Guan (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 114839
Licence(s) Held:	Carpentry and Roofing

Decision of the Board in Respect of the Conduct of a Licensed Building Practitioner

Under section 315 of the Building Act 2004

Complaint or Board Inquiry	Complaint
Hearing Location	Auckland
Hearing Type:	In Person
Hearing Date:	29 June 2021
Decision Date:	25 September 2021

Board Members Present:

Mr C Preston, Chair (Presiding)
Mr D Fabish, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2
Mr B Monteith, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2
Mrs F Pearson-Green, LBP, Design AOP 2

Procedure:

The matter was considered by the Building Practitioners Board (the Board) under the provisions of Part 4 of the Building Act 2004 (the Act), the Building Practitioners (Complaints and Disciplinary Procedures) Regulations 2008 (the Complaints Regulations) and the Board's Complaints and Inquiry Procedures.

Disciplinary Finding:

The Respondent **has** committed a disciplinary offence under section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act.

Contents

Summary of the Board’s Decision	2
The Charges	2
Function of Disciplinary Action	3
Inquiry Process	4
Evidence	4
Board’s Conclusion and Reasoning	5
Negligence and/or Incompetence	5
Record of Work.....	7
Penalty, Costs and Publication	8
Penalty	9
Costs.....	9
Publication	10
Section 318 Order	11
Submissions on Penalty, Costs and Publication	11
Right of Appeal	12

Summary of the Board’s Decision

[1] The Respondent to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work. He is fined \$2,000. The amount of the fine has been increased as this is the Respondent’s third offence. He is ordered to pay costs of \$500. The Respondent’s conduct with regard to negligence or incompetence was not serious enough for the Board to make a disciplinary finding.

The Charges

[2] The hearing resulted from a complaint about the conduct of the Respondent and a Board resolution under regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations¹ to hold a hearing in relation to building work at [Omitted]. The alleged disciplinary offences the Board resolved to investigate were that the Respondent:

- (a) carried out or supervised building work or building inspection work in a negligent or incompetent manner contrary to section 317(1)(b) of the Act, IN THAT, he may have carried out or supervised the following building work that might not have reached the standard expected of a Licensed Building Practitioner:

¹ The resolution was made following the Board’s consideration of a report prepared by the Registrar in accordance with the Complaints Regulations.

- (i) the building work set out in the complaint and photographs on Pages 29 through to page 39 of the Registrar’s Report (documents 2.1.15 to 2.1.25) and;
 - (ii) the building work identified in failed Council building inspections; and
- (b) failed to provide a record of work for 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) of the Act contrary to section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act.

Function of Disciplinary Action

[3] The common understanding of the purpose 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 Kingdom in *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales*² and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*³.

[4] Disciplinary action under the Act is not designed to redress issues or disputes between a complainant and a respondent. In *McLanahan and Tan v The New Zealand Registered Architects Board*,⁴ Collins J. noted that:

“... the disciplinary process does not exist to appease those who are dissatisfied The disciplinary process ... exists to ensure professional standards are maintained in order to protect clients, the profession and the broader community.”

[5] In a similar vein, the Board’s investigation and hearing process is not designed to address every issue that is raised in a complaint or by a complainant. The disciplinary scheme under the Act and Complaint’s Regulations focuses on serious conduct that warrants investigation and, if upheld, disciplinary action. Focusing on serious conduct is consistent with decisions made in the New Zealand courts in relation to the conduct of licensed persons⁵:

... the statutory test is not met by mere professional incompetence or by deficiencies in the practice of the profession. Something more is required. It includes a deliberate departure from accepted standards or such serious negligence as, although not deliberate, to portray indifference and an abuse.

[6] Finally, the Board can only inquire into “the conduct of a licensed building practitioner” with respect to the grounds for discipline set out in section 317 of the

² *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* [2011] UKSC 1, 19 January 2011.

³ [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724

⁴ [2016] HZHC 2276 at para 164

⁵ *Pillai v Messiter (No 2)* (1989) 16 NSWLR 197 (A) at 200

Act. Those grounds do not include contractual breaches other than when the conduct reaches the high threshold for consideration under section 317(1)(i) of the Act, which deals with disrepute.

- [7] The above commentary on the limitations of the disciplinary process are important to note as, on the basis of it, the Board's inquiries, and this decision, focus on and deal with the serious conduct complained about.

Inquiry Process

- [8] The investigation and hearing procedure under the Act and Complaints Regulations is inquisitorial, not adversarial. There is no requirement for a complainant to prove the allegations. Rather the Board sets the charges, and it decides what evidence is required at a hearing to assist it in its investigations. In this respect, the Board reviews the available evidence when considering the Registrar's Report and determines the witnesses that it believes will assist at a hearing. The hearing itself is not a review of all of the available evidence. Rather it is an opportunity for the Board to seek clarification and explore certain aspects of the charges in greater depth.
- [9] Whilst a complainant may not be required to give evidence at a hearing, they are welcome to attend and, if a complainant does attend, the Board provides them with an opportunity to participate in the proceedings.

Evidence

- [10] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed⁶. Under section 322 of the Act, the Board has relaxed rules of evidence that allow it to receive evidence that may not be admissible in a court of law.
- [11] The procedure the Board uses is inquisitorial, not adversarial. The Board examines the documentary evidence available to it prior to the hearing. The hearing is an opportunity for the Board, as the inquirer and decision-maker, to call and question witnesses to further investigate aspects of the evidence and to take further evidence from key witnesses. The hearing is not a review of all of the available evidence.
- [12] In addition to the documentary evidence before the Board heard evidence at the hearing from the Complainant, [Omitted] and the Respondent.
- [13] The Respondent was engaged to carry out cladding and roofing work on an existing dwelling under a building consent. The building work included restricted building work for which a record of work must be provided on completion. The Respondent's building work started on or about 1 February 2020 and came to an end on or about 6 May 2020. A record of work dated 15 August 2020 was, according to the Respondent, provided on 15 August 2020.

⁶ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

- [14] At the hearing, the Complainant confirmed the issues as outlined in his complaint, the main ones being:
- a. Poor installation of corner soakers;
 - b. Issues with roof cladding junctions;
 - c. Missing fillets under joinery;
 - d. Incorrect installation of a steel beam; and
 - e. Roof not fully secured with a screw missing.
- [15] A number of the above issues were also raised in a Council Inspection dated the 24 October 2020.
- [16] The cost to fix the issues that were not remedied by the Respondent totalled \$2,000 plus GST.
- [17] The Respondent gave evidence that, in the case of the corner soakers not being the ones that the cladding provider specified and the steel beam issue, he had, at the time, spoken to the Complainant who was acting as the project manager about the issues and was advised to proceed.
- [18] The Complainant also alleged the Respondent did not provide a record of work on completion of the Respondent's restricted building work. Rather it was only provided when it was requested. There was no record of work on the Council files.

Board's Conclusion and Reasoning

- [19] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has not** carried out or supervised building work or building inspection work in a negligent or incompetent manner (s 317(1)(b) of the Act).
- [20] The Board has also 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.

Negligence and/or Incompetence

- [21] Negligence and incompetence are not the same. In *Beattie v Far North Council*⁷ Judge McElrea noted:

[43] Section 317 of the Act uses the phrase "in a negligent or incompetent manner", so it is clear that those adjectives cannot be treated as synonymous.

⁷ Judge McElrea, DC Whangarei, CIV-2011-088-313

- [22] Negligence is the departure by a licensed building practitioner whilst carrying out or supervising building work from an accepted standard of conduct. It is judged against those of the same class of licence as the person whose conduct is being inquired into. This is described as the *Bolam*⁸ test of negligence which has been adopted by the New Zealand Courts⁹.
- [23] Incompetence is a lack of ability, skill, or knowledge to carry out or supervise building work to an acceptable standard. *Beattie* put it as “*a demonstrated lack of the reasonably expected ability or skill level*”. In *Ali v Kumar and Others*,¹⁰ it was stated as “*an inability to do the job*”.
- [24] The New Zealand Courts have stated that an assessment of negligence and/or incompetence in a disciplinary context is a two-stage test¹¹. The first is for the Board to consider whether the practitioner has departed from the acceptable standard of conduct of a professional. The second is to consider whether the departure is significant enough to warrant a disciplinary sanction.
- [25] When considering what an acceptable standard is, the Board must have reference to the conduct of other competent and responsible practitioners and the Board’s own assessment of what is appropriate conduct, bearing in mind the purpose of the Act¹². The test is an objective one, and in this respect, it has been noted that the purpose of discipline is the protection of the public by the maintenance of professional standards and that this could not be met if, in every case, the Board was required to take into account subjective considerations relating to the practitioner¹³.
- [26] The Board notes that the purposes of the Act are:

3 Purposes

This Act has the following purposes:

- (a) *to provide for the regulation of building work, the establishment of a licensing regime for building practitioners, and the setting of performance standards for buildings to ensure that—*
- (i) *people who use buildings can do so safely and without endangering their health; and*
 - (ii) *buildings have attributes that contribute appropriately to the health, physical independence, and well-being of the people who use them; and*
 - (iii) *people who use a building can escape from the building if it is on fire; and*

⁸ *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582

⁹ *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

¹⁰ *Ali v Kumar and Others* [2017] NZDC 23582 at [30]

¹¹ *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

¹² *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 at p.33

¹³ *McKenzie v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2004] NZAR 47 at p.71

- (iv) *buildings are designed, constructed, and able to be used in ways that promote sustainable development:*
- (b) *to promote the accountability of owners, designers, builders, and building consent authorities who have responsibilities for ensuring that building work complies with the building code.*

[27] The Board also notes, as regards acceptable standards, that all building work must comply with the Building Code¹⁴ and be carried out in accordance with a building consent¹⁵. As such, when considering what is and is not an acceptable standard, the Building Code and any building consent issued must be taken into account.

[28] Turning to seriousness in *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,¹⁶ the Court's noted, as regards the threshold for disciplinary matters, that:

[21] Negligence or malpractice may or may not be sufficient to constitute professional misconduct and the guide must be standards applicable by competent, ethical and responsible practitioners and there must be behaviour which falls seriously short of that which is to be considered acceptable and not mere inadvertent error, oversight or for that matter carelessness.

[29] The Board, which includes persons with extensive experience and expertise in the building industry, was of the view that the conduct was not sufficiently serious enough to warrant a disciplinary outcome, but the Respondent must, in future, pay more attention to the quality and compliance of the work he carries out or supervises.

[30] In addition, if, in the future, the Respondent is asked to undertake work or use materials that he feels are not appropriate, he should refuse to do the work or use those materials.

Record of Work

[31] There is a statutory requirement under section 88(1) of the Building Act 2004 for a licensed building practitioner to provide a record of work to the owner and the territorial authority on completion of restricted building work¹⁷.

[32] Failing to provide a record of work is a ground for discipline under section 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.

[33] The Board discussed issues with regard to records of work in its decision C2-01170¹⁸ 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

¹⁴ Section 17 of the Building Act 2004

¹⁵ Section 40(1) of the Building Act 2004

¹⁶ [2001] NZAR 74

¹⁷ Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

¹⁸ *Licensed Building Practitioners Board Case Decision C2-01170* 15 December 2015

provided, who a record of work must be provided to and what might constitute a good reason for not providing a record of work.

- [34] The starting point with a record of work is that it is a mandatory statutory requirement whenever restricted building work under a building consent is carried out or supervised by a licensed building practitioner (other than as an owner-builder). Each and every licensed building practitioner who carries out restricted building work must provide a record of work.
- [35] The statutory provisions do not stipulate a timeframe for the licenced person to provide a record of work. The provisions in section 88(1) simply states “on completion of the restricted building work ...”. As was noted by Justice Muir in *Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment v Bell*¹⁹ “... the only relevant precondition to the obligations of a licenced building practitioner under s 88 is that he/she has completed their work”.
- [36] As to when completion will have occurred is a question of fact in each case. In most situations’ issues with the provision of a record of work do not arise. The work progresses, and records of work are provided in a timely fashion.
- [37] In this case, the Respondent had completed his restricted building work on or around 6 May 2020. A record of work was not provided to the Complainant until 15 August 2020, and only after the complainant had asked for it. A record of work was not provided to the Territorial Authority. On this basis, the Board finds that the record of work was not provided on completion as required, and the disciplinary offence has been committed.
- [38] Section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act provides for a defence of the licenced 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. Each case will be decided by the Board on its own merits, but the threshold for a good reason is high. No good reasons were advanced.

Penalty, Costs and Publication

- [39] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 317 applies, the Board must, under section 318 of the Actⁱ, consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [40] The Board heard evidence during the hearing relevant to penalty, costs and publication and has decided to make indicative orders and give the Respondent an opportunity to provide further evidence or submissions relevant to the indicative orders.

¹⁹ [2018] NZHC 1662 at para 50

Penalty

[41] 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. The Board does note, however, that the High Court in *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee*²⁰ commented on the role of “punishment” in giving penalty orders stating that punitive orders are, at times, necessary to provide a deterrent and to uphold professional standards. The Court noted:

[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.

[42] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*,²¹ the Court noted that whilst the statutory principles of sentencing set out in the Sentencing Act 2002 do not apply to the Building Act, they do have the advantage of simplicity and transparency. The Court recommended adopting a starting point for a penalty based on the seriousness of the disciplinary offending prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors.

[43] Record of work matters are at the lower end of the disciplinary scale. The Board’s normal starting point for a failure to provide a record of work is a fine of \$1,500, an amount which it considers will deter others from such behaviour.

[44] The Respondent has previously appeared before the Board on a record of work matters. In CB25248, and again in CB25520, the Respondent was found to have been negligent and to have failed to provide records of work. Both matters were heard in early 2020, and before the current disciplinary conduct took place. It is an aggravating factor. Accordingly, the Board has decided to increase the penalty from the normal starting point. There are no mitigating factors.

[45] Based on the above, the Board’s penalty decision is that the Respondent be fined the sum of \$2,000. The Board hopes the Respondent will now amend his ways and issue records of work in a timely manner.

Costs

[46] Under section 318(4) the Board may require the Respondent “to pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.”

[47] 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

²⁰ HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

²¹ 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288

that the percentage can then be adjusted up or down having regard to the particular circumstances of each case²².

- [48] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,²³ 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.

- [49] The Board notes the matter was dealt with at a hearing. Ordinarily, the Board's costs scale for a half-day hearing is \$3,500. It is noted, however, that the charge under section 317(1)(b) was not upheld. On that basis, the Board has decided to reduce the costs to the amount that would normally be imposed for a record of work matters dealt with on the papers. As such, the Board will order that costs of \$500 be paid by the Respondent. The Board considers that this is a reasonable sum for the Respondent to pay toward the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.

Publication

- [50] 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 Licensed Building Practitioners' scheme as is required by the Act²⁴. The Board is also able, under section 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.

- [51] 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.
- [52] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990²⁵. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction²⁶. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive²⁷. The High Court provided

²² *Cooray v The Preliminary Proceedings Committee* HC, Wellington, AP23/94, 14 September 1995, *Macdonald v Professional Conduct Committee*, HC, Auckland, CIV 2009-404-1516, 10 July 2009, *Owen v Wynyard* HC, Auckland, CIV-2009-404-005245, 25 February 2010.

²³ [2001] NZAR 74

²⁴ Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

²⁵ Section 14 of the Act

²⁶ Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

²⁷ *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

guidance as to the types of factors to be taken into consideration in *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council*²⁸.

[53] The courts have also stated that an adverse finding in a disciplinary case usually requires that the name of the practitioner be published in the public interest²⁹. It is, however, common practice in disciplinary proceedings to protect the names of other persons involved as naming them does not assist the public interest.

[54] Based on the above, the Board will not order further publication.

Section 318 Order

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

Penalty: Pursuant to section 318(1)(f) of the Building Act 2004, the Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$2,000.

Costs: Pursuant to section 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 section 301(l)(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.

[56] The Respondent should note that the Board may, under section 319 of the Act, suspend or cancel a licensed building practitioner's licence if fines or costs imposed as a result of disciplinary action are not paid.

Submissions on Penalty, Costs and Publication

[57] The Board invites the Respondent to make written submissions on the matters of disciplinary penalty, costs and publication up until close of business on **15 September 2021**. The submissions should focus on mitigating matters as they relate to the penalty, costs and publication orders. If no submissions are received, then this decision will become final. 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.

[58] In calling for submissions on penalty, costs and mitigation, the Board is not inviting the Respondent to offer new evidence or to express an opinion on the findings set out in this decision. If the Respondent disagrees with the Board's findings of fact and/or its decision that the Respondent has committed a disciplinary offence, the Respondent can appeal the Board's decision.

²⁸ *ibid*

²⁹ *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

Right of Appeal

[59] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in section 330(2) of the Actⁱⁱ.

Signed and dated this 25th day of August 2021


Mr C 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."*

ⁱⁱ **Section 330 Right of appeal**

- (2) *A person may appeal to a District Court against any decision of the Board—*
 - (b) *to take any action referred to in section 318.*

Section 331 Time in which appeal must be brought

An appeal must be lodged—

- (a) *within 20 working days after notice of the decision or action is communicated to the appellant; or*

(b) *within any further time that the appeal authority allows on application made before or after the period expires.*