

## Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. CB25857
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Robert Hanks (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 125954
Licence(s) Held:	Bricklaying and Blocklaying

---

### 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	Board Inquiry
Hearing Type:	On the Papers
Hearing and Decision Date:	10/12/2021
Final Decision Date:	20/01/2022

#### Board Members Present:

Mr C Preston, Chair (Presiding)  
Ms F Pearson-Green, LBP, Design AOP 2  
Mr R Shao, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 1  
Ms J Clark, Barrister and Solicitor, Legal Member

#### 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)(b) of the Act.

The Respondent **has not** committed a disciplinary offence under section 317(1)(d) of the Act.

## Contents

<b>Summary of the Board’s Draft Decision</b> .....	2
<b>The Charges</b> .....	2
<b>Disciplinary Offences Under Consideration</b> .....	3
<b>Function of Disciplinary Action</b> .....	3
<b>Evidence</b> .....	4
<b>Draft Conclusion and Reasoning</b> .....	6
Negligence and/or Incompetence .....	6
<b>Draft Decision on Penalty, Costs and Publication</b> .....	8
Penalty .....	8
(Costs.....	9
Publication .....	10
<b>Draft Section 318 Order</b> .....	11
<b>Submissions on Draft Decision</b> .....	11
<b>Request for In-Person Hearing</b> .....	11
<b>Right of Appeal</b> .....	12

## Summary of the Board’s Draft Decision

- [1] The Respondent has carried out and supervised building work in a negligent manner. He is fined \$1,500 and ordered to pay costs of \$500.
- [2] The Respondent’s conduct with regard to the allegation of carrying out or supervising building work not in accordance with the building consent was not established, and the Board makes no disciplinary finding in respect of it.

## The Charges

- [3] On 10 December 2021, the Board received a Registrar’s Report in respect of a Board Inquiry about the conduct of the Respondent.
- [4] Under regulation 22 of the Complaints Regulations, the Board must, on receipt of the Registrar’s Report, decide whether to proceed no further with the complaint because regulation 21 of the Complaints Regulations applies.
- [5] Having received the report, the Board decided that regulation 21 did not apply. Under regulation 22 the Board is required to hold a hearing.

- [6] The Board’s jurisdiction is that of an inquiry. Board Inquiries are not prosecuted before the Board. Rather, it is for the Board to carry out any further investigation that it considers is necessary prior to it making a decision. In this respect, the Act provides that the Board may regulate its own procedures<sup>1</sup>. It has what is described as a summary jurisdiction in that the Board has a degree of flexibility in how it deals with matters; it retains an inherent jurisdiction beyond that set out in the enabling legislation<sup>2</sup>. As such, it may depart from its normal procedures if it considers doing so would achieve the purposes of the Act, and it is not contrary to the interests of natural justice to do so.
- [7] In this instance, the Board has decided that a formal hearing is not necessary. The Board considers that there is sufficient evidence before it to allow it to make a decision on the papers.
- [8] The Board does, however, note that there may be further evidence in the possession of persons involved in the matter or that the Board may not have interpreted the evidence correctly. To that end, this decision is a draft Board decision. The Respondent will be provided with an opportunity to comment on the Board’s draft findings and to present further evidence prior to the Board making a final decision. If the Board directs or the Respondent requests an in-person hearing, then one will be scheduled.

#### **Disciplinary Offences Under Consideration**

- [9] On the basis of the Registrar’s Report, the Respondent’s conduct that the Board resolved to investigate was that the Respondent may have:
- (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) carried out or supervised building work or building inspection work that does not comply with a building consent (s 317(1)(d) of the Act).

#### **Function of Disciplinary Action**

- [10] 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*<sup>3</sup> and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Clause 27 of Schedule 3

<sup>2</sup> *Castles v Standards Committee No.* [2013] NZHC 2289, *Orlov v National Standards Committee 1* [2013] NZHC 1955

<sup>3</sup> *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* [2011] UKSC 1, 19 January 2011.

<sup>4</sup> [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724

- [11] 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*,<sup>5</sup> 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.”*

- [12] 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 persons<sup>6</sup>:

*... 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.*

- [13] 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 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.

- [14] The above commentary on the limitations of the disciplinary process is 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.

### **Evidence**

- [15] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed<sup>7</sup>. 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.
- [16] On the 31 August 2021 the Board, in considering a complaint relating to another building practitioner (complaint number CB25805), resolved to undertake a Board Inquiry into the Respondent for building work undertaken at [Omitted]. Specifically, the investigation was into the Bricklaying he undertook.
- [17] The documentation that formed part of the original complaint was considered by the Board.

---

<sup>5</sup> [2016] HZHC 2276 at para 164

<sup>6</sup> *Pillai v Messiter (No 2)* (1989) 16 NSWLR 197 (A) at 200

<sup>7</sup> *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

[18] The Board noted that there were two reports reviewing the standard of brick work undertaken by the Respondent done by [Omitted]. [Omitted] is an assessor who belongs to the Brick and Block Laying Federation of New Zealand. The following summary of the issues noted was provided by the Registrar in the original complaint:

- (a) *Generally the top bed joint is well below industry standards;*
- (b) *Inconsistencies with a wide variance in bed joints;*
- (c) *Mortar joints throughout the build have a crumbly appearance and do not appear to meet the industry standards required to ensure that a sufficient mortar to brick bond had been achieved. Limited or no tooling of joint throughout build;*
- (d) *Inconsistent sizing and location of Weep holes as per NZS4210;2001;*
- (e) *Weep holes are of various sizes (NZS4210;2001);*
- (f) *Lack of control joints on long section of wall as per manufacturers specifications; and*
- (g) *Corner to right of front entrance exceeds vertical tolerances [...].*

[19] The Registrar also summarised the report writer's assessment of the remedial work as follows:

- (a) *20mm+ Bed Joints. Bottom bed joint, i.e. first brick course bed joint is at 20mm and in places exceeds to 25mm;*
- (b) *Mortar joints exceed NZS 4210 2.7.1.3. and vary in sizing on all areas of dwelling;*
- (c) *[...] walls are showing deviation outside of the maximum tolerances in most areas of the veneer;*
- (d) *Veneer shows relative displacement between masonry courses exceeding maximum tolerances [...];*
- (e) *Lack of vents for windows exceeding 2.4m long as in compliance documents;*
- (f) *Window to right of front entrance shows veneer exceeding vertical tolerances and resulting in veneer being 64mm to exterior face of brick beyond exterior of window joinery. Window, door jamb detail shows a 10mm cover at back of joinery, i.e., brick 70mm leaving 6mm from face of window joinery;*
- (g) *Lack of evidence of control joints as shown in Firth Control Joints Specifications with no evidence of control joints for windows exceeding 2m;*
- (h) *Veneer to the right of window to the right of front door shows bonding of 60mm using these defractions the brick bond should be 75mm which is less than the required bond;*

- (i) *Bricks have been laid hard into window joinery which is at variance to consented plans which show a 1-2mm gap in window / door jamb detail.*

- [20] In the response to the complaint (dated 4 November 2021) the Respondent accepts that “ *the work done on this property was not done to my usual high standard. I was suffering from a back injury at the time and this may have affected the quality of the work done on the site.*”
- [21] In regard to work not being done to the building consent the Board could not find evidence that the work the respondent did was not to the consent.

### **Draft Conclusion and Reasoning**

- [22] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has** carried out or supervised building work or building inspection work in a negligent or incompetent manner (s 317(1)(b) of the Act) and **should** be disciplined
- [23] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has not** carried out or supervised building work or building inspection work that does not comply with a building consent (s 317(1)(d) of the Act).
- [24] The reasons for the Board’s decisions follow.

### Negligence and/or Incompetence

- [25] 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<sup>8</sup> test of negligence which has been adopted by the New Zealand Courts<sup>9</sup>.
- [26] 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*,<sup>10</sup> it was stated as “an inability to do the job”.
- [27] The New Zealand Courts have stated that an assessment of negligence and/or incompetence in a disciplinary context is a two-stage test<sup>11</sup>. 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.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582

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

<sup>10</sup> *Ali v Kumar and Others* [2017] NZDC 23582 at [30]

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

[28] 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 Act.<sup>12</sup> 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 practitioner<sup>13</sup>.

[29] 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*
  - (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.*

[30] The Board also notes, as regards acceptable standards, that all building work must comply with the Building Code<sup>14</sup> and be carried out in accordance with a building consent<sup>15</sup>. 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.

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

---

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

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

<sup>14</sup> Section 17 of the Building Act 2004

<sup>15</sup> Section 40(1) of the Building Act 2004

<sup>16</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

*[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.*

- [32] The reports provided by the Assessor clearly showed work that did not meet the required standards expected of a licenced building practitioner and by his own admission the respondent accepted that the work was not done to his usual standard.
- [33] Given the above factors, the Board, which includes persons with extensive experience and expertise in the building industry, considered the Respondent has departed from what the Board considers to be an accepted standard of conduct and that the conduct was sufficiently serious enough to warrant a disciplinary outcome.

#### **Draft Decision on Penalty, Costs and Publication**

- [34] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 317 applies, the Board must, under section 318 of the Act<sup>i</sup>, consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [35] The matter was dealt with on the papers. Included was information relevant to penalty, costs and publication, and the Board has decided to make indicative orders and give the Respondent an opportunity to provide further evidence or submissions relevant to the indicative orders.

#### Penalty

- [36] 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*<sup>17</sup> 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.*

- [37] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*,<sup>18</sup> 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 have the advantage of simplicity and transparency. The Court recommended adopting a

---

<sup>17</sup> HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

<sup>18</sup> 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288



starting point for a penalty based on the seriousness of the disciplinary offending prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors.

- [38] The matter was at the lower end of seriousness. The Board considered that a fine was appropriate. It adopted a starting point of \$1,500. It did not consider that there were any mitigating factors that would warrant a reduction. As such, the fine is set at \$1,500.

#### (Costs)

- [39] 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.”
- [40] 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<sup>19</sup>.
- [41] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,<sup>20</sup> 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.*

- [42] In *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society*,<sup>21</sup> the High Court noted:

*[46] All cases referred to in Cooray were medical cases and the Judge was careful to note that the 50 per cent was the general approach that the Medical Council took. We do not accept that if there was any such approach, it is necessarily to be taken in proceedings involving other disciplinary bodies. Much will depend upon the time involved, actual expenses incurred, attitude of the practitioner bearing in mind that whilst the cost of a disciplinary action by a professional body must be something of a burden imposed upon its members, those members should not be expected to bear too large a measure where a practitioner is shown to be guilty of serious misconduct.*

*[47] Costs orders made in proceedings involving law practitioners are not to be determined by any mathematical approach. In some cases 50 per cent will be too high, in others insufficient.*

- [43] The Board notes the matter was dealt with on the papers. There has, however, been costs incurred investigating the matter, producing the Registrar’s Report and in the Board making its decision. The costs have been less than those that would have been

---

<sup>19</sup> *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.

<sup>20</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

<sup>21</sup> CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

incurred had a full hearing been held. 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

[44] 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 Act<sup>22</sup>. 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.*

[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] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990<sup>23</sup>. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction<sup>24</sup>. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive<sup>25</sup>. The High Court provided guidance as to the types of factors to be taken into consideration in *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council*<sup>26</sup>.

[47] 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 interest<sup>27</sup>. 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.

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

---

<sup>22</sup> Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

<sup>23</sup> Section 14 of the Act

<sup>24</sup> Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

<sup>25</sup> *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*

<sup>27</sup> *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

### **Draft Section 318 Order**

[49] 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 \$1500.

**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.**

[50] 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 Draft Decision**

[51] The Board invites the Respondent to:

- (a) provide further evidence for the Board to consider; and/or
- (b) make written submissions on the Board's findings. Submissions may be on the substantive findings and/or on the findings on penalty, costs, and publication.

[52] Submissions and/or further evidence must be filed with the Board by no later than the close of business on 19 January 2022.

[53] If submissions are received, then the Board will meet and consider those submissions.

[54] The Board may, on receipt of any of the material received, give notice that an in-person hearing is required prior to it making a final decision. Alternatively, the Board may proceed to make a final decision which will be issued in writing.

[55] If no submissions or further evidence is received within the time frame specified, then this decision will become final.

### **Request for In-Person Hearing**

[56] If the Respondent, having received and considered the Board's Draft Decision, considers that an in-person hearing is required, then one will be scheduled, and a notice of hearing will be issued.

[57] A request for an in-person hearing must be made in writing to the Board Officer no later than the close of business on 19 January 2022.

[58] If a hearing is requested, this Draft Decision, including the Board’s indicative position on penalty, costs, and publication, will be set aside.

### **Right of Appeal**

[59] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in section 330(2) of the Act<sup>ii</sup>.

Signed and dated this 24th day of December 2021.

  
**Mr C Preston**  
Presiding Member

**This decision and the order herein were made final on 20 January 2022 on the basis that no further submissions were received.**

Signed and dated this 4th day of February 2022.

  
**Mr C Preston**  
Presiding Member

---

<sup>i</sup> **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.*