

## Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. CB25547
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Wayne Ireland (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 118634
Licence(s) Held:	Carpentry and Site AoP 1

---

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

#### Under section 315 of the Building Act 2004

(Reissued)

---

Complaint or Board Inquiry	Complaint
Hearing Type:	On the Papers
Hearing and Draft Decision Date:	1 June 2021
Reissue Date:	2 August 2021
Final Decision Date:	22 September 2021

#### Board Members Present:

Mr C Preston, Chair (Presiding)  
Mr M Orange, Barrister, Deputy Chair  
Mrs F Pearson-Green, LBP, Design AOP 2  
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)(da)(ii) 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>Background to the Reissued Decision</b> .....	4
<b>Evidence</b> .....	4
Further Submissions.....	5
<b>Draft Conclusion and Reasoning</b> .....	6
<b>Draft Decision on Penalty, Costs and Publication</b> .....	8
Penalty .....	8
Costs.....	9
Publication .....	9
<b>Draft Section 318 Order</b> .....	10
<b>Submissions on Draft Decision</b> .....	10
<b>Request for In-Person Hearing</b> .....	11
<b>Right of Appeal</b> .....	11
<b>This decision and the order herein were made final on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 on the basis that no further submissions were received.</b> .....	11

## Summary of the Board’s Draft Decision

- [1] The Respondent failed to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work. He is fined \$1,500 and ordered to pay costs of \$500.

## The Charges

- [2] On 1 June 2021, the Board received a Registrar’s Report in respect of a complaint about the conduct of the Respondent.
- [3] Under regulation 10 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 9 of the Complaints Regulations applies.
- [4] Having received the report, the Board decided that regulation 9 did not apply. Under regulation 10 the Board is required to hold a hearing.
- [5] The Board’s jurisdiction is that of an inquiry. Complaints 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.

- [6] 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.
- [7] 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**

- [8] On the basis of the Registrar's Report, the Respondent's conduct that the Board resolved to investigate was that the Respondent had 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**

- [9] 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>.
- [10] 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:

---

<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

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

*“... 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.”*

### **Background to the Reissued Decision**

- [11] The Board issued its Draft Decision and sought submissions. On 29 June 2021, the Respondent requested that an in-person hearing be held. A Notice of Proceeding was issued and a prehearing conference was held prior to the matter being set down for a hearing.
- [12] At the prehearing conference, it became apparent that the Board had not received all of the Respondent’s submissions. A decision was made for the Board to reconsider the matter in light of those submissions and to reissue the Draft Decision. The same procedure will apply in that the Respondent will be provided with an opportunity to accept the Draft Decision, to make submissions on it, or seek an in-person hearing.
- [13] On 26 July 2021, a Committee of the Board convened to consider the further submissions. It has made the following decision.

### **Evidence**

- [14] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed<sup>6</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.
- [15] The Respondent was engaged to carry out building work on an extension to an existing dwelling under a building consent at [Omitted]. The building work included restricted building work for which a record of work must be provided on completion. The building consent was issued on 15 December 2016. The Respondent’s building came to an end on or about 10 October 2018 when the building contract was brought to an end. A record of work has not been provided. The Board was provided with evidence that the Respondent had carried out or supervised restricted building work during the time that he was involved in the project.
- [16] The Complainant noted that the Respondent had emailed on 11 September 2018 stating that all projects were on hold as a result of financial difficulties. In October 2018, the Respondent advised that he had gone into bankruptcy and that his company was no longer operating. The company, Auckland Renovations Limited, is shown on the Companies Office register as a current company. Wayne Ireland is noted on the Insolvency Register as having been adjudicated as bankrupt in 2002 and discharged from bankruptcy in 2006. He is not currently a bankrupt.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

[17] The Complainant noted that sub-contractors had not been paid by the Respondent and that they were refusing to provide documentation.

[18] On 20 October 2020, the Respondent was contacted by the Investigator. He responded to the complaint with the following:

- *I am happy to give a ROW for both [Omitted] and [Omitted]*
- *I had a few jobs going on at the time of both builds*
- *I had to shut the door on a couple of businesses*
- *Over the last 2-3 years I have been busy paying back creditors*
- *I stopped the jobs as I didn't have the funds to finish the the jobs*
- *So I had to stop*
- *I have never been asked for the ROWs by [Omitted] or [Omitted]*
- *I have not had contact with any of them except from the Councils*
- *They haven't had the paperwork as the jobs aren't finished and I don't want to give ROWs for work I haven't done or finished*

[19] The Investigator noted that the conversation ended on the understanding that the Respondent would check his records and provide records of work when he was able to for work he had done.

#### Further Submissions

[20] The Respondent's submission referred to the complaint form. He stated he was not the builder. He did not identify who, other was the carpentry licensed building practitioner was that carried out or supervised the restricted building work. The Complainant identified the Respondent as being on-site 50% of the time.

[21] The Respondent also noted that the building work had not been completed and that he could not, therefore, provide a record of work. He further noted that he did not know if the work would be progressed after he ceased to be the project manager on 24 August 2018. He also stated that he had not been asked for a record of work until 23 March 2020. He referred to correspondence with [Omitted] who were seeking records of work on behalf of the owner in May 2020. He stated the Complainant's first request was on 20 May 2020. PBC The complaint was made on 15 June 2020.

[22] The Respondent stated:

*We never said that we would not supply the paperwork. We said that this would take time to supply as many of the subcontractors we had contacted had just come out of lock down and needed time to locate their paperwork. We were dependent on the time it took for the subcontractors to respond.*

*I have fully co-operated with the requests to supply the required documentation and I passed on all of the documentation to [Omitted] from [Omitted].*

- [23] The Respondent also referred to a payment dispute and to other matters that were not relevant to the allegation that he had not provided a record of work.

#### **Draft Conclusion and Reasoning**

- [24] 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.
- [25] The Board has only made a finding as regards the Respondent's record of work. Each licensed person is responsible for their own documentation, and there are no disciplinary offences relating to withholding documentation other than a record of work.
- [26] With regard to a record of work, 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 the completion of restricted building work<sup>7</sup>.
- [27] 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.
- [28] The Board discussed issues with regard to records of work in its decision C2-01170<sup>8</sup> 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.
- [29] 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. In this respect, the Board is only considering the Respondent's conduct as regards his own record of work. The non-

---

<sup>7</sup> Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

<sup>8</sup> *Licensed Building Practitioners Board Case Decision C2-01170* 15 December 2015

provision of a record of work by other Licensed Building Practitioners is a matter for them to answer.

- [30] The Respondent has indicated that he subcontracted all the work but has not identified who the licensed building practitioner was that carried out or supervised the carpentry work. There was evidence before the Board that the Respondent was the Licensed Building Practitioner who was carrying out or supervising the restricted carpentry building work. If that was not the case, then the Respondent needs to provide acceptable evidence of who the Licensed Building Practitioner was. The Board has proceeded on the basis that the Respondent was the carpentry Licensed Building Practitioner who carried out or supervised restricted building work.
- [31] 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*<sup>9</sup> “... the only relevant precondition to the obligations of a licenced building practitioner under s 88 is that he/she has completed their work”.
- [32] As to when completion will have occurred is a question of fact in each case.
- [33] 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. Completion occurred in or about October 2018. A record of work has not been provided.
- [34] The Respondent notes that the work was not complete and that it was taking time to collate records of work. He is only responsible for his own record of work.
- [35] The Respondent also submits that he was not aware of the need for a record of work until March 2020. Even if the submission is accepted the record of work was not, thereafter, provided in a timely manner.
- [36] The evidence before the Board shows that the Respondent was not, after October 2018, going to return and complete any more building work and, as such, completion had occurred. His record of work was due when he decided to cease working under the contract. The Board, therefore, finds that a record of work was not provided on completion as required, and the disciplinary offence has been committed.
- [37] 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.
- [38] The Respondent’s financial circumstances are not a good reason.

---

<sup>9</sup> [2018] NZHC 1662 at para 50

- [39] It is not a good reason that the Respondent was not asked for a record of work. The requirement is on the licensed building practitioner to provide a record of work, not on the owner or territorial authority to demand one. The Respondent must act of his own accord and not wait for others to remind him of his obligations.
- [40] Nor is it a good reason that the Respondent's work was not complete. The record of work provisions are designed to create a record of all of the Licensed Building Practitioner involved in a project. How much or how little work they do is not relevant, and, as noted, when a practitioner can no longer return and carry out any further work, completion occurs.

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

- [41] 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.
- [42] 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

- [43] 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>10</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.*

- [44] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*,<sup>11</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 starting point for a penalty based on the seriousness of the disciplinary offending prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors.
- [45] 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

---

<sup>10</sup> HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

<sup>11</sup> 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288

amount which it considers will deter others from such behaviour. There are no aggravating nor mitigating factors present. As such, the Board sees no reason to depart from the starting point. The fine is set at \$1,500.

### 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 that the percentage can then be adjusted up or down having regard to the particular circumstances of each case<sup>12</sup>.
- [48] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,<sup>13</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.*
- [49] 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 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

- [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 Act<sup>14</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.*
- [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.

---

<sup>12</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>13</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

<sup>14</sup> Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

- [52] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990<sup>15</sup>. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction<sup>16</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>17</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>18</sup>.
- [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 interest<sup>19</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.
- [54] Based on the above, the Board will not order further publication.

### **Draft 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 \$1,500.

**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(I)(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 Draft Decision**

- [57] 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.

---

<sup>15</sup> Section 14 of the Act

<sup>16</sup> Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

<sup>17</sup> *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*

<sup>19</sup> *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

- [58] Submissions and/or further evidence must be filed with the Board by no later than the close of business on **21 September 2021**.
- [59] If submissions are received, then the Board will meet and consider those submissions.
- [60] 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.
- [61] If no submissions or further evidence is received within the time frame specified, then this decision will become final.

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

- [62] 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.
- [63] A request for an in-person hearing must be made in writing to the Board Officer no later than the close of business on **21 September 2021**.
- [64] 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**

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

Signed and dated this 31<sup>st</sup> day of August 2021

  
**Mr C Preston**  
Presiding Member

**This decision and the order herein were made final on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 on the basis that no further submissions were received.**

Signed and dated this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of September 2021

  
**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."*

**<sup>ii</sup> 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.*