

Before the Building Practitioners Board

BPB Complaint No. 26747

Licensed Building Practitioner: Timothy Barnes (the Respondent)

Licence Number: BP 150771

Licence(s) Held: Carpentry

**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 Location by audiovisual link

Hearing Type: In Person

Hearing Date: 30 October 2025

Decision Date: 17 November 2025

Board Members Present:

Mr M Orange, Chair, Barrister (Presiding)

Mrs F Pearson-Green, Deputy Chair, LBP, Design AoP 2

Mr G Pearson, Barrister and Solicitor, Legal Member

Mr C Lang, Building Surveyor and Quantity Surveyor

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 sections 317(1)(b), (d) and (da)(ii) of the Act.

The Respondent is fined \$2,000 and ordered to pay costs of \$1,075. A record of the disciplinary offending will be recorded on the Public Register for a period of three years.

Contents

Summary	3
The Charges	3
Consolidation	4
Evidence	4
Licensing.....	4
Building Issues.....	5
Record of Work	8
Negligence or Incompetence	8
Has the Respondent departed from an acceptable standard of conduct	9
Was the conduct serious enough	11
Has the Respondent been negligent or incompetent.....	11
Contrary to a Building Consent	11
Was there building work that differed from the building consent.....	12
Was the conduct serious enough	12
Has the Respondent breached section 317(1)(d) of the Act	12
Failure to Provide a Record of Work	12
Did the Respondent carry out or supervise restricted building work.....	13
Was the restricted building work complete	13
Has the Respondent provided a record of work.....	13
Was there a good reason for the Respondent to withhold his records of work	13
Did the Respondent fail to provide a record of work	13
Board Decisions	13
Penalty, Costs and Publication	14
Penalty	14
Costs.....	15
Publication	15
Section 318 Order	16
Submissions on Penalty, Costs and Publication	16
Right of Appeal	17

Summary

[1] The Respondent carried out and supervised building work in a negligent manner, carried out building work that was contrary to a building consent, and failed to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work. He was fined \$2,000 and ordered to pay costs of \$ 1,075. The costs were apportioned across the three persons who appeared at a consolidation hearing. A record of the disciplinary offending will be recorded on the Public Register for a period of three years.

The Charges

[2] The prescribed investigation and hearing procedure is inquisitorial, not adversarial. There is no requirement for a complainant to prove the allegations. The Board sets the charges and decides what evidence is required.¹

[3] In this matter, the disciplinary charges the Board resolved to further investigate² were that the Respondent may, in relation to building work at, [OMITTED], have:

- (a) carried out or supervised building work in a negligent or incompetent manner contrary to section 317(1)(b) of the Act;
- (b) carried out or supervised building work that does not comply with a building consent contrary to section 317(1)(d) of the Act; and
- (c) failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out or supervise, or has carried out 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.

[4] The Board gave notice that, in further investigating the Respondent's conduct under section 317(1)(b) and (d) of the Act, it would be inquiring into the issues noted in a Thames Coromandel District Council inspection report dated 13 May 2024, starting on page 63 of the Board's file, including whether correct building consent change processes were used for changes to the consent.

[5] The Board also gave notice that, as part of its investigations, it would be inquiring into who the responsible Licensed Building Practitioner(s) were for the building work under investigation, noting that two other Licensed Building Practitioners were involved and are being investigated in relation to the same allegations (matters [OMITTED] and [OMITTED]).

¹ Under section 322 of the Act, the Board has relaxed rules of evidence which allow it to receive evidence that may not be admissible in a court of law. The evidentiary standard is the balance of probabilities, *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1.

² The resolution was made following the Board's consideration of a report prepared by the Registrar in accordance with regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations.

Consolidation


[6] The Board may, under Regulation 13, consolidate two or more complaints into one hearing, but only if the complaints are, in the opinion of the Board, about substantially the same subject matter and the complainant and the licensed building practitioner in respect of each complaint agree to the consolidation. The matter proceeded as a consolidated hearing with matters [OMITTED] and [OMITTED].

Evidence

[7] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the alleged disciplinary offences have been committed³. Under section 322 of the Act, the Board has relaxed rules of evidence, which allow it to receive evidence that may not be admissible in a court of law.

Licensing

[8] The build started on or about 10 March 2023. Multiple Licensed Building Practitioners (LBPs) were involved in the build, which included restricted building work that, under Section 84 of the Act, must be carried out or supervised by an LBP. Each of the LBPs involved, the Respondent, [OMITTED], and [OMITTED] (a subcontractor), were licensed for stages of the build. The following table shows their licensing status at the early stages of the build.



[9] On the basis of the above, after the house foundations were completed by a separate foundation LBP sub-contractor [OMITTED] was the only LBP up until 6 July 2023, when the Respondent became licensed. From 24 July 2023, when [OMITTED] obtained his licence, both he and the Respondent were carrying out and supervising restricted building work, and were individually responsible and accountable for the building work they each undertook and supervised

[10] According to the Building Consent Authority (BCA) records, the first framing inspection was on 23 June 2023, when [OMITTED] was the only licensed person. A framing and pre-wrap inspection then took place on 10 August 2023, when both the

³ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

Respondent and [OMITTED] were licensed and [OMITTED] was no longer licensed due a relicensing suspension.

- [11] In terms of who did what, the Board received evidence that [OMITTED] involvement was limited to wall and truss framing. He stated he was not involved in any foundation work, and the Respondent stated that the foundations had been subcontracted to Base Up Foundations, which had its own LBP. The Board's file included a record of work from an LBP who had carried out the foundations. That record of work excluded portal pads that were under investigation.
- [12] Once [OMITTED] left the site, the Respondent and [OMITTED] continued on with the build, with [OMITTED] being the person who had the most involvement in the build. He estimated he was on-site 95% of the time, whereas the Respondent stated he spent 2 to 3 days a week on-site for 3 to 4 months. The Respondent stated his involvement was limited to framing, including steel portal frames, trusses, cladding, and internal doors.
- [13] [OMITTED] considered that he was the person who was supervising unlicensed persons, in terms of which there were two qualified builders, an apprentice and a labourer.

Building Issues

- [14] The issues investigated by the Board were outlined in a Building Final Inspection Report dated 13 May 2024, prepared by Dennis McLeod, a Senior Building Control Officer of the Thames Coromandel District Council. It noted 11 failed items, as follows:

Inspection Summary: Final Building inspection for a single level 3 bedroom dwelling with attached double garage.

ITEMS TO ADDRESS

1/ All exterior cladding is to be removed in areas to enable the Engineer to carry out onsite investigation / monitoring for all SEO Steel Beam Post installation and connections, Portal Frame and connections.

2/ Cladding is to be removed above the main entry door, D02, D04, W0061, and refitted with a 5mm gap from the head flashings to the bottom of Linea Weather boards.

3/ Molding's are to be removed from the top of all other items of aluminum joinery, and head flashings installed and cladding fitted to comply with NZBC-E2.

4/ Cladding above D03 is to be removed, head flashing installed and reclad.

5/ Sill support WONZ bar to be installed to D03.

6/ Facings are to be removed around the garage door, and head flashing installed, with new facings compliant with NZBC-E2.

7/ Box corner facings to all exterior corners are to be removed and replaced with detail in accordance with the Linea weather board detail for box corners.

8/ Exterior cladding is to be fixed on the gable end of South elevation.

9/ H3.2 Packers to be installed to the bottoms of aluminum joinery where there are 15mm gaps between aluminum and cladding.

10/ H3.2 Packers are to be installed between all bottom weather boards and the cavity closer where there are 15mm gaps.

11/ Four roof support Portals have completely missed the Engineers foundation design (S1-Drawing number S3.1), and have metal support brackets fitting the sides of the concrete foundations, this is to be rectified under the Engineer's recommendation and monitoring.

- [15] After the Council's final inspection, [OMITTED] carried out a site inspection. They removed cladding and internal linings to be able to inspect fixings and notice multiple instances of non-compliance, and in particular, with regard to the portal pads and portal frame base plates and fixings.
- [16] [OMITTED] noted that due to the liquidation of his company and a trespass order, he was unable to complete the build. He stated that in May 2024, when the full final inspection was carried out, the cladding had been completed and painted, but decks, a pool and tiling had not been completed.
- [17] The Board reviewed each of the failed items with the witnesses present. Mr McLeod expressed his opinion that the most serious item was that noted as number 11 above, which related to portal frames.
- [18] [OMITTED] gave evidence that the portal frames had been manufactured incorrectly and that, because they were the wrong size, the associated foundations had been constructed in the wrong position. The result was that modified plates had to be constructed to carry their weight and any transferred load, as shown in the following photograph.



- [19] The building consent included a requirement for the Engineer's Observations of the portal frame installation and connections. That did not occur. [OMITTED] stated he was not aware of the requirement but stated that he was the person calling for inspections.
- [20] [OMITTED] inspection carried out after the failed Final inspection, and some structural elements were exposed, noted multiple instances of loose fixings, a lack of dry packing under steel, and the length of bolt embedment into the concrete was questioned. The following photos are examples:



- [21] [OMITTED] was asked whether he had discussed the changes to the portal frames method of connection to the foundation with any of the Owner, the Designer, the Engineer ([OMITTED]), or the BCA before the work was carried out. He stated he had discussed the change on-site. He could not recall if any written instructions were issued by any of the aforementioned. He did not provide any evidence of any written instructions. There were no minor variations or amendments for the change on the BCA file. The Complainant (the Owner) stated that the change had not been discussed with him, and he had not authorised it.
- [22] [OMITTED] commented that the steel work may have been loosened to allow for adjustments and may not have been tightened afterwards.
- [23] The structural pads for the portal frames were, at a later point, enlarged to 450x450mm pads to enable the portal frames to sit on them (as shown below). That work was completed after the Respondent had left the site.



- [24] Regarding cladding changes from box corners to soakers, [OMITTED] stated the Complainant requested the change.
- [25] With respect to the issues with flashings, facings, and packers, [OMITTED] did not submit that the findings were not valid, but did give evidence that the issues were not brought to their attention, were going to be rectified, or they were waiting for materials. Also, regarding consent changes, [OMITTED] stated that all the changes had been discussed with the designer, and his intention was to address them all at once at the end of the project.
- [26] At the hearing, evidence was presented indicating that items 5 and 8 on the failed Final inspection were incomplete, rather than non-compliant.

Record of Work

- [27] The Respondent's involvement in the building work came to an end in March 2024 as a result of the head contractor's liquidation. His record of work, dated 5 August 2024, was provided to the owner in August 2024, after a complaint about the non-provision of [OMITTED] record of work had been made in July 2024 to the Board. [OMITTED] noted issues with its provision resulting from the liquidation and his access to documents during it. A copy of his record of work has not been submitted to the Territorial Authority.

Negligence or Incompetence

- [28] To find that the Respondent was negligent, the Board needs to determine, on the balance of probabilities,⁴ that the Respondent departed from an accepted standard of conduct when carrying out or supervising building work as judged against those of the same class of licence. This is described as the *Bolam*⁵ test of negligence.⁶ To make a finding of incompetence, the Board has to determine that the Respondent has demonstrated a lack of ability, skill, or knowledge to carry out or supervise building work to an acceptable standard.⁷ A threshold test applies to both. Even if the Respondent has been negligent or incompetent, the Board must also decide if the conduct fell seriously short of expected standards.⁸ If it does not, then a disciplinary finding cannot be made.

⁴ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1. Under section 322 of the Act, the Board has relaxed rules of evidence which allow it to receive evidence that may not be admissible in a court of law.

⁵ *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582

⁶ Adopted in New Zealand in various matters including: *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

⁷ In *Beattie v Far North Council* Judge McElrea, DC Whangarei, CIV-2011-088-313 it was described as “a demonstrated lack of the reasonably expected ability or skill level”. In *Ali v Kumar and Others*, [2017] NZDC 23582 at [30] as “an inability to do the job”

⁸ *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand* [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”.

Has the Respondent departed from an acceptable standard of conduct

- [29] When considering what an acceptable standard is, the Board must consider the purpose of the Building Act⁹ as well as the requirement that all building work must comply with the Building Code¹⁰ and any building consent issued.¹⁰ The test is an objective one.¹¹
- [30] The Board was investigating 11 items noted in a failed inspection report. Regarding items 1 and 11, the Board accepted that the Respondent was not the responsible LBP for those items, and it has made a finding against [OMITTED] on them.
- [31] Turning to the remaining items (2-10) the Board accepted that items 5 and 8 were incomplete, so it makes no findings about them. It also considers that item 7 is a matter for which [OMITTED] alone is responsible. Those factors do not apply to items 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10. Those issues were:
 - 2/ Cladding is to be removed above the main entry door, D02, D04, W0061, and refitted with a 5mm gap from the head flashings to the bottom of Linea Weather boards.*
 - 3/ Molding's are to be removed from the top of all other items of aluminum joinery, and head flashings installed and cladding fitted to comply with NZBC-E2.*
 - 4/ Cladding above D03 is to be removed, head flashing installed and reclad.*
 - 6/ Facings are to be removed around the garage door, and head flashing installed, with new facings compliant with NZBC-E2.*
 - 9/ H3.2 Packers to be installed to the bottoms of aluminum joinery where there are 15mm gaps between aluminum and cladding.*
 - 10/ H3.2 Packers are to be installed between all bottom weather boards and the cavity closer where there are 15mm gaps.*

- [32] The Board accepted that the Respondent was not supervising others and that he was not responsible for BCA inspections or change processes. He was, however, responsible for and accountable for his own work. There were multiple instances of non-compliance identified by the BCA, and the Board is of the view that the Respondent should have endeavoured to get the work right the first time. Regarding the above, during the first reading of changes to the Act around licensing¹² it was noted by the responsible Minister:

⁹ Section 17 of the Building Act 2004

¹⁰ Section 40(1) of the Building Act 2004

¹¹ *McKenzie v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2004] NZAR 47 at p.71 noted that the tribunal does not have to take into account the Respondent's subjective considerations.

¹² Hansard volume 669: Page 16053

In February this year the Minister announced measures to streamline and simplify the licensed building practitioner scheme. A robust licensing scheme with a critical mass of licensed builders means consumers can have confidence that their homes will be built right first time.

[33] The introduction of the LBP regime was aimed at improving the skills and knowledge of those involved in residential construction. The following was stated as the intention to the enabling legislation¹³:

The Government's goal is a more efficient and productive sector that stands behind the quality of its work; a sector with the necessary skills and capability to build it right first time and that takes pride in its work; a sector that delivers good-quality, affordable homes and buildings and contributes to a prosperous economy; a well-informed sector that shares information and quickly identifies and corrects problems; and a sector where everyone involved in building work knows what they are accountable for and what they rely on others for.

We cannot make regulation more efficient without first getting accountability clear, and both depend on people having the necessary skills and knowledge. The Building Act 2004 will be amended to make it clearer that the buck stops with the people doing the work. Builders and designers must make sure their work will meet building code requirements; building owners must make sure they get the necessary approvals and are accountable for any decisions they make, such as substituting specified products; and building consent authorities are accountable for checking that plans will meet building code requirements and inspecting to make sure plans are followed.

[34] Section 3 of the Act, which sets out the Act's purposes, notes that the Act includes the purpose of promoting the accountability of builders. Section 14E of the Act encapsulates the statements in Hansard noted above. It sets out that:

14E Responsibilities of builder

- (1) *In subsection (2), builder means any person who carries out building work, whether in trade or not.*
- (2) *A builder is responsible for—*
 - (a) *ensuring that the building work complies with the building consent and the plans and specifications to which the building consent relates;*
 - (b) *ensuring that building work not covered by a building consent complies with the building code.*
- (3) *A licensed building practitioner who carries out or supervises restricted building work is responsible for—*

¹³ Hansard volume 669: Page 16053

- (a) *ensuring that the restricted building work is carried out or supervised in accordance with the requirements of this Act; and*
- (b) *ensuring that he or she is licensed in a class for carrying out or supervising that restricted building work.*

[35] It is within this context that the Board considers that the acceptable standards expected of a reasonable LBP include taking steps to ensure building work is carried out competently and compliantly as and when it is carried out. That did not happen, and it follows that the Respondent's conduct has fallen below an acceptable standard.

[36] The Respondent should note that, whilst he was not the only LBP on site, under the LBP licensing regime each and every LBP is responsible for the work that they carry out. Because the Board received evidence that the Respondent had carried out work on the cladding, it has made its findings against both the Respondent and [OMITTED].

[37] [OMITTED] made submissions that many of the items could be rectified; however, the Board's view was that the work should have been completed in a compliant manner from the outset. Also, while rectification at a later point may have been possible, it was not logical, given that some deconstruction may have been required, and/or the rectification work would have been unnecessarily difficult due to the sequence in which it would have been completed.

[38] Based on the above factors, the Board finds that the Respondent's conduct has fallen below an acceptable standard and that he has carried out building work in a negligent manner.

Was the conduct serious enough

[39] The conduct was serious. There were multiple instances of non-compliance, and they were not mere inadvertent errors or oversights. The Board did note, however, that the Respondent was less culpable than [OMITTED]. That is a factor that will be taken into consideration when the Board determines the appropriate penalty.

Has the Respondent been negligent or incompetent

[40] The Respondent has carried out building work in a negligent manner and has breached section 317(1)(b) of the Act.

Contrary to a Building Consent

[41] Building consents provide detailed plans and specifications for building work. They are issued by Territorial or Building Consent Authorities on the basis that the building work will meet the provisions of the Building Code.¹⁴ Once issued, the building work

¹⁴ Section 49 of the Act

must be carried out in accordance with the building consent.¹⁵ Building consents also stipulate the number and type of inspections the issuing authority will carry out during the build.¹⁶ Inspections ensure independent verification that the building consent is being complied with.

- [42] If building work departs from the building consent issued, the Board can find that a disciplinary offence under section 317(1)(d) of the Act has been committed. The Board does not have to find that the departure was deliberate or a result of negligent conduct.¹⁷ The Board does, however, consider that the seriousness of the conduct under investigation does have to be taken into account. As such, even if the Respondent's building work departed from the building consent, the Board must also decide if the conduct fell seriously short of expected standards.¹⁸ If it does not, then a disciplinary finding cannot be made.

Was there building work that differed from the building consent

- [43] Items 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10 noted in the failed inspection were also issues that were inconsistent with the building consent that had been issued. It follows that the work, including the Respondent's work, had been carried out in a manner that was contrary to the building consent that had been issued.

Was the conduct serious enough

- [44] The conduct was serious. As with the findings on negligence, the departures, whilst not deliberate, were not mere inadvertence, oversight, or error.

Has the Respondent breached section 317(1)(d) of the Act

- [45] The Respondent has carried out building work that was contrary to a building consent and has breached section 317(1)(d) of the Act.

Failure to Provide a Record of Work

- [46] A Licensed Building Practitioner must provide a record of work for any restricted building work that they have carried out or supervised to the owner and the Territorial Authority on completion of their restricted building work.¹⁹
- [47] 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

¹⁵ Section 40 of the Act

¹⁶ Section 222 of the Act

¹⁷ *Blewman v Wilkinson* [1979] 2 NZLR 208

¹⁸ *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand* [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".

¹⁹ Section 88(1) of the Act.

territorial authority on completion of restricted building work²⁰ unless there is a good reason for it not to be provided.²¹

Did the Respondent carry out or supervise restricted building work

[48] The Respondent was engaged to carry out and/or supervise building work on a new residential dwelling under a building consent. His work included work on the primary structure and the external moisture management system of the residential dwelling, both of which are forms of restricted building work.²²

Was the restricted building work complete

[49] The Respondent's building work came to an end when the contract was terminated in or about March 2024. That was the completion date, and it was when a record of work was due.

Has the Respondent provided a record of work

[50] The Respondent did not provide a record of work on completion in March 2024. Rather, he provided one in August 2024. It was dated 5 August 2024, several months after completion had occurred. Its provision came after a complaint had been made in July 2024 against [OMITTED].

Was there a good reason for the Respondent to withhold his records of work

[51] The Respondent provided his record of work to the main contractor. An LBP has a duty to provide it directly to the owner and the Territorial Authority, and the Respondent should also note that the requirement is on the LBP to provide a record of work, not on the owner or territorial authority to demand one. He is required to act of his own accord and not wait for others to remind him of his obligations. The provision to a main contractor runs the risk that it may not be passed on; if that occurs, it is the author of it that may be disciplined, not the person who withholds it. The Respondent is cautioned against providing it to the main contract in the future.

Did the Respondent fail to provide a record of work

[52] The Respondent has failed to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work in accordance with section 88(1) of the Act.

Board Decisions

[53] The Respondent has breached sections 317(1)(b), (d) and (da)(ii) of the Act.

[54] The Board does note the commonality between the findings under sections 317(1)(b) and (d), and it will consider the two offences as one when it determines the appropriate penalty.

²⁰ Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

²¹ Section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act

²² Clause 5 of the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

Penalty, Costs and Publication

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

Penalty

- [57] The Board has the discretion to impose a range of penalties.ⁱⁱⁱ Exercising that discretion and determining the appropriate penalty requires that the Board balance various factors, including the seriousness of the conduct and any mitigating or aggravating factors present.²³ It is not a formulaic exercise, but there are established underlying principles that the Board should take into consideration. They include:²⁴
 - (a) protection of the public and consideration of the purposes of the Act;²⁵
 - (b) deterring the Respondent and other Licensed Building Practitioners from similar offending;²⁶
 - (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;²⁷
 - (d) penalising wrongdoing;²⁸ and
 - (e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).²⁹
- [58] Overall, the Board should assess the conduct against the range of penalty options available in section 318 of the Act, reserving the maximum penalty for the worst cases³⁰ and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.³¹ In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and proportionate penalty³² that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.³³

²³ *Ellis v Auckland Standards Committee* 5 [2019] NZHC 1384 at [21]; cited with approval in *National Standards Committee (No1) of the New Zealand Law Society v Gardiner-Hopkins* [2022] NZHC 1709 at [48]

²⁴ Cited with approval in *Robinson v Complaints Assessment Committee of Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand* [2022] NZCA 350 at [28] and [29]

²⁵ Section 3 Building Act

²⁶ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

²⁷ *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

²⁸ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

²⁹ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354; *Shousha v A Professional Conduct Committee* [2022] NZHC 1457

³⁰ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

³¹ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

³² *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

³³ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

- [59] In general, when determining the appropriate penalty, the Board adopts a starting point based on the principles outlined above prior to it considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors present.³⁴
- [60] In this matter, the Board adopted a starting point of a fine of \$2,000. The fine was less than the fine for [OMITTED] because he was considered to be more culpable for the issues that had arisen. The starting point is consistent with other findings made by the Board for similar conduct.
- [61] The Board does not consider that there are any aggravating or mitigating factors, but the Respondent will be given an opportunity to raise any mitigating factors that the Board is not aware of.
- [62] The fine is set at \$2,000.

Costs

- [63] Under section 318(4) of the Act, the Board may require the Respondent to pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board. The rationale is that other Licensed Building Practitioners should not be left to carry the financial burden of an investigation and hearing.³⁵
- [64] The courts have indicated that 50% of the total reasonable costs should be taken as a starting point in disciplinary proceedings³⁶. The starting point can then be adjusted up or down, having regard to the particular circumstances of each case³⁷.
- [65] The Board has adopted an approach to costs that uses a scale based on 50% of the average costs of different categories of hearings: simple, moderate and complex. The current matter was moderately complex, and it was a consolidated hearing.
- [66] Based on the above, the Board's costs order is that the Respondent is to pay the sum of \$1,075 toward the costs of and incidental to the Board's inquiry. The amount is half of what the normal half-day hearing costs would be. The amount has been halved because it was a consolidated hearing, and the costs have been apportioned between the three respondents.

Publication

- [67] 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,³⁸ and he will be named in

³⁴ In *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment* 3 November [2016] NZDC 21288 the District Court recommended that the Board adopt the approach set out in the Sentencing Act 2002.

³⁵ *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2001] NZAR 74

³⁶ *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society* CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

³⁷ *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.

³⁸ Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

this decision, which will be available on the Board's website. The Board is also able, under section 318(5) of the Act, to order further publication.

- [68] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990.³⁹ Further, as a general principle, publication 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, and the courts have stated that an adverse finding in a disciplinary case usually requires that the name of the practitioner be published.⁴⁰
- [69] Based on the above, the Board will not order any publication over and above the record on the Register, the Respondent being named in this decision, and the publication of the decision on the Board's website. The Respondent should note, however, that as the Board has not made any form of suppression order, other entities, such as the media or the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment, may publish under the principles of open justice reporting.

Section 318 Order

- [70] 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 \$1,075 (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, the Respondent will be named in this decision, which will be published on the Board's website.

- [71] 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

- [72] The Board invites the Respondent to make written submissions on the matters of disciplinary penalty, costs and publication up until the close of business on **Thursday, 22 January 2026**. 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

³⁹ Section 14 of the Act

⁴⁰ Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council [2013] NZAR 1055

consider those submissions prior to coming to a final decision on penalty, costs and publication.

Right of Appeal

[73] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in section 330(2) of the Act^{iv}.

Signed and dated this 10th day of December 2025.



Mr M Orange
Presiding Member

ⁱ Section 3 of the Act

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.*

ⁱⁱ 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."

iii Section 318 Disciplinary Penalties

- (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 1 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.

iv 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.*