

PRESENTERS

Dr Andrew Butler, Russell McVeagh, Wellington

Andrew has recently joined Russell McVeagh in Wellington. From May 1999 to May 2005 he was Crown Counsel at the Crown Law office in Wellington. Prior to 1999 he was a senior lecturer at Victoria University of Wellington, specialising in equity, trusts, restitution, human rights and public law. He has written extensively here and abroad on human rights and public law and is the general editor of *Equity and Trusts in New Zealand* (Brookers, Wellington, 2003). In 2004 he tutored in Equity and Trusts at the University of Durham, England.

Dean Knight, Lecturer – Law, Victoria University of Wellington

Dean's teaching and research interests are in the areas of public and administrative law, local government, resource management, and criminal law. Before joining the faculty, Dean worked for Phillips Fox and acted for a number of local authorities. He is the co-author of *LexisNexis Local Government* (LexisNexis, Wellington, 2002).

Geoff McLay, Senior Lecturer – Law, Victoria University of Wellington

Geoff has taught undergraduate and graduate courses including torts, advanced torts, intellectual property, competition law, comparative constitutional law, and ethics. He is the co-author of *Intellectual Property in New Zealand* (LexisNexis, Wellington, 2002) and in 2003 was awarded a joint university excellence award.

The statements and conclusions contained in this booklet are those of the author(s) only and not those of the New Zealand Law Society. This booklet has been prepared for the purpose of a Continuing Legal Education course. It is not intended to be a comprehensive statement of the law or practice, and should not be relied upon as such. If advice on the law is required, it should be sought on a formal, professional basis.

CONTENTS

1. NATURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.....	1
Types of local authorities	1
<i>Two-tiered system: regional councils and territorial authorities</i>	1
Related bodies	2
<i>Community boards</i>	2
<i>Council organisations</i>	3
Purposes and powers of local government	3
<i>Underlying theory of local government</i>	3
<i>Corporate body and (new) power of general competence</i>	6
Governance and decision-making	8
<i>Governance and management responsibilities</i>	8
<i>Decision-making</i>	9
<i>Delegations</i>	11
Personal liability of members	14
Litigation against local authorities – miscellaneous	16
<i>Name</i>	16
<i>Description</i>	16
<i>Service</i>	16
2. OFFICIAL INFORMATION	17
Immunity for disclosure of official information	17
Land information memoranda	20
<i>Introduction</i>	20
<i>Information that must be disclosed</i>	21
<i>Liability for erroneous LIMs</i>	23
3. VICARIOUS LIABILITY	29
Course of employment	29
Non-delegable duties	30
Special situations	32
4. NEGLIGENCE AND GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES	33
Introduction	33
The general approach to finding a duty of care	34
<i>A genuinely difficult issue</i>	34
<i>The common law approach to the duty question</i>	35
<i>New Zealand – just muddling through</i>	36
Where does the obligation come from – the statute, the common Law, the relationship between the government and the citizen?	38
Remedial gap or part of the essential division between public and private law?	42
Negligence, discretion and the interface with administrative law	45
<i>Lord Keith’s exclusionary rule</i>	45
<i>Liability within “justiciability”</i>	46
<i>The “policy-operational” distinction</i>	46
<i>The rejection of the policy-operational distinction</i>	46
<i>Barrett – a newer approach to governmental discretion</i>	49
<i>Gorringe – a possible limitation on Barrett</i>	51
<i>Liability for failing to protect?</i>	53
5. LIABILITY IN THE PLANNING PROCESS	55
Council planning decisions – no liability for mere illegality	55
<i>The traditional English position applied</i>	55
<i>The Canadian “immunity” cases</i>	56

<i>The Australasian unorthodox orthodox approach</i>	58
Providing information.....	59
<i>Shaddock – the recognition of liability</i>	59
<i>Applying Shaddock – limiting Shaddock – City of Botany Bay Council</i>	60
<i>The New Zealand high point – Brown v Heathcote County Council</i>	62
<i>The importance of keeping proper records – Bronland</i>	64
Limitations on the <i>Shaddock</i> principle.....	65
<i>Information that is too general</i>	65
<i>Not the authority’s job</i>	66
Failure to observe proper process	67
<i>A New Zealand high water mark</i>	67
<i>New South Wales refuses to follow suit</i>	70
<i>The New Zealand reaction to Craig</i>	72
<i>The concept of immunity</i>	72
<i>Morrison – no duty of care in interpreting or making planning decisions</i>	73
<i>Morrison and Craig</i>	75
<i>Applying Morrison – no liability for wrongly registering a transfer of a water consent</i>	75
<i>Some parts of the process are not subject to the immunity</i>	76
<i>De Nagy – a little more ambiguous</i>	78
6. LIABILITY FOR NEGLIGENTLY INSPECTING BUILDINGS.....	81
Leaky homes – new crisis and old cases.....	81
<i>The leaky homes system</i>	81
<i>The procedure under the Act</i>	82
<i>The jurisdiction of arbitrators</i>	83
<i>Problems with the procedure</i>	83
<i>Remedies under the Act</i>	85
The building cases.....	85
<i>The (almost) unique New Zealand case law</i>	85
<i>Cooke P and the “impossible distinction”</i>	86
<i>Richardson J and the unique New Zealand environment</i>	87
<i>The agnostic Privy Council</i>	88
<i>The English take on New Zealand’s approach – general reliance</i>	89
<i>The Canadian position</i>	90
<i>Developments in (restricting) economic loss</i>	90
<i>The responsibility of the owner-builder</i>	92
<i>The knock out blow argument fails</i>	92
<i>The patent-latent distinction</i>	93
<i>Questions left over after Hamlin</i>	94
(Non) liability of regulators	96
<i>Introduction – Fleming v Securities Commission</i>	96
<i>The Canadian decisions – Cooper and Edwards</i>	97
<i>Carter</i> – a man, a woman, a company and a boat.....	99
<i>Rutherford – a relic of a forgotten theory?</i>	101
<i>Carter – the possibility of a claim for breach of statutory duty</i>	102
<i>Breach of statutory duty and the Building Act</i>	103
<i>Carter as the trend for the future?</i>	104
The reaction to <i>Carter</i> and <i>Three Meade</i> in leaky homes cases	104
<i>Three Meade Street</i>	107
<i>The importance of the decision</i>	107
<i>Facts and holdings</i>	107
<i>Relationship of Three Meade to the building cases</i>	108
<i>The reaction to Three Meade</i>	109
Breach of the duty of care	111
<i>The importance of breach</i>	111
<i>Venning J’s approach to breach – the impact of the Building Act</i>	112

<i>Looking at the particular claims in Three Meade</i>	113
<i>Particular breaches in Ponsonby Gardens adjudication</i>	114
7. NUISANCE, RYLANDS V FLETCHER AND PUBLIC AUTHORITIES	119
The land based torts as a loss spreading instrument through the community.....	119
<i>Thames Water – the case for not spreading the loss</i>	120
<i>The approach of the High Court and the Court of Appeal</i>	120
<i>Ryland v Fletcher and public authorities</i>	121
<i>New Zealand councils – the nuisance clause and statutory authorisation</i>	122
<i>Thames Water and the burden of public obligation</i>	125
<i>The importance of other means of redress</i>	126
<i>The importance of the statutory scheme</i>	126
<i>Lord Hoffmann and the proper realm of public law redux</i>	127
<i>Public law for a privatised company?</i>	128
<i>Human rights actions are still subject to the same “public law”</i>	129
New Zealand’s drain law.....	130
The importance of causation.....	130
Strict liability.....	132
8. MISFEASANCE IN A PUBLIC OFFICE	135
Introduction.....	135
The justification for the tort.....	136
The relationship between misfeasance and other torts.....	137
<i>Misfeasance and the other intentional torts</i>	137
<i>Misfeasance and negligence</i>	138
<i>The elements of the tort</i>	138
Targeted malice.....	142
<i>Duty to the plaintiff?</i>	146
<i>Causation, damage and remoteness</i>	148
Misfeasance claims in planning cases.....	149
<i>The possibility</i>	149
<i>The difficulty of imputing malice</i>	150
Reservations about succeeding in misfeasance.....	151
9. UNDERLYING LIABILITY OF LOCAL AUTHORITIES	153
<i>Ardern v Rodney District Council and Roberts v Rodney District Council</i>	153
<i>Grubmayr v Auckland City Council</i>	154
10. RESTITUTIONARY REMEDIES	157
Restitution.....	157
<i>Electricity Corporation of New Zealand v Waikato Regional Council</i>	157
Conclusion on <i>ECNZ v WRC</i>	160
<i>Pacific National Investments Ltd v Victoria (City)</i>	160
<i>Implications</i>	162
11. BILL OF RIGHTS	163
Application of BORA to local authorities.....	163
<i>What type of conduct will implicate BORA?</i>	163
<i>BORA compensation principles and caselaw</i>	164
<i>Upton v Green</i>	165
<i>Binstead v Northern Region Domestic Violence (Programmes) Approval Panel</i>	165
<i>Udompun v A-G : High Court</i>	166
<i>Udompun v A-G : Court of Appeal</i>	167
<i>Conclusion</i>	169
Narrowing the scope of the application of s 27(1) BORA.....	169
Bylaws should be drafted to restrict BORA rights as little as possible.....	171

Conclusion on BORA	173
12. EQUITY	175
Rating	175
<i>Mackenzie District Council v ECNZ</i>	175
<i>Wellington CC v Woolworths NZ Ltd (No 2)</i>	176
<i>Subsequent cases: narrow application of Mackenzie</i>	177
Evaluation	178
Estoppel and representations by public authorities.....	178
(1) <i>Ultra vires representations</i>	178
(2) <i>“No-fetter” rule</i>	179
(3) <i>Ostensible authority and non-delegation of powers</i>	179
(4) <i>Representations as to public policy or political issues</i>	181
(5) <i>“Ordinary” commercial and proprietary transactions</i>	181