

From: [Allie Dunn](#)
To: [REDACTED]@stuff.co.nz
Subject: CM: Response to request re Questions regarding Determination 2023/031 and CCC reversal
Date: Thursday, 26 February 2026 9:47:00 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Kia ora

I am writing in response to your official information request dated 20 February 2026 regarding Determination 2023/031 and CCC reversal.

The information you have requested is outlined below.

1. The determination concluded the as-built dwelling did not comply with the Building Code, particularly in relation to structure (B1) and external moisture (E2). Does the council accept these findings in full?

The Determination makes a number of findings and conclusions. Tararua District Council (Council) participated in the MBIE Determination process, including making submissions to MBIE. Since the Determination was issued, Council has not taken any steps to challenge the decision, including by way of appeal.

2. The Ministry found the criteria under section 94 were not met when the Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) was issued. Why did council staff believe at the time that issuing the CCC was justified?

Council staff inspected the dwelling and sought and received information from the building prior to issuing CCC. At the time the CCC was issued, Council staff considered that construction of the dwelling complied with the Building Consent. As part of its submission to MBIE, Council accepted that that position was incorrect.

3. The dwelling was not constructed by a licensed building practitioner, and no Record of Work was provided. What internal legal or technical advice did council rely on in deciding that the absence of a Record of Work did not prevent issuing the CCC?

Council relied on the technical knowledge within its Building Team. The Council team was also relying on prior MBIE Determinations that the absence of a record of work is not a reason to refuse a CCC.

4. The determination identified insufficient detailing in the original consent documentation to demonstrate compliance with weathertightness requirements. How did the consent pass vetting given these gaps?

At the time the application for building consent was processed, Council staff relied

on the Multiproof Certificate A10135 supplied with the application for building consent.

5. Were any internal reviews, audits, or staff training changes undertaken after concerns were raised by the owner in 2020?

The consenting officer involved with the property and Building Manager departed Council in around 2021. Council subsequently appointed an external consultant who provided training and assistance to staff.

6. Does the council intend to issue a Notice to Fix or require further remedial work following the reversal of the CCC? If so, what is the expected process and timeframe?

The effect of the determination was that the building consent and CCC were reversed. The owner has already been notified of the position by MBIE. Council does not intend to take any regulatory action at this stage, including issue of a Notice to Fix.

7. Has council assessed whether other building consents issued under similar Multiproof circumstances may have comparable compliance risks?

This particular building is unique. We believe it is unlikely any other Multiproof consents would have similar risks.

8. What support, if any, is being offered to the homeowner now that the CCC has been reversed?

Council and its advisors have been in regular contact with the owner about this issue since the Determination was received.

9. Does the council accept any liability exposure as a result of this determination?

As noted above, Council is in communication with the owner, and, accordingly, does not comment on liability.

10. More broadly, what assurance can the council provide to ratepayers that its building control processes are robust, particularly where Multiproof certificates are involved?

Council considers that this matter is an unfortunate exception. Council's building control processes are robust and thorough. The only few other Multiproof buildings we have in the district, are different types of buildings and have had no issues.

Ngā mihi

Allie Dunn | Manager Democracy Services | Deputy Electoral Officer
Democracy Services | Tararua District Council

Phone: +64 6 3744080 | Mobile: +64 27 3331626

Allie.Dunn@Tararuadc.govt.nz

From: Allie Dunn

Sent: Friday, 20 February 2026 3:39 pm

To: [REDACTED]@stuff.co.nz

Subject: CM: Acknowledgement of receipt of information request re Questions regarding Determination 2023/031 and CCC reversal

Kia ora

We acknowledge receipt of your request for information relating to the recent determination issued by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment.

We are currently working on your request and will provide a response as soon as we are able. However, it is unlikely that we will be able to meet your requested timeframe of 12 noon on Monday, 23 February 2026.

Ngā mihi



Allie Dunn | Manager Democracy Services | Deputy Electoral Officer

Democracy Services | Tararua District Council

Phone: +64 6 3744080 | Mobile: +64 27 3331626

Allie.Dunn@Tararuadc.govt.nz

26 Gordon Street, Dannevirke 4930, PO Box 115

www.tararuadc.govt.nz

www.facebook.com/tararuadc

From: [REDACTED]@stuff.co.nz>

Sent: Friday, 20 February 2026 9:38 am

To: Info - Tararua District Council <Info@TararuaDC.Govt.NZ>

Subject: Questions regarding Determination 2023/031 and CCC reversal

EXTERNAL EMAIL ALERT: Caution advised. This message is from an external sender. Verify the sender's identity and use caution with attachments and links.

Kia ora,

I'm preparing a story following the November 9, 2023 determination issued by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (Determination 2023/031), which reversed the decision to issue a Code Compliance Certificate for the relocatable dwelling at 251 Priest Rd, Eketāhuna.

Given the determination's findings, I have several questions for the Tararua District Council:

1. The determination concluded the as-built dwelling did not comply with the Building Code, particularly in relation to structure (B1) and external moisture (E2). Does the council accept these findings in full?
2. The Ministry found the criteria under section 94 were not met when the Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) was issued. Why did council staff believe at the time that issuing the CCC was justified?
3. The dwelling was not constructed by a licensed building practitioner, and no Record of Work was provided. What internal legal or technical advice did council rely on in deciding that the absence of a Record of Work did not prevent issuing the CCC?
4. The determination identified insufficient detailing in the original consent documentation to demonstrate compliance with weathertightness requirements. How did the consent pass vetting given these gaps?
5. Were any internal reviews, audits, or staff training changes undertaken after concerns were raised by the owner in 2020?
6. Does the council intend to issue a Notice to Fix or require further remedial work following the reversal of the CCC? If so, what is the expected process and timeframe?
7. Has council assessed whether other building consents issued under similar Multiproof circumstances may have comparable compliance risks?
8. What support, if any, is being offered to the homeowner now that the CCC has been reversed?
9. Does the council accept any liability exposure as a result of this determination?
10. More broadly, what assurance can the council provide to ratepayers that its building control processes are robust, particularly where Multiproof certificates are involved?

Please provide responses by Monday 12pm. Thanks

<https://www.building.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/resolving-problems/determinations/2023/2023-031.pdf>

--

Ngā mihi,

[Redacted]

Reporter
Wairarapa Times-Age

E [Redacted] [stuff.co.nz](mailto:[Redacted]@stuff.co.nz) | M [Redacted]
Wairarapa Times-Age, 70 Chapel St, Masterton



The information contained in this e-mail message and any accompanying files is or may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, reliance, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail or any attached files is unauthorised. This e-mail is subject to copyright. No part of it should be reproduced, adapted or communicated without the written consent of the copyright owner. If you have received this e-mail in error please advise the sender immediately by return e-mail or telephone and delete all copies. Stuff Limited does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of any information contained in this e-mail or attached files. Internet communications are not secure, therefore Stuff Limited does not accept legal responsibility for the contents of this message or attached files.