



New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects Inc  
 PO Box 10-022, The Terrace, Wellington 6143, New Zealand  
 Phone: 0800 843 694, Email: info@nzila.co.nz, Web: www.nzila.co.nz

19 January 2013

Mr John Adams  
 Acting for the Adams and Huatau  
 24 Greens Road  
 RD2, Palmerston North

Dear John

Re **Complaint re NZILA member acting in his role as a landscape expert on Tiritea Board of Inquiry**

Tenakoe e John,  
 Tenakoutou Adams and Huatau,

I refer to your letter dated November 10 2012, with a follow up letter dated 13 December; addressed to the NZILA Executive Officer, together with Appendix 1 of 6 pages, Appendix 2 of 22 pages, and two further appendices. In your letter of complaint you note that members of Boards of Inquiry are not liable for actions undertaken in good faith in that capacity, but that your complaint hinges on your argument that Mr Hudson as a Board member did not act in good faith in the performance of his duties.

You also note in the final paragraph of your letter that the Adams and Huatau are seeking:

- that Mr Hudson be held accountable in terms of the NZILA Code of Conduct, and secondly
- that Mr Hudson assists the Adams and Huatau to have errors in the final report (of the Board of Inquiry ) rectified.

As you are aware the New Zealand Institute of landscape Architects (NZILA), along with other professions holds members to high standards of professional behaviour, has a professional code of conduct, and in the event of a possible breach of the code, has a complaints procedure to ensure that the reputation of the profession, and public respect and trust in the work of members is not damaged.

Please be advised that, in normal circumstances, the NZILA would expect that a member of a Government-appointed Board of Inquiry, acting in that capacity, would not fall within the purview of the NZILA. It may be that, in very exceptional circumstances, actions undertaken in such capacity may be argued to be beyond the decision-making role of the Board. However, after giving your letter and appendices careful consideration, at this preliminary stage in our Complaints Procedure we have formed the unanimous view that the matters you have raised are not such exceptional circumstances.

We have viewed the information you have provided in the light of the Code of Conduct, clause 1.2 (a), (c), (e), and (f) and have concluded as a preliminary assessment that there is no justification for undertaking a formal disciplinary committee hearing because in this particular circumstance there is no issue to answer and we find that Mr Hudson has not breached any of the above sections. Further there is no evidence that Mr Hudson has not acted with honesty, fairness and integrity, so that