

**EXPOSURE DRAFT - FOR COMMENT AND DISCUSSION ONLY | HUKIHUKI HURANGA
- MŌ TE TĀKUPU ME TE MATAPAKI ANAKE**

Deadline for comment | Aukatinga mō te tākupu: **18 December 2023**

Please quote reference | Whakahuatia te tohutoro: **PUB00427**

Send feedback to | Tukuna mai ngā whakahokinga kōrero ki
Public.Consultation@ird.govt.nz

QUESTIONS WE'VE BEEN ASKED | PĀTAI KUA UIA MAI

When is a subdivision project a “taxable activity” for GST purposes?

Issued | Tukuna: Issue date

QB XX/XX

This Question We've Been Asked sets out when a subdivision project is an activity carried on “continuously or regularly” in the definition of “taxable activity” for GST purposes. It also sets out when the sale of subdivided land is a supply made in the course or furtherance of a taxable activity.

Key provisions | Whakaratonga tāpua

Goods and Services Tax Act 1985 – s 6

**REPLACES | WHAKAKAPIA: Tax Information Bulletin Vol 7 No 2 (August 1995),
“GST and subdivisions – Court of Appeal decision in the *Newman* case”, Tax
Information Bulletin Vol 7, No 2 (August 1995): 10.**

All legislative references are to the Goods and Services Tax Act 1985 (GST Act) unless otherwise stated.

Question | Pātai

When is a subdivision project a “taxable activity” for GST purposes?

Answer | Whakautu

A subdivision project is a taxable activity when it is carried on continuously or regularly and involves, or is intended to involve, the making of supplies to another person for consideration.

Whether a subdivision project is carried on continuously or regularly needs to be considered on a case-by-case basis. This Question We’ve Been Asked outlines factors that might affect whether a subdivision project is continuous or regular, such as:

- the scale of the subdivision;
- the level of development work;
- the number of lots created and sold;
- the time and effort involved;
- the level of financial investment;
- the level of repetition; and
- whether the subdivision is done in the course or furtherance of an existing taxable activity.

Generally, a small-scale subdivision involving the creation of one extra lot and sale of the bare land will not be a taxable activity. Similarly, a small-scale subdivision involving the creation of one extra lot, and the construction and sale of a single house on the lot, will generally not be a taxable activity.

Key terms | Kīanga tau tāpua

Subdivision means dividing a parcel of land into two or more, or changing an existing boundary location. For the purpose of this item, subdivision also includes any development or building work on the land carried out as part of a subdivision project.

Explanation | Whakamāramatanga

1. A policy statement titled “GST and subdivisions – Court of Appeal decision in the *Newman case*” was published in *Tax Information Bulletin* Vol 7, No 2 (August 1995): 10.
2. That policy statement outlined the Commissioner’s position following the decision in *Newman v CIR* (1995) 17 NZTC 12,097 (CA). According to the statement, whether a subdivision project is a taxable activity for GST purposes depends on the facts of each case, considering factors such as the scale of the subdivision, level of development work, time and effort involved, amount of financial investment, and commerciality of the transaction.
3. The Commissioner considers most of these factors are still relevant when considering whether a subdivision is a taxable activity. However, this item clarifies and, in some respects, differs from that policy statement. This item replaces the policy statement and identifies elements that have changed.

Legislation

4. Section 8(1) imposes GST on the supply of goods and services in New Zealand by a registered person in the course or furtherance of a taxable activity. If you are carrying on a taxable activity, you may be required to register for GST.¹ For general guidance on GST registration and requirements, see the Inland Revenue guide IR 375, *GST Guide: Working with GST*.
5. “Taxable activity” is defined in s 6. Under s 6(1)(a), the main features of a taxable activity are:
 - there is an activity;
 - the activity is carried on “continuously” or “regularly”; and
 - the activity involves, or is intended to involve, the supply of goods and services to another person for a consideration.
6. The courts have held that an “activity” is a broad concept involving a combination of tasks undertaken, or a series of acts or course of conduct pursued by a person.² Subdividing land is almost always an activity for GST purposes.

¹ The requirements and conditions for GST registration are set out in ss 51 and 51B.

² See, for example, *CIR v Bayly* (1998) 18 NZTC 14,073 (CA) at 14,078, and *Case 14/2016* (2016) 27 NZTC 3,036 at [63].

7. Subdivision is also usually an activity that involves, or is intended to involve, the supply of goods or services to another person for a consideration. This is usually satisfied as, in most instances, some or all of the subdivided land is sold. However, this is not always the case, such as where the subdivided land is kept for private use.
8. This means that, in the context of a subdivision project, the most relevant factor will generally be whether the activity is carried on continuously or regularly. This Question We've Been Asked focuses on this factor.

Continuously or regularly

9. An activity is carried on continuously if it is carried on over a period or in a sequence uninterrupted in time or if it is connected.³
10. A taxable activity is carried on regularly if it is carried on accordance with a definite course or a uniform principle of action or conduct, or if a proper correspondence exists between the elements of the activity.⁴
11. With an activity like a subdivision project that involves creating one extra lot, it can be difficult to work out whether it will be carried on "continuously or regularly". The following guidance has been developed from comparing the facts, analysis, and outcomes of cases concerning the GST treatment of subdivisions. This is designed to assist taxpayers in working out whether a subdivision project they are involved in or plan to be involved in will be an activity carried on continuously or regularly, potentially requiring GST registration.

Newman

12. The leading case on the meaning of "carried on continuously or regularly" in the context of subdivisions is *Newman* (CA).
13. The taxpayer in *Newman* was a GST-registered builder who bought 2.7 hectares of land to build a family home. Due to financial difficulties, he subdivided the land to fund the completion of the family home. Minimal development work was undertaken, but some drainage and electrical work was done. Eventually, the taxpayer sold the subdivided lot.
14. The Commissioner determined this subdivision was a taxable supply. The Taxation Review Authority and High Court both found that the sale of the subdivided lot was a

³ *Wakelin v CIR* (1997) 18 NZTC 13,182 (HC).

⁴ *Wakelin* at 13,185-13,186.

taxable supply.⁵ This was consistent with most case law before *Newman*, where almost all subdivisions were found to be taxable activities.

15. However, on appeal, the Court of Appeal unanimously allowed the taxpayer's appeal and found the sale of the subdivided land was not, by itself, a taxable activity as it was not an activity carried on continuously or regularly.
16. In reaching its decision, the Court of Appeal did not consider it was necessary to break down an activity into a series of sequential steps. The Court used examples of shopping or selling a car as activities which, if broken down into a series of steps, could be described as carried on continuously. Instead, what is relevant is whether the activity (of which the series of steps formed part) was one that was carried on continuously or regularly.
17. The Court of Appeal in *Newman* deliberately did not express a view as to what would make a particular subdivision a taxable activity.⁶ The Court acknowledged that some factual circumstances will be hard to classify but stated it will be a matter of fact and degree.⁷

Wakelin

18. The High Court decision in *Wakelin v CIR* is often compared and contrasted with *Newman*.⁸ The taxpayer in *Wakelin* carried out subdivision work on a block of land. The taxpayer subdivided the land into six residential lots over a period of three years, and then sold all of the lots over the following six years. The case concerned five of the sales.
19. The High Court found that although there was not a "great deal" of work involved, and it could have been done in a relatively short time, the taxpayer continuously and regularly subdivided a portion of land and supplied five sections to the market over several years.⁹
20. The High Court distinguished *Newman* primarily based on the number of supplies made. While Paterson J acknowledged it is the activity that must be continuous or regular, not the supply of goods, the number of supplies made is still relevant.¹⁰

⁵ *Case P4* (1992) 14 NZTC 4,024, *Newman v CIR* (1994) 16 NZTC 11,229 (HC).

⁶ *Newman* (CA) per Richardson J at 12,101.

⁷ *Newman* (CA) per Richardson K at 12,101, per Gault J at 12,103, per McKay J at 12,104.

⁸ *Wakelin v CIR* (1997) 18 NZTC 13,182 (HC).

⁹ *Wakelin* at 13,186.

¹⁰ *Wakelin* at 13,185.

Other cases

21. Following *Newman*, there have been several TRA cases concerning the GST treatment of subdivisions. Where relevant, these cases have been referenced and relied on in the guidance below.

Relevant factors

22. The following factors that may be relevant when determining whether a person is carrying on an activity continuously or regularly include:
- the scale of the subdivision;
 - the level of development work;
 - the number of lots created and sold;
 - the time and effort involved;
 - the level of financial investment;
 - the level of repetition; and
 - whether the subdivision is done in the course or furtherance of an existing taxable activity.
23. This is a general guide and is not an exhaustive list. If a taxpayer's circumstances share some elements in common with statements or examples in this QWBA, this does not necessarily mean that the taxpayer's tax treatment will be the same as that indicated by the statements or examples. Ultimately, the activity must be considered as a whole, realistically as it is carried on, and all relevant factors must be considered together.¹¹

Scale of the subdivision

24. The greater the scale of the subdivision project, the more likely it is to be an activity carried on continuously or regularly. This factor is likely to overlap with the level of development work, as the greater the scale of the project, generally the more development work that is needed.
25. Subdividing land to construct and sell a block of townhouses, or to construct an office building or apartment building, would almost certainly be a subdivision project of sufficient scale for it to be an activity carried on continuously or regularly. Similarly,

¹¹ *Newman* (CA) per Gault J at 12,102.

subdividing a large plot of land to be used as a new housing development would be an activity carried on continuously or regularly.

Level of development work

26. It is common for subdivision projects to involve some development of the land, particularly as this is often a requirement for council consent. This item only concerns development work in the context of a subdivision, but similar factors are relevant when determining whether a land development project with no subdivision is a taxable activity.
27. The more development work involved in a subdivision project, the more likely it is to be an activity carried on continuously.¹² While *Newman* (CA) confirmed that an activity should not be broken down into sequential steps, it is still necessary to consider the steps involved in the activity to take a real and holistic view of the activity.¹³
28. Development work might include:
- earthworks and landscaping;
 - roading and installation of driveways and paths;
 - the installation of facility infrastructure, such as sewerage, power, wastewater drainage and so on;
 - the erection of retaining walls or dividing fences;
 - the demolition, removal, or renovation of existing structures or buildings on the land; and
 - construction of structures or buildings on the land.
29. Generally, the Commissioner considers that the level of development work involved in the construction and sale of a single house or other residential dwelling as part of a subdivision project is not, on its own, enough for an activity to be considered carried on continuously or regularly.¹⁴ On the other hand, the construction and sale of multiple residential dwellings, or a large commercial building, is more likely to be continuous or regular. See from [44] for more information on the “commerciality” of a subdivision project.

¹² In *Newman* (CA), the low level of development work was relevant to the conclusion that a taxable activity did not exist.

¹³ *Case S70* (1996) 17 NZTC 7,431 at 7,441.

¹⁴ Consistent with *Case T62* (1998) 18 NZTC 8,468.

30. In all cases, it is the level of development work which is relevant, rather than the specific form the subdivided land takes after development is completed.

Number of lots created and sold

31. There is no specific number of lots created that determines whether a taxable activity exists. However, case law indicates that where a subdivision activity involves the creation and sale of multiple lots, this may be a taxable activity even if the level of development work is similar to that in *Newman*.¹⁵ This does not mean a subdivision involving the creation and sale of multiple lots will always be a continuous activity.¹⁶ It may be that the subdivision is so straight-forward that the number of resulting lots sold is not significant to the question of whether the activity is continuous. However, a court is more likely to consider an activity “continuous” if it involves the sale of multiple lots.
32. On the other hand, an activity leading to the supply of only one section will not usually be considered an activity carried on continuously or regularly.¹⁷ Again, this does not mean that an activity leading to one supply can never be a taxable activity. If other factors are sufficiently present, such as the scale of the subdivision or the level of development work, this will indicate the activity is continuous even if it leads to only one supply.¹⁸ This is because it is the activity itself that must be continuous, not the making of supplies.¹⁹

Time and effort involved

33. If a project is carried on over a long period, this might point towards the subdivision activity being continuous. Similarly, if there is a large amount of effort involved on the taxpayer’s part, this may point towards the activity being continuous. This would include any work on the taxpayer’s part to effect the subdivision such as organising

¹⁵ In *Wakelin*, Paterson J distinguished a one-off transaction supplying one item as in *Newman* from the sale of several sections. In *Case T40* (1997) 18 NZTC 8,267, the taxpayer intended to sell five lots but at the time had sold only two. Judge Barber stated it was not a one-off. In *Case S70*, Judge Barber stated the level of development work was similar to that in *Newman*, but the increased number of resulting sections was a distinguishing factor.

¹⁶ In *Case S70* Judge Barber acknowledged that the sale of more than one section may not amount to a taxable activity.

¹⁷ *Wakelin* at 13,185, cited with approval in *Case T62*.

¹⁸ *Case S70* at 7,440.

¹⁹ *Newman* (CA) at 12,103, cited with support in *Wakelin* at 13,185.

consent, finance, or new titles, speaking with lawyers, surveyors and real estate agents, and any other general project management work.

34. It is noted that the time and effort involved in carrying out a subdivision project is likely to be higher if the taxpayer is carrying out development or project management work themselves, rather than hiring contractors to manage the project. This, on its own, is unlikely to change whether a taxable activity exists, but it is still relevant as part of the broader enquiry.
35. If a subdivision project is interrupted in time or sequence, then it is not continuous or regular. However, provided the intention to complete the activity is not interrupted, then an activity being carried on in “fits and starts” does not necessarily prevent it being continuous or regular, as Paterson J found in *Wakelin*.²⁰ That said, a continuous intention to complete the activity is not enough on its own. The more time in which there is no or only very little activity, the less likely an activity is to be continuous or regular.

Level of financial investment

36. The level of financial investment is unlikely to be a significant factor on its own. However, it may provide further support for other factors, such as the scale of the subdivision or level of development work.
37. If a subdivision activity is unusually costly because of specific factors relating to the location of the land (for example, if the land is in an area with a labour or material shortage leading to increased prices), this is unlikely to affect whether the activity is continuous or regular.

Level of repetition

38. In the context of subdivisions, an activity is likely to be carried on “regularly” if a person carries out the subdivision process on a regular or repeated basis. This will be the case even if each individual subdivision would not be a taxable activity on its own.
39. This could apply where a person has a pattern of acquiring land to subdivide, or where a person subdivides a single piece of land in a way that involves repeatedly supplying new lots over time. The High Court in *Wakelin* found that subdivision of the taxpayer’s land and supply to market of five sections over nine years was an activity carried on both continuously and regularly.²¹ Similarly, the TRA in *Case 7/2012* indicated that if

²⁰ *Wakelin* at 13,186.

²¹ *Wakelin* at 13,186.

the taxpayer's planned subdivision project (which was to involve the development and sale of several high-end residential properties over time) had proceeded as intended, it would have been an activity carried on regularly.²²

Existing taxable activity

40. If a taxpayer is already registered for GST, whether any subdivision activity is part of that taxable activity depends on whether the subdivision was carried on in the course or furtherance of that taxable activity. This in turn depends on its connection, if any, to the taxable activity in question.
41. A subdivision activity that might not constitute a taxable activity on its own still gives rise to GST obligations if it was done in the course or furtherance of another taxable activity.
42. In *Case P4*, which led to the *Newman* (CA) decision, the Taxation Review Authority found that, even though the taxpayer had a taxable activity as a builder, the subdivision activity was not done in the course or furtherance of that taxable activity.²³

Factors that are not likely to be relevant

43. Factors that are not usually relevant when determining whether a subdivision activity is an activity carried on continuously or regularly include commerciality, activity before there is an intention to make supplies, and actions that relate to subdivided land not used for making supplies.

Commerciality

44. The policy statement and some older cases referred to the relevance of the "commerciality" of a subdivision project, or distinguished between the sale of commercial assets and private assets, when determining whether a taxable activity exists.
45. The Commissioner considers commerciality is no longer significant following *Newman* (CA) and *Wakelin*. Richardson J in *Newman* disagreed with the approach taken by the Taxation Review Authority in *Case P4*. The Authority relied on the conclusion that the

²² *Case 7/2012* (2012) 25 NZTC 1,019 at [99].

²³ While the Court of Appeal overturned the decisions of the Taxation Review Authority and High Court, this element of the Authority's decision was not appealed.

subdivision project was “commercial in nature” in reaching its conclusion that the taxpayer was carrying on a taxable activity.²⁴

46. Richardson J stated that determining whether a transaction was commercial in nature was not the relevant enquiry.²⁵

As I see it, it is not a matter of importing any overlay of commercial dealing or of trying to draw a distinction between the divestment of commercial assets and private assets. Rather it is whether the process engaged in, whatever the asset or its location or the occupation of the taxpayer, comes within the statutory language.

47. Judge Barber in *Case S70* later accepted the *Newman* (CA) view that whether a commercial element exists in the relevant activity is “beside the point”.²⁶
48. Similarly, Paterson J in *Wakelin* stated that lacking a commercial or businesslike flavour does not preclude a taxable activity from existing.²⁷

The fact that the venture may lack a commercial or businesslike flavour or that it may be a sale of private assets is not sufficient to preclude the application of s 6(1). A transaction which involves the sale of private assets, if carried out continuously or regularly, falls within the provisions of the section (see McKay J in *Newman v C of IR...*).

49. Comments in *Newman* (CA) and other cases indicate that the construction and sale of a single commercial building on subdivided land is an activity carried on continuously or regularly.²⁸ The Commissioner’s view is that this does not mean the commercial nature of such a project on its own is significant. Instead, it reflects that, generally, the construction of a commercial building is on a greater scale, involves a higher level of financial investment, time and effort, and requires more development work than the construction of a residential dwelling. An example of this is the construction of a large office block, warehouse, or factory. This type of project will almost always be a taxable activity.
50. In some circumstances, constructing and selling a commercial building as part of a subdivision project will not be a taxable activity. The policy statement included an example involving the construction and sale of a tea shop on subdivided land. The example concluded the taxpayer was carrying on a taxable activity. The Commissioner now considers this example is incorrect. The level of work involved in building a tea

²⁴ *Case P4* at 4,034.

²⁵ *Newman* (CA) at 12,100-12,101.

²⁶ *Case S70* at 7,440.

²⁷ *Wakelin* at 13,185.

²⁸ *Newman* (CA) at 12,101.

shop will not normally be higher than that involved in constructing a residential dwelling.²⁹

51. These views are consistent with the requirements of s 6. No requirement exists for an activity to be commercial or business-like for it to be a taxable activity. On the contrary, s 6(1)(a) specifies that an activity need not be carried on for pecuniary profit, and non-business structures such as clubs are explicitly included as forms in which an activity can be carried on. This also means a subdivision project need not be profitable for a taxable activity to exist. Judge Barber made this clear in *Case 7/2012*.³⁰ However, an activity carried on essentially as a private pursuit or hobby is not a taxable activity.³¹

Activity before intention to make supplies

52. The definition of “taxable activity” refers to any activity that involves, or is intended to involve, the supply of goods and services for a consideration. The “or” in “involves or is intended to involve” suggests it is enough for one of these requirements to be met.
53. In *Case T62*, two taxpayers bought land with the intention of building two units for their families to live in, but when the units were approximately 65% completed, one of them decided to remain in their existing home. Both units were sold to the company the taxpayers operated, with one taxpayer using the unit as their family home and the other unit being sold to a third party.³²
54. Judge Barber found that because the building activity of the taxpayer’s apartment led to its sale, then the activity must have “involved” that supply even though it was not contemplated when the building work began.³³
55. For this reason, the Commissioner considers that if a taxpayer makes a supply or supplies of subdivided sections, whether there was originally an intention to make such a supply or supplies does not affect whether a taxable activity exists. In this situation, anything done in the course or furtherance of making that supply after the intention to make supplies for consideration arose is relevant to whether the activity is carried on continuously or regularly. If a taxpayer’s intention changes in the course of a

²⁹ However, if the taxpayer operated the tea shop or leased the shop to commercial tenants, rather than selling it, the costs involved in the relevant part of the subdivision and construction would form part of any taxable activity of running or leasing the shop.

³⁰ *Case 7/2012* at [102].

³¹ Section 6(3)(a) and (aa).

³² Judge Barber did not treat the sale to the company as significant.

³³ *Case T62* at [48].

subdivision project, the taxpayer has the onus of proving that intention changed and when, as with other factual matters.

Actions that relate to subdivided land not used for making supplies

56. Subdivision and development work that does not relate to the making of supplies is not relevant in determining whether a taxable activity exists. For example, if a taxpayer builds two units on subdivided land, lives in one unit and sells the other, only work and expenditure relating to the unit and land that is sold are relevant in determining the existence of a taxable activity.³⁴ However, consistent with the previous paragraphs, if a taxpayer intends to live in one of the units but changes their mind and sells both, then all the work involved in the subdivision and development after that intention changed is relevant when determining whether a taxable activity exists.
57. For similar reasons, the use of the land before its subdivision is not relevant. If a taxpayer lives on the land to be subdivided, this is not treated any differently from a subdivision project on land purchased specifically for that purpose. That said, buying a piece of land to subdivide is likely to involve higher upfront cost. It is also likely to require more time and effort in finding the right piece of land, and going through the processes to acquire it. As previously stated, these factors are relevant as part of the overall enquiry.

Income tax

58. This item addresses only GST treatment. Even if a subdivision activity is not a taxable activity for GST purposes, **the resulting sale may still be subject to income tax.**
59. For example, if you buy land with a purpose or intention of disposing of it, an amount derived from the disposal may be taxable income under s CB 6 of the Income Tax Act 2007. Sections CB 7 to CB 15B of the Income Tax Act 2007 also include in a person's income certain amounts relating to disposal of land, including sections CB 10, CB 12, and CB 13 which specifically refer to subdivisions. Residential land subdivided and sold within 5 or 10 years of acquisition may also be taxable under the bright-line tests in ss CB 6A or CZ 39 of the Income Tax Act 2007.³⁵

³⁴ *Tout v Cook* (1991) 13 NZTC 8,053 (HC) concerns a similar situation where a taxpayer built a house on subdivided land but then moved into the new house and sold the existing house. The High Court found the taxpayer was not carrying on a taxable activity.

³⁵ The relevant acquisition date for subdivided land is the date the undivided land was acquired.

60. Inland Revenue has released several items on the treatment of a sale or disposal of land for income tax purposes. Search the Inland Revenue [Tax Technical](#) website for more information.

Avoidance

61. All of the guidance in this item is subject to the GST avoidance provision in s 76. Under s 76, a tax avoidance arrangement entered into by a person is void against the Commissioner for tax purposes. "Tax avoidance arrangement" is an arrangement which has tax avoidance as its purpose or effect, or one of its purposes or effects, if the purpose or effect is not merely incidental. If a tax avoidance arrangement is void against the Commissioner, the Commissioner may adjust the amount of tax payable by, or the amount of tax refundable to, a registered person affected by the arrangement, to counteract any tax advantage obtained.
62. Please see the Commissioner's [Interpretation Statement IS 23/01: Tax avoidance and the interpretation of the general anti-avoidance provisions sections BG 1 and GA 1 of the Income Tax Act 2007](#) for more information about tax avoidance.³⁶

Examples | Taura

63. These examples/taura assume the resulting sales of subdivided land exceed the GST registration threshold of \$60,000. These examples/taura also assume that the arrangements are not tax avoidance arrangements under s 76.

Example | Taura 1 – Basic subdivision

Mike and Megan are not registered for GST. They have owned their own home in Auckland for 20 years. They subdivide their section into two to sell one lot and put the proceeds towards retirement savings.

Mike and Megan carry out development work to meet Auckland Council's requirements for consent. They engage contractors to:

- construct sealed road access and an extended driveway to the rear section;
- level terrain and improve drainage for stormwater management; and

³⁶ While this statement is primarily concerned with avoidance for income tax purposes, it is also relevant to s 76 as s 76 is aligned with s BG 1 of the Income Tax Act 2007. This is specified at para [1.3] of IS 23/01.

- install water, wastewater, telecommunications and power infrastructure and connections.

In addition to the fees for contractors and materials, and the time and effort of managing the project, Mike and Megan incurred costs to apply for consent, as well as professional fees (for surveyors, lawyers, real estate agents and so on), development contribution fees, and Land Information New Zealand fees. Once a new certificate of title is issued for the lot, Mike and Megan put the land up for sale, and it sells within a month. Mike and Megan continue to live in their house on the front section.

Are Mike and Megan carrying on a taxable activity?

GST treatment

Mike and Megan's subdivision activity is not a taxable activity as it is not carried on continuously or regularly. The subdivision is a straight-forward subdivision into two lots. While there is development work to meet Council consent requirements, and associated time, effort, and cost to meet these requirements, this is not on its own sufficient for the activity to be carried on continuously.

Example | Tauria 2 – Subdivision and small-scale development

Jensen is a GST-registered sole trader who runs a business inspecting and repairing ventilation systems.

Jensen's house is leaky and requires substantial repairs and full re-cladding. He receives advice that it would be more cost-effective to demolish the existing house and re-build two townhouses on his land, so he can sell one to offset costs.

Jensen arranges for the land to be subdivided and engages architects and contractors to design and construct the townhouses. Each is a two-storey, three-bedroom townhouse. After demolition and construction, Jensen moves into one townhouse and sells the other.

Is Jensen carrying on a taxable activity of subdivision?

GST treatment

Jensen's subdivision activity is not a taxable activity for GST purposes. This is because it is not an activity carried on continuously or regularly.

The level of financial investment and development work for the units is fairly high compared to subdividing and selling a bare lot, but the scale of the subdivision is still fairly low, only one new lot is created, and the time and effort on Jensen's part is limited to managing and consulting with contractors. Further, the cost and level of work involved in constructing the unit he later lives in is not relevant in considering whether the activity was one carried on continuously or regularly.

While Jensen is GST registered, the subdivision activity was not an activity carried on in the course or furtherance of his taxable activity of ventilation maintenance. It was not done as part of his business and had no connection with it.

Example | Taura 2B – Subsequent sale of residence

Jensen from Example | Taura 2 lived in his new house for a few months before deciding to sell it to move to the United States to expand his business.

Is the later sale of his house relevant when determining whether his subdivision project is a taxable activity?

GST treatment

No, the sale of Jensen's house is not relevant when determining whether his subdivision project is a taxable activity. The subdivision, development, and building of Jensen's house was not part of an activity involving, or intending to involve, the supply of goods for consideration. It was not until after the activity concluded that the intention to sell the house formed.

Example | Taura 3 – Subdivision and large development

Manaia is not registered for GST. They inherited a run-down block of farmland from a relative years ago. After retiring, they take the opportunity to get the land in good working order, including renovating the farmhouse, with the intention of keeping some animals and running a lifestyle block. However, part-way through renovation, Manaia decides instead to move closer to their elderly mother who has fallen ill. While the exterior and roof still need work, the kitchen and bathroom have been completely upgraded and a dividing wall has been removed to make the living area open plan.

Given the location of the land, Manaia, who has received several enquiries from developers, knows the land would be perfect for extending a new housing development in the area.

Rather than selling the land to another developer, Manaia decides to subdivide the land and sell the lots directly to potential owner-occupiers looking to build. Manaia:

- arranges for a surveyor to prepare a site plan;
- obtains the necessary approvals from the local council;
- engages contractors to construct a new road and driveways, and to level parts of the terrain to enable foundations to be laid; and
- organises the installation of water and power infrastructure.

The land is subdivided into six lots, one of which contains the partially renovated farmhouse. As Manaia is busy looking after their mother, work on the project continues on and off over three years. After new titles are issued, four of the new lots are sold but Manaia is unable to sell the others due to a recent downturn in the market.

Is Manaia carrying on a taxable activity for GST purposes?

GST treatment

Yes, Manaia is carrying on a taxable activity of subdivision. While the level of development work is similar to that in Example | Tauria 1, the large scale (and corresponding cost, time and effort) and number of lots created is a distinguishing factor. Work on the final two lots is also relevant even though they have not yet sold. Any renovation work on the farmhouse done after the intention to subdivide and sell arose is also relevant.

The length of time taken and the fact the work was done on and off does not mean the activity was not carried on continuously, as Manaia always intended to complete the project and it did not cease at any point.

Example | Tauria 4 – Part of existing taxable activity

Loammi and Marissa are GST registered as a partnership with a taxable activity of residential property development. They buy dilapidated houses and renovate them to sell for a profit. When considering purchasing an old dwelling in Island Bay, Loammi

realises that with the large backyard, she and Marissa could make a greater profit if they subdivided the land before sale. They purchase the property and begin work.

Loammi and Marissa focus most of their time and money on renovating the existing dwelling, and do only the minimum required to get resource consent and approval from Wellington City Council for the subdivision. Once they obtain a certificate for the new lot, they manage to secure a quick sale, which helps them fund the remainder of the renovation work on the dwelling.

Is the sale of the subdivided lot a taxable supply for GST purposes?

GST treatment

Yes, the sale of the subdivided lot is a taxable supply for GST purposes. Even though the level of work, effort, and cost involved in the subdivision was relatively low, and the subdivision and sale would not be a taxable activity on its own, the subdivision was done in the course or furtherance of Loammi and Marissa's existing taxable activity of property development.

Example | Taura 5 – Regularly subdividing land

Mario-Ken discovers he can make a good profit from subdividing beachfront land, as prices are getting cheaper due to coastal erosion and global warming. He buys a parcel of land, subdivides it in two, carrying out no development on the land beyond installing water and creating easements for stormwater discharge, and then sells the bare lots.

Mario-Ken makes a good profit from the sales, so he decides to buy another lot further down the coast and subdivides it for sale, using the profits from his last subdivision to help fund the purchase. A year later he finds a good price on the neighbouring lot and subdivides it into three, again doing little development work and selling the subdivided land.

Is Mario-Ken carrying on a taxable activity?

GST treatment

Yes, Mario-Ken is carrying on a taxable activity. Even though the first subdivision would likely not be enough on its own to be a taxable activity, the repeating pattern of buying and subdividing land indicates the activity is one carried on regularly.

Draft items produced by the Tax Counsel Office represent the preliminary, though considered, views of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

In draft form these items may not be relied on by taxation officers, taxpayers, or practitioners. Only finalised items represent authoritative statements by Inland Revenue of its stance on the particular issues covered.

Send feedback to | Tukuna mai ngā whakahokinga kōrero ki
public.consultation@ird.govt.nz

References | Tohutoro

Legislative references | Tohutoro whakatureture

Goods and Services Tax Act 1985, ss 6, 8

Income Tax Act 2007

Case references | Tohutoro kēhi

Case 7/2012 (2012) 25 NZTC 1,019 (TRA)

Case 14/2016 (2016) 27 NZTC 3,036

Case P4 (1992) 14 NZTC 4,024

Case S70 (1996) 17 NZTC 7,431

Case T40 (1997) 18 NZTC 8,267

Case T62 (1998) 18 NZTC 8,468

CIR v Bayly (1998) 18 NZTC 14,073 (CA)

Newman v CIR (1994) 16 NZTC 11,229 (HC)

Newman v CIR (1995) 17 NZTC 12,097 (CA)

Tout v Cook (1991) 13 NZTC 8,053 (HC)

Wakelin v CIR (1997) 18 NZTC 13,182 (HC)

Other references | Tohutoro anō

GST Guide: Working with GST – IR375 (Inland Revenue, March 2021)

www.ird.govt.nz/gst/what-gst-is

"GST and subdivisions – Court of Appeal decision in the Newman case" *Tax Information Bulletin* Vol 7 No 2 (August 1995): 10.

<https://www.taxtechnical.ird.govt.nz/tib/volume-07---1995-1996/tib-vol7-no2>

[Tax technical \(website, Inland Revenue, 2023\)](#)

www.taxtechnical.ord.govt.nz

About this document | Mō tēnei tuhinga

Questions We've Been Asked (QWBAs) are issued by the Tax Counsel Office. QWBAs answer specific tax questions we have been asked that may be of general interest to taxpayers. While they set out the Commissioner's considered views, QWBAs are not binding on the Commissioner. However, taxpayers can generally rely on them in determining their tax affairs. See further [Status of Commissioner's advice](#) (December 2012). It is important to note that a general similarity between a taxpayer's circumstances and an example in a QWBA will not necessarily lead to the same tax result. Each case must be considered on its own facts.