

PRESENTERS



Helen McQueen, Law Commission, Wellington

Helen was a partner at Chapman Tripp before joining the Law Commission in 2016. She is the Lead Commissioner on the three year review of the Property (Relationships) Act 1976.



Professor Nicola Peart, University of Otago, Dunedin

Nicola's research has focused on family property law, including trusts and succession law. She has published several articles on trust law, and is the author of Trusts in Nicola Peart (ed) *Brookers Family Property Law* (Thomson Reuters, 2011) and *Equity in Family Law* in Andrew Butler (ed), *Equity and Trusts in New Zealand* (Thomson Brookers, 2009).

The statements and conclusions contained in this paper 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

PROPERTY (RELATIONSHIPS) ACT 1976: LAW REFORM ISSUES.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
CHANGING SOCIAL CONTEXT IN NEW ZEALAND	1
ARE OLDER PEOPLE TOO EASILY CAUGHT OR EXCLUDED BY THE PRA’S DEFINITION OF DE FACTO RELATIONSHIP?	4
<i>The definition of de facto relationship: s 2D of the PRA.....</i>	4
<i>Two people who “live together as a couple”</i>	5
<i>The factors in s 2D(2).....</i>	6
<i>Issues with the definition of de facto relationship</i>	11
<i>Does the definition include relationships that are not substantively the same as marriages and civil unions?</i>	12
<i>Should more weight be given to the nature and extent of common residence?</i>	12
<i>Should more weight be given to financial dependence or interdependence and financial support? ..</i>	13
<i>What do we know about the way couples who live together manage money?.....</i>	14
<i>Should more weight be given to the degree of mutual commitment to a shared life?.....</i>	15
<i>Should more weight be given to the care and support of children?</i>	16
<i>Should less weight be given to some s 2D(2) factors?.....</i>	16
<i>Does the definition achieve the right balance between flexibility and certainty?</i>	16
<i>Start and end dates of a relationship.....</i>	18
<i>Intermittent and sequential relationships</i>	19
<i>Law Commission’s options for reform</i>	20
<i>Should any changes have retrospective or prospective effect?</i>	22
<i>Is reform of the s2D definition required?.....</i>	23
WHAT PROPERTY SHOULD BE SHARED?	23
<i>The current law</i>	23
<i>Trusts as protection against relationship property claims</i>	25
<i>Section 182 Family Proceedings Act 1980.....</i>	30
<i>Constructive trusts on express trusts</i>	32
<i>Contracting out</i>	35
<i>Thoughts on law reform in relation to what property should be shared</i>	37
<i>Do we need to change the way the PRA deals with contracting out agreements?</i>	45
SHOULD THE PROPERTY SHARING REGIME APPLY ON THE DEATH OF ONE SPOUSE OR PARTNER?.....	45
<i>Claims after death by the surviving spouse or partner.....</i>	46
<i>Claim by the personal representative of the deceased spouse or partner</i>	48
<i>Preparing for death: advising a client</i>	49
<i>Problems with the PRA’s death provisions</i>	51
<i>Do the death provisions require reform?</i>	54