

## PRESENTERS



### **Daniel Kelleher, Simpson Grierson, Auckland**

Daniel is a senior associate in the firm's commercial property group. He has over 15 years experience and has also worked for one of the world's leading law firms, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, in London. His experience covers all areas of commercial property – including commercial leasing, acquisitions and disposals, urban redevelopment projects, property aspects of corporate transactions, finance transactions, due diligence investigations; and the energy and electricity sectors. Daniel has extensive experience in project work and large transactions requiring a commercially astute and strategic approach. He is also a regular presenter at conferences on property law, contract law, and sustainable buildings.



### **Elizabeth Toomey, Associate Professor of Law, University of Canterbury**

Elizabeth specialises in the areas of real property law, resource management law, public works and sports law. She publishes widely in her areas of expertise both in New Zealand and internationally. She has presented papers at numerous conferences, is a co-author of *Brookers New Zealand Land Law* (2009) and is a regular contributor to *Butterworths Conveyancing Bulletin*. Elizabeth has advised the New Zealand Law Commission on real property issues, and undertakes consultancy work for the legal profession. She is a member of the Environmental Law Reform Committee, a member of the Legal Aid Review Panel, an adjudicator in the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and plays an active role in the wider university environment.

## **Acknowledgements**

Elizabeth Toomey wishes to acknowledge the following publishers in whose publications various articles or commentaries written by her provide a base for some of the material in this seminar.

*New Zealand Land Law* (2 ed, 2009) Thomson Reuters  
New Zealand Universities Law Review  
New Zealand Law Review  
New Zealand Law Journal  
Lexis Nexis Conveyancing Bulletin

*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

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>THE CREDIT CONTRACT – WHAT PERILS LIE IN WAIT? .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. THE CREDIT CONTRACTS AND CONSUMER FINANCE ACT 2003 .....	3
<i>Purposes</i> .....	3
<i>Buy-back transactions of land</i> .....	4
<i>Reopening of oppressive contracts</i> .....	5
2. THE BUY BACK TRANSACTION.....	6
<i>Robson v Shortt</i> .....	6
<i>Emslie v Genuine Investments Ltd (in liq)</i> .....	6
<i>The Blue Chip Debacle</i> .....	7
3. WHEN A CASE FALLS OUTSIDE THE CCCFA – FRAUD AN ALTERNATIVE ACTION .....	11
<i>Burmeister v O'Brien – actions against the mortgagee and the registered proprietor</i> .....	11
<i>The action against the mortgagee</i> .....	12
<i>The action against the registered proprietor</i> .....	14
4. WHEN A BUY-BACK SCHEME IS ARGUED STRICTLY ON FRAUD .....	17
<i>Waller v Davies</i> .....	17
5. CONCLUSION.....	20
<b>AN AGENT’S FRAUD: WHAT EFFECT DOES IT HAVE ON THE REGISTERED MORTGAGEE? .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<i>NATHAN V DOLLARS &amp; SENSE FINANCE LTD</i> [2008] 2 NZLR 557 (SC): A SHIFT IN JUDICIAL THINKING ...	21
<i>The Distressing Scenario</i> .....	22
IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES OF LAW .....	23
(a) <i>Wilful Blindness</i> .....	23
(b) <i>Was Rodney an agent for Dollars &amp; Sense?</i> .....	25
(c) <i>Was Rodney Nathan’s forgery of his mother’s signature performed within the agency? The principle of vicarious liability replaces the “imputation of knowledge” principle</i> .....	25
IMPUTATION OF KNOWLEDGE NOW INCORRECT PRINCIPLE.....	26
<i>Cricklewood Holdings Ltd v C V Quigley &amp; Sons Nominees Ltd</i> [1992] 1 NZLR 463.....	27
<i>Schultz v Corwill Properties Pty Ltd</i> [1969] 2 NSWLR 576. ....	28
THE IN PERSONAM CLAIM ARGUMENT .....	29
SUBSEQUENT DECISIONS .....	30
<i>Blue Chip</i> .....	30
<i>Not an agent for Bridgecorp</i> .....	30
<i>Undue influence</i> .....	31
<b>FORESHORE AND SEABED ACT .....</b>	<b>33</b>
BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW.....	33
RECAPPING ON THE FORESHORE AND SEABED ACT 2004.....	33
GOVERNMENT’S PROPOSED REPLACEMENT FOR THE ACT .....	34
ACT AS A CONTEMPORARY BREACH OF THE TREATY .....	34
URBAN IWI.....	34
MARINE AND COASTAL AREA (TAKUTAI MOANA) BILL.....	35
<i>Accretion/erosion</i> .....	35
<i>Ownership of minerals</i> .....	36
<i>Structures</i> .....	36
<i>Resource consents</i> .....	36
<i>Public rights</i> .....	36
<i>Management of CMCA</i> .....	37
<i>Reclaimed land</i> .....	37
<i>Applications under Resource Management Act for reclaimed land</i> .....	39
<i>Right of first refusal</i> .....	39
<i>Customary interests</i> .....	40
<i>Recognition by agreement or order</i> .....	41
<i>Protected customary rights</i> .....	42

CUSTOMARY MARINE TITLE .....	44
SCHEDULE 2 .....	47
<i>Resource consents for activities in the protected customary area</i> .....	47
<i>Approval from a protected customary rights group</i> .....	48
<i>Controls on protected customary rights</i> .....	48
<i>Ministerial controls</i> .....	49
<i>Effect of Schedule 2 on consenting processes</i> .....	50
FINAL THOUGHTS .....	50
<b>LANDLOCKED LAND .....</b>	<b>51</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	51
PROPERTY LAW ACT 2007, SS 326-331 .....	51
<i>Effect of court order</i> .....	53
WHAT IS A “PIECE OF LAND”? .....	53
<i>B A Trustees Limited v Druskovich [2007] 3 NZLR 279</i> .....	53
<i>The apartment over the chemist’s shop</i> .....	54
<i>Was the apartment a “piece of land”?</i> .....	55
<i>Was the apartment an authorised use?</i> .....	55
<i>Relief and the Order</i> .....	56
<i>Compensation</i> .....	57
WHAT IS THE DEFINITION OF “RIGHT” IN S 326? IS IT A RIGHT TO APPLY FOR A RESOURCE CONSENT? .....	58
<i>Maclaurin v Hexton Holdings Ltd (2008) 10 NZCPR 1</i> .....	58
<i>The bottling plant land and the neighbouring vineyard</i> .....	58
<i>What issues did the appeal raise?</i> .....	59
<i>Hexton’s claim dismissed but what is the problem? A “chicken and egg” scenario</i> .....	61
WHEN VEHICULAR ACCESS NOT CONSIDERED ESSENTIAL – IN 2010 .....	62
<i>Murray v BC Group (2003) Limited [2010] NZCA 163</i> .....	62
<i>The panhandle section adjoining a council footpath</i> .....	62
<i>The owners’ appeal – did reasonable access to enable use of land for domestic residential purposes necessitate vehicular access?</i> .....	63
<b>UNIT TITLES ACT 2010.....</b>	<b>65</b>
BACKGROUND.....	65
REGULATIONS.....	65
TRANSITION .....	66
BACKGROUND TO OUR DISCUSSION.....	66
WHAT WE WILL COVER .....	67
LAYERED DEVELOPMENTS .....	68
OWNERSHIP AND UTILITY INTERESTS .....	70
MAINTENANCE PLANS .....	71
<i>Definition of common property</i> .....	71
<i>Definition of building element</i> .....	71
<i>Definition of infrastructure</i> .....	72
FUNDS.....	73
BODY CORPORATE RULES.....	74
<i>QUEENSTOWN MANAGEMENT SERVICES LIMITED V St JAMES BODY CORPORATE 21507 (CIV2007-425-347)</i> .....	75
<i>BODY CORPORATE No 366611 v Yin Mai and Others (CIV2008-404-809)</i> .....	75
<i>ETHAN INVESTMENTS LIMITED AND OTHERS V GABRIELLES TRUSTEE COMPANY LIMITED (2004) 6 NZCPR 155</i> .....	76
<i>BODY CORPORATE 199883 v CLARKE FAMILY ASSOCIATES LIMITED (2005) % NZ CONVC 194,087</i> .....	76
<i>CHAMBERS V STRATA TITLE ADMINISTRATION LIMITED (2004) 5 NZ CONVC 193,684</i> .....	76
<i>RUSSELL MANAGEMENT LIMITED V BODY CORPORATE No 341073 (2009) 6 NZ CONVC 194,699</i> .....	77
<i>FIFER RESIDENTIAL LIMITED V GIESEG (2005) 6 NZCPR 306</i> .....	77
SERVICE CONTRACTS .....	78
DISPUTES .....	80
FINANCIAL MATTERS .....	82
BODY CORPORATE LEVIES .....	83
<b>A LEAKY BUILDING SAGA ON ITS WAY TO THE SUPREME COURT .....</b>	<b>85</b>
SUNSET TERRACES .....	85

INTRODUCTION .....	85
THE DEPRESSING SCENE .....	86
<i>Who were the plaintiffs?</i> .....	86
<i>The High Court findings</i> .....	86
<i>The Hamlin principle</i> .....	87
<i>The Appeal</i> .....	88
<i>The result</i> .....	90
<i>Leave to appeal to the Supreme Court</i> .....	91
<b>DISPOSITIONS THAT PREJUDICE CREDITORS GIFTING THE FAMILY HOME TO A TRUST: BEWARE!.....</b>	<b>93</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	93
TRANSACTIONS ON OR AFTER 1 JANUARY 2008: PROPERTY LAW ACT 2007: SS 344-350 .....	93
<i>Purpose</i> .....	93
<i>Property/proceeds</i> .....	93
<i>To whom do the provisions apply?</i> .....	93
<i>Disposition</i> .....	94
<i>Who may apply for an order?</i> .....	94
<i>Setting aside dispositions</i> .....	95
<i>Exception for person who acquires property for valuable consideration and in good faith without notice</i> .....	95
<i>The person in whom the property may vest or to whom compensation is payable</i> .....	95
CAUGHT IN THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD? THE EFFECT OF <i>REGAL CASTINGS LTD V LIGHTBODY</i> [2009] 2 NZLR 433 (SC) .....	96
<i>The jeweller transfers his family home into a trust</i> .....	96
<i>The Supreme Court decision: appeal upheld</i> .....	97
<i>A warning</i> .....	102
HOW DO THE 2007 PROVISIONS CLARIFY THE LAW? .....	102
CONCLUDING COMMENT .....	103
<b>PUBLIC WORKS ACT 1981 .....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>THE OFFER BACK PROVISIONS.....</b>	<b>105</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	105
THE LEGISLATION .....	105
<i>Section 40</i> .....	105
<i>Section 50</i> .....	106
FOUR CASE STUDIES .....	106
(1) <i>What is a public work?</i> .....	106
(2) <i>When is land required for a public work?</i> .....	108
(3) <i>When is the public work “no longer required”?</i> .....	109
<i>At what date should the land have been offered back?</i> .....	109
<i>At what date should the value of the land be assessed?</i> .....	109
(4) <i>What is the relationship between s 40 and s 50 Public Works Act 1981?</i> .....	112