

Azalea Warren

From: Chantelle Stevenson
Sent: Tuesday, 21 October 2025 3:10 pm
To: Azalea Warren
Subject: FW: Nags Head - Hearing 22nd October 2025

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Nicola Cowley <Nicola.Cowley@fndc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 October 2025 3:07 pm
To: Chantelle Stevenson <Chantelle.Stevenson@fndc.govt.nz>
Cc: Leeara Maxwell <Leeara.Maxwell@fndc.govt.nz>; Nick Eagle <Nick.Eagle@fndc.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: Nags Head - Hearing 22nd October 2025

Hi Chantelle,

Please could this email be added to the link this afternoon. Please could it could be called 2250414-RMACOM - Clarification from submitter - Kim Taylor

Thank you
Nicola

-----Original Message-----

From: kim taylor <kftuk50@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 20 October 2025 8:41 pm
To: Nicola Cowley <Nicola.Cowley@fndc.govt.nz>
Cc: Nick Eagle <Nick.Eagle@fndc.govt.nz>
Subject: Nags Head - Hearing 22nd October 2025

[You don't often get email from kftuk50@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside Far North District Council.
Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Nicola - For the attention of Mr Watson

Whilst I may have implied it in my evidence , I wish to clarify :-

1. The indefeasible private property rights guaranteed to Mrs Houry and Mr Malcolm by C.871824.6 are the prior and therefore priority private property rights . They hold all the subdivision rights to the maximum 8. Those rights were registered against the title of Nags Head's title predecessor see Mr Malcolm's submission and C.871824.5 2. In my view these rights cannot be defeated by any subsequent registration ie C.871824.10 under which the Applicant now claims to be entitled to some of those rights. In my view Nags Head can only have the legal right to access for one lot and not the 4 claimed. Under S106 they cannot demonstrate that they have the legal access rights for the proposed 4 lot subdivision because the Houry/Malcolm rights have guaranteed legal priority by the prior registration at LINZ.
3. I argue that because C.871824.6 are the priority rights they do not need to be registered on the Nags Head title for their protection. In my view LINZ has not registered them against the Nags Head title because they do not need to be.
4. If I am wrong on that then, given they were registered on C.871824.5 but have not filtered down to the Nags Head title, a mistake appears to have been made at LINZ and this matter cannot be resolved until the situation from LINZ is clarified.

I hope this email may be read out or circulated at the hearing, to clarify the points made in my evidence .
Perhaps you will be kind enough to acknowledge receipt.
Regards

Kim Taylor