Rural.

Edition 13 July 2026

anderson lloyd.



Inside this issue:

The Crown Land Legislation Amendment Bill 2026: What does it mean for rural stakeholders?

Voluntary nature and carbon markets: Government support and what it means in practice

Are you sale ready? Rural transactions and the importance of early legal housekeeping

When farm succession goes wrong: Lessons from *Sewell v Sewell*

The Conservation Amendment Bill 2026: Four changes the rural sector needs to understand

Permanent forestry and overseas investment: Practical implications of the new framework

Fairness in farm succession: Protecting the farm and the family

Navigating trust disputes

Private property rights vs cultural heritage protection: Lessons learned from *Heritage Lifestyle Parks NZ Limited & David Rowe v New Plymouth District*



Kia ora, Hello. Welcome to our Winter edition of Rural 2026

It's been another period of change for the rural sector. Across the people we work with - farmers, forestry owners, agribusiness operators, rural professionals, bankers, and accountants - we're seeing many of the same issues coming through, just from slightly different angles. For most, things are still feeling pretty complex.

There are some encouraging signs starting to come through, but at the same time, there is a steady flow of new regulations and policy changes, along with ongoing decisions about land use, future-proofing and how rural assets are successfully passed on to the next generation.

In this edition, we've pulled together some of the key developments we are seeing on the ground, and what they mean in practice.

We have examined the recent changes to the Overseas Investment Act and what they mean for permanent forestry. On paper, the new framework looks like it should make things easier for overseas investment into permanent forests. In reality, it's not quite that simple. There are still some open questions, including what "permanent" will actually mean in practice, what conditions might be imposed, and how the Overseas Investment Office will approach applications under the new regime.

Succession continues to be one of the biggest issues we're working through with rural families. As significant farming assets move between generations, the challenge is often how to treat children fairly while still keeping the farm business viable. We touched on the scale of this "great wealth transfer" in our last edition, and in this issue, we look more closely at that fairness question. We've also included a recent High Court case (Sewell v Sewell), which shows how quickly things can unravel when ownership structures and exit options haven't been properly worked through. The message, as always, is that starting early and having a clear plan makes a real difference.

Linked to that, we're seeing more disputes involving estates and family trusts. As wealth transitions, different expectations can come to the surface, even where things were set up with the best of intentions. In our "Navigating Trust Disputes" article, we look at what we are seeing in practice, what the Courts are saying, and some practical steps that can help manage issues early or avoid them altogether.

We also look at the growing focus on voluntary nature and carbon markets. These are expected to sit alongside the Emissions Trading Scheme and may provide new income opportunities for landowners over time. That said, they're still evolving and can be quite complex, so it's important to go in with a clear understanding of how they work and where the risks sit.

Another area worth keeping an eye on is the Crown Land Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. It signals a move toward more flexibility in how Crown pastoral land can be used, including more scope to diversify and a simpler process for lower-risk approvals. There's also a potential pathway for land to move out of the Crown pastoral system in certain situations. The detail is still being worked through, but the overall direction is clear.

From a land management and planning perspective, we've highlighted a recent Environment Court decision that's a useful reminder that things like cultural and heritage overlays can have a real impact on what you can and can't do with rural land. These constraints aren't always obvious, but they can be significant.

And finally, we've included something very practical - when is a rural property actually "sale-ready"? Recent transactions show that even well-run businesses can run into avoidable delays where things like leases, licences, access arrangements, and consents haven't been kept up to date.

As always, our aim is to share what we're seeing and help make sense of it across the rural sector. We hope you find this winter edition useful, and if anything here raises questions, or you'd like to talk through your own situation, please feel free to get in touch with our team of experts.



Vanessa Robb, Partner
Property and Private Client

The Crown Land Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 – What does it mean for rural stakeholders?



Introduced on 22 April 2026, the Crown Land Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (the Bill) proposes significant changes to the management of Crown pastoral land under the Land Act 1948 framework and related Crown land regimes in New Zealand.

For high country and other rural stakeholders with interests in Crown pastoral leases, the Bill signals a clear policy shift. It promotes greater flexibility in land use, reduced regulatory friction for defined activities, and introduces new statutory pathways for alternative uses – while retaining Crown ownership and environmental oversight.

Snapshot: what does the Bill do?

At a high level, the Bill:

- **Expands the scope for diversified land use** by introducing a secondary use permit system, allowing a wider range of non-pastoral activities alongside farming.
- **Cuts red tape for low-risk activities by** removing or simplifying approvals for certain routine farming activities.
- **Creates a limited pathway for land to exit the Crown pastoral estate** in exceptional cases where there is clear public benefit.
- **Confirms no return to tenure review,** with continued oversight, including ongoing environmental, Māori, and Treaty considerations.

Expanded scope for diversified land use

The introduction of a secondary use permit regime allows specified non-pastoral activities to operate alongside pastoral farming, subject to approval and conditions.

Eligible activities include:

- Arable farming (other than activities that are ancillary to pastoral farming);
- Viticulture, horticulture, and apiculture;
- Aquaculture;
- Renewable energy generation (e.g. solar and wind);
- Gravel extraction and processing;
- On-site processing or sale of products;
- Research, training, and educational activities; and
- Visitor accommodation, hospitality, and other commercial recreation activities.

This is a significant widening of how the land can be used. For Crown pastoral leaseholders, it creates opportunities to use leased land more productively, diversify income streams, and gain more value from existing assets without stepping away from pastoral farming as the primary authorised use.

These opportunities will sit within a structured statutory framework with secondary use permits subject to conditions, monitoring, and potential revocation to ensure pastoral farming remains the dominant land use and that adverse effects are appropriately managed.

From a commercial perspective, diversification supports resilience in the farming sector. It allows farm businesses to manage seasonal variability, commodity price fluctuations, and long-term succession challenges.

Cutting red tape for low-risk activities

The Bill simplifies the regulatory treatment of lower-risk farming activities by reclassifying certain lower-risk activities as permitted or subject to streamlined approvals.

This change is intended to:

- Reduce administrative burden;
- Shorten approval timeframes; and
- Provide greater certainty for day-to-day farm management.

For leaseholders, this would mean more efficient operations, with fewer regulatory delays for low-impact activities.

The proposed framework distinguishes between low-risk and higher-impact activities. Activities with the potential to affect environmental values, landscape characteristics, or Māori interests will be considered higher-risk and remain subject to detailed assessment and approval.

A pathway to remove land from the Crown pastoral estate

The Bill introduces a new statutory pathway to reclassify and dispose of land from the Crown pastoral estate in exceptional circumstances.

This pathway is designed for proposals that:

- Cannot be accommodated within the pastoral lease system (including secondary use permits); and
- Deliver clear and significant public benefit.

Applicable projects may include large-scale infrastructure, renewable energy developments, or land uses requiring different tenure arrangements.

This pathway is deliberately narrow and tightly controlled. Decisions will require a structured assessment balancing public benefit, environmental and inherent values, Māori interests (including Treaty considerations), and impacts on pastoral farming and the wider Crown estate.

Under the Bill, key decisions are made by the Minister and are not delegated. The framework is described as policy-led and transparent, with provision for Cabinet-level accountability where applicable.

For leaseholders, this would create a narrow but potentially significant opportunity for projects that go beyond what secondary use permits can accommodate.

No return to tenure review, with continued oversight

The Bill builds on the 2022 reforms, which strengthened environmental stewardship and transparency under the Land Act and effectively brought tenure review to an end.

The 2026 Bill retains that framework but proposes to rebalance it by improving flexibility and commercial workability through the expanded land use options, streamlined approvals, and limited pathway for land reclassification.

However, the position on tenure is clear. The Bill does not reinstate tenure review or provide any general right or expectation of freeholding Crown pastoral lease land.

Environmental considerations, Māori interests, and Treaty obligations remain central to all decision-making. Increased flexibility is therefore paired with ongoing regulatory oversight, with the objective that land management outcomes reflect broader public and cultural interests.

Leaseholders should view the Bill as enabling specific, proposal-driven outcomes within a controlled framework, not as a return to historic tenure pathways.

Where to, from here

The Bill remains before Parliament and may evolve through the select committee process. However, its central direction appears clear – greater operational flexibility within a regulated framework.

For rural stakeholders, the implications are both legal and commercial, potentially enabling land to support a wider range of productive uses while remaining subject to Crown ownership and oversight.

Submissions will open once the Bill is referred to the select committee, and those wishing to make submissions will be able to do so through the New Zealand Parliament website's "Make a submission" page.

We work closely with a range of rural stakeholders, including landowners, leaseholders, and farming businesses, and understand the practical issues on the ground. If you have any questions or would like to talk through how the Bill may apply to your situation, please get in touch with our property and rural team.



Vanessa Robb, Partner
Property & Private Client



Charlotte Abernethy, Senior Associate
Property & Private Client



Emma Lloyd, Solicitor
Property & Private Client

Voluntary nature and carbon markets: Government support and what it means in practice

The Government has recently announced a framework to support the growth of voluntary nature and carbon markets in New Zealand. This follows a series of policy signals aimed at attracting private capital into climate and environmental projects, alongside the existing New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).

While voluntary markets are not new, the Government's endorsement is a clear indication that they are expected to play a more prominent role going forward.

What are voluntary nature and carbon markets?

Voluntary nature/biodiversity and carbon markets operate alongside, but separate from, the ETS.

The ETS is a regulated system, where participants are required to surrender New Zealand Units (NZUs) to account for emissions, while voluntary markets are not mandated by law. Instead, organisations choose to purchase credits from project developers or landowners who are running verified projects to meet internal climate targets or demonstrate environmental outcomes.

In practice, voluntary markets are not a single system. They are a loose network of project developers, landowners, standard-setting bodies, verifiers, brokers and buyers. In simple terms, a landowner or project developer undertakes an activity that removes emissions or restores nature; the activity is measured and verified under a recognised methodology or standard (often international), and credits are issued and sold to buyers seeking to support those outcomes. Unlike the ETS, there is no central registry or regulator. The consequence is that the credibility of a project depends on the quality of the standard and verification process.

Interaction with the ETS

The ETS remains New Zealand's primary compliance mechanism and NZUs are primarily earned through carbon sequestration using trees. This concentrates incentives on forestry and limits the ability to monetise other types of environmental / carbon sequestration projects.

Voluntary markets operate outside that framework and can support projects that sequester carbon using other non-forestry techniques, and have other environmentally positive outcomes such as native restoration and biodiversity protection that would not generate NZUs or where participation in the ETS is not commercially attractive.

The Government's approach

The recent announcement introduces a framework aimed at increasing trust and participation in voluntary markets. However, the Government is not introducing a regulated market. Instead, it is creating a credibility overlay on top of a decentralised system.

At a high level, the new framework has three core elements:

- **Recognition of international standards:** Schemes accredited by recognised international bodies will be automatically recognised in New Zealand.
- **A domestic endorsement pathway:** New Zealand-based schemes can opt into an approval process, where they are assessed against integrity principles aligned with international benchmarks. If a scheme meets those criteria, they may then be endorsed by the Government.
- **Government assurance role:** The Government will not certify projects or guarantee outcomes. Instead, it will endorse high-quality standards and certification frameworks, signalling which schemes meet acceptable integrity criteria.

The intention is not to directly regulate these markets, but to provide enough structure to make them investable and credible through an assurance role described by Associate Minister Hoggard as a "warrant of fitness", while leaving transactions to private participants. Buyers will continue to be responsible for due diligence and risk allocation.

The policy direction reflects the reality that public funding for projects alone is unlikely to meet climate and biodiversity goals at scale. Voluntary markets are intended to attract private investment into projects that would not otherwise proceed and to support a wider range of environmental outcomes than the ETS currently incentivises. Globally, voluntary markets are expected to scale significantly over the coming decades, as companies look beyond regulated systems for credible ways to meet climate and sustainability commitments.

This approach is intended to position New Zealand as a credible source of high-integrity environmental credits, by combining recognised international standards with a locally tailored endorsement framework.

What this means in practice

The Government's announcement signals that voluntary markets are likely to become a more established part of New Zealand's climate and land use framework.

In our view, they are likely to grow in importance, particularly as an alternative to ETS participation where forestry is not the preferred land use or where projects do not meet ETS criteria.

A recent example of the growing importance and uptake of voluntary biodiversity markets is the naming of Sanctuary Mountain Maungatautari as the world's top-selling biodiversity credit project in May 2026. Ekos' BioCredita programme issued and sold the credits, which accounted for 43% of the global biodiversity credits sold globally in May. Nearly all of the buyers of the credits were New Zealand organisations.

Voluntary markets will remain commercially and legally complex, and outcomes will depend heavily on the credibility of the chosen standards and project structures.

We are working with a number of clients on voluntary schemes and will be watching developments in this space with keen interest. We will provide further updates when relevant.



Maree Baker-Galloway, Partner
Environment & Planning



Dan Williams, Partner
Property & Private Client



Danielle Bailey, Associate
Property & Private Client

Are you sale ready? Rural transactions and the importance of early legal housekeeping

In large-scale rural transactions, the focus is often on price, stock numbers, plant and equipment, water, settlement timing and continuity of operations. However, recent transaction experience has again reinforced a more practical point: a farming business may be commercially attractive and well operated, but still not be legally "sale ready".

For vendors, this can create delays, additional cost and negotiating pressure. For purchasers, it can create uncertainty about what is actually being acquired and whether all parts of the farming operation can continue after settlement.

What does "sale ready" mean?

In a rural context, being sale ready means more than having the records of title and financial information available. It means the legal arrangements underpinning the farming operation are current, complete and capable of transfer.

Common issues include:

- land being used as part of the farm, but not actually owned by the vendor;
- informal occupation of council land, Crown land, railway land, paper roads or road reserves;
- stock underpasses, races, pivots or accessways located on land where no licence or permit is in place;
- leases or licences that are unsigned, incomplete, expired or not assignable;
- change of control provisions in leases or key contracts;
- rights of first refusal or other pre-emptive rights that may restrict a sale or restructure;
- water takes, dairy shed supply, irrigation infrastructure and resource consents not aligning neatly with current use;
- easements or infrastructure rights that may affect future farm layout; and
- technology, grazing, sharemilking or service contracts that create ongoing obligations or unexpected liabilities.

These issues often arise because farming operations develop over time. Practical arrangements are put in place, parcels are grazed or irrigated, access is used, and relationships with councils or neighbours continue without anyone revisiting whether the paperwork still reflects reality.

That may not matter day to day. It matters greatly when a purchaser, financier and their advisers are undertaking due diligence.

Why it matters

For a purchaser, the key question is not simply "what land is on the title?" but "what does the business need to operate as it currently operates?"

If a pivot crosses land held under a non-assignable licence, the purchaser will need a new licence after settlement. If a stock underpass sits within road reserve without formal authority, use may not be guaranteed. If an operational contract has rolled over into a new fixed term, the purchaser may inherit a cost that was not factored into the price.

None of these issues necessarily prevents a transaction proceeding. However, each needs to be identified, assessed and dealt with — whether through a condition, warranty, indemnity, completion adjustment, retention, settlement deliverable, or post-settlement action plan.



The vendor's perspective

For vendors, unresolved legal issues can reduce control of the sale process. A purchaser may seek to delay settlement, require additional protections, or use uncertainty to renegotiate risk. Matters that could have been tidied up before going to market can become live negotiation points once the transaction is underway.

A pre-sale legal health check can make a material difference. At a minimum, vendors should consider reviewing:

- titles, easements and statutory notations;
- all leases, licences and occupation arrangements;
- paper roads, road reserves and council or Crown land use;
- water and irrigation rights;
- resource consents and Farm Environment Plan obligations;
- key operational contracts;
- sharemilking, grazing and service arrangements;
- rights of first refusal or options; and
- whether all documents needed for due diligence are complete and readily available.

Practical takeaway

Rural transactions often involve more than a simple transfer of land. The value of the business may depend on a network of leases, licences, water rights, access arrangements, operational contracts and infrastructure rights.

For vendors, getting the paperwork in order before going to market can preserve value and reduce transaction friction. For purchasers, careful due diligence remains essential to ensure that the legal position matches the practical farming reality.

The message is simple: the earlier these issues are identified, the easier they are to manage.



Ingrid Taylor, Partner
Property & Private Client

When farm succession goes wrong: Lessons from *Sewell v Sewell*

[2026] NZHC 1440

A recent High Court decision provides a timely reminder of the importance of clear succession planning for farming families – particularly where land is inherited by more than one family member without an agreed ownership structure or exit mechanism.

In Sewell v Sewell [2026] NZHC 1440, the High Court was asked to resolve a long-running dispute between siblings who equally inherited a Gisborne farm from their parents as tenants in common.

While the facts in this case involved one sibling continuing to occupy the farm, the broader issues raised by the decision are relevant to any situation where farming assets are inherited by multiple family members and co-owners later have different financial needs, objectives, or expectations.



The background

The farm, valued at approximately $3 million, was inherited equally by brother and sister, Grant and Hillary Sewell, following their parents' deaths. Grant had lived on the property for many years and continued occupying the farm after their mother died in 2018 (their father having died some years earlier).

Hillary, meanwhile, was living in Auckland and dealing with serious health issues following a stroke. The Court noted she was unemployed, renting accommodation, and relying on savings and government assistance while waiting to receive her share of the farm. The farm represented most of Hillary's inheritance from her parents and, without access to her share, she had little in the way of assets or financial security for retirement.

Despite ongoing attempts to negotiate a resolution, Hillary was unable to obtain meaningful engagement from Grant regarding buying out her interest, arranging a valuation, contributing occupation rent, or agreeing to a sale process.

The relationship deteriorated significantly over time. The Court noted Grant had delayed the proceedings repeatedly, was difficult to contact, refused valuers access to parts of the property, and ultimately failed to appear at the hearing.

The Court's approach

Under the Property Law Act 2007, the Court has broad powers to resolve disputes between co-owners of property, including ordering a buy-out between owners, sale of the property and payment of occupation rent or reimbursement of expenses.

Justice Grau found there was clear hardship to Hillary if orders were not made. Her inheritance was effectively "tied up" in a farm she could not access, live on, or derive income from, despite it making up the majority of her parents' estate.

The Court also expressed concern about deterioration of the property, lack of insurance, and the ongoing deadlock between the siblings.

The Court ultimately ordered that:

1. Grant be given two months to purchase Hillary's half share; and
2. if he failed to do so, the farm was to be sold on the open market with vacant possession.

The judgment also addressed issues including occupational rent, maintenance costs, sale expenses, and practical mechanisms to progress a sale where co-owners are no longer cooperating.

Key lessons for farming families

While not every farming succession arrangement will give rise to this type of dispute, the case illustrates the kinds of challenges that can occur where farming assets are inherited by more than one child without clear arrangements around ownership, occupation, valuation, and exit.

Importantly, these challenges are not limited to situations where one family member remains living on the farm. Similar issues can arise whenever farming assets are held by family members with differing objectives — for example, where:

- one sibling wants to continue farming while another wants liquidity;
- one family member wishes to retain the property as a long-term investment while another wants a sale;
- co-owners disagree on leasing, development, borrowing, or succession decisions; or
- circumstances change over time due to retirement, health issues, relationship breakdowns, or financial pressure.

This case highlights the importance of putting clear succession and governance arrangements in place early, particularly where farming assets are intended to be inherited by multiple family members. Consideration should be given to documenting:

- a clear buy-out mechanism and valuation process;
- arrangements for occupation and rent;
- responsibility for maintenance and outgoings;
- dispute resolution and deadlock provisions; and
- a mechanism for sale or exit where agreement cannot be reached.

Without clear arrangements, farming assets inherited by multiple family members can become a source of significant emotional, financial, and legal strain for families.

Final thoughts

Sewell v Sewell is a stark example of the difficulties that can arise where farming assets are inherited by more than one family member without a practical framework for how ownership will operate.

For rural families, the decision reinforces that succession planning is not simply about deciding who inherits the farm – it is also about ensuring there is a clear pathway for co-owners to live, work, exit, or realise value fairly in the years that follow.



Vanessa Robb, Partner
Property & Private Client



Charlotte Abernethy, Senior Associate
Property & Private Client



The Conservation Amendment Bill 2026: Four changes the rural sector needs to understand

anderson lloyd.



The Conservation Amendment Bill 2026 is currently before Parliament and represents the most significant reform of New Zealand's conservation legislation since the Conservation Act 1987 was enacted nearly 40 years ago.

The Bill seeks to modernise the management of public conservation land, reform concession processes and introduce a new planning framework.

Much of the public discussion surrounding the Bill has focused on conservation outcomes, public access and environmental protection. However, for many in the rural sector, the more immediate question is what the reforms could mean for farming businesses, irrigation schemes, rural infrastructure providers and landowners who regularly interact with conservation land.

While the Bill remains subject to the Parliamentary process and may yet change, here are four aspects of the reforms that are particularly relevant to the agricultural sector.

It is worth noting that, earlier versions of the Bill proposed broader powers to facilitate exchanges and, in some circumstances, disposal of conservation land. Following public feedback, the Government has announced that those provisions will be removed from the Bill.

The submission deadline on the Bill has also been extended until midday, Monday 13th July 2026.

Continued >

The Conservation Amendment Bill 2026: Four changes the rural sector needs to understand (Continued)

1. Concessions, Easements and Access Rights

What is changing?

The Bill proposes a substantial overhaul of the concessions regime. This is the framework used by DOC to authorise activities on conservation land, including easements, licences, leases and permits. The Government's objective is to create a more standardised and nationally consistent system.

Why does it matter?

Some farming businesses rely on rights over conservation land for access, infrastructure and operational purposes; for example, a farm track, irrigation pipeline, grazing concession, telecommunications facility or electricity line.

In some parts of the country, particularly in high-country and hill-country farming areas, grazing activities, stock movement and farm access can depend on concessions involving marginal strips, river corridors, valley systems and other areas of conservation land.

A more standardised concessions framework may provide greater certainty and efficiency around how these arrangements are managed, renewed and administered. However, the practical implications will depend on the final form of the legislation, the content of the NCPS and Area Plans, and how grazing and access-related activities are ultimately classified within the new framework.

Key takeaway

For many farmers and rural businesses, concession reform could prove to be the most important aspect of the Bill. Greater certainty and efficiency around access and infrastructure approvals would be relevant to many rural businesses.

2. Faster and More Standardised Concession Processes

What is changing?

Alongside broader concessions reform, the Bill proposes a more nationally directed and standardised approach to how concession applications are categorised, processed and managed.

A key feature of the proposed framework is the creation of activities that may be classified as either "exempt" or "pre-approved" under the future NCPS. Exempt activities would not require concessions, while pre-approved activities will be able to access a simplified approval pathway. The Bill also includes provisions aimed at improving allocation processes and introducing more consistent concessions management across the country.

Why does it matter?

One of the frustrations often expressed by concession applicants is that similar activities can be treated differently depending on where they are located and which planning documents apply.

For farmers, irrigation schemes and infrastructure providers, uncertainty can be as problematic as regulation itself. Delays in obtaining approvals can increase project costs, affect financing arrangements and complicate long-term planning.

The Government's intention appears to be to create a framework that provides greater consistency and clarity regarding what activities can occur on conservation land and how they will be assessed.

For an irrigation scheme seeking approval for infrastructure crossing conservation land, the reforms may provide a clearer indication of whether the activity is likely to require a full concessions process.

A farmer requiring ongoing access rights may benefit from greater consistency in how applications are considered across different parts of the country.

Importantly, much of the detail has yet to be developed. Whether an activity becomes exempt, pre-approved or requires a full concession process will depend on future policy documents, including the NCPS and Area Plans. As a result, the practical effect of these reforms remains uncertain at this stage.

Key takeaway

The proposed reforms are aimed at creating a more predictable, efficient and consistent concessions system. For farming businesses, irrigation schemes and infrastructure providers, the most significant benefit may ultimately be greater certainty around how activities on conservation land are managed and approved, although the practical implications will depend heavily on the next stage of policy development

3. A Shift Towards Enabling Development on Conservation Land

What is changing?

One of the Bill's most significant policy changes is the introduction of a new statutory function that explicitly recognises the benefits of economic opportunities arising from the use and development of public conservation land. The Bill seeks to enable this use and development to the greatest extent practicable while continuing to protect conservation values.

Why does it matter?

Under the current framework, decisions are focused on conservation outcomes. The proposed reforms signal a greater willingness to recognise that conservation land can support economic activity where that activity is consistent with conservation objectives.

For rural businesses, this may influence how future infrastructure and use proposals are assessed.

Projects such as:

- irrigation schemes;
- stock water infrastructure;
- renewable energy developments;
- access roads;
- telecommunications facilities; and
- rural utility infrastructure

may be assessed within a framework that more explicitly recognises economic considerations alongside conservation outcomes.

That does not mean such projects will automatically be approved. Conservation values will remain important, and many activities will continue to require detailed assessment.

4. National Conservation Policy Statement and Area Plans

What is changing?

The Bill proposes replacing the current collection of conservation strategies and plans with a NCPS and a suite of Area Plans. The Government's intention here is to simplify the current planning framework and provide more consistent national direction.

Why does it matter?

Infrastructure providers, irrigation schemes, forestry operators and agribusiness investors often make decisions years in advance. Understanding what activities may be appropriate in particular locations can significantly influence investment decisions.

As seems to be the case for many of the proposed changes, much of the detail remains to be developed. The content of the NCPS and Area Plans will ultimately be important in determining how the new framework operates in practice.

Key takeaway

The Conservation Amendment Bill has the potential to reshape the way many rural businesses interact with public conservation land. While the final outcomes remain uncertain, the reforms are significant enough that farmers, irrigation schemes, infrastructure providers and rural land users should remain engaged as the legislation continues through the Parliamentary process.

While the proposed concession reform is likely to be the most significant change for many farmers and rural businesses, particularly where access or infrastructure crosses conservation land, infrastructure providers and irrigation schemes should also monitor developments closely, as several reforms could influence future project planning and approvals.

The National Conservation Policy Statement and Area Plans will also be important, with many practical outcomes ultimately influenced by those future planning documents.



Maree Baker-Galloway, Partner
Environment & Planning



Hannah Zydenbos, Solicitor
Environment & Planning



Permanent forestry and overseas investment: Practical implications of the new framework

Following recent forestry reforms now in effect under the Overseas Investment Act 2005 (OIA), we have been considering how the amended regime is likely to operate in practice for investors looking at permanent forestry assets.

Recent commentary has highlighted that the reforms may open a new pathway for overseas investment into permanent forests. While that is broadly correct, the position is more nuanced in practice. In this article, we set out how we expect the Overseas Investment Office (OIO) to approach these applications, and where the key risks and uncertainties remain.

A different pathway for permanent forestry

As outlined in a previous Anderson Lloyd article, the 2026 reforms to the OIA replaced the former "benefits to New Zealand" test for forestry acquisitions with a national interest framework.

In broad terms, acquisitions of production forestry by overseas investors typically proceed under the specialised "production forestry pathway" while acquisitions of permanent forestry fall instead within the primary consent pathway under the OIA.

At a high level, both pathways are now anchored in the same core question: whether the investment is contrary to New Zealand's national interest.

However, the practical operation of these pathways differs in important ways.

No prescribed conditions for permanent forestry

The most significant point of difference is the treatment of conditions.

Production forestry investments remain subject to mandatory standards and conditions set out in the Ministerial Directive Letter (**MDL**) issued on 6 March 2026. These largely replicate the former "special forestry test" and include requirements such as replanting after harvest and maintaining forestry use.

Permanent forestry investments, by contrast, are not subject to these prescribed conditions.

This absence of mandated conditions has been interpreted as making OIO approvals simpler for permanent forestry investments. While that may be true in some cases, it is important not to overstate the point.

The OIO retains a broad discretion under the national interest test and may still impose bespoke conditions where appropriate. While the scope of any special conditions remains uncertain at this stage, we expect that, in practice, these will often focus on ensuring that the land:

- is maintained as permanent forest; and
- is not converted into production forestry or alternative land uses (such as farming).

The central issue: proving "permanence"

In our view, the key focus for investors if utilising the primary consent pathway for permanent forestry will be on demonstrating that the forest is genuinely permanent. This is also likely to be the primary focus of the OIO's assessment under the national interest framework.

The most straightforward way to evidence permanence will be registration of the forest in the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) as permanent forestry, with a condition requiring this to occur within a defined timeframe.

However, ETS registration is not the only possible pathway. It is possible that the OIO may also accept other evidence, such as:

- long-standing non-harvest history;
- the age and characteristics of the forest;
- established land use patterns demonstrating an intention not to harvest; or
- registration in a reputable voluntary carbon market scheme.

What remains uncertain is how flexible the OIO will be in accepting alternative evidence where ETS registration is not feasible or is delayed. This will likely develop on a case-by-case basis.

Timing and process

One of the more notable features of the new framework is the potential for faster decision-making.

Where the investment does not raise national interest concerns and the land is clearly and wholly (or almost wholly) permanent forestry there is scope for applications to be processed relatively quickly, compared to the previous regime. However, this should not be treated as a guaranteed fast-track.

The national interest test is inherently discretionary. Applications may still be:

- escalated;
- subject to further scrutiny; or
- delayed where the OIO requires additional comfort on permanence or wider policy considerations.

What this means in practice

The changes do appear to create a clearer pathway for investment into permanent forestry. However, in our view the OIO is likely to continue taking a case-by-case approach, including the imposition of tailored conditions where relevant.

For investors, this means that early engagement and careful structuring remain essential.

In particular, we recommend:

- confirming at the outset whether land can genuinely be characterised as permanent forestry;
- considering ETS registration (or an alternative evidentiary strategy) early in the process; and
- assessing whether any part of the land may trigger the farm land regime (in which case the farm land benefit test will still apply).

Looking ahead

As this pathway is still relatively new, there is limited decision-making practice to draw on. Greater certainty will emerge over time as the OIO develops a body of precedent around acceptable evidence of permanence; and the types of conditions applied to permanent forestry consents.

We expect this to be an evolving area and will continue to monitor developments closely.



Dan Williams, Partner
Property & Private Client



Danielle Bailey, Associate
Property & Private Client



Fairness in farm succession: Protecting the farm and the family

Farm succession is rarely just a legal or financial exercise. For many families, the farm is both the principal business asset and the family's history, identity and home. That makes succession planning deeply personal – particularly where one child is working on the farm and others have built their lives elsewhere.

The challenge is familiar: how do parents treat children fairly without placing so much debt or financial pressure on the farming child that the business is set up to fail?

There is no single answer. However, families are increasingly looking beyond the traditional "one child takes the farm and the others receive what is left" approach. More structured arrangements – including equity partnerships, family governance charters and staged succession plans – can help preserve the farming business while recognising the interests of off-farm children.

Fair does not always mean equal

A common difficulty is the assumption that fairness requires each child to receive an equal share of the farm's value. In many cases, that is simply not practical. Farm businesses can be high value but cash constrained. Requiring the farming child to borrow heavily to "pay out" siblings may protect equality on paper, but damage the long-term viability of the farm.

A better starting point is to distinguish between equality and fairness. Fairness may involve recognising:

- the contribution of the farming child, including unpaid or underpaid labour;
- the need for the parents to retain financial security;
- the economic capacity of the farm;
- the expectations of off-farm children;
- the importance of maintaining family relationships; and
- whether non-farming assets, insurance, staged payments or off-farm investments can be used to balance outcomes over time.

The key is that the plan is deliberate, transparent and commercially realistic.

Equity partnerships and staged ownership

Equity partnerships can provide a useful pathway where parents want to transition ownership without losing control immediately or overloading the next generation with debt.

These arrangements may allow the farming child to acquire an interest progressively, often alongside continued family or trust ownership. They can also create a structure for future buy-ins, buy-outs, dividend policies, decision-making and exit rights.

However, equity arrangements need careful documentation. Families should be clear about who has control, how interests are valued, when ownership can change, how debt is serviced, and what happens if there is disagreement, death, relationship breakdown or a decision to sell.

Without that clarity, an equity partnership can simply move the family dispute into a more complicated structure.

The role of a family governance charter

A family governance charter can be particularly useful where the family wants to preserve both the farm and family cohesion.

The charter does not replace wills, trusts, company constitutions or shareholders' agreements. Instead, it records the family's agreed principles — the "rules of the road" — and provides a reference point for future decisions.

A good charter might address:

- the family's long-term vision for the farm;
- what fairness means in that family;
- how active and passive family members will be treated;
- expectations around employment, remuneration and sweat equity;
- how information will be shared with off-farm children;
- how major decisions will be made;
- whether the farm is to be retained, grown or ultimately sold; and
- how disputes will be managed.

The value of the charter is often in the conversation required to create it. It brings difficult issues into the open before there is a crisis.

Looking after off-farm children

Off-farm children should not be an afterthought. If they are not involved in the farm, that does not mean they have no emotional or financial interest in the succession plan.

Options for recognising off-farm children may include:

- distributions from non-farming assets;
- insurance-funded provision;
- staged payments over time;
- minority or non-voting interests;
- separate investment structures;
- trusts with clear distribution policies; or
- agreed future sale or liquidity events.

The right answer will depend on the family's assets, debt, relationships and appetite for shared ownership.

Start before there is pressure

The worst time to design a succession plan is when a parent is unwell, a child is leaving the farm, debt needs refinancing, or a relationship has already broken down.

Early planning gives families more options. It allows time to build off-farm assets, manage debt, document arrangements properly and bring children into the conversation in a controlled way.

A successful plan should protect three things: the parents' security, the farm's viability, and the family relationships.

Practical takeaway

Farm succession is not about forcing equality at all costs. It is about creating a plan that is fair, understood and workable.

For many families, that will require a combination of legal structure, financial modelling and honest family governance. The earlier those discussions start, the more likely it is that both the farm and the family remain intact.



Ingrid Taylor, Partner
Property & Private Client

Navigating trust disputes

The transfer of intergenerational wealth is steadily increasing the number of estate and family trust disputes our Dispute Resolution Team is assisting our clients to resolve.

While careful succession planning as recommended in our earlier article, "Fairness in farm succession: protecting the farm and the family", is best to avoid disputes like that in, *Sewell v Sewell*, (see our article on page 10), even the most harmonious family relationships can come under pressure.

What we are seeing

We are increasingly advising on disputes involving:

- challenges to trustee decisions;
- beneficiary requests for trust information;
- allegations of conflicts of interest; and
- applications to remove trustees.

Now that the "new" Trusts Act 2019 has been in force for five years (it took effect from January 2021), we have clearer guidance from the courts on how the Act will be applied in disputes.

Protecting trustee decision-making

Beneficiaries can ask the court to review a decision, or proposed decision, of the trustees under sections 126 and 127 of the Act. Trustees can also proactively apply to the court for directions or "blessing orders" under section 133 seeking the Court's approval (blessing) of a proposed decision.

What the Judge will consider is not whether the Judge would reach the same decision as the trustees, but *was the decision reasonably open to the trustees in all the circumstances?*

The key considerations are:

- Have the trustees acted within the terms of the Trust?
- Have the trustees taken into account irrelevant considerations or failed to consider relevant considerations?
- Have the trustees acted in bad faith or for an improper purpose?
- Is the trustees' decision perverse or irrational?

Unequal distributions are often challenged by beneficiaries. While trustees have a duty of impartiality and even-handedness towards beneficiaries, this does not require equal treatment (unless the Trust Deed specifies this). The case of *Paton v Acropolis Holdings Limited* [2024] NZHC 43 highlights this.

The trustees of various trusts set up by the now deceased Bob Paton proposed to distribute approximately $4.6 million of trust assets between his three surviving grandchildren. His granddaughter Raven, the only child born before Bob's death, was to receive $4.2 million, while each of Bob's two grandsons born after he died were to receive only $200,000. Despite the grandsons only receiving one 20th of the sum received by Raven, the Court held that the disparity did not make the trustees' decisions unreasonable or perverse.

The grandchildren were all discretionary beneficiaries of the various trusts. Although Bob's most recent memorandum of wishes expressed that the grandchildren should be treated equally, the Trust Deed did not require equal treatment and the Court confirmed that memoranda of wishes are *"relevant and important considerations" but nevertheless only "an expression of desire rather than obligation"*.

The trustees had considered the memorandum of wishes and the needs of all beneficiaries and the amount of $200,000 was still said to be a "not insignificant" sum.

Paton is a useful case for supporting robust decisions by trustees, but it is hardly surprising that such a decision ended up before the courts. The trustees' application for directions blessing the distributions was heard together with the application on behalf of the grandsons for a review of the proposed decision. Seeking the Court's approval before making the distributions in this case was wise.

Requests by beneficiaries for trust information

When disputes are brewing, beneficiaries will often request trust information from trustees.

There is a presumption that trustees will provide "trust information" to beneficiaries upon request.

"Trust information" is any information (other than the reasons for trustees' decisions) regarding the terms of the trust, the administration of the trust or the trust property which is *reasonably necessary for the beneficiary to have to enable the trust to be enforced*.

At a minimum, this usually means beneficiaries should have the Trust Deed and recent accounts.

However, the Act sets out reasons which might displace the presumption that a beneficiary is entitled to trust information.

Refusing disclosure can further sow suspicion and if proceedings are commenced, the trustees will likely be required to disclose the information sought in the

process of discovery (now called disclosure). This can be why trustees might also decide to disclose the reasons for their decision-making, even though that is expressly carved out of the definition of "trust information" to which beneficiaries are presumed to be entitled.

More often than not, it is pragmatic to be transparent. However, as these decisions can be strategic (particular care needs to be taken if beneficiaries are requesting legal advice given to trustees), we recommend seeking advice if you are faced with a request for trust information.

Conflicts of interest

Allegations that trustees are acting in their own self-interest are common. Unless the trust deed says otherwise, trustees have default duties not to exercise power for their own benefit and to avoid conflicts of interest.

It is common, however, for trustees to be beneficiaries. It is critical that trustees understand the terms of the trust and, in particular, follow any specific terms addressing distributions to themselves.

Independent trustees must make sure that they are not passive and are fully informed of and partake in all decisions. Things often come unstuck where any distribution benefiting a trustee beneficiary is required to be made by the independent trustee and any other remaining trustee but the independent trustee is not involved in the decision-making. The independent trustee cannot sit back and later ratify decisions made by the other trustees to distribute to trustees – they must have been part of the decision-making at the outset.

The exercise of the power of appointment and removal of trustees is also where advice should be sought.

Dysfunction and removal of trustees

It is common for aggrieved beneficiaries alleging conflicts of interest to seek the removal of trustees. This is not always necessary but trustees should seek advice if the conflict has escalated to this point.

Removal does not require any wrongdoing or breach of trust. The Court only has to be satisfied that removal of one or all trustees is expedient.

This can arise where there is breakdown in the relationship between trustees and decisions are deadlocked, and the trust assets are at risk because of the level of dysfunction.

Independent trustees might find themselves required to remove their co-trustees who are in a couple in the process of separation.

Sadly, once the parent generation has passed, there can be an impasse between the siblings of the next generation when they replace their parents as trustees. Trustees may be unable to agree on whether the trust asset should be sold or retained. If the trust assets are at risk from the inertia, the court will intervene.

Resolving disputes out of court

It is never in anyone's best interests for a dispute to end up in court. This is particularly so for trusts, where the disputes often involve personal affairs and are between family members. Litigation is also costly and prolonged, and there are many examples of the legal costs of trust disputes gutting the trust of its assets.

The Trusts Act recognises this and gives the courts the power to compel parties to engage in alternative dispute resolution (ADR), which includes mediation and arbitration.

Mediation involves an experienced mediator being appointed to facilitate the parties meeting to try to resolve their dispute. The role of the mediator is not to determine the dispute, but to assist the parties to communicate with each other to negotiate a resolution. It is often successful and it usually allows the parties an opportunity to lay the foundation for repairing relationships.

Arbitration is best described as a private court process. The parties (or Court) appoint an arbitrator (usually a lawyer or retired judge) to determine their dispute, instead of having their case go through the court system. The procedure can be more flexible and, most importantly, it is a private forum so the dispute does not play out in the public eye. There is also usually only a limited right of appeal, so the process is not prolonged by appeals.

The ability to apply to the court to compel other parties to engage in ADR is a powerful strategic tool to get reluctant parties to work towards a resolution rather than embarking on litigation.

Takeaways

Trustees can minimise the risk of challenges to their decisions if they ensure they know the terms of the trust and act within them, particularly where they might have a conflict of interest.

However, when tensions are rising, or when making a momentous decision, we recommend seeking advice early so we can navigate you towards a resolution before your dispute becomes the next published court case.

If litigation is unavoidable, our Dispute Resolution team are experienced advocates with expertise in this space.



Sarah McClean, Senior Associate
Dispute Resolution

Private property rights vs cultural heritage protection: Lessons learned from *Heritage Lifestyle Parks NZ Limited & David Rowe v New Plymouth District Council*





The recent Environment Court decision in *Heritage Lifestyle Parks NZ Ltd & David Rowe v New Plymouth District Council* [2026] NZEnvC 68 is a clear example of the tension between the right of landowners to use and develop their property and the obligation on decision makers to recognise and protect culturally significant sites. It's important to understand the implications before you buy, particularly if you're looking to develop the land.

Introduction

Landowners often assume that they will generally be able to use and develop their own land at their discretion. When purchasing property, cultural or heritage notations are commonly treated as background noise. Purchasers may first become aware of these notations in a land information memorandum report (commonly referred to as a "LIM report"), noting a "site of significance" or "wāhi taonga" (cultural significance) and/or an "archaeological site" (heritage significance) on a property. It's important to understand the implications of these notations for land use and development to avoid unexpected consent requirements, associated costs for legal and technical advice, and potential loss in property value.

In broad terms, the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**) aims for sustainable management of land use and development, while appropriately managing any adverse effects on the environment. Decision makers must recognise and provide for matters of national importance, including the relationship of Māori with ancestral lands and sites; and the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.

District Plans may identify cultural and heritage sites. Generally speaking, these plan notations restrict land use, by imposing further consent requirements through rules; identifying specific matters of consideration which may shape or constrain how development occurs; and typically requiring consultation with mana whenua.

The recent Environment Court decision in *Heritage Lifestyle Parks NZ Ltd & David Rowe v New Plymouth District Council* highlights the tension between property rights and cultural heritage protection in a rural context. While the Court notes the presence of the culturally significant site does not create a "no development" scenario, it is apparent that development plans may be substantially constrained and the use of privately owned land seriously impacted.

Continued >

Private property rights vs cultural heritage protection: Lessons learned from *Heritage Lifestyle Parks NZ Limited & David Rowe v New Plymouth District Council* (Continued)

The facts

The appellant, Heritage Lifestyle Parks NZ Ltd and David Rowe, challenged a decision of the New Plymouth District Council (**Council**) on its proposed district plan, identifying 90% of its 2.9ha rural zoned property located in the Bell Block area of New Plymouth as a Site of Significance to Māori (**SASM**), recognising Te Oropuriri Pā **(Pā**) site.

The Pā is both a SASM and an archaeological site, with excavations uncovering several occupation phases, including a fortified gunfighter pā. Puketapu Hapū hold mana whenua in relation to the property which is part of the Puketapu rohe.

The property has a protracted planning history, including being subject to the uncertainty of a roading realignment for a number of years, which the appellant emphasised impacted its ability to develop the land.

In 2006, the appellant bought the property with the intention of operating it as a lifestyle village with relocatable homes which could also be moved off the property to other lifestyle villages.

At the time of purchase the property included a wāhi taonga site, identified in the operative district plan, which meant that parts of the property located within 50m-100m of the wāhi taonga site were subject to further consent requirements. At that time the Pā site was identified on adjacent land. The Operative District Plan noted that the sites had not been verified and their location was accurate to +/- 200m.

In 2008 the appellant was advised that SASM sites were being reviewed; and Puketapu Hapū collaborated with Council in this process. A Council plan change to the Operative District Plan then removed the wāhi taonga site from the property.

An archaeological report released in 2010 identified a broader area for the Pā, covering the majority of the property, consistent with the current Proposed District Plan mapping of the SASM. From notification of the Proposed District Plan in 2019, the SASM overlay relating to the Pā was applied to approximately 90% of the property with immediate legal effect.

The appeal argued that the application of the SASM made the property incapable of reasonable use, not only for rural production but also for typical rural lifestyle development, seeking a direction under s85 of the RMA that the Council buy the property.

Environment Court decision

The question for the Court under s85(3B) of the RMA was whether the scheduling of the SASM and applicable historic heritage provisions:

(a) make the property incapable of reasonable use; and

(b) place an unfair and unreasonable burden on the property's owner.

The cultural evidence regarding the significance and extent of the SASM was unchallenged at the hearing.

Reasonable use

The Court rejected the landowner's argument that "reasonable use" should enable a more dynamic use of the property.

The Court noted that the number of permitted activities was limited given the SASM overlay, for example grazing, horticulture, fence mending. However, the requirement for resource consent as a discretionary activity for new buildings, house extension or driveway construction, or



for land disturbance beyond the first 300-400mm of the surface, was not considered an unreasonable barrier to reasonable use of the property.

Council's evidence was that consent applications in relation to SASMs are typically not notified and the vast proportion of them are granted. It argued that "reasonable use" does not mean the owner's preferred use, or the most profitable use. It simply means the land can still be used in a way that is viable, even if that use is more limited than expected.

Evidence on behalf of hapū stated that the primary concern of hapū and mana whenua is to ensure that the mana, mauri and integrity of the Pā is protected. While mana whenua wished to be consulted on resource consent applications in relation to SASMs to ensure the best outcomes, it was not their intention to stand in the way of development.

The Court concluded that a careful assessment of the appropriateness of a proposed activity against the values of the SASM did not amount to insurmountable obstacles to consent.

Unfair and unreasonable burden

In the event it was wrong on the first ground, the Court went on to consider whether the district plan provisions placed an unfair and unreasonable burden on the appellant. While the Court was sympathetic to the appellant's position, it found that the planning history was not relevant to its assessment. The Court found that a requirement to obtain resource consent, with the exclusion of non-complying activities, does not amount to an unfair and unreasonable burden. In fact, if granted, it would improve the value and saleability of the property.

The Court concluded that the Proposed District Plan struck the right balance between the need to recognise and provide for a site of significance and reasonable use of the property. The appeals were dismissed.

Lessons learned

The difficulty in this case did not arise solely from the existence of the heritage overlay. It arose from a mismatch between what the appellant thought it could do and what the planning framework ultimately allowed. That mismatch was compounded over time by evolving understanding of the site's cultural significance, changes to planning maps and overlays and shifting development expectations.

This case therefore highlights several practical lessons:

- **Treat cultural and heritage notations with caution:** Take the time to find out what the practical implications are for your intended use of a property, which may impact how and where you build, whether earthworks are restricted and how easily you can develop or subdivide. Do not assume these will be minor issues that can be worked around later. Review both the operative and any proposed district plan and any relevant plan changes to understand what applies to the property now and what may apply in future.
- **Expect planning frameworks to evolve:** Timing is important for any development. Planning environments change and verbal assurances from Council staff will not hold up over time. Sites can be more accurately mapped, increase in extent or be subject to more restrictive rules over time. This is particularly true for sites of significance to Māori, where identification and mapping has been progressively refined across many districts.
- **Time well spent in early engagement with mana whenua and Council:** Early engagement or pre application meetings, which can be fairly informal, are often important for building relationships; identifying and resolving issues before they become barriers; shaping proposals in a way that is more likely to be supported and ultimately may clear the way for consenting; reducing cost and potential for delay later in the process.

Closing comments

This case reinforces the position that private property rights are important, but not absolute. The title to a property only tells part of the story. Planning overlays can shape what is realistically achievable on a property.

Sites of cultural significance and heritage sites are often not fully understood at the time of purchase. Their extent can be refined, expanded, or reinterpreted as better information becomes available. From a planning perspective, that is expected. From a landowner's perspective, it can feel like the goalposts have moved.

Going forward, a regulatory relief mechanism proposed in the new legislation to replace the RMA, may provide landowners in similar positions to that of the appellant with the ability to obtain compensation.

The proposed test for relief – whether a rule is reasonably likely to have a significant impact on the reasonable use of land – suggests a lower threshold than that imposed by s85 of the RMA. However this test will rely heavily on future criteria yet to be finalised. Landowners trying to navigate the new system should seek guidance from a trusted legal adviser.



Danielle Bailey, Associate
Property & Private Client



Sarah Schulte, Associate
Environment & Planning

Our Rural and Agribusiness Team

If you have any questions about the topics raised in this newsletter please contact one of our rural and agribusiness specialists:



Jo Appleyard
Partner
Environment & Planning

03 335 1252
jo.appleyard@al.nz



Maree Baker-Galloway
Partner
Environment & Planning

03 450 0736
maree.baker-galloway@al.nz



Sarah Eveleigh
Partner
Environment & Planning

03 335 1217
sarah.eveleigh@al.nz



Ben Williams
Partner
Environment & Planning

03 335 1250
ben.williams@al.nz



David Goodman
Partner
Corporate Commercial

03 335 1235
david.goodman@al.nz



Sharon Knowles
Partner
Property and Private Client

03 467 7178
sharon.knowles@al.nz



Robert Huse
Partner
Property and Private Client

03 450 0746
robert.huse@al.nz



Vanessa Robb
Partner
Property and Private Client

03 471 5430
vanessa.robb@al.nz



Ingrid Taylor
Partner
Property & Private Client

03 335 1251
ingrid.taylor@al.nz



Dan Williams
Partner
Property and Private Client

09 338 8320
dan.williams@al.nz

Anderson Lloyd is a trusted legal advisor to the businesses that support New Zealand's primary sector – from the family farm, through to co-operatives, large corporate farms, and rural service providers.

Our nationally recognised team of rural and agribusiness experts are able to advise you on a variety of legal matters. We form solid partnerships with our clients and are focused on achieving the best possible outcomes. Across our full service firm we also bring together the right people when it comes to banking, construction, dispute resolution, employment, overseas investment and environment & planning legal advice.

Our lawyers advise on:

- due diligence for acquisition and disposal of farming properties and rural businesses
- finance and ownership structures of farming businesses
- succession and inheritance issues
- agreements for joint venture farming entities
- co-operative company shareholdings
- overseas investment requirements
- industry specific advice for example, dairy, sheep and beef, orchardists, winemakers and grape growers
- resource management including consents for irrigation and effluent discharge
- water rights and irrigation schemes
- submissions on plans and policy reform
- environmental compliance and prosecutions

This publication is intended only to provide a summary of the subject covered. It does not purport to be comprehensive or to provide legal or tax advice. No person should act in reliance on any statement contained in this document without first obtaining specific professional advice. If you require any advice or further information on the subject matter of this article, please contact the partner/solicitor in the firm who normally advises you.