

13 March 2024

The Secretary  
Cadastral Surveyor Licensing Board  
PO Box 1208  
Wellington 6140

Dear Sir

I have received your letter dated 21 February 2024 and respond as follows:-

I acknowledge that this error should have been picked up as part of the checking process.

In relation to the error report I comment as follows:

1. The report correctly identifies the error and summarises the history of the titles and land involved and the impact on the Cadastre, which is obviously not acceptable.
2. As the report states the error was discovered by LINZ staff when integrating the dataset into the Cadastre and the overlap was discovered.
3. There is little in the way of mitigation as, while the area of Section 92 is small in relation to the overall survey, its boundaries are clearly shown in the spatial view and the title description does not include it. The title diagram is at a scale where it is not possible to clearly show this parcel.
4. It is likely that the overlap was mentioned in the pre-validation report, but this would have been in with many other overlap comments that always appear in this item of the pre val. and are usually of no consequence.
5. In summary the report accurately describes what happened.

**(i) Action taken to correct the survey**

Once I was advised of the error, options were looked at, including the transfer of the small parcel to the current owners so that it could legitimately be held in the new parcel. Since the listed owners of Section 92 were numerous and possible very difficult to track down, given the time lapse since the title was issued it was instead decided to prepare a correction survey to exclude Section 92 from the parcel and issue a replacement Record of title. The owners of Lot 2 DP 588572 agreed to this through their lawyer.


The replacement plan was approved as to survey on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023 and the new title has now been issued

**(ii)(iii) Measures taken to avoid this type of error again**

It is clear that more attention needs to be given to the prevalidation report item that would have brought this to my attention, even though it would have been buried within a lot of "white noise". An item has been added to our check list to high light this and also to check that the correct parcels are included in the dataset by cross referencing the title description and diagram and the extinguished parcels list.

Yours faithfully,

[s 9(2)(a)]



Released under the Official Information Act 1982