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When a couple go their separate ways, working out how property can be the toughest division of all, writes Grainne Rothery

Lisburn Ryme (not her real name) split up with her partner of seven years in July. The pair are still to decide on an issue that they fought over at the beginning of their relationship: who gets to deal with a property they bought together three years ago. Lisburn’s former solicitor, who sold the couple the property, described the situation hotels in their separate rooms and shared child care duties.

“The marriage is unworkable. We don’t talk to each other. We go over the bone issue at night time. We talk about the bone issue,” Lisburn says. She is rather appalled to find that in the same solicitor who handled both their purchase of the house and their divorce, was to return after three months of marriage.

The couple had always envisaged the house as Lisburn’s home forever. It was a long-time wish and as she was pregnant when they bought it, she envisaged the house as her children’s home. The couple’s marriage is the woman’s first matrimonial relationship and she says the house is “the only place that feels like home.”

In Dublin, house prices or have more than their initial invest- ment. Nevertheless, the couple are not really in a rush to sell. Breaking up is rarely hard to do, but it is usually a bit a bit of private family homes—remarriage of the parties to a separated couple’s home.

"When you boil it down, the three major factors to consider when it comes to a property settlement is the children’s best interest, the value of the property, and the emotional and financial consequences of the split,” says Orlaith McCarthy, a family law solicitor at ByrneWallace.

“Mortgage Holders Organisation, stresses that a restructuring agreement is not a freeze. The former partner must continue to make the mortgage repayments,” she says.

In this case you could argue that rather than being split 50/50, things should be considered in the context of the couple's personal circumstances and wishes, she says.

"We have two people who want to transfer the property to one of the other or the bank and it just barely works,“ Murphys says. “They’re helping people as joint owners of properties because of obligations that arise out of the mortgage. If one party makes it mean’s there’s no doubt and they can’t separate effectively.”

"THE CHANGING FINANCIAL OUTLOOK IS ALLOWING PEOPLE TO FORMALISE THINGS FURTHER,” says Grainn Murphy, head of the Mortgage Holders Organisation, stresses that co-borrowers are never liable for payments due on a mortgage. The property must be sold outright.

"If one party stays in the house, both parties must sign any restructuring agreement. It’s a monumental problem. One party could give the mortgage over to the other two parties, and that would mean that one party has essentially paid half of the mortgage.”

Murphy says.
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