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1. Introduction
In May 2016 Land Registry published a consultation on the draft Local Land Charges Rules 2017.

The consultation page is available at the following link: https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/consultation-on-draft-local-land-charges-rules-2017

An Impact Assessment was published alongside the consultation document and is available on the consultation page.

The consultation closed on 11 July 2016 and Land Registry is analysing the responses.

This document provides a summary of the responses received to the consultation. It is intended the Government response and an updated Impact Assessment will be published when the Local Land Charges Rules 2017 are laid before Parliament.
2. Responses received
We received 104 written responses to the consultation. Annex 2 contains the list of respondents.
Details of the distribution:

- Local Authority = 74
- Regulatory or Representative Organisation/Trade Body = 9
- Property Professional = 7
- Private Individual = 4
- Other = 4
- Software Supplier = 2
- Solicitor/Other Conveyancer = 1
- Channel Hub Provider = 1
- Personal Search Company = 1
- Trade Union = 1

The majority were received via the online consultation platform, and a handful by email in a free format so they could provide further comment and/or concentrate on particular questions. Some respondents chose to answer only some of the questions or provided further detail within responses to other questions. All responses have been considered.
3. Summary of responses
The consultation asked for views on the proposals for draft Local Land Charges Rules 2017. Annex 1 contains a copy of the draft rules.

This document contains details of the individual consultation questions and summarises the responses received to each of them.

A significant number of responses made reference to the potential moving of Land Registry operations to the private sector. This has been the subject of a separate consultation run by the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (formerly the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills). No decision has yet been taken on these measures.

Question 1 - Do you agree with the requirements for applications for registration of charges (other than light obstruction notices) being those set out in rule 3?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to this question were mixed. Some respondents felt the level of detail required was right whilst others felt more information should be included. Suggestions as to the additional information that might be included were given in response to question 5.

Some respondents also expressed concern in respect of the lack of detail provided as to the means and form of electronic communication and stated that this made it difficult to give an informed response.

Several responses also stated that the means and form of electronic communication should be agreed with local authorities.

Question 2 - Do you agree that it should not be compulsory to apply electronically to register a light obstruction notice but that a paper application (using Form A) may be made instead?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many respondents felt that their lack of involvement with light obstruction notices meant that they could not express a view.

Some of the respondents that did express a view felt that whilst electronic delivery should be the default position, the alternative for paper applications was important so as not to disadvantage those not having access to electronic systems, or in circumstances where supporting material cannot easily be supplied electronically.

Other respondents felt that paper applications should not be provided, on the basis that an electronic only service would be simpler and more efficient.

**Question 3 - Do you agree to continue having a prescribed Form A?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents thought that it was beneficial to continue having a prescribed Form A to:

- Provide consistency of information
- Provide a clear procedure that is easy to follow
- Retain familiarity

Some respondents felt unable to express an opinion as they had little or no experience with light obstruction notices.

A small number felt that applications should be made or encouraged to be made electronically.

**Question 4 - Do you think that the wording of the Form A in these draft Local Land Charges Rules 2017 should be changed in any way?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents felt unable to express an opinion as they had little or no experience with light obstruction notices.
Only a limited number of comments were received but suggestions were made for amendments to the form including the need to make clear that a corporate entity can apply.

**Question 5 - Do you agree that the digital local land charges register should contain all the particulars referred to in Schedule 1, and nothing more?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents felt that the level of detail included in the register should be more comprehensive. One respondent commented that the level of information provided should be sufficient to ensure that conveyancers are not routinely directed back to the local or other authority to obtain required information.

Several respondents queried the removal of the 12 parts of the register and suggested that this would make it more difficult to establish the type of charge.

Many local authority respondents expressed concern that they and not Land Registry would hold the documents that constituted or comprised the charge and that the cost of dealing with queries arising from search results and / or providing copy documents would therefore fall on them.

Some local authorities commented on the financial burden that not replicating the current rule 7 of the Local Land Charges Rules 1977 would create, as this would require the transfer of data from other registers to the local land charges register.

A number of respondents expressed concern in relation to the proposals for the identification of the land affected by the charge, suggesting that it would not be possible to provide a meaningful postal address in all circumstances and also stating that relying on a spatial polygon footprint would not reveal where a charge only affected, for example, a single flat in a building.

Suggestions as to the additional information that might be included were:

- The date of the decision or agreement
- The decision code
- Details of legislation under which the charge arose
- Details as to where documents are located / may be located
- Further particulars for specific financial charges

It was also suggested that there should be the capacity to add miscellaneous additional information.
Question 6 - Do you agree that it is not necessary to include the additional particulars of registration for specific financial charges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents expressed the view that it was not necessary to include any additional particulars of registration for specific financial charges, as the current additional particulars of registration under Local Land Charges Rules 1977 were often not entered or updated. Additionally, it was always likely that it would prove necessary to contact the originating authority for further information.

Other respondents thought that all the current additional particulars of registration should be retained.

However, the vast majority of respondents stated that the particulars of registration for a charge of this type should include the amount originally secured and the rate of interest (if any).

Question 7 - Do you agree with the proposals for variation and cancellation of registrations of charges in the register (other than those in respect of light obstruction notices)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents disagreed with the proposals, stating that the Chief Land Registrar should not be able to cancel or vary a registration without the consent of the relevant originating authority.

Other respondents thought that the Chief Land Registrar should be obliged to notify the relevant originating authority before the Chief Land Registrar cancelled or varied a registration other than on the application of the originating authority.

Others thought that the Chief Land Registrar should not have the power to cancel or to vary a registration at all.
Question 8 - Do you agree with the proposals for variation and cancellation of registrations in respect of light obstruction notices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of respondents agreed with the proposals, some saying that they were similar to the existing rules.

Other respondents felt unable to express an opinion as they had little or no experience with light obstruction notices.

Question 9 - Do you agree to continue having a prescribed Form B?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with responses to question 3 relating to the proposed Form A, where a respondent expressed a view, the majority thought it beneficial to continue having a prescribed Form B.

Some respondents felt unable to express an opinion as they had little or no experience with light obstruction notices.

Question 10 - Do you think that the wording of the Form B in these draft Local Land Charges Rules 2017 should be changed in any way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents felt unable to express an opinion as they had little or no experience with light obstruction notices.
Most of those who did comment repeated the comments given in the response to question 4 in the response to this question.

**Question 11 - Do you agree with the proposal for notification and cancellation for general charges?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents queried whether the reference to general charge should be to “general financial charge”.

Several respondents expressed concern in relation to the automatic cancellation of Community Infrastructure Levy charge registrations after 15 months, as it was stated that it may take several years until the amount of the charge becomes clear.

**Question 12 - Do you agree with the proposal for personal searches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of respondents stated that the proposals would bring no real benefit as personal search agents would still attend local authority offices for CON 29 purposes.

Some respondents were of the view that Land Registry must hold all the documents necessary to deal with queries arising from searches.

It was also suggested that the extent of the land that can be searched against should be limited.

**Question 13 (a) - Do you agree with the provision made in respect of official searches?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to this question were mixed.

Several respondents expressed concern in relation to the inability to know in advance of a search being made what the maximum area of land was that could be searched against.

Some respondents also suggested that problems may arise if an applicant needed to submit more than one set of CON 29 enquiries when only one LLC1 application would be required.

A few respondents expressed the view that an alternative to electronic search application should be provided.

A few respondents also suggested that under current proposals a quicker service would not be achieved as any queries would be referred back to the relevant local authority.

**Question 13(b) - In particular do you agree with what is required of applicants and what the official search certificate must contain?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mixed response was also received to this question. Many of the comments received in the responses to question 13(a) were repeated in responses to this question. Where separate comments were provided, they followed the themes referred to in response to the previous question.

**Question 14 - Do you have comments on the proposed restriction contained in paragraph (2)?**

Many respondents expressed similar views to those given in response to question 13(a) stating that the maximum area of the land that can be searched should be defined.

The view was also again expressed that because an LLC1 application is generally made alongside of the submission of CON 29 enquiries as part of one “local authority search” there should be commonality in relation to the area.

Concerns were also expressed by a few respondents that allowing searches against a large extent of land may encourage speculative trawls or data banking.
Question 15 - Do you agree with the proposal for destruction of documents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority of respondents agreed with the proposals for the destruction of documents.

Some respondents commented on how they felt the process should operate.

Others felt that paper copies of documents should be retained by Land Registry either indefinitely or for a set period.

Question 16 - Do you think that there are any other types of documents that are likely to be kept by the Chief Land Registrar in respect of which it ought to be possible to apply for copies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of respondents thought that there were other types of documents that Land Registry should keep.

Some had the view that Land Registry should retain copies of all documents relating to local land charges.

Others questioned what documents Land Registry would actually hold when the new service is operational and who would be responsible for issuing copy documents.

Question 17 - Do you have any comments on the matters which the Chief Land Registrar may determine?

A large number of respondents stated that the data and means of electronic communication would need to be safe and secure and felt that the costs incurred by originating authorities must be met by Land Registry. Others said that Land Registry should not be permitted to sell or re-use local land charges data.
Some felt that the determination of a particular electronic means of communication should be by agreement with originating authorities so that all relevant aspects were considered.

Other respondents thought that Land Registry should allow for paper applications to prevent certain categories of person from being excluded or disadvantaged. Others thought that alternative means for communications should be provided in the event of IT system problems.

**Question 18 - Do you agree with the proposal for the Chief Land Registrar to be obliged to specify an address to which paper applications in respect of light obstruction notices must be sent?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Of those who responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents felt unable to express an opinion as they had little or no experience with light obstruction notices.

Of those that did express a view, a majority agreed with the proposal but some stated that the address to be specified by the Chief Land Registrar must be a Land Registry Office address.

**Question 19 - Do you have any further comments on the proposed draft Local Land Charges Rules 2017?**

Most respondents had further comments on the proposed draft rules.

Some respondents suggested that the rules were not detailed or comprehensive enough and others commented on the similarity between the current and proposed rules. Comments were expressed about the identification of land affected by local land charges and also about the implementation plan and timescales.

Others suggested there is a difficulty in considering the draft rules in context until further details about the Local Land Charges Register Service are available.

Some respondents felt that additional clarity is required about the effect of the overall changes to stakeholders and clarity of the migration plan and practicalities of the roll-out of the service.

**Question 20 - Do you have any comments on the Regulatory Impact Assessment?**
Almost three quarters of respondents commented on the current Regulatory Impact Assessment as well as earlier published versions.

Respondents made reference to the:

- costs of the programme and timescales;
- fees to be charged;
- policy aims;
- impact on stakeholders, including burdens payments for local authorities; and
- relationship between LLC1 and CON 29.

**Question 21 - Do you have any comments at this stage on CON 29 searches and how they relate to our proposed changes to local land charges, including the practical steps taken to digitise local land charges information?**

This question was included in the consultation to assist Government with separate work on CON 29. The large number of comments received will be passed to both the Department for Communities and Local Government and the Department of Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy for their consideration.

Some felt that the responsibility for dealing with LLC1 searches and CON 29 enquiries should not be separated.

A range of views were offered as to if or how the CON 29 service could be improved.
4. Next Steps

Land Registry would like to thank all respondents for taking the time to contribute to this consultation and is considering the views of respondents. The comments will be taken into account when making recommendations to Ministers and finalising proposals.

It is intended the Government response and an updated Impact Assessment will be published when the Local Land Charges Rules 2017 are laid before Parliament. We are planning for the rules to come into force on 6 April 2017. However, the rules will only take effect in relation to local authorities in stages, as there will be an incremental roll-out of the Local Land Charges Register Service.

Land Registry will continue to liaise and work with stakeholders.

If you have any enquiries or queries regarding this document, please contact:

Ken Glindon  
Chief Executive and Chief Land Registrar’s Office  
c/o Peterborough Office  
West Wing  
Stuart House  
City Road  
Peterborough  
PE1 1QF

DX No. 313801 Peterborough (29)

Tel: 0300 0065190

Email: llcconsultation@landregistry.gov.uk
The Lord Chancellor, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 14 of the Local Land Charges Act 1975(a), makes the following Rules:

Citation and commencement

1. These Rules may be cited as the Local Land Charges Rules 2017 and shall come into force on 6th April 2017(b).

Interpretation

2.—(1) In these Rules—

“the Act” means the Local Land Charges Act 1975;

“charge” means a local land charge or a matter which is registrable in the register;

“date of registration” in relation to a charge registered in a local land charges register for a local authority’s area immediately before Part 1 of Schedule 5 to the Infrastructure Act 2015 first had effect in relation to that area means the date of registration in that local land charges register;

“definitive certificate” means a certificate issued by the Upper Tribunal under section 2(3)(a) of the Rights of Light Act 1959(c);

“description” in relation to a charge means a description which is sufficient to indicate—

(a) the nature of any agreement, certificate, notice, order, resolution, scheme or other instrument or document (not being a statute or any instrument embodying statutory provisions) which comprises the charge or in connection with which the charge came into existence,

(b) where apparent from the instrument or document, the date on which the charge came into existence,

(c) any statutory provision (other than section 1(1)(e) of the Act) under or by virtue of which the charge is a local land charge or registrable, or which comprises the charge;

“dominant building” and “servient land” have the meanings given by section 2(1) of the Rights of Light Act 1959;

---

(a) 1975 c.76; section 14 was amended by paragraph 13 of Schedule 5 to the Infrastructure Act 2015 (c.7).
(b) Under paragraph 40(4) of Schedule 5 to the Infrastructure Act 2015, these Rules have effect in relation to the area of a local authority only if a notice has been given to the local authority and publicised in accordance with paragraph 40(1) of that Schedule.
(c) 1959 c.56; section 2 was amended by paragraph 28 of Schedule 5 to the Infrastructure Act 2015 (c.7).
“light obstruction notice” means a notice which is registrable under section 2 of the Rights of Light Act 1959;
“particulars of registration” means the particulars specified in Schedule 1;
“register” means the local land charges register kept by the registrar under the Act;
“registrar” means the Chief Land Registrar;
“temporary certificate” means a certificate issued by the Upper Tribunal under section 2(3)(b) of the Rights of Light Act 1959.

(2) In Schedule 1, “originating authority” means the authority or person who by virtue of section 5(4) of the Act or some other statutory provision is the originating authority for the purposes of the Act.
(3) A reference in these Rules to Form A or Form B is to the form so designated in Schedule 2.

Application for registration of charges other than light obstruction notices

3.—(1) This rule applies to all applications for registration of a charge in the register except an application for registration of a light obstruction notice.

(2) The application must contain a description of the charge and the other information necessary to enable the registrar to register the charge in accordance with rule 5.

(3) The application must be made using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

Application for registration of a light obstruction notice

4.—(1) This rule applies to applications for registration of a light obstruction notice in the register.

(2) The application may be made using an electronic means of communication.

(3) An application made using an electronic means of communication must contain such of the particulars required by Form A as are appropriate and be in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

(4) If the application is not made using an electronic means of communication, it must be made in Form A and be delivered to the address specified by the registrar under rule 14.

Registration

5.—(1) The registration of a charge must be effected by entering in the register the particulars of registration for the type of charge concerned.

(2) The registration of a charge must be by reference to the land affected by the charge in such a manner as to show the situation and extent of that land.

Variation and cancellation of registrations other than in respect of a light obstruction notice

6.—(1) This rule applies to all registrations of charges in the register except the registration of a light obstruction notice.

(2) Where a registered charge has been varied or any registration is incorrect, the person by whom the charge is enforceable must apply for the variation or cancellation of the registration.

(3) Where a registered charge has been discharged, ceased to have effect or ceased to be a charge, the person by whom the charge was enforceable must apply for the cancellation of the registration.

(4) An application for the variation or cancellation of a registration must identify the charge.

(5) The application must be made using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

(6) The registrar must vary a registration if an application for its variation is received from the person by whom the charge is enforceable.
(7) The registrar may of his or her own motion vary a registration if satisfied that the charge has been varied or that the registration is incorrect.

(8) The registrar must cancel a registration if an application for its cancellation is received from the person by whom the charge is or was enforceable.

(9) The registrar may of his or her own motion cancel a registration if satisfied that the charge has been discharged, ceased to have effect or ceased to be a charge, or that the registration is incorrect.

Variation and cancellation of registrations in respect of light obstruction notices

7.—(1) The original applicant for registration of a light obstruction notice in the register, or any successor in title to the original applicant as owner of the servient land or part of it, may within a year beginning with the date of registration apply for—

(a) variation of the registered particulars of the position or dimensions of the structure to which registration is intended to be equivalent, so as to reduce its height or length or to increase its distance from the dominant building, or

(b) cancellation of the registration.

(2) An application under paragraph (1) may be made using an electronic means of communication.

(3) An application under paragraph (1) made using an electronic means of communication must contain such of the particulars required by Form B as are appropriate and be in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

(4) If an application under paragraph (1) is not made using an electronic means of communication, it must be made in Form B and be delivered to the address specified by the registrar under rule 14.

(5) Where an application under paragraph (1) is made, the registrar must vary or cancel the registration accordingly.

(6) Where—

(a) an application for registration of a light obstruction notice in the register was accompanied by a copy of a temporary certificate, and

(b) a copy of a definitive certificate is lodged with the registrar before the expiry of the period for which the temporary certificate operates,

the registrar must vary the registration accordingly.

(7) The registrar must cancel the registration of a light obstruction notice in the register—

(a) where in relation to the notice a copy of a temporary certificate has been lodged and no copy of a definitive certificate has been lodged, on the expiration of the period of operation specified in the temporary certificate,

(b) in any other case, on the expiration of 21 years beginning with the date of registration.

(8) The registrar must give effect to an order of the court under section 3(5) of the Rights of Light Act 1959 directing the registration of a notice to be varied or cancelled.

(9) A copy of a certificate is lodged for the purposes of this rule if—

(a) it is sent to the registrar using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13, or

(b) it is received at the address specified by the registrar under rule 14.

(10) In this rule, “owner” has the meaning given by section 7(1) of the Rights of Light Act 1959.

General charges

8.—(1) A notification under section 6(4) of the Act must be made using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

(2) The period within which the registration of a general charge in the register must be cancelled pursuant to section 6(5) of the Act is 15 months starting with the day on which the specific charge comes into existence.
Personal searches

9.—(1) The right to search in the register under section 8(1) of the Act may be exercised only on an application to the registrar.

(2) The application must identify the land in respect of which the search is to be made.

(3) The application must be made using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

Official searches

10.—(1) A requisition for an official search of the register under section 9(1) of the Act must identify the land in respect of which the official search is to be made.

(2) The extent of the land identified must not be such that the registrar considers that the search could prejudice the exercise of any of his or her functions under these rules or the Act.

(3) The requisition must be made using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

(4) The official search certificate issued under section 9(4) of the Act must either—

(a) certify that there are no subsisting registrations in respect of the land, or

(b) where there are any subsisting registrations in respect of the land, show the particulars of registration.

(5) The official search certificate must be in electronic form.

Destruction of documents

11. The registrar may destroy any paper document relating to the registration of a charge if satisfied that—

(a) he or she has retained a sufficient copy, or

(b) further retention of the document by the registrar is unnecessary.

Copies of documents

12.—(1) A person may apply for a copy of—

(a) any document which is listed as being kept by the registrar in the particulars of registration for a light obstruction notice, or

(b) any court order or item of correspondence kept by the registrar which relates to a registration or to an application or requisition under these rules or the Act.

(2) The application must identify the document.

(3) The application must be made using an electronic means of communication and in accordance with any determination by the registrar under rule 13.

(4) Where an application is made under this rule and the prescribed fee (if any) payable in respect of it is paid in the prescribed manner, the registrar must issue a copy.

(5) Any copy of a document issued under this rule must be in electronic form.

Determination by the registrar of particular electronic means of communication, etc

13.—(1) The registrar may determine—

(a) the particular electronic means of communication which may or must be used for making applications or requisitions, or sending anything to the registrar,

(b) the circumstances in which a particular electronic means of communication may or must be used (which may be all circumstances, subject to exceptions),

(c) the form of any applications or requisitions made using electronic means of communication or anything sent using electronic means of communication, and
(d) subject to paragraph (2), in addition to the contents required under any other rule for an application or requisition of the type concerned, the contents of any applications or requisitions made using electronic means of communication.

(2) A determination under paragraph (1)(d) may only require information which the registrar considers is necessary or desirable for the purpose of facilitating the processing of the application or requisition as a result of it being made using electronic means of communication.

**Specification by the registrar of address**

14.—(1) This rule applies to applications for the registration of light obstruction notices and for the variation or cancellation of such registrations where the applications are not made using an electronic means of communication.

(2) The registrar must specify an address to which the applications to which this rule applies must be sent.

(3) The specification of an address must be publicised in such manner as the registrar considers appropriate for the purpose of bringing it to the attention of persons who are likely to want to make such applications.

**Revocations**

15. The Local Land Charges Rules 1977 are revoked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatory text</th>
<th>Signatories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Job Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHEDULE 1

PARTICULARS OF REGISTRATION

Light obstruction notices

A. Description of charge
B. Description of dominant building
C. Name and address of applicant and short description of their interest in servient land
D. Position and dimension of structure to which registration equivalent
E. Date of temporary certificate (if any) and of its expiration
F. Date of definitive certificate
G. List of any applications or certificates kept by the registrar and relating to the registration
H. Date of registration

Charge constituted by deposit of particulars under section 8(4) of the Land Compensation Act 1973(a)

A. Description of charge
B. Originating authority
C. Postal address or verbal description of retained land
D. Particulars of nature and extent of works relating to acquired land
E. Where further information about charge can be obtained
F. Date of registration

Charge constituted by deposit of particulars under section 52(8) of the Land Compensation Act 1973(b)

A. Description of charge
B. Originating authority
C. Postal address or verbal description of land affected by charge
D. Particulars of relevant interest in land
E. Particulars of advance payment and agreed or estimated compensation
F. Where further information about charge can be obtained
G. Date of registration

(a) 1973 (c.26); section 8 was amended by section 17(2) and paragraph 19(2) to (4) of Schedule 1 to the Local Land Charges Act 1975 and section 66(6) and paragraph 40(1) of Schedule 16 to the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994 (c.19).
(b) Section 52 was amended by section 17(2) and paragraph 19(2) to (4) of Schedule 1 to the Local Land Charges Act 1975 and section 66(6) and paragraph 40(1) of Schedule 16 to the Local Government (Wales) Act 1994.
Other charges

A. Description of charge
B. Postal address or verbal description of land affected by charge
C. Originating authority
D. Where further information about charge can be obtained
E. Date of registration
Application for registration of a light obstruction notice

I/We (name of applicant(s))……………………………………………………………………………………………………
of (address)…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..being
  ● the freehold owner(s)
  ● the tenant(s) for a term of which over 7 years remain unexpired
  ● the mortgagees(s) in possession
of (address or description of the servient land)…………………………………………………………………………
which is shown edged/coloured (state colour) ……………………………………… on the attached plan, apply
to the Chief Land Registrar for registration of this notice under section 2 of the Rights of Light Act 1959
against the building known as (name and address of building)………………… which is shown
edged/coloured (state colour) …………………………………… on the attached plan (edge or colour the
building only and not any additional land on which the building is located)

Registration of this notice is intended to be equivalent to the obstruction of the access of light to the said
building across my/our land which would be caused by the erection of an opaque structure
  ● on all the boundaries of my/our land
  ● in the position on my/our land marked by a line drawn in (state colour of
   line)………………… between points A and B on the attached plan
of
  ● unlimited height
  ● (state height and other dimensions)…………………………………………………..

I/We have enclosed a copy of the certificate issued by the Upper Tribunal

Signed …………………………………
Date …………………………………

Delete inapplicable wording in bullet points
Form B

Application to vary or cancel the registration of a light obstruction notice

I/We (name of applicant(s))…………………………………………………………………………………… being

of (address) ……………………………………………………………………………………… be

● the freehold owner(s)
● the tenant(s) for a term of which over 7 years remain unexpired
● the mortgagee(s) in possession

of (address or description of the servient land) …………………………………………………………………………

apply for

● the variation of the registered particulars of the position or dimensions of the structure to which registration of the light obstruction notice is intended to be equivalent
● the cancellation of the registration of the light obstruction notice

The light obstruction notice was registered

● on my application
● on the application of (name(s)) ………………………………………………………………………………………

of (address) ………………………………………………………………………………………………

The variation which I require is (if variation is required, give particulars; if cancellation, delete sentence)……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Consent to this application by the following persons, being persons who would be entitled to apply for the registration of a light obstruction notice, is attached: (give names and addresses; if there are no such persons, delete sentence)

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

I confirm that there are no other persons who would be entitled to apply for the registration of a light obstruction notice

Signed ………………………………………

Date ………………………………………

Delete inapplicable wording in bullet points
EXPLANATORY NOTE

(This note is not part of the Order)

[Text]
Annex 2: List of respondents

- Amber Valley Borough Council
- Arun District Council
- Ashford Borough Council
- Aylesbury Vale District Council
- Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
- Birmingham City Council
- Borough Council of Wellingborough
- Borough of Poole
- Bracknell Forest Council
- Breckland District Council
- Building Societies Association
- Caerphilly County Borough Council
- Cambridge City Council
- Cambridgeshire County Council
- Castle Point Borough Council
- Cheshire West and Chester Council
- Chichester District Council
- Chiltern District Council and South Bucks District Council
- City of London Corporation
- City of Stoke-on-Trent
- Combined Councils across Suffolk
- Conveyancing Systems & Solutions
- Corby Borough Council
- Cornwall Council
- Council of Property Search Organisations
- Council of Mortgage Lenders
- CMS Cameron McKenna LLP
- Devon County Council
- Devon and Somerset Law Society
- East Devon District Council
- Fareham Borough Council
- Gateshead Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Hart District Council
- Havant Borough Council
- Highways England
- Historic England
- Idox Plc
- Islington Council
- Kettering Borough Council
- Kirklees Council
- Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Lake District National Park Authority
- Land Data cic
- Leeds City Council
- Leicestershire County Council
- Local Government Association
- Local Land Charges Institute
- London Borough of Havering
- Manchester City Council
- Medway Council
- Mid Kent Councils
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Milton Keynes Council
- Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
- New Forest District Council
- North East Lincolnshire Council
- North Hertfordshire District Council
- North Lincolnshire Council
- North Norfolk District Council
- North Warwickshire Borough Council
- Northumberland County Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Pendle Borough Council
- Powys County Council
- Property Information Exchange Limited
- Public and Commercial Services Union
- PSG Connect Ltd
- Sefton Council
- Sheffield City Council
- South Holland District Council
- South Kesteven District Council
- South Lakeland District Council
- Southampton City Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- The Chartered Institute of Legal Executives
- The Information Commissioner
- The Law Society
- The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
- Three Rivers District Council
- Thurrock Council
- Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
- Tower Hamlets Council
- Vale of White Horse and South Oxfordshire District Councils
- Wakefield Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Wealden District Council
- West Lancashire Borough Council
- West Lindsey District Council
- Wirral Council
- Wokingham Borough Council
- Wycombe District Council
Individual expressing view as a property professional (7)

Private individual (4)