



Canterbury City Council

What does the change relate to?	Change	Live example (before and after)
Charge creation & registration dates	<p>The charge creation dates of some charges were found to be the date they were digitised and not the date the charge was created.</p> <p>For conditional planning charges, if a decision date is held and no appeal date is present, the charge creation date will match the decision date. Where a charge has successfully been appealed, the date of the appeal decision will be used instead.</p> <p>For other charge types, the most relevant effective date of the charge was used.</p>	<p>Before: Creation date: 01/10/2022, Registration date: 22/03/1984.</p> <p>After: Creation date: 18/03/1984, Registration date: 22/03/1984.</p>
Charge types, Charge Sub-categories and Statutory Provisions	<p>All charges in the register now contain a charge type and a sub-category in accordance with the HMLR schema. The appropriate Legislation (Statutory Provision) has also been standardised for clarity.</p>	<p>Before: Inconsistencies in charge-types, sub-categories, instruments, and statutory provisions.</p> <p>After: Charge type mapping successfully applied to all charges where applicable in accordance with the HMLR schema and valid legislation list.</p>
Further information location reference	<p>Further Information location has been standardised.</p>	<p>Before: Variations of further information location</p> <p>After: Standardised location for Listed Buildings and Ancient Monuments: "https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list"</p>

		Standardised location for all other charge types: “ https://www.canterbury.gov.uk ”
Financial Charges	All charges will have a rate of interest, and an original amount secured.	Before: Some charges were missing one or both pieces of information. After: All charges will have a rate of interest and amount originally secured.
Ex-Acolaid charges manually entered onto TLC	Canterbury’s local land charge register was migrated onto TLC from Acolaid. Some planning charges (about 6700) were identified as conditional planning consents and keyed directly onto TLC. These don’t have an accompanying planning application on uniform. Rules have been written to take Decision Date from the charge description for these, to provide a decent charge-creation-date. Rules were also written to acquire planning references for these. Rules could not be written to acquire addresses so these were reviewed and corrected at source.	Before: Manual intervention to check decision date present, amend TLC refs to planning refs, check address, etc, on search results. After: Searches will provide reliable charge-creation-dates, further-information-references and addresses/land descriptions automatically.
Listed Building & TPO de-duplication	Due to a previous migration onto TLC, duplication existed for Listed Buildings and Tree Preservation Orders. All were reviewed and duplicates removed by the LA.	Before: search revealed multiple charges for the specific land/property and duplicates removed manually. After: search now reveals only those reviewed and retained.

<p>Large polygons</p>	<p>Canterbury's dataset contains 2 polygons with too many nodes for our API to handle consistently. The originating-authority- charge-identifiers are: - 222017 222301</p> <p>The charges are related to birdlife and wetland protection and stretch along the whole Thanet coast.</p> <p>These polygons have been sub-divided and attached to the original charges to ensure any changes are received without issue.</p>	<p>Before: Spatial data not received, API failures and the LA were unable to access the charges on TLC.</p> <p>After: sub-divided polygons received successfully via the HMLR API, and the LA are able to make changes to the charges.</p>
<p>Listed Buildings' polygons not covering everything described on Historic England's listing description.</p>	<p>The LB checks at FQA found approximately 8% had polygons that don't cover all features described on the HE listing.</p> <p>This was deemed low risk as polygons cover buildings and curtilage, so a search extend would have to be plotted just over the missing features and not the building for the LB to not be revealed.</p> <p>An example has been placed alongside this document in the "11. Sign off and serve notice" folder. See email entitled "RE Listed buildings risks."</p> <p>The LA accepted the risk for a charge not being revealed on our register due to this issue and will continue to review these in their own time.</p>	<p>Before: Spatial doesn't always cover handrails, steps, etc to older buildings.</p> <p>After: Spatial still doesn't always cover handrails, steps, etc to older buildings. However, the risk of under revealing lies with the LA and they are reviewing them in BAU post-migration.</p>

