

- Events discussed under **Headlessors # 10**
- Snapshot: **Doc library # 5.5**

Mrs L Booth
Assistant Land Registrar
Birkenhead (Rosebrae) District Land Registry
Rosebrae Court
Woodside Ferry Approach
Birkenhead
Merseyside
L41 6DU

Needless to say that this
letter generated another
'Get lost!': **25.04.06**

Ms N K-Dit-Rawé
3 Jefferson House
11, Basil Street
London SW3 1AX

18 April 2006

Your Ref: NGL373 333/K&C/CL3/205

(By Recorded Delivery)

Dear Mrs Booth

THEY created the situation by granting the title, and typically for this island-Kingdom's public sector that is dripping with hatred for 'the little people', while licking a certain part of the anatomy of the sacrosanct landlords so hard that you can barely see the feet sticking out.. **it placed the responsibility on 'me' to sort out the mess it created.**

Acquisition of the headlease Title NGL 373 333 by Lavagna Enterprises, a superior headlessor first registered by the Land Registry on 31 January 2006, under Title BGL 56 642, has rendered the headlease materially defective

Thank you for your letter dated 4 April 2006 in reply to my letter of 28 March 2006.

Your comment:

"Regrettably, I do not have details of the Adjudicator case referred to in your letter and am unable to comment further on that decision"

I read this as an admission that your Office does not have the capability to implement the requirements comprised under the Land Registration Act 2002. In particular:

Section 73 – Objections:

- (1) "...anyone may object to an application to the registrar"
- (7) "If it is not possible to dispose by agreement of an objection...the registrar must refer the matter to the adjudicator"

Given the situation, I enclose a copy of the case:

- Kintyre Ltd v Romeomarch Property Management Ltd ¹
- copied from the 25 February 2006 issue of the Estates Gazette on pages 176 – 178, stating "Adjudicator to HM Land Registry, 4 November 2005, Mr Michael Mark, sitting as deputy adjudicator" – and on which I have highlighted the main points.

To remind you, the case can be summarised as follows:

"The Land Registry Adjudicator, Mr Michael Mark, dismissed the application to register the lease, because the roof space was required for the proper management of the roof..."

To assist you further, I also enclose:

- a copy of the website page from the Tribunals Service, Adjudicator to HM Land Registry detailing its contact details (address, telephone and fax number, as well as email address) ²

¹ Copy of Kintyre Ltd v Romeomarch Property Management Ltd sourced from the 25 February 2006 issue of the Estates Gazette

² Copy of Tribunals Service website page detailing contact details

- a copy of its “About us” website page giving a brief overview of the role of the Adjudicator³. Comprehensive detail of the role of the Adjudicator is comprised under Part 11 of the Land Registration Act 2002.

(The URL for accessing the site is at the bottom of each of the enclosed pages)

Your comments:

“I...regret that the Registry is unable to simply revoke the lease and title of BGL 56642”

“The lease dated 15 December 2005 has been registered under title BGL 56642 and the Registry cannot simply revoke the title”

“The Registry is not able to provide legal advice and I would suggest that you seek independent legal advice in respect of your concerns”

My reply to you is:

1. Your Office granted the title - I did not.
2. Consequently, your Office created the resultant situation of, among others, my headlessor, Steel Services, being unable to perform highly material covenants in my lease – not I.
3. Therefore, it is up to your Office – not I – to undo what has been done.
4. Consequently, I suggest you - rather than I - seek legal advice.

In relation to **your comment:**

“The Registry cannot comment on whether the requirements have been met in respect of the Notice to Qualifying Tenants under section 5 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1987”

Upon rereading my 28 March 2006 letter to your Office, I cannot see anywhere where I have asked for your assistance on this issue. I am of course aware that this is not a matter for your Office.

Finally, I note that in your letter header you stated the address for NGL 373 333 as “3-7 (Odd) Basil Street”. I assume it is a typographical error as the copy of the title I obtained, “Edition date 31 January 2006”, gives the address as “7-13 (odd) Basil Street”

Yours sincerely

N K-Dit-Rawé

³ Copy of Tribunals Service website page “About us”

Edited by Barry
Denyer-Green,
barrister

Leasehold reform Kintyre Ltd v Romeomarch Property Management Ltd

Adjudicator to HM Land Registry

4 November 2005

Mr Michael Mark, sitting as deputy adjudicator
[2006] 08 EG 176

Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 – Lease of roof space – Registration of title – Collective enfranchisement – Landlord granting lease of roof space following initial notice of enfranchisement – Whether lease of roof space would have been liable to acquisition under section 2(1)(b) of 1993 Act before initial notice registered – Whether lease void under section 19 of 1993 Act – Whether Land Registry should accept application to register title to roof-space lease

B was the registered proprietor of the freehold interest in a block of flats. The flats were subject to long leases. In December 2002, a number of the lessees served on B a notice of collective enfranchisement, under the Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993, naming the respondent as the nominee purchaser. Following a dispute as to the enfranchisement price, the leasehold valuation tribunal determined the price payable in March 2004. Approximately three months later, B granted the applicant a lease of the surface of, and the airspace above, the flat roof of the block for a term of 999 years. The permitted user was the development of a flat or flats, in respect of which a draft lease was attached, and the locating of telecommunications apparatus. The applicant applied to the Land Registry to register the lease under the Land Registration Act 2002. The application was disputed by the respondent, and it was referred to the Adjudicator to HM Land Registry.

Decision: The application was dismissed. The roof space was required for the proper management of the roof, and proper management would not be possible were the applicant to build flats or place mobile masts upon it. Had the lease of the roof space existed prior to the initial notice of collective enfranchisement, it would have been liable to acquisition under section 2(1)(b) of the 1993 Act. The lease was therefore void under section 19 of the Act.

This was an application by the applicant, Kintyre Ltd, for an order that the Land Registry should register a lease under the Land Registration Act 2002; the respondent was Romeomarch Property Management Ltd.

Edward Peters (instructed by Wallace LLP) appeared for the applicant; Christopher Heather (instructed by Charles Russell) represented the respondent.

Giving his decision, Mr Michael Mark, sitting as deputy adjudicator, said:

1. For the reasons given below, I direct the Chief Land Registrar to refuse the applicant's application to register the lease dated 15 June 2004 (the lease) made

between Buildinvest Ltd and the applicant (Kintyre) on the ground that it is void by virtue of section 19(1) of the Leasehold Reform Housing and Urban Development Act 1993 (the 1993 Act).

2. Buildinvest is the registered freeholder of Baronsclere Court, 23 Avenue Road, London N6, (Baronsclere) under title EGL 307179. Baronsclere includes a purpose-built block of 14 flats (the block) and grounds, including garages for the flats. The flats were sold in the 1980s on 99-year leases. All contain similar terms.

3. In December 2002, various leaseholders gave notice of their claim to exercise their right to collective enfranchisement with respect to Baronsclere, pursuant to section 13 of the 1993 Act. The respondent (Romeomarch) was named as the nominee purchaser, pursuant to section 15 of the 1993 Act. On 24 December 2002, Romeomarch registered a caution against dealings with Baronsclere. There was a dispute as to the price to be paid for the freehold, but, on 17 March 2004, the leasehold valuation tribunal determined the price payable for the freehold at £32,657.

Lease

4. The lease was purportedly granted some three months later. In consideration of a premium of £5,000, Buildinvest purported to grant to Kintyre (an associated company of Buildinvest) a lease of the surface of the flat roof of the block and the structure beneath the surface, comprising everything above the ceiling joists of the flat or flats on the floor immediately beneath the roof and the airspace above the flat roof, "including all additions alterations improvements thereto and any constructions or development now or at any time in the future erected thereon (subject to clause 5.5 hereof)". The lease was for 999 years. The permitted user was the locating of one or more telecommunications aerials or mobile telephone masts and/or following development as one or more residential flats.

5. The lessee's and lessor's covenants were as set out in a draft lease of a flat annexed to lease (the flat lease), but with certain modifications in an attempt to make those covenants relate appropriately to the subject matter of the lease. By clause 5.5, it was provided that following completion of "the Development", that is, the construction of one or more units capable of occupation, references to the roof in the flat lease were to be deemed to be references to the roof of the development, which was not to form part of the demised premises and was to be treated as the roof of the block and was to be the roof referred to in para 1 of the third schedule of the flat lease.

6. I interpose that the flat roof was not the entire roof of the block. There were two smaller roofed areas outside the area of the purported demise under this lease.

7. Clauses 5.1 to 5.4 of the lease contain further provisions as to the repair of the demised area prior to the completion of the development. By clause 5.1, prior to the development taking place or Kintyre using the premises for the permitted user, the premises were to be repaired by Buildinvest in accordance with its covenants and obligations as lessor in the flat lease.

8. By clause 5.2, it was provided that:

After the Development or after the Lessee commences using the Premises for the Permitted User the Premises shall be repaired in accordance with the respective covenants and obligations of the Lessee in the Flat Lease or if deemed necessary by the Lessor's surveyor after the Development in accordance with such alternative covenants and obligations as are appropriate and are agreed between the Lessor's surveyor and the Lessee's Surveyor (the Surveyors) (acting in each case reasonably and in good faith) taking into account the nature of the Development in relation to the remainder of [Baronsclere] principles of good estate management and any other relevant factors and/or circumstances.

9. Clause 5.3 provides for such matters as are agreed by the surveyors to be recorded in a deed to be executed by "all relevant parties" and registered at the Land Registry. Clause 5.4 provides for arbitration by a chartered surveyor in the event of any dispute.

10. Thus, after any permitted user started or after any development commenced either: (a) Kintyre, as lessee, became liable to repair the demised roof; or (b) the roof had to be repaired as determined by one or more surveyors. Once the development had been completed, the repair of the old roof area was to become the responsibility of Kintyre (so far as I can see whether or not the development covered the entirety of that roof area) and the new roof of the development (that is, the one or more units capable of occupation) was to be the roof referred to in the third schedule to the flat lease.

11. The flat lease is expressed to be between: (i) an unidentified lessor; (ii) an unidentified lessee; and (iii) Baronsclere Court Residents Association (described as "the Company"). The company was not consulted in relation to the lease and has not agreed to be party to it. It recites, at recital V, that there has been an agreement between the lessee and the lessor and the company by which the lessee has agreed to enter into covenants with the company and, in consideration thereof, the company has agreed to enter into covenants with the lessor and the lessee as set out in the third schedule to the flat lease. In fact, there has been no agreement involving the company.

12. The third schedule is headed "The obligations of the Company". It includes covenants for the company to repair and insure the common parts, including the roof of the block.

13. It is also relevant to note that the combined effect of the lease and the flat lease is that rights of entry and repairing rights are reserved by the lease to the lessor and to the company. Thus, Kintyre covenants that it will permit the company and the lessor and others "at all reasonable hours in the daytime after reasonable notice (except in case of emergency) to enter on and pass through the demised premises for the purpose of executing repairs or alterations to or upon any part of the block (whether hereby demised or not) or (in the case of the Lessor or the Company) neighbouring premises" or for various other related matters "all damage thereby occasioned being made good by whomsoever shall exercise the rights hereby granted": see clause 2.2 of the lease and clause 3(b) of the flat lease.

14. By clause 2.2 of the lease and clause 2(x) of the flat lease, Kintyre also covenants to permit the lessor or its agents "at any reasonable hour in the daytime after reasonable notice except in case of emergency to enter the flat and examine the state and repair thereof".

15. There is also a reservation out of the lease in favour of the lessor, added by para 2 of the schedule to the lease, of:

The right to enter upon the Premises (but only where the purpose of such entry cannot reasonably without undue difficulty or expense be fulfilled without such entry) at all reasonable times and upon reasonable prior notice for the purpose of cleansing maintaining and executing repairs to the Building (including the Premises) or otherwise as may be reasonably necessary for the proper management or maintenance of the Building (including the Premises) the party exercising such right causing as little inconvenience as possible thereby and making good all damage thereby occasioned.

16. Finally, power is reserved by para 1(b) of the second schedule to the flat lease for the company and the lessor at all reasonable times on notice (except in case of emergency) to enter the demised premises for the purpose of carrying out their obligations under the third schedule of this lease.

Leases of individual flats in the block

17. The flat lease follows the terms of the leases of the individual flats in the block, to which the company is a party. In those leases, of which two have been included in the trial bundle, a distinction is drawn between "the Block" and "the estate". "The estate" is defined as the whole of the areas edged blue on the plan, which appears to correspond with the registered freehold estate, while the block is defined to mean "the block of 14 flats erected on part of the land...". The leases go on to recite that the lessor has offered to lease parts of the block in accordance with a general scheme and intends that every such lease will impose upon the lessee of that part and upon the company in accordance with the general scheme the obligations and restrictions set out in the third and fourth schedules to the leases. They also identify the company as having been incorporated to manage the estate.

18. Clause 4 of each lease contains a covenant by the lessee with the lessor and with the company to contribute and pay on demand a proportionate part of the costs, expenses and outgoings mentioned in the third schedule, that is, the costs, etc, of managing the estate. By clause 5 of each lease, the lessor granted the company an unfettered right to enter the estate to perform its management duties and the company covenanted with the lessor to perform those duties. By clause 6(ii), the lessor covenanted with the lessee not to dispose of any of the other flats on the estate save by a lease in "the form of the present Lease or as near thereto as the circumstances may admit or require".

19. Paragraph 1 of the third schedule to each lease includes a covenant to "keep the foundations main walls timbers and floors and doors of the block (other than those included in any other demise) and the roof structure and main drains thereof in good and substantial repair and condition".

Kintyre Ltd v
Romeomarch Property
Management Ltd (cont)

* Editor's note:
*Meadowside Freehold Ltd
v Shellpoint Trustee Ltd*

Provisions of the 1993 Act

20. By section 2(1)(b) of the 1993 Act, where the right to collective enfranchisement is exercised, the tenants are entitled to have acquired on their behalf (by cross-reference to section 2(3)) any common parts of the relevant premises "where the acquisition of that interest is reasonably necessary for the proper management or maintenance of those common parts, or (as the case may be) that property on behalf of the tenants by whom the right to collective enfranchisement is exercised".

21. By section 101 of the 1993 Act, common parts includes the structure and exterior of that building or part and any common facilities within it.

22. By section 19(1)(a) of the 1993 Act, once the initial notice had been registered, the freeholder was precluded from granting out of its freehold interest "any lease under which, if it had been granted before the relevant date, the interest of the tenant would to any extent have been liable on that date to acquisition by virtue of section 2(1)(a) or (b)". Any transaction is void by virtue of that section "to the extent that it purports to effect any such disposal or any such grant of a lease as is mentioned in" that subsection.

First issue

23. The principal question before me therefore is whether the lease grants an interest that, had it existed before the initial notice had been registered, would have been liable to acquisition under section 2(1)(b) of the 1993 Act. In essence, this turns on whether the acquisition of that interest would have been reasonably necessary for the proper management or maintenance of the common parts.

24. I have come to the clear conclusion that Romeomarch succeeds on this issue for the following reasons, which, taken together and separately, would make the acquisition of the lease reasonably necessary for the proper management or maintenance of the common parts of the block:

(1) I agree with the views of the leasehold valuation tribunal in LON/ENF/1177/04* that the maintenance of the roof itself, or any structure placed upon the roof, such as an aerial, depends upon the proper management of the airspace and that where, as here, the management of the roof space affects the maintenance of the roof as a whole, such management is reasonably necessary for the proper management of the roof.

(2) In particular, I find it impossible to see how there can be proper management of the roof space by the management company when Kintyre is building flats upon it or placing mobile telephone masts upon it.

(3) I accept the uncontradicted expert evidence of Mr Terence Firrell that: (i) although the roof is described as a flat roof, it is in fact pitched and tiled; (ii) development of the roof to form one or more residential units cannot be undertaken unless the existing roof structure is demolished and reconstructed; (iii) this will cause substantial disruption; (iv) the installation of mobile telephone masts cannot be undertaken without reconstruction of the existing roof; and (v) access to the existing roof space, including the electric lift motor

room, is necessary at all times and without hindrance for the proper management of the block.

(4) I am unable to see how the management company can effectively manage the roof of the block if Kintyre can at any time demolish it, reconstruct it and even take over responsibility for it by constructing a dwelling over all or part of it, imposing new liabilities on the management company in respect of a new roof over which it has no control.

(5) During the period covered by clause 5.2 of the lease, that clause purports to remove control of the roof from the management company and place it either in the hands of Kintyre or, as agreed, between two surveyors or as determined by an arbitrator.

(6) There is a possible contradiction between clause 2(x) of the flat lease, which is drafted on the basis that the primary responsibility for the roof is placed upon Kintyre and that the management company can carry out repairs only if Kintyre fails to do so after being required to do so, and the need for the management company to be able to manage the roof itself.

(7) The requirement of reasonable notice in the case of repair to the roof space impedes the proper execution by the management company of its management obligations, in that it requires service on Kintyre at a post office address in the Channel Islands. The flat lease does provide for service if "left addressed to him in the flat" (see clause 7(4)), but if the flat is to be construed as the roof, there would be clear room for dispute as to whether service was in fact effected by notice being left in or on the roof, and whether such notice was reasonable in all the circumstances.

(8) The reservation in para 2 of the schedule to the lease also, in my view, creates uncertainty that would inhibit the management company in carrying out its management obligations.

25. I therefore conclude that the lease is void under section 19 of the 1993 Act and that the application to register it must be refused by the Chief Land Registrar.

26. In those circumstances, it is unnecessary to decide the remaining issues. However, it appears to me at present that the company is not a party to the lease and execution by the company is not required for it to be binding if it is otherwise valid. It also appears to me that the fact that the lease is not in the form of the other leases is not something about which Romeomarch has any right to complain. If that fact puts Buildinvest in breach of covenants in the other leases, that may give a cause of action to the other lessees, but not to Romeomarch.

Application dismissed.



Tribunals Service
Adjudicator to HM Land Registry

Search this website

About us

We are an independent office created by the Land Registration Act 2002.

We deal with cases that are referred to us by the Land Registry where there is a dispute between the people involved regarding an application to the Land Registry and no agreement has been reached. This represents most of the cases we deal with.

We also deal with applications to rectify, correct or cancel documents relating to registered land. These cases come to us directly from members of the public.

The service we give to the public is to resolve disputes about registered land in England and Wales.

The Adjudicator is an independent statutory judicial office holder. The current Adjudicator is Edward Cousins and there are 12 part time deputies.

This page was last updated on 20 February 2006

© Crown Copyright 2006



Tribunals Service

Adjudicator to HM Land Registry

Search this website

Contact us

If you need help or an explanation of the procedures of this office please contact us. This site also contains documents that may be of help to you. However, the Adjudicator to HM Land Registry is unable to offer legal advice to members of the public. The service we give to the public is to resolve disputes.

Adjudicator to HM Land Registry contact details

The Adjudicator to HM Land Registry
Procession House
55 Ludgate Hill
London
EC4M 7JW

Phone: +44 (0)20 7029 9860

Fax: +44 (0)20 7029 9801

Email: Adjudicator to HM Land Registry

Website feedback

We welcome comments and suggestions about how this website may be developed and improved; if you have a query or comment about this website, you can email the TS Webmaster.

Please note: enquiries for appeals should be directed to the Adjudicator to HM Land Registry contact, as listed above.

Tribunals Service contact details

For further information about the work of the Tribunals Service or to comment on any issue other than this website, please use the contact details below:

The Customer Strategy and Communications Unit
Room 504
Victory House
30-34 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6EX

Phone:+44 (0)20 7273 8562

Email: Tribunals Service

Royal Mail®
recorded 1st or 2nd class

Signed for

Standard postal service with signature and barcode scanning on delivery. Ideal for items you might need to prove were received, like job applications or legal documents

Use **Special Delivery** for guaranteed next morning delivery with the security of barcode tracking throughout and compensation for loss or damage with details of where your item is going

Name	Mrs L Booth - LR
Address	Ashtankland Road Birkenhead (Merseyside) Woodside Ferry App. Birkenhead - Merseyside
Postcode	CH41 16 1U

Reference

DK 7872 3340 2GB

Place barcode label to top left of package