

This official copy issued on 20 April 2009 shows the state of this title plan on 27 April 2009 at 11:25:36; it is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original (s.67 Land Registration Act 2002).

This title plan shows the general position, not the exact line, of the boundaries. It may be subject to distortions in scale. Measurements scaled from this plan may not match measurements between the same points on the ground. See Land Registry Public Guide 19 - Title Plans and Boundaries.

This title is dealt with by Land Registry, Leicester Office.

+



Freeth Cartwright LLP

Freeth Cartwright LLP Solicitors 2nd Floor, West Point Cardinal Square 10 Nottingham Road Derby DE1 3QT United Kingdom

DX 729800 Derby 25

For the attention of Kurt Sergeant J S Bloor (Measham) Limited DX 22656 ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH

14 May 2010

Our Ref:

ALC/1230/D3180/188/sm

Dear Sirs

## **COLEORTON HALL - POSITION RE BOUNDARIES**

We understand that you have requested clarification as regards the ownership of the boundaries at Coleorton Hall. Having reviewed the title deeds, we would comment as follows.

The title deeds to Coleorton Hall are silent as to the ownership of the majority of the boundaries of the development (and by development we mean the whole of the area shown edged red on the attached plan), however, the title does expressly provide that the following boundaries are the responsibility of the owners of the development:-

- 1. The boundary located between points A, B, C, D marked on the attached plan and located on the south western boundary of the development).
- 2. The northern boundary of the land shown tinted blue on the attached plan.
- 3. The boundary between points E and F on the attached plan.
- 4. The boundaries which the previous owners of the development are obliged to maintain. Unfortunately, there is little information in the title deeds to identify the extent of the land belonging to the previous owners and which they were obliged to maintain and we are therefore unable to advise of the location of these boundaries.

In situations where the title deeds are silent as to the boundaries or there is insufficient detail to identify the extent of the boundaries to be maintained, it is



Registered Charity no 803716/SC038827

Direct dial: +44 (0)845 272 5686 Direct fax: +44 (0)845 634 1732 Switchboard: +44 (0)1332 361000 Email: louise.calow@freethcartwright.co.uk

www.freethcartwright.co.uk Doc Ref: 8786356.doc





Freeth Cartwright LLP is a limited liability partnership, registered in England and Wales, partnership number OC304688.

Registered Office: Cumberland Court, 80 Mount Street, Nottingham NG1 6HH.

Regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. Authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority.

The members of Freeth Cartwright LLP are solicitors and a list of members' names is available for inspection at the registered office.

necessary to apply common law presumptions. These depend on the type of boundary structure in place and without knowing the situation on the ground, it is difficult for us to specifically comment on each boundary. We do however set out details of the basic presumptions. If a wall marks the boundary, the location of the buttresses of the wall will determine ownership — it is likely that on whosever land the buttresses lie, is the land to whom the wall belongs. Similarly, if the boundary structure is marked by a fence, it is likely to be the case that the fence would be deemed to belong to the person on whose side the posts are placed.

If the boundary is marked by a hedge, then the hedge and ditch rule applies which states that where land is separated by a hedge and a man-made ditch, the boundary lines is presumed to lie on the far side of the ditch from the hedge.

Trees will belong to the person on whose land they were planted even if its trunk, roots or branches extend onto adjoining land. If it cannot be established who planted the tree, (eg because the trunk straddles the apparent boundary) ownership may be inferred from the circumstances. Regular maintenance eg (pruning or lopping) by one person may indicative of ownership by that person.

These common law presumptions may however be rebutted by evidence to the contrary. For example, if acts of ownership (such as one party maintaining the boundary structure) can be shown, this may demonstrate that the boundary belongs to one party or another. Equally, historic acts of ownership, such as the maintenance of a hedge in previous years, may indicate ownership of the boundary.

It may be the case that the deeds of adjoining land owners contain information as to the boundary ownership and we are happy to investigate this further, but additional costs will be incurred. Please advise.

If the boundary structure does not fall into any of the above, the default position is that the structure is a party boundary. The implication of this on a basic level is that both parties on either side of the structure will share the cost of maintaining the same.

Please note, we believe the boundary between points G and H on the attached plan is the responsibility of the adjoining landowner.

We trust this information is sufficient for your purposes.

Yours faithfully

Fr. UP

Freeth Cartwright LLP
Please respond by e-mail where possible

Enc