

Case No: 915
Date Received: 08:12:2017
Topic: Correspondence relating to Land Registry application at Thornham
Request
<p>I also want you to address the issue of prescriptive rights. HMLR have now sent us a map of any conflicting titles Crown Estates have and have openly admitted they should never have been registered without notice being given to us to allow us to object. We are now going to challenge all those titles which are in the creeks or cover land the NCC map of CL41 shows to be CL41.</p> <p>I have also been told by my client to expand our FOI request further to all Crown Estates correspondence with HMLR re these registrations. As HMLR now openly admit those titles should never have been registered without challenge this request is clearly not vexatious.</p> <p>Finally, I want to know how Crown Estates thinks inundation principle applies within CL41 when NE are paying Thornham Farm (Norfolk) Ltd large sums to artificially raise water levels in the marsh. Halsburys Laws is very clear that inundation principle does not apply if inundation is artificial. The reason the Law is this way is very simple - why would any landowner agree to any artificial changes if it then meant him losing title to the land then inundated.</p>
Response
<p>I turn now to the mixture of further enquiries and a request for information in your email of 12 November. The Freedom of Information Act gives you a right to request recorded information, but this does not extend to a right to receive replies to normal order of business enquiries. Given that a meeting to resolve the matter has now been held and gave you an opportunity to discuss these matters freely, we do not wish to comment further on the enquiries you have made.</p> <p>The request for information was for all Crown Estate correspondence with HM Land Registry regarding our registrations of land at Thornham, a request for which we have given the case reference 915. Given that there are established processes at the Land Registry for challenging registrations which your client is pursuing, and given the meeting held to discuss these matters with you, your client and his MP, my comments about the vexatious nature of your requests remains valid, and this request has also been refused under section 14(1).</p>