

Press release: March 2018 Transaction Data

The transaction data shows HM Land Registry completed 1,688,244 applications in March compared with 1,632,969 in February and 1,796,056 last March, of which:

1. Transaction Data is published on the 15th working day of each month. The April Transaction Data will be published at 11am on Tuesday 22 May 2018 at [HM Land Registry Monthly Property Transaction Data](#).
2. The monthly Transaction Data showing how many applications for new titles, leases, splitting titles, updating existing titles, official copies of the register and search and hold queries (official searches) were received, reflects the volume of applications lodged by customers using an HM Land Registry account number on their application form.
3. We are challenging ourselves to reassess our language to make our terms understandable to both our commercial and citizen customers. This is in line with our commitment set out in the [Business Strategy 2017-2022](#) under the 'simplicity' element of our ambition.
4. Completed applications in England and Wales shown by region and by local authority include postal applications as well as those sent electronically.
5. Transaction Data excludes: pending applications, bankruptcy applications, bulk applications, discharge applications (to remove a charge, for example a mortgage, from the register).
6. Transactions for value are applications lodged involving a transfer of ownership for value. For an explanation of other terms used, see [abbreviations used in the transaction data](#).
7. Most search and hold queries (official searches) carried out by a solicitor or conveyancer are to protect the purchase and/or mortgage. For example, a search and hold query will give the buyer priority for an application to HM Land Registry to register the purchase of the property. This can give an indication of market activity.
8. Reasonable skill and care is used in the provision of the data. We strive to ensure that the data is as accurate as possible but cannot guarantee that it is free from error. We cannot guarantee our data is fit for your intended purpose or use.

9. Transaction Data is available free of charge for use and re-use under the [Open Government Licence](#) (OGL). The licence allows public bodies to make their data available for re-use.
 10. If you use or publish the Transaction Data, you must add the following attribution statement: *Contains HM Land Registry data © Crown copyright and database right 2017. This data is licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0.*
 11. HM Land Registry's mission is to guarantee and protect property rights in England and Wales.
 12. HM Land Registry is a government department created in 1862. It operates as an executive agency and a trading fund and its running costs are covered by the fees paid by the users of its services. Its ambition is to become the world's leading land registry for speed, simplicity and an open approach to data.
 13. HM Land Registry safeguards land and property ownership worth in excess of £4 trillion, including around £1 trillion of mortgages. The Land Register contains more than 25 million titles showing evidence of ownership for some 85% of the land mass of England and Wales.
 14. For further information about HM Land Registry visit www.gov.uk/land-registry
 15. Follow us on Twitter [@HMLandRegistry](#), our [blog](#), [LinkedIn](#) and [Facebook](#)
-

[Press release: Wolverhampton man fined £1,000 for burying illegal waste](#)

Wolverhampton Crown Court fined Ivor David John Powell (aged 65) £1,000 and ordered him to pay £4,000 in costs, along with a £100 victim surcharge, in addition to being ordered to clear the site within 3 years.

The charges were brought by the Environment Agency contrary to Regulations 12(1)(a) and 38(1)(a) Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.

As part of routine inspections Environment Officers visited the site on 11 November 2015, and observed a tractor operating on the land that appeared to be levelling the ground. The officers also saw large heaps of shredded mixed

waste and noticed the land had been landscaped to incorporate the waste material, which Mr Powell confirmed had been coming onto the site for 4 months.

Environment Agency officers visited the site again in March 2016 and found buried compressed waste that had been imported on to the site.

The court heard that Mr Powell had avoided paying charges to dispose of the 5,335 tonnes of waste. If the landowner had taken the waste to an appropriate waste site or landfill, approximately £533, 500 of charges would have been incurred.

Speaking after the case, an Environment Agency officer in charge of the investigation said:

Waste crime is a serious offence with tough penalties as it can damage the environment, blight communities and undermine those operating legally. This case sends out a clear message that we will not hesitate to take action against anyone that fails to comply.

In mitigation on behalf of his client, Mr Powell's solicitor stated that Mr Powell had been naïve and doesn't have any previous convictions and acknowledged he had avoided paying disposal costs in relation to the waste.

Press release: Wolverhampton man fined £1,000 for burying illegal waste

Wolverhampton Crown Court fined Ivor David John Powell (aged 65) £1,000 and ordered him to pay £4,000 in costs, along with a £100 victim surcharge, in addition to being ordered to clear the site within 3 years.

The charges were brought by the Environment Agency contrary to Regulations 12(1)(a) and 38(1)(a) Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010.

As part of routine inspections Environment Officers visited the site on 11 November 2015, and observed a tractor operating on the land that appeared to be levelling the ground. The officers also saw large heaps of shredded mixed waste and noticed the land had been landscaped to incorporate the waste material, which Mr Powell confirmed had been coming onto the site for 4 months.

Environment Agency officers visited the site again in March 2016 and found buried compressed waste that had been imported on to the site.

The court heard that Mr Powell had avoided paying charges to dispose of the 5,335 tonnes of waste. If the landowner had taken the waste to an appropriate waste site or landfill, approximately £533, 500 of charges would have been incurred.

Speaking after the case, an Environment Agency officer in charge of the investigation said:

Waste crime is a serious offence with tough penalties as it can damage the environment, blight communities and undermine those operating legally. This case sends out a clear message that we will not hesitate to take action against anyone that fails to comply.

In mitigation on behalf of his client, Mr Powell's solicitor stated that Mr Powell had been naïve and doesn't have any previous convictions and acknowledged he had avoided paying disposal costs in relation to the waste.

[Press release: MPs to debate new legislation to bring long-term empty homes back into use](#)

Measures to equip councils with powers to bring thousands of long-term empty homes back into use will be debated in Parliament today (23 April 2018).

The new legislation will allow councils to charge double the rate of Council Tax on homes left empty for years. Local authorities can currently levy a 50% premium.

Whilst the number of homes empty for 6 months or longer remains substantially lower than when records began in 2004, councils will be handed powers to levy additional charges on homes standing empty for 2 years or more.

The move is one of a range of measures introduced by the government to fix the country's broken housing market, and councils will be able to use funds from the premium to keep Council Tax levels down for working families.

Through an ambitious package of long-term reform and targeted investment, the government is ensuring communities have the homes they need.

Local Government Minister, Rishi Sunak, said:

While we should celebrate the number of long-term empty homes dropping by a third since 2010, there are still 200,000 vacant

properties across the country.

This bill hands councils further tools to bring much-needed homes back into use and provide thousands of families with a place to call home.

There are currently just over 200,000 long-term empty dwellings in England, compared to 300,000 in 2010.

The number has reduced since 2013, when councils were given powers to charge a 50% premium on Council Tax bills. The vast majority of councils currently apply this premium on long-term empty homes.

The [Rating \(Property in Common Occupation\) and Council Tax \(Empty Dwellings\) Bill](#) was introduced on 28 March 2018.

The number of homes empty for 6 months or longer remains substantially lower than when records began in 2004, when the figure was 318,642. As of October 2017, the number had fallen to 205,293. The lowest number recorded was in October 2016, when there were 200,145. Councils already have powers and incentives to tackle empty homes.

Through the New Homes Bonus scheme introduced in 2011, councils earn the same financial reward for bringing an empty home back into use as for building a new one. And since 2013, councils have been able to charge a 50% premium on the Council Tax bills of owners of homes empty for 2 years or more. 291 out of 326 councils applied an empty homes premium in 2017 to 2018.

The government has published guidance that makes clear that the premium should not be used to penalise owners of homes that are genuinely on the market for rent or sale.

There are exemptions in place for homes that are empty due to the occupant living in armed forces accommodation for job-related purposes, or to annexes being used as part of a main property.

Also, the Council Tax system provides statutory exemptions for properties left empty for a specific purpose – for example, when a person goes into care. Councils also have powers to apply discounts in cases where homes are empty due to special circumstances – for example, hardship, fire or flooding.

There is a Council Tax exemption for homes which are empty due to probate.

[Speech: Remarks by British High](#)

Commissioner at the Commemoration of 1994 Genocide in Rwanda

Colleagues, friends, ladies and gentlemen, First of all I would like to thank Robert, Hypolitte and Zephy for everything that they have done to organise today's events.

This month was the first time I had attended the Genocide Commemoration. I accompanied our Minister for AF to the Gisozi memorial on 7 April. I also attended the Walk to Remember and the event at the stadium and today we had the very moving experience of visiting Ntarama Genocide Memorial Site.

I wanted to share my thoughts and impressions with you and they are set against two experiences. First I visited Rwanda in my first role in the FCO in 1995 when of course the events were still very raw. Secondly I was posted in Bosnia from 2011 to 2015 and visited Srebrenica and the genocide memorial there several times. The scale of Srebrenica was much smaller – about 9000 mostly Bosnian Muslims were killed. But of course if you are a mother or a sister or a wife your experience of deep loss and tragedy is a shared one. At the same time Bosnia is a country that has not reconciled, which is still in huge denial and very ethnically divided. It's a sharp contrast with Rwanda.

My First impressions after visiting the memorial were:

1. The scale of the Genocide against the Tutsi as well as the large number of others killed is something we as foreigners will never really be able to comprehend. I find the scale, the level of brutality, and the rapid breakdown of relationships that made the genocide possible hard to comprehend. But we must understand as much as we can if we are to understand Rwanda today.
2. I am impressed by how this commemoration involves every single member of Rwanda society. Young and old. Survivors and perpetrators. People of different ethnicity and religion. Rwanda can truly be proud of the way it brought its people together to remember and to unite. And I am proud of the role UK has had through organisations, like the Aegis Trust to help that remembrance and commemoration process.
3. And thirdly those of us who are foreigners who come for short periods cannot but be amazed at how Rwanda has moved on and progressed. I can think of no other country in modern history which has taken such steps to emerge from such atrocities and in such a united way.

I wanted to say something about the UK in Rwanda. No Western country in hindsight is proud of its role during the genocide. We frankly did not do enough. For us, as for many countries we did not have representation in the

country, but we did not know or care enough. Things have changed. The UK is now a proud partner of Rwanda. I see Rwandan politicians very positive about our development relationship because they know we are now here for the long term. The UK took the decision in the mid-nineties that we were going to invest in Rwanda and stick with it on its journey to becoming a peaceful, successful country.

I wanted to add a note on the genocidaire case which you will see has been in the news over the last week. Spoke to Foreign Minister and Justice Minister about this over last fortnight. This is a Judicial/technical not political decision. Rwanda asked us to prosecute. Metropolitan Police may decide on conducting preliminary enquiry. I cannot prejudge but I can say that the UK government is extremely keen to see those involved in atrocities face justice

Colleague and friends today

- we remember because it is our duty to remember all those who died
- we unite to ensure these sort of events never happen again
- we renew our commitment to move forward with Rwanda and her long term development and security

So in closing, I would like to thank once again all those who have organised this afternoon, and to everyone for taking part and sharing experiences on what is a painful but hopeful day.

Thank you.