



ros.gov.uk

Registers of Scotland

Fee Review 2010

Consultation Report



**REGISTERS OF SCOTLAND
FEE REVIEW 2010 CONSULTATION REPORT**

Section 1 Background

Section 2 The Consultation Process

Section 3 RoS View of the Consultation Responses

Section 4 Next Steps

**Annex A Proposed Fees and Comparison Over Time
Creation Transfer or Variation of an Interest in Land
(Transfer Fees)**

Section A

Section B

Section C

Section D

Section E



1. Background

1. Registers of Scotland (RoS) is the non-Ministerial Government Department responsible for registering a variety of legal documents in Scotland mainly in relation to interests in land. We are self-funding, having been established as a Trading Fund in 1996. Following Devolution, we became part of the Scottish Administration and we are now associated with the Finance and Sustainable Growth Portfolio of the Scottish Government.

2. RoS is headed by a statutory officeholder, the Keeper of the Registers of Scotland (the Keeper), who is responsible for compiling and maintaining 16 public registers. Our work is primarily associated with the Land Register and the General Register of Sasines. We handle around half a million registration transactions each year and we also make information from the registers publicly available.

3. The setting of fees in our registers is within the statutory responsibility of Scottish Ministers and this consultation was undertaken on their behalf and with their authority. The fees that RoS charge are required to be calculated on the principle of cost recovery. This derives from section 25 of the Land Registers (Scotland) Act 1868¹, which provides that "the amount of fees so fixed shall be no greater than is reasonably sufficient for defraying the expenses of the department of the Keeper, including the expenses of the improvement of the systems of such registration and recording".

4. The fees must be in line with the requirements of the Scottish Public Finance Manual, which states that "the standard approach to setting charges for public services (including services supplied by one public sector organisation to another) is full cost recovery".

5. In the last decade, Scottish Ministers have introduced a number of reductions in the fees that RoS charge. These were planned to reflect the increasing efficiency of RoS and reduce the reserves then held. In the intervening period, there has been a dramatic change in the housing market and in the wider economy. The reduction in fees, combined with the fall in house prices and the volume of sales, has resulted in RoS incurring substantial annual losses. These are much larger than had been planned and are not sustainable in the medium to long term.

6. The Keeper announced in the 2010-13 Corporate Plan that she intended biennially to conduct a review of both information and registration fees to ensure that the fees charged were within the above requirements. In order to maintain the service that we provide to our customers and to invest in the future, a consultation paper was issued on 21 June 2010 with responses required by 10 September 2010. The aim of the fees and charges consulted on was to re-establish full cost recovery. This paper reports on that consultation and sets out how RoS intends to take forward the setting of the fees that we charge for information and for recording and registration in the

¹ c. 64 as inserted by section 23 of the Land Registration (Scotland) Act 1979 c.33

Land Register, the General Register of Sasines and Chancery and Judicial Registers.

2. The Consultation Process

7. In undertaking the review, a pre-consultation exercise was undertaken to seek the views of the public through their appointed agents, being solicitors and private searchers. RoS Account Managers also contacted other users of our services such as local authorities and the Police. The pre-consultation exercise gathered views on the current fees that RoS charge and on the impact that any potential increase in fees would have.

8. The feedback showed that while customers would prefer for there not to be any increase in fees, there was understanding of the need for RoS to recover the cost of providing services. The initial feedback highlighted two changes introduced from previous reviews that customers wished to retain. These were the retention of no fee being charged for a nil return on Registers Direct and the retention of fixed fees for Charges. The consultation paper that was issued proposed to retain these changes.

9. Approval was given to RoS by Scottish Ministers to conduct a public consultation. The consultation paper was emailed to 179 individuals and organisations and 12 paper copies were sent out. It was also posted on the Scottish Government and RoS websites and attracted 1028 hits. An article highlighting the consultation was published in the July edition of The Journal and a reminder was included in the August edition.

10. The distribution list covered all of our key stakeholders and stakeholder groupings with consultees being invited to submit responses on the proposed changes highlighted in the consultation paper. In accordance with Scottish Government guidelines, the consultation paper was accompanied by a covering letter informing consultees on how their responses would be handled.

11. The consultation exercise generated twenty-four formal responses. One indicated that they had no substantial comment to make and they did not give permission to publish their response. Twenty-three responses contained substantive comments, of which six did not give their permission to publish their response. A detailed analysis of the responses has been published on our website at www.ros.gov.uk/feereview2010. (The response rate is comparable to the last fee review consultation conducted by RoS in 2008. It covered only information fees, generated 641 hits on the consultation paper on our website, with fourteen responses, including one that had no comments to make.)

3. RoS View of the Consultation Responses

Transfer Fees

12. Scottish Ministers proposed to increase the minimum fee for applications, such as Dispositions, submitted in paper form from £30 to £60, with the Automated Registration of Title to Land (ARTL) minimum fee increasing from £20 to £50. It was proposed that all other fee bands would increase by 20% except those applying to properties with a value greater than £1 million, as these fees are already set at a relatively high level in comparison to lower value properties.

13. The proposed increase to the transfer fees proved relatively uncontentious except for that to the minimum fee. One respondent even suggested that there may be a case for charging more to those who can pay more for a property and another proposed a greater increase so that other proposed changes could be avoided.

14. Four respondents questioned the increase in the minimum fee, believing that the increase appeared disproportionately high especially in the case of ARTL applications. Three respondents expressed concern at the reduction in the fee differential for using ARTL. This was seen as not being helpful in promoting the use of ARTL but another respondent noted that they didn't benefit from ARTL as much of their property is in the General Register of Sasines. Another two respondents appreciated the need for RoS to recoup its running costs but had concerns about the impact of the proposed increases on the wider property market and questioned the comparison of fees. Although one respondent believed that the increase was not a lot in comparison to 1995 fees, they believed that it was a large increase to be introduced at a single time.

15. The view of the Keeper is that it is necessary to increase the minimum fee to reflect the cost to RoS. The average RoS unit cost of processing a Dealing with Whole application is £78 with the cost of a First Registration and a Transfer of Part being considerably higher. The proposed minimum fee also compares favourably to the fees charged by RoS in 1995. At that time the fees for transferring properties up to £50,000 ranged from £22 to £110.

16. In relation to ARTL, the differential is being reduced from 33% to 17% in respect of the minimum fee (i.e. for properties valued up to £50,000) with all other fee bands retaining the same percentage differential as previously. In monetary terms, the fee differential remains at £10 for properties up to £50,000 and increases for all other bands up to properties valued at over £1 million. For properties valued at over £1 million the ARTL differential is unchanged.

17. Having considered the views offered in the consultation responses, Scottish Ministers intend to introduce the proposed changes to transfer fees as highlighted at Annex A of this report.

Charges, Miscellaneous Deeds and other Registrations

18. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to retain a fixed fee for deeds such as Charges but to increase it from £30 to £60 (and from £20 to £50 for ARTL applications) attracted eight responses. Two respondents agreed with the proposal to retain the fixed fee structure but four believed that the increase to £60 was too large. One of the two respondents to agree with the retention of fixed fees for Charges was the Council of Mortgage Lenders. They noted that although the increases were substantial, the proposed fees bore comparison to 1995 fees and welcomed the retention of a lower fee for ARTL applications. They stated that more information on whether these fee increases would stop losses being occurred was required before it could be said that they were justified. Another respondent thought that the proposals were reasonable but would prefer a greater increase to avoid other proposed changes.

19. One respondent suggested a change to the way Rectifications are charged. They currently attract the minimum fee but the respondent suggested that the fee be refunded if the error to be rectified has not been caused by the fault of the applicant or their solicitor. Another respondent believed that the increase appeared disproportionately high in view of the work involved, especially in the case of ARTL applications.

20. Two local authorities highlighted the pressures on budgets and the impact that the increase in fees would have. One noted that they don't get the benefit of the ARTL discount as much of their property is in the General Register of Sasines. Another respondent expressed concern at the impact the increased fees would have on multiple assignments, suggesting a lower increase or a discount for bulk titles.

21. As explained in paragraph 15, it is the view of the Keeper that it is necessary to increase the minimum fee to reflect the cost to RoS. The proposed fee for registering deeds such as Charges is £60, which compares well with the 1995 cost ranging from £22 to £3,750. The intention of the proposed fees is to stop RoS making losses and put it on a sound financial footing. Having considered the views of respondents and RoS' financial position, Scottish Ministers intend to introduce the proposed change to £60 for Charges and Miscellaneous Deeds as highlighted in Annex A, Section A of this report.

Multiple Applications

22. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to remove the provision relating to single transactions effected by more than one deed attracted two responses. One respondent thought that it seemed reasonable but that it would cause confusion and misunderstanding amongst solicitors, which could result in more rejected applications. The other respondent thought that it would have a negative impact on their clients' transactions and questioned whether RoS would benefit financially from this change.

23. RoS believe that charging a fee on the basis of the value of each deed submitted better reflects the true costs to RoS of processing such applications. It means that all applications will now be charged on the same basis. Scottish Ministers therefore intend to introduce this proposed change.

Rejections

24. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to introduce a £30 fee for rejected applications attracted ten responses. The Law Society of Scotland conceded that it was disappointing that a significant number of applications have to be rejected, many for easily avoidable causes. They went on to note that if the reason given for rejection proved wrong then RoS should provide a refund and this indeed would be the case. One respondent suggested that solicitors should introduce a double checking system to reduce the number of applications submitted with basic errors. Another respondent appreciated the requirement to charge for work and time incurred during the processing of applications that are rejected but called for the availability of checklists to be highlighted and this will be done.

25. There were eight respondents who expressed concerns over the rejection proposal with some being strongly against the measure. Two of the respondents believed that it could potentially lead to the Keeper rejecting more applications rather than requesting the required supplementary evidence to be submitted. This will not be the case: the rules for rejecting applications prior to their being accepted for the Land Register will remain as set out in section 4 of the Land Registration (Scotland) Act 1979².

26. Three of the respondents highlighted that in cases where the Keeper makes errors and Land Certificates have to be returned for correction, there will be no reciprocal penalty. One of the respondents believed that it was a fundamental change with far-reaching consequences beyond RoS and could open the flood gates for other government agencies and similar bodies to charge similar rejection fees.

27. The Keeper has a target to achieve a registration accuracy rate of at least 98.5% for applications despatched and does not believe that the fees that RoS charge will impact on any other government department. Last year, some 20,712 applications that were submitted for registration were rejected at the initial intake stage because of fundamental legal errors or omissions. This increases the cost and time of registration for all applicants.

28. Scottish Ministers have taken account of the comments received and the cost to RoS of having to reject a large number of applications each year and intend to introduce the proposed rejection fee of £30.

² c.33

Cancellations

29. The proposal from Scottish Ministers to change the cancellation fee from £30 to the application fee but capped at £400 received comments from ten respondents. One respondent believed that such a potentially high increase in cancellation fees should be reconsidered as it is unclear why such applications should not be weeded out at the initial check and that it is not always possible for submitting agents to know what is required.

30. One respondent had similar concerns as to rejections in that there would be no similar mechanism for solicitors to charge RoS for errors. Two respondents believed that the cancellation fee should be based on the time expended on it and that it should be discretionary, not mandatory. Three respondents believed the cancellation fee should remain at £30 and another two respondents thought the increase to be punitive with a higher fee being seen as excessive and indefensible. The final respondent had concerns about the increase, particularly in light of the proposed changes to pre-registration enquiries, which they believed could result in more cancellations.

31. As explained in paragraph 25, there are only very limited circumstances in which the Keeper can reject an application prior to its being accepted for the Land Register. Where an application is in doubt, there is generally a further dialogue with the submitting solicitor either to return a deed for amendment or to requisition further evidence. However, sometimes, cases that reach this stage have to be cancelled because they are not supported by the basic evidential requirements necessary for registration.

32. In 1995, the cancellation fee could be up to half the application fee. This was changed to the current fixed cancellation fee of £30 but means that RoS makes a substantial loss on such applications. The change to a capped cancellation fee at £400 would enable RoS to recoup the costs involved and should be an incentive to applicants and their agents to provide the required evidence.

33. Scottish Ministers have taken account of the comments received and the cost to RoS of having to cancel a number of applications each year and intend to change the cancellation fee to the application fee but with a cap of £400.

Dispositions Containing Real Burdens

34. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to introduce a £400 supplementary charge for constitutive deeds containing Real Burdens in terms of the Title Conditions (Scotland) Act 2003³ attracted comments from thirteen respondents. Three agreed that in some circumstances, such as where Real Burdens are being imposed on two or more properties or a housing development, the most effective way would be by using a Deed of Conditions

³ asp 9

but questioned if this would be the case if the new Real Burdens were being created over just one property.

35. The ten other responses were strongly against the introduction of the £400 supplementary charge. It was highlighted by many of them that if it was a small piece of ground that was being sold from a larger area the best way of doing this would be a Disposition. One of the respondents could not understand why the Keeper would want to encourage Deeds of Conditions at the expense of Dispositions. It was also highlighted by six respondents that constitutive deeds containing Real Burdens are permitted by legislation and an alternative method for RoS to pursue would be to have this legislation changed.

36. Scottish Ministers have considered the responses received and will not be including the additional charge of £400 within the current set of proposed fees but may revisit the topic at a future date. The Keeper accepts that in some cases, such as a small piece of ground being sold from a larger area, that a Disposition containing Real Burdens is appropriate. In the case of housing developments, the Keeper believes that a Deed of Conditions or a Deed of Real Burdens is more appropriate and would improve the registration process for everyone.

Registers Direct

37. The setting of the fee for the proposed service of making Sasine deeds available via Registers Direct at £3 was welcomed by two respondents. One respondent was pleased to note that it is proposed to retain the nil charge for a Registers Direct search that produced a nil return but another believed that this should incur a charge. Another respondent thought that the increase from £1.80 to £3 for searches on Registers Direct was a slight increase of not great consequence but had some quality issues with Registers Direct. It is the intention of Scottish Ministers to introduce the proposed Registers Direct fees as highlighted in Annex A, Section B of this report.

38. Six public organisations did say that the general rise in Registers Direct fees would have an impact on their budget with some highlighting the cost involved in having to search all counties. Four of the organisations raised the possibility of certain types of public organisations being given free or discounted access to Registers Direct and another organisation raised the possibility of a discount for regular users. Neither of these would meet the requirements of the Scottish Public Finance Manual, which states that "the standard approach to setting charges for public services (including services supplied by one public sector organisation to another) is full cost recovery". It is also proposed that the structure of charges for multiple county searches remain unchanged with £3 being substituted for the current £1.80 in the cost structure.

Customer Service Centre Charges

39. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to introduce a charge for the cost of RoS staff conducting searches of Registers Direct attracted four responses. One of the respondents did not object to the charges but two of the respondents highlighted that it would increase their costs. One of these thought that it could possibly result in changed working practices. They asked for clarity on whether charges will be affected by the time taken or whether in the case of a list of individual names to be searched the fee would be charged per person or on the enquiry. They suggested that the fee be levied per request rather than per search as this would reduce costs. The final respondent asked for clarity on why a different fee was proposed based on how the search was submitted.

40. In practice, it is the intention that the additional RoS staff cost fee will be based on the number of searches undertaken, with each name searched attracting the additional RoS staff cost fee. In the case of multiple county searches, if one name is to be searched against all counties then the Registers Direct fees will be calculated as per paragraph 38 but there would only be one additional RoS staff cost. The additional RoS staff cost would be either £8 or £12 plus VAT depending on how the search was submitted. The fee difference is due to it being cheaper for RoS to deal with searches submitted by letter, fax or email as staff resource is easier managed in comparison to searches requested in person that have to be conducted as the customer waits.

41. In light of the comments received and the way the Keeper will operate the new charge, it is the intention of Scottish Ministers to introduce this charge as highlighted in Annex A, Section B of this report.

Personal Presentments

42. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to introduce an additional fee of £15.00 plus VAT for applications that are personal presentments at RoS Customer Service Centres attracted two comments. One respondent asked for clarity on the interaction of the rejection and personal presentment fees and on how a single deed affecting multiple titles personally presented would be charged. The other respondent noted that due to the location of their office they rarely used the personal presentment service. It is proposed that a personal presentment that has to be rejected will attract the £30 rejection fee. A single deed that affects multiple titles will attract a personal presentment fee of £15 for each title. It is the intention of Scottish Ministers to introduce this proposed change.

Pre-Registration Enquiries

43. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to introduce a £50 fee for pre-registration enquiries attracted fourteen responses, all of which were opposed. The general view expressed was that the pre-registration service is a valuable service to both RoS and customers. The view was that the Keeper provides a good service in this area and it helps to sort out problems at an early stage, thus cutting down on the time and cost involved to everyone.

44. If a charge was to be introduced the view is that this would deter many solicitors from using the service. This may result in more applications being submitted with problems that would have to be researched by RoS staff at a later date. There was also some concern expressed about the possibility of this charge resulting in more rejections with RoS collecting increased revenues for rejections. One respondent was concerned that if this fee was introduced that it would result in other service providers charging an enquiry fee. Another respondent thought that, due to the law becoming more complicated, it was a naïve assumption that enquiries would drop over time.

45. The Keeper is pleased that the consultation highlighted how much this service was valued by customers. It is a non-statutory service, which was only intended to be a short-term service to assist with the rollout of counties on to the Land Register. Although all counties have now been on the Land Register for a number of years, RoS still receive between 400 and 500 pre-registration enquiries each month. This brings significant cost to RoS with skilled staff dealing with those enquiries.

46. Scottish Ministers have taken account of the comments received and the cost to RoS of providing the pre-registration enquiry service and intend to introduce the proposed pre-registration enquiry fee of £50 per enquiry. This would cover the cost to RoS of the skilled resource required to deal with such enquiries. RoS intends to work with solicitors to highlight the sources of information available to ensure that only those enquiries that need to be considered by RoS are submitted as a pre-registration enquiry.

Reports

47. The proposal by Scottish Ministers to increase the fees for the provision of Land Register Reports in line with costs did not attract any comment. It is therefore the intention of Scottish Ministers to introduce this proposed change as highlighted in Annex A, Section C of this report.

Miscellaneous Services

48. The Miscellaneous Services section of the consultation paper dealt with the fees charged for copies and extracts as well as the fees for the provision of certain types of information to customers. The proposed fees for the provision of this information attracted no comment. The proposed fees for copies and extracts attracted two responses. One respondent commented that the fee for an Office Copy seemed high.

49. The other respondent believed that the increase in fees for copies, extracts and Land Register Archive information would have a big impact on their costs and on the resultant service that they could provide. They were worried about customer service charges for RoS staff conducting searches, as highlighted in paragraph 39, applying in this area but this will not be the case. Given that the fees in this area reflect costs, it is the intention of Scottish Ministers to introduce these proposed changes as highlighted in Annex A, Section D of this report.

Chancery and Judicial Registers (CAJR)

50. Scottish Ministers proposed retaining CAJR fees at current levels, as they already cover costs. There were no comments on the proposal so it is the intention to maintain these fees as highlighted in Annex A, Section E of this report.

Scotland's House Prices

51. Scottish Ministers proposed retaining Scotland's House Prices as a free service to the public. This enables people to access house prices for a particular area for free. Two respondents expressed the view that the Keeper should consider charging for this service. Given the value the public attach to this service, the very small income RoS derived from it when it was chargeable and the minimal cost to RoS in providing this service, Scottish Ministers intend to maintain it as a free service.

4. Next Steps

52. Scottish Ministers and the Keeper are grateful to those who have responded during the consultation period and believe that the responses provide a good indication of the views of those with an interest in these proposals. Comments have been received from a variety of sources, including RoS's main stakeholder groups such as the Law Society of Scotland and the Council of Mortgage Lenders. We have also had responses from solicitor groups, as well as from local authorities and other public sector organisations and individual solicitors. Taken together, these respondents are representative of our customer base. Copies of the seventeen responses for which we received permission to publish will be placed on the RoS website at www.ros.gov.uk/feereview2010 and are also available from the Scottish Government Library.

53. A number of respondents acknowledged the changed environment that RoS is operating in and recognised that the proposed fee changes are part of a wider financial sustainability review that will seek to introduce greater efficiencies to RoS. This includes a recently-announced voluntary early severance scheme and the work underway to take a detailed examination of current processes and system architecture. The proposed fees, along with the introduction of greater efficiencies, will set in place the basis of full cost recovery for the services that RoS provides.

54. Scottish Ministers will be seeking to introduce the new fee levels as soon as possible by bringing forward a Fee Amendment Order for consideration in the Scottish Parliament. It is anticipated that the new fees will come in to force in the first quarter of 2011.

October 2010



Proposed Fees and Comparison Over Time

Creation, Transfer or Variation of an Interest in Land (Transfer Fees)

Consideration Paid or Value	Actual 1995 Fees		1995 Fees with inflation to 2010		Actual Current Fees		Proposed Fees	
	Paper £		Paper £		Paper £	ARTL £	Paper	ARTL
0 - 50,000	22	- 110	34	- 168	30	20	60	50
50,001 - 100,000	121	- 220	185	- 336	100	75	120	90
100,001 - 150,000	231	- 330	353	- 504	200	150	240	180
150,001 - 200,000	341	- 440	520	- 672	300	225	360	270
200,001 - 300,000	500		763		400	300	480	360
300,001 - 500,000	550	- 600	839	- 916	500	375	600	450
500,001 - 700,000	650	- 700	992	- 1,068	600	450	720	540
700,001 - 1,000,000	800	- 900	1,221	- 1,374	700	550	840	660
1,000,001 - 2,000,000	1,500	- 2,000	2,289	- 3,052	1,000	800	1,000	800
2,000,001 - 3,000,000	3,000		4,579		3,000	2,500	3,000	2,500
3,000,001 - 5,000,000	5,000		7,631		5,000	4,500	5,000	4,500
5,000,001+	7,500		11,446		7,500	7,000	7,500	7,000

Other Fees

SECTION A: Land Register and General Register of Sasines Fees	1995 Charge	Current Charge	Proposed Charge
	£	£	£
Standard Security/Discharge	22 - 3,750	30(20 ARTL)	60 (50 ARTL)
Miscellaneous Deeds	25	30(20 ARTL)	60 (50 ARTL)
Form 5 (noting overriding interest)	22	30	60
Form 9 (rectification)	25	30	60
Recording any memorandum	11	30	60
Grant of Long Lease - on consideration plus 10x Rent	Formula	Formula	No Change
Assignment of Lease - on consideration plus 10x Rent	Formula	Formula	No Change
Completion of Title by certain public bodies	44	30	60
Excambion	On Value	On Value	No Change
Operation of a Survivorship Destination	22	30	60
Single Applications - Multiple Titles - Fee on Total value + a minimum fee for each other Title	+ 22 per Title	+ 30 per Title	+ 60 per Title
Single Transactions - more than 1 deed - Fee was based on Total value + a minimum fee for each deed/title	Formula	Formula	N/A
Receipt under Industrial & Provident Societies Act 1965	0.25	0.25	0.25
Cancellation	22 or 1/2 App Fee	30	App Fee to max of £400
Rejections	N/A	N/A	30
Constitutive Deed containing Real Burdens and section 53 of 2003 Act does not apply - supplementary charge in addition to transfer fee	N/A	N/A	N/A

SECTION B: Inspection of the Registers – plus VAT	2005 Charge	Current Charge	Proposed Charge
	£	£	£
Sasine Presentment Book	1.65	1.80	3.00
Sasine Minute Book	1.65	1.80	3.00
Sasine Search Sheet	1.65	1.80	3.00
LR Application record	3.30	1.80	3.00
LR Map Navigation	1.65	1.80	3.00
LR Title Sheet Record	3.30	1.80	3.00
Deeds Searches	1.65	1.80	3.00
Judgments Defender Searches	1.65	1.80	3.00
ROI Searches	1.65	1.80	3.00
Property Price Search	3.30	Nil	Nil
Fee for Nil Return	Standard	Nil	Nil
Sasine Copy Deeds via Registers Direct	N/A	N/A	3.00
Search submitted by e-mail, letter, fax and conducted by RoS Staff - per search in addition to the standard search fee	N/A	N/A	8.00
Search submitted in person and conducted by RoS Staff - per search in addition to the standard search fee	N/A	N/A	12.00
Personal Presentments (in addition to application fee)	N/A	N/A	15.00
Pre-Registration Enquiries	N/A	N/A	50.00

SECTION C: Reports - plus VAT	2005 Charge	Current Charge	Proposed Charge
	£	£	£
Form 10 Report prior to registration	27.00	28.50	32.00
Form 11 Continuation of report prior to registration	15.00	16.50	19.00
Form 12 Report over registered subjects	27.00	28.50	32.00
Form 13 Continuation of report over registered subjects	15.00	16.50	19.00
Form 14 Report to ascertain whether subjects registered	27.00	28.50	32.00
P16 Comparison of bounding description with Ordnance Map	27.00	28.50	29.50
P17 Comparison of Certificate Plan with Ordnance Map	27.00	28.50	32.00
Form 10/P16 Combination	40.00	41.00	45.00
Form 12/P17 Combination	40.00	41.00	45.00

SECTION D: Miscellaneous Services – plus VAT	2005 Charge	Current Charge	Proposed Charge
	£	£	£
Provision of a plain or duplicate copy	16.50	8.00	16.00
Provision of a certified copy or official extract	20.70	15.00	30.00
Provision of an official extract from NAS	N/A	5.00 + NAS fee	10.00 + NAS fee
Provision of Office Copy	25.00	15.00	30.00
Provision of Sasine Copy Deed	9.00	8.00	5.00 + NAS fee
Handling second copies requested same time as the first	6.00	8.00	10.00
Provision of Land Register Archive Information	14.20	8.00	16.00
Provision of ROI in bulk (per day)	21.00	19.50	21.00
Sales for consideration (for all of Scotland). Note: Also available on a registration county basis for a reduced fee.	n/a	450 per month	675 per month
Land values report (for all of Scotland). Note: Product available on a registration county basis for a reduced fee.	n/a	622 per month	933 per month
Creditor/legal agent report	n/a	100 per month (or quarter)	150 per month (or quarter)
Data set of registration county boundaries	n/a	100	150
Provision of minutes of General Register of Sasines	n/a	252 per month	378 per month
Report on post code sectors	n/a	105 per month (or quarter)	150 per month (or quarter)

SECTION E: CAJR – plus VAT on extracts and copies	1995 Charge	Current Charge	Proposed Charge
	£	£	£
Register of Inhibitions & Adjudications	20	15	15
Register of Deeds & Protests, Judgements	10	10	10
Register of the Great Seal for a Charter of Incorporation	170	250	250
For a Crown grant of land, Unsealed/Sealed	44/170	60/250	60/250
For a Commission	500	630	630
Register of the Cachet Seal	15	30	30
Register of the Quarter Seal	44	130	130
Register of Community Interests in Land (Agricultural Tenants) - initial registration of tenant's interest	n/a	40	40
Register of Community Interests in Land (Agricultural Tenants)-registration existing/previously reg interest	n/a	25	25
Handling second and subsequent extracts and for copies	6	8	10
Certificate issued under the Civil Jurisdiction and Judgements Act 1982(a)	21	30	30
Certificate of Custody when a deed is retained for permanent preservation	10	20	20