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## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE appointed at the meeting of Commoners held on Easter Tuesday, 1901, to investigate the question of Common Rights, as amended in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Meeting of Commoners held on 8th April, 1902.

The Committee have held eleven meetings since their appointment and have, to the best of their ability, investigated the question referred to them of determining in respect of what properties Rights of Common are exercisable, and the number of Stints to which each property is entitled.

They have taken as the basis of their investigations the certificate of the Chief Clerk in the Chancery suit of Monro v. Proctor, made in 1858, pursuant to the decree of Vice-Chancellor Kindersley directing enquiries as to the persons entitled to participate in the moneys paid into Court by the Great Northern Railway Company as the price of the strip of the Common acquired by the Company for the purpose of their undertaking. This certificate merely finds the names of the owners of the properties to which Rights of Common attached with the number of Stints allotted to each-( $a$ ) in respect of houses and (b) in respect of land. None of the properties are identified either by plan or description; but as several members of the Committee were resident at Hadley at the date of the enquiry, the Committee have fortunately been able in almost every case to trace the devolution of title to the several properties from the owners thereof named in the certificate to the present owners; and there are only one or two cases in which it appears there can be any reasonable doubt upon thequestion of identity. But

 to come forward and powe their title: and this is sedmeely a matter of surprise when it is rememberel that almost the whole of the purchase-money paid into Cout by the (imat Norllem Railway Company was swallowed up by the cost incorred in aseortaining the prosens entitled to it.

The Commillew thewfore invited all Owners of property within the atmient Pratist of Monken Hathey who, or whose predecossors in tille, were not rotified, but who mevertheless, claim to be entitied to lights of common to come in and prowe their clams. In response to this insitation simpal owners have produced their Title deeds which show conchuswely that the houses in respect of which they claim were cither standing or occupy the sites of houses standing in the year 1777, the date of the Aet for colosing Enfeld Chase under which the Conmon is regulated. Others although they have no fitle demds in their possession dating back as far as as 1777 hawo satisfied the Committee that there must have been houses staming at that date on the site of the promises in respet of wheh they claim ; white others have been allowed to tura on their beasts without challengo during a considerable number of years, a circumstance from which a lewal right hadoso would probably be inferted. In all these cases the commitiee fee that it word be dificult, if mot impossible, for the Trusteres to prove their calse wete they wo take procerelings to restrain the clamants from turning flatir beasts on to floe (ommon, ant they are aceordingly of opinion that the chams shonli be allowet.

In ordey to show at a glance the result of their inwestime tims the Committo have prepared and sumbib herewith three Scherintes.

The first of these Schelules contrint partirntars of the properlies in regiect of which hights of Commen were allowed
in the suit of Monro v. Proctor with the names of the present Owners and Occupiers of the properties so far as they can be ascertained, and the number of Stints allowed in respect of each property, a column being added to show the cases in which claims have recently been made in excess of the number of Stints recognised by the Certificate.

The second Schedule contains a list of the houses in respect of which no claim was made in the suit, but which the Committee are satisfied were either standing or occupy the sites or portions of the sites of houses standing in the year 1777, with the names of the Owners and Occupiers of such houses (so far as they can be ascertained) and the number of Stints claimed in respect of each house. These Stints, eight in all, the Committee are of opinion should be allowed.

The third Schedule contains particulars of the properties not included in either of the foregoing categrories, on which, for the reasons already stated, the Committee think Rights of Common should be allowed.

In considering the number of Stints to which each Commoner is entitled there is one point to which the Committee wish to direct partieular attention. The Rules for the management of the Common drawn up in the year 1777, immediately after the passing of the Act, contained a provision that two Stints should he allowed in respect of each messuage assesced to the Land Tiax at a rent of 220 or upwards, one Stint in respect of each messuage assessed to the Land Jax at a rent of less than $\mathbb{L} 20$, one Stint in respect of every other house not assessed to the Poors Pate, and one Stint in respect of every three acres of land.

By the rules now in force, which were passed in the year 1886, it is proviled that the Rights of Commonage shall be enjoyed by the several persons entitled thereto according to the following Stints, viz.:-every occupier of a dweling house within the parish
(of Monken Hadley) assessed to the Poor Rate at $x 20$ a year or upwards, and entitled to Rights of Common in respect thereof, shall be entitled to keep on the Common two head of commonable beasts or cattle in respect of such house and no more; and if assessed at less than $\mathscr{L}^{2} 20$ a year to keep one head in respect of such house and no more; and every occupier of three acres of land and upwards within the parish who is entitled to commonage in respect thereof shall have liberty to keep on the Common in respect of such land after the rate of one head of commonable beasts or cattle for every three acres of land he or they shall so occupy. The test for determining the number of Stints to which a Commoner is entitled is therefore no longer the amount at which the qualifying property was assessed to the Land Tax in the year 1777, but the amount at which it is assessed to the loor Rate apparently at the date at which the claim to turn out upon the Common is made. The Committee are of opinion, that having regard to the general seope and purpose of the Act of Parliament under which the rules purport to have been made, the intention of the legislature was to fix thee number of Stints once for all at the date at which the Act came into operation : and in so far as the rules of 1886 maty have the effect of increasing the number of Stints they wre ultru circs. Many properties, for instance, which were assessed to the P'oor Rate at less than $\mathfrak{f} 20$ per annum at the date of the Chief Clerk's certificate are now assessed at a far higher figure, and the rateable value of several of the properties specified in Schentale III. has similarly increased. The Committee have felt themselves bound to assume that the existing rules are vatid and binding upon the Commoners, the consequences being that in a considerable number of cases two stints have been claimed and allowed where a few years ago only one could have been claimed. This gradual extension of Common Rights may become a serious matter, and the Committee think the question should be set at rest at as early a date as possible.

In the course of their investigations several other matters have been brought to the notice of the Committee upon which they feel themselves unable to express any delinite opinion.

In the year 1870, or thereabouts, the British Land Company purchased from Captain Strong some 41 acres of land partially abutting on the Common, which they latit out as a Building Estate. Of this lamd eight acres, with a farm house, were owned by Captain Strong, the remaining thirty-three acres being in his occupation. The famm house and some three acres of land were purchased from the British Land Company ly one Charles Dickens, and the Compuny purported to assign to Dickens the whole of the Common lishts ( 1.1 in all) exereisable in respect of the farm house and land purchased by them. Since this assimment to Dicliens subsequent purchasers of three acres or upwards from the British Land Company have chamed and have been allowed one Stint in respect of each three acres to which they could show a title: and to this extent the lights of fickens and those deriving title under him have been ignored.

This is a question clenty requiring consideration, and one upon which the Commoners ought to be alvised in view of the not impobable contingency of rival chams being pat forward by two or more persons to exercise the Rights of Common in respect of the same property.

There are cases in which chams have been put forward in excess of those allowed by the Chief Clerk in the suit of Momero v. Prof(or. Almost all of thrse claims are for two stints when the Chiof Clerk allowed only one, and arise lig reason of the rateable valne of the property in respect of which the chams are makle having risen to a stm exceding $\mathfrak{b} 20$ since the date of the certiticate. As already stated the Committee have no option bui to :tssume the validity of the liules of 1886 , but the question is one which olvionsly requires further consideration.

With regard to the site on Habley Green on which JWert Cottacre formerly stomb, the (mmmitto hare ascertained that the property was parelased in 1sem. by Mr. (i. D). Byfichl, as Trustee for the Fast Barnet Valley Trhan Jistrich Comeil, and paid for ont of the Gencral hiatrim late, and that the legality of the purchase is at present the suliget of an apperal to the Local Govermment Board.

In the course of their investigations the Commithe have diseovered that the Rules for the manarement of the (ommon at present in fore were confimmal by a majority of those Commoners only who were actually assossed to the Land Tax in the year before the Riles were drawn up. This would soem to be in striet aceordance with the det of 1757; hut bearine in mind that at the date of tho ket there was no mathmay in existence for the rerlemption of the Sant Jax, and fhat, since the redemption of the The hats lereone possible a latre number of peesons have redecomest, thare world seem to be a pllewion whether, so far as the eonfimatian of Pales for the femblation of the Common is concerned, the let ean be strietly fallowed.

In view of the digienties with whica they haw fommat themssives confronted, the Committes recommend flat the following prestions should bo sumbitted for the opituon of Connsel, viz. :

1. Whether the Theles mow in force have. heen validly confirmod, and if not, what stops (if any) should be tathon for their eonfirination?
2.-Whether any, and if any, which, of such rules are ultra rires!
3.-What procedure should be adopter in the event of the Commoners resolving to frame new rules for the managmment of the Common.
4.-Whether the number of Stiuts was irrevocably fixed at the date of the passing of the Act of 1777 , or whether it is
susceptible of variation from time to time? And if suscoptible of variation whether the Poor late can properly be adopted as the standard for ascertaining the number of Stints to which a Commoner is entitled?

- 5.-Whether on the sale of either the whole or part of a property in respect of which Rights of Common are exercisable, the vendor can either (1) reserve the Stints to himself, or (2) convey them to one or more purchaser or purchatsers to the exclusion of the other or others? and
(6.-Whether such Rights of Common can be sold or otherwise disposed of in !rosss, i.c. apart from the property in respect of which they are exercisable?

Thiti] these questions are solved, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the 'Trustees to determine how many beasts may properly he allowed upon the Common; and it is obviously for the benefit both of the Trustees and the Commoners that they should be solved at as early a date as possible.

The Committeo further venture to recommend, with the view of protecting the Commoners, that when any clain to a Stint is made in respect of any property not included in any of the Schedules the claimant should be called on to sulstantiate his title by showing that the messuarge in respect of which he claims was either standing or erected in whole or in part on the site of a messuage standing in the year 1777; and that, in the absence of such evidence, the Churchwardens, as Trustees of the Common, should refuse to allow any claimant to turn out his heasts, leaving it to him to take such steps for enforcing his rights (if any) as he may be advised.

> For the Committec,
F. A. MILNL,

Monten Hapley, Chaiman. Nocmber 10th, 1902.

## SCHEDULE I.

Particulars of the Properties in respect of which Rights of Common were allowed by the Certificute of the Chief Clerk in the suit of Monro v. Proctor, and of the Numher of Stints allowel by him in respert of pech of surh Properties, with the names of the present Ooners anl Ocrupiers, and of the number of Stints claimed in excess of such Certificate.


SCHEDULE I.-Continued.



## SCHEDULE II．

Partirultres of Mossuages proved to have been standing in the year 1777 A．D．，or to have been erected on the site of M山ssuages thrn standing，which are vot included in the Chief Clerk＇s Certificate in the suit of Monro v．Proctor， but in respect ，fhich Rights of Common have been claimed，with the names of the Ouners and Occupiers and the inmber＂f stints rlaimed in revpect of earh such Messuage．


## SCHEDULE III．

Partimtars of Propertios not incluled in the Chief Clerh＇s Certificate in the suit of Mono v．Proctor，in respect of which Riylts af Common are in the ominion of the Commitlee porertiwh ，notuithatanting that the Graers have
 in reapert wi eath surh propertly．

|  | Description of Propert |  |  | Stints Claimed． | Owner． |  | Occupier． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | The＂Cock＂Inn，Comlifosters |  |  | 2 | Prior，Reid \＆Co． | $\ldots$ | IV．Hicks |
| 2 | ここム，Hich Street，Hadley |  | $\ldots$ | 2＊ | G．Hieber |  | G．Hieber |
| 3 | 230，High Street，Hadley |  | ．． | 1 | P．J．Baughen ．．． | $\ldots$ | Mrs．Godfrey |
| 4 | 2－6，High Street，Hadley | $\ldots$ | ． | 2 ＊ | S．Philp ：$\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | S．Philp |
| ธ | 214，High Street，Hadley | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $1)$ | W．Ager $\quad .$. | ．．． | W．Sharp |
| 6 | 212 ，Itigh Street，Haulley | ． | ．．． | $1)$ | W．Arer | ．．． | －Swarbrick |
| 7 | 2．4），Itionstreet，Hathey | ． | ． | 1 | WV．Aser | ． | IV．Langlale |
| 8 | 10＾，Hion Street，Hatley | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | 1 | IV．Ager | $\ldots$ | F．A．Coleman |
| 9 | 100，IIish Street，Itiulley | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 2＊ | W．H．Shepherd |  | W．H．Shepherd |
| 10 | 194，Mish Strect，Hanley | $\ldots$ |  | 1 | F．C．Anstee | ． | F．C．Anstee |
| 11 | 188，Mish Street，Mad．ey | ．． | $\ldots$ | 1 | C．Allen，sen． | $\ldots$ | A．J．Southam |

## SCHEDULE III.-Continued.
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Moskes Hambir,
Norembler 101h, 1503.

Fur tine Committee,
F. A. MHLNE, Chairman.

