



COMMONS REGISTRATION ACT 1965

Reference No. 206/D/720

In the Matter of Carn Brea,
near Redruth, Kerrier District,
Cornwall

DECISION

This dispute relates to the registration at Entry No. 1 in the Land Section of Register Unit No. CL 332 in the Register of Common Land maintained by the Cornwall County Council and is occasioned by Objection No. X 1074 made by Mrs Norma Mary Hill and noted in the Register on 12 September 1972.

I held a hearing for the purpose of inquiring into the dispute at Camborne on 6 and 7 October 1980. At the hearing (1) Kerrier District Council as successors of Camborne-Redruth Urban District Council on whose application the registration was made, were represented by Mr R G Winslade Solicitor with the Council; (2) Mrs N M Hill was represented by Mr J Boyle solicitor of G C Davies & Partners, Solicitors of Redruth; and (3) Percy Williams (Development) Limited of No. 58 Falmouth Road, Redruth as successors in title of Mrs Hill as regards part (about 6 acres) of her land, were represented by Miss B Beak solicitor of Exelby, Solicitors of Redruth.

The land ("the Unit Land") in this Register Unit is a track of about 112 acres or a little more, having an approximately elliptical boundary, and being a little over half a mile long from west to east and for the most part about one-third of a mile wide. From its boundary inwards it generally slopes upwards, and in places steeply. In general appearance, it is open moor land. On or near its west highest point there is a high stone monument dated 1836 "To the memory of Francis Lord de Dunstanville and Bassett". On or near its east highest point stands Carn Brea Castle, of which parts are of great age and parts have resulted from a recent modernisation for it to be usable as a restaurant. Between and around the Monument and the Castle are outcrops of rock, many of fantastic shape such as when viewed from a distance give the higher part of the Unit Land a strange appearance, enough to excite in any susceptible pedestrian an irresistible urge to explore; a walk or a scramble around these outcrops of rock would be interesting and the view in almost any direction superb. To the north-east is the well built-up area of Redruth; in other directions can be seen villages, less built-up areas and remains of quarries and mining shafts. Obviously the Unit Land is to any walker with energy enough, of high recreational value; and also to horse riders; and also too to motorists prepared to take a somewhat circuitous route to the car park by the Castle.

The registration was made on 8 October 1968 and the grounds of the objection dated 23 June 1972 are "the land is not Common Land".

At the commencement of the hearing I was handed a written agreement made between the District Council and Mrs Hill to the effect that the registration should at least be modified by excluding from it a piece ("the Bungalow Area") on which there is now a dwelling house called Castle Bungalow with a garden fronting on the road or track which leads across the south boundary of the Unit Land up to the Castle. From the map attached to the agreement the Bungalow Area appears to be about 140 yards from north to south and about 100 yards from east to west. Mrs Hill in



a letter dated 21 March 1979 estimates the area as five acres, but I am inclined to think that it may be less. Nobody at the hearing suggested that I should not give effect to this agreement.

The course of the proceedings was as follows. Mr Winslade said, and it was not disputed, that the Unit Land was formerly in the Urban District of Camborne-Redruth; by such statement he intended, as I understood him, to emphasise that under Section 193 of the Law Property Act 1925 members of the public had rights of access for air and exercise to it, if it was at the commencement of that Act "manorial waste or a common". Oral evidence was then given by (1) Mr G H Curwen, assistant County Land Agent with Cornwall County Council, (2) by Mr A W Glasson who is 71 years of age has lived in Redruth over 60 years and had been familiar with the Unit Land from the age of 10 years; (3) by his wife Mrs G Glasson who could recollect it for just over 60 years; (4) by Mr R N Eddy an auctioneer and estate agent of Redruth who knew the Unit Land because for the last 9 years he had ridden on horse-back over it regularly sometimes as often as 4 or 5 times a week and because he had acted professionally for Mrs Hill in respect of her ownership; (5) by Mr W A Hill who is her stepson and has been concerned with the land since she purchased it in 1958 until his father died in 1969 and afterwards on her behalf; (6) by Mr D K J Vanhaften who now lives at Castle Bungalow; (7) by Mr I B Poole Assistant Engineer with Kerrier District Council and (8) by Mr L Williams who is a director of Percy Williams (Developments) Ltd ("PW(D)"). In the course of such evidence the documents listed in the Schedule hereto were produced.

On the day after the hearing I inspected accompanied by Mr Hill and Mr Williams the part of the Unit Land near the Bungalow and the Monument, inspected accompanied by Mr Williams the Castle and the land around it, and inspected by myself the north boundary of the Unit Land.

In some respects the evidence about the Castle and the areas around it was different from that relating to the rest of the Unit Land so I must define these areas with some precision. The outside walls of the building now known as the Castle follow an irregular line; on the north-west and south-west of this line there is a stone wall (with an access gate to it) which together with the walls of the building and a strange outcrop rock which has somehow been incorporated into the building enclose a reasonably flat area which as a garden or otherwise appears to belong to the Castle; in this decision I call this flat area and the land on which the Castle building stands (including the rocks incorporated with it) "the Small Castle Area". The access to the Castle for visitors coming by motor car is now on its east side; in front of the door through which such visitors would enter the restaurant is an area of reasonably flat hard surfaced land laid out as a car park; I call this area "The Castle Car Park Area". At the conclusion of the evidence Mr Winslade conceded that the registration should be modified by excluding what he referred to (as others had during the hearing) as the "5 perches Area". When I came to prepare this decision, I realised that this description may be ambiguous in that in the Schedule to the 1921 settlement (PWD/1) there is a description of "Carn Brea Castle" with an area of "Co.Or.5p", in that the Schedule to the 1935 conveyance (PWD/3) contains the words "the building known as Carn Brea Castle and the five perches of land or thereabouts attached coloured blue on the said plan" (this plan indicates a piece of land a short distance to the east of the Castle main building possibly near what I have called the Castle Car Park Area), and in that the Schedule to and the plan annexed to, the 1956 assent (PWD/6) is similar in effect to the 1935 conveyance. As I understood Mr Winslade his concession was intended to relate to the Small Castle Area,



as I have defined it. Mr Winslade also conceded the registration might be modified by removing the Castle Car Park Area because "nobody would be any the worse off".

In this decision I use the expression "the Disputed Area" as meaning the part of the Unit Land (nearly the whole), being all except the Bungalow Area, the Small Castle Area and the Castle Car Park Area. At the conclusion of the evidence Mr Winslade stated that his Council was concerned to establish that under the 1925 Act members of the public had rights of access for air and exercise to the Disputed Area, and contended that nobody had done or failed to do anything required by the 1965 Act which could adversely affect such rights, that these rights still existed and that the proper way of giving effect to them would be either for me to confirm the registration of the Disputed Area as common land without any modification or alternatively to confirm it with the modification that the registration should be in the Register of Town or Village Greens. In the course of the discussion of the legal position he referred to re Britford 1977 1 All ER 532 and 1977 1 WLR 39, and re Box 1980 Ch 109. Contra it was contended that the Unit Land was severed from the Manor by the 1935 conveyance (PWD/3) so none of it has ever been "waste land of a manor" within the 1965 Act definition of common land, that the only rights the public have of access over the Unit Land is along the public footpaths, that none of the Unit Land was manorial waste at the commencement of the 1925 Act, that the Unit Land has never been a village green, and that I had no jurisdiction to modify a registration in the Common Land Register by transferring it to the Register of Towns or Village Greens.

As to such a transfer:- Section 6 of the 1965 Act imposes no limitation on the power of the Commons Commissioner to modify a registration, and I consider I have jurisdiction in a proper case and upon sufficient evidence to modify a registration by effecting such a transfer; the two Registers and their accompanying maps are all on loose sheets, and there are no practical difficulties; and I can find no legal prohibition in the 1965 Act; I have in two other cases (my jurisdiction was either agreed or not contested) effected a transfer from the Register of Town or Village Greens to the Register of Common Land. However to do a transfer I must at least have evidence that the land is within the definition of a town or village green in section 22 of the 1965 Act: "land ... on which the inhabitants of a locality have a customary right to indulge in sports and pastimes or on which the inhabitants of any locality have indulged in sports and pastimes as of right for not less than twenty years", meaning 20 years before the date of the Act (5 August 1965).

As to this evidence, from the appearance of the Disputed Area and the evidence of Mr and Mrs Glasson, I find that for at least 20 years before the date of the Act and probably from time immemorial the inhabitants of Redruth and the inhabitants of other nearby villages have used the Unit Land for air and exercise by walking generally over the Disputed Area or at least a large part of it, without confining themselves to the footpaths; although on the steeper parts (as distinct from the flatter part near the northern boundary and the attractive rocky part around and between the two summits) the footpaths of which there are many, would be preferred. And I reject the suggestion made at the hearing that such walking was done by permission in any sense of the word permission which could now be relevant. But in my opinion such use of the Disputed Area is not a pastime within the meaning of the said definition; and even if it is such a pastime I could not associate it particularly with the inhabitants of a locality because there was no evidence that



any such recreational walking was done pursuant to a right enjoyed by the inhabitants as such rather than by the public at large. There was no evidence or suggestion of the land being used for any other pastime. So as regards this part of this Matter, my decision is that the Disputed Area is not a town or village green within the said definition.

The question of fact most discussed at the hearing and most in my mind during my inspection was whether the Unit Land is now waste land, and if so whether it always has been waste land. First at to what it now is:-

During my inspection Mr Hill drew my attention to the similarity between the land on one side of, and the land on the other side of the west boundary of, the Bungalow Area and contended that the District Council by agreeing that the land on one side was not properly registered could not now sensibly contend that the land on the other should be registered. The 1979 Agreement is expressed "to be without prejudice to the dispute as to the registration of the remaining land" and the District Council are I think in no such dilemma. Clearly the Bungalow and some of the land around it is not waste land. I see nothing unreasonable in the District Council reaching an agreement as to how much of the land near the Bungalow should cease to be registered; in making such agreement they unavoidably (having regard to the nature of the land near it as I saw on my inspection) would have to draw the west boundary arbitrarily; I see no reason for criticising them for being too generous; from the public point of view the Bungalow Area is of small consequence. The documents produced to me suggest that the land occupied with the Bungalow may in the past have been much smaller than the Bungalow Area: but this provides no good reason for my not acting on the agreement reached without in any way prejudicing any contention the District Council may have as regards the Disputed Area.

Mr Hill during my inspection pointed out a number of grassy patches and said to me that they could be cultivated. These patches are all small and I accept that anyone who had the time and energy could, if he took enough trouble grow flowers and vegetables on them. Any such cultivation appeared to me to be commercially quite impracticable, and I cannot imagine any owner of the Disputed Area ever having any reason commercial or otherwise to undertake any such cultivation; certainly not on the higher part of the Disputed Area to which Mr Hill drew my attention particularly.

Mr Cernow in the course of his evidence said that when pipes were layed near the north boundary of the Unit Land the rock was only a few inches below the surface. When I walked over the area described by Mr Cernow I realised that owing to the unevenness of the land his statement could not be exactly true everywhere. But of its general truth from my inspection I am satisfied; I suppose, a person who was determined as a scientific experiment to cultivate some part of the Disputed Area regardless of expense would find no insuperable difficulty but I cannot imagine any person would ever want to do this, except possibly in some of the small and flatter areas (not in these proceedings significant) near the north boundary.

In my view in determining whether land is waste land at any particular time the test is not what might or could be done to it by a determined person but what is being done to it at the time. There was no sign of cultivation being or having been done to the parts of the Disputed Area pointed out to me by Mr Hill or any



where else I noticed. It all looked like waste land. I find that the Disputed Area is now waste land.

As to the Disputed Area having been waste land in the past:-

Mr and Mrs Glasson described how it had been generally used by the public during the period they had known it and Mr Tangy in his September 1980 letters said that as far as is known the whole of the Carn has remained unobstructed to the general public from time immemorial.

Against the contention that it has always been waste land my attention was drawn to: (a) the Schedule to the Tithe Apportionment Award of 1840 (DC/4) in which the Unit Land with much other land to the north (total 209a. 2r. 22p.) is described as let at a rack rent and treated (with such other land) as tithable; (b) the OS map (survey 1878) shows a "Volunteer Rifle Range" with butts and the 200 and 300 and possibly the 500 yards firing points within or near the north boundary of the Disputed Area; (c) the OS 1906 map also shows the rifle range but it is thereon described as "old"; (d) the most recent OS map shows numerous shafts "disused"; (e) in the Schedule to the 1895 Settlement (PWD/1) the Unit Land with other land to the north up to the Railway (total 209.139 acres) is described as having a tenant for 14 years; (f) in the Schedule to the 1921 conveyance (also PWD/1) the Unit Land (including particularly Carn Brea Castle, total 111a. 1r. 28p.) is described as let yearly at £15; (g) the 1974 conveyance (PWD/6) is expressed to be subject to a licence dated 26 December 1935 by Mr E C Carvolth in favour of the Master of the Four Burrow Fox Hounds; and (h) various other alleged permissions.

Land does not I think cease to be waste land merely because it is let, although a letting may be some evidence that it is occupied; but any inference of actual occupation which might be drawn from a letting is much weaker when the letting as those above mentioned includes other land capable of profitable occupation. I infer from the OS maps that at one time there were mining activities near to the Unit Land and that some of these activities extended at least incidentally to some parts of it; there was no evidence of any recent mining and I infer that all such activities were before living memory. Its use as a rifle range is not inconsistent with it being waste land. Nor is the occasional grazing which was mentioned. Nor is any permission given to the Hunt. In my view the various conversations mentioned during the evidence and alleged to be permissions are of no significance on any question now before me either because the things allegedly permitted are not inconsistent with the Disputed Area as a whole being waste land or because the circumstances of the conversations were such as to negative the conversations being a permission in any now relevant sense in relation either to the Disputed Area as a whole or to any part of it which could for the purposes of the 1965 Act be regarded as distinct. I see no reason to ascribe to what has been done about the Castle itself or on the Castle Car Park Area to the remainder of the Unit Land.

The present appearance of the Disputed Area strongly favours the conclusion that subject to the changes necessarily consequential on the commencement, continuation or discontinuance of the activities in this decision mentioned particularly, it has certainly as far back as 1925 and probably from time immemorial always appeared to be much as it now appears; obviously waste land. Balancing the conflicting considerations above mentioned as best I can, I find that the Disputed Area is now and at all relevant times has been waste land.



As to the Disputed Area being of a manor:-

By the 1895 settlement and the 1921 conveyance the Unit Land was expressly conveyed at the same time the Manor of the Tehidy. The inscription on the 1833 Monument, and the 1754 acknowledgement by Borlase (DC/3) to John Prideaux Basset on the illustration of the Castle are and the 1737 plan (DC/2) consistent with the Unit Land having before 1895 been in Basset ownership. I do not regard as significant the possible activities of the Druids presented so elaborately by Borlase although I think I can infer from his description the strange outcrops of rock above mentioned, they were in his time much as they are now. I therefore find that the Unit Land has at least up to 1935 conveyance been "of the Manor of Tehidy".

And I infer from my finding that the Disputed Area has always been waste land, that it was at all times before 1935 waste land of the Manor of Tehidy within the meaning of these words as ordinarily understood.

Section 193 of the 1925 Act is ambiguous in that it is not clear whether the words "which is wholly or partly situated within a borough or urban district" govern not only the immediately preceding words "a common" or also govern the preceding words "manorial waste or". It was assumed by the 1955 Royal Commission on Common Land that the words also govern "manorial waste". However this may be, from the said finding, I conclude that the Disputed Area from 1 January 1925 was within the section. By the 1935 conveyance the Disputed Area and the Manor of Tehidy came into different ownership; in my opinion the public rights of access granted by the said section were not thereby extinguished.

Paragraph (d) of subsection (1) of section 193 provides that the public right of access shall cease to any land over which commonable rights are extinguished (i) under any statutory provision (unconditionally) and (ii) otherwise extinguished (if certain conditions are fulfilled). In *Central Electricity Board v Clwyd* 1976 1 WLR 151 it was decided that rights of common which were not registered under the 1965 Act and therefore by subsection (2) of section 1 ceased to be exercisable, became extinguished. That there were ever rights of common over the manorial waste of the Manor of Tehidy or over that part of it which I have called the Disputed Area, I had no evidence; although it was mentioned that the Disputed Area had been grazed. If there were any such rights they are because those entitled had not registered them, been extinguished.

But such extinguishment does not conclude the matter because by section 21 of the 1965 Act, section 1(2) is not to affect the application to any land registered under the 1965 Act of section 193 of the 1925 Act, and in the judgement of *Central Electricity Board v Clwyd* this point is particularly discussed, as I read it establishes that commonable rights are for the purposes of section 193 not extinguished by non-registration under the 1965 Act. So public rights of access over the Disputed Area continue at least as long as it is registered under the 1965 Act; but the position of the Disputed Area will be confusing because the 1965 Act does not indicate how a right which has been extinguished for all purposes except those of section 193 can subsequently be extinguished so as to bring into operation paragraph (d) of subsection (1) of it.

The Disputed Area at the date of the hearing was (provisionally) registered under the 1965 Act, so I conclude then the public rights of access granted by section 193 were still in existence. Bearing in mind that sections 193 and 194 of the 1925 Act have as it were fixed in the English language the idea that the words "common land"



can mean and usually do mean land over which the public have a right of access. it would be odd if Parliament had in the 1965 Act altogether left out the registration system thereby constituted, section 193 lands; particularly as the Act is apparently intended to enable persons who wish to deal with land, merely by consulting the registers to know certainly whether the land in which they are interested is in any sense common land, and this intention would be defeated if they could not safely assume that sections 193 and 194 of the 1925 Act did not apply to land which was not registered under the 1965 Act. But whatever may have been the actual intention of Parliament I am I think bound by the words in section 22 of the 1965 Act which defines common land as "waste land of a manor" and also by the decision in re Box supra as to the meaning of this definition.

Land which is subject to a public right of access under section 193 is as it were impressed with a Manorial character in the sense that it is connected with the Manor which lead to its coming within the section; nevertheless I do not feel justified in giving the word "connected" used in the judgement in re Box supra such an enlarged meaning. In my view the public right of access granted by section 193 of the 1925 Act is not a right of common within the meaning of the 1965 Act and re Turnworth 1978 1 Ch 251 is not applicable; in my opinion the Disputed Area after the 1935 conveyance ceased to be "connected" to the Manor of Tehidy and was therefore not within the definition. So my decision on this part of the Matter is that the Disputed Area was not properly registered under the 1965 Act.

In giving this decision I have not overlooked that I leave unresolved whether the public right of access over the Disputed Area will continue to exist when pursuant to this decision it is no longer registered under the 1965 Act for the reason that section 21 of the 1965 Act will no longer apply to it; but also leave unresolved the question which may arise under paragraph (d) of section 193(1) as to whether the Disputed Area was ever subject to a "commonable right" and if so whether such right has been extinguished by statute (ie the 1965 Act) or otherwise extinguished (ie by the person entitled to the right failing to register it under the 1965 Act). So

Mrs Hill's main purpose which was as I understood Mr Boyle, to establish that the Unit Land (apart from the public footpaths) was free from any public rights, will remain unfulfilled, although she will under my decision have succeeded in her Objection; at any rate unless either she or the District Council can obtain the views of the High Court on the overall position either by appealing this decision or otherwise.

From my views about Section 193 of the 1925 Act set out above, it follows that not only the Disputed Area but also the Bungalow Area, the Small Castle ~~Castle~~ Area and the Car Park Area should not have been registered. But in case my views are mistaken and my decision should have been that the Disputed Area was properly and should remain registered, I record that for the reasons below mentioned, I would nevertheless have decided that the registration of these three Areas should be avoided.

The status under the 1965 Act of the ~~Small~~ Bungalow ^{Area} was when the said written agreement was made doubtful enough for it to be contrary to the public interest not to give effect to the compromise agreed.

The Castle itself, meaning the land on which it stands, is not now and at no material time ever was waste land, although surrounded by it. I understood during my inspection that the Castle was reputed to have been originally a beacon tower to help seamen navigate the entrance of the harbour at Portreath, a short distance to the north; and I had evidence that it has in the past been used as a dwelling house and is now as above stated used additionally as a restaurant. The small enclosed area above mentioned which together with the Castle makes up the Small Castle Area has never been waste land, any more than the Castle itself.



Perhaps the Castle Car Park Area is marginal; nevertheless having looked at it I agree with the District Council that nobody would be any worse off if its registration was avoided. Having regard to the planning permission given to FW(D) it cannot be in the interest of the District Council or I think of the public that I should refuse to act on their concession.

For the reasons set out above I refuse to confirm the registration.

I record that if contrary to my views of the law hereina^{before} set out, I should have confirmed the registration as regards the part of the Disputed Area owned by Mrs Hill, I would see no reason for treating differently the 4 or 5 acres ^{Area} surrounding the Small Castle ~~area~~ which were by the 1974 Conveyances conveyed to FW(D); these surrounding ~~area~~ ^{acres} are unenclosed and their history and appearance are indistinguishable from the rest of the Disputed Area and should therefore be treated similarly. Indeed I understood from Mr Williams that he had no intention of inclosing these ~~area~~ ^{acres} because they include the outcrops of rock which are explored by persons who have visited or are likely to visit the restaurant.

I am required by regulation 30(1) of the Commons Commissioners Regulations 1971 to explain that a person aggrieved by this decision as being erroneous in point of law may, within 6 weeks from the date on which notice of the decision is sent to him, require me to state a case for the decision of the High Court.

SCHEDULE

A. Mr Gill for County Council

CC/1	25 July 1979 17 August 1979	Agreement between Kerrier District Council and Mrs N M Hill to exclude land outlined on Plan attached.
------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

B. Mr Winslade for District Council

CD/1	1974 or later	- Camborne-Redruth Official Guide: photographs at pages 25 and 26.
DC/2	1737	A copy of plan in County Archives of part of Manor of Tehidy in Parish of Illogan, being part of the estate of John Pendarves Bassett, surveyed by Wm Doidge.
DC/3	1754	Antiquities of Cornwall by Wm Borlase: large quarto book printed in Oxford.
DC/4	1840	Extract from Tithe map of Parish of Illogan, and from Tithe Apportionment Award for Illogan.
DC/5		Ordnance Survey, 1st Edition 1/2500.
DC/6		" " 2nd "
DC/7		" " 3rd "



DC/8 24 September 1980 Letters from Mr Michael Tangye,
DC/9 28 September 1980 President, Recorder, Redruth Old
Cornwall Society.

DC/9 bis Copy of Register Map produced by
Mr Curnow while giving evidence.

DC/10 21 March 1979 Letter from Mrs S M Hill to Kerrier
District Council with map enclosed.

C. Produced for Mrs Hill

NMH/1 OS map (about 1/4000, ? reduced from
2nd Edition of 1/2500), marked with
blue, red and green lines.

NMH/2 13 July 1972 Letter District Valuer to
Richard, Son and Murdock.

NMH/3 30 October 1974 " " "

NMH/4 26 December 1935 Copy licence to Master of Four Burrow
Fox Hounds.

D. Produced by Miss Beck on
behalf of P W (D)

PWD/1 18 November 1935 Examined abstract of title of
Albert Orlando Davies to hereditaments
at Carn Brea Hill in Parish of
Illogan: being: -

28 June 1895 Settlement by Arthur Francis Basset
of Manor of Tehidy with the Mansion
House of Tehidy and all other
hereditaments subject to a settlement
of 3 March 1854 with ... heath moor ...
including all land specified in 1st
Schedule to the use of Arthur Francis
Basset for life.

8 March 1921 Conveyance by Arthur Francis Basset
with the concurrence of trustees to
Albert Orlando Davies (sub-purchaser)
of the Manor of Tehidy and all land
constituting the Basset Estates
described in the schedule and
delineated on plan.

PWD/2 18 November 1935 Examined abstract of will and probate
of A O Davies including probate dated
9 June 1928, and A O Davies (he died
17 March 1928).



PWD/3	24 December 1935	Conveyance by executors O A Davies to E C Carvolth of "Carn Brea Hill" containing 114a. 3r. 38p coloured pink on plan.
PWD/4	16 August 1954	Office copy of probate will of E G Carvolth (he died 14 June 1954).
PWD/5	9 June 1954	Copy of his will.
PWD/6	22 March 1954	Assent by his personal representatives in favour of Mrs Maud Durbin.
PWD/7	9 December 1958	Conveyance by Mrs Maud Durbin to Mrs Norman Mary Hill of Carn Brea Hill as on plan of conveyance of 24 December 1935.
PWD/8	12 September 1974	Conveyance by Mrs N M Hill see to PW (D) of Carn Brea Castle as edged brown on plan.
PWD/9	23 October 1979	Letter ?
PWD/10	16 April 1975	Notice Carn Brea listed as of Special Architectural Interest under Section 54 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971.
PWD/11, 12 and 13	24 February 1976 18 May 1978 11 April 1976	Planning permission to provide restaurant and living accommodation with conditions (1976) about car parking facilities.
PWD/10 bis		Postcard.
PWD/11 bis		Postcard.
PWD/11 bis		Plan.
PWD/12 bis	13 December 1944	Lease by E C Carvolth to Mrs B Shelley of a dwelling house or structure Carn Brea Castle for 21 years from 13 September 1944.

Dated this 7th — day of April — 1981.

a. a. Baden Fuller

Commons Commissioner