



Reference Nos 212/D/107 to
130 inclusive

In the Matter of The Green, Hall Hill Common,
Fort Road Common, Parsonage Common, Walton Common
and Tilbury Fort Common, all in West Tilbury,
Thurrock Borough, Essex.

DECISION

These 24 disputes relate to the registrations at Entry No. 1 in the Land Section, at Entry Nos 1 to 22 (inclusive) in the Rights Section and at Entry Nos 1 and 2 in the Ownership Section of Register Unit No. CL 228 in the Register of Common Land maintained by the Essex County Council, and at Entry No. 1 in the Land Section and at Entry No. 1 in the Rights Section of Register Unit No. VG 16 in the Register of Town or Village Greens maintained by the said Council, and at Entry No. 1 in the Land Section of Register Unit Nos. VG 17 and VG 151 in the said Register of Town or Village Greens, and are occasioned by the CL Land Section registrations being in conflict with the VG Land Section registrations, by the Objections specified in the First Schedule hereto, and by CL 228 Rights Section Entry Nos. 6 and 19 being in conflict.

I held a hearing for the purpose of inquiring into the disputes at Chelmsford on 22 February 1979. At the hearing (1) Essex County Council (the VG Land Section registrations were made by them as registration authority without application) were represented by Mr J R M Brown, solicitor, being Assistant Clerk in their Chief Executive and Clerk's Department; (2) Thurrock Borough Council, as successors of Thurrock Urban District Council (they made objections Nos 127 and 128) were represented by Mr M J Pratley a solicitor in their employ; (3) Anglian Water Authority (as successors for the purpose of the said Objections of the Rural District Council) were also represented by Mr M J Pratley; (4) The Ramblers Association (an application by them is noted in the VG 17 Land Section and in the CL 228 Land Section) were represented by Mr R J Carpenter, Hon Footpaths Secretary of their Chelmsford District; (5) Mr Charles Henry Cole (at Entry No. 1 of the CL 228 Ownership Section he is registered as the owner of all the land in the Register Unit and the registration at the CL 228 Rights Section Entry No. 1 was made on his application) was represented by Mr R T Asplin solicitor of Hatten Asplin Channer & Glenry, Solicitors of Grays; (6) C H Cole and Sons (a firm comprising Mr Alan Charles Cole and Mr Robert Lindsay Cole they made Objection Nos. 156, 157, 512 and 513 and the registrations at the CL 228 Rights Section Entry Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, were made on their application or on the application of one of them, and they or one of them was applicant with another for the registration at Entry Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11) were also represented by Mr R T Asplin; (9) Mr R T Asplin (as joint applicant with Mr A C and Mr R L Cole for Entry No. 7) attended in person; (9) Mr William John Ockendon (applicant for the registration at Entry No. 8, jointly with Mr A C Cole applicant for Entry No. 9 and with Mr R L Cole applicant for Entry No. 10) and Mr Colin Ockendon (the other member of the firm of Ockendon Bros) were also represented by Mr R T Asplin; (11) Mr D S O Hunt (he made Objections Nos. 514 and 516) was also represented by Mr R T Asplin; (11) The Chelmsford Diocesan Board of Finance Limited (as being concerned with CL 22 Rights Section Entry Nos 18 and 19 made on the application of the Rev D A Whitwham) were represented by Mr D C Bright solicitor of F H Bright & Sons, Solicitors of Witham.

The land ("the Disputed Land") which is that in Register Unit No. CL 228 and to which or to part of which all the 24 disputes relate, comprises a number of tracts extending (not continuously) from West Tilbury Village on the north down to a short distance from Tilbury Fort (by the River Thames). The larger of these tracts, all on one or both sides of Coopers Lane or Fort Road are known as Parsonage Common, Hall Hill Common, Fort Road Common and Tilbury Fort Common; the Disputed Land



includes a tract south of Parsonage Common (the other side of the Railway) known as Walton Common; these so called Commons contain (as I read the maps I have) about $13\frac{1}{2}$, $12\frac{1}{2}$, $10\frac{1}{2}$, $29\frac{1}{2}$ and 25 acres respectively. The Disputed Land includes a number of smaller tracts by the sides of these roads and of Gun Hill, and also a triangular area ("The Green") containing about 0.303 of an acre and situated in the middle of the Village of West Tilbury (a short distance north of St James Church). The land ("The Green") in Register Unit No. VG 17 comprises The Green (the triangular area above mentioned). The land ("the VG 16 Land") in Register Unit No. VG 16 comprises the whole (possibly with some small and not now relevant addition or exception) of the Disputed Land except the rectangular area south of the Railway and northwest of Walton Common. The land ("the VG 151 Land") in Register Unit No. VG 151 is the said rectangular area. The registrations in the CL 228 and the VG 16 Rights Section are summarised in the Second Schedule hereto. In the CL 228 Ownership Section at Entry No. 1 Mr C H Cole is registered as the owner of all the Disputed Land, and at Entry No 2 Mr W Gothard is registered as owner of a comparatively very small part south of Sandhurst Road and north of the Railway.

As to Objections Nos. 470 and 471:- I have a letter dated 25 January 1979 from Mullis & Peake, Solicitors of Romford saying that their client D L & P Luck Ltd (who made the Objection) do not wish to pursue any claim. My decision is therefore against these Objections.

Objections Nos. 127 and 128 are to the registration (whether it be CL or VG) of Land coloured red on plan "A" or "B". Mr Pratley said that all but a small part of plan B is outside the Disputed Land, and to give precision to the Objection as now supported by Anglia Water Authority be put in a plan ("Plan TBC/1") which showed cross hatched black the land which he contended should be removed from the Register. With the explanation of the plan recorded later in this decision, Mr Brown and Mr Asplin conceded the objection. Nobody suggesting otherwise, my decision is these objections succeed to the extent explained.

As to Objection No. 476:- I have a letter dated 18 April 1978 from Mrs W Barnett of Clematis Cottage, Sandhurst Road in which she says (in effect) that she as sole executrix of Mr Diprose, who made the Objection and who had then died nearly 2 years ago, wished to withdraw his claim. My decision is therefore against this Objection.

On the question whether the Disputed Land is a town or village green or is common land:- Mr Carpenter said that the Ramblers Association supported the VG 17 registration (The Green) and were to that extent against CL 228 registration. Mr Brown contended that the VG 16 and 17 registrations were all properly made because the Disputed Land was within the words "been allotted by or under any Act for the exercise or recreation of the inhabitants of any locality" in the definition of a "town or village green" in Section 22 of the 1965 Act, and in support of this contention oral evidence was given by Mr S J Gardner, senior administrative officer, (countryside) in the Chief Executive and Clerk's Department of the County Council, in the course of which he produced the documents ECC/1 to 5 specified in the Third Schedule hereto. After this Mr D S O Hunt who is now and has been for the last 15 years Secretary of the West Tilbury Commons Conservators gave oral evidence in the course of which he described the Disputed Land in some detail. Then Mr Carpenter gave oral evidence in the course of which he produced the documents RJC/1 to 3 specified in the Third Schedule hereto. About 6 weeks after the hearing, I motored through West Tilbury village and along Coopers Lane and Fort Road.



By the 1893 Act the scheduled Provisional Order was confirmed. In this Order the lands known as The Green, Hall Hill Common, Fort Road Common, Parsonage Common, Walton Common and Tilbury Fort Common were referred to as "the common"; the order provided for the regulation of the common by a valuer's award and for the appointment of seven Conservators, and paragraph 3 was as follows:-

"There be reserved to the inhabitants of the parish and neighbourhood at all times a right of free access to the common, and a privilege of playing cricket and other games, and of enjoying reasonable recreation thereon, subject to such byelaws and regulations as may from time to time be made by the Conservators ..., and that the Conservators may set apart such portion or portions of the common as they may consider expedient for cricket and other games, and may enclose the same temporarily with posts and chain or other open fence, so as to prevent cattle or horses straying thereon."

The 1895 Award contained a declaration similar to but rather shorter than the words above quoted. Mr Brown referred me to the Inclosure Act 1845 Section 15, to the Commons Act 1876 generally and particularly to Section 7 which expressly requires every provisional order made ~~it that~~ contained words such as those above quoted.

As to Mr Brown's contention:- By Section 30 of the 1845 Act, provisional orders made under it for the inclosure of a common may include an "appropriation of an allotment for the purposes of exercise and recreation for the inhabitants of the neighbourhood". The Commons Act 1876 preamble refers to "the appropriation of an allotment for the purpose of exercise and recreation by the inhabitants of the neighbourhood ... (in this Act referred to as allotment for recreation grounds ...)". As a Commons Commissioner I have seen many awards which contain allotments "for the purposes of exercising recreation by the inhabitants of a parish and the neighbourhood and some of such awards were made before the 1845 Act. In my opinion the words above quoted from the 1965 Act definition appropriately apply to such allotments, so great effect can be given to such words without construing them as applicable to anything else.

The possibility of giving the 1965 Act definition a wider meaning was considered by the High Court in *re Rye, High Wycombe*. Section 58 of the Chepping Wycombe Corporation Act 1927 provided that Rye Mead should be "deemed to be a public park or pleasure ground or land acquired by the Corporation for the purpose of cricket, football or other games and recreation ... as the Corporation may from time to time determine ...". In a judgement given on 16 March 1977 (not reported) the Court held (Brightman J) that the land was not within Section 22 definition of a town or village green because by the 1927 Act the land was not allotted to ^{the} Corporation but was included in the Act merely to define the purposes for which it was to be held by the Corporation. The circumstances in *re Rye* are different to those of this case (*West Tilbury*): however the judgement supports the view that the words in the 1965 Act definition are not to be read in any large way.

I get I think some guidance from the 1876 Act. Section 7 which is the Statutory Authority for the words above quoted from the Provisional Order, includes at (paragraph 3) "where a recreation ground is not set out"; indicating that the Act contemplates that land to which the provisions of the Section are applicable is not an allotment within the meaning of the preamble. This indication accords with the view I have reached from the consideration of the words used in the 1965 Act and the 1893 Provisional Order.



On the above considerations, my conclusion is that the Disputed Land is not within 1965 Act definition (first part) by reason of the 1893 Act and the 1895 award made under it.

As to the possibility of the Disputed Land being within the second part of such definition (on which the inhabitants of any locality have a customary right to indulge in lawful sports and pastimes):- Except as regards The Green (the said triangular area) nobody at the hearing suggested it could be; rightly I thought when I saw it.

As to The Green:- It is called "The Green" on every map I have, and in the 1893 Act and 1899 Award. It is a grassed area open to the surrounding roads and of attractive appearance, such that the name "The Green" is, in accordance with popular usage, appropriate. When questioned about it Mr Hunt said (in effect):- Apart from a bus shelter, a lamp standard at the west end and normal road furniture, it is open grass land; at one time it was mown by Thurrock Borough Council once or twice a year, but he understood that now it is mown by Scouts. He had never known it to be grazed.

Mr Carpenter in the course of his evidence produced the documents RJC/1 to 3 mentioned in the Third Schedule. The 1584 Survey contains an item:-

"The Syght of the howse with the hill and the land grownde Enclosed aboute the same having parte of the parsonag lande and the Church Yarde with the high way on the Este ... on the weste and ... on the South and the fayer grene on the north".

Mr Carpenter on the map identified the site with the land on the west of The Green and contended that this Survey showed that in 1584 it was used for the purposes of a Fair. The 1740 history, says of Tilbury (among other things) "Richard de Tilbury succeeded, and had a Fair granted in here, and a Market" and reference is made to "Cart. 41 Hen.III. m.i.".

I am prepared to infer from the above quoted documents that at the time they were made The Green was used for the purposes of a "Fair" as the word was then understood. The word in modern times is commonly used to describe recreational activities associated with roundabouts and other amusements provided by travelling showmen; but in older times the meaning was "only a market held at rarer intervals", see *Wyld v Silver* 1962 Ch. 243. Although even in old times most fairs may have been followed by some local jolification, the mere circumstances that a place was used for a Fair, is I think no certain indication the land was subject to a customary recreational rights.

The 1893 Act Provisional Order includes The Green in "the common" therein stated to be waste land of the Manor of West Tilbury.

I am concerned to determine not whether The Green is a "green" within the popular meaning of these words but whether it is within the definition of the 1965 Act. Of any inhabitant of West Tilbury ever having indulged in any sport or pastime on it within living memory, there was no evidence at all, and I think I can properly infer that such indulgence has never been to any extent which could now be significant. Balancing this information against the indication summarised above that The Green could at some time have been used for the purpose of recreational activities often associated with a Fair my decision that The Green is not within 1965 Act definition and accordingly VG 16 and 17 and the CL 228 conflict should be resolved against the VG registrations.



The 1957 Order (ECC/5) shows that the VG 151 was substituted for that under it compulsorily purchased, and accordingly became subject to all the incidents which were applicable to VG 16 Land and the rest of the CL 228 Land. It follows therefore that my decision is against VG 151 Land also.

As to the Rights Section Entries:-

As to the conflict between the CL 228 Rights Section Entry No. 6 (C H Cole & Sons) and No. 19 (Rev D A Whitwham) and, as to Objection No. 512 by C H Cole & Sons against Entry No. 18 (Rev D A Whitwham), Mr Asplin and Mr Bright were agreed that I refuse to confirm Entry No. 6 and should treat the Objection as withdrawn. Accordingly my decision is against the Objection and on the conflict against Entry No. 6.

As to Rights Section Entry No. 13 (Mr W G Gothard) to which C H Cole & Sons and Mr Hunt have made Objection Nos 513 and 514:- The land to which the right Register is attached is a small piece by the Old Fort Road Railway level crossing (now replaced by a bridge) and in the Register called Gate House; the right over the part of the Disputed Land south of the Railway and west of Marsh Farm Sewage Works. Mr Hunt pointed out that a right to graze 20 cattle was equivalent to 100 stints. Of any such right the Conservators have no record, and there is nothing in the Award made under the 1893 Act to support it. In the absence of any evidence supporting the right, my decision, is, the registration ~~was not properly made~~ was not properly made.

As to VG 16 Rights Section Entry No. 1 (Mr S J Melder) to which C H Cole & Sons have made Objection No. 156:- Mr Hunt said (in effect):- Mr Melder had not and never had any rights such as those claimed. As tenant he claimed they were attached to land which was outside West Tilbury (as is apparent on the maps attached to his application). He has never paid stint money. In the absence of any evidence in support of the right, my decision is, the registration was not properly made.

As to Rights Section Entry No. 16 (C H Cole & Sons) to which Mr Hunt has made Objection No. 516 that it should be only in respect of $17\frac{1}{2}$ stints (instead of $41\frac{3}{4}$ as now registered):- There was no agreement at the hearing, but I have since received a letter dated 15 May 1969 from Hatten Asplin, Channer & Glenny in which they say on behalf of Messrs A C & R L Cole that they concede of the Objection. My decision is that the Objection succeeds.

All the Rights Section Entries are in dispute by reason of the objections made to the various Land Section Entries and the operation of Section 5(7) 1965 Act. However I have no reason to give such Objections a wider effect than was intended by those who made them. Mr Hunt save as otherwise mentioned in the preceding 4 paragraphs of this decision supported the registrations as being as far as he knew in accordance with the information available to the Conservators. My decision is therefore that save as aforesaid all the now Disputed Rights Section Entries were properly made.

As to CL 228 Ownership Section registrations:- Mr Asplin produced 1961 conveyance and abstracts CEC/1-2 specified in the Third Schedule hereto. The 1893 Act Provisional Order recites that the "common" is waste land of the Manor, West Tilbury of which George Richard Burness Esq is the Lord. The abstract shows that he died on 17 January 1925 having devised all his land in East and West Tilbury, known as



the Tilbury Hall Estate (other than as therein mentioned) to his son Mr G W I Burness; and also shows that he died on 30 December 1935 having devised his property to Trustees who under appointment of 30 June 1961 were the vendors mentioned in the 1961 conveyance. By this conveyance was conveyed to Mr C H Cole "THIRDLY ALL such rights as the Vendors may have in the lordship of the Manor of West Tilbury".

There was no evidence to support Mr Gothard's claim that Ownership Section Entry No. 2 to be the owner of the part of the Disputed Land south of Sandhurst Road and north of the Railway. Having regard to evidence summarised about Rights Section Entry No. 13 is unlikely that Mr Gothard is the owner of the land.

The 1895 Award does not clearly state who is to be the owner of "the common", and it might perhaps be argued that the ownership of the lord of the Manor was displaced so that the stint holders became owners as tenants in common; no objection to this effect had ever been made, and no suggestion as to this was made at the hearing. However this may be, the 1893 Act, the 1961 conveyances and abstract in my opinion show Mr Gothard is not the owner of any part of the Disputed Land. But for his registration, that made at Entry No. 1 on behalf of Mr C H Cole would have become final. My decision is in having regard to such conveyance and abstract, the conflict between the Ownership Section registration should be resolved in favour of Entry No. 1.

For the above reasons, I refuse to confirm the registrations at:- (a) Entry No. 1 in the VG 16 Land Section and Rights Section; (b) Entry No. 1 in the VG 17 Land Section; (c) Entry No. 1 in the VG 151 Land Section; (d) Entry Nos. 13, 16 and 18 in the CL 228 Rights Section, (e) the Entry which by reason of regulation 14 of the Commons Registration (General) Regulations 1966 is deemed to have been made in the CL 228 Rights Section by reason of Entry No. 1 in the VG 16 Rights Section; and (f) Entry No. 2 in the CL 228 Ownership Section. I confirm the registration of the CL 228 Land Section with the modification that there be removed from the register the lands referred to in Objection No. 127 and which for greater precision are shown cross hatched black on the TBC/1 Plan before mentioned (a copy of which is appended to this decision) with the explanation that the road so cross hatched shall be assumed to be the new existing carriageway (be it a little more or less than the land so cross hatched) with the result that there be removed from the Register this carriageway considered as extending for 10 ft north of and 10 ft south of middle line of the part now made up. I confirm the registration at Entry No. 16 in the CL 228 Rights Section with the modification that in Column 4 for "41 $\frac{3}{4}$ " there be substituted "17 $\frac{1}{2}$ "; and I confirm the registrations at Entry ~~numbered~~ 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 *without any modification.*

I am required by regulation 30(1) of the Commons Commissioners Regulations 1971 to explain that a person aggrieved by this decision is 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.

TURN OVER for First Schedule



FIRST SCHEDULE
(Objections)

Relevant file and Entry No. affected	No of objection and date noted in the Register	Name of objector	Ground
212/D/126 VG16; Land Section Entry No. 1	No. 127 17 Oct 1970	Thurrock Urban District Council	That those parts of the land comprised in Register Unit VG 16 as are also shown coloured pink on the two plans lettered A and B attached hereto were not town or village greens at the date of registration.
212/D/126 VG16; Rights Section Entry No. 1	"	"	(Deemed objection under Section 5(6) of the 1965 Act).
212/D/110 CL228; Land Section Entry No. 1	No. 129 27 Oct 1970	Thurrock Urban District Council	As in objection No. 127 to
212/D/111 CL228; Rights Section Entries Nos. 1 to 22 inclusive	"	"	(Deemed objection under Section 5(6) of the 1965 Act).
212/D/128 VG16; Rights Section Entry No. 1	No. 156 3 Oct 1970	C H Cole & Sons	The rights have not been acquired by grant prescription, custom or otherwise.
212/D/123 CL228; Ownership Section Entry No. 2	No. 158 3 Oct 1970	C H Cole & Sons	No rights of ownership have been acquired in the land under the limitation Act 1939 or otherwise in contravention of the Commons Act 1876 section. 36
212/D/122 CL228; Ownership Section Entry No. 1	No. 470 7 Aug 1972	D L & P Luck Ltd	That the person named as owners was not at the date of his registration as such not the owner of that part of the land edged red on the plan attached hereto.



212/D/112 No. 471
CL228; Rights 17 Aug 1972
Section
Entries
Nos. 1 to 22

D L & P
Luck Ltd

That the rights do not exist at all over the land edged red on the plan attached hereto.

212/D/124 No. 475
CL228; 8 Aug 1972
Ownership
Section
Entry No. 1

William
Diprose

That the person named as owner was at the date of his registration as such not the owner of the part shown edged red on the attached plan.

212/D/113 No. 476
CL228; 22 Aug 1972
Rights
Section
Entries
Nos. 1 to 22

Mr William
Diprose

That the rights do not exist at all over the land edged red on the plan attached hereto.

212/D/116 No. 512
CL228; 23 Aug 1972
Rights
Section
Entry No.18

C H Cole &
Sons

These rights do not exist.

212/D/118 No. 513
CL228; 21 Aug 1972
Rights
Section
Entry No.13

C H Cole &
Sons

These rights do not exist.

232/D/119 No. 514
CL228; Rights 23 Aug 1972
Section
Entry No.13

D S O Hunt
as clerk to
the West
Tilbury
Commons
Conservators

These rights do not exist.

232/D/117 No. 516
CL228; Rights
Section
Entry No. 16

D S O Junt
ditto

There should only be 17½ rights registered in respect of this land.

TURN OVER for Second Schedule



SECOND SCHEDULE
(Rights Section Entries)

Part I: CL228

Notes (1) 1 sheep is deemed 1 stint; 1 cow or bullock is deemed equivalent to 5 sheep; 2 donkeys are deemed equivalent to 5 sheep. (2) All rights except CL228 No. 1 are attached to land. (3) All rights by section 5(6) of the 1965 Act in the CL228 registration are deemed to have been made in the VG registers and conversely

Entry No.	Applicant	Right
<u>Part I: CL228</u>		
1	Charles Henry Cole, owner as Lord of Manor.	31 $\frac{1}{2}$ stints
2	Charles Henry Cole, owner.	4 stints
3	Allen Charles Cole, owner.	145 stints
4	Robert Lindsay Cole, owner.	148 stints
5	Allen Charles Cole and Robert Lindsay Cole, owners.	7 stints
6	C H Cole & Sons, tenants.	6 stints
7	Allen Charles Cole and Robert Lindsay Cole, joint owner and joint tenants; Richard Timothy Asplin joint owner.	42 $\frac{3}{4}$ stints
8	William John Ockendon, tenant	26 stints
9	William John Ockendon tenant and Arthur Alan Charles Cole owner.	6 $\frac{3}{4}$ stints
10	William John Ockendon tenant and Robert Lindsay Cole owner.	12 $\frac{1}{4}$ stints

TURN OVER



11	Miss Bertha Evelyn Bull owner and Allen Charles Cole and Robert Lindsay Cole tenants.	2 stints
12	David Nelder and William Nelder owners.	5 stints
13	Walter Gothard, owner.	To graze 20 cattle over part of land south of railway line and west of Marsh Farm sewage works.
14	Allen Charles Cole and Robert Lindsay Cole owners.	24 $\frac{1}{4}$ stints
15	C H Cole & Sons, tenants.	25 stints
16	C H Cole & Sons, tenants.	44 $\frac{3}{4}$ stints
17	C H Cole & Sons, tenants.	2 $\frac{3}{4}$ stints
18	Rev. Dudley Arthur Whitwham, owner.	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ stints
19	Rev. Dudley Arthur Whitwham, owner.	2 $\frac{3}{4}$ stints
20	Thurrock Urban District Council, owner.	2 $\frac{1}{4}$ stints
21	Thurrock Urban District Council, owner.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ stints
22	Thurrock Urban District Council, owner.	15 stints

Part 2: VG16

1	Stanley John Nelder, tenant.	Graze 15 cattle over part: of land south of railway line with some exceptions.
---	---------------------------------	--

THIRD SCHEDULE
(Documents produced)

TBC

ECC/1

29 June 1893

Commons Regulation (West Tilbury
Provisional Order Confirmation Act
1893 (56 & 57 Vict. c. cii).

TURN OVER



ECC/2	21/26 February 1895	Award under said Act confirmed by Board of Agriculture.
ECC/3	ditto	Copy (reduced) map accompanying Award.
ECC/4	ditto	Copy further map accompanying Award.
ECC/5	14 November 1957	Central Electricity Authority (Tilbury) Compulsory Purchase Order 1957.
RJC/1	1584	Extract from "The Survey of West Tilbury" by John Walker, Architect (Essex Record Officer D/DU23/138.
RJC/2	1584	Transcript of above.
RJC/3	1740	Title page of History and Antiquities of Essex by N Salmon (London) with copy of page 300.
CHC/1	31 October 1961	Conveyed by Mrs O M Burness and Mr R T D Stoneham to Mr C H Cole of land at Tilbury, manorial right and stints.
CHC/2	21 October 1920 to 30 June 1961	Abstract of will and codicils of George Richard Burness (he died 17 January 1925), of an assent in favour of his son G W I Burness, of his will and codicil (he died 30 December 1935) and an 1961 appointment of new trustees.
-	25 March 1909 to date	West Tilbury Commons Conservators Account Book.
-	-	Copy Title Award map (the Disputed Land coloured green).

Dated this *6th* day of *July* - 1979

a. a. Barton Fuller

Commons Commissioner

TURN OVER for copy of TBC/1 plan

produced from the Ordnance Survey Map with the Sanction of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

authorized reproduction of Ordnance Survey drawings Crown Copyright.

SCALE: 1:2500

TBC1

4-82	2300	3300
11-25	3-61	2-04
1-77	2706	3500
	10-28	4-23

COMMONS REGISTRATION ACT 1965

Ref Nos 212/D/107-130

Re The Green etc West Tilbury, Thurrock Borough, Essex

This is a copy of the plan TEC/1 referred to in the decision dated 6 July 1979 and made by The Commons Commissioner in this Matter.

a. a. Boden Fuller

Commons Commissioner

