

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND REGULATION COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a Meeting of the Development Control and Regulation Committee held on Wednesday, 22 January 2020 at 10.00 am at Council Chamber - County Offices, Kendal, LA9 4RQ

### **PRESENT:**

Mr GD Cook (Chair)

Mr A McGuckin (Vice-Chair)	Mr LN Fisher
Mr RK Bingham	Mr KR Hamilton
Mr A Bowness	Mr JS Holliday
Mrs HF Carrick	Mr AJ Markley
Mr F Cassidy	Mr FI Morgan
Mr N Cotton	Mr D Wilson
Mrs BC Gray	Mr CP Turner
Mr D English	Mr M Wilson

### **Also in Attendance:-**

Philippa Christie	- Solicitor
Richard Cryer	- Lead Officer - Development Control
Paul Haggin	- Manager - Development Control and Countryside Management
Edward Page	- Planning Officer
Andy Sims	- Countryside Access Officer
Carl Drakes	- Regulation and Compliance Officer

### **Attendance for Public Participation**

Item 8 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 Application to add a right of way in the parish of Long Marton:

A Todd, J Todd, C Cheyne, A Potter, J Bellas, C Kipling, C Grimes

Item 9 Highways Act 1980 Section 119A – Application to divert unrecorded public footpath at Bayley/Bailey Lane grange over Sands: District of South Lakeland:

Councillor B Wearing, W Woods, J Shapland, R Shapland, G Wilson, A Buckley, G Parr

### **PART 1 – ITEMS CONSIDERED IN THE PRESENCE OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr W McEwan and Mr M Worth

## **99 CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP**

It was noted that Mr M Wilson replaced Mr M Worth as a member of the Committee for this meeting only.

## **100 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Agenda Item 8 Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981- Section 53 Application to add a public right of way at Brampton in the parish of Long Marton: district of Eden:

Mr D English declared that he had used the lane for forty years.

Agenda Item 15 – Forward Plan:

Mr F Cassidy declared his involvement in the Commons Registration CA9/4 Application to register as a town or village green, Land at the Celtic, Walney Island. He stated that he had been involved in the application and therefore would preclude himself from determining the application when it was considered by the Committee on the grounds of bias and predetermination.

## **101 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

RESOLVED that, the press and public not be excluded during consideration of any items of business.

## **102 MINUTES**

Minute 90 Highways Act 1980 Section 119 – Application to divert a section of public footpath no 570030 in the parish of Skelsmergh, district of South Lakeland:

2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, add in 'lane' after 'Bridge'.

2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5<sup>th</sup> line, replace 'for' with 'from'.

RESOLVED that, subject to the corrections above, the minutes of the meeting held on 4 December 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **103 HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 119 - APPLICATION TO DIVERT PUBLIC FOOTPATH NO 331015 PARISH OF HUNSONBY: DISTRICT OF EDEN**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding the Highways Act 1980 Section 119 – Application to divert public footpath no 331015, parish of Hunsonby: district of Eden. The report advised that it was proposed to divert a section of public footpath no 331015 at Long Meg Mine in the parish of Hunsonby, District of Eden. This diversion could be done under Sections 119 of the Highways Act 1980. Consultations had taken place so as to assist

members to reach a decision as to whether or not a diversion order should be made. The plan at Appendix A of the report showed the proposal and a location plan was included at Appendix B of the report.

The Countryside Access Officer presented a plan of the proposed order and showed photographs showing the route from various viewpoints. A map of the diversion was shown and it was reported that no objections had been received. The Countryside Access Officer advised that it had been confirmed that the route would be incorporated into the Fell Foot funding project. As all of the legal tests had been passed, the officer asked the Committee to make the order.

Mr Wilson moved the recommendation as set out in the report. This was seconded by Mr English. Following a vote in favour of the motion cast as follows, 17 members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstaining, it was

RESOLVED that, pursuant to the power set out at Part 2G paragraph 2.1(g)(iii) of the Council's Constitution, an order be made under Section 119 of the Highways Act 1980 to divert that section of public footpath no 331015 in the parish of Hunsonby shown A-B to a new route A-C-D-E-B on the plan at Appendix A of the report and that all necessary actions be taken to confirm the order.

#### **104 HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 25 - CREATION OF A PUBLIC FOOTPATH IN THE PARISH OF ALSTON MOOR - DISTRICT OF EDEN**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding the Highways Act 1980 Section 25 - Creation of a public footpath in the parish of Alston Moor - District of Eden. The report advised that the County Council had been approached to enter into an Agreement with the landowner to dedicate a section of public footpath at Ashgill in the parish of Alston Moor District of Eden. This could be done under Sections 25 of the Highways Act 1980. Consultations had taken place so as to assist members to reach a decision. The plan at Appendix A of the report showed the proposal and a location plan was included at Appendix B of the report.

The Countryside Access Officer presented a map of the area and photographs showing the route in its current condition and the stile to be replaced. He advised that no objections had been received.

A member expressed her desire for the stone stile to be retained in addition to the proposed gate. The Countryside Access Officer outlined the work required to replace the stile and the reasons for its replacement. He undertook to advise colleagues of the member's request but commented on the need for another right of way should this be pursued. He confirmed that the stile was not historical.

The recommendation, as set out in the report, was moved by Mr Cotton and seconded by Mrs Gray. Following a vote, cast as follows, 17 members in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED that, pursuant to the power set out at Part 2G paragraph 2.1(g) (i) of the Council's Constitution, the County Council enter into an Agreement under Section 25 of the Highways Act 1980 with the landowner to create a public footpath in the parish of Alston Moor shown A-B-C-D-E-F-G on the plan at Appendix A of the report.

#### **105 WILDLIFE & COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981 - SECTION 53 APPLICATION TO ADD A PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY AT BRAMPTON IN THE PARISH OF LONG MARTON: DISTRICT OF EDEN**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 – Section 53 Application to add a public right of way at Brampton in the parish of Long Marton: district of Eden. The report advised that an application had been received to add a section of public bridleway adjacent to Midtown Farm, Brampton in the Parish of Long Marton to the County Council's Definitive Map and Statement of Public Rights of Way. The plan at Appendix A of the report showed the path to be added and a location plan was also attached at Appendix C of the report. The purpose of the report was to present Members with the evidence regarding the use of the route, and for a decision to be made whether to proceed with the next stage of the process by making a legal order.

The Countryside Access Officer presented the background to the application and a plan showing the route. He showed an overhead image of the area. Members were shown other rights of way in the area and the public bridleway to be added. He reported on the 32 rights of way evidence forms that had accompanied the application.

A member referred to the lack of evidence of bicycles using the route and talked about the status of the route. The Countryside Access Officer advised on recent legislation used to determine the status of a route. It was raised by a member that the footpath appeared to go around the outside of the farmyard. The Countryside Access Officer agreed that the path historically went around the farm and not through the yard but that recent development and removal of a wall had caused the path to now be included within the curtilage of the development.

Following a member question on who would maintain the surface of the public bridleway, the Countryside Access Officer stated that surface maintenance would be undertaken by Cumbria County Council and to a standard equivalent to the condition of the route when the application was made.

The position of the present day gates were identified for the Committee and clarification was provided that the site had previously been a working farm but was now a housing development site into which the claimed path had been merged. Clarification was also provided by the Countryside Access Officer that evidence of use was 'implied' from the landowner for two users whilst the majority of other users had not been given permission.

The people indicated below had attended the meeting to speak, or asked a representative to speak on their behalf, under the Public Participation Scheme.

1 Councillor A Connell – Local Member

(Read out by the Manager Development Control and Countryside Management)

I wrote about this to relevant Council officers in November 2018. It was clear that there was a general local demand to add a public right of way because the status of the existing route was ambiguous and a landowner had been blocking access. I am sorry that I didn't respond to Sandra Smith's attachment; I believed that, in the absence of any objection to the proposal of which I was aware, the matter was settled. I think the addition of a right of way is a good solution, and that no objections from residents have been raised with me.

2 A Todd

It is difficult to understand as to why I'm stood here, attempting to justify that the lane passing Midtown Farm is a continuation of the Back Lane, which Lowis Lane joins, these are already classed as bridleways.

It has been a lane since 1838, as the Tithe map shows, it is clearly shown on all the ordnance survey maps that have been produced over the years.

The lane is an established lane, having stone sets all the way around the area in question, as has the rest of the lane.

It would appear there has never been any obstruction during this time, no gates, as there are no gate stoops along these lanes, no fences of any description blocking the lane.

Where Lowis Lane and the Back Lane meet, there is no barrier across the Back Lane and no evidence of there ever being one.

I'm now in my 70's and I am the third generation living at Ivy House, the Back Lane has always been used, by horse and cart in the early days, latterly tractors and quad bikes. Walkers, cyclists and horse riders have always used the lane. Being an equestrian and livery centre, I take more notice of the amount of horses who use the back lane, to which there are many.

The Public Bridleway sign, at the corner of Pearson Lane, clearly points up the Back Lane and therefore the Back Lane is naturally used and has been used as a footpath and bridleway, past Midtown Farm, by many local people and visitors alike, over many, many years.

It is hard to understand as to why the beneficiaries of Midtown Farm have attempted to destroy this lane, stating no-one uses it, unfortunately they have not lived in Brampton since the 1960's and do not realise how much the local community use it, including the elderly of the village as it is not too far to walk in a round route, those

who stay at the caravan site at Croft Ends or those who live in Appleby, walk through to join Wood Lane which takes them up through Dufton Ghyll and joins the Pennine Way.

The same can be said about horse riders, this lane enables riders to keep off the busy roads and safely join other routes. The roads are getting busier and busier with faster cars and bridleways are a safer way of riding.

### 3 C Cheyne

My interest in and enjoyment of using paths and rights of way stem from my family upbringing where my father was a lawyer in Edinburgh and for many years chairman of The Scottish Rights of Way Society (now Scotways). In this capacity he had been involved in many cases and as a family we often visited locations and father would describe the history and relevance of routes.

My knowledge and use of the route being examined today commenced in 1984 when as a Licensee in Appleby I visited Bill Rumney who was the proprietor of The New Inn, Brampton. At this time I spent much free time exploring and walking in the area including having used the route in question.

John Sowerby for over 40 years at Banks View, Brampton, my wife's cousin, has told me on many occasions the history of the village and its historical routes; so, when we moved to Brampton in 2014, I enjoyed exploring the paths and bridleways. The one used most days by myself was the one around the side and back of Midtown Farm. It was obvious this had been used for horse and cart traffic for over 200 years as you could see the original stone cobbles under the grassy surface and the original boundary dry stone walls would date from the same period. John and his father before him used the back lane round the side of Midtown Farm frequently through the fifties and up to date.

Our concern for addressing environmental issues should mean that we understand and respect the benefits old routes contribute to permitting wild-life to move freely and also where they have significant links to the heritage of communities, especially where the local people show strongly that they have used the routes and see any restriction a major detriment to village life.

### 4 A Potter

I am Chairman of Long Marton Parish Council, which I have served for over 14 years, 10 years of that as Chairman.

Living in the neighbouring village of Long Marton for all 55 years of my life, I have when I was younger walked, cycled and played occasionally with school friends in Brampton Village and on the associated footpath/bridleway in question.

Many of my colleagues representing their respective wards of Long Marton Parish Council in particularly the following:

Councillor Holdsworth has 58 years close association with Brampton living there most of his life, can also recollect using and playing with school friends in the area mentioned.

Councillor Cannon has 70+ years knowledge of the area and living in the Brampton area all his life, can confirm regular use of horses and horse drawn vehicles, tractors, motorcycles and cyclists and walkers.

Councillor Sowerby has 60+ years knowledge of the area and spending most of her youth living in Brampton, can also recollect using the said footpath/bridleway.

The beneficiaries stated in a public meeting that they held title deeds to the footpath/bridleway in question. As I chaired the meeting, I requested that the beneficiaries presented proof of this document to the Parish Council but to date, no such proof has been provided to us.

Finally, I have been saddened to hear reports of Brampton residents, old and young having a barrage of insults, intimidation and verbal abuse hurled at them when doing what they have always done; walking and enjoying their country constitutional on the same footpath/bridleway as they have done for many years.

## 5 J Bellas

1 Having Purchased some of the land at Mid-Town Farm, from the beneficiaries, with the beneficiaries" claiming to own "the stretch of lane from the corner to the main road. It was agreed by both Parties that I/We would have a right of way, via Back Lane to our land for :-

- i. The movement of livestock
- ii. Unrestricted access for Motor and Agricultural vehicles

We used the said right of way right from day 1 as we have other land to the South of Brampton enabling us to check or stock in a loop direction back to the farm, however on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2019 we discovered 2 locked gates blocking the Back Lane in both directions, therefore making the usual route impossible, adding both valuable time, extra fuel and access to our land for us or emergency veterinary very difficult.

I can produce document JB1, clearly showing our Right of Way, which is signed by the Beneficiaries.

2. The back Lane has been used for many years by responsible dog walkers, whilst we are lambing in the fields behind our farm during April and May each year, as an alternative to the footpath which runs through the fields in which we lamb our ewes. This sadly is no longer an option as the locked gates and intimidating signs which the beneficiaries have erected, with threats of prosecution to "Trespassers" will no doubt have an impact on our sheep.

3. Having lived and worked at Croft Ends all my life I have used Back Lane to walk to the pub, which I no longer do as its almost a mile further to walk along an

unlit road at night on which vehicles travel at alarming speeds. sadly, this will not only affect my wellbeing through lack of social interaction but also the village pub which relies on local trade.

4. We at Croft Ends operate a CL touring caravan site and the Back lane was used by our visitors daily to walk to

i. The Pennine way

ii. Duffton

iii The New Inn

## 6 C Kipling

Mr Kipling made the following points:

- He knew the former owner who had never mentioned any restrictions, and that they would talk frequently,
- He had used the lane twice daily with his dog but the use of the lane was now hindered by the erection of gates across the bridleway
- The demolition of the boundary wall between the land of Midtown Farm and the bridleway appeared to be an offence of theft, anyone taking land that is not theirs is a misappropriation of property. The land grab was therefore an illegal act
- He urged members to take into consideration how the changes had affected the local people in a negative way.

## 7 C Grimes

I have been resident in Brampton for over 22 years, having moved here in August 1997.

From the outset, I used the sections of lane in question, initially on foot at least weekly and occasionally on horseback then, for over 13 years (since acquiring a dog) at least twice weekly and often on a daily basis. This was until the erection of the first barrier across the lane on 11 August 2018.

I continued to use the route whenever the barriers were removed or unlocked. This has not been possible recently, since the installation of a double padlocked gate and more barbed wire.

Not once did I see any notice inviting other landowners to come forward. The No Entry sign and the notice erroneously threatening 'trespassers' with a criminal record only went up after the barbed wire fence was replaced by a metal gate. A CCTV camera was removed when it was illegally pointed into a house.

The landowners have also removed a boundary wall between points B and C on your map. The land has been left to grow wild so that now it looks as though the lane between these points is actually part of the adjacent field. However Long Marton Parish Council is in receipt of a letter from the landowner's solicitors,

admitting that they don't own that section. A recent planning application refers to it still being for agricultural use but there is a planning application in for housing.

Until we were physically prevented from using the track (those who hadn't been put off by the verbal abuse and intimidating behaviour of a representative of the landowners), I frequently met other walkers, horse riders, residents of Brampton, Croft Ends and Long Marton, holiday makers and those en route to The New Inn and Duffton.

Conversations with neighbours indicate that the blocking of this track is having a detrimental effect on local tourist industry businesses.

The previous owner of Midtown Farm frequently spoke to me as I used this lane. He never questioned or challenged my access even though we occasionally conversed about farming and fields etc. Whilst he was alive, the beneficiaries of his estate had also, over a number of years, seen me and others use the lane and never once challenged me or others or even mentioned the issue or the possibility of denying access.

There has been intimidating behaviour and the neighbours say that blocking the route has had a detrimental effect on holiday makers in the area.

#### 8 A Armstong (read by A Todd)

I am writing in support of residents and Long Marton parish council as the representative on Eden District Council for Long Marton Ward of which the village of Brampton is in.

I have talked and listened to many local residents who have used the footpath/bridleway for as long as they can recall.

On a personal note my wife, a local and a keen horsewoman all her life, has been using the bridleway since 1984.

At the close of public participation for this item, the Chair invited questions from members.

Mr English declared that he had used the path for forty years when visiting the local pub and walking his dog and had never been impeded from using the route. He highlighted that the travelling community may use the path during Appleby Fair.

A member asked Mr Todd whether the path existed on tithe maps, whether it was recorded as a lane or was designated on other maps. Mr Todd was unsure but stated that as third generation living at Ivy House there had never been a gate. The Countryside Access Officer stated that as 32 evidence forms alleged use of the path between 1 and 71 years, this passed the 'reasonably alleged' test and therefore it was unnecessary for Officers to refer to historical maps at this stage of the process.

A member referred to the path being a historic feature of the area and was concerned about the stone wall being moved. In understanding the concerns raised, the Countryside Access Officer explained that the removal of walls adjacent to the track was not material to the legal claim of the path and the County Council had no authority to address the action. The local District Council Planning Department had the powers of enforcement with regard to the situation.

Mr Markley moved the recommendations, as set out in the report, which was seconded by Mr Fisher. In support of the motion, a member highlighted that in general, it was irrelevant that landowners claimed paths because they owned the land because most rights of way were on private land and many paths were used for generations without permission.

The Countryside Access Officer confirmed that it was, as yet, unknown whether the new properties to be built would have access onto the right of way. In response to a member question about restoring the width, the maintenance of and restoring the path, the Countryside Access Officer explained the process and advised that the width and any limitations would be recorded and included in the legal order. In terms of rebuilding the wall, this would be a planning matter and not for the Committee to consider.

A vote was cast as follows, 17 members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions. Therefore, it was

RESOLVED that,

- 1 Members authorise the Chief Legal Officer to make an order under section 53(3) (c) (i) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, the effect of which would be to add a section of public bridleway at Brampton in the parish of Long Marton shown A-B-C on the plan at Appendix A of the report to the County Council's Definitive Map and Statement of Public Rights of Way.
- 2 If objections are received with significant new evidence against the made order then the Council should from then on take a neutral stance.
- 3 If there are no objections to the made order Members authorise the Chief Legal Officer to confirm the order.

A 5 minute recess took place at 10.50am

**106 HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 SECTION 119A - APPLICATION TO DIVERT UNRECORDED PUBLIC FOOTPATH AT BAYLEY/BAILEY LANE GRANGE OVER SANDS: DISTRICT OF SOUTH LAKELAND**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding the Highways Act 1980 Section 119A – Application to divert unrecorded public footpath at Bayley/Bailey Lane, Grange Over Sands in the district of South Lakeland. The report advised that on the 13<sup>th</sup> August 2019 the Committee had approved the making of the order under Sections 119A of the Highways Act 1980 to

divert the unrecorded public footpath that passes over the railway at Bayley/Bailey Lane, Grange Over Sands to an alternative route that incorporated the nearby railway underpass. Substantive objections had been received to the advertised order and the County Council needed to consider how to proceed with the matter. A copy of the order plan was shown at Appendix A of the report and photographs of the location were included at Appendix B of the report.

In presenting the background to the making of the Order and subsequent objections following its advertisement, the Countryside Access Officer drew members' attention to the made order plan and photographs of the location.

The Countryside Access Officer explained that new evidence had been received (which was presented to the Committee) and the objections were arguable. He commented on the complexity of the case and the conflicting evidence which he had considered carefully. He added that as it was a finely balanced matter, it would be beneficial for all the evidence to be tested by way of a Public Inquiry. He advised on the cost implications of this and on the opportunity for the applicant to be heard by the Planning Inspectorate.

He presented a number of options for the Committee to consider on how to proceed in the case. He recommended that members approve submitting the Order to the Secretary of State for resolution and inform the Planning Inspectorate that from now on the County Council would be taking a neutral stance.

A member noted that if it was to be considered by the Secretary of State then the decision of the Committee may have little impact. He queried what would happen if the legal order was abandoned. The Countryside Access Officer advised that the crossing would have to be reopened and the legal diversion would not take place. The member then asked if this could be challenged and be referred to a Public Inquiry and could the landowner seek to make the order. The Countryside Access Officer was unsure of procedure at this point. He explained that this was a Section 119A order, specific to rail crossings and explained that there were significant differences in the legal tests and requirements between this and a Section 119 order that the Committee more frequently considered.

A member queried if the County Council took no further action and abandoned the legal order and the footpath was reopened, whether the County Council could insist that safety measures were imposed given the accidents that had taken place. The Countryside Access Officer advised that as the Highways Authority, the County Council could not do this, it was the landowner's responsibility.

It was confirmed by the Countryside Access Officer that if the order was submitted to the Secretary of State, he/she would review all of the facts and decide whether the Bailey Lane railway crossing should be re-opened. The Solicitor advised that the railway crossing gates were currently locked/closed and legal access was restricted by a temporary Traffic Regulation Order on safety grounds and that the decision before members related to permanent closure of the route.

When commenting on the number of families using the route to access the playground and promenade, a question was asked by a member about who had

ultimate responsibility for health and safety at the crossing. The Countryside Access Officer confirmed that this was Network Rail.

A member referred to the site visit in July 2018 when a number of issues, safety concerns and improvements had been raised by members. It was queried whether the applicant had undertaken work to address these issues. The Countryside Access Officer clarified that the applicant had to undertake a list of improvement work to the diversion route, including items highlighted at the site visit before the order could be confirmed and brought into operation.

The people indicated below had attended the meeting to speak, or asked a representative to speak on their behalf, under the Public Participation Scheme.

1 Councillor Bill Wearing – Local Member

I am here today to support the diversion order and the permanent closure of Bayley Lane Crossing.

Speaking as the Local Member and long standing resident of more than 50 years, I consider it my duty and position to point out to members the necessity to agree to this diversion and closure of the crossing on safety and general usage grounds.

The promenade is and will continue to be a major attraction for tourists to our Town and also a much loved area for residents to walk and enjoy the views in this part of our county.

I know there will be many people speaking about this application from both sides of the argument and I respect them both.

I am looking at this from the long view point and the fact that many more people will be using the promenade over the next few years. The public footpath diversion will meet all their needs especially relating to ease of access and managing the volume of people using the promenade in a safe and secure environment.

I hope members will be able to see my point of view and support the diversion and closure of the crossing.

2 Mr W Woods

Months ago you read the reports, heard from supporter and objectors and debated the application to close the railway crossing. You decided on balance, safety was paramount in protecting the public and the numerous unaccompanied children from the dangers of crossing the railway line and decided to support a closure order request.

The objectors to the proposed order are just repeating 'the incident evidence statistics'. It's not high enough to support closure and in their view the crossing could be made safer.

My property overlooks the crossing and the antics of pedestrians and children on the crossing amazes me. It is not the placement of the crossing which was the problem, it is the behaviour of people. No amount of additional signage etc can eliminate human behaviour. The introduction of the new quieter passenger trains greatly increases the danger.

I am no fan of Network Rail but I am sure if there was a solution to making the crossing 100% safe then they would not have constructed the million pounds plus underpass and agreed upgrading of the current footpath. Closure of the crossing, keeps not only the public including children safe from crossing the railway it also eliminates the incident effect on train passengers and train drivers.

The crossing has been closed for over a year now and there has been no public outcry as it was accepted the crossing would close once the underpass was completed, in fact the public appreciate the underpass from the car park, and to Network Rail's credit have not indicated, the underpass could close if the diversion is not granted.

I used the crossing daily and if there was no underpass I would be objecting to the closure but the few additional metres is acceptable, there is no problem with the railway line, it is humans crossing it.

Please stick to your decision to support the diversion of the footpath. Please do not wait for the next victim's family to address you.

Mr Woods made the following additional points:

- He thought that nothing had changed materially since the site visit in 2018
- He thought that a Public Inquiry was the best place to determine the outcome of the application and would be a once in a lifetime cost to the Council.

3 J Shapland

I know that many members of this Committee visited the site of Bailey Lane Crossing and the new underpass in 2018. Therefore, I am very grateful to you because you will know that five of the letters of objection to it remaining closed contain untrue facts.

Letter 1: the number of access points to the promenade are five at the present time not four as stated. Also it says that keeping Bailey Lane shut would reduce it to three.

Letter 2: States the underpass has been flooded, there are no dates and times to back up the statement

Letter 3: Bailey Lane has a gradient of 1:5 so was not suitable for wheelchairs and mobility scooters as the gates open outwards. Also it cites the incorrect number of access points.

Letter 4: The writer has currently a bad leg so I don't think a 1:5 gradient plus a level crossing would be better than the underpass.

Letter 5: cites an over-reaction to the incidents. There have been two deaths – how can anyone over react to death and the repercussions to the families involved. The only way to keep the crossing 100% safe is to keep it closed.

Not one of the objections mentions the Sellafeld train which uses the line twice a day which does not stop for anything, the times of which vary every day for obvious reasons.

4 R Shapland

In 2005 there was a proposal from Northern Rail that they would replace Bailey Lane crossing with a new underpass. This was thought to be a good thing as lots of things have changed. The pier at the bottom of Bailey Lane was demolished in 1906 and the use of the car park expanded and is now full of cars. Something therefore needed to be done to improve access.

The underpass opened in 2006 but Cross Hill remained open. Comments were made that the legislation dealing with the closure wasn't precise and therefore open to interpretation this is why there are technical objections.

As an example, it is argued that the path from the bottom of Bailey Lane into the car park and onto the underpass is not of an acceptable condition to be used by the public. This is despite it being used for 40 years until the opening of the underpass.

In 4.3 of the report the District Council had registered with the Land Registry a small piece of land under the promenade which affects the legal designation at the promenade. It is under different regulations to other parts of the promenade.

This needs to be dealt with by transfer of the question to the Secretary of State. There has been a Public Inquiry in the past over two access points. I suggest a Public Inquiry is the way forward.

5 Dr Irwin (read by Councillor B Wearing)

Dr Irwin, a retired GP from Grange over Sands, had recently passed away and her daughter advised that her mother was very keen to make sure that the crossing remained closed.

Councillor Wearing read out the following statement:

My name is Dr Jane Irwin and I was a GP in Grange over Sands for 35 years until my recent retirement. During that time I attended 2 fatalities at the Bailey Crossing. The first, an elderly lady, gained access to the line at the crossing and was killed about 200yds along the track. It is to be noted that the crossing gives easy access to the track, especially for teenagers. The second extremely distressing case was a

young child who was crossing with her family on a sunny summer's day after a visit to the playground.

The salient point about this crossing is that it is immediately adjacent to the main path to the playground, without even accessing the Prom. On coming from the playground the crossing is straight ahead and looks the obvious route to town and the carpark. People don't realise that there is now a safer option, or just assume it is a short cut. It is a busy line with more than one train every hour. Recently the footfall along the playground path has increased due to the opening of a new cafe on the same path.

Although this incident occurred many years ago, it was extremely distressing for all involved and left a blot on the reputation of our town. The family could not believe the closeness of the crossing to the playground. If the crossing reopens, nothing has substantially changed and this is an accident that could recur tomorrow, next week or next year. I strongly feel that we cannot justify the risk of reopening the Bailey Crossing in such close proximity to our children's facilities. It puts lives at risk.

#### 6 M Robinson (read by J Shapland)

When the crossing was in use I witnessed the public, using and abusing it on a daily basis from my house which overlooks the crossing and promenade.

Examples are:

- Groups of young people, usually girls, walking down the lane totally absorbed in their mobile phones and not stopping at the gates to make sure it is safe to cross.
- People crossing at the last minute in sight of an oncoming train.
- Someone picking blackberries inside the crossing boundaries.
- People stopping in the middle of the crossing to look at the view.

On two occasions I have witnessed a train stopping to avoid hitting pedestrians; – one involved an elderly couple with a wheel chair which the man found difficult to push across the crossing. Trains are travelling around 50 miles per hour when they pass the crossing and the drivers have little or no time to react as they cannot stop several tons of train quickly to respond to something seen at the last minute.

One way in which the situation has changed from 18 months ago is that there are now new trains running on the line which are much quieter and therefore it is more difficult to hear them approaching.

What concerns me is that a percentage of the public feel that they have to

cross at the last minute in front of an approaching train instead of waiting for it to pass and cross with safety.

Bailey Lane crossing is, therefore, no longer needed as an alternative, safer ways to access the promenade are available. My concern is that an incident or worse still a fatal accident may happen as it did in May 1988. I strongly feel that to re-open the crossing at this stage would be a backward step. I therefore fully support the permanent closure of Bailey Lane crossing.

## 7 G Wilson

I oppose the officer recommendation that the Order in question be submitted to the Secretary of State for resolution and that the Council should take a neutral stance.

If the committee today resolves to accept the officer's recommendation you are letting yourselves and your community down. You are giving yourselves a let-out that's unsupportable. The decision that the committee took to make the Order was on the grounds that Network Rail presented to you. But Network Rail is not an independent arbiter on rail safety. Network Rail is prejudiced; in some ways it's their job to be. Network Rail has shown in a succession of locations throughout the country that they will seek the closure of such crossings almost at any cost .... because it's their policy to do so. In pursuing that policy they seek closure of crossings in locations where even their own safety assessment doesn't justify the closure. You should not be impressed by or afraid of that.

And .... You, the committee members, are not experts in rail safety; but you have not required that the Council commissions an independent assessment of the dangers asserted by Network Rail at Bailey Lane to cover that lack of expertise. The officer report that's before you today tells you that at para. 7.3. Your duty to your communities, even to those members of the community who are passionately in favour of the closure of the crossing, is to be sure that you are not acquiescing to Network Rail without very good reason to do so. You should have reached your own informed decision ... which you've not done; not in any way that can be identified anyway.

Your officer's report lists a number of other key requirements of confirmation of this type of Order which objectors have highlighted as not having been met. At section 6 of the officer's report members are given the three options available to the committee. All of those options remain open to you.

At section 7 of the report your officer says unequivocally that 'new evidence objecting the making of the order ... leads me to advise that County Council should not continue to support the confirmation of the legal order'. But, in the light of your previous decision to have the Order made (contrary to his earlier advice), your officer feels some obligation to recommend that you send the Order to the Secretary of State ... to make a decision that you are not sure on. But that's not how it works. The Secretary of State should not be placed in the position of having to make a decision because a Council wishes to avoid doing so. The Secretary of State's job is

to deal with objections to a clear council decision, not to deal with Councillor prevarication.

If, as a result of the further objections to the making of the Order in question, you are no longer sure that you wish the Order to be confirmed, then you must abandon this Order. That's option 6.1.

If you are as convinced as you ever were that the crossing should be closed then you should be prepared to put your money where your decision is, and support the order. That's option 6.2. That it may cost the Council some money to do should not be a factor in your conviction.

To resolve to accept your officer's recommendation to submit the order to the Secretary of State and take a neutral stance; option 6.4 ... would be a giant and disgraceful cop-out.

Please have the courage of your convictions. Don't avoid your responsibility. Don't leave to the Secretary of State a decision that should be yours to take; and whose inspector will hear the apparent authority of Northern Rail and their highly paid barristers being contested by members of the community (such as me) funding themselves when they should also have the support of the Council that landed them in this position.

## 8 N Thorne (read by the Manager Development Control and Countryside Management)

The key points in the officer's report are:

2.2 "Members have discretion [in this matter]... such discretion must be exercised reasonably"

7.2 "County Council should not continue to support confirmation of the Order"

7.6 "Network Rail do not appear to have carried out improvements as required by the legislation"

Officers explain that the objections have 'substantial content and difficult to refute'.

A 'neutral' stance is not reasonably open to you in discretionary matters such as this.

It is now incumbent upon councillors to revisit your earlier decision by examining the objections alongside the original documents and arguments, to consider them in detail and how they impact on your original decision. Basically you should reassess the safety case with the objections, and the choice here is binary:

A. You decide, like Officers, that the safety case has not been met. The Order should then be abandoned. Option 6.1.

B. You decide, against Officer advice, that the safety case has been met and submit the Order to the Planning Inspectorate for confirmation. In this instance, you should support your own decision. Option 6.2

If the Council has 'doubt' over justifying the safety case, which it seems to have, then you should not pursue the Order any further (6.1).

It's important to note that the only safety assessment carried out by CCC was prior to the July 2018 committee meeting. Officers concluded that the safety case had not been met. Councillors rejected this – but at that meeting, and in the minutes, there was no detail of the assessment you made, how it was reached, what evidence convinced you. Nothing that can now be used to support your decision.

Submitting the case and taking a neutral stance is not a “reasonable exercise of your discretion” (paragraph 2.2).

It is effectively saying 'this crossing is so dangerous, more dangerous than any other crossing in Cumbria, that it is imperative that it is closed. However, we don't really know why it is dangerous, so aren't going to tell you why we think it is more dangerous than any other crossing, and haven't actually assessed this crossing properly ourselves, or indeed any other crossing – but, despite our Officer's opposite assessment we think it is unsafe, so here you go Planning Inspector, go and make a decision without us'. This is not a reasonable stance.

Yes – supporting the Order at a public inquiry is likely to be expensive for Cumbria County Council. However, this is what you have let yourselves in for. It is you, the councillors alone, who are exercising your discretion. And your conundrum now is the entirely foreseeable consequence of your previous decisions.

You have to deal with those decisions - you cannot just wash your hands of them. You yourselves, as councillors, must explain your decision in detail.

Public inquiries are expensive for all parties, including the public purse. They are not a fall back for a lack of courage of conviction to properly determine something. If supporting the case at Inquiry costs CCC money, so be it. You shouldn't pass these costs onto others (such as myself) who will incur costs to debate your decision.

If Cumbria County Council cannot financially afford to support your discretionary decision – then you should instruct your officers to abandon the Order.

I am sure that you will appreciate that not supporting a discretionary decision is a wholly unreasonable action.

Officers have stated that the safety case has not been met, that a safety audit of the alternatives has not been carried out, and that Network Rail has not carried out the improvements as required by legislation. Consequently, it's difficult to see how you can still justify your earlier decision. You cannot conclude that Network Rail have not fulfilled their legal requirements, yet still tacitly support them in their actions. If you

cannot support the Order (as your Officer says), then it is appropriate to abandon it now.

I personally consider that you should abandon the Order, but failing that, you should support your decision properly.

## 9 G Parr

Grange Town Council has adopted a neutral position on this because the majority public opinion in Grange is not obvious. Everyone will be moved by any fatal accident at the crossing and will support anything that will reduce the risk. Thankfully these events have been very few, with Network Rail's prediction of a return period probability of one death in 119 years; this means for example, that within any time span of 50 years the probability of a fatal accident is about 35%.

The only reason for closing the railway crossing is public safety. Within a few days of Network Rail's illegal use of locks and chains to stop up Bailey Lane crossing, Cumbria County Council; being the agency with statutory responsibility for rights of way was applied a closure order. By applying the closure order, Cumbria County Council's implicitly declared the crossing unsafe for public use. This was confirmed by the Committee on 13 August 2019 when the diversion order was made.

Today, there are four options for the Committee to consider. The Committee's stance is not neutral because its decisions have been predicated upon the crossing being unsafe; this makes option 4 tenuous as you aren't neutral. Before option 6.2 could be adopted, decision would be needed on matters arising out of the objections to this order. Supporting option 6.3 would require unsupportable logical conditions. Because the important new information in the objections casts doubt upon the diversion order, Option 1 is the way forward. Adopting option 1 would allow full consideration of previously unknown highly relevant matters.

Opposition to keeping the crossing open is because it is reckoned to be unsafe. The hazard only exists when a train is passing, it's quiet like a lane when there are no trains. There are no hazards until a train appears. Trains are timetabled. Thus, the danger can be predicted, anticipated, catered for and reduced significantly. Clearly, anything that would reduce this one hazard, and this the transient unusual danger should have been done already.

Without giving any reasons, Network Rail has dismissed as impossible all obvious measures that would warn of the approach. Usual methods such as warning lights, barriers, warning sounds, display screens, realignment to reduce the crossing length, have all been rejected out of hand. With reference to section 4.10 of the report to the Committee, obviously Cumbria County Council and the Secretary of State should not be satisfied that it is not reasonably practical to make the crossing safer for use by the public.

The prom is the major attraction to visitors to Grange and South Lakeland District Council is preparing plans to spend multi-million pounds to rejuvenate the prom and the redundant open-air swimming pool site. This will be a high boost to the town's

prosperity. Without the crossing and when the underpass is flooded, there would be two routes from the underpass car park to, say, the redesigned children's play area on the prom. Northwards, over the bridge and back, the distance is about 2km, southwards over the bridge and back it is about 1.1km via the crossing which would always be open it is about 250m.

The obvious route to access the prom from the town centre is down Bayley Lane and over the crossing. Now, much about the proposed diversion is unknown or unresolved. Closure of the crossing should be considered only if an alternative is secure and the alternative is not secure. Otherwise we could fall between two stools.

## 10 A Buckley

My name is Ann Buckley, I am the Liability Negotiations Adviser who submitted the s119A application and I will speak on behalf of the applicant, Network Rail.

Although Network Rail would prefer the Council to support the confirmation of the Order, we welcome the Officer's recommendation to submit the Order to the Secretary of State for resolution and from then on to take a neutral stance.

The legal test for making an Order is one of Public Safety and in July 2018 and August 2019 this Committee agreed with Network Rail that it is expedient in the interest of the public using or likely to use the crossing to make the Order and voted accordingly.

Several of the objectors refer to the need for a Road Safety Audit as prescribed in a Memorandum of Understanding between Network Rail and ADEPT, LGA & IPROW.

Although your Council Officer has confirmed no audit is required at this time, Network Rail is prepared to fund such an audit if it is required in the future.

Network Rail has considered various ways to improve the safety at the crossing as demonstrated within the application, but the only way to eliminate the risk is to close the crossing. This diversion will permanently eliminate all risk to crossing and railway users alike, without unduly inconveniencing members of the public. This is a requirement of Network Rail and Local Authorities and is consistent with their responsibilities under the Health & Safety at Work Act.

There exists nearby a safe and convenient alternative to cross beneath the railway, which was originally provided to replace the level crossing. The construction and requirement for the underpass was supported by South Lakeland District Council and Grange Town Council. If the underpass had not been constructed at that time, this would be the solution proposed today. In addition, the alternative route also provides a more accessible path for all members of the public, which cannot be said of the level crossing. We have agreed to work with all parties to ensure the alternative route is fit for public use.

I agree with the Officers comment that this is a complex case and it would be beneficial for all the evidence to be tested by way of a public inquiry and agree with

your Officer's comment that Network Rail should not be denied the opportunity to submit our evidential case before the Planning Inspectorate.

I therefore ask the committee to accept the officer's recommendation.

The Chair invited members to speak about the application.

A member considered that evidence had been provided which highlighted the danger in the area, commenting that 2 deaths in 30 years was too many. He referred to the Sellafeld train which he had not considered on previous occasions and felt that there was a strong argument to proceed to a Public Inquiry.

Another member commented that people dealt with danger in everyday life and that all risk could not be eliminated from life. He expressed that people would use their common sense using a special crossing or convenient place to cross. He queried how often the diversion would be used as a lot of money had been spent on a potential diversion route which may not be used. He asked whether sufficient consideration had been given to alternative crossings.

In stating that he had listened carefully to the statements made at the meeting and had visited the site, Mr Markley advised that he did not think that a level crossing was warranted at the location and acknowledged the money that had been spent on the diversion under the underpass. He proposed that the Committee stood by its original decision. This was seconded by Mr Turner who was convinced that the risk to safety was too great and he could not live with the potential for further deaths on the line. In reminding members of the debate at previous meetings and how he had voted in favour of the diversion order, another member reaffirmed the original decision of the Committee.

In highlighting that the decision was finely balanced, Mr McGuckin reiterated his concerns raised in a previous meeting, that closing railway crossings was a mechanism for extinguishing rights of way, however, a judgement should be made in the interests of public safety and it be ensured that a safe alternative be provided. He expressed that there should be a reticence to extinguish rights of way and highlighted the legal implications ahead dependent on the decision of the Committee. He moved that the Committee approve submitting the Order to the Secretary of State for resolution and inform the Planning Inspectorate that from now on the County Council will be taking a neutral stance. This was seconded by Mr Morgan.

The Chair stated that the first motion (that the County Council cannot confirm an opposed 1980 Highways Act 119A legal order but may submit the legal order to the Secretary of State and support its confirmation) would be put to the vote.

Following a vote cast as follows: 9 members in favour, 7 against and 1 abstention, it was

RESOLVED that, the County Council approve the submission of the legal order to the Secretary of State and support its confirmation.

## **107 SAFETY AT SPORTS GROUNDS**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding Safety at Sports Grounds. The report informed the Committee that a supplemental note amending an engineer’s structural report was received the day before a second case management hearing was held at Workington Magistrates’ Court on 17 December 2019. The Safety Advisory Group (SAG) had met to discuss this on 3 January 2020 and decided to recommend that this note did not substantially alter the initial conclusion. The SAG therefore maintained its position that the capacities of the stands at Borough Park remain at zero.

This item was noted with no discussion.

RESOLVED that, the report and action taken be noted

## **108 APPLICATION REFERENCE NOS. 5/19/9012, 5/19/9013 & 5/19/9014. PROPOSALS: TO REMOVE OPERATIONAL HOURS RESTRICTIONS ON THE SITE REF. 5/19/9012: SECTION 73 APPLICATION TO REMOVE CONDITIONS 9 AND 10 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF. 5/16/9014 SO AS TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON THE OPERATIONAL HOURS OF THE SITE (MAIN SITE) REF. 5/19/9013: SECTION 73 APPLICATION TO REMOVE CONDITIONS 2 AND 3 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF. 5/16/9015 SO AS TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON THE OPERATIONAL HOURS OF THE SITE ACCESS REF. 5/19/9013: SECTION 73 APPLICATION TO REMOVE CONDITIONS 4 AND 5 OF PLANNING PERMISSION REF. 5/16/9016 SO AS TO REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON THE OPERATIONAL HOURS OF THE WASH PLANT. LOCATION: ROAN EDGE INERT LANDFILL, WASTE RECYCLING FACILITY AND QUARRY, NEW HUTTON, KILLINGTON, KENDAL, LA8 0AP**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding planning application reference nos. 5/19/9012, 5/19/9013 and 5/19/9014 at Roan Edge Inert Landfill, Waste Recycling Facility and Quarry, New Hutton, Killington, Kendal, LA8 0AP. The proposals were as follows:

Proposals: To Remove Operational Hours Restrictions on the site

Ref. 5/19/9012: Section 73 Application to Remove Conditions 9 and 10 of Planning Permission Ref. 5/16/9014 so as to remove restrictions on the operational hours of the site (Main Site)

Ref. 5/19/9013: Section 73 Application to Remove Conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Permission Ref. 5/16/9015 so as to remove restrictions on the operational hours of the site access

Ref. 5/19/9013: Section 73 Application to Remove Conditions 4 and 5 of Planning Permission Ref. 5/16/9016 so as to remove restrictions on the operational hours of the wash plant

The Planning Officer guided members through the applications and presented plans showing the site's proximity to the M6 and the Yorkshire Dales National Park boundary. Plans were shown of the different application areas and these were described in detail. Photographs showing the sites in different years were presented. The issues at the site were presented in detail, this included the height of the stockpiles, however it was noted that this was not relevant to the application. The Planning Officer considered the times of operation to be acceptable and advised that there had been no complaints during the trial period. He considered the temporary time period for night time operation of the wash plant to be acceptable. He recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions in the appendices to the report.

A member familiar with the area referred to the objections of New Hutton Parish Council, in particular the reduction in volume of water in the tributary beck and its concern that it may be caused by the quarry. The member queried if anyone was establishing whether there was a link between the reduction in the volume of water and the quarry and/or the recycling site. The Planning Officer explained that the Environment Agency were investigating and that their findings would be fed back to the Parish Council when the information was received.

Another member, also familiar with the site commented on its proximity to the M6 which could reduce pollution on local roads. He considered the recycling facility and quarry to be useful, did not harm anyone and was good for local industry and the economy.

The recommendation as set out in the report was moved by Mr McGuckin and seconded by Mr Markley. Following a vote, cast as follows, 17 members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED that,

- a) Planning permission is granted for planning application ref. 5/19/9012 subject to conditions set out in Appendix 1 to this report so as to allow night-time working for specified operations for up to 30 days per year.
- b) Planning permission is granted for planning application ref. 5/19/9013 subject to conditions set out in Appendix 2 to this report so as to allow unlimited night time use of the access.
- c) planning permission is granted for planning application ref. 5/19/9014 subject to conditions set out in Appendix 3 to this report so as to allow a further two year temporary time period for night time operation of the wash plant (as the wash plant is not yet operational).

**109 APPLICATION REFERENCE NO. 5/19/9017. PROPOSAL: SECTION 73 APPLICATION TO VARY CONDITION 1 OF PLANNING PERMISSION**

**5/18/9010 SO AS TO RETAIN A PORTACABIN UP TO 31 JANUARY 2021.  
LOCATION: ULVERSTON FIRE STATION, THE ELLERS, ULVERSTON,  
LA12 0AB**

A report was considered from the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure regarding application reference No. 5/19/9017. Proposal: Section 73 application to vary Condition 1 of planning permission 5/18/9010 so as to retain a portacabin up to 31 January 2021 at Ulverston Fire Station, The Ellers, Ulverston, LA12 0AB.

The Planning Officer presented a map showing the location of the application as well as a site plan, aerial photographs and a photograph of the portacabin. He explained the site planning history and the planning assessment and recommended to members that planning permission be granted subject to conditions set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

A member highlighted that no response had been received from Ulverston Town and South Lakeland District Councils. He thought they had not seen the application therefore were unable to comment. The Planning Officer advised that both had been consulted and that he understood that Ulverston Town Council were due to discuss it at the meeting held on 20 January but no response had been received following this.

It was moved by Mr Markley and seconded by Mr Wilson that planning permission be granted subject to the condition set out in Appendix 1 to the report. Following a vote cast as follows, 17 members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED that, Planning Permission be granted subject to condition set out in Appendix 1 to the report

**110 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

RESOLVED that, the report be noted

**111 APPLICATIONS PROPOSED TO BE DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

RESOLVED that, the report be noted

**112 FORWARD PLAN**

The Forward Plan for the Committee was considered.

The Manager Development Control and Countryside Management reported on the invitation for a site visit to Sellafield on 4 February 2020 in order to get a general overview of the site and to understand the planning proposals (though not specific as yet) for the next five years. Further details would be circulated by the Senior Democratic Services Officer.

The Manager Development Control and Countryside Management talked about a potential site visit and briefing on the Carlisle Southern Link Road planning application possibly in February 2020

Mr F Cassidy stated that in the past year he had worked with residents on the Commons Registration application for CA9/4 Application to register land as a town or village green, Land at the Celtic, Walney Island. He requested a site visit as the application was significant for a lot of residents in the area.

A short discussion took place on the application to add a path at Centurion's Walk, Carlisle and whether the route had been determined. The Manager Development Control and Countryside Management undertook to ascertain whether it had been confirmed and identify whether a site visit could be undertaken on the same day as the Carlisle Southern Link Road briefing, in Carlisle.

A member suggested that in addition to a site visit to Sellafield, that an additional visit be made to the LLWR at Drigg. The Manager Development Control and Countryside Management would ascertain if there were any planning proposals due to be considered by the Committee in the near future and arrange a site visit if appropriate.

RESOLVED that,

- 1 A site visit be held in March 2020 to Land at The Celtic, Walney Island
- 2 The Manager Development Control and Countryside Management to ascertain whether the route at Centurion's Walk, Carlisle had been confirmed and then identify whether a site visit could be undertaken on the same day as the Carlisle Southern Link Road briefing, in Carlisle.
- 3 Details to be circulated by the Senior Democratic Services Officer on the site visit to Sellafield on 4 February 2020.

### **113 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Committee would be held on 4 March 2020 at 10.00am at County Offices, Kendal

The meeting ended at 12.40 pm