

STATES OF JERSEY

Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel Fort Regent

WEDNESDAY, 27th MAY 2009

Panel:

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman)

Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier (Vice-Chairman)

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade

Mr. I. Barclay (Panel Adviser)

Witnesses:

Senator F.E. Cohen (The Minister for Planning and Environment)

Mr. P. Thorne (Director of Planning)

Present:

Mrs. E. Liddiard (Scrutiny Officer)

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier of St. Saviour (Chairman):

I would like to welcome you to this Education and Home Affairs Scrutiny Panel on the future of Fort Regent. For the purposes of the tape we shall introduce ourselves because I know there is at least one person you do not know. So Roy Le Hérissier, Chair, Deputy of St. Saviour.

Deputy T.M. Pitman of St. Helier:

Deputy Trevor Pitman, St Helier, Vice-Chairman.

Deputy M. Tadier of St. Brelade:

Deputy Montfort Tadier from St. Brelade.

Mr. I. Barclay (Panel Adviser):

Ian Barclay from Torkildsen Barclay, sports and leisure planning consultants, Panel Adviser.

Senator F.E. Cohen (The Minister for Planning and Environment):

I am Freddie Cohen, Minister for Planning and Environment.

Mr. P. Thorne (Director of Planning):

I am Peter Thorne, Director of Planning.

Mrs. E. Liddiard (Scrutiny Officer):

Elizabeth Liddiard, Scrutiny Officer.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Okay. As you know, we do not administer oaths any more but obviously the understanding is that while you are speaking as a witness, you are protected in the sense that delivering the truth provides that protection. We thank you very much indeed for attending and we thank you very much indeed for attending at this somewhat late notice.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It is a pleasure to be here so far.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Very kind of you, Minister. As you see, we have a few fairly broad questions and I am sure we will go up some highways and byways but could we start things if I could ask you, Minister, either what are your plans or what are your thoughts, if you are at that stage, for the development of Fort Regent and what is seen as the relevant contextual area, so to speak?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I have not got any specific plans but I do have some views. My view is that if we are to get the best out of the Mount that it needs to be looked at holistically. I have not done the figures and I do not know the

figures but I would guess the concept of doing something significant with the Fort on its own would be hard to justify financially and it would need cross-subsidy from other opportunities on the Mount and that includes the South Hill site which I would guess is probably the big value on the site. My personal view is I think that we should concentrate as much as we can on recovering the historic status of the Fort. As a child I used to go up there because I was a keen radio ham and the Radio Ham Club used to meet up there and it was a fantastic Napoleonic structure. That has all rather been lost in this cloak of additions and alterations. I rather looked at the Fort in similar way as the castle at Krakow, that it is this fantastic opportunity and you could not imagine Krakow without the castle in its present restored state. We have not got that with Fort Regent. I am not saying that I think we should chuck everything out but I think that you can have a long term plan to greater promote the historic status of the building.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

In terms of work in progress or thinking in progress, is your department actively involved in working with bodies like EDAW has previously, W.E.B. (Waterfront Enterprise Board) as they come around East of Albert and Property Holdings? Are there any discussions going on?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Yes, there is. There is a report on Fort Regent which has been prepared by EDAW. It was supposed to be the bones of something that would go out to interested parties. It is with Property Holdings at the moment. I am perfectly happy to make a copy available to you.

Mr. P. Thorne:

Do you have copies of that?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Do we have one?

Mrs. E. Liddiard:

Yes, we have got one of the others but I am not sure we have got that.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We better have a copy as a precaution. (copies of Fort Regent Development Brief supplied – EDAW September 2007)

Senator F.E. Cohen:

That report also focuses on signalling the historic status of the Fort as a primary objective. One of the things you may or may not know is I decided not to list the current roof structure. It is not because I think that it is necessarily a bad piece of architecture. I just think that the primary objective should be with the restoration of the historic appearance of the Fort and I understand with the EDAW proposal is that in the long term when the roof runs out of life, then it should be replaced with another roof that is hidden behind the parapets rather than something that dominates. That is correct, is it not?

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

The thinking though, on the heritage aspect, and obviously with a bit of luck we will have time to develop this further, is your view, Mr. Minister, that as far as possible à la Gibbs report that the Fort should revert to its original state?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I think in an ideal world, yes, but I do not think that is likely to be achievable. I think that we need to test plans against hierarchy and objectives, and one of those objectives is maximising the return of the historic status of the Fort. It does not mean necessarily the historic state, so it does not have to be exactly as it was before work began in the 20th century, but it has lost its historic status. The historic structure is hidden among things, and I think that we should set as a primary objective returning as much of the status of the Fort as we possibly can. But you are going to have to test that against the hierarchy; and clearly if the public sector is prepared to invest significantly in the whole of the area, then you have got a much greater chance of delivering a historic restoration than you have if the public sector says we

are not prepared to put a penny in. All you have really got to play with is the value of South Hill, and whatever other little sites that you can throw in, in terms of value, and then you have got the conundrum of what you do with Glacis Field, because clearly the objective should be to have nothing on the field; but it may be that you have to consider something on the field in order to fund the greater objective of the restoration of the main part of the Fort.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you. I will move over to the Deputy to put question number 2.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Can I come in before then? One of the tensions that has always existed between the various multi-users of Fort Regent is to do with the compatibility. Now, I think we are grateful that we are hearing probably a lot more than we have from other groups about the heritage aspect of Fort Regent. But to what extent are they mutually exclusive in the sense of the sports usage and the heritage aspect? To what extent is there a tension there?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

There is a tension, but it may be that the solution is that one area of the whole Fort becomes dedicated to renewed and rejuvenated sports facilities, and another part is restored to its original Napoleonic form. There is a tension, and that is one of the things that clearly will have to be resolved. For example, if you were going to take the sports facilities out and design and build a new purpose-built sports facility somewhere else on the Mount or somewhere else, then very clearly that gives you much greater opportunity in terms of delivering the historic objectives. But I think one is going to have to be very practical with this. Very clearly we need to provide sports facilities. There is only going to be a limited amount of money, and if your aspirations are too high in terms of historic restoration, you may risk achieving absolutely nothing at all. Every time that I hear people talking about the future of Fort Regent, they seem to be pulling in entirely different directions, and I wonder if the way to tackle it is not to progress the EDAW work, which you are getting a copy of, and to consider a dedicated architectural

master plan for the whole of the Mount, bringing in all the architectural objectives, all the use objectives and rolling the whole lot up all into one. It was not my idea; it was Sean Power's idea; he suggested it to me last week.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Just to follow on, I think towards the beginning of when you started speaking you mentioned that it has been or that it is difficult to justify that element at the moment in financial terms.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It may be.

Deputy M. Tadier:

It may be.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

We do not know.

Deputy M. Tadier:

But we heard from earlier witnesses that money has almost been lavished on other sites such as Mont Orgueil Castle, which presumably is not viable if you measure that in purely financial terms. We are not going to get that money back directly.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I was very involved in the Mont Orgueil restoration, because I was vice chairman of Jersey Heritage Trust at the time. The total States commitment was £3 million - sorry about the term commitment - the original grant from the States was £3 million, and it was in a very different financial environment from today. It was literally based on the States having a surplus of income, a very rosy future and this wonderful historic monument that needed money spent upon it. I would not say the decision was made

on the back of a fag packet, but the original decision was not based on a very detailed proposal. I think that the objective at Mont Orgueil is very fundamentally different from the Fort Regent, because at Mont Orgueil all you are doing is creating a regenerated castle. You are not putting anything in it other than art displays and attractions. Any work at Fort Regent, any project at Fort Regent, is going to be more inclined towards something that people use for a particular function like sports, like concerts, that sort of thing.

Deputy M. Tadier:

The figure we heard earlier was closer to £8 million, was it not, in investments?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

No. To the best that I remember, the original investment by the States was £3 million and although I am not 100 per cent sure, I think, including interest accrued, the total that was spent was £4.5 million - because remember in those days there were very high interest rates, and the interest rolled up because Jersey Heritage Trust was given the money that they wanted practically, I think. I could be wrong, but I think it was £4.5 million.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I was going to ask, has the term “master plan” replaced “iconic” as the new ministerial buzz word, but I am not going to ask that.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Not yet.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

What restrictions are in place in regards to developing the Fort and the surrounding land? What are the major issues?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Peter would probably be better to answer that, but my perspective it is only the listing designation.

Mr. P. Thorne:

Clearly the site is a site of special interest, as the Minister has already said, which brings with it certain constraints, as it does for any other property so designated. One of the interesting things about the Fort is that it is still virtually wholly intact, and to that extent I think it is more important that we retain that intactness about it. So, there are clearly restraints on what you can do on the hill as a whole, not just within the main ramparts of the Fort. There is a redoubt on the southern end of Mount Bingham behind South Hill. That is part of the defensive structures, as is the area that was cut out where the driving lessons are done - as indeed is the Snow Hill cutting, that was created as part of the defensive structure. So, they are all part of the value in historic terms. So, there is clearly a constraint from that perspective. I think in terms of development generally, by its very nature Mont de la Ville is a promontory; it has a skyline which already has incursions into it. Personally I do not find the parabolic roof unacceptable. I think the way it floats over the building, particularly in the evening, and there are lights between the masonry and the roof. I think the former swimming pool is an absolute disaster - I look at it out of my office window every day. That structure is a disaster, as I say, and ought to be removed. So, there is some scope for moving things. The skyline is important in terms of heights of buildings, and certainly South Hill is a potential development site, and I think it is very important that we respect the skyline of Mount Bingham in any development that goes into the former quarry site.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

There are plans that have been put forward in the past for South Hill development. Is that correct to say that?

Mr. P. Thorne:

Never detailed ones. I think it has been seen as a development site for many years, and certain estimates have been made of what the yield might be, but I have never seen any drawn plans - not a proper

drawing. There have been some sort of valuation drawings or yield drawings produced, but not a real scheme for the site.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Slightly at a tangent from that; we have just heard from a previous interview about plans in the past if we sell off the site for £1 to private enterprise. Is that something you would ever see yourself supporting as Planning Minister?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Well, it is not my job to decide on financial deals, but it would sound a bit odd.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I was saying would you support such a ...?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

In principle, no, but it is not the Planning Minister's job to say whether or not the deal is a good deal. I would have thought that the South Hill site has very significant value, and that is why I think you need to package it up with the whole of the Mount, and you literally need a list of objectives and, starting with number one objective and running right the way through, go out to the private sector if you are going to go out to the private sector, and ask them to submit proposals based on delivering as many of your objectives as the private sector can - and have quite a flexible approach to the South Hill site. The South Hill site is a very exciting site, because so much of the development there will have fabulous sea views, and it is a pretty wonderful site. But what value you get out of it I do not know.

Deputy M. Tadier:

To what extent does the covenant on the field have an impact? Because presumably with a covenant on there, cannot be developed. It is not going to be quite such a good deal to primary developers.

Mr. P. Thorne:

I am not aware of any covenants. That is not to say they do not exist, I just do not know personally.

Deputy M. Tadier:

To my understanding there is a covenant on the actual ...

Mr. P. Thorne:

On the Glacis?

Deputy M. Tadier:

Which prevents any kind of development.

Mr. P. Thorne:

I would be surprised if there was a covenant, quite honestly. A covenant would need to have been imposed by the British Government, presumably, when they passed it over to the States, and that would be the source of any covenant. But I am not aware. I think there is an historic buildings interest in not allowing further developments on that field. If there were a covenant, then the swimming pool would not have been built, because it would be ...

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

In those days when the site was transferred, 1968,1969, there was quite a significant sum of money donated to the States with conditions. I do not know to what extent those conditions remain. This was in the 1970s, I think. The donor placed some conditions. Now, whether the States accepted them and what they amount to, I think we will have to ...

Mr. P. Thorne:

It will be a matter of record somewhere, I presume.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Okay. We will move to question number 3.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Where does Fort Regent sit in the Minister's priorities for redevelopment?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

High, but I do not have a specific order of developments that I want to achieve, because the Minister's job really is responding to opportunities, and the Minister does not usually actively go out and invite development. The Minister will play his part and usually responds to proposals about development. In terms of delivering a better St. Helier, it is going to be right at the top. It is a huge opportunity for St. Helier and it is, at the moment, certainly hardly making the best of itself, or we are not making the best of it. So, it should be a high priority, but somebody needs to take charge, putting the whole thing together. It is all very well to say it is a high priority, but I have now been at Planning for 3 and a half years and nothing has happened, and we were talking about something happening the week I started, and it just seems to always be talked about ...

Deputy M. Tadier:

Are you totally powerless at Planning to influence what goes on in the department?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I would not say we are totally powerless, but it is not really our job. If it was decided that it was appropriate for us to do another master planning exercise then, yes, it becomes more of our job. We commissioned the EDAW report that sits now with Property Holdings; they have got lots of other essential things they have got to get on with as well, and they only have a limited, finite amount of resource, and presumably they have to priorities this within their capabilities and within their resource.

Deputy M. Tadier:

On a general point, you have said that it is not necessarily the department's job to be proactive insofar as you said that you respond to opportunities. You could say that are reactive rather than proactive in that respect.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It is a bit of a mixture. It is far more of an effort at Planning and Environment to be proactively trying to create development opportunities than it is to be the easy option which is to respond to development opportunities, and opportunities to try and correct what you think are appropriate development proposals - proposals, not opportunities. So, we do a bit of master-planning already. I would like to do more master planning, but master-planning takes up an awful lot of resource, and it is often the same resource if you are going to do it in-house as you use to react to the mainstream work, which is responding to people's planning applications. If I was given lots of cash to go out and master-plan different parts of the town, then it would be much easier. But we have had to cobble together a few pounds from here and a few pounds from there to do the north of the town master plan. We have no money to do any more at the moment.

Deputy M. Tadier:

The message I am getting from you, then - and I hope it is an accurate one - is that there is some frustration about the fact that nobody is really taking charge of the situation at Fort Regent which has been ongoing for a long time. There is a perception that although it is still well-used and it is well-loved, it is not necessarily being used to its maximum potential. So, where would you like to see the leadership come from, and the direction for that?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I think that it will come from Property Holdings. I am sure that Property Holdings when they apply the resource to it, will respond to the opportunities that are available in the Fort. But quite how that happens, I am afraid I do not know. I do not know that anyone has produced this hierarchy of objectives, and I think until somebody does that and says what the Island wants out of this, is number 1

(a), number 2(b), on down the list, I am not sure we are going to get anywhere. We just talk round and round and round in circles.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

With your guardianship of the Fort's S.S.I. (Site of Special Interest) status, if you were to receive evidence for example, that because of the lack of care and maintenance, and indeed investment, its historical aspects were in some part deteriorating, how could you step in and do something? Could you step in and do something?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

We have powers to require property owners to keep their property wind and watertight, but not much more than that.

Mr. P. Thorne:

We could serve a repairs notice under the law if we felt that the intrinsic nature of the building was being damaged through neglect or other actions on behalf of the owners. But coming back to the Minister's powers which you are alluding to, the Minister does not have the power to require anybody to do anything, on the other hand, and that is really what he is saying about responding to the wishes of land owners, whether they are State or private individuals. I mean, part of the problem with Fort Regent is it has been managed by so many different bodies down the years, and it has never been managed as a property as part of the States broader portfolio. It has just been seen, I think probably, as a liability on the Education Department's budget or whatever, Fort Regent Development Committee or the Sports, Leisure and Recreation Committee in the past. You know, it is the same old thing - they have only had so much money to spend, and it has tended to go on to the facilities. It was administered by those different committees at different times, with no money to spend on the buildings themselves - or the historic buildings, anyway.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

We are almost running out of time, and in a way I suspect we have already had the answer to this, but I will come to question number 4. What consultation has taken place, or it is proposed will take place, between your department and key stake holders to ensure all aspects of the Fort are considered when creating a masterstroke development?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Well, that is really the EDAW work, but the Fort Users' Group supported the EDAW proposals, I think.

Mr. P. Thorne:

When we published the EDAW report, the whole thing, which contains the gist of what is in the more detailed brief anyway, we did a number of sort of guided walks around different parts of the town, and I took a party of about 20 or 30 people around the Fort on a day like today, which was pretty miserable. But certainly in terms of the consultation we did on the main report and the responses received, there was quite a bit of support for certain things. They were concerned about the damage being done to the historic building structure, including the Snow Hill cutting, because there have been suggestions in the past about building in the cutting. There were certainly concerns expressed about the potential to lose the recreational facilities that exist there at the moment, but I think people were reassured that certainly EDAW's view was that the sports facilities ought to remain. They did not discount the fact they may be moved, but really they took a pragmatic view as well, you know: realistically, to replace those facilities somewhere else is going to cost a lot in cash terms, and also in land which could be used perhaps for other opportunities. But generally speaking, as the Minister said, the brief and the proposals for Fort Regent in the EDAW report were quite well received, and certainly the users were right on side, but that is probably because we said we were going to keep the sports there - the recreation facilities there.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

But at that point, Peter, were you aware that the problem to which the Minister has referred was going to be probably the greatest impediment - that is, the fact of the absence of someone who is really going to drive it forward?

Mr. P. Thorne:

Yes. I think now that States property is administered corporately, it probably will get more attention than it has had in the past, and I think the Minister is right: the only way we are going to achieve any developments at Fort Regent is by exploiting the other opportunities that exist on the hill, like the South Hill site which is the obvious one. But you know, ultimately there will be rebuilds of some of the places on the Pier Road; I mean, the Pier Road car park, taking the long-term view, may be used for some other purpose in the future. It depends how far you extend that, you know. You can look down on to the harbour side beneath Fort Regent, and you have got La Folie and Commercial Buildings and places like that where, you know, if you look at a package over a broad area, it may be that by juggling the values and costs, you can make things work.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Well, certainly Property Holdings made the point very strongly that the master plan was needed, and the impression we got was that until that occurred there would be, what you might call, planning blight - you know, there would be no progress; and of course, with the Fort in the state that it partly is in, and with the heritage site in particular looking very uncared for in parts, we are desperate to explore whether there are kind of interim measures that can move it ahead while the bigger issues get resolved, perhaps, or they get studied. I mean, could your department play a role in that?

Mr. P. Thorne:

Yes, we can, but I think we have already done it in identifying what the opportunities are, and certainly when David Flowers, the Property Holdings director, was given a copy of the brief and effectively asked to see if there is a viable project in there, has taken on board those comments. It is really a question of whether you look solely at Mont de La Ville itself or whether you include it in a broader area, but there are not any specific plans to my knowledge at this stage to do that.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I think that there is an absence of project champion, and somehow or other there needs to be a champion who is prepared to prioritise and effectively put his head on the chopping block and say: "This is what I believe is the vision for Fort Regent." I am not sure that we have identified the champion, and that means holistically taking a view of the States.

Deputy M. Tadier:

Who is the champion to be: a politician, or just someone externally?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It could be. It needs a politician to drive it forward. It could be one of you.

Deputy M. Tadier:

It needs a Minister.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It needs somebody to drive it forward. It needs somebody to do what we are trying to do with the north of the town master plan - to try and create a group, and collectively create a vision and stand up and say: "This is what I believe is the vision," and stand or fall by it.

Deputy M. Tadier:

With due respect - I am sorry to interrupt, Senator - it is very difficult, I think, for a Back-Bencher to do that, purely because a Back-Bencher does not have the time to do that nor the resources. I suspect if another member of the committee were here they would be saying that this is classic case of buck-passing - that the responsibility ultimately needs to be taken with the Council of Ministers. It needs to be pushed forward.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It is not a question of buck-passing. It is just stating a fact that it needs a champion, whether it is a

Minister or a Back-Bencher or even a civil servant or an external individual - it needs a champion. It is not passing the buck; I am just saying it needs a champion.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

You said you had been discussing within a week of taking office, and I sense your own frustration here. How hopeful are you that within 3 years which is left of your term, something may progress?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

We will always be hopeful.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Genuinely hopeful, or desperately?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

No. I am hopeful. I am hopeful. But at the moment there is nothing concrete happening, and it needs somebody to have the time to take it forward, and come forward with some proposals. The States needs to have a set of proposals, and say either we are going to approve of these or we are going to reject these, and out of that will come other ideas. But at the moment we have probably got 50-odd States Members with 50-odd different views of what should happen to Fort Regent.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

As we said, could that man be you?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It could be.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Or a Minister?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

It could be.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Or will it?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

I have not got the resources or the time to do it at the moment.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

Or the power?

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Or the power.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier

Sorry. We have detained the Minister a bit longer. Are there any further questions that we have? Quick questions?

Mr. I. Barclay:

Just 2 very quick ones. One was just probably a question of naivety of how you work in Jersey, but as I am not a local, do you have a plan for the whole Island in terms of what would be a local plan?

Mr. P. Thorne:

Yes, we do. We are reviewing it at the moment.

Mr. I. Barclay:

Right. Okay.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

But it is not going to give you the answers.

Mr. I. Barclay:

Secondly, is the status of the EDAW report. You have mentioned it a number of times, and you say it is with Property Holdings at the moment. What does that mean in practice? It has not been adopted yet? It has not been agreed?

Mr. P. Thorne:

If I can answer that. The EDAW report took slightly longer to be finalised than was originally intended, by which time we had started our review of the Island Development Plan. So, what we are doing at the moment is rolling up the proposals that were put forward by EDAW in 2007 into the new Plan, which will then give them the opportunity of going to the States and obviously be considered in the context of other things that are beyond their area of concern. That study was a study which arose from concerns that all investments in town were going to the waterfront, and what would happen to the established town? So, it looked at ways and means of regenerating the town area. There was a drift of footfall for shops and so on moving down to the west and what was going to happen with the eastern and northern extremities of the town centre? That in a nutshell was why the report was commissioned. The EDAW report stands as a strategy for the town as a whole, but within that there were 2 development briefs produced at our request. One was for Fort Regent and the other one was for the town park area, or for the town park, I should say. It was quite specifically for the Town Park. So, the thing which is with Property Holdings at the moment is the development brief that was produced by EDAW for Fort Regent, not the whole strategy, and as I say that has been rolled up into the plan review.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

You are not going to get a pretty picture, a vision, therefore. That is what is needed.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Any further comments?

Mr. P. Thorne:

Have you managed to count up how many different studies have been done into Fort Regent? It must be 15 or 20; something like that.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

It is a study, not the lack of political will, but certainly the lack of a strong driver or champion, as our Minister said.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Somewhere we need to find a champion, and I think until there is a champion we will just float about.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Somebody with planning experience, heritage experience ... charm. Yes. Okay. On that very positive note I would like to thank you again. Thank you for coming at such late notice. Your evidence has been very useful, and we may well be in touch as we try and finish this history together and move forward. So, thank you.

Senator F.E. Cohen:

Trevor has been smiling. He may want to be a champion.

Deputy T.M. Pitman:

I am a champion for many of you.

Deputy R.G. Le Hérissier:

Thank you. We will reconvene at approximately 1.15 p.m. for Jersey Heritage.