

**QUESTION TO BE ASKED OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE EDUCATION, SPORT AND CULTURE
COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, 18th MARCH 2003 BY DEPUTY G.C.L. BAUDAINS**

Question

Following the debate on the Jersey Heritage Trust: amendments to constitution, (P.37/2002), on 4th March 2003, would the President explain –

- (a) why he stated that the Trust's constitution was a matter for the Royal Court rather than the States, when the States has the power to determine such matters, as has, indeed, been the case in the past? and,
- (b) why he suggested that criticisms of the Trust by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings were incorrect based on an e-mail communication dated 4th May 2002, by the Society in which it withdrew its comments, and would he provide details of the content of the e-mail, the addressee, the sender, whether or not it was solicited and, if so, by whom, and whether it was subsequently confirmed by letter or fax.?

Answer

- (a) My comment referred to in Deputy Baudain's question was made in seeking clarification from the Attorney General of the legal position of the Jersey Heritage Trust, (JHT), in relation to the Deputy's proposed amendments. I can confirm the JHT was established by the States and unlike certain other trusts is not registered with the Royal Court.
- (b) I stated that criticism of the Trust by the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, (SPAB), had been incorrect because of an e-mail received by the chairman of the Trust, John de Veulle, from Peter Burman of SPAB, on 4th May 2002, in which he stated -

“Turning to the earlier report, which I made with John Goom, I would like to withdraw the lines on page 5 which read:

‘the manner and extent of the archaeological intervention has aroused criticism, with which we agree, particularly since so much has been carried out before the Conservation Plan Process has been completed.’

You may remember that I raised this matter towards the end of the seminar last week, because I thought it might be sensible and helpful to articulate it. Warwick Rodwell's reply was entirely reassuring; but, even more important, I believe that the open and thorough way in which he had earlier explained on site just exactly what he had opened up and why more than satisfied this area of concern.”

The sentiments expressed in the e-mail confirm an earlier conversation between John de Veulle and Peter Burman. These comments were offered unsolicited by Peter Burman at the seminar on 24th April 2002. In that conversation John de Veulle requested that Peter Burman confirm his views in writing. A copy of the full text of the email is attached for members with both author's and addressee's permission. There was no further correspondence on this matter by fax or letter.

Original Message-----

From: pab12@imap.york.ac.uk [mailto:pab12@imap.york.ac.uk] On Behalf Of

PETER BURMAN

Sent: 04 May 2002 13:03

To: John de Veulle

Cc: Day, Michael; pab12@york.ac.uk

Subject: Re: Mont Orgueil

Dear John

Thank you so much for your letter. I will send a copy of my short report to the SPAB (or ask for it to be sent for me, as I go to Germany for two and a half weeks tomorrow, on study and lecture tour), but I have tried to convey in it just what a tremendous success I thought the two-day seminar was last week. It is just over two pages but I would be glad if you were to be so indulgent as to publish the whole text of it!

Turning to the earlier report, which I made with John Goom, I would like to withdraw the lines on page 5 which read:

'the manner and extent of the archaeological intervention has aroused criticism, with which we agree, particularly since so much has been carried out before the Conservation Plan Process has been completed.'

You may remember that I raised this matter towards the end of the seminar last week, because I thought it might be sensible and helpful to articulate it. Warwick Rodwell's reply was entirely reassuring; but, even more important, I believe that the open and thorough way in which he had earlier explained on site just exactly what he had opened up and why more than satisfied this area of concern. As I understand it, what he had removed were essentially twentieth-century fillings. It looked much more alarming than it was! That I suppose was the origin of the concerns which had certainly been expressed to us very strongly.

I believe that if John Goom and I had met Warwick on site, by happy chance, last December we should never have made that criticism.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity, and thanks to you and Michael and everyone else for a thoroughly worthwhile seminar.

Best wishes

PETER

--

Peter Burman
Centre for Conservation
The University of York