

**Cornwall Council**

Agenda No. 4

Not Confidential

Decision Sheet From: **Special Cabinet**Date: **25 January 2010**Title: **ISLES OF SCILLY LINK PARTNERSHIP**Cabinet Member: **Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Planning**Divisions Affected: **All plus Isles of Scilly**Relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee: **Environment and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committee**Key Decision: **Yes** Checklist Compliant: **Yes**Urgent Decision: **Yes** Implementation Date: **25 Jan 2010**Author: **Tim Wood** Role: **Project Director**Contact: **01872 326868 or twood@cornwall.gov.uk****DECISION**

It was moved by Councillor Hicks, seconded by Councillor Kaczmarek, and

**RESOLVED** that

1. The outcome of the further work to investigate the alternative proposal for Penzance harbour (Option C) be noted.
2. The views of Cornwall Council's Procurement Assurance Scheme Panel on both Option A and Option C also be noted.
3. Option C is not pursued.
4. Subject to the further comments of English Heritage which the Council is expecting to receive and having full regard to those comments every effort is made to secure planning permission and listed building consent for the works associated with Option A.
5. In parallel, the viability of Falmouth as the mainland port for the Isles of Scilly link is initially assessed to serve as the potential fall-back option in the event that Option A cannot be delivered.

6. The 2010-11 Corporate Contingency budget funds the costs of continuing with Option A and the initial work on the viability of the Falmouth Option, estimated at £550k.
7. Corporate Reserves are used to fund expenditure incurred in 2009-10 and repaid from the Corporate Contingency budget in 2010-11.
8. A further report be brought to Cabinet to update on the status of Option A approvals and to report findings from the initial review of Falmouth harbour.
9. The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Planning together with officers hold regular meetings with the representatives of Penzance Town Council and Electoral Division Members to appraise them of the current and ensuing position.

### **Summary:**

Following the Cabinet's decision at its meeting on 16 September 2009 relevant approvals have been sought for Option A (comprising freight and passenger facilities on reclaimed land at the harbour, pier extension and rock armour protection to the pier) and further investigation has been undertaken on Option C (freight depot at Longrock, passenger terminal in Trinity House, pier extension and rock armour protection to the pier).

Option C was investigated further including seeking legal opinion on the operator procurement, reviewing planning and heritage requirements, undertaking surveys and preparing designs for the required buildings, designing appropriate traffic calming works, liaising with land owners and obtaining property valuations, reviewing operating costs, estimating construction costs and preparing a financial business model.

Option A Planning applications were submitted on 15 October 2009. On 26 November 2009 English Heritage objected to the sea wall Planning application and Listed Building Consent. On 14 December 2009 the Council's Strategic Planning Committee refused the Listed Building Consent application (voted 12 to 7). The application for the sea wall was deferred.

Following the Strategic Planning Committee there have been further discussions with English Heritage on the need for the project, the shortcomings of the current sea link, the need for the solution to be economically affordable and sustainable, option selection, the effect of rising sea levels, the need to maintain the listed structures and the repair and enhancement measures proposed to mitigate for the proposed works. A decision whether to submit a new application for Option A Listed Building Consent and a request for the deferred sea wall Planning application to be considered will be taken once the anticipated letter from English Heritage is received.

On 25 November 2009 the Council's Procurement Assurance Panel met to consider the procurement processes relating to Option A and the financial

performance of Options A and C. The Panel approved the approach to the procurement and gave their unanimous support for progressing Option A.

The current position gives rise to a number of general issues for the project; there will be a delay, the project cost will rise, additional funding will need to be identified and the existing vessels will need to be in service for at least a further year. Progress could be delayed further by the High Court challenge of the Harbour Revision Order (HRO). In addition a variety of alternative options for Penzance have been promoted through correspondence, web sites and at the Strategic Planning Committee which puts into question whether it will be possible to develop an alternative option should the need arise, which does not continue to polarise local opinion.

To provide a fall-back option in the event that Option A cannot be delivered it is imperative that the option chosen minimises further delay to the project and cost increases. The development of a further option in Penzance would require an extensive piece of work, would need to address all the issues and command widespread support. In order to minimise delay in safeguarding the sea link it is recommended that Falmouth is assessed to determine if it could be a viable mainland port option for the Isles of Scilly link. Falmouth has the existing marine infrastructure and does not require extensive permissions.

### **Background:**

The background to this project up to 16 September 2009 was detailed in the 16 September 2009 Cabinet report so is not repeated here.

On 16 September the Cabinet decided to submit Option A for Planning approvals, further investigate Option C and to seek advice from the Council's Procurement Assurance Panel. Photo montages and sketches of both Options A & C are shown in Appendices 1 and 2.

For clarification Option B (Use of Trinity House for freight and Waterside Meadery for passengers) was discounted in the Penzance Harbour – Appraisal of Alternatives which was reported in August 2009.

### Option A

On 15 October 2009 a Planning application was submitted for the additional sea wall (above the reclaimed area) and an application for Listed Building Consent for works to the Listed South Pier, for Option A. In response to previous public and English Heritage feedback the area of reclamation was reduced by 20% and the length of high sea wall reduced by 19 metres, from that proposed in February 2009. As can be seen from the images in Appendix 3 the impact on views from Battery Road has been greatly reduced.

On 14 December 2009 a report was presented to the Strategic Planning Committee with a recommendation of 'minded to approve' the Listed Building Consent application and a recommendation 'to approve' the sea wall planning application. The Committee members voted 12/7 to refuse the application for Listed Building Consent. The project team decided to defer the sea wall application until a later meeting pending a review.

On 20 October 2009 operator tender prices were received, based on Option A. A dialogue with operators is continuing to ensure that tenders are kept open until a decision can be made to award or not to award the operator contract.

### Option C

A review of the operator procurement by Legal Services and confirmed by Corporate Procurement has identified that the change from a harbour side depot (Option A) to the Longrock freight depot (Option C) constitutes a material change to the procurement. Therefore, if the Council wishes to tender the operation for Option C it must first decide not to pursue Option A and then go back to the six short listed operators to repeat the competitive dialogue stages of the tender. A tender to operate Option C has not been sought as there has been no Council decision to abandon Option A.

During October and November the project team consulted the Planning Service and key stakeholders to inform the design for Option C (see Appendix 4). Architects Trewin Design Partnership have developed a design for the passenger terminal in the old lighthouse museum (Trinity House depot) and LV Shipping have prepared a schedule of work for the minor refurbishment of Unit 18 Long Rock Industrial Estate for use as the freight terminal.

Birse Coastal has prepared cost estimates for Option C using Kier Western (Truro based) to price the Trinity House and Unit 18 building costs. The implications of not reclaiming the foreshore on the placing of the rock armour have also been reviewed. The construction cost of Option C has been determined to be £213k less than Option A (based on December 2009 prices).

In reviewing the need to cross passengers from Trinity House to the South Pier we have consulted Highways Development Control staff and agreed an appropriate solution (see Appendix 5). For both options the current 20mph zone would be extended from its end outside Trinity House to west of the Jubilee Pool pedestrian crossing. Road narrowing and consequential footway widening would be undertaken from the junction of Battery Road and St. Anthony Place to South Pier. Some further narrowing on the Barbican corner is also proposed with a new footway along the East side of 'The Quay' between South Pier and North Pier. Specifically for Option C a coach bay and zebra crossing would be created outside Trinity House and Quay Street would be made one way (westwards). Granite kerbing would be used to follow the Conservation Area materials proposed in the Penzance Design Guide.

We have approached both the Regional Development Agency (Unit 18) and Trinity House (for their depot) who have confirmed that both properties are available to purchase. Valuations for the properties have been obtained. Both organisations are intending to place the properties on the open market in early 2010.

A review of Planning requirements has shown that Unit 18 has sufficient permissions for the intended use (B8). The Trinity House depot will require permissions for change of use and for Listed Building Consent (grade 2 listed, in two parts).

In the Penzance Harbour - Appraisal of Alternatives report (August 2009), undertaken by Halcrow, LV Shipping estimated that Option C would cost £150k per annum more to operate the freight facility than Option A. The LV figure was challenged by the Friends of Penzance Harbour so for this review we sought input from one of the tendering operators who did not ultimately submit a price. Red Funnel are a well known ferry company operating principally between Southampton and the Isle of Wight carrying three million passengers annually as well as vehicles and palletised freight. The company operates two remote freight depots so is well placed to comment on the Longrock proposal. Red Funnel Ferries reviewed the Option C proposals and advised that it would have reduced its Option A charter fee by £330k per annum to operate separate freight and passenger facilities.

On 14 January 2010 the Isles of Scilly Steamship Company issued a statement (included at Appendix 7) saying "In our view a passenger and freight terminal adjacent to the South Quay in Penzance [Option A] would offer the greatest opportunity for improving operating efficiencies."

The financial business case for Option C has been assessed by the Council's Finance team and has been compared to Option A.

A report was submitted to the Council's Corporate Procurement team and a presentation given to the Council's Procurement Assurance Scheme (PAS) Panel on 25 November 2009.

### General

Vessel tenders were submitted in June 2009 and currently remain open for acceptance until 31 January 2010. Dialogue is continuing with the shipyards to ensure that tenders are kept open until a decision can be made to award or not to award the vessel build contract. Increased tender prices are anticipated because the risk of Sterling to Euro currency exchange rates lies with the shipyard and there has been significant change since the tender was submitted.

During a parliamentary debate on Island Transport Services about this project, on 5 January 2010, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Transport, Paul Clark MP, confirmed what the Council had been advised previously by civil servants at the Department for Transport. He also advised that whilst there was no deadline for approval he could not guarantee funding would still be available following public spending reviews after the forthcoming General Election. He stated

"Working up alternative schemes to the one currently presented to the Department is possible but will be time-consuming and costly for the council to pursue, and there is no guarantee that the complex and hard-won funding arrangement in place today will be available when a new proposal is tabled. I believe that it is reasonable that hon. Members and others involved are aware of the risks to funding and relative priorities and how that impacts on the timing of replacement of the ageing vessels."

In that same debate Julian Brazier MP (Shadow Shipping Minister) stated that

*"..it is impossible for a spokesman for a party that might well be in office in a few month's time- ...- to make an absolute commitment on public spending."*

## **Issues:**

### Further Assessment Outcome

A comparison between Options A and C is included in Appendix 6. Both options are potentially deliverable but it is considered that Option A is the best solution because operationally it is simpler and easier to manage with activity on only one site; it maximises harbour regeneration opportunities; it allows the repair and enhancement of the South Pier by a series of measures agreed with the Conservation Officer; and the reclamation and rock armour protect the full length of the listed structure reducing storm damage upon it, improving safety for quay users and reducing the Council's liabilities for its ongoing maintenance. Option A is capable of being adapted to suit an increase in security requirements with minimal cost implications whereas Option C is not, particularly with a passenger terminal remote from the Quay.

The operator tender for Option C could only commence once the Council has decided not to pursue Option A and would require a repeat of the competitive dialogue stages with short listed operators. This process would delay project delivery by 6 months.

Legal advice has confirmed that shipyards can be requested to review their prices to keep vessel tenders open for acceptance. An extension is being sought in line with anticipated project delays.

Approvals for Option C would not be in place before Winter 2010 and therefore a 12 month delay in the harbours construction would be experienced, to suit the seasonal needs of marine works.

The consequential delay in implementing Option C will increase the project costs by approximately £5m. The Option C business case has been assessed on this basis.

The harbour works are projected to increase by £1.5m for construction inflation and the vessel cost is expected to increase by £3.5m due to the Euro to Sterling exchange rates. The vessel contract is in Sterling but extension of tenders or re-tender invites shipyards to review their prices. We were advised by yards that between June and October 2009 the exchange rate realised £1.75m of their risk allowance for exchange rate changes.

With the delay now experienced with Option A a construction start later in 2010 is possible but vessel delivery is assumed to be the same as for Option C, Spring 2013. For the purposes of comparison Option A costs are assumed to increase by the same £5m as included in Option C.

The increased costs would exceed current funding approvals. Convergence funding is already at its maximum intervention level. Until alternative funding

sources are identified it has been assumed that Cornwall Council would increase its borrowing to bridge any funding gap.

The table below shows the financial comparison of Option A (Dec.09), Option A (Jan.10) and Option C:

Option	Council borrowing	Loan repaid	Vessel replacement fund, at year 24	Delivery
A (Dec.09)	£10m	~Year 10	£24.9m	Spring 2012
The option above is included for comparison purposes. It is not now deliverable.				
A (Jan.10)	£15m	Year 20	£8.7m	Spring 2013
C	£15m	~Year 34	-£5.5m	Spring 2013, if funded

Note: operator contract periods are 12 years, the maximum allowed by European procurement rules, and the vessel design life is 25 years.

For Option A it can be seen that the additional £5m Council borrowing required delays repayment of the loan by 10 years and reduces the vessel replacement fund by £16m.

For Option C the loan is unpaid after 24 years (two operator contract terms) and is only repaid after 34 years. No vessel replacement fund is established.

A sensitivity test of the additional project costs was undertaken to check the financial position if the additional costs predicted +£3.5m instead of +£5m:

Option	Council borrowing	Loan repaid	Vessel replacement fund, at year 24	Delivery
A (Jan.10)	£13.5m	Year 16	£13.2m	Spring 2013
C	£13.5m	Year 25	-£0.9m	Spring 2013

If the Council has to fund the cost increases through Council borrowing neither option will generate a sufficient vessel replacement fund to avoid having to seek Government grant funding to replace the vessel at the end of its service life. It can be seen from both tables above that with the additional operating costs implicit with Option C it returns a vessel fund £14m less than Option A. (i.e. no fund is created with Option C).

### Procurement Assurance Panel

A special meeting of the Council's Procurement Assurance Scheme Panel was held on 25 November 2009 to consider the project in depth. The Panel received a detailed presentation from the Project team on Option A and Option C and considered the associated financial and procurement implications on the three elements of the project (vessel build, harbours and vessel operations). The Panel were unanimous in their support for progressing Option A and to awarding the related contracts, once funding approval was confirmed.

### Legal Challenge

On 13 October 2009 a member of the Friends of Penzance Harbour submitted a claim to the High Court challenging the Penzance Harbour Revision Order 2009. If the challenge is successful neither option A nor option C can be delivered.

### General

In Spring/Summer 2010 there will be a General Election which will mean that the Secretary of State for Transport will not be able to make any Government funding decisions from 6 weeks before the election until several months afterwards. It is now improbable that the DfT can give Full Approval before the purdah period starts so it is unlikely that a decision will be made before October 2010 on the funding although every effort should be made to progress this matter swiftly in case it is possible to get a pre-election decision on the funding. This is why the decision is being treated as urgent.

In the parliamentary debate on 5 January 2010, mentioned earlier in this report, Paul Clark MP stated

"The scheme currently has in place for the first time all the funding sources that it requires." and

*"..it is evident that an appropriate solution needs to be found, and quickly. The Convergence funding must be programmed by the end of 2013 and spent by mid-2015. With pressure elsewhere and such a sizeable commitment involved, any submissions for funds made towards the end of the programme may be too late to secure the £11m required."*

It is clear that the regional priority of the link project will be considered by the Minister in making the final decision. He advised

"The South West Region will need to consider whether retaining the island link as a top priority represents good use of its capital allocations. Clearly, it believes that at the moment, because it has reaffirmed that and the allocation has been increased to £36m." and

*"With potential delay, regional partners may consider reprioritising this scheme and bringing forward another scheme from the Region....the Isles of Scilly link could possibly find itself reprioritised to later in the 10-year transport programme, which runs to 2018-19."*

There may be opportunity to seek additional DfT funding via the Regional Funding Allocation but that avenue has not been investigated yet as the Council has only just received confirmation of an additional £12m from the Region, as noted by the Minister.

The risk of the existing vessels being withdrawn from service due to the need for uneconomic repairs/refits increases the longer the project is delayed. The Steamship Company is having to make increasingly difficult investment decisions. By its nature the passenger safety certificate, issued by the Marine & Coastguard Agency (MCA), for the Scillonian is issued annually so only a single year can be forecast. The Shipping Minister, Paul Clark MP, said on 5 January 2010 "Further extensions to the licence may be possible, but that must be underpinned by a firm commitment to replace those vessels at the earliest opportunity." If the Steamship Company cannot afford to replace the vessels then the Minister is looking to the Route Partnership to secure project funding and place an order for a new vessel. If the project does not progress one might argue that there is a risk that the certificate will not be renewed.

It is apparent from the 10 December 2009 public meeting called by the Chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee, comments on websites and through correspondence that there is an appetite to consider a wide range of alternatives in Penzance including different piers, off-shore breakwaters and even to re-open discussion about the vessel choice. The Friends of Penzance Harbour is also seeking consideration of "variations on Option C".

To recommence option selection in Penzance will set the project back seven years. Any option will require a Harbour Revision Order as there is insufficient space in the harbour. From experience over the last two years it will be very difficult to reach a consensus and it is likely that every decision will be challenged.

### **Analysis:**

The implications of the delay experienced due to refusal of the Listed Building Consent are (i) the new vessel cannot now be delivered for Spring 2012, Spring 2013 is most likely (ii) project costs are predicted to increase by £5m, and (iii) the Council's business case to establish a vessel replacement fund is reduced by £16m unless further grant funding can be secured to fund the gap.

On 5 January 2010 the Shipping Minister, Paul Clark MP, said

*"..I will state again that securing a long-term solution must allow the sea link to operate economically. It must be done on an economic basis or it will not work.... this must be done on an economic basis or it will have no sustainability."*

He did not state that the DfT will bear any additional costs.

Consideration of any option for delivery must have a strong business case to allow a significant replacement fund to be established and must be deliverable within the timescales of the funding opportunities. DfT funding opportunities may be delayed but the Council will always seek part funding from DfT. Convergence funding however will not be available after mid 2015 and the RDA cannot hold back funding on the hope that the project gets planning approval. Any option that may require a different Harbour Revision Order (HRO) from that already in place will not be deliverable with Convergence funding because of the time required to secure HROs.

### Option A

The Procurement Assurance Panel have stated that they support the progress of Option A and have confirmed that the appropriate procurement processes and advice have been followed.

Following the Strategic Planning Committee there have been further discussions with English Heritage on the need for the project, the shortcomings of the sea link, the need for the solution to be economically affordable and sustainable, option selection, the effect of rising sea levels, the need to maintain the listed structures and the repair and enhancement measures proposed to mitigate for the proposed works. A decision whether to submit a new application for Option A Listed Building Consent and a request for the deferred sea wall Planning application to be considered will be taken once a letter anticipated from English Heritage is received.

Approved funding has now been expended and it will require an additional £250k to submit the application, seek final funding approvals and complete pre-construction procedures.

### Option C

Further investigation of Option C has shown that its construction costs are only marginally lower than for Option A and that the order of operating costs previously calculated have been confirmed. It has a weaker business case than Option A, generating £14m less income over the business case period. Option C has the additional risk that over the life of the new vessel it will not recover the Council's costs and is therefore not supported by the Procurement Assurance Panel.

### Other Options

Given the general scheme issues - delay and vessel life expectancy – there is a need to undertake initial investigation of another option as a fall back position if Option A fails.

With the High Court challenge of the existing Penzance Harbour Revision Order (HRO) and the diversity of options raised by interested parties in Penzance that would have to be assessed it is considered that only the Falmouth option is capable of being developed within a relatively short timescale (10 months). The Full Council of the Isles of Scilly has already voted (10 September 2009) to support Falmouth as the preferred option should Option A not be delivered.

Other mainland ports that were previously only briefly considered and discounted (ref: Fisher Report 'Moving On', 2003) namely Newlyn and St.Ives. Both of these ports would require HROs for either a new road to improve traffic access or to locate appropriate ferry facilities so both ports should still be discounted from further consideration.

Vessel berthing is available in Falmouth without the need for a HRO. Fuel bunkering is sited in the docks so the fuel price will be less than it is in Penzance. Falmouth would have a different business case than that for the established route to Penzance and the DfT would need to be convinced on the anticipated patronage and split between freight and passengers as part of the economic appraisal.

An initial feasibility for Falmouth, such as that adopted for Option C, is likely to cost £300k including further passenger and freight customer surveys.

If Option A cannot be delivered and Falmouth proves to be have a viable business case approximately a further £500k will be required to repeat operator tenders, review vessel design, finalise design for any facilities required and seek Planning approvals.

### **Consultation:**

Aspects of the Option A Penzance proposal were subject to consultation through consideration of the application for Listed Building Consent and sea wall Planning application registered on 15 October 2009.

The Chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee held a public meeting at the Acorn Theatre, Penzance, on 10 December 2009 to listen to the views of the public.

The owners of the properties required for Option C have been approached, as detailed above.

The Department for Transport and the RDA's Convergence Team have been updated following the Planning refusal and are very interested to hear the outcome of discussions with English Heritage.

The televised Parliamentary adjournment debate on 5 January 2010 has already been mentioned.

On 14 January 2010 a statement was received from the Chairman of the Isles of Scilly Steamship Company. He re-confirmed the Company's support of " ... securing public funds to enhance the infrastructure on the route" and stated "In our view a passenger and freight terminal adjacent to the South Quay in Penzance would offer the greatest opportunity for improving operating efficiencies." The full statement is included in Appendix 7.

### **Debate at the Cabinet - 25 January 2010**

The Leader advised of an inaccuracy in the report. On page 14 of the report under Division Member comments, the second paragraph should have stated that Mrs Pass CC spoke at the planning meeting to object to the proposals rather than Mr Fonk CC.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Planning presented the report and outlined the importance of the sea link to the Isles of Scilly for the Penzance area and strategically for the whole of Cornwall. He advised that it had been an emotive issue and following deliberations no option had been fully supported. He gave details regarding the constraints for obtaining funding for the scheme and advised that Cabinet were seeking approval to re-submit the planning application for listed building consent. Further, he gave details of his commitment to invite representatives of local people and the Penzance Town Council to meet with the project team to be appraised of the agreed option and to identify further amendments for the benefit of local people.

The Cabinet Member for Housing raised the point that Penzance was a working port and that very few remained in Cornwall. He requested clarity of the current situation and the decision taken by the Strategic Planning Committee. In response, the Head of Planning & Regeneration confirmed the Council had assumed that English Heritage had taken a 'balanced decision'. It had since been clarified in a recent letter (a copy of which was circulated at the meeting) that their views had only represented a conservation aspect. He confirmed, in his view, that the Council could submit a fresh application for listed building consent based on the need to formulate a balanced view of issues

Cabinet Members raised concerns regarding the risk on losing funding for the scheme if there were further delays and that residents of the Isles of Scilly were concerned that the service to the islands was in jeopardy. The cost to the Penzance economy was estimated at around £2.5 million.

It was confirmed by the Head of Transportation that a petition had been registered with the High Court regarding the challenge to the Harbour Revision Order and that a decision was expected shortly whether this would be heard or dismissed.

In response to a question regarding the Government Office, the Head of Planning & Regeneration confirmed that although the Strategic Planning Committee had refused the application for listed building consent, a decision notice had not been issued. If the Council wished the listed building application to be re-considered, the normal procedure for any applicant would

be to re-submit a fresh application, he confirmed this would need to be referred to Government Office for final determination.

The Leader invited Members present to put questions and/or statements and a general debate ensued, the points of which included the following:-

- Members welcomed and gave their support on the importance of calling a meeting with representatives of groups in Penzance as a matter of urgency.
- It was felt by many Members that local people were not consulted early enough in the scheme on the proposed options.
- It was noted that regarding the case for Falmouth, an initial assessment would be carried out to assess viability of the proposal and if the findings showed a business case then a more detailed study would commence with a view to putting forward the submission to the Department for Transport by the end of 2010.
- The general consensus was that the Isles of Scilly link should be retained in Penzance. However Members stated that if the community of Penzance were not cohesive in retaining the link there were facilities in Falmouth to accommodate the link which was of strategic importance to both the Isles of Scilly and the mainland.
- It was imperative that the link continued whether it was Penzance or not.
- The decision should be made strategically for the whole of Cornwall, the Strategic Planning Committee had been overwhelmed by objectors who had been organised to attend the public meeting, the link was of vital importance to be retained in Penzance to maintain employment and business development opportunities for the town.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services confirmed that the matter was being dealt with as an urgent decision in accordance with the Constitution. The reasons for urgency were that the Council had to work to a tight timescale if there was to be a possibility that it could attain Department for Transport approval for grant funding ahead of the pre-election period for the upcoming General Election. If the funding approval from the Department of Transport was not given before the pre-election period then there would be a significant risk that the project may not proceed.

Voting in respect of the Resolution as set out in the Decision Notice was recorded as unanimous.

Following this item, the Meeting was adjourned at 3.35pm and reconvened in the Trelawney Room at 3.45pm.