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Introduction

This Conservation Statement for La Hougue Bie Chapel was commissioned by Jersey Heritage and prepared by Dr Aylin Orbasli in May-June 2012. The remit of this Conservation Statement is the historic chapel only, and its purpose is to improve the understanding of the historic chapel, its significance and values and based on this understanding to propose conservation policies that inform its protection, conservation and future management.

The research that informs the Conservation Statement is largely based on published information available on the chapel. It was not possible within the time limits of a conservation statement to undertake detailed studies of late 19th century and early 20th century publications or undertake an extensive archival search. The property was visited in March 2012.

The property

La Hougue Bie Chapel is located on the eastern side of Jersey, 2.5 km inland from Gorey, on the border of the parishes of Grouville and St Saviour, and is at 86m above sea level. Positioned at a significant junction of routes across the island, the mound on which the chapel is located is 58m in diameter and 12.2 in height. The mound complex comprises of a east, with an east-west oriented chapel above it.

The property is owned by Société Jersiaise and is managed by Jersey Heritage. The property is Grade 1 listed.

Figure 1: Aerial view of the Chapel, showing it in relation to the Neolithic passage grave and current visitor centre, the focus of this Statement is the chapel marked in red (Jersey Mapping, 2012)
1 Understanding the site

1.1 Introduction and overview

The most recent source on La Hougue Bie is the 1999 volume *La Hougue Bie Jersey*, written by Mark Patton, Warwick Rodwell and Olga Finch, that was published following the 1991-95 excavations. This volume has been the major reference source used for this Conservation Statement and is taken to be the most authoritative and recent study of the site.\(^1\) Within the confines of a Conservation Statement, it has not been possible to re-visit a number of primary sources, such as early 20th century reports of the excavations and restoration works, and letters and correspondence held in archives. Extensive information on the ownership of the chapel and later tower, recorded in *La Hougue Bie Jersey* have not been repeated here unless it has direct relationship to interventions in the built fabric.

The 12th century chapel and the Neolithic passage grave of c.4000 BC have been used, altered and interpreted in various ways through time, including as a focal point of pilgrimage in the late Medieval period and a romantic ruin encased in the late 18th century into a Neo-Gothic castle by Pilippe de la Tour d’Auvergne. In order to evaluate the significance of the standing ruins of the Chapel, the focus of the historic background section will be the period between the 12th century when the chapel was first built, up to most recent conservation works undertaken at the end of the 20th century. However, the story cannot be told without an understanding of what went before it, or the developments that followed the building of the Princes Tower and its later removal in conjunction with the rediscovery and excavation of the tomb in 1924.

This section of the Conservation Statement is in three sections. The first (1.2) summarises the known history of the site, the second (1.3) provides a description of the building as it is today, supported by Warwick Rodwell’s 1999 interpretation, while the third (1.4) considers the values and significance of the chapel in its context.

1.2 Historical overview

1.2.1 Name and setting

The name Hougue is thought to come from the Old Norse *haugr*, meaning mound. The origin of Bie is less clear, with several theories, some relating it to Hamby as reference to ownership, others to another Old Norse word *byr*, meaning homestead or abode.

The chapel is located above a Neolithic passage grave dated to c.4000 BC and likened in from and eastern orientation marking the sunrise at the winter solstice to New Grange in Ireland (McCormack, 1986). Christianity is known to be prevalent in the Channel islands since Roman times, though the scattered nature of a farming population would have reduced the need for centralised parish churches. Dating the parish churches or even the emergence of parish boundaries has been difficult, but it is generally assumed that the island was highly Christianised by the 5th century (McCormack, 1986). Viking raids in the 9th century are often cited as the cause of destruction of early Christian churches and monasteries on the islands and their notable absence. It is not known whether there was an earlier chapel at Hogue Bie.

The next generation of churches are linked to Celtic influences in plan form, with two chambers separated by a chancel arch and square east end. By the time of the Reformation there is thought to be close to 100 chapels on the Channel islands.

\(^1\) Where conflicting views have been cited by Nicolle (1925) or McCormack (1986), this 1999 publication has been taken as the most recent and authoritative source.
1.2.2 The Early Chapel

Warwick (1999) argues that aside from the number of legends connected to the site, it is possible that there is a 12th century link to the Paisnels of Hamby in Normandy, making the Paisnel family the likely founders of the chapel. Given that both the Jersey fiefs of Mélèches and Hommet of which the Paisnel’s were seigneurs, were escheated to the Crown in 1213, the chapel would have had to have been built before this date.

The location of the chapel has also been much debated as it is neither serving a parish nor is it a private manorial chapel. The spiritual sense of the mound being regarded as a loci sancti and subsequently Christianised in the Early Christian era is cited by Rodwell (1999, p.198) as a reason for the presence of the chapel, with strong precedent of similar practice from Brittany with which Jersey shared close associations at the time. Another chapel, since lost, of Notre Dame des Pas in St Helier was also evidently built on a prehistoric mound.

Apart from the myths, however, there is no concrete evidence or precise date of the building of the chapel. Nor is it known whether the Norman builders were aware of the burial chamber within the mound, though Patton et al. (1999) suggest that they may have had access to the chamber at that time. The very close alignment of the two structures on the east-west axis is seen as an indication that the builders of the Chapel must have had some link or knowledge of the Neolithic tomb. Evidence of any earlier Christian buildings on the site or the use of the chapel for burial, however, would have been obliterated by the excavations undertaken by Bishop Mabon in the 16th century.

Figure 1.1 The slightly off centre window of the 16th century rotunda lines up with the entrance to the tomb chamber, indicating known links through the medieval period.

In its earliest form the chapel is rectangular with two cells separated by a pilaster arch, an entrance on in the west corner of the south wall and a narrow entrance in the north wall. The width of the division between the nave and sanctuary is only 50cm. Rodwell (1999) draws similarities to the Fisherman’s chapel in St Brelade, and dates it to the latter half of the 12th century based on the pointed barrel vault. The evidence of windows has been much altered
with later interventions and the addition of wall recesses, so the window configuration shown in Figure 1.2 can only be conjectural.

![Figure 1.2 Layout of 12th century chapel (Rodwell, 1999, p.195)](image)

Much discussion surrounds the question of whether a small dwelling existed at the site at this time, with the possibility that the narrow door would have provided access to it. However, no concrete evidence has been found to date to verify this claim.

1.2.3 Mabon's 16th Century Chapel

The first mention of a chapel in written sources is not until the early 16th century in 1533, when it is referred to as la Chapelle de Notre Dame de la Clarté, Our Lady of the Light. A map regression analysis carried out by Warwick Rodwell clearly shows indication of a chapel at the location and references to the mound on the 1593 (Popinjay), 1595 (Norden), 1606 (Mercator), 1610 (Speed) and 1795 (Richmond) maps.

![Figure 1.3 La Hougue Bie as shown on the 1795 Richmond map.](image)

It is thought that the first known owner of the site, Richard Mabon, may have purchased it from Eleazor Le Marchant of Guernsey, who was Seigneur du Fief de La Hougue. Richard Mabon was rector of St Martin and Dean of Jersey, and was known to have travelled to Jerusalem in c.1520. This trip it is thought to have inspired him to alter the chapel at Hougue Bie to resemble what he had seen in the Holy Land. He built a bell shaped rotunda around the square east end, with a lower level crypt, dug into the ancient mound, to symbolise the Tomb of Christ in the Holy Sepulchre. The east end of the chapel, known as the Jerusalem Chapel, became a popular centre for pilgrimage and according to some accounts a good money spinner for Mabon.
The property as remodelled by Mabon is described in records as the Chapelle de Notre Dame de la Clarté, Our Lady of the Light (western chapel), the Jerusalem Chapel (eastern chapel) and beneath it the an oratory in the form of a sepulchre, alongside a small house on the mound. This is also likely to be the first partitioning of the sanctuary from the nave, the foundation of which was discovered in the 1924 excavation. The three niches in the east end were also cut into the wall at this time supported by the new elliptically shaped wall surrounding the east end. The windows over the later passage (and doors in the east) section are attributed to this period. Rodwell (1999) also claims the presence of a screen separating the sanctuary behind the altar. The triangular headed recess seen in the west chapel is also thought to date to this time, and is similar to contemporaneous examples in Jersey domestic buildings. No early floor was recovered or level recorded in 1924. The new crypt may have introduced the change in floor level between the two chapels.

The newly dug out crypt has a ‘tomb chamber’ at its centre surrounded by an ambulatory which probably exited from the north doorway. The entry to the ambulatory is less clear but according to Rodwell (1999) may have been via a flight of steps leading down from the south west corner of the chapel. Any arrangement is speculative. The single window on the south east side aligns with the passage grave entrance, a clear indication that the entrance was known and visible in the 16th century (Figure 1.4).

There is evidence that the vault in the east chapel collapsed at some point during Mabon’s operation and had to be re-built. It is likely that the misalignment between the two vaults dates to this time, and the spring of the original vault is still evident in the northwest and southwest corners. The eastern wall is also likely to have been much altered during the works. Mabon notes the presence of a house on the mound. According to Rodwell (1999) the most likely location is to the north of the chapel, connected via a doorway. No further evidence, however, has come to light.

1.2.4 The post-Medieval Period

On Mabon’s death the property passed to Amy and Falle, two priests, and later transferred to the Crown at the Reformation, before being sold into private ownership in 1607 initially to Thomas Tanner. It’s use in the 17th century is unclear, though it may have been used as a dwelling and there is evidence that it was repaired, based on the date of 1638 painted on the ceiling vault.

Figures 1.5 The chapel converted to domestic use in the post-Reformation period, according to Rodwell (1999, p.195)
Rodwell suggests domestic use with the fireplace being inserted into the northeast niche at this time, the west chapel becoming a kitchen with a cross passage between the two spaces, thus explaining the insertion of the doors on either side. An upper floor is also presumed to have been inserted at this time, which may be linked to the date and painting on the vault.

Figure 1.6 Extract from a drawing of the chapel c.1760 before the tower was built, made by James d'Auvergne and published as an engraving in 1812 (Patton et al., 1999, p12).

A drawing of the chapel prior to the tower being constructed shows the east end and north elevation of the chapel (Figure 1.7). The gable end is seen with the rotunda, with a small vertical slit window and arched doorway on the base facing north. The north wall is shown with various windows, including a wide 3 pane window on the ground floor adjoining the rotunda, a small window above it with another high level window on the west end. The gap in the roof is presumably the place where lightning struck the belfry.

Attempts to demolish the building are recorded in 1708 and 1749, but these were contested at Royal Court and the building survived. The belfry is known to have been destroyed following a lightning strike in 1728.

1.2.5 The Prince’s Tower

By the 18th century, the Chapel clearly appears to be in private ownership. Having acquired it in 1759, in 1792 James d’Auvergne gave the property to his nephew Philippe, Duc de Bouillon. Vice Admiral Philippe d’Auvergne was a Jerseyman and Commander of the Channel Fleet, responsible for strengthening the island’s defences during the Napoleonic War. He was principally based at Mont Orgueil Castle and lived at Bagatelle in St Saviour from 1802.

Philippe d’Auvergne transformed the chapel into a Neo-Gothic castle more akin to a folly, though it did provide residential accommodation with a water supply between 1792–93. Consequently the property became known as Prince’s Tower or La Tour d’Auvergne. The building had a purpose as well as its heightened elevation that made it an ideal location for a signalling post, and a signalling mast was placed on the southwest corner of the old chapel. This was the only position from which the signals stations across the whole island could be controlled when they were established in 1792. The date of construction of the tower is placed as 1792–93.
Regrettably no drawn records appear to have been made of the Prince’s Tower or the chapel following the demolition and removal of the Tower accretions, and the plans as seen are conjectural. The construction of the castle, thought to have been occupied by Philippe d’Auvergne on a seasonal or occasional basis, involved a number of significant changes and additions to the structure of the chapel. The ground floor layout centres around the central passage that has been widened with the eastern cell becoming a library and the west reverting to use as a chapel, in the form of a domestic chapel. A lean-to extension on the north side is referred to as the dining room which at one time had a crenelated parapet, with an octagonal staircase to the east of it. The circular shaped tower itself was built off the rotunda with a drawing room and a bed chamber above it, both accessed by a spiral staircase on the west side which was placed over the medieval belfry. Little is known about the basement kitchen, which may be revealed through further excavation.
The additions were built out of brick, and the building was fully rendered, with ashlar effect, including the granite chapel walls. Works included the opening of new windows in the rotunda and chapel, and remodelling existing ones to pointed Gothic arches. Most notably a large ‘ecclesiastically’ styled window was inserted on the west gable end with a pointed Gothic arch, tracery and coloured glass lights.

The tower was completely demolished during the works undertaken in 1924 and “thus perished Jersey’s highly original and most distinguished contribution to the Gothic Revival’ (Rodwell, 1999, p. 217).

1.2.6 Pleasure grounds

On the death of Philippe d’Auvergne in 1816, La Hougue Bie was purchased by the then Lieutenant Governor of Jersey, Major General Hugh Mackay Gordon, who also used it as an occasional residence, but relinquished his interest in the site shortly afterwards in 1821, enabling the site to be developed as a pleasure ground.

Pleasure grounds had at this time become popular in Regency England, and the venture was supported by the newly built Prince’s Tower Hotel. Following Philippe d’Auvergne’s extensive planting strategy, the tower and former chapel were now surrounded by a mature garden, making it a much sought after combination of romantic landscape and centre piece. The influences of English Romanticism were also being felt in Jersey at this time as it became a popular Regency visitor destination.

Sometime in the late 19th century the chapel was used as a small museum of ecclesiastical objects. The render was stripped in the late 19th century, exposing the building to much of the decay that was to follow. By the end of the end of the 19th century the property, though structurally sound, had fallen into dereliction. The dining room on the north side is known to have been demolished at the turn of the 20th century having lost its roof.
1.2.7 The Restoration of 1925

Following an earlier attempt in 1912, the Société Jersiaise purchased the property in 1919 for the sum of £750. The Société’s interest in the site focused on the possibility of ancient remains in the mound and the reclamation of the medieval chapel that lay within the tower. The unpopularity of Victorian Gothic Revival architecture at the time would have added weight to the demolition of the tower. The tower was thus demolished and all later additions removed from the chapel in 1924. Excavations at the site commenced the same year. One of the outcomes of this excavation, in which the burial chamber was found, was the construction of a concrete tunnel to enable public access and extensive landscaping around the site.

The chapel, now stripped of its later accretions was restored in 1925. The Prince’s Tower hotel was also demolished at this time and in 1925–26 a new L shape lodge was constructed providing a residence for the caretaker and a tea room. The Archaeology and Geology Museum, opened in 1977, is now on the site of the former hotel. The bowling alley and later garage were also replaced by a new building in 1956.

The 1924 restoration is very much an interpretation of the Société’s Restoration Committee of the time. Later writers have observed various discrepancies including the construction of a wall that created two chapels in place of the sanctuary arch (Patton et al, 1999:29). Other interventions during the restoration include the insertion of out of size windows on the east end, which were later removed. It is likely that both the demolition, and subsequent restoration would have caused damage to or loss of original fabric. Unfortunately very limited records have been kept of the works undertaken at the site at this time. The limited amount of records surviving indicate that the works carried out between 1924–25 and resulted in:

- Demolition of structures relating to the chapel
- Removal of brick alcoves within the chapel
- Discovery of some former doorways and windows
- Discovery of traces of wall paintings
A piscine uncovered in the south wall
- Excavation of the chapel floor
- Cross wall built within chapel
- Jambs of doorways and windows reconstructed
- New belfry placed on roof
- Repair of the exterior of the chapel
- Masonry pier constructed in crypt to support vault and continued into south recess of chapel above
- Discovery of wooden window frames in recesses and new windows reportedly inserted into two of them.

The building of the tower in the 18th century and its subsequent demolition in 1924 collectively account for considerable loss of original medieval fabric and features. Compared to current day approaches to conservation, the restoration works carried out in 1924 appear to be excessive, with little respect for the various layers of historic fabric, but this was not uncommon for many similar projects in England in the 1920s, where monuments were stripped back to what was believed to be their Medieval cores.

The demolition and restoration works were completed in a relatively short period and the mound was opened to the public in April 1925. New doors were made for the chapel in the early 1930s and the western chapel was re-dedicated by the Bishop of Winchester in 1931.
1.3 Description

The chapel is described in some detail in Chapter 5: The Medieval Chapel (Rodwell with Jean Arthur) in *La Hougue Bie Jersey* (1999), and this section is largely based on the interpretations presented by Rodwell following a survey undertaken in 1996.

The chapel is 12.5m long and approximately 5.0m wide. It is divided into a two cells by a transverse arch. An elliptical shape rotunda incorporating a below ground ‘crypt’ envelopes the east end.

1.3.1 South elevation:

The tiled roof was part of the 1925 restoration, as was the new belfry which is supported by the medieval stone base. Although originally thatched, the roof is reported to have been slate since the 16th century.

Random granite rubble masonry, with larger stone quoins at the base of the south west corner. The southwest quoins, though largely rebuilt, has an original base stone that has been linked to a jamb of a door, reverting to original pink irregularly sized granite above door level.

A projecting eaves band along the length of the elevation up to the rotunda is a Norman feature. The clay tile band above it with a second rise of masonry is a later addition, most likely of the 1925 restoration. The corner stones would have originally supported the gable stones of a thatched roof.

The sockets visible between the two bands and presumed to be linked to the medieval formwork, were opened up as part of the 1925 restoration, as they are not evident in photographs from that time.

Both the doorway openings, as seen, are 1925 restorations following the removal of the Gothic arches.

The small slit window between the two door openings with a segmental head may be a widening of a 12th century original unglazed opening. The window above the door is from the 1925 restoration.
1.3.2 North elevation

Random granite rubble masonry, with larger stone quoins at the base of the south west corner. A projecting eaves band along the length of the elevation up to the rotunda is a Norman feature. The clay tile band above it with a second rise of masonry is a later addition, most likely of the 1925 restoration. The corner stones would have originally supported the gable stones of a thatched roof.

A lean-to extension was built against this wall as part of the tower and removed in 1925. The extent of intervention and addition known to have taken place in 1925, renders it difficult to establish how much of the wall is original, but there are distinctly large and rough quoin stones, including around the doors. The longer quoin blocks on the northwest corner are possibly 17th century.

The small slit window between the two door openings may be original to the 12th century. It was unblocked in 1924 and has asymmetrical splays and arched head. The window above the doors is from the 1925 restoration.

On the rotunda, a narrow doorway to the crypt with a arch head. Above the crypt door is an outline suggesting the position of a rectangular window.
1.3.3 West elevation

Random granite rubble masonry forming the gable end. Projecting foundation stone at the base. The longer quoin blocks on the northwest corner are possibly 17th or 18th century replacement, while the thinner quoins towards the top are more likely to be Norman originals.

The l’Auvergne scheme was known to have had rendered brick copings, which it is presumed were a replacement for original granite ones linked to a thatched roof. Neither survives, and the chapel today is tiled up to the gable end.

The stone cross on the apex is of medieval origin and was found lying in the chapel. There is evidence of a cross on the west gable in 19th century illustrations.

The Norman window on the west wall is 20th century, replacing a large 18th century Gothic style stained glass window.

During the German Occupation a lookout tower was built in front of the west gable. This tower was removed after the war, with only the base of the foundations still remaining.
1.3.4 East elevation:

The west end is composed of the rotunda up to eaves level, where it joins the gable end. The rotunda base is offset from the ground floor level, which is battered. Excavations have indicated the presence of a battered foundation, approximately 40cm deep. Random granite rubble masonry.

The stone cross on the apex has been recorded as coming from Le Rué, St Martin.

A small slit window to the crypt facing southeast with quoined surround is from the 16th century.
1.3.5 Western chapel

Pointed barrel vault, typical of Channel Island churches. Vault mixed rubble in lime mortar built on temporary formwork. Apex 4.65m above floor level. An offset in the west wall may have been to accommodate a door that was not as wide as the current one. The small hole in head of the vault links to the belfry and allows the bell to be pulled.

Investigations have revealed 3 layers of render: medieval, 18th century and 1924, alongside some areas of cement based render. Faint traces of medieval painted decoration survive on the vault of the south wall, though much is likely to have been lost in the 18th century.

There is evidence at the base of a medieval cross wall onto which the 1924 wall has been erected. This may have originally been arched. There is no evidence to indicate that there was a wall as has now been built, and the wall with a window in Norman style is 'wholly conjectural' (Rodwell, 1999:164).

There is a triangular shaped recess in the south wall. This was rediscovered in 1924 and referred to as a piscine, but no evidence of drains have been found. Rodwell suggests it may also have been an aumbry. Construction indicates that it is a late medieval insertion. The south door has square cut jambs (18th century). There is no evidence of door fixings and the shallow recess on the wall may be modern. This doorway was filled in in the 18th century and the granite lintel is a 1924 addition. It is thought to be the location of the original Norman door.

The north door is a late medieval replacement of the arched original. The original lintel is presumed to have been timber and not stone. The lintel was removed when the door was blocked in the 18th century. The threshold slab extends to the location of the original door, which was a narrow opening of 50cm, widening to 70cm on the interior.

The floors are granite tiles, laid in the 1930s. The Medieval floor level is not known, and excavations to date have been inconclusive. The age of the threshold slab in the south doorway is unknown.

No evidence of an altar was found during excavations in the 20th century, and the dais is a 1930 structure and the altar a slab found at Mont Orgueil Castle. The planked door is also 1930s in date, with recycled 18th century lock.
1.3.6 Eastern Chapel

Pointed barrel vault, slightly higher than in the western chapel, indicating that the two spaces were at some point separated. Their apices also do not line up. The junction with the wall on both north and south sides indicates that there may have been an earlier shallower vault. A good survival of 18th century plaster is evident here with painted figures on the east end. The background of pale ochre is thought to have been the colour for the whole chapel. The date of 1638 on one of the figures is an addition. The visible beam sockets are from when the first floor was added in the 18th century.

Rectangular space, with plastered niches on the north, east and south sides, surrounded by the structure of the rotunda. The east, south and north walls have been cut away to accommodate various features, the west wall is from the 1925 restoration. The niche on the east wall is rectangular in plan with a segmental arch; the one on the south wall is not fully rectangular, slightly skewed with a segmental arch head; and the one on the north wall has been reduced in size and is thought to be the location of a pre-18th century fireplace. The flue has been obscured by a later soffit.

The north and south doorways are 1924 replacements for 18th century Gothic pointed arch doorways which replaced the originals and were built against one of the side jambs. The east jamb of the south doorway is clearly older. Traces of late medieval plaster. The north door also has a rebated east jamb and pink granite upright at the base. There is evidence of a window above the doorway.

The windows above both doors are 1924 restorations as the originals that were destroyed by the pointed arch heads of the 18th century Gothic doorways. A Gothic style window on the east wall was removed during the 1924 restoration.

The floors are granite tiles, laid in 1930s. The Medieval floor level is not known, and excavations to date have been inconclusive. The level difference between the chapels is due to crypt inserted on the east end.
1.3.7 Rotunda

The exterior was largely rebuilt following removal of the tower. The door on the north side and the window on the south east are thought to be original to the 16th century structure. The plaster is probably 18th century.

The key feature is the ‘tomb’ chamber which is rectangular in plan, but irregular in volume (so it emulates rock cut chambers). An ambulatory passage surrounds it, and there is evidence here of various phases of building. The triangular pier to support the vault was inserted in 1925.
1.4 Assessment of Significance

1.4.1 Historical and archaeological values

The chapel was built on a location of great antiquity and has probably undergone more alterations and changes than most places of worship in Jersey in its 800 years of existence. The archaeological and historical values of La Hougue Bie Chapel can be summarised as:

▫ Located on the mound covering a 4000 BC Neolithic passage grave, which is an important example of its type for the British Isles;
▫ As yet not fully understood or established link between the erection of Christian places of worship above important pagan sites, and its links in orientation and plan to the passage grave beneath it;
▫ One of the earlier surviving chapels in Jersey and the Channel Islands;
▫ The remodelling of a chapel to resemble the Holy Sepulchre and its consequent use as a place of pilgrimage on the island;
▫ An example of the evolution of a chapel and place of worship into residential use following the Reformation;
▫ A unique re-modelling of a chapel to incorporate it into a Gothic Revival tower and gentleman's residence, described as one of Jersey's most outstanding Gothic Revival buildings;
▫ A command centre for a signalling system for defence of the island during the Napoleonic War;
▫ Making a contribution to a 19th century landscape gardens as a feature;
▫ Links to the research and archaeological interests of the Société Jersiaise in the early 20th century, and to the work of Dr Arthur Mourant;
▫ Location of a tower and a bunker during the German Occupation;
▫ The archaeological potential of the mound and the site to reveal information, artefacts and other structures from the Neolithic, medieval and post-medieval periods.

1.4.2 Architectural and artistic values

Although a simple building in plan, the architectural and artistic values of the chapel can be summarised as:

▫ A good survival of a 12th century two cell chapel;
▫ A unique interpretation and remodelling of a chapel to resemble the Holy Sepulchre, with a tomb chamber;
▫ Surviving evidence of painted ceilings, most probably of 16th century origins;
▫ The now lost value of being one of Jersey's foremost Gothic revival buildings.

1.4.3 Spiritual value

By virtue of being a place of worship the chapel maintains past and present spiritual values including:

▫ As the location of a Neolithic/ pagan burial ground recognised for its sacred and spiritual associations in the Christian era;
▫ As a place of Christian worship from the 12th century to the present day;

1.4.4 Setting and landscape value

The location of the chapel on top of a mound has always made it evocative as can be evidenced through the way it was used and referenced in literature and art. The landscape setting, which has come to be defined by the mature trees that surround it, however, relates to later developments. The landscapes values of the site, relating to various phases of development can be summarised as:
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- A prominent mound, and a highly visible landmark that could be seen from various parts of the island up until the 18th century;
- The centrepiece in a pleasure garden in the English Landscape tradition;
- An inspiration to artists, poets and writers, especially because of its landscape setting.

1.4.5 Social values
Through its various stages of development and evolution the site is also intimately linked with the social history of Jersey, notably as:

- A place of Christian worship since the 12th century, and possibly earlier;
- A place of pilgrimage in the 16th century;
- A gentleman’s residence of the late 18th and early 19th century;
- A popular visitor attraction since the mid 19th century
- A focus and inspiration for artists and antiquarians;
- Entered Jersey folklore though legends of a place as the burial place of a knightly dragon slayer;
- Exemplar of the early work of the Société Jersiaise and current stewardship of Jersey Heritage.

1.4.6 Economic value
The economic value of the site is largely linked to its current use as a visitor attraction in conjunction with the Neolithic passage grave and visitor centre.

1.4.7 Statement of significance
This Conservation Statement has established that La Hougue Bie Chapel is of significance to Jersey and internationally:

- For being one of the earliest surviving chapels on Jersey and a good survival of a modest two cell chapel from the 12th century;
- As a good example of the practice of placing a chapel on a prehistoric burial ground to Christianise a ‘sacred’ places, and a rare survival of this practice in the Channel Islands;
- As a visitor attraction in Jersey from the 16th century to the present day;
- As a rare surviving example of the remodelling and reinterpretation of a chapel to resemble the Holy Sepulchre;
- For its unique legacy as a late 18th century tower and gentleman’s residence in the Gothic Revival style;
- For its setting in a landscape garden, modelled in the English Romantic style;
- As a legacy of the early work of the Société Jersiaise and antiquarian and conservation approaches of the early 20th century.
2 Conservation Policies

This part of the Conservation Statement indicates how the various individual values placed on the property are vulnerable to damage, and then proposes a series of Conservation Statement Policies, which should ensure that the significance and values of the property are protected and, wherever possible, enhanced for public enjoyment and benefit.

The framework of policies seeks to:

▫  Preserve and enhance the significance of the chapel and its setting for future generations, and ensure that all conservation work is undertaken in strict accordance with international best practice;
▫  Guide management proposals for the preservation and future development of the property as a heritage and educational asset;
▫  Ensure that the property can be maintained as a sustainable heritage asset for the foreseeable future.

The conservation policies that are set out are intended to ensure an adequate balance between all the values placed on the property during its ongoing management and in any future proposals to develop it; conserving La Hougue Bie Chapel as a heritage asset to the highest possible standards, whilst securing maximum benefit to the community. For the purposes of the Statement, the term development includes repair, restoration, interpretation, and the provision of facilities to encourage and improve public enjoyment and sustainability.

2.1 Vulnerability

There is evidence of damp in both the eastern and western chapels and in the crypt. This may in part be related to some of the conservation practices employed in the 1925 restoration, notably the reinforcement of the vaults with ferrocrete binder after the demolition of the tower, evidence of cement based render in the western chapel and the external repointing using a hard Portland cement based render. It is evident that moisture is being trapped in the building causing low level and high level damp, moss growth and flaking mortar, that is more than might be seen in an unheated building of this type. The solid stone floors, also inserted in 1925, might also be reducing the ability of the structure to breathe. The damage to interior plaster surfaces is particularly a threat to the surviving traces of medieval painted plaster.

Figure 2.1 Loss of internal plasters and moss growth in the western chapel, and rusting fixings in the wall
The Chapel is also vulnerable to unprecedented or heavy climate events such as high winds, heavy rain and flooding. The proximity of large trees that surround the mound could present additional risks in case of high winds or in the case of a fire.

2.2 Conservation philosophy and objectives

The policies set out in this Conservation Statement seek to ensure compliance with international and States of Jersey laws, planning policies, principles, guidelines, and best practice concerning the conservation and development of historic properties. In particular the policies pertaining to Listed Buildings and Places in the Island Plan (2011) and Planning Advice Note 6: Managing Change in Historic Buildings (2008).

There are also a range of policies, principles, and guidelines for the care of heritage sites and these are set out in a range of international documents. Clear policies for repair and restoration are set out in the international Venice Charter (1964) and the ICOMOS specialist charters, in particular the Australian ICOMOS Burra Charter (1979 – revised in 1981 and 1988), whilst the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada 1988) and the European Convention on the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Valetta 1992), both signed by the States of Jersey, are more concerned with sustainable access and interpretation. The British Standard Guide to the principles of the conservation of historic buildings (BS 7913:1998) is a valuable standard in that it sets out general conservation principles relating to historic buildings as well as providing definitions of terminology. English Heritage’s advisory publication *Informed Conservation* (Clark, 2001) makes a series of valuable suggestions on understanding historic buildings.

The following key principles are adapted in this Conservation Statement for La Hougue Bie Chapel:

▫ The qualities of later additions and changes to the fabric and structures on the site should be recognised and conserved as layers in the history of the development of the property.

▫ In exceptional circumstances, where structures, fabric or layout belonging to a certain period need to be prioritised, then these should be in favour of the structures and fabric belonging to the earlier stages of development.

▫ Proposals to remove significant historic fabric must be justified in terms of the relevant planning policies and conservation best practice, as well as in the light of maintaining the physical, visual and structural integrity of the chapel and its interpretation.

▫ No attempt should be made to restore or reinstate historic fabric where there is no firm evidence backing such conjecture.

▫ Conservation interventions should be reversible and, wherever possible, should seek to retain historic fabric.

5.3 Conservation Statement Policies

5.3.1 Cultural policies (conservation)

**Policy CP1:** Seek to preserve the setting of La Hougue Bie Chapel and the contribution that it makes to La Hougue Bie and its landscape setting.

**Implementation**

**CP1.1** Ensure that development to and around the site consider and maintain views to and from the Chapel.
**CP1.2**: Development and landscaping proposals for the site should be sensitive to the below ground archaeology, avoiding areas that are known to have substantial and significant deposits.

**Policy CP2**: Meet legal and statutory requirements having regard to Jersey Heritage’s obligations to the States of Jersey to comply with the Island’s laws; with policies contained in the Island Plan; and with supplementary planning guidance.

**Implementation**

**CP2.1** Satisfy local planning requirements, and particularly policies relating to registered historic buildings and archaeological sites.

**CP2.2** Comply with local building byelaws as far as they are relevant.

**CP2.3** Comply with Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law (1989).

**CP2.4** Comply with provisions of environmental health legislation.

**Policy CP3**: All conservation work should be carried out in accordance with the conservation philosophy stated in this document and conservation good practice, as outlined in national guidelines and international conventions.

**Implementation**

**CP3.1** Ensure that staff of Jersey Heritage, its advisors and contractors are familiar with the relevant international practice and guidelines pertaining to the historic property, and seek to apply them in all works that are proposed and undertaken, whenever it is appropriate to do so.

**CP3.2** Employ suitably qualified professionals to prepare specifications and to supervise all works.

**CP3.3** Employ appropriately skilled and qualified contractors and craftspeople with experience of similar conservation work for all repairs.

**CP3.5** Ensure access arrangements for conservation and maintenance works are carefully planned so as to cause the least damage to the historic fabric, while ensuring all visitor management and health and safety provisions are adequately met.

**CP3.6** Ensure conservation proposals relate to the management and interpretation of the property and the site as a whole.

**Policy CP4**: Make decisions concerning repair and restoration based on the best available information about the original fabric and form of the property.

**Implementation**

**CP4.1** Undertake appropriate levels of research prior to the commencement of repairs or restoration works. This might range from archival research to the specialist study of materials.

**CP4.2** If any new works are proposed which might adversely affect historic fabric, seek to mitigate those affects either by a change of design or, as a last resort, by recording historic fabric before it is removed.

**Policy CP5**: Employ the most appropriate materials and methods of construction in all repairs and works of restoration.
Implementation

**CP5.1** Ensure techniques employed for conservation works are those methods recommended by reputable conservation bodies and institutions.

**CP5.2** Whenever possible, use traditional, like-for-like, materials and methods for all repairs and restoration works. It may be necessary to employ the use of specialist materials and conservation repair techniques that may not be available in Jersey. For these reasons it may sometimes be necessary to source materials and craftsmen with appropriate skills outside Jersey.

**CP5.3** The use of modern materials as an expedient during repair is not considered good practice. However, if no alternative course of action is available then they should be capable of being removed without damage to the historic fabric.

**CP5.4** Where modern materials have been used previously and are seen to be harming the fabric or integrity of the historic building, and where removal will not cause further damage, then these should where possible be removed and new repairs using traditional materials and techniques implemented.

**Policy CP6:** Ensure that the historic property and its integrity, including any below ground material of archaeological value, is not adversely affected by alterations, new development or the provision of services.

**Implementation**

**CP6.1** Any investigation or excavation must be based on a thorough understanding of the site and commenced only after sufficient desk-based assessment has been carried out.

**CP6.2** Maintain and implement a strategy whereby services are installed with a minimal loss of historic fabric, do not disrupt below ground archaeological material and are placed in routes where they are accessible for future work.

**CP6.3** Wherever possible, ensure that functions and services that may adversely affect the historic significance and integrity of the Chapel are placed elsewhere and/or in newer buildings on the site.

**Policy CP7:** Mitigate risks and vulnerabilities affecting the cultural significance of the property by taking appropriate and timely actions.

**Implementation**

**CP7.1:** Prepare a detailed risk assessment to identify areas at risk from fire, extreme weather, high winds, heavy rainfall and flooding, and include preventative measures in the property and overall site maintenance plan.

**CP7.2:** Identify the carrying capacity for the Chapel spaces to determine limitations on visitor numbers at events.

**Policy CP8:** Ensure the long-term sustainability of the fabric by maintaining consistent records of research and work undertaken at the property.

**Implementation**

**CP8.1** Ensure that a record is made of all alterations to the fabric, including ongoing maintenance, repair and servicing works, and that this is deposited in an appropriate off-site archive and a copy maintained on site.

**CP8.2** Ensure these records are regularly updated.
Policy CP9: Encourage ongoing research on the history and architecture Chapel, and the timely dissemination of new information that comes to light.

Implementation

CP9.1 Promote further research into the Chapel, including non-destructive surveys where this may shed light on the age of various components.

CP9.2: Any excavation or physical investigation should be based on a thorough understanding of the site and commenced only after sufficient desk-based assessment has been carried out.

5.3.2 Social policies

Policy S1: Convey the significance and values of the site in various forms of interpretation and activities at the site.

Implementation

SP1.1 Provide a good range of interpretation facilities that will enhance the visitor experience, whilst maintaining the integrity of the historic property.

SP1.2: The use and activities, including those of a temporary nature, taking place in the Chapel and its surrounds should continue to be of a nature that enhances the archaeological, architectural, historic and educational value of the site.

Policy S2: Maintain a good provision of physical, social and intellectual access to the property that will promote its significance and values to a wide audience.

Implementation

SP2.1 Produce interpretive material that is easily available and accessible to a range of audiences, and considers those with physical and non-physical disabilities.

SP2.2: Designs and strategies to ensure the safety of all users of the site should be in keeping with the property and its setting, as defined in this Conservation Statement.

SP2.3: In undertaking access improvements, the presumption should be in favour of the preservation of the historic fabric and below ground archaeology, unless a convincing case can be made for alteration. Reasonable alternatives should be considered before alterations are permitted to the historic fabric.

5.3.3 Economic policies

Policy E1: To manage and develop La Hougue Bie Chapel as a sustainable heritage asset to the benefit of the local community and visitors to the island.

Implementation

EP1.3 Undertake necessary and urgent repairs to prevent further decay, based on available funding.

EP1.2 Manage the property in a way that maximises income from all existing sources, without damaging or threatening the authenticity and integrity of the Chapel.
5.3.4 Implementation and review

Jersey Heritage intends to implement the Conservation Statement Policies during its management of La Hougue Bie Chapel and comply with them during any future proposals to conserve and interpret the property.

The Conservation Statement should be reviewed at appropriate times in order to ensure compliance with changing circumstances, changing approaches to conservation, and changing visitor needs.
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