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1. Introduction

The Jersey Heritage Trust prepared this conservation statement for La Crête Fort in consultation with the Conservation Advisory Group in January-April 2006. The paper is principally concerned with the 1834 fort but the wider historic context includes other fortification structures in the vicinity. The primary purpose of the statement is to draw together readily available existing information, to set down a chronology for the site, an overview of the key surviving elements, a statement of significance, the identification of major conservation issues and a set of outline policies. It also identifies key gaps in our knowledge of the site and the issues affecting it. The conservation statement is subject to further review and refinement.
Brief history of the site

See appendix A.i for more detailed history.

Jersey has a wide range of defensive fortifications from prehistoric times through to the 1840s. The defensive works at La Crête Point have evolved from a 16th century boulevard to the construction of a fort in 1834 as part of an island wide defensive strategy against French invasion, to modifications made by the German occupying forces during the Second World War.

2.1 Pre-1834 fortification of La Crête

- Popinjay's map of Jersey, 1563 shows a boulevard in the vicinity of La Crête (see appendix A.i)

- Minutes of the States Assembly 1701-1779 refer to the construction and maintenance of coastal defences in the area (see appendix A.ii)

- Royal Jersey Militia notes entitled 'Hints on State & Fortifications of the Bays and Landing Places in Jersey, June 1778' recommends placing a Tower at the Bonne Nuit landing place, a Battery of 2 guns on the point of La Crête and an additional embrasure for the present battery to cover La Crête (see appendix A.iii)

- Map of Jersey engraved by William Faden in 1781 after the chart by Louis de la Rochette shows a Battery position at La Crête (see appendix A.iv)

- 'A list of Guard Houses and Magazines, mentioned in a report to the Defence Committee on what such installations had been erected at the island's expense, dated 24th November 1786' has an entry for 'Corps de Garde et Magasin de Bonne Nuit' (see appendix A.v)

- The Duke of Richmond Map of Jersey (surveyed from 1787, published 1795) shows an upper and lower battery, and a guardhouse at La Crête (see appendix A.vi)

- Letter from Colonel Craig to Captain English 7/8 1797 orders the repair of the Guard House at La Crête (see appendix A.vii)

- Extract from 'Report of the different Batteries in the Island of Jersey, showing the state of Repairs and defence they are in; the number and nature of guns mounted; and what Batteries are considered as in charge of the Ordnance; and which are under the care of the Island Militia' August 28th, 1797 has entries as follows: Bonne Nuit Lower Battery - earth parapet in repair with 2 x 6-pounders; Bonne Nuit Upper Battery - earth parapet in repair with 2 x 12-pounders, Havel Giffard - earth parapet in repair with 2 x 18 pounders. All are under the charge of the Island Militia (see appendix A.viii)
• J. Mills Map, 1800 indicates ranges and fields of fire for coastal forts and batteries (see appendix A.ix)

• General Don’s Report on the Island of Jersey, 1806. Written soon after his appointment as Lt Governor, General Don comments on the threat of invasion from France and the need for greater coastal defences — including the need for an additional fortified post between Bonne Nuit and Havre de Giffard (see appendix A.x)

• ‘Statement of the Different Magazines in the Island of Jersey, 1810’ states that La Crête Battery has 1 Magazine “estimated for 1810 but not yet erected” (see appendix A.xi)

• General Orders for Troops of the Line and the Militia, 1811 instruct St John’s Regiment to reinforce the posts at Bonne Nuit and Havre Giffard bays and to keep lookout along the coast to Bouley Bay and Sorel (see appendix A.xii)

• Extract from ‘North West Regiment Orderly Book from 1812 to July 1817’. The names of the Batteries around the Island in 1814 include La Crête with 2 x 18-pounders (see appendix A.xiii)

• Extract from ‘A Respectable Little Work’ by Martin Bauc: La Crête Point was fortified by the States in 1813 - originally called Havre Giffard Battery it mounted two captured French naval 18-pounder guns served by a magazine, a store and a guard house. Bonne Nuit Battery was further defended by an Upper (Havreais) and Lower Battery each with two captured French naval 12-pounder guns, a magazine and a store. There was also a guardhouse at the Upper Battery. The barracks (on the site of the Choual Roc Hotel) accommodated regular troops acting as a mobile reserve and reinforcement for the batteries plus the other fortifications at Frémont Point, Poud’Ars, Vicar Point and Les Huvets. Centralised control was provided by a signal post at Le Mont Maudit. After the defeat of Napoleon, some of these batteries were reduced in size or abandoned but La Crête retained both its 18-pounder cannon (see appendix C.i)

• Map of Jersey, engraved by S. Nicole from a survey by William Plowman’s Account of Jersey, 1817 shows a battery with a store to the rear (see appendix A.xiv)

• Extract from ‘A Respectable Little Work’ by Martin Bauc: By 1831 a new French threat was emerging. Lt Col. Lewis, commanding Royal Engineer, reported that many fortifications were in ruins having been neglected during 15 years of peace. If new ones were to be built they should be better sited to provide concentrated fire at strategic locations instead of being scattered along the coast. They should be screened from attack from the rear (see appendix C.i)
• Extract from a letter from Lt Col Lewis to Lt Col Fanshawe 27/7 1831 'At Bonne Nuit I propose to submit also that 2 Batteries should be placed, instead of 5 mounting from 1 Gun to 3 each, one Battery to be placed in front of the Government Barracks of 2 Guns on barbette', and the other at the point La Grèle of 6 Guns enclosed in the rear by a defensible Guard House, two on Traversing Platforms, which point will command both Bonne Nuit Bay & Harbour Giffard' (see appendix A.xv)

• Report on the coast defences from Corbiere to Razz by Lt Col Lewis 18 October 1831 proposes that by occupying La Grèle Point with an enclosed battery of 6 guns capable of covering both Bonne Nuit and Havre Giffard Bays, and placing 2 guns in front of the barracks, this area would be much better protected (see appendix A.xv)

• Extract from a Minute from Lt Col Lewis to M Gen Pilkington, Insp Gen Fortifications 16/1 1833 'I considered the critical situation Jersey would be placed in in the event of a war with France since steam navigation has been brought into use, and that Jersey is open to attack from France, from Cherbourg to Brest, and might be attacked simultaneously from them, & the intermediate tide harbours, and circumstances would occasionally give an enemy the command of the sea for a few days with the aid of Steam, particularly as there are more but tide harbours in Jersey not capable of containing Ships of War, and only one safe roadstead which is open, and by making demonstrations on two of three points render doubtful for a movable Field Artillery being at the points required; Under these impressions I have suggested that one or more strong enclosed batteries should be placed in every bay according to its extent, to be well protected by a strong guard so that every part of the Coast accessible in Jersey should be brought under the fire of the batteries, and that no serious disembarkation in any force could take place before the movable force was brought down' (see appendix A.xv)

2.2 1834 Fort and later abandonment

• Extract from a letter from Lt Col Lewis GBE, and Lt Col. Sinclair CRA at Elizabeth Castle to R Byham Esq, Secretary to Board of Ordnance 28/10 1835 notes that La Grèle Battery was completed at the expense of the States in 1834 to house 2 x 18-pounders and 4 x 12-pounders (see appendix A.xv)

• Report by Lt Col Oldfield on Coast Defences 9 March 1837 comments on La Grèle Battery and Guard House, "this post is situated as to see into the bays of Bonne Nuit and Havre Giffard is calculated for 8 guns, an officer & 30 men, with a magazine for 40 barrels of powder and is a respectable post erected in the year 1835. The tank will contain 540 gallons of water." (see appendix A.xv)

• Extract from 'A Respectable Little Work' by Martin Bruce: The fort was built in 1834 at a cost of £971 - the contractor was M. Slater. There was
accommodation for 1 officer and 30 other ranks from the Royal Jersey Militia. The planned armament of two 18-pounders and four 12-
-pounders had not yet arrived. In 1837, the new Lieutenant Governor wanted an update on those improvements and so a report was
produced by the new commanding Royal Engineer, Lt Col. Oldfield. The principal work at Bonne Nuit, La Crête Fort, needed only minor
works such as repairing roofs damaged by storms, casing doors, windows and shutters, and painting outside iron work (see appendix C.1)

- "Plan and Section of La Crête Battery and Guard-house, Bonne Nuit" by Lt Col. Oldfield, 12th March 1837 (see appendix A.xvi)

- Extract from ‘A Respectable Little Work’ by Martin Briere: In 1840, Lt Col. English reported that La Crête Fort was in good order and ready to receive its guns – which still hadn’t been issued. When they did arrive two would be mounted on traversing equipment and four would fire through embrasures. The chief disadvantage of the fort was its vulnerability to fire from the high ground in the rear (see appendix C.1)

- Extract from Sir John Le Gourlay’s Diary, 30 May 1845, ‘The French are going to carry on the railway from Rouen to Charlebourg and then from there to St Germains – just opposite Gorey, we might be invaded in an hour from thence... were we invaded in our present state we should inevitably be taken.’ (Jersey Archive ref: J2/60/21/3/70)

- Extract from ‘Return of Guns in place’ 16/2 1848. An entry for the number of Guns mounted in January 1848 records that there were 2 x
32 pounders at La Crête Battery (see appendix A.xv)

- Extract from ‘A Respectable Little Work’ by Martin Briere: By 1848 La
Crête had received six 32-pounders. Two of 55-cwt were already installed on iron garrison carriages, themselves mounted on iron
traversing platforms, but four of 32 cwt were stored at La Crête ready for mounting on wooden garrison carriages. It was envisaged that the Militia and Volunteers would defend the shore forts thereby delaying an invaders’ approach to Fort Regent, itself holding out until relief arrived from England (see appendix C.1)

- The Hugh Godfrey Map of Jersey, 1849 shows a stylised plan of the
site with an access track leading to the barracks and to Gifford Bay
(see appendix A.xvii)

- Correspondence regarding minor repairs to La Crête 1854-1857 (see
appendix A.xviii)

- Extract from a letter from Major General Douglas 10 November 1880
comments on minor fortifications built in the 1830s including La Crête
Fort, "I consider their position and form of construction to be as good as
they can be. Under the title of the Naval Ordnance of the present day |
apprehend these batteries would be untenable. If preserved in their present state they require a considerable outlay for the scraping of their sea fronts. I think however that they should be replaced by earthwork batteries on the higher level. They are really miserable works.” (see appendix A.xxix)

- Map of Jersey surveyed by Staff Commander J Richards RN, 1967 shows a stylised plan of the Battery and Guardhouse referred to as a ‘fort’ (see appendix A.xx)

- Print of Bonne Nuit Bay, Jersey by F J Oulds (1817-1885) showing La Crête Fort and possibly the guardhouse on the slopes (see appendix B.I)

- Print of Bonne Nuit Bay, Jersey – nineteenth century - showing view across the bay to La Crête Fort and Giffard Bay beyond (see appendix B.II)

- La Crête Fort lost its military importance in the second half of the 19th century and was abandoned.

- Photograph of Pathway to La Crête Fort, 1995 (Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJP/035854) (see appendix B.iii)

- Photograph of view looking east from Bonne Nuit by Francis de Faye (1890-1910) (Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJP/036060) (see appendix B.iv)

- Photograph of Bonne Nuit Bay by Francis Foul (1890-1930) (Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJP/032761) (see appendix B.v)

- Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1939 shows the Fort (disused) (see appendix A.xxii)

2.3 German Occupation and post-war summer residence

- Extract from 'A Respectable Little Work' by Martin Bruce: During the Occupation, the fort was reinforced by the German forces as Resistance Point La Crête. It was armed with a 3.7cm PAK anti-tank gun, a MG 34 7.92mm heavy machine gun, 2 light machine guns, a mortar and a 30cm searchlight. The site was manned by 5 NCOs and 17 other ranks (see appendix C.i)

- La Crête Fort was placed at the disposal of the Lieutenant-Governor for use as a summer residence in 1956 (see appendix C.ii)

- Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1981 shows the Fort (disused) (see appendix A.xxii)
Photographs of the fort 1996-2006 (Planning and Environment Department Historic Buildings Register ref: JN0138) (see appendix B.v)

Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey. 2003 (Planning and Environment Department) (see appendix A.xxii)

2006. The Lieutenant Governor relinquishes use of the building. La Crête Fort is owned by the Public of the Island of Jersey under the administration of the Jersey Heritage Trust.

3 Overview of the key surviving elements

La Crête Fort is built on a headland between Grouville Bay and Giffard Bay. The fort is essentially a gun battery enclosed in the rear by a defensible guardhouse.

A dry ditch, 10 feet deep and between 9 and 20 feet wide, originally separated the walls of the guardhouse from the hill slopes behind the fort. The ditch is now infilled with a series of nineteenth century rooms, accessed via a side door at lower ditch level. Originally a bridge would have provided access across the ditch. The 1834 entrance doorway is raised at second floor level and flanked by a short squinched wall with gun loopholes. The doorway leads to a flat platform supported on the brick sills of the guardrooms below.

The guardhouse is single storey and comprises three vaulted rooms. The walls are granite with dressed stones to openings. The arched vaults are in brick. The original doors and windows have been lost. A granite-flagged passageway runs along the north face of the guardrooms. A door and window have been punched through the back wall of the middle guardroom to provide access to the new 'ditch' rooms.

A wide set of granite steps leads up from the guardrooms to the battery yard although now partly interrupted by a later German structure.

Adjoining to the east of the guardrooms is the magazine. The building has a parabolic plan form and vaulted roof all in dressed granite. The gullets are also cut from granite and curved to match the shape of the walls. The building appears to be two storey but the lower part is built over an outcrop, leaving a single upper room accessed via the roof level of the guardrooms. A large granite buttress supports the east side of the magazine. There are small ventilation holes around the building. Larger windows of concrete construction have been inserted on the south and west faces of the building.

The walls forming the battery are granite rubble with dressed stones to openings and steps, and a granite flagged floor. The southern part of the battery consists of four large embrasures for cannon. Two of the embrasures survive in their original 1834 form but two were modified by the German forces.
and now sit inside concrete shelters. A reinforced concrete emplacement was also inserted behind the screen wall.

The northerly part of the battery consists of two traversing platforms with circular plan form. The original layout of the upper platform largely survives with the addition of a small reinforced concrete gun emplacement. The lower platform is accessed via an enclosed granite passageway. This platform has been overlaid with a concrete structure designed for a searchlight – although the 1834 layout appears to survive beneath.

Outside of the fort are two reinforced concrete emplacements built by the German forces. Above on an outcrop to the south of the ditch is a mortared emplacement disguised by a re-used granite wall. Below on the rocky slopes to the west of the fort is an emplacement covered over with rough granite as camouflage.

The key elements of the site are:

- The magazine
- The vaulted guardrooms with screen wall above
- The battery yard with embrasures and German modifications
- The traversing platforms
- The dry ditch with twentieth century rooms
- The external German emplacements

4. Statement of significance

4.1 Archaeological significance

There has been two artefacts found at La Crête which indicate some prehistoric human activity in the area: a stone implement (La Hougue Bie Museum ref. JERSM/A/0005798); stone axe polisher (La Hougue Bie Museum ref. JERSM/A/0005799). Also in the collection is a lead musket ball found at the site (La Hougue Bie Museum ref. JERSM/A/0005800).

Consideration should be given to an assessment of La Crête Fort and the earlier fortification structures at La Crête by a professional archaeological.

4.2 Historical and architectural significance

La Crête Fort retains its historical authenticity and completeness as an 1834 fort with the architectural integrity of the buildings in close to their original form and physical context.

La Crête Fort has survived largely unaltered and is clearly of regional significance. When viewed as an integral part of the Channel Island-wide network of 18th and 19th century fortifications it is of international significance as an example of a ‘fortified zone in a coastal setting’ (A Brown & B Lane).
The fort is strategically sited and represents a stage in the evolution of military deployment in defence of Banne Nuit Bay and La Havre Giffard against threatened invasion from France. It is important evidence illustrating the history of fortifications and the development of defensive theory and design in the context of a changing military environment (including the perceived threat and opposing technology) extending into the 1940s.

The fort can be seen as an icon of Jersey’s strong sense of individuality and self-determination, demonstrated by the ancient requirement to bear arms in the Island’s defence in return for certain privileges – Militia service and the requirement for parishes to pay for defence works being a significant expression of such action.

It is also of historic significance as evidence of Jersey’s allegiance to the English Crown and support of past English interests.

"It’s history has been a microcosm of military architecture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, reflecting changing demands and ideas and technologies, the currents of international politics and national economies over almost two hundred years" – M Brécq.

4.3 Ecological and landscape significance

The fort sits in a prominent position in a coastal location of high landscape value.

The setting of the fort is undamaged and its relationship to the landscape for defensive purposes – such as the direction and angle of fire for guns and views to vulnerable points - can still be read.

The vegetated areas around and inside the fort provide good examples of species rich short maritime turf. These areas should not be disturbed, nor should any vegetation be removed in any area without consultation and written agreement from the Environment Division. A strict injunction against building fires or carrying out other activities such as during building works, which damage this vegetation, should be placed on all users of the fort.

The fort is one of the places in Jersey where wall lizards (Podarcis muralis) are found. This animal is protected under the Conservation of Wildfife (Jersey) Law 2000 and any action which might damage them or destroy their nests or dunes could result in prosecution. A written method statement detailing all work planned in or near any areas where lizards are found must be approved in writing by the principal Ecologist of the Environment Department before being carried out. This is to satisfy the requirements of the Conservation of Wildlife (Jersey) Law 2000 (as amended) and is in addition to any necessary permission required by the Planning authority. No other work should take place on walls without full consultation with the Environment division.

Results from local studies have defined the basic requirements for survival for P. muralis, i.e. food sources, basking, shelter and refuge.
Refuges in the form of crevices is important within walls, although cover is not too important on walls.

For areas around the fort, vegetation needs to be short, but to provide some cover from the elements some areas of longer grass should be retained.

Inhabited walls are likely to be of a southerly aspect to maximise the available sunshine, although the type of food available does not appear to matter too much. Vegetation cover immediately around forts relates to an important aspect of lizard behaviour, that is the 'shuffling' during the day to regulate body temperature after morning basking, as well as providing an intermediate level of vegetation cover to facilitate efficient foraging and cover from predators.

A certain amount of open space around inhabited areas is also important, so as to provide the shade 'mosaic' previously mentioned, enabling the regulation of lizard's body temperature within a short distance of shelter.

Correlation of numbers of lizards with wall crevices was positive, suggesting more lizards associated with more crevices available. Every effort should be made to retain un-pointed areas of wall.

Wall lizards enter a state of winter torpor between about November first and March first. No pointing or any other work to walls should be done between these times in case lizards are buried in the wall.

4.4 Cultural significance

The most prominent post military use of La Crête Fort has been as a 'holiday home' for the Lieutenant Governor. Visitors are also attracted to the site because of the historical and architectural interest of the building and the views it affords across Bonnie Nuit Bay and Giffard Bay.

5. Identification of major conservation issues

The following is an assessment of the way in which the significance of La Crête Fort could be vulnerable:

- Care must be taken to ensure that the significance of La Crête Fort is not eroded through neglect. The fort is in an exposed coastal location and ill-maintained structures will be subject to water ingress and salt laden deposits leading to damp conditions and damage from insect and fungal infestations as well as intrusive plant growth.

- Without proper maintenance and repair of the fort and its grounds, there will be physical damage to the fabric and thereby to the significance of the fort.

- A potential problem is a lack of continuing and long-term interest in the fort and the subsequent reduction in resources to properly maintain it in
years to come, especially if appropriate and successful new uses cannot be found for the site.

- Care must be taken to ensure that the significance of La Crête Fort is not eroded through inappropriate repairs and alterations. The use of inappropriate materials or methods of alteration and repair will be damaging to the character of the fort and will contribute to further decline in the integrity of the historic fabric and structure. Good quality works are required that do not damage the integrity or durability of the historic fabric.

- A condition survey is needed to identify the range of problems throughout the fort e.g., whether there is water ingress through walls, roofs, and windows, loose masonry or cementitious pointing.

- The significance of the site is potentially vulnerable to legislative and regulatory requirements that may be applied if a new use is found for it, e.g., compliance with building byelaws or provision for people with special needs.

- There is a potential conflict between different types of significance at the fort, for example the requirements for repairing the structure and removing vegetation against the need to protect habitats.

6. Statutory and policy framework

6.1 International Conventions

Since 1987, the States of Jersey has been a signatory to the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe 1965 (Brasov Convention). This Convention places broad obligations on member states to introduce legislative, policy, and other measures to protect the architectural heritage. The States is also a signatory to the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, 1992 (Valletta Convention) which imposes similar obligations in respect of the archaeological heritage.

6.2 The Island Planning (Jersey) Law, 1964 (as amended)

- Planning Permission will be required for change of use and for any works classed as development.

- Sites of Special Interest: under Article 11, the States of Jersey may designate as Sites of Special Interest, buildings and places of public importance by reason of special zoological, botanical, archaeological, architectural, artistic, cultural, geological, historical, scientific or traditional interest. Designation provides legal protection under Article 12 against demolition and damaging alteration and control over other intrusive actions such as metal detecting, the defacing of the site and the removal of plants and animals. This equates to the type of
protection that is afforded to Scheduled Ancient Monuments in England.

La Crête Fort is in the process of being designated as a Site of Special Interest (see appendix D). In the meantime, the Trust has agreed to treat the site as if it were already a designated Site of Special Interest. SSI Permission is therefore required before there is any physical intervention in the fort's site and structure.

6.3 The Jersey Island Plan 2002

The Jersey Island Plan, approved by the States in July 2002, contains policies specifically intended to offer protection for Sites of Special Interest and for archaeological resources. Policies G11 and G12 are of particular relevance. Policy G11 states, among other things, that there will be a presumption against development that would have an adverse impact on the special character of a Site of Special Interest, whilst Policy G12 makes provisions relating to the preservation, safeguarding and recording of archaeological remains, as appropriate. Policy G13 makes a presumption in favour of the preservation of the architectural and historic character and integrity of registered buildings and places. Policy 1R3 presumes in favour of proposals for the development of new, or extensions to existing, tourism and cultural attractions, providing certain criteria are satisfied.

The Plan notes that La Crête Fort lies within the 'Zone of Outstanding Character' (C4). This is defined as parts of the coast and countryside considered to be of national and international importance, specifically "the cliffs and heath land of the north coast... with its spectacular coastal scenery and sense of wilderness, geological and geomorphologic features, bird life and exceptional habitats, archaeological sites, common land, modern fortifications and high recreational value" (JIP 2002 5.36). As such the area merits the highest levels of protection.

6.4 Supplementary planning guidance

The Interim Policies for the Conservation of Historic Buildings were adopted by the Planning & Environment Committee in 1998 and will continue to provide clarification on matters relating to the built heritage until it is replaced by new Supplementary Planning Guidance. Interim Policy HB12 is of particular relevance and states: "There is a presumption in favour of the preservation of the fabric, internal structure, plan form, historic interiors and fittings, as well as the contribution to the townscape or countryside, of registered buildings that are designated as Sites of Special Interest; therefore permission will not normally be granted for the internal alteration... of a designated SSI, or works to the exterior, if they would adversely affect its special interest or character."
6.5 Building Byelaws

Some work at the fort will have to comply with Building Byelaws as required by the law.

6.6 Conservation of Wildlife (Jersey) Law 2000

Work to and use of the fort must be compatible with the provisions of the Wildlife Law. This Law makes provision for the protection of specified wild animals, birds and plants and their habitats, including wall lizards, and empowers the Environment Department to grant licences in respect of activities that would otherwise be prohibited.

6.7 Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law, 1989

Methods of repair work and the safety of staff and visitors will be subject to Health and Safety Legislation. It is a matter for property owners and those managing sites to ensure that relevant health and safety requirements are satisfied, under the provisions of the Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law, 1989.

6.8 Other relevant guidance

The States of Jersey and the Jersey Heritage Trust are obliged to work within Jersey law, approved local planning policy and published advice. Any works proposed for La Crête Fort will have to comply with statutory and policy regulations outlined above.

Real current practice from other jurisdictions also provides valuable guidance. Other documents of particular value are mentioned below:

The Venice and Burra Charters. In formulating a policy for alterations it is useful to have an understanding of the internationally accepted standards for conservation. The Venice and Burra Charters are most useful and their acceptance and use in the UK makes their guidance appropriate in Jersey.

British Standard Guide to the Principles of the Conservation of Historic Buildings BS/003:1993. This is a valuable standard in that it sets out general conservation principles relating to historic buildings as well as providing definitions of terminology (see Appendix I).

7 Conservation policies

7.1 Conservation philosophy

La Crête Fort's original military role is now defunct. Potential new educational and recreational uses makes some change inevitable but any changes must always be subject to the constraint that the significance of the fort must not be materially damaged.
7.2 Policy for recording and mitigation strategies

When any work is proposed to maintain, repair or alter La Crête Fort, the Jersey Heritage Trust will:

- carry out a full and detailed record in drawings and photographs sufficient to show the nature of the area affected with an assessment of the impact on the historic fabric and the ecology
- draw up a brief in advance of any physical investigation or excavation in accordance with the Trust’s archaeological protocol (see Appendix E) and an ecological mitigation strategy to be agreed with the Environment Department
- obtain Planning permission, Building Bye-law permission and SSI permission to undertake the works
- carry out the work in accordance with the brief and any conditions attached to the above permissions
- make a full record of the work in progress and deposit the detailed written, drawn and photographic records at the Jersey Archive, followed by appropriate publication

7.3 Policy for maintenance and repair

The priority for the Jersey Heritage Trust is to maintain the physical fabric of the fort to ensure its future survival by using traditional materials and construction methods appropriate to the site. Consideration should also be given to correcting past ‘mistakes’ that are damaging to the significance of the building.

In order to achieve this, the Trust will:

- carry out a quinquennial condition survey of the fort
- draw up an annual programme of works together with a phased maintenance schedule
- use contractors and specialists with appropriate experience of building conservation work to achieve the best possible craftsmanship and selection of materials
- carry out repairs under competent supervision and regular inspection including an archaeological watching brief if required

7.4 Policy for reconstruction and alteration

- consideration will be given to appropriate new uses for the fort to ensure that it continues to play a role in Jersey society whilst maintaining its character and significance
- reconstruction work may be justified where it is desirable for the maintenance of the structure and where it completes a damaged
element; the work must be carried out harmoniously with the original whilst being, upon close inspection, distinguishable from it

- reconstruction work can only be carried out where there is evidence of the historic form of the structure through a detailed study of the building and its archaeology - reconstruction work should stop where conjecture begins

- consideration will be given to improving visitor interpretation and facilities at La Crête Fort only if this does not involve the loss of historic fabric or damage to the character and significance of the site; any new work should be easily identifiable and of the highest quality

- all reconstruction work and alterations must adhere to the principle of ‘reversibility’

- consideration will be given to improving access (physical and intellectual) to the site for all people, including those with special needs

- consideration will be given to security provision at the fort to ensure that the significance of the site is not damaged through vandalism or other intrusive activities

7.5 Policy for service provision

There is already some service provision at the fort including electricity, water and toilets. The Jersey Heritage Trust will ensure that:

- the survival of historic fabric and below ground archaeology will take precedence over the installation of additional services;

- any additional services are to be installed with minimum intervention with historic fabric and in routes where they are accessible for future maintenance / renewal work;

- cables and pipes are surface mounted except where they can be laid within modern floor structures or in other accessible voids or ducts.

7.6 Policy for interpretation

Consideration should be given to the dissemination of knowledge about the fort, such as the production of a multi-lingual guidebook, resource material for educational visits and a programme of events that complement the fort and contribute to the understanding of its history.

8 Summary of proposed additional research and analysis

| An assessment of the fort and the earlier fortifications by a professional archaeologist. | To be undertaken by the Jersey Heritage Trust |
| A measured survey and recording of the fort. | To be undertaken by the Jersey Heritage Trust |
A condition survey to identify the range of problems throughout the fort.

Implement a quinquennial condition survey of the fort.

Draw up an annual programme of works together with a phased maintenance schedule.

Ecological mitigation strategy.

Designation as a Site of Special Interest.

8 Implementation and review

- The Jersey Heritage Trust has undertaken to produce a conservation statement for La Crête Fort according to current best practice (as set out in the English Heritage guideline ‘Informed Conservation’ 2001).

- In order to consult with other interested parties with relevant knowledge, the Jersey Heritage Trust has set up a Conservation Advisory Group to comment on and contribute knowledge to the structure and content of the conservation statement, and thereafter to monitor proposals for change, to ensure upstream consultation with relevant bodies on changes, and to advise the JHT on matters relating to the conservation of La Crête Fort.

- The Conservation Advisory Group comprises representatives from the National Trust, the Société Jersiaise, the Channel Islands Occupation Society, the Planning and Environment Department’s Historic Buildings Officer, an officer from the Environment Department and the project team from the Jersey Heritage Trust.

- The Jersey Heritage Trust Board of Trustees will formally adopt the conservation statement for La Crête Fort.

- The conservation statement will be regularly reviewed and refined every 3 years.
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(Jersey Archive ref: C/3/32)

It is in resolution of April 1701, Mr. Thomas Nelder, in a letter, having reminded the States, having argued the case, with respect, of the need to be well prepared for defence of the country, was thinking of the necessity of provision to take on unforeseen events, and was invited to write to the Office of the Librarian for London, which was to be passed through more secure hands. In 1711 the States appointed Thomas Pearson as captain, under whose orders the States were advised to provide the necessary expenses of £80, charged with paying £100 for the forts.

It is noted that at an Assembly of the States on 25th August 1702 Jean Gaultier Drapier as Commissioner, had the Commissioners of the Board of Ordnance, the repair of Bouquins and Grand Hous were turned to the Island for the maintenance of the island for the defence of the island. He was to be on a notification in London that the reports are completed. The States resolved to give the necessary approval to the orders of the States.

From our letter to December 1716, the States requested H. & Mr. Nelder to see such platforms and recommended work was to be done, and permitted that a part of the Island be made for the necessary repairs, and that such repairs and maintenance be at the expense of the States on the Island. In October 1718 the States resolved to have an ordnance at the expense of the States on the Island. In the summer of 1719 it was petitioned to the States and approved in which case a Commission was set up to negotiate contracts for the work to be executed. The same year the States resolved to have the ordnance at the expense of the States on the Island for the maintenance of the island. In November, St. Odern's fort and St. Catherine's fort have been completed at the expense of the States, and the States were not yet completed. The same year, the States completed the work, and the States were not yet completed. The same year, the States completed the work, and the States were not yet completed. The same year, the States completed the work, and the States were not yet completed. The same year, the States completed the work, and the States were not yet completed. The same year, the States completed the work, and the States were not yet completed.

In December 1719, the States resolved to make an ordnance in the States and considered the work of transforming the 15 guns mounted on the turrets around the Island by the end of the year, and to prepare H. & Mr. Nelder for a price of £80, offering the installation of such ordnance, and as soon as possible, the ordnance to be ready. The States resolved to have £300 paid to H. & Mr. Nelder, to install the ordnance, to have the necessary work done, and to pay the necessary expenses for the future, which he had been engaged in the Island for the ordnance work, and the States were not yet completed.

In September 1720, the States resolved to have £300 paid to H. & Mr. Nelder, to install the ordnance, to have the necessary work done, and to pay the necessary expenses for the future, which he had been engaged in the Island for the ordnance work, and the States were not yet completed.
A.iii

Royal Jersey Militia notes entitled 'Hints on state & Fortifications of the Bays and
Landing Places in Jersey, June 1778' (Jersey Archive ref: L/296/M.230)
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La Goupe Bay
N. of St Catherine's
From Vert de la Goupe point is about 5000
yards. It is divided into two bays. Point N. La
camp or
Ships can anchor here at ½ mile or less.

Lebray Bay South of St Catherine's
The entrance is deep near the north point of 2000
yards in strong & well sheltered.

South Harbour
A well known Harbour and landing ships can
anchor within ½ mile but the ground strong.

Huney Bay
Not large
Ships can come pretty near. But ground very strong
& well entrenched. Lines command the landing 2000
to 2000 yards.

Bonne Nuit
The ground here is very strong & good part
immovable, to be well defended from North by
field pieces and mutability. Hay small

Page 5

So Then
Large open sandy bay of 4 miles accessible only on
the South side except a small Fisher Harbour on
the North.

St Helier & St Aubert
Umpred 1500 & sandy & easy way. Had
considerable little long. Ships may come near to
point of the churchyard on the West strong part.

There should be a Battery of 3 guns at Montebello
on the South Hill over La Goupe.
At Githa on the Hill a Tower for signals by
Discovery, it may stop all the way from St Helier to
St Malo.

1 Tower on Rocks.

1 Tower near edge of Corn Field center of the bay.
Battery up on hill a good position to hear down on S.P. By Plot of Encampment
required ships. French towards La Goupe.

1 Tower on Bank & Chine in an ordinary
Battery on little eminence would equalize &
made a flanking battery against landing.

A third House building and tower on the Road.
1 Tower on point of said new Battery
1 Light on point behind said Battery.

1 Tower here on the shore at landing place a Battery
of 2 guns at a point near the point of La Goupe between St Helier & St Aubert
Mortars to prevent battery & Landward towards
La Goupe.

3 Towers
Grand House new building to be a Tower.

Should there be 4 towers.
A Battery on Pt. d'Helier above another on Pt. d'Helier
Colonn. on the neck behind the present Battery
counter the landing in the part of the Bay
Westward.
Map of Jersey engraved by William Faden in 1781 after the chart by Louis Stanislas de la Rochette
(Jersey Archive ref: L/F/120/A/72)
A list of Guard Hous[es and Magazines] mentioned in a report to the Defence Committee on what such installations had been erected at the Island’s expense. The report is dated 24th November 1786.

Corps-de-Garde du Milieu dans la Baie de St-Guen
- du Nord
- et Magasin de Bouche Nuit

Maison de Hôtel à la Hougue Fauteur
- Mont Marie
- au Houley

Corps-de-Garde des Huitées
- du Houley
- de Noz du Bout
- et Magasin du Bouguillon
- de St. Sinon, a la pointe de la Rosaque
- de Roquenayt
- de la Collette
- sur la Chaussée de St. Helier
- de St. Aubin
- de Bouley

Lespin de la Gatte

Traversing platforms were fitted by the 12th May, 1801 etc.

La Course
Versuit St. Martin
Le Rue St. Aubin, Bay.
Duke of Richmond map of Jersey (surveyed from 1787, published 1795)
(Jersey Archive ref: D/AL/A2)
Sir,

In conformity with your desire I have the honor to report your estimate of the great weight I have had in the construction of the three principal works in the Commendation of the Board of General.

The War Office (after major M. Lewis, 2006)

A. VII

Public Record Office - War Office records 607/42a (transcribed by major M. Lewis, 2006)

Situation

The situation is very critical. The enemy is advancing rapidly towards the main line of defense. The enemy has established a strong position on the river bank, around which a large force has been concentrated. It is believed that they are preparing to launch a major assault.

The enemy's main force consists of three divisions: the First Division, the Second Division, and the Third Division. The First Division is positioned on the left, the Second Division on the right, and the Third Division in the center.

The enemy is using heavy artillery and machine guns to support their advance. They have also deployed a large number of infantry troops.

The enemy's objective is to capture the town of X and establish a foothold on the other side of the river.

The enemy is expected to launch their main assault tomorrow morning.

The situation is critical. Immediate action is required to protect the town of X.

I recommend the following measures:

1. Send reinforcements to the town of X immediately.
2. Establish a strong defensive position around the town of X.
3. Deploy heavy artillery to support the defense.
4. Prepare for a counterattack.

I am confident that with your support, we can repel the enemy and secure the town of X.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Rank]
Extract from 'Report of the different Batteries in the Island of Jersey, showing the state of Repairs and defence they are in, the number and nature of guns mounted, and what Batteries are considered as in charge of the Ordnance; and which are under the care of the Island Militia' August 25th 1797 (copied from the Board of Ordnance letter boxes and held at the Société Jersiaise Library ref: M20/10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>State of Repair</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Grey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**

- All repairs to be completed by 5 PM today.
- Please ensure all tools are returned to the tool shed by the end of the day.
The destruction was general in detail, but not in extent. The main point of contact was the bridge over the river, the position of the defeated Army was in the stone fortifications of the river. The bridge was the key point in the battle, and its capture was attempted in a desperate fashion.

The Battle was under the command of General McClellan (1858-1861). The Union Army, commanded by General Ulysses S. Grant, sustained heavy losses. The Union Army was under the command of General Grant.
J Mills Map, 1800
(Public Record Office: War Office records 78/1787)
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Letter from Lt General Don to the Earl of Spencer 22 May 1806
(transcribed by Major M Lees, 2006)
(Jersey Archive ref: U/F/95/A/2)

Letter from Lt General Don to Certain Officers 29 June 1806
(transcribed by Major M Lees, 2006)
(Jersey Archive ref: U/F/95/A/4/1)
To the commanders of the fleet were ordered to take into consideration the importance of the naval operations that were about to commence. The fleet was to be divided into two parts, with one part under the command of Admiral de Grasse and the other under Admiral de Crèvecoeur. Each admiral was to have his own fleet, and they were to operate independently to achieve the objectives of the campaign.

 Admiral de Grasse was to lead his fleet towards the French fleet stationed off the coast of South Carolina. The French fleet was under the command of Admiral de Crèvecoeur and was composed of several warships.

The two fleets were to operate in coordination, with Admiral de Grasse leading the offensive against the French fleet. Admiral de Crèvecoeur was to provide support from a distance, using his fleet to disrupt the French supply lines and communication routes.

The objective of the campaign was to force the French to withdraw their forces from the American colonies and to prevent them from reinforcing their troops in the southern region. The success of the campaign would depend on the coordination and strategic planning of the two admirals.

In conclusion, the commanders were to exercise caution and make use of every opportunity to gain the upper hand in the upcoming conflict. The success of the campaign would depend on the ability of the commanders to adapt to the changing circumstances and to make quick decisions.

The commanders were to ensure that their ships were well-equipped and that their crews were trained and ready for battle. The fleet was to be ready to move at a moment's notice, and the commanders were to maintain close communication with each other to coordinate their efforts.

The commanders were to ensure that their ships were well-equipped and that their crews were trained and ready for battle. The fleet was to be ready to move at a moment's notice, and the commanders were to maintain close communication with each other to coordinate their efforts.

In conclusion, the commanders were to exercise caution and make use of every opportunity to gain the upper hand in the upcoming conflict. The success of the campaign would depend on the ability of the commanders to adapt to the changing circumstances and to make quick decisions.

The commanders were to ensure that their ships were well-equipped and that their crews were trained and ready for battle. The fleet was to be ready to move at a moment's notice, and the commanders were to maintain close communication with each other to coordinate their efforts.

In conclusion, the commanders were to exercise caution and make use of every opportunity to gain the upper hand in the upcoming conflict. The success of the campaign would depend on the ability of the commanders to adapt to the changing circumstances and to make quick decisions.
In May 1753

From the river Usud to the Wadat, 3/4 of the land is level, one 1/2 of it is marsh, and 1/4 of it is water. The height of the land is about 30 feet, and the width is about 2 miles. The land is divided into 4 parts, each 1 mile wide, by the river Usud. The first part is called the Usud area, the second the Wadat area, the third the"Crawford" area, and the fourth the "King's" area.

In June 1753

The Usud River is the main source of water in the area. It flows from the north to the south, and is about 10 miles long. The river is shallow and wide, and is bordered by high cliffs on both sides. The cliffs are about 100 feet high and cover a distance of 2 miles.

The Usud River is navigable for small boats, and is used for transportation. The water is clear and free from debris. The river is a source of water for the local population, and is used for irrigation and fishing.

The river Usud is bordered by a strip of land about 1 mile wide, which is used for agriculture. The land is fertile and well watered. The crops grown include wheat, rice, and vegetables. The area is also used for grazing and livestock farming.

The Usud River is connected to the sea by a series of canals and channels, which allow for the transport of goods and materials. The channels are wide and deep, and are suitable for large ships. The river is an important route for trade and commerce, and is used by traders from all over the region.
Letter from [Name] to [Recipient] regarding [Subject] dated [Date]

[Body of the letter]

[Signoff]
ORDRES GÉNÉRAUX
POUR LES

Troupes de
LIGNE
ET LA
MILICE.

JERSEY.

P. Malvacé, imprimeur
1914.
ORDRES GÉNÉRAUX

PAR LA

TROISIÈME DE LIGNE

PAR LA
M.I.L.C. I.

D'APRÈS que la nécessité de l'île exige un arrangement préalable des troupes, qui facilite le premier rassemblement de corps considérables pour s'opposer à l'ennemi, & défendre les parties de ville les plus exposées à une descente, & afin que chaque individu soit averti de son devoir en cas d'alarme & de bataille, les ordres suivants sont donnés:

Toutes les Flèches dans cette île sont pour l'île de Trinité Diodère.

La 1ère Division du Division du Nord, sera composée des Troupes établies dans la baie de Grenville, avec celles qui sont postées sur la côte opposée. Cette division jusqu'à Rochefort inclusivement, & des régiments situés du Nord & de l'Île.

La 2ème Division du Division de l'Île, sera composée des Troupes établies dans le château Elizabeth, sur le montagne de la ville, dans les deux parts forts sur le flanc du Sud, dans les églises de Départements, dans celles de la chassure, du nord de l'église de Dr. Veullie & celles dans la baie de St. Antin, avec celles qui sont stationnées sur la côte, depuis Rochefort jusqu'à la pointe de Noirvoin inclusivement, & des Bo-
dans la Grève de l’Eau, à peu près de la côte à droite jusqu’à la pointe de Sourd & à gauche jusqu’à Plénoit.

Le Bataillon de St. Jean du Régiment du Nord, en haut du bourg de Bournonville, pour renforcer les postes dans ces bars, & aussi pour observer la côte à gauche jusqu’au Bouley, & à gauche jusqu’à Ser. Les

Le Bataillon de la Trinité du Régiment du Nord, sur les bateaux du Bouley, pour renforcer les postes de cette baie, & pour observer la côte à droite vers le havre de Naze, & à gauche jusqu’au havre de Cailleux.

Le Bataillon de St. Martin du Régiment du Nord, en haut des îlots qui sont au-dessus de la baie de St. Catherine, pour renforcer les postes entre la Coupe & Amne Port.

Le Régiment de l’Eau, au poste général d’alarme dans la baie de Guelphville.

Le Bataillon de la Ville, au poste général d’alarme entre les eaux de de Veule & les Baquettes.

Le Bataillon de St. Laurent, primitivement au Fort des Volontaires, dans la baie de St. Aubin, & ensuite au poste général d’alarme entre les Baquettes & les eaux de de Veule.

Le Régiment du Sud-Ouest, aux hauteurs derrière la batterie du Greim dans la baie de St. Bélande, pour renforcer les postes qui pourraient être attaqués entre la pointe de Noisetier & la Carrière.

Les trois Gens de Volontaires, aux signaux d’alarme, s’assembleront d’abord dans la cour de l’Ordonnance, dans la ville de St. Helier.
Names of Batteries round the Island, beginning by Middle Battery in St. Cuthin’s Bay. 1814.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gun Range (in feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middle Battery</td>
<td>30 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L'Ailet</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L'Hommet</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Les Charruies</td>
<td>2 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L'Espine</td>
<td>2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Négoci Bourg</td>
<td>2 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Négoci Bourg, Royal Marine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mont Crennen</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bouqaon</td>
<td>2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>La Coupa</td>
<td>2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fliegu Tower</td>
<td>1 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Velalet</td>
<td>2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cotil de Whitley</td>
<td>1 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Houguillon</td>
<td>3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>St. Catherine’s Tower</td>
<td>1 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Les Vuesirs</td>
<td>3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>La Crête</td>
<td>2 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Anne Port (2 Batteries)</td>
<td>4 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Haarle Monde</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mont Degrue</td>
<td>3 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map of Jersey engraved by Samuel Neele from a survey carried out to illustrate William Plee’s Account of Jersey published in 1817
(Jersey Archive ref: L/F/120/A/100)
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Public Record Office - War Office records 44/76
(transcribed by Major M Lons, 2005-6)
Dear [Name],

Assuming the action of the 14th regiment in this undertaking, it has been suggested by the headquarters, the 3rd and 5th batteries of the 4th Regiment be kept up by the beholder of his [name], engaging from Point Comfort and the West End to the mouth of the North River up the Sound, which it is necessary neither to harm the state, nor to damage the highest bidder in the area, to provide the means of defensive action to the defense of the position, and which is otherwise than has been desired to show an equal portunity.

My views on this subject you may say are calculated to be more or less injurious to the plans and disposition for the protection of our Alexander [name] being in my mind, it is not necessary to detail them, as the same is generally understood.

Noting now that the employment of the 14th regiment is to be a matter of very great importance, I am glad to see it in the hands of the regiment and the battery [name], the bane of your labor and home, that have been brought to the fore and placed in the hands of the regiment and the battery [name] to be the only one that it would be advantageous under these circumstances, and considering that these considerations are such that new positions should be taken by the battery, and that that command be concentrated at as much as possible of the time, rather than being scattered at every point in such a controversy to them. I am satisfied that the batteries should be so placed in the new.

The 14th regiment approved of my suggestions and have desired me to make the plan & estimate in writing.

I have this opportunity of writing to you in the assurance of being your obedient.
St. Ouen's Bay

The Western Entrance of Jersey is protected by St. Ouen's Bay, extending about 4 miles in length, and had for its defense 1. The Battery of Jersey, consisting of 3 guns, and 2 small batteries each consisting of 3 guns, mounted by the King, besides the usual defenses erected by the States, which were strengthened during the latter part of the present and previous years. The latter were formed of stone, so as to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the seaport of Jersey, and the harbor. The harbor is enclosed by a wall about 12 feet high, and the same is calculated to cost about $800,000.

Sec. Plan 2

Sec. 1.4

From the life history of St. Ouen's Bay it is possible to place the site of the entrance of the New Road Harbor, which is about 500 yards north of Tower B, to be erected by a wall about 12 feet high, and protected by a battery. The Battery of Jersey, which is considered the most important of the harbor's defenses, is in position to cover the entrance of the harbor. The battery is of stone, and its position is calculated to cost $800,000. It is designed to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the seaport of Jersey, and the harbor.

The Battery of Jersey is the most important of the harbor's defenses, and is considered the most important of the harbor's defenses. It is in position to cover the entrance of the harbor. The battery is of stone, and its position is calculated to cost $800,000. It is designed to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the seaport of Jersey, and the harbor.

At the entrance of the harbor, there is a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the harbor. The battery is of stone, and its position is calculated to cost $800,000. It is designed to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the harbor.

The Battery of Jersey is the most important of the harbor's defenses, and is considered the most important of the harbor's defenses. It is in position to cover the entrance of the harbor. The battery is of stone, and its position is calculated to cost $800,000. It is designed to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the harbor.

The Battery of Jersey is the most important of the harbor's defenses, and is considered the most important of the harbor's defenses. It is in position to cover the entrance of the harbor. The battery is of stone, and its position is calculated to cost $800,000. It is designed to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the harbor.

The Battery of Jersey is the most important of the harbor's defenses, and is considered the most important of the harbor's defenses. It is in position to cover the entrance of the harbor. The battery is of stone, and its position is calculated to cost $800,000. It is designed to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 1,000 feet in length and accommodating a battery of 6 guns, mounted with stone, and intended for the defense of the harbor.

Conclusions

A considerable additional expense will be incurred by the States in proposing the harbor's defenses, and the Battery of Jersey, consisting of 3 guns, and 2 small batteries each consisting of 3 guns, mounted by the King, besides the usual defenses erected by the States, which were strengthened during the latter part of the present and previous years. The latter were formed of stone, so as to be on the level of the water, amounting to about 12 feet high, and the same is calculated to cost about $800,000.
## Table: Estimate of man-days required at Suez during Big Mound Day by Lieut. Kevan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Man-days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-19</td>
<td>Digging and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-26</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-27</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-28</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-29</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-30</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-03-31</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-04-01</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-04-02</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-04-03</td>
<td>Excavation and beaching, Suez Canal, Egypt</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The total man-days required for the excavation and beaching of the Suez Canal during Big Mound Day was 1000.
In preparing a draft for the Works Committee to consider, we have reviewed the existing documents and discussed the current situation with the project managers. The main objectives are to ensure the project is completed on time and within budget. The task force has identified several key areas for improvement:

1. **Material Procurement:** A detailed list of materials required for the project has been compiled. This includes the quantities, specifications, and suppliers. Regular audits will be conducted to monitor the progress and ensure the materials are delivered on time.

2. **Quality Control:** A rigorous quality assurance process has been established to ensure that all work meets the required standards. This includes regular inspections and testing of materials and workmanship.

3. **Safety Measures:** The project site has been equipped with the necessary safety equipment and procedures. Regular training sessions will be conducted for all staff to ensure they are aware of the safety guidelines.

4. **Communication:** Effective communication channels have been established to facilitate timely updates and address any issues promptly. Regular meetings with the stakeholders are scheduled to discuss progress and address any concerns.

5. **Cost Management:** A comprehensive budget has been prepared, and a detailed cost control plan is in place. Regular reviews will be conducted to monitor the costs and adjust the budget as necessary.

The project team is committed to completing the project on schedule and within the budget. Regular updates will be provided to the Works Committee to keep them informed of the progress.
Sir,

In consideration of the urgent request made by the Governor to me, as a Member of a General Court Martial, I have been enabled to supply your Minute of Instructions in the Board on the 23rd March 1812, and I have been able to comply with your Minute in every respect that any person, in the defence of the State, may possibly be capable of doing. In this respect, it may be said that the defence of the State is at present in the hands of a number of able and experienced officers, who have been selected for their services in the field, and who have been appointed by the Governor. The Governor has been pleased to appoint me to the office of Assistant Adjutant-General, and I am ready to do my duty in every respect, and to assist in every way in the defence of the State.

I have been directed to report to you that the defence of the State is at present in the hands of a number of able and experienced officers, who have been selected for their services in the field, and who have been appointed by the Governor. The Governor has been pleased to appoint me to the office of Assistant Adjutant-General, and I am ready to do my duty in every respect, and to assist in every way in the defence of the State.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

[Signature]
PRO Extracts

Return of the Number and Nature of Guns and Carriages

Which may possibly be required in the defence of Jersey, after damaging the wooden defences & fortifications of Jersey, as recommended and taken by Mr. H. H. of the Commanding Officers of the Artillery & Engineers. Signed, 30th October 1814.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Batteries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Battery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

The number of guns and carriages were 360, namely 180 manufactured in the Island during the late War, amounting between 30 & 35 tons in weight. Out of which

- 12 were 18-pounder howitzers
- 8 were 19-pounder howitzers
- 5 were 18-pounder culverins
- 4 were 24-pounder culverins
- 3 were 8-pounder culverins
- 2 were 24-pounder culverins
- 2 were 12-pounder culverins
- 2 were 8-pounder culverins
- 2 were 24-pounder culverins
- 1 was a howitzer cast by Darton & Co.
- 1 was a howitzer cast by Darton & Co.
- 1 was a howitzer cast by Darton & Co.

Total: 360 guns and carriages.
Report of the proceedings of the Committee appointed by the Society of Jersey to consider the extension of the Royal Albert Hotel and the need for additional accommodation with the consent of the Minister of the Interior. 1917. Together with observations thereon.

Presentation

Plan A

The proposed new building to be erected on the south-west corner of the site of the present Grand Hotel. It should be

Hammie Nutt

Plan B

There are many objections to the building of the new hotel on the site of the present Grand Hotel. The cost of building would be very high. It is suggested that the present building be extended and a new wing added.

La Croix Hunt & Clarke

Plan C

This plan, which is based on the idea of extending the present building, is more economical and practical. It is recommended that this plan be adopted.

Hammie Nutt March

Plan D

Although this plan is more expensive, it is recommended that this plan be adopted to ensure the future of the hotel.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Battery</th>
<th>Service No.</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Date of Entry</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>J.S.</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1st Company</td>
<td>A Battery</td>
<td>12345</td>
<td>01/01/1850</td>
<td>01/01/1860</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Brown</td>
<td>L.B.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>2nd Company</td>
<td>B Battery</td>
<td>67890</td>
<td>01/01/1851</td>
<td>01/01/1861</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Anderson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>3rd Company</td>
<td>C Battery</td>
<td>11223</td>
<td>01/01/1852</td>
<td>01/01/1862</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Johnson</td>
<td>S.J.</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>4th Company</td>
<td>D Battery</td>
<td>45678</td>
<td>01/01/1853</td>
<td>01/01/1863</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- J. Smith was commended for bravery in action.
- L. Brown was promoted to Major due to exceptional service.
- M. Anderson was awarded the Medal of Honor.
- S. Johnson was transferred to the Medical Corps due to injury.
Plan and Section of La Crête Battery and Guard-house, Bonne Nuit
as completed in 1835 by Lt Col. Oldfield, 12th March 1837
(Société Jersiaise Library ref: M20)
Map of Jersey by Hugh Godfray, 1849
(Jersey Archive ref: L/F/120/A/107)
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Correspondence between Committee of Defence and Royal Engineers regarding repairs to La Crête and l’Etacorol Batteries, 1854
(Jersey Archive ref: D/AP/B/4)

Invoice from Soysal Asphalto Company to the States of Jersey for repair works to Kempel Tower, L’Etacorol and La Crête Batteries, 1855
(Jersey Archive ref: D/AP/B/5/1)

Correspondence from the Lieutenant-Governor to the Defence Committee regarding repair work to coastal defences, 1857
(Jersey Archive ref: D/AP/B/7/4)
Nov. 25th, 1826

Sir,

I beg to recommend you that I have not yet received the official notification that the House have authorized the expenditure of £205 3s. 4d. in respect to the two Batteries on the Coast, La Cote and St. Blane, and I have to request that the necessary authority may be forwarded to me accordingly.

I would also beg to call the attention of the Committee to the circumstance, that a quantity of paving stones taken up from the Tere plain of the said Batteries will not be required for the repairs in question, and not being worth the expense of conveying to St. Helen's, I beg to suggest they should be disposed of on the spot and the amount deducted from the Bill for the work.

I have the honor to be,

Your most obedient,
Assemble Council.

E. P. Belson Esq.,
Chairman of Committee of Defense.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**:

£13 6 4
Government House
6th August 1847.

Sir,

I have the honor to transmit to you the enclosed account certified by the Commanding Royal Engineers amounting to £13.9.7 due to Mr. Field (the Government Contractor) for work and materials used in the repair of the Coast Defences, and to request that you will submit the same for payment to the Committee of the States for the Defense of the Island.

I have the honor to be

Your most obedient
Humble Servant.

[Signature]

F. F. DJIAN LEFEU
President of the Committee
of the States for Defense.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of work, materials and rate per quarter</th>
<th>Material Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Jan</td>
<td>Rempey and Lewis towers and work to erect battery</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Days Carpenter</td>
<td>174.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40 Macos, Warden</td>
<td>112.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Laban</td>
<td>122.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burschel,EventType of Count</td>
<td>21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Or Roman</td>
<td>113.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coal Fast Line undated</td>
<td>108.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add 15% per cent as per contract for distance beyond 10 miles from site.

Subtotal of contract: 1027

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of work, materials and rate per quarter</th>
<th>Material Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Nov</td>
<td>Castel, Bones, Bay's de Cost</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Foot Taps &amp; Deal</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Days Carpenter</td>
<td>174.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10' pine plate, black oak</td>
<td>112.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Door of 8' galley on 1</td>
<td>21.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oak bead, screw oak 0.5, q, gallon 1</td>
<td>108.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shaker</td>
<td>300.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Gallons Coal Ton</td>
<td>406.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20' 3' oak</td>
<td>108.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>16' 2' oak</td>
<td>406.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Small dray salt</td>
<td>129.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complied for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 Fred Cabe, swivel lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Fred Cabe, swivel lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 A. Wilson lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add 15 per cent as per Contract for distances beyond 1 mile from Marin

Add 1 per cent as per Contract

Abstract:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnt &amp; Lewis, Thomas, and Co.</td>
<td>10.2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cate Battery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Battery, Bay &amp; Le Cate</td>
<td>3.7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £13.9.7

Certified that the aforementioned services were actually performed and materials supplied as charged for on this Bill.

C. H. Reynolds

John Blayney, Clerk of Works
5th Aug 1857
Forwarded for payment.

C. J. Blayney

John Blayney
5th Aug 1857
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Extract from the Records of the Lieutenant Governor of Jersey

(Jersey Archive of Alderney)

Sir,

Having been asked on 19th Sept to receive from Col. Harwick the mess from the New Master as per your request, I am pleased to inform you that I have taken the liberty to forward the same to you as per your instruction.

I have read with great interest the forward report of the General Officer, who, in his capacity as the head of the Military Department, has made an inspection of the whole island. I am glad to see that the report is favorable, and that the improvements that have been made in the barracks and other military buildings are most appreciated.

I hope that you will find this information useful and that it will assist you in your duties.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Lieutenant Governor of Jersey
Map of Jersey surveyed by Staff Commander J Richards RN, 1867
(Jersey Archive ref: L/F/120/A/114)
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Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1981
(Jersey Archive ref: L/F/70/A/3)
Bonne Nuit Bay, Jersey - nineteenth century print
(Société Jersiaise Art Collection ref: SJA/0000/01883)
B.iii

Pathway to La Crête Fort near Bonne Nuit Bay, 1895
(Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJPA/005654)
B.iv

View, looking East from Bonne Nuit by Francis de Faye (1890-1910)
(Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJPA/035850)
View of Bonne Nuit Bay by Francis Foot (1900-1930)
(Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJPA/032781)
B.vi

Photographs of La Crête Fort, 1996-2006
(Planning and Environment Department Historic Buildings Register ref: JN0138)
8cm mortar emplacement

May 1996
Occupation Structures

Non-standard machine gun & observation post

Ref: J16

May 1996
La Crête Fort - vaulted magazine

January 2006
La Crête Fort

central guardroom

western guardroom

January 2006
La Crête Fort - stairs to infill rooms in the former ditch

January 2006
La Crête Fort - 1834 ditch with infill rooms

January 2006
La Crête Fort - upper traversing platform with German modifications

January 2006
La Crête Fort - lower traversing platform and access passage

January 2006
La Crête Fort

north-east embrasure

north-west embrasure

January 2006
La Crête Fort

south-east embrasure

south-west embrasure

1834 embrasures with German modifications

January 2006
La Crête Fort - German machine gun position

January 2006
La Crête Fort - views of Bonne Nuit Bay and Le Havre Giffard

January 2006
"A RESPECTABLE LITTLE WORK"
THE STORY OF A CRÈTE FORT,
BONNE NUIT BAY, JERSEY

by
MAREIN L. BRIECE

During the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars of 1793-1815, the Channel Islands served as bases for operations against French shores and shipping and as advanced posts against possible invasion of England. However, their very location meant that the islands were themselves very vulnerable to assault from France.

Nowhere was this more appreciated than in Jersey. Not only is the island the farthest from England and only fifteen miles from France but the people of Jersey had memories of 1795. In that year, during the previous conflict, the War of American Independence, the French had landed on the east coast and advanced a considerable distance before being halted. 1805 after the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte's army had driven off Trafalgar in 1805 there was still the danger of another Napoleonic-style attack on Jersey. Perhaps even a full-scale invasion trying to occupy and hold Jersey as a bargaining counter at some future peace conference. However, the British Government had worldwide defence commitments and defence was expensive.

On 16th October, 1806, the British Government in England and the States of Jersey came to an agreement regarding the cost of coastal defence. The main nationally significant fortification in Jersey, both island and coastal, such as Fort Regent and the coastal towers, plus barracks and stores and munitions for strategically-based troops, would remain the responsibility of the British Government. Jersey would build the lower forts and fortlets along the eastern and southern shores, which were nearest to France. Meanwhile the States of Jersey would assume financial responsibility for the construction and maintenance of these works along the eastern and southern coasts - areas accessible to the enemy, but still important for local defence.

Reference was made to the document wherever there was debate over who paid for what. In spite of the agreement, their valiant soldiers and sorted members and administrative confusion, the States of Jersey may have owned certain fortifications, but their location was determined by the Board of Ordnance at St James, London, and then design was undertaken by the Royal Engineers, while their maintenance was recommended by the Royal Artillery and overseen by the Board of Ordnance. In fact, all the cannon, mortars, ammunition and associated equipment remained the property of the Board of Ordnance, warded by the British Government's local armories for use on
old-fashioned convicts' uniforms).

The senior Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers officers in Jersey thus had the difficult duty of reporting both to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Island and to the Master-General of the Ordnance in London. In addition, there was an Inspector-General of Fortifications, Harque-Master and other Army and Navy officers, government officials, elected representatives and influential pressure groups, all of whom had valid and legitimate reasons for asking questions, issuing instructions, requesting reports, offering advice and making suggestions. That the system worked at all is a tribute to the personalities involved, only occasionally does the correspondence betray irritation at some other department's interference.

La Côte Doué (Great Bay) lies between Bonne Nuit Bay and Giffard Bay. The latter was known as La Hève Giffard when the headland was fortified by the States of Jersey in 1813. Indeed, the work at La Côte was initially known as the Giffard Battery. It amounted to four 18-pounder guns served by a magazine, a store and a gun house. Bonne Nuit Bay itself was further defended by the Upper (Harrow's) and Lower Battery, each with two French iron 13-pounder guns, a magazine and a store. There was also a gun house at Harrow Upper Battery, the whole Harrow Nuit double-battery complex being paid for, like La Côte, by the States.

In those days the Admiralty was not in charge of ordnance and ammunition as it was to become, but was the presence of the Board of Ordnance. So, when the Royal Navy captured an enemy warship, it was the Board of Ordnance which arranged for the vessel to be repaired with British weapons for the purpose of Ordnance. The supplies for the warship were sent ashore by rowboat, if sufficient time had been captured, issued to certain land fortifications. Thus, in 1814, La Côte and Bonne Nuit Batteries were armed with French naval guns and manned by officers and men of the Jersey Militia. In England, each county had its own Militia, the Interesting was being known as a regiment, under the command of the Lord Lieutenant of the county. Most able-bodied men were expected to serve in the Militia, or, the only source of contribution to money or land. For example, farmers had to provide houses, elderly men cleared equipment and fishermen joined the Sea Service. Training and occasional duties were part-time, undertaken in addition to full-time civilian employment. There was a dearth of unemployment in the form of unemployment, subsistence allowances or occasional wages. However, regular wages were paid in an emergency, which officers and men might be required to spend several days away from their regular employment. Indeed, some Militia men became so proficient at the military life that they became full-time members of the Army, their only difference being that they did not wear outside the British Isles. These full-time Militia regiments provided gunners for families, warhorses and prisoners of war camps, provided guards for regular regiments marching through their area and recruits for deserters being returned to their units and paroled elsewhere. Where there was danger of their own men and territories by the enemy. During the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, the Militia was an efficient, knowledgeable and enthusiastic home defence army and armed police force that the part-time Militia units had taken over both land and sea.
stationed there as a mobile reserve and reinforcement for the nearby batteries, plus the main coastal fortifications at Fortres Point, Punche, Vicars Point and La Motte (sou). Centralised control was provided by a signal post up on La Motte Maria. Another permanent installation, this comprised a gunhouse with a single 12 pdr. cannon.

All this equipment and organisation remained in place until the departure of Napoleon Bonaparte for Saint Helena and the apparently definitive partition of Europe. Once this had been achieved, recommendations were made for the reduction of the armament in Jersey. In the unlikely event of an invasion ever being attempted again, Fort Regent would be the centre of the island's defences—a citadel capable of holding out until relieving troops could arrive from England. The central fortifications would merely delay the enemy's approach to Fort Regent. Being now of minor significance, they could be reduced in numbers, those retained being so selected that the forties overlooked two possible landing-places. It was recommended, therefore, that the two Lower Nine Barracks be reduced from a total of four to two 12 pdr. guns, while La Gavotte retained both its 12 pdr. cannon. The structural condition of both works was described as "good".

The Mont Maria signal post was also one of the installations to be abandoned altogether. The Bonne Nuit Barracks were not mentioned in this May, 1816, report, but it does not seem likely that they were ever used again for military purposes, other than training, in the Island being concentrated around and around Fort Regent.

The Board of Ordnance received this report on 7th July, 1816. Just over a week later, they ordered its recommendations to be implemented, which is very quick for such a decision. Evidently, the Jersey Office of Ordnance was already beginning to organise the "Defences of the Island for demanding" in advance of London's official orders.

By 28th September, 1816, the two 12 pounders at Bonne Nuit Lower Upper Battery had been dismounted and left lying on the sloping platform, the masts being being placed in store. Meanwhile, Bonne Nuit Lower Battery and La Gavotte Gibraltar (La Gavotte) Batteries still manned their two 12-pounders and two 10-pounders respectively—and continued to do so until the 1820s.

By the spring of 1816, France was recovering her power in Europe and was again being regarded as a threat to the Channel Islands. There was, too, the danger of blockade, invasion, and landing from steamships, which, being independent of wind and current, could now approach shores which hitherto had been too hazardous for sailing vessels. Many reports urged new works and works in the event of war. Accordingly Major-General Thornton, Lieutenant-Governor of Jersey, called for a report on these Island defences paid for by the States. Lieutenant-Colonel Lewis, the Commanding Royal Engineer, reported that many fortifications were now in ruins, having been neglected during fifteen years of peace. If new ones were to be built, they should be even better and more to provide gun emplacements at some points along the coast. They should be sited also from a safe place from the sea.

Regarding the work of Bonne Nuit Battery itself, Lieutenant-Colonel Lewis suggested placing two guns on harbiour (i.e. firing from behind and over a protective sloping apron of earth and brick) on the front of the Barracks. Meanwhile La Gavotte Battery should be rebuilt to take six guns on a strengthen platform (similar to those on top of "Martello" towers), and work in the rear by a defensible guardhouse. This battery would dominate simultaneously
Le Havre, Gaultier and Havre-Neuf-Baye and the approaches to both.

The position, therefore, approved all their suggestions, and told Lieutenant Colonel Lewis to prepare plans and estimates — which he did, submitting them on 20th October, 1853. However, the idea for a Manne-Neuf-Batack Battery seemed to have been dropped, evidently it was felt that a new fort in this area would be sufficiently effective to deal mainly with an enemy attack on the bays each side of the headland. The total cost of occupation of the site was estimated at £25,000. The whole plan for the establishment of the defences was prepared by the Board of Ordnance and the Secretary of State for War at London, further copies of plans being necessary for supply to the various contractors.

Before the work could be undertaken, the two batteries taking place during the months of November, 1853, December, 1853, and January, 1854, when the decision to go ahead was made. The works also agreed to pay £2,000 a year for the construction, maintenance and repair of the works until 1857. All had been used. It is not clear how they arrived at this last figure, but they must of the States' and contractors' attention was concentrated on coping with the cholera epidemic which broke out early in 1853.

Tenders for the construction of the fortifications were advertised from 26th March, 1853, onwards. On that date the Lieutenant-Colonel Lewis sent the whole detailed scheme to the Inspector-General of Fortifications, Major-General Sir Alexander Blythe. From that date Blythe forwarded it to the Master-Gardener of the Ordnance. Arguments regarding the cost of which was then occupied the rest of the year. There was also frequent reference to the dangers from the Channel and a suggestion from the Lieutenant-Governor of Jersey, that in an emergency some warships and transports, the Royal Navy should have its own steam squadron stationed in Jersey waters. Not only would it be made to rely on this, but the British ships could themselves capture Channel islands as soon as they were released, being it is an advance base against French invasion and attack. The movements of the British and French Royal Navy being a much better defence against a war than any fixed shore defence were known as "The Balancing Scheme." Usually the Admiralty was a strong advocate of such a policy naturally, but in this manner, they do not seem to have welcomed such a suggestion from a man naval officer. The idea was repeated in Jersey some time before, local defence installations now. The Navy would do what thought best of it when there was a future war.

This exchange of correspondence in the middle of 1853, seems to have been the final consideration before the programme of work began. The final contract being signed in May 1854, the contractor being Mr. Sable. When completed, there was a culmination for the officer and thirty other ranks, a water tank held five hundred and forty gallons and forty barrels of gunpowder could be stored in the magazine. That was for the planned ammunition of two 18-pounders and four 18-pounders. However, on 28th October, 1854, there guns had still not arrived for mounting and, in fact, it seems as though they never did. Meanwhile the old portmanteaus were rendered inoperable by having a tramway knocked off (so that the guns could never again be fired into a martingue) and were then used for sale for scrap. That was in the winter of 1854, for 18th September of that year, they had all gone.
By 1837, there was a new Lieutenant-Governor, Major-General Campbell. He wanted to know how well the improvements desired by his predecessor had been achieved. Accordingly, the new Commanding Royal Engineer, Lieutenant-Colonel T. Oldfield, delivered a very full report on the condition of all the works owned and maintained by the States of Jersey. He stated that in March, 1837, it covered not only the new and updated works but also the earlier buildings surveyed by Lieutenant-Commander Lees. When he came to the House of Commons, "a great building in good order" should be retained as a Grand House, to be occupied in war time. There were running of houses at Harrow and Old La Crête. "At the former they are very trifling and scarcely worthy of notice. At the latter it may be well to secure the buildings from further dilapidation; the expenses would probably be £1 10s. 6d. The walls of the Watch House above House Nut, where there had been the old signal post on La Mont Made, were "in tolerable order; the expenses of £1 9s. 3d. would save them from further dilapidation."

The principal work in the area was New La Crête Fort, "a respectable post." It required no work done to it, apart from inclusion in a list of buildings needing routine "repairs to tanks (damaged by rats), casing doors, windows and shutters, painting outside iron work, numbering batteries, cleaning drains, etc." All the buildings in the area had to have the boundaries of the States' property marked. In addition, there was permission in the estimates for paying the travelling expenses of clerks and foremen of works.

La Crête Fort and the other States' defence works were still expected to be manned by part-time members of the Militia, now the Royal Jersey Militia, regular troops being concentrated on Fort Regent. House Nut Barracks had thus become totally surplus to requirements. However, the Board of Ordnance did not wish to relinquish ownership entirely, just in case it was needed in some future emergency. Accordingly, they lent it to a Colonel John Calve, retired from the Royal Irish Artillery. The rent was £20 per year, beginning Michaelmas (29th September), 1837. Colonel Calve seems to have been a farmer, probably raising cattle, and using the empty barracks to accommodate livestock. By March, 1839, he was applying to make alterations to the property, principally the conversion of a round drum to a round drum. The Board of Ordnance was not happy about his proposal for a covered drum under what had been the Barrack Square. The Barrack Square was long known to be unhealthy and the Army preferred open areas because they were easier to clean out if they becameEncoding failed.
Navy, but just in case something happened, Jersey's militia must always be ready and manned. And what of the Militia who were to man those defences?

Even since 1818, the reputation of England's Militia had been declining. After twenty-five years of peace, many county militia had become little more than social clubs, their most active employment being public dinners, hunting down turnpike strikers, trade unionists and farm labourers; large-rolled gunpowder using their superior weaponry to defend the unequal privileges of their own landowners, they also alleged the propaganda of such causes as the Peterloo Massacre. Fortunately for Jersey, perhaps because of its proximity to the traditional foreign enemy, the Royal Jersey Militia had retained its military function. An 1830 report stated that "The defence of this island very materially depends upon the five, loyal, spirited and well-organised militias. This body notwithstanding the long period of peace, are still most efficient." However, most of their muskets were old and irreparable. They had twenty-four-pounder guns "which make splendid practice" but were worn out. Lieutenant Colonel English, the Commanding Royal Engineer, recommended re-equipping the Royal Jersey Militia with 6-pounders, which not only fired heavier shot but also had longer range.

This, however, was field artillery. Regarding fixed works, Lieutenant Colonel English made a number of comments about Howe's Harbour and its vicinity. The remains of the Grand Harbour at Étretat Point could be expected to serve as a blockhouse for eighteen men. The Lime Battery Barracks, officially accommodating three officers and eighty-six men, were intended being made of Colonel Carr's lime-slab, was soon exposed to fire from ships in the bay. It should therefore be secured by an earthwork, the buildings themselves being converted to a loopholed wall, twenty feet high. This fort was in good order and ready to receive its guns, which still had not been mounted. When they did arrive, two would be mounted on traversing equipment while two would fire through embrasures or holes in the wall. These cannon would dominate the entrance from Étretat to La Belle Radeque. Some alterations were necessary to inhibit enemy ships from any attacker's point of view but it led disadvantage was that it was vulnerable to fire from the high ground on the east.

As the decade wore on, Jerseymen continued to fear attacks from French incursion. The expansion of Metropolis France into Algeria, in 1830, meant that the French had seventeen powerful steamships in the Mediterranean to transport two thousand men to a site to attack the southern bases and the east coast of Jersey in 1831. The new French railways under construction, meant that forces could be brought secretly from any distance for the attack on Jersey. Well may the French at Saint Malo and Gérande confidently explain that Jersey is to be taken as a declaration of war. Jersey must defend itself by strengthening the coastal fortifications, building a coastal railway to link them up and by arming the population. Major General John Le Caneur, 1831, commanding the 5th Regiment of the Royal Jersey Militia.

By 1848, the Year of Revolutions in Europe, it seems that such bolstering had taken effect. La Caneur had revised it guns to put 24-pounders. Two of these were already installed on iron garrison carriages, themselves mounted on traversing platforms, but four of them were stored in the area separately from, but ready for mounting on wooden garrison carriages. The report of Lieutenant Colonel A. W. Starfield, the commanding.

...
Royal Engineers, dated 29th September, 1940, recommended that all the guns should be manned. In the event of war, stationed at the Island of Jersey, it is not improbable would be given for preparation by an active enemy close at hand. This would also give the Militia practice in exercising with the guns which they would use in time of war.

To ensure that nothing happened to this weaponry in these remote places, it was proposed that Military Personnel be employed as security guards at each gun. This last also provided the following comment from the authorities: "The services we rely on who should now be occasioned for these men when these have in fact been without them." It was as a result of this report of 19th December, 1943, that La Côte Fort received its highest commendation — "A Xonportable little work."

However, it was not many years before the development of warships, modern fanstices and magazine loading rifles vandalized the arguments of all protagonists. In other hardships like H.M.S. Home, the strengthening and defending (in fresh construction) of a few massive nineteenth century Quadrants, such as the Fort of the Alps outside Pamiers, and the rise of the Rifle Volunteers movement was the Victorian equivalent of Britain's traditional strategy of "Fire - Burn - Field Army."

From Jersey's point of view, this meant that the Militia and Volunteers would defend the shore forts, including La Côte, delaying an invader's approach to Point Regent, until holding out until relief arrived from England — relief depending on the Royal Navy's control of the sea. Never that were lost, then no base defences — not even Point Regent — could hold the Island indefinitely. Not that such an event seemed likely — or even thinkable — as the nineteenth century merged into the twentieth with France now allied against a distant Germany.

The events of 1940, showed that the Channel Islands were indeed very vulnerable, especially when control of the sea and of the air passed to the enemy. Having occupied the Channel Islands, the Germans proceeded to fortify them, believing that any government would give top priority in reclaiming the sacred soil of the homeland. The coastal defences, in particular, were likely to be attacked from England. Accordingly, Resistance Point La Côte was armed with one 3.7cm Pak 35/36 anti-tank gun and one MG 34/42 heavy machine gun. Illumination was provided by a 300mm diameter searchlight, while the troops manning the fort not only had their personal weapons, but could also deploy two MG 13 7.92mm light machine guns and a 9.2mm Garm. This last was of German manufacture and was brought, apparently, by the seventeen Russian soldiers who had been captured and transferred to the Wehrmacht. One wonders if these three German N.C.O.s experienced the same difficulties with their Russian comrades as did the British Board of Ordinance when their Russian allies were stationed in Jersey back in 1799-1801.

With La Côte Fort passes from war to leisure. It may not have withstood violent siege or witnessed other dramatic events, but its history has been a microcosm of military architecture in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, reflecting changing dangers and ideas and technologies, the currents of international policies and national economics over almost two hundred years.

Notes
1. The Royal Battery, a powder magazine built in 1808, is on the site at La Valette (now owned...
by the National Trust (Jersey) was bought by Mr Bross and later was demolished (Geoffrey Pick, Jersey: A Short History, p 300).

1. Les Hugues. This is probably Les Hugues (Royal Jersey Chronicle: The Hugues between Man and Man) (Jersey Public Library, 1976, page 5).
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Editor’s note

Martin H. Bross is an experienced professional researcher and author. The article is part of a report commissioned by the States of Jersey Public Services Committee to whom we are grateful for permission to publish it.

The original text of the article and the copious notes made by Mr Bross during his research, which are of much interest, have been deposited in the Library of the Society of Jersey.

They cover a period from 1799 to 1854 and include much correspondence between the Board of Ordnance, the Lieutenant-Governor of the day, Officers commanding the Royal Engineers in Jersey, the Home Office, etc., extracts from local newspapers and photographs of some plans and correspondence. They include also an item relating to the Russian troops quartered in Jersey from 1799 to 1801 and a summary of officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the 1st (North West) Regiment and 2nd (North) Regiment of the Royal Jersey Militia on 31st October, 1819.

M. N. M.
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'Phrases relating to the Lieutenant Governor's summer residence'
LA CRETE FORT REPLACEMENT FOR LIEUT.-GOVERNOR'S BUNGALOW

His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor, Vice-Admiral Sir Michael Villiers, whose summer bungalow overlooking St. Ouen's Bay was burnt to the ground on December 12 last year, is to have La Crête Fort on the north coast placed at his disposal. Approval of the plan has been given by all the States committees concerned and renovation work is now in progress.

The work currently being done at the fort—which stands on a rocky promontory between Bottel and St. Ouen—will be done in an effort to keep it wind and water tight. Much work is being done by the Public Works Committee for all the buildings of a similar nature for which it is responsible. 

German bunker

Part of the fort area—which is reached via a track from Dalle Maiti Ridge—was used by the Germans during the occupation for the construction of a bunker. In addition to it, there are also four rooms within the fort itself. The latter is a square surrounded by a null or inside wall.

230 years old

La Crête Fort was built about 230 years ago as part of the island’s defensive system against French invaders. The bungalow at La Poulette was recently occupied by Sir Edward Granville, Lord lieutenant of Jersey from 1845 to 1847, and was occupied by the Reviewer for the use of Lieutenant-Governor, before it was evicted, the St. Ouen's Bay Working Party had recommended its demolition.
Higher Level Information
A Records of the Lieutenant Governor of Jersey
A/D General Files
A/D1 Main Series: These file of correspondence and other papers appear to have been artificially arranged under subject headings. It would seem that the original files and bundles of papers were dismantled for this purpose and in this way the original context and arrangement of the papers has unfortunately been lost. The former references are included in the new ones, after the prefix.
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Appendix D
Site of Special Interest draft designation
Position and extent of the proposed Site of Special Interest

The position and extent of the proposed Site of Special Interest are shown on the plan and are:

(a) An imaginary line taken from the south-west corner of the granite wall that forms part of the German mortar emplacement, as indicated by the letter “a”, to the south-east corner of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the car park, as indicated by the letter “b”;

(b) the outer south face of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the car park, from its south-east corner, as indicated by the letter “b”, to its south-west corner, as indicated by the letter “a”;

(c) an imaginary line taken from the south-west corner of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the car park, as indicated by the letter “b”, along the same alignment as the south face of the boundary stone, to the intersection with mean high water, as indicated by the letter “c”;

(d) mean high water from the intersection with an imaginary line along the same alignment as the south face of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the car park, as indicated by the letter “b”, to the intersection with an imaginary line along the same alignment as the south-east face of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the coastal footpath, as indicated by the letter “d”;

(e) an imaginary line taken from the intersection with mean high water along the same alignment as the south-east face of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the coastal footpath, as indicated by the letter “c”, to the east corner of the boundary stone, as indicated by the letter “f”;

(f) the outer south-east face of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the coastal footpath, from its east corner, as indicated by the letter “f”, to its south corner, as indicated by the letter “g”;

(g) an imaginary line taken from the south corner of the boundary stone marked “b” that is situated by the coastal footpath, as indicated by the letter “c”, to the south-east corner of the concrete wall that forms part of the German mortar emplacement, as indicated by the letter “h”;

(h) an imaginary line taken from the south-east corner of the concrete wall that forms part of the German mortar emplacement, as indicated by the letter “h”, to the south-west corner of the granite wall that forms part of the German mortar emplacement, as indicated by the letter “a”.

22nd September 2005
Appendix E
Jersey Heritage Trust - protocol for archaeological work
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 In the absence of statutory guidance the Jersey Hortano Trust has developed its own protocol for archaeological work.

1.2 The purpose of this document is to set out the methods to be employed and the standards to be achieved when undertaking works of an archaeological nature at JHT sites.

1.3 The protocol mirrors standard practice in England and encompasses the draft *Supplementary Planning Guidance - The Historic Environment*.

2. **STATUTORY, POLICY AND ADVISORY FRAMEWORK**

2.1 The Island Planning (Jersey) Law, 1964 (as amended) Article 12 Protection of Sites of Special Interest

Site of Special Interest Protection is required from the Environment & Public Services Committee for the following works to an SSI:

- the demolition of a building or its alteration or extension in any manner which would seriously affect its character;
- the use or operation of any device designed or adapted for detecting or locating any metal or mineral in the ground;
- the insertion of a probe into the surface of an SSI;
- the digging of any hole on an SSI;
- the excavation in an SSI;
- the removal of any sand, stone, gravel, earth or rock from an SSI.

The sites and monuments in the care of the JHT are either designated as Sites of Special Interest (SSI) or registered as proposed Sites of Special Interest (pSSI). Whichever the case all sites will be treated as designated.

2.2 **Jersey Island Plan (2002) - Policies relevant to Archaeology**

- G11 Sites of Special Interest
- G12 Archaeological Resources
- G13 Buildings and Places of Architectural and Historic Interest

2.3 **Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance - The Historic Environment**

The SPG provides support to the policy framework set out in the Jersey Island Plan 2002 and is intended to ensure that the historic environment, including the archaeological and built heritage, is a material consideration in planning decisions, that those decisions are informed and reasonable, and that the impact of development on the historic environment is sustainable.

2.4 **International Conventions** - Jersey has ratified the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada 1986) and

The conventions place obligations on member states to introduce legislative, policy and other measures to protect the archaeological and architectural heritage.

2.5 Other Guidance – It is the intention of the JHT to take into account best current practice from other jurisdictions especially English Heritage, Institute of Field Archaeologists, Council for British Archaeology etc. (see bibliography).

2.6 Conservation Plans – Work must be considered in the light of policies set out in Conservation Plans which provide site-specific guidance.

3. DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT (DBA)

3.1 A programme of assessment of the known or potential archaeological resource. It consists of a review of existing written, graphic, photographic and electronic information in order to identify the likely character, extent, quality and worth of the known or potential archaeological resource. This will inform the requirement for, and scope of, any non-intrusive or intrusive surveys.

3.2 On a large complex site like Mont Orgueil Castle a phased programme of evaluation is adopted, with each stage informing the next.

3.3 The DBA should be submitted to the Planning department who will decide whether further information is needed in order to make an informed decision regarding the archaeological resource.

3.4 All work should be carried out with reference to the IFA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment.

3.5 Consultation

The JHT aims to ensure involvement and support from those other organisations which have an interest in the project.

3.6 SSSI permissions are automatically referred to the Archaeology Section of the SJ for comment.

3.7 Also consideration is given at this stage to seeking any additional academic guidance needed.

4. MITIGATION PLAN

4.1 This is required to demonstrate that primary consideration has been given to mitigating loss by the appropriate design of foundations and other interventions prior to determination.
4.2 Where archaeological remains are present but preservation in situ is not appropriate, we must make appropriate provision for the implementation of a programme of archaeological investigation in accordance with the specification produced by the Planning Committee.

5. PROJECT DESIGN

5.1 Required to submit a project design to the planning department. This comprises a comprehensive document describing the background to the project, listing aims and objectives, describing the methodologies and resources to be employed and the form of reporting and archiving (EH 1991). The project design will also include appropriate risk assessments.

5.2 Project designs are to be produced for each stage of evaluation/mitigation works in response to a brief/specification produced by the planning department.

6. METHODS STATEMENT

6.1 The proposed data collection methods should be described, making clear why those advocated are the most appropriate and will best ensure that the data collected can fulfill the project aims.

7. ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION

7.1 Excavation will examine and record the archaeological resource within a specified area (usually areas that contain significant archaeological deposits, but do not warrant preservation in situ) using appropriate methods and practices. These must satisfy the stated aims of the project (Project Design) and detailed in the brief/specification produced by the planning department. It will result in one or more published accounts and an ordered, accessible archive.

7.2 A unique site code is issued by the JHT.

7.3 All work should be carried out with reference to the IFA Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation (1995, revised 2001).

8. ARCHAEOLOGICAL WATCHING BRIEF

8.1 In some cases where pre-determination evaluation has shown that archaeological remains are expected to be sparse, poorly preserved
and are not significant enough to require preservation in situ or by
detailed investigation and record, the Planning department may still
require archaeological monitoring to be undertaken.
The scale and scope of archaeological monitoring can vary according
to circumstances and are subject to a brief provided by the department.

8.2 In certain circumstances remains found during a watching brief may
require detailed investigation, analysis, publication and archiving.

8.3 On completion of the watching brief a programme of post-exavcation
will be undertaken, culminating in the publication of the results of the
investigations and deposition of the site archive.

8.4 All work should be carried out with reference to the IFA Standard and

9. BUILDING INVESTIGATION AND RECORDING

9.1 Preservation by record will be required by condition (planning) where
features of interest are likely to be exposed during the works or where
damage is unavoidable, or in the case of the removal or covering up of
features.
The mitigation will be a full written and graphic record of the
investigation.

9.2 The work will be undertaken by properly experienced
archaeologist/building investigators and conducted according to a brief
agreed with the Planning department.

9.3 The product of the investigation and recording of the building will be an
illustrated report and published account of any discoveries.

9.4 All work should be carried out with reference to the IFA Standard and
Guidance for the archaeological investigation and recording of standing
buildings or structures.

10. POST-EXCAVATION

10.1 On completion of the fieldwork a programme of post-exavcation will be
undertaken, culminating in the publication of the results of the
investigations and deposition of the site archive.

10.2 A post excavation assessment should be carried out after completion
of the fieldwork and site archive to assess the potential for further
analysis and publication.

10.3 Proposals for work to be carried out will be expressed as an updated
project design.
11. COLLECTION, DOCUMENTATION, CONSERVATION AND RESEARCH OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

11.1 All finds and samples should be treated in a proper manner and to standards agreed by the JHT.

11.2 JHT must make available a copy of its Acquisition Policy and Collection Management Plan. This will include recommendations on the content and presentation of the archive, the selection and retention of material, standards for documentation, packaging and conservation requirements, storage grants to be charged and arrangements for transfer of ownership and copyright issues.

11.3 The Curator of Archaeology to be responsible for all archaeological finds.

11.4 At the end of each investigation artefacts and samples to be taken off site by the Curator of archaeology – usually to La Hougue Bie.

11.5 The Curator of Archaeology to arrange for appropriate cleaning, marking and storage, with the assistance of the Société Jersiaise Archaeology Section.

11.6 The Project Archaeologist/Curator of Archaeology to inform the JHT Conservator of any conservation requirements.

11.7 All work should be carried out with reference to the IFA Standard and Guidance for the collection, documentation, conservation and research of archaeological material. Best practice is also represented in the UKIC Conservation Guidelines No 2 and English Heritage Centre for Archaeology Guidelines.

12. PUBLICATION AND DISSEMINATION

12.1 Technical reports detailing the results of the various stages of evaluation will be required for approval by the Planning department. A programme of appropriate analyses and publication will form part of that requirement. This is likely to take the form of an Assessment report and updated project design. A summary of the result will be required for inclusion in the Heritage Environment Database.

12.2 The JHT will seek to ensure the prompt dissemination of all work. The project archaeologist is responsible for the analysis and publication of the data. While exercising this responsibility they shall enjoy consequent rights of primacy. However failure to prepare or publish the
results within 10 years of completion of fieldwork shall be construed as a waiver of such rights.


12.4 Consideration will also be given to more wider publications, through the JHT website and exhibitions.

13. ARCHIVE DEPOSITION

13.1 JHT must make provision for the archival storage of artefacts retrieved during archaeological investigations together with associated written and drawn archives.

13.2 A copy of all reports should be deposited with the Planning department for the Heritage Environment Database, SJ Library and the SJAS library.

13.3 The archive must be treated and packed in accordance with requirements of the JHT Curator of Archaeology, Conservator and Archivist.

14. STAFF AND VOLUNTEERS

14.1 All staff including volunteers must be suitably qualified and experienced for their project role.

14.2 All staff and volunteers must be fully briefed and aware of the work required under the specification and must understand the aims and methodologies of the project.

14.3 The site director should preferably be a corporate member of the IFA or equivalent.

14.4 The JHT Site Resource Officer will maintain a digital photographic archive of all works in progress.

15. HEALTH AND SAFETY

15.1 All work is to be carried out in accordance with the latest Health and Safety legislation and good practice.

16. REFERENCES

- The Island Planning (Jersey) Law, 1964, as amended
- Island Plan Policies G11, G12, G13
- Supplementary Planning Guidance - The Historic Environment (draft)
- Granada Convention 1985
- Valletta Convention 1992
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994 Standards and Guidelines, By-laws
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 1996 Code of Conduct
- Institute of Field Archaeologists Code of Approved Practice for the Regulation of Contractual Arrangements in Field Archaeology
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 1992 Guidelines for Finds Work
- English Heritage: Management of Archaeological Projects 1991
- Society of Museum Archaeologists 1995 Towards an Accessible Archaeological Archive
- Museum Documentation Association and Society Museum Archaeologists 2000 Standards in Action: Working with Archaeology
- United Kingdom Institute for Conservation 1990 Guidelines for the Preparation of Excavation Archives for long-term storage
- Association of County Archaeological Officers 1993 Model Briefs and Specifications for Archaeological Assessments and Field Evaluations
- Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers 1997 Analysis and Recording for the Conservation and Control of Works to Historic Buildings
- Clark, K. 1999 Conservation Plans in Action
- Clark K 2001 Informed Conservation
- ICOMOS 1990 Guide to Recording Historic Buildings
- Dixon, P & Kennedy, J 2002 Mont Orgueil Castle Conservation Plan
- Jersey Heritage Trust: Mont Orgueil Castle Development Strategy
- Council for British Archaeology - Various fact sheets
Appendix E

Glossary of building conservation terminology


NOTE. The terms defined are those which can be regarded as having precise or technical meanings in the context of building conservation. No definitions are offered for such general terms as restoration, rehabilitation or recreation.

alteration
Work the object of which is to change or improve the function of a building or artefact or to modify its appearance.

archaeology
Scientific study and interpretation of the past, based on the uncovering, retrieval, recording, and interpretation of information from physical evidence.

NOTE 1. Archaeological evidence in buildings is as likely to be visible or concealed in the superstructure as below the ground.

NOTE 2. Archaeological investigation can be destructive.

conservation
Action to secure the survival or preservation of buildings, cultural artefacts, natural resources, energy or any other thing of acknowledged value for the future.

NOTE. Where buildings or artefacts are involved, such actions should avoid significant loss of authenticity or essential qualities.

conservation area
Area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance.

conversion
Alteration of the object of which is a change of use of a building or artefact, from one use or type to another.

design
Abstract concept of a building or artefact. It can exist in the mind or on paper and if realised, it can be represented in the building or artefact itself.

NOTE. The design of a building can be original and unique, or it can be a composite made up of a series of successive designs.

fabric
Physical material of which a building or artefact is made.

NOTE 1. Each of any particular type will be a product of the original design and of everything to which it has been subject in the course of its history, including deliberate alterations based on well-considered necessities of subsequent changes, repairs and changes, the effects over time of weather and use, damage and decay.

intervention
Any action which has a physical effect on the fabric of a building or artefact.
maintenance
Routine work necessary to keep the fabric of a building, the moving parts of machinery, grounds, gardens or any other artefact, in good order.

preservation
Style of survival of a building or artefact, whether by historical accident or through a combination of protection and active conservation.

protection
Provision of legal restraints or controls on the destruction or damaging of buildings or artefacts, natural features, systems, sites, areas or other things of acknowledged value, with a view to their survival or preservation for the future.
NOTE: An intervention or work likely to affect the essential qualities of a building or its character, land or location which is legally protected would normally require a consent to be obtained through a procedure established by the relevant legislation.

rebuilding
Remaking, on the basis of a recorded or reconstructed design, a building or part of a building or artefact which has been irretrievably damaged or destroyed.

reconstruction
Re-establishment of what occurred or what existed in the past, on the basis of documentary or physical evidence.
NOTE: The extent of this explained regarding how deliberate or haphazard the reconstruction is.

repair
Work beyond the scope of regular maintenance to remedy defects, significant decay or damage caused deliberately or by accident, neglect, normal weathering or wear and tear, the object of which is to return the building or artefact to good order, without alteration or restoration.
NOTE: Most repair work should be unobtrusive and planned, but occasionally it can be required in response to a specific event, such as a threat of disaster.

replication
Making an exact copy or copies of a building or artefact.

restoration
Alteration of a building, part of a building or artefact which has decayed, been lost or damaged or is thought to have been inappropriately required or altered in the past, the objective of which is to make it conform again to its design or appearance at a previous date.
NOTE: The extent of any restoration depends on the extent to which the original design or appearance at a previous date is known, or can be established by research.

reversibility
Concept of work in a building, part of a building or artefact being carried out in such a way that it can be reversed at some future time, without any significant damage having been done.