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1 Introduction

The Jersey Heritage Trust prepared this conservation statement for Lewis's Tower July-November 2006, in consultation with the Conservation Advisory Group. 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.
2 Brief history of the site

See sources and references on page 17 for further detailed reading on Jersey's coastal defences. See also Jersey Heritage Trust conservation statements for Archirondel Tower, Seymour Tower, La Crête Fort, Fort Leicester, L’Etacquerel Fort and La Tour Carrée.

2.1 Pre-1835 defences

- The 18th century was a period of political tension between Britain and France and the two nations clashed as their ambitions grew. Because of its position, Jersey was more or less on a continuous war footing.

- A Survey of St Ouen's Bay produced by J Chamberlaine in 1758 indicates proposals for static works for the defence of the bay, which would have been manned by the Militia Artillery of the parishes of St Peter, St Mary and St Ouen. The proposals arose out of the threat to Jersey arising from the Seven Years War but were never put into effect (Public Record Office ref: MR 1030)

- There was an attempted invasion of the Island in 1779. A party of Frenchmen led by the Prince of Nassau arrived in St Ouen's Bay but was prevented from landing. The attack highlighted the need for more fortifications in the area (the militia artillery was lead by the Rector of St Ouen, le Sire du Parcq who brought the guns to a favourable position under fire from the hostile fleet – his name was later given to the Du Parcq Battery).

- A map of Jersey engraved by William Faden, Geographer to the King, in 1781 shows the batteries, redoubts and entrenchments raised along the coast in defence of the Island, including on the site of Lewis’s Tower (see appendix A.1).

- A list of stone and wood gun platforms in need of repair are noted in the Defence Committee Minutes, 26 October 1787. The following are recorded in St Ouen’s Bay: Half Moon Battery, 3 guns; Middle Battery, 2 guns; North battery, 3 guns; New North battery, 3 guns; and Du Parcq’s Battery, 3 guns. All were 24-pounder guns with only the Middle and North Batteries being provided withy stone platforms (Jersey Archive ref: C/B/B1/1)

- A report on the batteries around the Island, 28 August 1797, records that Du Parcq’s Battery (believed to be located near to the site of Lewis's Tower) had a sod parapet in tolerable repair with 3 x 24-pounders on traversing platforms under the charge of the Island Militia (Société Jersiaise Library ref: M20/10).

- In a letter from General Don to Earl Spencer, 22 May 1806, Don highlights the threat of a French attack on Jersey and recommends the best means of defending the large bays is by combined operations of
Field Artillery, Cavalry and Infantry supported by a line of armed round towers on the beach, “such as lately built on the coast of Suffolk and Kent”. In an accompanying report Don observes that the capture of the Channel Islands by the French would provide them with the means of interrupting British trade in the Channel (Jersey Archive ref: L/F/95/A/2)

- A statement of the different magazines in the Island, 1810 notes a magazine at Du Parcq’s Battery erected by the Island by contract (Société Jersiaise Library ref: M20/8).

- A map of Jersey engraved by Samuel John Neele from a survey carried out to illustrate William Plee’s Account of Jersey, published in 1817, shows defences along the coast including the Du Parcq Battery with the new magazine to the rear (see appendix A.ii).

- By 1830 most of the defences of Jersey had fallen into disrepair as both the States of Jersey and the Board of Ordnance were reluctant to spend money on their upkeep (Clements)

- King William IV enquired as to the state of Jersey’s coastal defences in 1831 and a report was commissioned from Lieutenant-Colonel Lewis, the Commanding Engineer in Jersey. A chain of batteries and coastal defence towers (known as Conway towers) existed in locations where a risk of enemy landing was present but the report found that with the advent of steam-powered naval vessels able to hold their position close to the shore even in areas previously protected by reefs, new measures would be necessary on parts of the coastline now exposed to the risk of bombardment. As a result, a series of towers of the English Martello pattern was built between 1831 and 1837.

2.2 Lewis’s Tower

- The States of Jersey ordered that work commence on the construction of new coastal defences on 3 March 1832 (Jersey Archive ref: C/A1/15)

- Jean Gruchy was appointed as contractor for Lewis’s Tower. Foundations were laid in May 1835.

- In June 1835 Mr Philippe du Heaume, Seigneur of the Fief of Morville and Robilliard raised the Clameur de Haro on the site. The Jersey workmen involved in the construction downed tools and Colonel Lewis ordered the Royal Engineers back to barracks until the matter was settled in court. The Bailiff, Sir John de Veuille, called a meeting of the States on 9 June 1835 “To consider ways and means to continue the erection of a fortification at St Ouen’s Bay which has been suspended by Mr Philip du Heaume, Seigneur of the Fief on which the Tower was being constructed”. The Seigneur was paid 50 francs per square perch in compensation (the tower took up 12 square perches) and the States also compensated local farmers who had right of common on the site.
Work resumed on the construction of Lewis’s Tower in July 1835 and was completed later in the year at a cost of £798 (see appendix B)

- A report by Lt Col Lewis CRE and Lt Col Sinclair CRA, 28 October 1835, records 1 x 24-pounder at the “One Gun Tower” later named after Col Lewis (Public Record Office ref: WO 44/76)

- A letter from Lt Col Oldfield to the Lieutenant-Governor, 9 March 1837, describing the coast defences between Corbiere and Rozel notes that the tower situated in St Ouen’s Bay between Kempt Tower and L’Etac, is calculated for 1 heavy gun, an officer and 18 men, and has a magazine capable of containing 90 barrels of powder. The letter observes that the magazine floor is prepared but not laid and the tank will contain 460 gallons of water (Public Record Office ref: WO 44/76)

- A survey of Lewis’s Tower drawn by Lt Ogle RE and signed by Lt Col Oldfield CRE on 11 March 1837 shows detailed plans of the tower as built [note that these plans incorrectly show the First Floor and Top in reverse] (see appendix A.iii)

- The ‘One Gun Tower’ was soon renamed after Lieutenant-Colonel Lewis, RE.

- A letter from Major Jones, Commanding RE, 18 September 1839 refers to the damp conditions inside the tower and requests permission to coat the exterior with cement to make it more weather-tight (Jersey Archive ref: C/A5/3)

- Colonel English Memorandum Book, 9 November 1840 has the following entry for Lewis Tower:
  Present state - erected in 1835 at the expense of the States - the interior is damp, which a coating of cement outside will remedy - requires the interior fitments;
  Situated on the sands, North of Kempt Tower 1100 yards (1795 Ordnance Survey)
  Object of tower to protect this part of the bay formerly without a work;
  Armament - intended for one Heavy Gun on a traversing platform - demanded but not on site;
  Magazine for 90 barrels of powder – it is not sufficiently dry to receive ammunition;
  Barrack for 1 officer and 18 men Water tank to contain 460 gallons;
  Proposed - to cover the exterior wall of the tower with a coating of cement in order to correct the damp of the interior, which has been found to succeed at point de Pas Tower. The gun in the Tower to be fitted with a percussion Lock. 3 wall muskets with percussion Locks. Interior fitments. The above will amount to £20 (Public Record Office ref: WO 55/1550/2)

- A Royal Engineers Office report on the general state of the defences of Jersey and the number of guns mounted in January 1848, dated 15
February 1848, records a total of 1 x 32-pounder at Lewis's Tower (Public Records Office ref: WO 44/76).

- Inspection Report of Ordnance, Carriages, Ammunition by CRA & CRE, 30 September 1848 records Lewis Tower (Martello), St Ouen's Bay "for one heavy 32-pounder Gun (of 56 cwt) on an iron traversing platform, and iron Garrison Carriage, which are on the spot, mounted" (Public Record Office ref: WO 44/77)

- A map of Jersey by Hugh Godfray, 1849 shows 'Martello - Les Laveurs' (see appendix A.iv)

- Correspondence between the Committee for Defence and F Hodel Contractor and J Farrell Contractor, 26 July – 30 December 1855 notes the very damp conditions inside Lewis's Tower and recommends that the tower be asphaltted (Jersey Archive ref: D/AP/B/5/1)

- Report by Colonel Le Couteur on the defence of Jersey, 14 January 1860, refers to Lewis Tower and Letac Tower commanding the only inlet into Letac (Jersey Archive ref: A/D2/1 – see also appendix A.v).

- A memorandum from Col Le Couteur to Major General Mundy, 14 February 1860 indicates the short range of the gun mounted at Lewis Tower in comparison to the 5½ mile range of the new Armstrong gun proposed for the battery close to Tower B (Jersey Archive ref: A/D2/1)

2.3 Late nineteenth century decline and the German Occupation

- A letter by Lt Gov Douglas, 10 November 1860 observes that Kempt, Lewis and L'Etac Towers require much internal repair before they can be occupied, "they have been left in a most neglected position for many years" (Jersey Archive ref: A/D2/1)

- A map of Jersey surveyed by Staff Commander J Richards RN in 1867 calls Lewis's Tower 'Martello Tower No.1' (see appendix A.vi)

- Lewis's Tower appears to have been sold privately by the War Department to the States of Jersey before 1922.

- The Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1935 shows the tower as 'Tower No.1 (Lewis Tower)' (see appendix A.vii)

- A photograph of Lewis's Tower by Emile Gilton, 31 July 1939 shows the original appearance of the tower before later alterations (see appendix A.viii)

- During the German Occupation of Jersey, 1940-1945, Lewis's Tower was requisitioned - a concrete searchlight housing was added to the base of the tower and a new entrance door created at ground level. A
post-war photograph shows the searchlight housing and an aerial on top of the tower (see appendix A.ix)

- The Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1981 shows the tower as ‘La Petite Tour (Lewis Tower)’ set within a landscape of German defensive works (see appendix A.x)

- A photograph of Lewis’s Tower in 1989 shows doors added to the searchlight housing (see appendix A.xi)

- Photographs of Lewis’s Tower taken between 1987-1989 show the tower with failing render (see appendix A.xii)

- Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 2003 (see appendix A.xiii)

- Photographs of Lewis’s Tower taken in July 2006 show an un-rendered tower with pointed granite, new timber doors and window shutters (see appendix A.xii)

- 9 November 2006 – Lewis’s Tower is Listed under the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002 as a Site of Special Interest (see appendix C)

- 16 November 2006 – Lewis’s Tower is owned by the Public of the Island of Jersey under the administration of Jersey Property Holdings.

3 Overview of the key surviving elements

See appendix A.xii.

Lewis’s Tower is built on the coast of St Ouen’s Bay near to the slipway at Les Laveurs. It is an 1835 Martello tower with a c.1942 German searchlight housing and entrance at the base.

The tower is circular - approximately 38 ft in diameter at the base and a squat 33 ft height. It has a noticeably battered outer wall of squared granite with dressed granite openings. The outer wall is robust – the front section being 9ft thick and the rear section 8ft thick.

A dressed granite doorway faces inland away from the direction of attack. It has a carved lintel LEWIS’S TOWER and the two upper jamb stones are carved with the date 1835. The timber door is modern. The tower has just three small window openings at first floor level. The timber shutters are modern.

Below the doorway, sunk below ground level is an inserted concrete doorway and access steps. On the northeast side of the base of the tower is a concrete searchlight housing with arched roof.

The tower is arranged on three levels.
The 1835 entrance is raised at first floor level. The doorway has a specially profiled threshold that enabled the original entrance ladder to be withdrawn from above. The first floor room is designed as a ‘bomb-proof’ vault protecting the accommodation for gunners. The walls are ashlar granite with a central dressed granite pillar and brick vault supporting the gun platform above. There are no loopholes but a circuit of three deep-set windows dressed with ashlar granite. There is a small fireplace with brick hearth. The room is separated from the magazine below by a 1940s steel and concrete floor. Access to the magazine is via a metal staircase through the concrete floor. Access to roof level is via a metal ladder set in a niche within the thickness of the external wall.

At basement level is a magazine divided into two rooms. The magazine was originally only accessible via an internal stair ladder from the first floor but the ‘outer’ room can now be entered either by a metal staircase from above or through an external doorway inserted by the German forces in the 1940s - defended by a small gun embrasure. The ‘outer’ room has squared granite walls, granite flag floor with inserted concrete and steel ceiling above, and a central dressed granite pillar. A dressed granite doorway connects with the enclosed magazine room. There is a small internal window between the two rooms to enable the magazine to be illuminated by candlelight. The enclosed magazine has squared granite walls with baffled ventilation slots dressed with brick. The outer wall follows the curve of the tower. There is a granite flag floor and brick arched ceiling.

The roof platform is supported off the brick vault below. The platform is granite flags with a central granite pillar with iron pivot to house the traversing gun. There is a masonry parapet with dressed copings and raised step. A drainage channel runs into a rainwater spout on the exterior of the wall. There are three storage niches around the parapet and a modified capping to the chimney.

The key elements of the site are:

- The 1835 tower
- The c.1942 German searchlight housing and entrance

4 Statement of significance

4.1 Archaeological significance

Evidence has been recorded of a submerged Neolithic forest and coastal peat deposits on the nearby foreshore. Much of St Ouen’s Bay preserves a prehistoric landscape beneath the sands.

It is unknown if there is any surviving physical evidence of earlier defences nearby - such as the Du Parcq Battery.
4.2 Historical significance

Lewis's Tower is important evidence illustrating the history of fortifications in Jersey 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.

Lewis's Tower is one of a series of towers of the English Martello pattern built in Jersey between 1831 and 1837. Whereas Kempt Tower and La Collette Tower were of the East Anglian cam-shaped design, Lewis's Tower and Victoria Tower were of the smaller English South Coast type.

4.3 Architectural significance

Lewis's Tower was built to a standard design approved by the Board of Ordnance for such towers in their charge around the world. The highest standards of construction were achieved by the supervising RE Officers and Jersey contractor Jean Gruchy and his stonemasons.

The tower substantially retains its completeness and architectural integrity as an early nineteenth century Martello tower with the structure close to its original form and physical context. It is strategically sited and can still be read in terms of its strategic defence value as originally conceived.

4.4 Ecological significance

Wildlife assessment (GR 558535) 2006

The tower is situated in a valuable coastal strip that supports good quality dune and maritime vegetation, a variety of rare plants and a high diversity of invertebrate species. Many of the island's most important plants and invertebrates occur here. The strip is part of an area that is under consideration for designation as a SSSI and is within the "St. Ouen's Bay and Les Mielles" proposed Ramsar site.

In 1973 Dr D.S. Ranwell of the Institute of Terrestrial Ecology surveyed the dunes of St Ouen's Bay on behalf of the Public Building and Works Committee of the States and confirmed their value. The Societe Jersiaise published two of his papers (Annual Bulletin 21: 381-391 and 505-516) in which he described these dunes as "among the ten largest single dune systems in the British Isles and remarkably rich in species."

Dr A.C. Warne's invertebrate surveys in 2002 confirmed that the strip has a remarkably rich and diverse fauna including significant numbers of rare species. His report drew attention to the need to protect the strip as a whole - rather than just individual parts of it - and warned against mounting pressures that threaten the plant and animal communities.
At the present time the maritime grassland extends up to the base of the tower on all sides. In the immediate vicinity it does not appear to be particularly rich but it includes dune grasses (whether *Agropyron junceiforme* or *A. pungens* - or hybrids - is not recorded), wild carrot (*Daucus carota*) and frequent hare’s-tail (*Lagurus ovatus*). The latter is believed to have been introduced to St Ouen’s Bay in the 1870’s and is now abundant there. One of Jersey’s rarest plants, the hybrid sea lavander *Limonium auriculae-ursifolium*, is said to be well established in the zone behind the sea wall; and a number of other local species have been reported.

The walls of the tower support a few lichens but no ferns or flowering plants. The flat top has not been examined.

Development and/or increased use of the tower will inevitably increase the pressures on that part of the coastal strip leading to loss of species and further fragmentation of the habitat. The danger of adding to the pressures and further diminishing the quality of this important and vulnerable coastal strip needs to be taken into account when considering future use of this tower.

**Bat Survey Report, 2006**

This is an 1835 Martello Tower with a separate German searchlight housing attached. The German section is a domed, concrete structure with metal lined roof. There is no obvious bat access and the structure is unsuitable for use. The tower is accessed via a German-built door at ground level. Two small, old bat droppings were found on the basement floor of the tower. However, there are no significant roosting features and there were no other signs on the upper platform or elsewhere. Thin cobweb threads span much of the internal air space.

The tower is marginally better located in landscape terms than La Tour Carree with a reasonable good tree line an estimated 150m away on the opposite side of the road. Nevertheless, evidence of bat use is minimal, and roosting is considered unlikely.

### 4.5 Other significance

The most prominent post-military use of Lewis’s Tower has been as leased storage space.

### 5 Identification of major conservation issues

The following is an assessment of the way in which the significance of Lewis’s Tower could be vulnerable.

- Care must be taken to ensure that the significance of Lewis’s Tower is not eroded through neglect. The tower 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 tower, there will be physical damage to the fabric and thereby to the significance of the tower.

• A potential problem is a lack of continuing and long-term interest in the tower 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 Lewis's Tower 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 tower 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 tower 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 tower, for example the requirements for repairing the structure 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 1985 (Granada Convention). The 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, (Valetta Convention) which imposes similar obligations in respect of the archaeological heritage.

There is also a series of multi-lateral environmental agreements for which ratification has been extended to Jersey:

• The Convention on Biological Diversity is concerned with the conservation of species and habitats.
• The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention) aims to conserve terrestrial, marine and avian migratory species throughout their range.
• Jersey is an important migratory refuge to at least 50 species of ducks, waders, terns, gulls and geese listed in the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement.
• The Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats covers the conservation and management of bats.
• The Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention) aims to conserve wild flora and fauna and their natural habitats.

6.2 Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002

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

• Sites of Special Interest - under Articles 51 and 52, the Minister for Planning and Environment 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 Articles 54 and 55 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.

Lewis’s Tower is designated as a Site of Special Interest (see appendix C). SSI Permission is therefore required before there is any physical intervention in the tower’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 TR3 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 Lewis’s Tower lies within the Green Zone (C5) This is defined as ‘areas of countryside identified as having an intact character and comprising an important range of environmental features needing a high level
of protection’, such as the St Ouen’s Bay coastal plain (JIP 2002 5.39). As such the area merits a high level of protection with a general presumption against all forms of new development for whatever purpose.

Lewis’s Tower also comes within the area of the St Ouen’s Bay Planning Framework. Policy C7 of the JIP states that ‘the planning policies set out in the St Ouen’s Bay Planning Framework are adopted by the Planning and Environment Committee for the purposes of development control and integrated management within the area’.

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 new Supplementary Planning Guidance replaces it. 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 Bye-Laws

Some work at the tower will have to comply with Building Bye-laws as required by the law.

6.6 Conservation of Wildlife (Jersey) Law, 2000

Work to and use of the tower 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 Lewis’s Tower will have to comply with statutory and policy regulations outlined above.

Best 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 BS7913:1998.** 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 D).

7 Conservation policies

Lewis’s Tower’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 tower must not be materially damaged.

7.1 Policy for recording and mitigation strategies

When any work is proposed to maintain, repair or alter Lewis’s Tower, 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
- draw up a brief in advance of any physical investigation or excavation in accordance with the Trust’s archaeological protocol (see appendix E)
- 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

7.2 Policy for maintenance and repair

The priority for the Jersey Heritage Trust is to maintain the physical fabric of the tower 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 tower
- 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

7.3 Policy for protecting the natural environment

When any work is proposed to maintain, repair or alter Lewis’s Tower, the Jersey Heritage Trust will:

- ensure that work to and use of the tower is compatible with the provisions of the Wildlife Law and the St Ouen’s Bay Planning Framework, 1999
- 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 ecology
- draw up a brief in advance of any physical investigation or excavation in accordance with an ecological mitigation strategy to be agreed with the Environment Department
- obtain SSI permission and appropriate licences 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

7.4 Policy for reconstruction and alteration

- consideration will be given to appropriate new uses for the tower 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 Lewis’s Tower 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 tower 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 an electrical supply to the tower. The Jersey Heritage Trust will ensure that:

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

- any 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 tower, such as the production of a multi-lingual guidebook, resource material for educational visits and a programme of events that complement the tower and contribute to the understanding of its history.

8 Summary of proposed additional research and analysis

| A condition survey to identify the range of problems throughout the tower. | To be undertaken by the Jersey Heritage Trust |
| Implement a quinquennial condition survey of the tower. | To be undertaken by the Jersey Heritage Trust |
| Draw up an annual programme of works together with a phased maintenance schedule. | To be prepared by the Jersey Heritage Trust |
9 Implementation and review

- The Jersey Heritage Trust has undertaken to produce a conservation statement for Lewis’s Tower according to current best practice (as set out in the English Heritage guidance ‘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 change, and to advise the JHT on matters relating to the conservation of Lewis’s Tower.

- 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 Lewis’s Tower.

- The conservation statement will be regularly reviewed and refined every 3 years.
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- List of stone and wood gun platforms in need of repair noted in the Defence Committee Minutes, 26 October 1787 (ref: C/B/B1/1)
- Letter from General Don to Earl Spencer, 22 May 1806 (ref: L/F/95/A/2)
- Map of Jersey engraved by Samuel John Neele from a survey carried out to illustrate William Plee's Account of Jersey, published in 1817 (ref: L/F/120/A/100)
- States Minutes, 3 March 1832 (ref: C/A1/15)
- Letter from Major Jones, Commanding RE, 18 September 1839 (ref: C/A5/3)
- Map of Jersey by Hugh Godfray, published in 1849 (ref: L/F/120/A/107)
- Correspondence between the Committee for Defence and F Hodel Contractor and J Farrell Contractor, 26 July – 30 December 1855 (ref: D/AP/B/5/1)
• Memorandum by Col Le Couteur on the defence of Jersey, 14 January 1860 (ref: A/D2/1)

• Memorandum from Col Le Couteur to Major General Mundy, 14 February 1860 (ref: A/D2/1)

• Letter by Lt Gov Douglas, 10 November 1860 (ref: A/D2/1)

• Map of Jersey, surveyed by Staff Commander J Richards R N, 1867 including bays, soundings and rocks (ref: L/F/120/A/114)

• Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1935 (ref: D/Z/L/8/7)

• Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 1981 (ref: L/F/70/A/21)

Jersey Heritage Trust (other sources):

• Protocol for Archaeological Work, 2005


Société Jersiaise Library:

• A report on the batteries around the Island, 28 August 1797 (ref: M20/10)

• A statement of the different magazines in the Island, 1810 (ref: M20/8)

• Plans of Lewis’s Tower by Lt Col. Oldfield, 11 March 1837 (ref: M20)

Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection:

• Lewis’s Tower by Emile Gulton, 31 July 1939 (ref: SJPA/008044)

• Lewis’s Tower, undated (ref: SJPA/008045)

• Lewis’s Tower, 1989 (ref: SJPA/008046)

Public Records Office: (transcribed by Major M Lees 2005-6 unless otherwise stated)

• Survey of St Ouen’s Bay produced by J Chamberlaine, 1758 (ref: MR 1030)

• Report by Lt Col Lewis CRE and Lt Col Sinclair CRA, 28 October 1835 (ref: WO 44/76)
• Letter from Lt Col Oldfield to the Lieutenant-Governor, 9 March 1837, describing the coast defences between Corbiere and Rozel (ref: WO 44/76)

• Colonel English Memorandum Book, 9 November 1840 (ref: WO 55/1550/2)

• Royal Engineers Office report on the general state of the defences of Jersey and the number of guns mounted in January 1848, dated 15 February 1848 (ref: WO 44/76)

• Inspection Report of Ordnance, Carriages, Ammunition by CRA & CRE, 30 September 1848 (ref: WO 44/77)

States of Jersey Planning and Environment Department:

• Historic Buildings Register (ref: OU0092)

• Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 2003

• Plan of Site of Special Interest

Statutory and policy framework references:

• Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada, 3.X.1985)

• European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) (Valletta, 16.I.1992)

• International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter) – 1964

• The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (The Burra Charter)

• Convention on Biological Diversity

• Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention)

• African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement

• Agreement on the Conservation of Populations of European Bats

• Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention)

• Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002
• The Building Bye Laws (Jersey), 2004
• The Conservation of Wildlife (Jersey) Law, 2000
• The Health and Safety at Work (Jersey) Law, 1989
• The Jersey Island Plan, 2002
• The St Ouen’s Bay Planning Framework, 1999
• The Interim Policies for the Conservation of Historic Buildings, 1998 (States of Jersey Planning and Building Services Department)
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Plan of the Magazine
Map of Jersey by Hugh Godfray, published in 1849, after a survey by Elias Le Gros - showing parish boundaries, vingtaine boundaries, roads, lanes and every house (Jersey Archive ref: L/F/120/A/107)
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Report by Colonel Le Couteur on the defence of Jersey, 14 January 1860
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(Société Jersiaise Photographic Collection ref: SJPA/008045)
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July 2006

Interior of enclosed magazine
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Ordnance Survey Map of Jersey, 2003
(Planning and Environment Department)
Lewis's Tower and its Associations

E. PHILIP AMER, B.S.

A challenge was recently put out in the "Junior Evening Post" that there were many interesting stories around the coast whose history had yet to be written. Lewis's Tower (Tower No. 17) was far away from the railroad known as Les Everats, one of which has been mentioned for so long a time, particularly, it is the name of its designer and builder, Colonel G. W. Lewis, whose name, curiously enough, is perpetuated in Lewis Street looking Chesterfield and the Expositor.

The year 1882 was in many respects a big one for Gurnsey in the first place the Lieutenant-Governor, William Thornton, was absent and not quite a year during his tenure of office from 1882-1883 the Deputy, Colonel C. W. Tolson, was a local gentleman, who was vice-president in the art of military fortifications as the go-cousins in the Royal Engineers.

Moreover there were now developments in naval and military matters, and the thrilling news of the "Victoria" type was almost completely disappeared. In 1883, a general return to sail power and formidably armed vessels could be easily used to attack a target on a sandy beach.

The defence of the island was a much more serious to the possibilities of an attack on Jersey from the south east. The coast was vulnerable to the effects of the tide, and the defense of its shores was a serious matter. In 1884 it was decided to erect a battery of four guns on a prominent point.

Lewis, the commanding Royal Engineers, had, at the request of the Defence Committee, made a report on the possibilities of the situation around the coast. The report was submitted to the committee and was received with enthusiasm. The plans of these forts were to be designed by the Royal Engineers, and were designed by G. W. Lewis, an engineer from St. Helier.

The Defence Committee was presided over by Mr. John de Carteret, the leader of the committee, was an ordinary, special meeting of the States to consider this proposal.

The States met on June 11, 1884, and the committee was appointed. To consider ways and means to continue the erection of the fort at St. Ouen's Bay which was suspended in 1884. The committee was appointed to write to the chief engineer of the States and to carry on the construction of the fort.

Sir John de Carteret opened the communications, saying that the States had received a letter from the Defence Committee asking to read it to the Assembly. In the letter, the committee asked for an explanation of the States for the reasons why the work was suspended. The Solicitor-General also read a letter from G. W. Lewis, the chief engineer of the States, explaining the reasons why the work was suspended.

COMPENSATION

An interesting feature in the States was the discussion of the compensation of the owner of the property which was to be expropriated. The owner of the property, S. C. Marshall, was not satisfied with the compensation offered. The committee sent a demand for the compensation to be paid to the owner of the property. The compensation was finally agreed upon, and the owner of the property was satisfied.

The District of St. Helier was also discussed, and the committee decided to make some changes to the streets in the district. The changes were made, and the streets were improved.

The committee also discussed the matter of the water supply in the district. The water supply was improved by the installation of a new water pipeline. The committee also discussed the matter of the roads in the district. The roads were improved by the installation of a new road system.

The committee also discussed the matter of the schools in the district. The schools were improved by the installation of new school buildings. The committee also discussed the matter of the hospitals in the district. The hospitals were improved by the installation of new hospital buildings.
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Lewis's Tower, La Grande Route des Mêlles, St Ouen

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

(a) the outer face of the concrete searchlight housing from its south corner, as indicated by the letter “a”, to its west corner, as indicated by the letter “b”;

(b) the outer face of the rendered granite tower from the west corner of the concrete searchlight housing, as indicated by the letter “b”, to its junction with the south corner of the southern flanking wall of the concrete steps, as indicated by the letter “c”;

(c) the outer face of the southern flanking wall of the concrete steps from its south corner, as indicated by the letter “c”, to the south corner of the top of the concrete steps, as indicated by the letter “d”;

(d) the top of the concrete steps from the south corner of the steps, as indicated by the letter “d”, to the north corner of the steps, as indicated by the letter “e”;

(e) the outer face of the northern flanking wall of the concrete steps from its junction with the north corner of the concrete steps, as indicated by the letter “e”, to its junction with the rendered granite tower, as indicated by the letter “f”;

(f) the outer face of the rendered granite tower from the junction with the northern flanking wall of the concrete steps, as indicated by the letter “f”, to its junction with the south corner of the concrete searchlight housing, as indicated by the letter “a”.
Appendix D
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 refurbishment, rehabilitation or renovation.

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, 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 unaltered, 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. Its state at any particular time 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 secondary or subsequent designs, careless 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
State 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. Any intervention or work likely to affect the essential qualities of a building or its character, land or anything 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 strength of this evidence determines how accurate or hypothetical 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 anticipated and planned, but occasionally it can be required in response to a specific event, such as a storm or accident.

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 repaired 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 accuracy 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 to 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 being done.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 In the absence of statutory guidance the Jersey Heritage 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 **Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002**

_Sites of Special Interest_

Under Articles 51 and 52, the Minister for Planning and Environment 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 Articles 54 and 55 against certain operations and activities on sites of special interest including the use or operation of a device designed or adapted to detect or locate metal or minerals in the ground, and any activity which might injure or deface the site or a part of the site. SSI Permission is required from the Minister of Planning and Environment for any of the stated operations and activities.

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 1985) and the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Revised) (Valletta 1992). 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 collation 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 SSI 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 assessment(s).

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 fulfil the projects 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-excavation 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 Guidance for Archaeological Watching Brief* (1994, revised 2001).

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 recoding of standing buildings or structures.*

10. **POST-EXCAVATION**

10.1 On completion of the fieldwork a programme of post-excavation 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 access 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 analysis 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 investigation 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
- Valetta Convention 1992
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 1994 Standards and Guidance, By-Laws
- Institute of Field Archaeologists 1986 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
- 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