The high level strategy management cycle for St Helena’s Historic Environment is illustrated above. It is anticipated that this will be regularly reviewed, possibly quinquennially, and that the lessons learned and experience gained will reinvigorate the policy cycle at every iteration. [this illustration is based on the Scottish Heritage Review, amended to suit St Helena]
Statement of Heritage Value

1. St Helena’s distinctive character has been shaped by geological and other natural forces over millions of years and by human activity, for the past 500 years. Past generations have left their mark in the form of monuments, buildings and sites, in our towns and in the countryside around us, even in the patterns of our roads, streets and fields. This rich historic tapestry is our historic environment. The historic environment is part of our everyday lives. It helps give us a sense of place, well-being and cultural identity. It enhances regional and local distinctiveness. It forges connections between people and the places where they live and visit. It helps make St Helena an attractive place to live and work. It is important that everyone in St Helena takes care of this inheritance now, so that future generations will also be able to enjoy it.

2. Our buildings include houses and homes, forts and defences commercial and industrial structures churches and temples. Although the majority of older buildings are not listed, most provide flexible and often spacious domestic and non-domestic accommodation. An enormous investment of money, energy and materials went into these buildings – it would be poor stewardship of this inheritance to neglect it.

3. Our whole environment, whether rural or urban, terrestrial or under water, has a historic dimension that contributes to its quality and character. It has been shaped by human and natural processes. This is most obvious in our built heritage: historic monuments; archaeological sites and landscapes; historic buildings; townscapes; parks; gardens and designed landscapes; and our marine heritage, for example in the form of historic shipwrecks. We can see it in the patterns in our landscape – the layout of fields and roads, and the remains of a wide range of past human activities.

4. The emergence of these patterns on St Helena strongly reflects the interaction of people and place. The steep hills constrain settlement and access, and the resultant and sometimes vertiginous road network is a very distinctive element of the island’s built heritage. It also provides viewpoints from which the island’s spectacular forms and their enfolded towns and villages, fields and farms can be observed.

5. The context or setting in which specific historic features sit and the patterns of past use are part of our historic environment. The historical, artistic, literary, linguistic, and scenic associations of places and landscapes number amongst the intangible elements of the historic environment and these, together with local beliefs, traditions and vernacular histories make a fundamental contribution to our sense of place and cultural identity.

6. The sense of place and the strong cultural identity provided by the historic environment plays a large part in the maintenance and regeneration of communities and in promoting a positive image of St Helena across the world.
7. Everything changes, matures and decays. Natural processes, such as climate change and erosion, and human interventions through land management, urban and rural development, transport and pollution, constantly erode or change our historic environment. The sustainable management of the historic environment is an integral part of the wider management of resources.

8. The historic environment is a palimpsest that has been adapted over time to meet changing needs. Our view of what is important develops and changes. New buildings, sites and environments are created, and over time, become historic. The challenge for sustainable management of the historic environment and how it contributes to the vitality of modern life, is to identify its key characteristics and to establish the boundaries within which change can continue so that it enhances rather than diminishes historic character.

9. The remains of the past can act as a powerful catalyst and a stimulus to high-quality new design and development, leading to successful regeneration and community-building. We believe that the historic environment should be valued as an asset, rather than thought of as a barrier to development. It reinforces the identity of communities, and can add value, especially if that value is recognised at the outset and it becomes an integral part of any development or regeneration project.

10. The protection of the historic environment is not about preventing change. SHG believes that change in this dynamic environment should be managed intelligently and with understanding and compassion, to achieve the best outcome for the historic environment and for the people of St Helena within the overriding constraint of economic realities.

11. The historic environment faces many challenges:
   a. poor understanding of the positive role it can play in the maintenance, development and regeneration of communities, their culture and their economy;
   b. short-term visions for the development of places;
   c. changing land-management practices and restructuring in the farming industry;
   d. lack of knowledge and understanding of how older buildings were constructed and perform and their maintenance needs;
   e. loss of sites to natural soil flow on steep slopes, hill wash, coastal and agricultural land erosion;
   f. inappropriate change that reduces the cultural significance, or detracts from the appearance or quality of conservation areas;
   g. the needs of infrastructural works, like the airport, road works, electricity generation and distribution, water and waste distribution and
management, and so on.

12. The challenges of the future are best met by positive, careful and active management of the historic environment, acknowledging the inevitability of change but striving to ensure that we preserve that which contributes to our quality of life and sense of identity. Some elements of the historic environment are precious, some are not well understood; if they are lost or damaged, they cannot be replaced.
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

13. SHG has set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment (LDCP 2012, LPDCO 2014), including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, SHG recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and will strive to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, SHG takes into account:

i) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

ii) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;

iii) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, and

iv) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of St Helena.

14. In determining applications, SHG will require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to each asset's importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the Historic Environment Record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, SHG will require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

15. SHG will identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the developers report on the impact of a proposal on each heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

16. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. This, like all the requirements of this guidance will apply to properties in Crown Ownership as well as those in private ownership.

17. In determining development applications, SHG should take account of:

i. the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

ii. the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

---

iii. the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

18. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight will be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater that weight will be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a Grade II listed building, park or garden, or to a Heritage Significance Grade 2 heritage asset should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, i.e. Scheduled Monuments, Protected Wrecks and Grade I listed buildings, parks or gardens, significant heritage assets within National Conservation Areas [and World Heritage Sites], should be wholly exceptional.

19. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to, or total loss of, significance of a designated heritage asset, SHG will refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
   i. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
   ii. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
   iii. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
   iv. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

20. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing the optimum viable use of the asset.

21. The effect of a development application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

22. SHG will not permit loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.

23. SHG in collaboration with the St Helena Heritage Sector will look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas [and World Heritage Sites] and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness should be encouraged.

---

2 Historic shipwrecks are designated, and thereby protected, under the PWMAHO (2014). ‘Protection of Wrecks and Marine Archaeological Heritage Ordinance, 2014’. Jamestown, St Helena Government.
contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

24. Excavation and conservation of built fabric for academic or tourism reasons, on or in the vicinity of Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings will require Development Permission, and the appropriate Development Application in such circumstances will be a completed Conservation Management Plan in the approved format (see e-Appendix 1 for guidance on the preferred format of CMP).

25. Not all elements of a Conservation Area [or World Heritage Site] will necessarily contribute to its significance. Loss of a building (or other element) which makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area [or World Heritage Site] should be treated either as substantial harm (19 above) or less than substantial harm (20 above), as appropriate, taking into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area [or World Heritage Site] as a whole.

26. Non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments or that are considered by the Chief Environmental Officer, taking advice from the Heritage Sector, so to be, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

27. Enabling Developments, are those that offer conservation of certain heritage assets, or elements of them, in return for relaxation of development control rules and regulations leading to development permission on ancillary development on the same site. SHG should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for ‘enabling development’, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies.

28. SHG will make information about the significance of the historic environment gathered as part of plan-making or development management publicly accessible by including it in the NHR/HER. They will also require developers to record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost (wholly or in part) in a manner proportionate to their importance and the impact, and to make this evidence (and any archive generated) publicly accessible by its inclusion in the NHR/HER. However, the ability to record evidence of our past should not be a factor in deciding whether such loss should be permitted.
PART II: The HER

29. The software consisting of a database (in Access) and a presentational module (or ‘front end’) derived from GIS software has been referred to as the HER, and this is the subject of the current review. This was compiled by Ben Jeffs, working to the St Helena National Trust (SHNT) on a commission originating with Enterprise St Helena, Tourism (ESHT). This writer has not seen the brief to which Ben Jeffs worked. Before addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the data captured in this software, it seems wise to clarify what an HER is, in terms of definitions in existing St Helena Ordinances.

The Land Planning and Development Control Ordinance 2014 (LPDCO) notes that

Without prejudice to the generality of section 13, the Chief Planning Officer may (and, if so directed by the Governor in Council shall) submit to the Governor in Council proposals for the preparation of a Development Plan (to be known as the Historic Environment Record) identifying buildings, parts of buildings, or groups of buildings, and their settings, which ought to be protected due to their importance in relation to the architectural, cultural, or historical heritage of St Helena. (Part VIII, section 39, clause (1); underlining is by this writer)

30. It will be clear that the submission of the Development Plan by the Chief Planning Officer to the Governor in Council is a prerequisite for the existence of an HER, and as this prerequisite has not been met to date, no HER can be said to exist currently. It will also be clear that the mandate for the preparation and submission of the Development Plan lies within St Helena Government (SHG). It is a mandated government function that properly lies outwith the remit of an NGO such as the SHNT. The heritage database currently residing with the SHNT may be judged to be the National Heritage Register (NHR) which was mandated to the SHNT in its founding instrument, The Saint Helena National Trust Ordinance ((SHNTO 2002).

National Heritage Register

(Subsection 9 of Section 14 of the SHNT Regulations)

(1) The Trust shall establish and maintain a National Heritage Register of natural, cultural and historical resources and property that the Council determines are of national significance and worthy of preservation.

(2) The Council shall, from time to time, fix criteria for the inclusion of any cultural, historical or natural resource or property in the Heritage Register.

(5) The Council may categorise resources or properties included in the Heritage Register according to the importance of their preservation.

(emphasis added by this writer)
31. As the extracts presented above demonstrate, SHNT is required to produce a National Heritage Register (NHR) which includes data on all natural, cultural and historical resources and properties deemed to be of national significance. In this context, the phrase 'national significance' is taken to mean, of significance to the nation of Saint Helena. For the avoidance of doubt, this does not imply the technical, heritage-professional sense of being of outstanding national significance and therefore to be preserved against all but the most exigent need. That interpretation would be incompatible with the subdivision of the NHR list into four significance classes, based on criteria selected and applied by Jeffs as advocated in paragraph 5 of the subsection cited above. In addition to forming the register, SHNT has the power to modify entries in that register from time to time by addition (Paragraph 2) or by categorisation, or re-categorisation, in the light of the perceived importance of the preservation of the items in the data set (Paragraph 5).

**Roles, powers and responsibilities in re the HER**

32. These, Ordinances create a useful and important separation of powers and responsibilities of the kind common in all modern heritage legislation and governance. On the one hand, the Heritage Sector (see below for definition), represented on St Helena by the SHNT, the Heritage Society and Museum Service, *inter alia*, is tasked with the evaluation of the cultural values of the surviving heritage assets on the island, and with championing their conservation, unconstrained by any financial or other practical consideration. On the other hand, the Chief Planning Officer is tasked with determining the planning balance, i.e. determining where the greatest public benefit lies when irresolvable conflicts arise between development proposals and heritage preservation. The Heritage Sector has an advocacy role to play and should act as a brake on poor, or superficial decision making affecting heritage. The Planning Office has a legislated role to play in steering economic development via the planning process, thereby facilitating the economic life of the island. Of course, heritage has an economic value also and it is reasonable to expect the island’s heritage to make as full an economic contribution as possible to the lives of the island population. The Opportunity Cost of lost heritage value should routinely be evaluated to help planners to weigh the significance of other public benefits accruing from particular developments, against the loss of heritage value.

33. A healthy creative tension should exist between the Heritage Sector and the Planning Office and its advisers within SHG. Despite receipt of annual stipends from SHG, the Heritage Sector should be sufficiently independent of SHG to be able, in a worst case scenario, to take ill-advised or capricious judgements to local appeal or, *in extremis*, to British judicial review.

34. The planning advice of heritage professionals should be strictly limited to advice on heritage issues. Heritage professionals are not usually designers, or

---

3 Development decisions are made by the Land Development Control Authority, to whom the CPO makes recommendations based on his/her determination of the planning balance. For convenience, all references to the CPO’s decision making powers in this text should be interpreted as his/her recommendations to the LDCA.
economists, or social workers or town planners and they should resist the pressures they will experience to assume those roles by persons who strongly disagree with or strongly support particular planning applications/decisions. If the heritage professionals pursue such a course they are in danger of acting *ultra vires* (beyond their powers) which could open them to commercial claims for compensation and probably nullify their professional indemnity insurance. In such matters the heritage professional’s opinion should carry no more, but no less, weight than that of any other citizen.

35. It should also be a matter of concern that the existing NHR contains time-constrained assessments and potentially idiosyncratic judgements, for example, assessment of the person-days required to conserve the monument, assessments of the feasibility of occupancy or re-occupancy, and suggestions for the reuse potential and its of structures. Not only are these apparently subjective, but the indication of a suitability for reuse within a true HER might seem to circumvent the powers of the St Helena Development Control System, offering, or seeming to offer assurance of development permission outwith the development process of the St Helena Government.

36. As matters of opinion, within a non-statutory NHR listing their import is reduced to that of academic interest. If, as noted, they were to be carried into the new HER, there is a danger that they would compromise the development control processes by potentially constraining its freedom of action.

37. For the avoidance of doubt, objective heritage data can and must inform judgements about the cultural values of sites, monuments and cultural landscapes. The heritage professional is entitled to expect that these judgements will be given appropriate weight in the development process (see Heritage and Planning, below), as the existing ordinance stipulates. Heritage decisions made by SHG will be accessible to the Heritage Sector who, having been appointed as Statutory Consultants to the planning process, will both contribute to the decisions made and have sight of them.

*Initiation and Change Control for NHR and HER*

38. It is proposed that the existing database and GIS displays should be accepted as the heritage element of the Saint Helena National Trust’s *National Heritage Register* and that it should be identified as ‘NHR Ver 2014’. For the avoidance of doubt, a master copy of this version should be lodged with the SHG-IT Service, and locked against any alteration. True and verified copies of the Master Copy will be lodged with the SHNT, and the Museum, to provide access for the public and for potential developers or their agents.

39. SHG-IT will strip away all of the matter excluded from decision-making for Development Control purposes within SHG and forward to the Chief Environmental Officer an Excel spreadsheet copy (True and Verified) conforming with the situation represented in Table 1 (below). This will be proposed to the Governor in Council and, upon acceptance, it will constitute the HER. The Excel version of the HER will be designated the '*HER Ver 2014*'.

---

4 See the IfA ‘Code of Conduct’ for guidance on this matter.
Since the digital copies of the NHR *Ver 2014.1* and the HER *Ver 2014.1* will be subject to alteration in day to day use within the Heritage Sector and SHG, it is proposed that these primary copies be electronically locked, i.e. will be a read-only copy, within these organisations and unalterable for current use. Working copies can be made from them for day to day use, and these can be altered, sorted, extracted from, etc, etc.

**Recommendation 1**

Where planning advice or decisions are founded on the data contained in the HER dataset, The Planning Officer will check that the details founded upon are drawn from the current, true and verified copy before issuing that advice or decision so as to ensure that they are based on the legally valid HER.

Over the course of a working year, new information will arise and the need will be identified for editorial and other amendments to existing data within the NHR and HER Versions. It is proposed that the Heritage Sector be tasked with the initial change control for these data sets, with SHNT acting as lead organisation. Two Excel spreadsheets will be created by SHG-IT which mimic the format of the Access database of the existing version, one for the editing of existing records, the other for the addition of new records. SHG-IT will forward these Excel templates to the Heritage Sector. Amendments, whether arising within the Heritage Sector or SHG will be forwarded to SHNT for inclusion in these files. At appropriate intervals, and not less than once a year, these files will be forwarded by the Heritage Sector to SHG where the proposed changes will be reviewed and edited. Where disagreements arise in matters affecting the status of monuments and their cultural values, these should be addressed by discussion, either face to face or by exchange of papers, between the Heritage Sector and SHG. Irresolvable disputes will be determined by the decision of SHG, who may seek expert advice elsewhere. The reasons for each such decision being documented and that document, with the supporting dialogue, will be recorded in the HER, in the interests of transparency.

The edited files will then be forwarded to the SHG-IT department to be added to the NHR and the new version will be renamed, e.g. NHR *Ver 2014.2* and the HER *Ver 2014.2*, (and so on) and issued to SHNT and SHG. The latter will in turn seek Governor-in-council agreement to institute the latter as the definitive HER. The revised NHR will not be opened to public access until after the HER (new version) has been authorised to prevent public confusion and to avoid provision of incorrect information to developers, their advisors or their agents. Thereafter, the process will continue as described above in paragraph 41.

The redundant versions of the HER and NHR should be archived with the Museum, in the first instance and quinquennially thereafter should be included in the National Archive, for their historiographical value.

---

5 In a recent Info LegCo meeting elected members asked that the HER should also be made publicly available and there is no reason why this should not be done.
The Current NHR

44. It is accepted here that the writer's contractual obligation to review of the HER should, in the absence of an HER, be read as a requirement for a review of the NHR. Although the existing document is entitled ‘HER’, it will be referred to below as the NHR, for the sanity of the writer and reader alike.

45. Ben Jeffs very kindly provided the writer with a full copy and working version of the NHR which is appended here at e-APPENDIX 2. The headings under which data was entered in the main body of the database are set out in Table 1 (below) and a full record for one monument is reproduced in e-Figure 1. There are approx. 1000 monuments in this version of the NHR. Ben Jeffs also provided this writer with a report on the database contents and structure and this is attached as an e-copy in e-Appendix 3.

46. Jeffs is clear about the raison d'être of the NHR, which he suggests:

‘...is designed to generate and provide access to primary data detailing the historic environment of Saint Helena. It divides the islands structures into Historic Assets and gives details of what they are, where they are, how significant they are and why and finally what condition they are in. The information is intended to be used to provide statutory protection for the island’s valuable historic environments’

47. The National Trust Ordinance makes no reference to statutory protection and the source of this aspiration is not to be found in the LPDCO either. It would be unusual to have an NGO determine statutory designations not least because of their significance for strategic development and for development control. A measure of financial exposure would attach to SHNT in consequence of inappropriate use (adventitious or otherwise) of these powers which, frankly, is a risk it cannot afford to carry and one with which it should not be tasked. Designation for statutory development control purposes is a function of government, and is dealt with in this context below (see Designation).

48. Again, Jeffs is clear about the purposes for which this database was formed and these he suggests are:

1. To generate a baseline level of objective information illustrating the island’s historic environment; providing details of the location and nature of the various ‘Assets’ that make up that historic environment.

2. To provide information to facilitate the long term management and protection of the significances of the islands tangible heritage and its connections to the intangible cultural landscape.

3. To make the contained information available as widely as possible.’

49. In the objective data provided, Jeffs has clearly achieved his first aim in large part and whilst there is reason to query both the comprehensiveness of the coverage and some of its detail, the core data is present and is coherently and consistently presented. This is the abiding value of the work undertaken on this database.

---

HER Files Received 2014 Mar 04 from Ben Jeffs
His second aim, the facilitation of long term management and protection of tangible heritage, by data provision, is a worthy aspiration, whose execution lies outside the database and requires the processes and procedures set out in this report (Barber 2014). The protection of the links between tangible and intangible heritage is a pipe dream because the database is not structured to accept intangible heritage inputs. Nevertheless, this is a worthy, longer term aspiration.

Finally, the third issue, of availability of information, is somewhat less successfully addressed. The internet basis of the data presentation makes it 'clunky' and somewhat unfriendly to the user, even in areas with better internet facilities than St Helena. There are irritating glitches in the software, pop-up data labels do not pop back down again and so occlude other data; the illustrations are held on 'Flickr' and can only be accessed indirectly and require the enquirer to carry reference numbers into Flickr, and so on. Most importantly, access is provided only to the individual presentation of the data in forms built into the software. Researchers and other enquirers cannot easily access the raw data to analyse or take extracts from it. This limits its utility for developers, their agents or advisers and indeed also for tourists, and for its use by tourism agencies and the public on the island.

To some extent, these shortcomings arise from, it is deduced, shortcomings in the brief, and to the use of free or very cheap software. It is likely that they could be remedied by the use of industry standard software and a measure of reprogramming. The IT department of SHG has all the necessary skills and software licenses required to take over and redevelop this product in a more robust and user friendly form.

Recommendation 2

It is strongly recommended that SHG-IT should take over and redevelop the NHR, on the basis of inputs from the Heritage Sector, and from Tourism and Enterprise, within SHG, under the direction of the Chief Environmental Officer and that this be done immediately.

This redevelopment would also nullify the potential difficulties arising from Mr Jeffs’ claim to copyright and IPR over the current software application. It is believed that the data is in the ownership of SHG, given that they have funded its collection and the redeveloped package should clearly acknowledge Jeffs’ authorship of the core data.

Limitations of the data

In his report ‘The Saint Helena Historic Environment Record’ (e-Appendix 3) Jeffs acknowledges that the database is incomplete because it lacks data on moveable heritage, i.e. artefacts of all types, and lacks input on Intangible Heritage, i.e. cultural practices and processes, as defined in the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Heritage (UNESCO 2003). In addition, the important class of Marine Heritage is also absent. In practice, some elements are included that fall into these categories. The ‘Historic Tree’, for example, may be understood to form a cultural landscape or an associative landscape of one plant. But it remains an anomalous inclusion and one better dealt with under the Tree Preservation Order mechanism in the LPDCO. Similarly, the ‘Cooking Pot’, ‘Machinery’ and ‘Metal Fixings’ categories are really the concern of museology, as arguably are one or two additional categories (Jeffs uses the field name ‘Asset Type’ for categories).
55. The Museum has in practice no database of assets and one is required as a matter of urgency. A design for this has been sketched out and a working prototype database will be provided to the museum by the writer. The writer is content to develop this database further, provided that an assistant is appointed to the museum to input the necessary data.

Recommendation 3

A temporary full time assistant should be appointed to the museum for a period of up to three months, tasked with data entry for the Museum’s collection and all other mobiliary heritage artefacts on the island. The assistant should identify overlaps with the NHR and recommend their removal from the NHR/HER by the museum’s use of the change control processes set out above.

Lacunae

56. There are major lacunae, or gaps in the heritage information selected for inclusion in the database, and these relate to the strength of its underlying assumptions, arising from the current zeitgeist7 of the island. Since this is a fundamentally important consideration it is dealt with here, and the discussion will return to the database below. Zeitgeist is rarely set out explicitly but exists mainly in the set of common or shared beliefs and prejudices that inform decision making at a particular time and place. It is capable of change; zeitgeist made slavery acceptable at one time and rejected it at another.

57. It is this writer’s view that the current heritage zeitgeist of St Helena is fixed in a conception of the middle England of the mid nineteenth century. That no such place ever actually existed is not an objection as zeitgeist is a selective process that fastens onto those aspects of the past that are believed to inform our present. Georgian townhouses and Indian Hill-Bungalows, the ‘longhouses’ of the Jeffs database, are the architectural manifestations of the St Helena zeitgeist in urban and rural contexts respectively. These form a physical manifestation of the British Empire at its splendid best and highlight the then role of St Helena as a servicing point on the principal pre-Suez route way for the projection of power and influence into the Indian Ocean. They have now become the vernacular architecture of St Helena.

58. The vernacular architecture of a place may be described as the architecture of structures built by local empirical builders, from local materials, consistent with local traditions and to cope with local environmental conditions. Tradition is central to vernacular architecture and, as Le Corbusier noted, tradition is our surest guide to the future viz: ‘...tradition is the unbroken chain of all renewals and, beyond that, the surest witness of the projection towards the future.’ (Corbusier 1957). Tradition is thus a force for conservatism but, of course, blindly followed, it becomes a straitjacket.

59. Vernacular structures are characterised by their use of local materials and their evolution of strategies to cope with the local environmental conditions. For example, mud-brick or stone structures with thatched wooden roofs are common in tropical and sub-tropical areas and the high thermal capacity and insulating qualities of these materials create comfortable interiors in summer and winter (c- Figure 2). Use of clerestories in the roofs allowed light in and heat out and acts as

7 Spirit of the age or spirit of the times
a passive heat pump in the roof drawing comforting breezes up though the house and venting them through the clerestory or via an ope higher in the roof (see Weber and Yannas 2014 for relevant studies).

60. The Greek Island of Santorini, and its vernacular structures has been chosen here as an apt comparison for Saint Helena, because like St Helena it is an small volcanic island, cliff fringed and resource poor (Stasinopoulos 2014 11-36). The stone built houses use pozzolanic materials as cement (also present on St Helena and used here in the past). They also have semi subterranean and subterranean rooms in addition to their surface-built elements. On steep cliff faces this style yields very high stacking density which simplifies infrastructure, reduces costs and in its Warren of narrow paths and steep stairways, creates shelter from sun and wind in an intimate ambiance of great charm in constantly changing patterns of light and shade. More importantly, the structures provide a comfortable indoor environment all year round without air conditioning or fans and with minimal heating costs in the winter.

61. In contrast the derived Indian Hill-Bungalow of St Helena, despite it more generous proportions and pleasing form, is environmentally expensive, made from imported elements, has poor thermal self regulation and high energy costs. Adhering to a zeitgeist that did not arise from a local traditional vernacular architecture will ensure that the future for St Helena’s structures is as environmentally unfriendly and as costly as today. Herein lies a challenge for the design requirements of future developments, especially of village scale developments, which can be encouraged by planning, not necessarily to mimic Santorini, or any other place, but to develop a new St Helenian vernacular norm, acceptable to its population and capable of meeting the environmental and energy stringency of the near future. Similarly, when elements of St Helena’s heritage are being sacrificed to development for the greater common good, it would not be unreasonable for planners to seek a higher standard of design and build than the norm. Positive inducement to a greater creativity that embodies sensitivity to the landscapes of the island, could be fostered by the exhibition of a greater flexibility in the acceptance of harm to non-designated heritage assets in return for a significant uplift in quality.

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the proposed Development Conditions (below) require quality improvements above the prevailing norms in circumstances in which the loss of some heritage value will result from Development Permissions with impacts on heritage.

62. The influence of zeitgeist can also be detected in the dislocation between Big Culture and small culture on the island. In structured, but informal, interviews with islanders this writer has noted that the views and cultural values of the population at large do not reflect those of the dominant ruling elites. The prevailing Big Culture zeitgeist is clearly of little relevance to the bulk of the population and influences like radio and TV, internet and video, and sojourns in Ascension and elsewhere are beginning to formalise young islanders’ self images in ways that owe nothing to the middle England of 1850. There is always some dislocation between Big Culture and small culture, but the scale of that

---

8. Pozzolana, also spelled pozzolana, or pozzuolana, is a hydraulic cement discovered by the Romans and still used in some countries, made by grinding pozzolana (a type of slag that may be either natural—i.e., volcanic—or artificial, from a blast furnace) with powdered hydrated lime. Roman engineers used pozzolana by weight of pozzolana mixed with two parts of lime to give strength to concrete and mortar in bridges and other structures and buildings. During the 3rd century BC, the Romans and provincialed several types of cement and also used animal glue, giving extraordinary strength. For a description of “Indian Hill-Bungalow,” see below, the essay.)

---
manifested on St Helena limits and will further limit the ability of heritage to maximise its potential role in quality of life and in the economic development of the island.

63. The redress of this imbalance requires educational initiatives, on the one hand, and, on the other, targeted engagement with the public, on their own terms. Three of the four aims expressed in the SHNT website, are concerned with education and training, and SHNT have a track record of successful provision of training in conservation of masonry in simple stone walls. For these reasons, they seem the most appropriate agency to drive forward an educational initiative to maximise public awareness of, and involvement in heritage. The Museum is essentially a didactic institution and has also undertaken ad hoc training initiatives, mainly with school children. Thus the skills exist within the Heritage Sector of Saint Helena to cooperate with the education authorities and with the public in raising heritage awareness.

64. Intangible heritage has already been referred to and its absence from the NHR regretted by Jeffs and by others on St Helena. It comprises, in the words of the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Heritage (UNESCO 2003):

'1. The “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.‘

65. The emerging schism between Big Culture and small culture on St Helena may also be addressed by emphasising the island’s intangible heritage. The definition above from the UNESCO convention is compatible with, for example, the collection and curation of the early radio tapes from St Helena Radio, now stored in the museum. As reel-to-reel tapes, these are of limited access, but they can be readily digitised for greater accessibility to islanders and to global scholarship.

66. In addition recording of the older generation of islanders, in particular of their earliest memories would make a wonderful project, and if used by schoolchildren undertaking media studies, could be of great benefit to their education. Gradually, an archive of collective memory could be developed to help a new generation of Saints, whether by birth or adoption, to form meaningful relationships with the island and its past. Once initiated, this project could run indefinitely, constituting a global first.
Recommendation 5

Acknowledging that this is not his area of expertise, the writer nonetheless recommends that consideration be given to the following: that:

i) The Director of Education and Employment in consultation with the chair of the Heritage Sector should embark on a programme of educational engagement with St Helena’s heritage

ii) The museum be instructed and resourced to digitise its radio tapes archive and

iii) That the museum, in consultation with the Director of Education and Employment, seek to engage some schoolchildren, with other interested parties, in the digital recording of early memories of the older generation of Saints.

Missing Data

67. The exclusion of whole fields of heritage data from the existing database results from some combination of the particular interests of those who compiled it and the current zeitgeist. The latter is very largely an historical narrative based closely on a small number of written records. No archaeologist, and very few historians, would accept that historical documents present an unbiased record. Literacy was restricted to not much more than 1% of the population over the greater part of St Helena’s known history. Even if these all wrote only the literal truth as known to them, which is improbable, the views they express do not represent in any meaningful way the lives and concerns of the other 99% of the population. Archaeology of the historical periods, once used to provide footnotes to ‘known’ history, has long since grown out of that role because it provides evidence for the population as a whole, and evidence that is free of the contemporaneous biases of the relevant periods; people did not choose to lose things in some structured way to justify or conceal some action already taken, unlike historical documents which are often written specifically for those purposes.

68. The historical narratives of St Helena are held with such enthusiasm by some of their advocates that they preclude consideration of other possibilities. The recognised historical narrative records events since 1502, but the possibility that humans lived on St Helena before then is nowhere considered. Easter Island is considerably more remote than St Helena, and yet was densely populated before the arrival of modern colonialists, having been settled, probably soon after 700 AD. The overemphasis on St Helena’s colonial history has precluded any search for earlier settlement, and yet, if earlier settlement were located, the enhancement of St Helena’s heritage profile would be very great indeed and of global significance and interest. This should be sufficient to encourage a project searching for settlement from the remote past of the island.

Recommendation 6

Collaboration should be sought with an appropriate university (or universities) in the UK and/or elsewhere to form and fund a joint University/SH Heritage Sector project to undertake a systematic search for

9 The nearest inhabited land to Easter Island with just 50 residents, is Pitcairn Island, 2,075 kilometres (1,289 mi) away, and the nearest continental point lies in central Chile, 3,512 kilometres (2,182 mi) away.
pre-colonial settlement in the deeper sediment traps of the island and including, but not limited to, palynological studies of marshy areas.\textsuperscript{10}

69. Clearly present on the island but absent from the database are the remains of earlier episodes of agriculture on the island. Arable cultivation by ploughing and land terracing, together with water management and irrigation schemes are written into this landscape, but have escaped the attention of ‘Official Culture’. A brief perusal of the historical record suggests that when external economies support life on the island, the islanders abandon domestic agriculture and import basic commodities, including food. When that external interest wanes, the island economy contracts and the population defaults to agriculture at or just above subsistence level. This has resulted in the surviving evidence for agricultural activity that is visible over most of the island (e-Figure 3). A positive programme of research should be fostered into agricultural history of Saint Helena.

70. Similarly, with a few exceptions, the technological heritage of the island is poorly represented. The removal, without site record, of the early desalination plant from Rupert’s Valley is deeply to be regretted. The technological innovation represented by the desalination plant for Boer POW Camp is quite clearly a significant part of the heritage of Saint Helena. It is therefore to be hoped that the recovered fragments of the boiler and pumps (e-Figure 4) will be conserved and suitably displayed, either on site – the preferable option – or at the museum in Jamestown.

Recommendation 7

A professional archaeologist or archaeological group with an appropriate range of experience should be engaged for a three month period to identify and record agricultural traces on the island. This person or agency should also identify and record technological traces on the island. The data arising will be added to the NHR/HER and/or where relevant the Museum Database by the change control mechanism identified at para 41 above. The precise locations of both sets of remains will be surveyed onto the existing base maps by SHG staff and the coordinate sets will be added to the edited data set before its submission to the NHR/HER change control process.

71. Integration of the Museum records with the NHR, would go some way to redressing the technology imbalance and a review of its exhibits identifies the metanarratives\textsuperscript{11} set out below. It will be noted that some of the metanarratives do not find expression in the built heritage and this is to be expected.

\textbf{Saint Helena Museum: Metanarratives}

\textbf{Ships}

Navigation, maritime technologies-engineering-trade-harbourage

\textbf{Survey}

\textsuperscript{10} Palynology is the study pollen sequences in stratified deposits to reconstruct past environments, in which signatures representation of human intervention can be discerned and dated. The methodological handbook of one of its founding fathers, Knut Faegri is still in print (Faegri, K. and J. Iversen (1964). Textbook of Pollen Analysis. Oxford, Blackwell Scientific Publications).

\textsuperscript{11} A meta-narrative is a grand narrative common to all. The term relates, in critical theory and particularly in postmodernism, to a comprehensive explanation, a narrative about narratives of historical meaning, experience or knowledge, which offers a society legitimation through the anticipated completion of a (yet unrealised) master idea.
Roads-vehicles-maps-mapping-survey

Coins and stamps
  Numismatists and philatelists-minting and printing-related technologies

Geology
  Volcanism and metamorphism-minerals-petrology-Geologists

Biological collections
  Collectors-collections-voucher samples

Colonial history
  1659 settlement-settlers-regal bric a brac-militaria-police-justiciary-boers and other PoWs

Transformations
  St Helena as a prison-the Emperor Napoleon-Boers-Zulus-Middle Eastern prisoners

Communication (comms)
  Ship’s mail-radio comms-amateur radio on St Helena – trans
  Atlantic cables – ecomms

Slavery
  Historical narrative-structures and practices on island-protagonists – RN – Island Administration – EIC – deportation and resale

72. The development of the museum database is the subject of a separate recommendation, but it should be noted that the museum’s metanarratives, \textit{de facto}, recognise the major themes of St Helena’s past, albeit that we might now strive to add further metanarratives. Nonetheless, these are the themes which, \textit{inter al}, island-based scholarship imagines are attractive to visitors. Enterprise Saint Helena should embrace these metanarratives, or argue for their amendment, extension or replacement in a dialogue with the Heritage Sector.

Recommendation 8

Enterprise Saint Helena, Tourism, should appoint a senior staff member to the Heritage Sector, tasked with:

i. homologating the heritage offer for visitors to the island to ensure consistency of information presentation

ii. designing consistent signage to and on heritage assets throughout the island, to ensure consistency of information presentation

iii. providing editorial input to heritage offering originating from the Heritage Sector and where necessary translating ‘heritageese’ to English.
iv. Stimulating high level vision in the conservation and presentation of heritage on the island and internationally

**Broadening the scope**

73. It is necessary to develop a willingness to adopt some metanarratives, or overarching themes, that are currently not under consideration probably for zeitgeist reasons. Implicit in the foregoing is the need for consideration of technological and agricultural histories of the island and indeed, its past and current agricultural policies also. But more bizarrely absent is any profound consideration of the slaving history of St Helena and the ancestry of the bulk of the population. Clearly there may be zeitgeist sensitivities about this issue, especially as the role of the island and its administration, even after the abolition of slavery, was rather short of compassion and at times, deeply regrettable. But that was then, and our responsibility now is to record and conserve what is left of that history so that we and mankind may learn from it.

74. Daniel Libeskind’s *Jewish Museum* was constructed in Berlin (opened in 2001) to a design resulting from an anonymous architectural design competition. The *Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe* (also known as the *Holocaust Memorial*) was designed by architect Peter Eisenman and was also constructed in Berlin (2005). These monuments commemorate the Jewish victims of the holocaust and they are not comfortable places to visit, but the museum has attracted some three quarters of a million visitors annually (6.7 million to 2009, latest year for which reliable statistics are available) while the monument attracts approximately 2,000 visitors a day. The sensitivity of the subject matter was sensitively handled and local feelings have not been outraged. That sensitivity has not been a factor in determining the attractiveness of such memorials for visitors and being a focus for emotional release has had some cathartic benefit.

75. Black tourism is growing faster than almost every other type within the cultural tourism sector and even from that commercial perspective, the merits of undertaking further study of the phenomenon of slavery on and around St Helena must surely be justified. In addition, the sparse references in the database to the physical remains of the slave trade should be augmented and given higher status in terms of their cultural value. This could be pursued as a first annual review theme.

76. The idea of creating an ossuary for slave remains has been under consideration and the writer understands, its construction is now a firm plan. This is an excellent idea, so long as scientific access to the remains, under appropriate license, is ensured for future studies. The ossuary provides a further opportunity to mark the suffering of these poor people by the creation of a monument to their memories. This is the sort of thing that can be done in an international competition, at minimal cost. The competition would produce designs for work of international stature. These could be short listed by cultural experts elsewhere in the world, and the short listed entries could be displayed in St Helena. From these, one could be chosen, taking into account the views of islanders, and when funds permitted, its designer could be commissioned to create the work. In the

---

12 Black tourism is tourism undertaken by black people and this is distinct from Dark tourism, which is tourism to places associated with great loss of life from natural catastrophes or great atrocities. Perhaps both terms apply to St Helena.
design process alone, St Helena would receive international news coverage and exposure to an appropriate demographic that it cannot now afford to purchase. It would, handled properly, also build bridges across the community and contribute to eroding the Big Culture/small culture disjunction which is not without its racist overtones at times.

**Recommendation 9**

Saint Helena should, via the Heritage Sector and SHG, embrace the meta narrative of slavery and its role in the evolution of the island, in token of which the following actions should be undertaken:

i. Appropriate scholars should be identified to help form relationships between the island and international agencies engaged in slavery studies

ii. Commitment to the creation of the ossuary should be confirmed and work on it progressed as soon as civil engineering works in Rupert’s Valley are completed.

iii. An international competition should be announced, concurrently with the announcement of the formation of the academic relationships (above), calling for designs for a monument to the memories of slaves everywhere for placement at the ossuary.

**Review of the HER; Conclusion**

77. The core data set of the NHR is competently developed and has lasting value. It provides a solid basis of work that will be edited, developed and expanded over the coming years. Its front end is not user friendly and not fit for the purposes of public and developer access. Its inclusion of recommendations for future use of structures renders it unfit for use in development control, where these recommendations could be argued to usurp the decision making powers of the Development Control process in SHG.

78. Existing Ordinance and effective management requires a split between the advocacy role of the Heritage Sector and the legislated role of Development control. Proposals have been developed for the creation from the NHR of a common data set, reconfigured to meet the disparate needs of its several end users and for the management of the ensuing software sets by the SHG-IT Department which has the necessary skills. Details of a change control system for the ongoing development of the core database have been set out above and individual and group responsibilities have been identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NHR fields (Jeffs 2011)</th>
<th>HER</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reference</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asset_name</td>
<td>asset_name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcel</td>
<td>parcel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above_ground</td>
<td>above_ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below_ground</td>
<td>below_ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub_type_1</td>
<td>sub_type_1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub_type_2</td>
<td>sub_type_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X coordinate</td>
<td>X coordinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y coordinate</td>
<td>Y coordinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description</td>
<td>description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td>interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>historical_context</td>
<td>historical_context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event_type</td>
<td>event_type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event_date</td>
<td>event_date_or_period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period1</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period2</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Replaced by new Chrono Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period3</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Replaced by new Chrono Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period4</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Replaced by new Chrono Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period5</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Replaced by new Chrono Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated_finds</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Replaced by Museum database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>In New Database Chrono_Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional_information</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Buy a notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspection_date</td>
<td>inspection_date</td>
<td>In New Database Inspection Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspection_type</td>
<td>inspection_Type</td>
<td>In New Database Inspection Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspection_by</td>
<td>inspected_by</td>
<td>In New Database Inspection Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspection_interior</td>
<td>inspected_interior</td>
<td>In New Database Inspection Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Field</td>
<td>Inspection report</td>
<td>In New Database Inspection Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance_grade</td>
<td>significance_grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significance_comment</td>
<td>statement_of_significance</td>
<td>Change field title and content. Take entry from monument assessment. Make hyperlink field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition_grade</td>
<td>condition_grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>condition_comment</td>
<td>condition_comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trend</td>
<td>trend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days_to_stabilise</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied_feasible</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessibility</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_none</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_tourist_attraction</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_tourist_accommodation</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_dwelling</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_public_facility</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_commercial</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_administrative</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reuse_agricultural</td>
<td>Omitted</td>
<td>Not relevant to development control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thumbnail</td>
<td>thumbnail</td>
<td>Change to Hyperlink Field add many photographs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART III: Designation

BH1: Primary Policy

a) Development which encourages, supports and includes conservation of historic structures and their setting, including listed buildings, monuments and fortifications and related artifacts, will be permitted with appropriate requirements, including planning gain, to secure such conservation.

b) Development which affects historic structures and their setting and does not encourage, support and include its conservation or does not comply with the Management Plan of the Historic Conservation Area will not be permitted.

c) Development in Historic Conservation Areas will be permitted only if it enhances and protects the character of the Area by reference to scale, proportion, details and external materials of the proposed development in relation to those of the Historic Conservation Area.

(St Helena: Land Development Control Plan 2012-2022)

Introduction

79. In this section of the report SHG policies on the designation of sites, structures, shipwrecks and conservation areas are reviewed and recommendations for consolidation, amendment, extension or supplementation are offered. It is important to reiterate that all heritage remains constitute a finite and non-renewable resource and their preservation in situ is the preferred policy of the St Helena Government. Not all heritage remains are of equal value but some are of such outstanding national value for the cultural heritage of the island that they merit special protection. This protection is provided by designating them in a scheme with clear links to the ordinances already in existence.

80. Heritage designations are used to provide protection for the most important of the nation's heritage assets, i.e. those which are of 'national significance'. These assets are of such diversity that a single scheme of designation cannot easily be created to embrace all and four statutory designations are recommended here, one of which, the National Conservation Areas already exists (REF) and in addition, the 'Protection of Wrecks and Marine Archaeological Heritage Ordinance, 2014' is already in advanced draft and this writer has had an opportunity to see and comment on it.

Monuments, on land designated by 'Scheduling' Buildings, designated by 'Listing' Cultural Landscapes, Heritage Conservation Areas, and National
Conservation Areas (Existing) Protection of Wrecks and Marine Archaeological Heritage (In Draft)

Power to designate

81. The SHNTO can be read as suggesting that it empowers the SHNT to designate monuments and this has been proposed to the writer, who cannot discern this intent anywhere in its text. Designation can affect the values of properties in private and public ownership and thus has the potential to affect the rights and freedoms of citizens. It would be invidious to place that power in the hands of an unelected body such as an NGO and it would potentially expose the NGO to legal pursuit for redress, especially in cases where proposals for redevelopment are constrained by designation. Designation is, in the writer’s opinion, a central SHG function, but if the decision is made to devolve the process to SHNT, that organization will need to be indemnified by government from all legal actions arising.

82. The ENRD of SHG is already the lead organization on Saint Helena for the designation of the National Conservation Areas, including Heritage Conservation Areas and:

Recommendation 10

It is recommended that ENRD should become the lead organization for all heritage designations and that the Chief Environmental Officer will become the person responsible for designations within that Directorate.

General Policies

83. Some policies apply to all forms of designation, especially policies relating to decision-making, transparency and communication. These are:

i. that decisions on designation and removing a designation will be made on the sole basis of the best evidence available;

ii. that information on designated sites, structures and places and on the processes involved with designation will be made widely and easily available; and

iii. that all decisions relating to designation will be explained in clear language.

It will, however, be appreciated that these are complex issues and while simplicity of language will help with their understanding, nonetheless, these are not simple provisions.

Scheduling

84. This section sets out SHG policy for the identification and designation of nationally important monuments. This process will become the primary instrument for the protection of the most significant monuments on Saint Helena.

85. Monuments offer a tangible, physical link with the past. They are a finite and non-renewable resource containing unique information and have the potential to contribute to increasing our knowledge of our past. Such remains are part of Saint Helena’s identity and are valuable both for their
own sake and as a resource for research, education, regeneration, leisure and tourism. The remains are often very fragile and vulnerable to damage or destruction and care must be taken to ensure that they are not needlessly damaged or destroyed.

For the purposes of this report, ‘monuments’\(^{13}\) are defined as:

i. any building, structure or work, whether above or below the surface of the land, and any cave or excavation or underwater;

ii. any site comprising the remains of any such building, structure or work or of any cave or excavation; and

iii. any site comprising, or comprising the remains of, any vehicle, vessel, aircraft or other moveable structure or part thereof which neither constitutes nor forms part of any work which is a monument as defined within paragraph (a) above.

iv. any machinery attached to a monument shall be regarded as part of the monument if it could not be detached without being dismantled.

v. any site (other than one falling within paragraph (b) or (c) above) comprising any thing, or group of things, that evidences previous human activity.

86. The definition of ‘remains’ includes any trace or sign of the previous existence of the thing in question.

87. To be scheduled, a monument must meet the definitions set out above. A structure in current use as a dwelling house cannot be scheduled as an ancient monument, nor can buildings in ecclesiastical use.

88. The process of Scheduling is entirely separated from the process of Listing, set out below, not least because the specialist inputs to both processes are best derived from different professionals, archaeologists and architectural-historians, respectively. However, they are not inherently mutually exclusive categories. Scheduled monuments must be of national significance (see below) but three categories of listed building are envisaged, of which only the first can be said to have the same heritage standing as a Scheduled Monument. Listed Buildings are listed for their special Architectural or Historical significance, alone.

89. Archaeology, can be considered to be the set of forensic approaches to monuments and buildings (as defined here) used to gain information on their original creation and authentic use over time.

\(^{13}\) This definition runs somewhat counter to the general usage of the term, i.e. ‘remains of the past that are visible at ground surface’ however it is used here in the senses defined to avoid lengthy descriptions and circumlocutions.
90. The processes of Scheduling and ‘Descheduling’ (removing a monument from the Schedule) and of the provision of Scheduled Monument Consent (the control of works affecting scheduled monuments) are undertaken on behalf of SHG by the ENRD.

91. The sole legal criterion for inclusion in the Schedule is that a monument is of ‘national importance’. After consultation, SHG has determined what constitutes national importance and how it should be determined. The Criteria and Guidance for Scheduling are set out below.

92. Once a monument is Scheduled, it becomes an offence to carry out, without the prior written consent (Scheduled Monument Consent) of SHG, any works which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up the monument.

Recommendation 11

It is recommended that the maximum penalties applied to such works which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a scheduled monument should be homologated with the penalties being set for cognate offences in the ‘Protection of Wrecks and Marine Archaeological Heritage Ordinance, 2014’ now in draft.

93. The Scheduling Process and the need for Scheduled Monument Consent can run in parallel with the statutory development control process, where development permission is also necessary for any planned work. The protection of ancient monuments is a material consideration in the determination of development applications and where both are required, the Chief Planning Officer will not recommend permission if SMC has not already been secured. The grant of development permission conditional on getting SMC would constitute the use of an ‘unreasonable condition’ and open SHG to legitimate claims for compensation.

94. Saint Helena Government recognizes that:

i. All parts of the past of all parts of Saint Helena are worthy of study and should be considered for conservation;

ii. No part of Saint Helena’s past and no part of Saint Helena is inherently more or less likely to produce monuments of national importance than another;
iii. Scheduling will be based on an appreciation of the regional character of St Helena's past, as reflected in its monuments, and on the basis of an up-to-date set of criteria and guidance;

95. Scheduling will be applied to monuments across Saint Helena in a consistent way;

i. Monuments that no longer meet the criteria for national importance will be removed from the Schedule (descheduled);
ii. Owners and occupiers of land on which monuments lie will be consulted on proposals to add a monument to the Schedule, other than in exceptional circumstances;
iii. Scheduling will be an ongoing process that recognizes that every generation will have its own view of what comprises its heritage

96. Scheduling is applied to secure the legal protection of monuments in the national interest. It is the intrinsic value of the monument to the nation’s heritage that is the primary consideration in deciding whether or not a site shall be Scheduled and in determining applications for Scheduled Monument Consent.
**Implementation of policy on Scheduling**

97. The ENRD will take the lead role on behalf of SHG in implementing policy on scheduling. In carrying out this work the Directorate will:

i. publish its operational policies on scheduling on its website;
ii. maintain the Schedule through a programme of review including, where necessary, updating scheduling documentation and maps;
iii. add monuments to the Schedule in response to requests and as resources permit, especially types of monument or in areas of Saint Helena under-represented in the existing Schedule;
iv. ensure that information on scheduled monuments is made as widely available as possible, both to specialist users and to the general public; and
v. keep the strategic and operational policies on scheduled monuments under review.

**The determination of National Importance for Scheduling: Criteria and Guidance**

98. The sole criterion for scheduling monuments is that they are of national importance. The criteria and guidance set out here are an updated version that takes account of the development of treaty, charter and practice in the UK and elsewhere in the world.

99. One of the most influential of the international charters is the Burra Charter, which introduced the now widely accepted concept of 'cultural significance'. While taking into account national and international developments, this revised guidance has been prepared with the welfare of Saint Helena’s archaeological and built heritage in mind. The primary aim of this document is to provide guidance in determining whether monuments are of national importance.

**Role of the Environmental Directorate**

100. The process of scheduling is undertaken within SHG by the Environmental Directorate. The selection of monuments and the scheduling process is undertaken by applying the policies, criteria and guidance set out in this document.

---

14 These are the criteria used in Scotland by Historic Scotland and are used in preference to those used by English Heritage and CADW, largely because of their clarity and lack of ambiguity.
Cultural Significance

101. The first step in considering whether a monument is of national importance is to identify and understand its cultural significance. The concept of 'cultural significance' will apply widely and to different degrees to all of St Helena's historic environment, and should not be confused with the establishment of 'national importance', which is a separate process (below). For a monument or a class of monuments to be considered as being of national importance it must, first, have a particular cultural significance – artistic; archaeological; architectural; historic; traditional; aesthetic; scientific; social – for past, present or future generations. Such significance is inherent in the monument itself, its fabric, setting, use, associations, meanings, records, related monuments and related objects.

102. For most of humanity's past, there are no 'national' prehistories or histories, as reflected in the historic environment. Instead, there is an aggregation of related prehistories and histories of different regions, which may have wider national or international links. St Helena, although a small island has widely divergent ecological zones and it is not unreasonable to expect that human interactions with these zones may have produced different cultural responses. For example, the highest and perhaps most barren hilltops have been fortified, as have the exits of valleys to the sea while fortifications are rare in the intermediate zone. It is through these linked regional histories and prehistories that the history of St Helena can be understood.

103. The written history of St Helena is currently believed to be well understood. Analysis of the island's physical remains is likely to challenge this assumption. These physical remains present new and independent lines of evidence for the past of the island against which the veracity of the historical narrative can be tested. In addition, writing, even into the recent past, was the province of a small section of society, probably no more than a few percent. Physical remains have the potential to provide insights into the lives and deaths of the more than 90% of the population unrepresented in 'courtly' historical narratives.

104. The cultural significance of any monument, whether of national importance or more local significance, can be characterised by reference to one or more of the following traits; these traits are in three groups:

i. Intrinsic: Characteristics inherent in the monument;

ii. Contextual: Characteristics relating to the monument's place in the landscape or in the body of existing knowledge; and

iii. Associative: A more subjective assessments of the associations of the monument, including with current or past aesthetic preferences.
Intrinsic characteristics

105. the condition in which the monument has survived; 'condition' includes the potential survival of archaeological evidence above and below ground, and goes beyond the survival of marked field characteristics;

106. the archaeological, scientific, technological or other interest or research potential of the monument or any part of it;

107. the apparent developmental sequence of the monument. Monuments that show a sequence of development can provide insights of importance, as can places occupied for a short time;

108. the original or subsequent functions of the monument and its parts.

Contextual characteristics

109. the present rarity or representativeness of all or any part of the monument, assessed against knowledge of the archaeology of Saint Helena and of the region in which the monument occurs;

110. the relationship of the monument to other monuments of the same or related classes or period, or to features or monuments in the vicinity. This is particularly important where individual monuments, themselves perhaps of limited immediate significance, form an important part of a widespread but varied class. The diversity of the class should be a material consideration in making individual decisions;

111. Where the monument forms a functional part of an original or authentic arrangement of monuments, e.g. the coastal defenses at the shoreline of Rupert's Valley, then all of the parts will acquire the heritage value of the most important part, by virtue of their group status.

112. the relationship of the monument and its parts with its wider landscape and setting.

Associative characteristics

113. the historical, cultural and social influences that have affected the form and fabric of the monument, and vice versa;

114. the aesthetic attributes of the monument;

115. its significance in the national consciousness or to people who use or have used the monument, or descendants of such people; and

116. the associations the monument has with historical, traditional or artistic characters or events.
118. Understanding of cultural significance may change as a result of the continuing history of the monument, or in the light of new information, or changing ideas and values.

**National Importance**

119. The primary purpose of scheduling is the preservation of, and control of works on, monuments, the survival of which is in the national interest. These provisions are consistent with the principles of minimal intervention to ensure that the characteristics that make a monument of national importance are preserved as far as possible in the state in which it has come down to us, and is passed on to future generations in as unchanged a state as is practicable, in accord with the principles of sustainable development. In general, those principles will only be set aside in circumstances where wider considerations are deemed, on balance, to be of greater importance to the national interest, rather than to any sectoral or local interest; in individual cases such considerations may include the needs of research into Saint Helena's past.

120. It should be noted that no period of Saint Helena’s past and no part of Saint Helena's land is inherently more or less likely to produce monuments of ‘national importance’ than another.

121. The purpose and implications of scheduling are issues that need to be taken into consideration when assessing monuments for Scheduling. Scheduling may not be the only, or the most appropriate, mechanism to secure the future of all sites, even those that may otherwise meet the criteria.

122. The particular significance needed to define the monument as of ‘national’ importance may be established in terms of one or more of the following:

i. its inherent capability or potential to make a significant addition to the understanding or appreciation of the past;

ii. its retention of the structural, decorative or field characteristics of its kind to a marked degree;

iii. its contribution, or the contribution of its class, to today's landscape and/or the historic landscape;

iv. the quality and extent of any documentation or association that adds to the understanding of the monument or its context;
v. the diminution of the potential of a particular class or classes of monument to contribute to an understanding of the past, should the monument be lost or damaged; and

vi. its place in the national consciousness is a factor that may be considered in support of other factors.
Listing

Legal and administrative context for Listing

123. This section sets out SHG’s policy on listing, the process that identifies, designates and provides statutory protection for buildings of ‘special architectural or historic interest’.

124. Historic buildings and structures are a highly visible and accessible element of Saint Helena's heritage. They cover a wide range of uses and periods, which together chart a great part of the history of Saint Helena. They affect all aspects of life, from education to recreation, to defence, industry, homes and worship. Much of Saint Helena’s social and economic past and its present is expressed in these exceptional buildings. Listing recognizes their historic importance. This in turn helps ensure that their potential for the study of history and for wider issues such as sustainability, community identity, local distinctiveness, and social and economic regeneration are all fully explored.

125. The listing process is entirely separate from the scheduling process.

126. Most countries have systems to protect and to control change on important historic buildings. The system in Saint Helena operates under the Development Control Process within ENRD and the Chief Environmental Officer is the person responsible for the management of the Listing Process. Listing ensures that a building’s special character and interest are taken into account where changes are proposed.

127. Listing is the statutory process by which buildings are added to the Lists. Once included on the lists the building – both exterior and interior – has statutory protection under the LDPCO Section 39 (2) (referring to the HER). Listing is intended to safeguard the character of Saint Helena’s built heritage and to guard against unnecessary loss or damage.

128. Initially, the Listed Buildings of St Helena will be those identified by Hugh Crallan in 1974 and graded by him in three categories, Grades I to III (Crallan 1974). This writer, sees great value in retaining Crallan's designations without demur at this point and has listed them in e-Appendix 4. This table is based on Ben Jeffs transcription of Crallan’s work into the NHR.
129. As noted in section (18) above, substantial harm to or loss of a Grade I listed building [park or garden], significant should be wholly exceptional: and

130. As noted in section (18) above, substantial harm to or loss of a Grade II listed building [park or garden], significant should be exceptional: and

131. Substantial harm to or loss of a Grade III Listed Building must be preceded by a Historic Building Survey according to a brief that is proportionate to the significance of the Listed Building. Proportionately more onerous briefs would be applied to alterations to or loss of Listed Buildings of Grades I or II in those wholly exceptional or exceptional circumstances in which the public good outweighed St Helena’s need to preserve them (see Section 18 above).

132. Any building or man-made structure may be considered for Listing. In order to be Listed a building or structure must be of special architectural or historic interest. Other factors, such as condition, implications for future use or financial issues are not relevant in considering whether a building should be listed.

133. Any individual or organisation can propose buildings to Saint Helena’s Environmental Directorate, Listing. Buildings can be Listed both routinely and in response to new development proposals which appear to threaten as yet unlisted buildings that could be of interest. However, it would be unreasonable routinely to list structures for which development applications had been lodged and this ‘reactionary’ form of Listing should be an exceptional occurrence because it brings the process into disrepute.

134. Consultation with appropriate persons or bodies with a special knowledge of, or interest in, buildings of special architectural or historic interest may be carried out before a building is Listed. Consultation with owners is not a requirement although as a matter of courtesy Saint Helena Government will normally consult owners on a proposed Listing.

135. The Development Control section will automatically be notified when a building is listed because they work from the primary List, and the owner,

---

lessee and occupier will be informed, normally by mail. This will be done as soon as possible after Listing takes effect.

136. A Listing applies to any building within the curtilage of the subject of listing which was erected on or before 1 July 1948. This could include many ancillary structures such as boundary walls, garages or estate buildings. Where these structures fulfilled a functional role in the historic operations of the listed building, they will be considered to lie within its curtilage. It is not necessary that these buildings be separately identified in the Listing, although this will usually be the case and is commonly the case in the Ben Jeffs database.

137. Any work which affects the character of a Listed Building or structure will require Listed Building Consent (LBC). Applications for listed building consent are, in normal circumstances, subsumed within a development application and dealt with by the Development Control Officer.

138. Any work carried out to a listed building without consent and which affects its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, is an offence punishable by a fine or imprisonment.

139. There is no right of appeal against listing, but the ENRD may reconsider a specific Listing if a building has lost its special architectural or historic interest, for example through alteration. This may be because the building in question has been demolished or altered in such a way as to reduce its special architectural interest, or because an interested party or the owner, has demonstrated to the satisfaction of SHG that the building is not of sufficient architectural or historical interest to merit listing.

140. Prior to, or at the same time as, formal notification by the local authority, the owners of newly listed or re-categorised buildings are supplied with key documentation and supporting material by the ENRD.

Certificates of intention not to list

141. SHG may, on the application of any person, issue a certificate stating that they do not intend to list a building for a period of 5 years from the date of the issue of the certificate. This is known as a certificate of intention not to list. When such a certificate has been issued, Development Control may not for that period serve a building preservation notice in relation to the building, or affix such a notice to the building.

SHG Policy on Listing

142. Listing is applied to afford protection, where possible, to buildings of special architectural or historic interest for future generations. The lists are compiled to give guidance to planning and development authorities in the course of their work by identifying buildings of special architectural or
Many buildings are of interest, architecturally or historically, but for the purposes of listing this interest must be ‘special’. Listing is therefore assessed against a set of clear criteria which are set out below.

The following principles, additional to those set out above, underpin listing policy:

i. the selection process is informed by a wide range of factors which help determine the level of special architectural or historic interest which the subject of listing may possess;

ii. listing will follow the consistent application of clear criteria, as set out below

iii. all aspects of Saint Helena’s past are worthy of study and examples should be considered for listing;

iv. Listing will be based on an understanding of regional differences as expressed in Saint Helena’s architectural and built heritage, especially on the differences between the urban and rural contexts;

v. Listing will be an ongoing process that recognizes our changing level of knowledge and that every generation will have its own view of what comprises its heritage;

vi. buildings less than 30 years old will normally only be considered for listing if found to be of outstanding merit and/or facing immediate threat.

SHG will consult relevant authorities about a Listing proposal or an amendment to the List. SHG will normally also consult with such other persons or bodies as appear as having specialist knowledge of or interest in buildings of architectural or historical interest. In addition, they will normally consult with the owner of the property.

Where anyone is making or is aware of proposals that might make changes to or lead to the demolition of a building that is not listed but may be of special architectural or historic interest, SHG encourages them to contact the Environmental Directorate as early in the process as possible. This is to enable an assessment of the special interest of a building to ensure that resources are not wasted on abortive schemes.
Implementation of Policy on Listing

147. Saint Helena Government implements this policy on Listing. In fulfilling that duty the agency will:

i. create, add to, re-categorise or remove subjects from the List through ongoing List maintenance, revision of topographic areas and through thematic surveys;

ii. use a range of techniques and mechanisms and supporting leaflets and guides to make relevant information available as widely as possible and pursue a programme to tell people about the process and operational programmes of Listing;

iii. publish and regularly update guidance on Listing, particularly for the owners and occupiers of Listed property;

iv. review operational programmes of work regularly in consultation with stakeholders;

v. make its decision-making process transparent; and

vi. keep policy and process for listing under review.

Conservation Areas

Legal and administrative context

148. The Land Development Control Plan 2012-2022 designated nine National Heritage Areas and set out policies for their protection and this matter is not dealt with in any detail in this report. The writer has visited one National Conservation Area for which a management plan in now in draft and has advised on the treatment of heritage matters within the management plan.

149. The designated areas comprise:

- Heritage Coast (including Banks, Rupert's wall, Munder's and Ladder Hill Fort)
- High Knoll Fort
- Jamestown
- Knollecombes cemetery
- Lemon Valley
150. Some of these HCAs consist of a single monument, e.g. High Knoll Fort, whilst others, notably Jamestown, contain many individual monuments. The designation of the HCAs conveys an elevated status on those monuments and Listed Buildings contained in them that enhance the ambience of the National Conservation Area, even where the reasons for designation are primarily concerned with nature conservation.

151. Nonetheless, it is necessary to evaluate the monuments in the HCAs individually, to inform development control decision-making. In addition, conservation areas for heritage remains are generally defined as ‘areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance’. For these reasons, the management plans for the HCAs should contain information about, and management policies for, the natural heritage elements that fall within them, and with NCAs, vice versa. This position is established de facto in the Primary Policy on Built Heritage set out in the LDCP 2012-22, for HCAs:

‘Development in Historic Conservation Areas will be permitted only if it enhances and protects the character of the Area by reference to scale, proportion, details and external materials of the proposed development in relation to those of the Historic Conservation Area.’

(LDCP 2012-22 BH1, subclause (c)).

152. The conservation of National Conservation Areas and the Heritage Conservation Areas will be managed by ENRD using area, and designation-specific Conservation Management Plans (CMPs). These will set out the reasons for the designation and provide a summary of all that is currently known about the monument/s contained within or the subject of the Conservation Area. It will assess their cultural value and reflect that in a brief ‘statement of heritage significance’. Then it will set out the scope and terms of works necessary to conserve the heritage value of the monument.

153. Any proposal for development in a Conservation Area will be required to establish its compatibility with the conservation of the area’s heritage significance. In terms of Implementation Policies BH4, BH5 and BH6, the onus will reside with the developer to demonstrate that the planned development is consistent with the conservation aims of the designation.
Cultural Landscapes

154. Landscapes are not physical entities. Landforms are ‘real’, actual things whose qualities are unambiguous and discoverable by the simple act of observation. Landscapes, on the other hand are concepts compounded from the landform (including its biota) and the intellectual contribution that the observer brings to the observation of that landform. In viewing landscapes, some observers focus on and express their experience in terms of ecologies and interactions, many archaeological observers see landscapes in terms of their evidence for processes and change over time. No basis exists to allow one perception to be valued over another.

155. Archaeologists speak and write about ‘archaeological landscapes’ by which they seem to mean a landform containing many heritage assets. However, no system exists for valuing areas with dense monument concentrations and the phrase, like Milton's 'two handed engine', is one whose obscurity lends it power - to borrow Quiller Couch's happy phrase. However, obscurity makes poor regulation and legislation requires clarity.

156. The World Heritage Convention founds on global scholarship to come to a good definition of ‘Cultural Landscape’, being an area that exemplifies the joint forces of nature and humanity (UNESCO 2013) and set out at section 74, thus:

'47. Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the “combined works of nature and of man” designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.'

157. The island of St Helena as a whole could fit under this definition and fit very well. With the exception of an area not more than 200m in diameter, no virgin land survives on St Helena and all of her landscapes are artefacts of human intervention in the natural processes of the island. One submission has been made for WHO status for the island and it failed, which is perhaps a good thing. The dynamics of life on the island would have brought the development control process constantly into friction with the heightened expectation of almost global conservation on the island implicit in the designation of 'World Heritage Site'.

158. However, that designation brings with it a level of global advertisement that is unmatched in the arena of cultural tourism. This is not always a blessing either given that visitor pressure is now the major threat to many World Heritage Sites. The writer does not recommend a more competent resubmission of the island-wide application but instead
advocates the selection of a ‘cultural landscape’ area that meets the WHO submission criteria and an area within which a tighter development control regimen could be tolerated. This would secure the advantages of worldwide dissemination of information about St Helena without incurring the dead hand of international bureaucratic interventions in local development control.

159. The World Heritage Convention requires that areas proposed for designation as Cultural Landscapes should be of ‘outstanding universal value’ but there are on St Helena areas of less significance, some of which have been designated as National Conservation Areas or as National Heritage Areas.

Recommendation 12

It is recommended that in all of the NCA’s the combined role of nature and humanity in the evolution and maintenance of these cultural landscapes should be identified and emphasised in the Management Plans now in draft. Further, the metanarratives of human/landscape interactions seem to this writer central to what survives on St Helena and it is therefore recommended that the relationship of people and place be given a higher prominence in all tourist-orientated writing about the island.
PART IV: Heritage and Development: A matter of balance

**Development Conditions**

160. The LDCP (2013) set out the St Helena Government’s policy position on heritage, viz:

‘PRINCIPLE 1

Whilst protecting absolutely the critical natural habitats and conserving the built heritage:

1. to enable and facilitate air access to the Island
2. to encourage and enable well located tourist facilities primarily based on the Island’s natural and historic heritage
3. to provide for and enable appropriate and well-located housing development, including for domestic demand
4. to provide for and enable appropriately sited business and employment, cultural, recreational and social facilities and appropriate infrastructure.’

161. This recognises the vital importance of the heritage of Saint Helena to the people of St Helena and through them to the global population, for its ability to inform this and future generations about the human condition on St Helena over time. Concurrently, it recognises that importance in the context of a changing physical environment. It is clearly couched in terms of the acceleration in rates of change to be anticipated with the opening of the airport.

162. The opening pages of this report comprise a statement of the importance of heritage for St Helena which reflects the firm commitment to heritage made in the LDCP 2013. However, these commitments do not and cannot amount to unreserved guarantees to preserve all of the heritage of the island. The population of St Helena, like any population anywhere on the planet, cannot be expected to live in a museum. Change and growth are essential to create a viable economy on the island and the contribution that easier access the airport will facilitate will be inhibited if some development cannot proceed in a measured fashion. Balancing the populations need for development with the conservation of the most important heritage assets is the central theme of this report and the interdigitation of heritage and development control is the mechanism of its expression.
The Land Planning and Development Control Ordinance 2013 (LPDCO), which came into force on St Helena on 1st February 2014, sets out provisions for the treatment of the island's heritage assets in the development process. The related regulations include the Land Planning and Development Control (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2013, regulating the EIA process for the island and the Land Planning and Development Control (General Development) Order 2013 (GDO), regulating permitted development; both of which have some relevance to the provisions set out in this report. Consistent with these ordinance and guidance positions, and compatible with the existing development control process, the following discussion of Heritage Development Conditions outline the measures necessary to effect a reasonable balance between the needs of development and the imperatives of conserving our heritage.

Heritage Development Conditions and the General Development Order

The general development order excludes or limits the deemed development permission affecting Listed Buildings from the following Sections:

3.1 Alteration of buildings
3.2 Extension of buildings
3.4 Construction for purposes incidental to residential dwelling
3.5 Radio or television antenna or satellite dish
3.6 Solar hot water or photovoltaic panels
3.8 Demolition
3.9 (a) Development by the Crown for road maintenance or improvement
3.10 (a) Underground sewers, water mains and cables
3.11 (c) Overhead cables
3.14 (a) Gates, fences, walls and enclosures

It also excludes or limits its provisions in respect of National Conservation Areas (NCAs) for the above sections also, save only for Section 3.9 and adds Section 3.12(d) ‘Use of land for agricultural or forestry purposes’ to the list of exceptions for NCAs.

\[16\] In Part VIII, ‘Conservation of Natural and Built Heritage’
166. The effect of these exclusions is that the Heritage Development Control Conditions set out herein apply without constraint on the majority of developments undertaken on the basis of the GDO.

Heritage Development Conditions and the LDCP

167. These development conditions are consistent with Primary Policy BH1 of the LDCP and are designed to facilitate its implementation and the functional deployment of the provisions of the relevant ‘implementation policies’, of the LDCP Ordinance. They bear also on the provisions of paragraphs 22.1 to, and including paragraph 22.9 of the ordinance, not least by demonstrating the practical commitment of the island to the preservation of its own cultural heritage. Thus, the Heritage Development Conditions set out herein are consistent with the relevant primary and implementation policies of the St Helena Government.

Heritage Development Conditions

168. It is proposed that the interdigitation of heritage and development control should mainly be achieved via the application of appropriate development conditions and draft model conditions are set out below, with some guidance on the contexts in which they may appropriately be deployed. However, they are not, and cannot be, prescriptive because every development application is evaluated on its own merits. Furthermore, the Chief Planning Officer is tasked with recommending acceptance or rejection of individual development application on the basis of securing the optimum outcome for the common good of the island’s population. And this is the basis on which the XXX committee will make their decisions. Prescriptive development conditions would undermine this necessary social control on development.

169. Development conditions and other planning requirements may be deployed by SHG Land Planning and Development Control to secure the future of the built heritage, either in fact or by record. Experience in the UK has shown that fewer than 11% of planning applications encounter significant heritage remains and of these, the vast majority (varying from 6 to 8% of the 11% total) are dealt with by Watching Brief conditions. The remainder (2 to 4%) are mainly dealt with by Field Evaluations alone with less than 1% by Fieldworks (Survey and Excavation). The larger the development area or the closer it is to known heritage sites or monuments, the more likely it is to encounter known or previously unknown archaeological remains and to require excavation works. The paucity of land suitable for building on St Helena may increase these percentages by constraining development to those areas with access to services and to the restricted road network.
**Heritage, Pre-Determination**

170. The Land Development and Planning Control section of ENRD is encouraged to invite early discussion with developers when heritage assets are known to exist on or near the proposed development area, or where designated heritage assets are intervisible with the development area. These discussions would be held with the Chief Environment Officer, or his/her appointee.

**Recommendation 13**

It is recommended that the note 'Advice to Developers' drafted by David Taylor (e-Appendix 5), erstwhile CPO on St Helena, be expanded to include this encouragement to early consultation on developments with heritage entailments. It should also contain the following advice:

*Heritage is a competent planning matter. Planners will expect planning applicants, or their agents, to have assessed the likelihood of the existence of heritage assets on or near the development area or intervisible with it and to have assessed the likely impact of the development on these heritage assets and their settings. A larger scale of assessment undertaken at a higher standard will be required in the case of all EIA-scale developments.*

171. Pre-Determination, the Chief Planning Officer, advised by the Chief Environmental Officer, may enter into voluntary agreements with prospective developers to secure heritage studies in advance of determination of the Development Application. These are not Development Conditions but constitute a standard provision of modern planning control systems worldwide, used to manage heritage concerns. In general, these agreements are used to ensure that the information necessary to make informed decisions is available to the decision makers, and the agreements also protect SHG from residual costs for dealing with heritage materials recovered in such exercises. Section 23 of (LPDCO 2014) q.v. sets out a framework for the legal formalisation of agreements and this could be used where, in the opinion of the Chief Planning Officer and the Attorney General, such formality is required.

---

17 Guidance on the required standards is provided in documents 1.1 to 1.n, which are consistent with the standards and guidance of the UK’s Institute for Archaeologists (IfA) and which have been repeatedly tested at Public Local Inquiry and at Judicial Review.
Development applications; scope and scoping documents

172. Developers will therefore require access to an agreed dataset of heritage information. True and verified copies of the St Helena HER form the core of the National Heritage Register, which will be accessible at the SHNT and at the St Helena Museum (SHM). Provision to update these databases has been set out elsewhere in this report. The NHR database, as noted above, will be a true and verified copy of the current SHG_HER and SHG is responsible for its contents. Any additional advice or information offered by the SHNT or the Museum is proffered at their own commercial risk. Acting severally, or jointly as the Heritage Sector of St Helena, either or both organisations may enter into commercial agreements with developers to service their needs for information or for specific fieldwork services.

173. In the case of small to medium developments, the Chief Planning Officer, advised by the Chief Environmental Officer, may provide a Scope of Heritage Works, if significant impacts of heritage assets, or their settings are anticipated.

174. In the case of developments for which screening has identified a need for an EIA, a Heritage Scope will be produced by the Chief Environmental Officer for inclusion in the Chief Planning Officer's Scoping Report to the developer. If the information provided in the developer's EIA Report proves inadequate for informed decision-making, the Chief Planning Officer, advised by the Chief Environmental Officer may require provision of further information or a more detailed report and may require a Further Environmental Information (FEI) Report. Where the need for the additional information arises from information gathered in servicing the original scoping documents, additional or amended scoping documents may also be prepared.

175. The scope for a development application may take the form of

176. a note of heritage remains on or immediately adjacent to the development area which may contain a GIS mapping of the adjacent heritage assets and their zones of sensitivity

177. a note of the heritage sensitivity of the area

178. a note of the more significant remains potentially within the sight of the development

179. a request that a report in the standard form be prepared setting out:

   a. the heritage values of these monuments, their settings and their associative heritage values should be established (in terms of their roles in contemporary society)
b. their sensitivity to the proposed change 

c. the magnitude of any potential direct impact\(^\text{18}\) upon them from the proposed development  

d. identification of the positive, negative or neutral indirect impacts\(^\text{19}\) on all or parts of their settings 

e. a global statement of heritage impact, and if this reaches a significance threshold, a mitigation statement that seeks to establish; 

f. proposals to mitigate those impacts  

180. Where the threshold of significant harm or loss of the asset/s has been reached or surpassed, the developer, or his agents, will face the challenge of demonstrating to the Chief Planning Officer that the social benefits of the development outweigh the loss of significant heritage value. 

181. The planning balance then arising is a matter for the Chief Planning Officer, who will, if development permission is granted, provide the Chief Environmental Officer/Environmental Coordinator with a written justification for the decision taken. This can be the justification offered in the Development Permission documentation, or an annotated version thereof. The Chief Environmental Officer/Environmental Coordinator will consider the import of this decision for future decision-making strategies.  

**Statutory Consultation** 

182. The Chief Planning Officer will forward copies of the development application and/or the EIA report to the Heritage Sector at the same time as forwarding copies to the Chief Environmental Officer. The covering letter to the Heritage Sector will stipulate a date before which the statutory consultation response is required, and it will direct that the response should be sent to the Chief Environmental Officer. 

**Recommendation 15?** 

The resourcing of the Heritage Sector needs to be increased to help them provide the service of statutory consultees. Currently SHG supports both the SHNT and the Heritage Society, the latter via the Museum. A daily rate value shall be calculated from this subsidy and a fixed number of days service shall be identified, from within the existing subsidy, to provide the 

\(^{18}\) A direct impact is one that alters the fabric of the monument. 

\(^{19}\) An indirect impact is one that alters the setting of the monument in ways that affect the observer’s ability to understand, interpret and appreciate the monument.
statutory consultation service described here, free of charge. When this fixed allotment of days is exhausted, the Heritage Sector will invoice SHG at the calculated daily rate for all subsequent consultations within that financial year. The Heritage Sector will keep an account of the consumption of the allotted days and communicate this monthly to SHG’s Chief Planning Officer.

183. The Chief Environmental Officer will give appropriate weight to the Heritage Sector Response in arriving at a formal statement of advice to the Chief Planning Officer on the heritage issues and impacts of the proposed development.

**Physical interventions; pre-determination**

184. Even following receipt of a heritage statement that is adequate in terms of the available evidence, the Chief Environmental Officer or Environmental Coordinator may determine that the evidence presented in support of an application is inadequate for the purposes of determination because of the ambiguity of the physical remains. If, for example, development is proposed close to a known heritage asset or is set amidst a number of heritage assets, even if not containing or lying immediately adjacent to any one of them, the probability exists that currently unknown, buried archaeological remains exist which would be impacted upon by the development. If on balance, the probability of such unknown archaeology is deemed to be ‘Low’, the planning officer may opt to determine the application on the basis of the information available by applying a Watching Brief condition to a successful development application.

185. Alternatively, if the probability is deemed to be greater than ‘Low’, the planning officer may require a field evaluation (with associated analysis and publication of results) of a sample proportion of the development area.

**Recommendation 16**

It is recommended that the Chief Planning Officer will formulate a Section 23 agreement with the developer for action by the Attorney General (LPDCO 2014). This will take the general form:

‘[The developer] will undertake the programme of archaeological fieldwork appended hereto, complete with its written acceptance by the Chief Environmental Officer, in exploration of the development area pre-determination, to establish the absence or presence, and if present, the nature of currently unknown heritage remains whose existence is suspected because of the local presence of significant monuments [or for some other stated reason]’ and the developer will fund the field
work and the analysis and publication of the results thereof regardless of whether the proposed development application is submitted or not, and regardless of the outcome of the application, if submitted. To secure this outcome, a codicil should be added to the Section 23 agreement in the following general form: ‘Before the commencement of a pre-development evaluation, the planning officer will require sight of a competent contract awarded to a suitable person or organisation and covering the costs of fieldwork, analysis, publication and archiving, in the absence of which, the planning application will not proceed to determination.’

186. The codicil is required so that a refused or abandoned development does not leave SHG to bear the costs of analysis, publication and archiving of results for a rejected development.

187. Following all pre-determination evaluations, the developers, or their agent, will submit a summary report in the approved form within 6 weeks of the end of the evaluation. This, the Evaluation Report, will be a development advisory report and is not the report required under the ‘publication’ element of the Section 23 Agreement.

188. Where the results of the evaluation, amongst other factors, does not preclude development and Development Permission is granted, but subject to a Development Condition requiring further excavation, the planning officer may, if asked to do so by the developer, take the view that the complete analysis and publication of the evaluation can be deferred and included with the results of the excavation.

189. Statistical studies undertaken by Oxford Archaeological Unit on behalf of English Heritage have shown that if unknown archaeological remains are suspected on a site, the probability of encountering them rises to about 80% if an area equivalent to 8 to 10% of the development area is trial trenched. The lower threshold, 8%, is often chosen by planning officers in the UK.20 Where the development requires SI works, or trenching for foundations or drainage, etc, the heritage trenching can be sited over these areas, reducing operational costs to the developer, but this cannot be done to the detriment of taking a representative sample of the whole of the development area.

---

20 Individual trenches are of little value if too small or too narrow and typically, a nominal 2 m wide trench made by a tracked excavator using a wide toothless ditching bucket, has become the norm. Usually 10m lengths of 2m wide trenching are spread either regularly or randomly over the development area until the sum of their areas equals 8% of the area of the redline plot.
190. In general, the aim of evaluation is to establish the character, nature and three dimensional extent of surviving archaeological remains. Therefore, fieldwork should be limited to the minimum intervention required to establish these parameters. Digging will normally cease at the first encounter with archaeologically significant deposits: their depths will be determined in small 'sondages’ or test pits, and their archaeological character, including age, will be assayed by sub-sampling the deposits. Evaluations are limited assessment exercises and the revealed archaeology is best preserved in situ to the greatest extent possible, to await full preservation or full scale excavation, depending on the outcome of the Development Application.

191. Based upon the results of the evaluation the planning officer may be free of heritage constraint on the granting of planning permission or its granting subject to specific conditions, including watching brief conditions or excavation conditions.

**Watching brief Development Conditions**

192. In cases where the likely archaeological remains are of a very minor or very uncertain nature, (even after field evaluation as described above) the development control authority may wish to ensure that reasonable access is given to a named commissioned archaeologist or archaeological body either to hold a watching brief throughout the construction period or specifically to carry out archaeological investigation and recording in the course of permitted operations on site (a ‘strip and map condition’). It should be stressed, however, that the application of a watching brief condition is not appropriate where significant archaeological remains are known to exist within a proposed development. The following recommendation is made in the light of the specific preconditions outlined in this paragraph.

**Recommendation 17**

The developer shall commission and afford access at all relevant times to an archaeologist or archaeological organisation acceptable to the development control authority, and shall allow them to observe work in progress and record items of interest and recover samples and finds as appropriate. A contract defining the nature of the brief, including the powers of the archaeologist to halt progress temporarily, and for longer intervals, and establishing the right of the archaeologist to report findings directly to the Chief Environmental Officer shall be submitted to the Development Officer for approval in writing in advance of the start of works. This contract will acknowledge the legal obligation to analyse and publish the results of the fieldwork and to archive the record in the approved manner.
193. The Chief Planning Officer will ensure that the developer and his on-site contractors understand that works will occasionally be interrupted and recommend that they build the maximum flexibility into their scheme of works, e.g. ensuring that stoppages in one area will allow works to continue in another, still under archaeological supervision in the agreed terms. If nationally significant remains are encountered, the works will cease until an appropriate excavation can be agreed with the Chief Environmental Officer. Delays will also arise if human remains are encountered.

194. Notification of the commencement date, information as to whom the Chief Planning Office should contact on site and the name of the archaeologist or archaeological organisation retained by the developer shall be given to the planning authority in writing not less than 14 days before development commences. The CPO will forward these details to the CEO on receipt thereof.

195. The archaeologist shall be on site for all ground breaking works and shall submit a Watching Brief Report within 6 weeks of the completion of the Watching Brief.

**Development Conditions for fieldworks**

**Protection & Preservation of monuments in situ**

196. It is open to the planning authority to impose a condition to protect a monument or its setting during the construction project. Where this is appropriate the following model condition is suggested and should be applied bearing in mind the impact of fencing upon the setting and surroundings of the monument:

**Recommendation 18**

No development shall take place until the developer has erected temporary fencing of acceptable type in a manner to be agreed with the planning authority, about [insert name/s of monument/s] along the line/s shown on the plan annexed; and no works, including dumping, or vehicular movement or parking, shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the prior agreement of the planning officer.

**‘Preserving by record’**

197. The term ‘preserving by record’ means the preservation of a monument by the substitution for it of a record compiled by its survey, excavation, analysis, publication and archiving, of materials and documents
to an agreed standard. This is always a poor second best to preservation in situ but may be judged an appropriate response in the light of the particular circumstance of the specific planning application. Preservation by record can be secured by planning conditions or Section 23 Agreements and more than one form of agreement may apply to a development.

Excavation, post-determination and prior to development

198. Where the loss of the whole or a material part of a heritage asset's heritage value is justified by the demonstrably greater public good arising from the development, the Planning Office will require the developer to record and advance understanding of the significance of the heritage asset before it is lost, using development conditions or obligations as appropriate.

199. In cases where the planning officer has decided that development permission may be granted but s/he wishes to secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the analysis, publication and archiving of the results, it is open to them to do so by the use of a negative suspensive condition. This is a condition prohibiting development until such time as works or other actions, e.g. survey or geophysical survey, has been carried out by a third party. In such cases the following model is recommended.

Recommendation 19

No development shall take place within the area indicated [this would be the area of archaeological interest] until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted by the applicant and agreed and approved in writing by the Planning Officer acting on the advice of the Chief Environmental Officer.

200. The WSI may set out staged timings for the agreed fieldwork and variations can be accommodated by further agreements in writing authorised by the Chief Environmental Officer. Developers will wish to ensure that in drawing up such a scheme, they make reasonably generous allowances for the archaeological programme within their construction programme because archaeological operations have the capacity to create unanticipated delays to the development programme.

201. It is anticipated that the Developer’s archaeological consultant will draft a proposed WSI for presentation to the Chief Planning Officer, who in turn will forward it to the Chief Environmental Officer for review. The CEO may, but need not, further consult the Heritage Sector or other advisers on the content of the WSI. The CEO may accept or reject the proposed WSI or, in discussion with the developer’s advisers, identify necessary amendments or extensions. The CEO’s decision, issued via the CPO, in this matter is final and binding on all parties.

202. Developers are required to fund:

a. the fieldwork, i.e. surveys and excavations,

b. the post-excision, i.e.
i. analysis and publication of the revealed evidence

ii. updating of the HER database

iii. deposition of all materials arising (artefactual, ecofactual, environmental and palaeoenvironmental) with the St Helena Museum, in the form and with the documentation advised by that body and to transfer ownership of these materials to the Crown.

iv. deposition of the collated original site record and copies of all interim and final reports with the St Helena Museum Archive, cross referenced with the Museum depositions and the HER; and

v. surrender of all copyright and IPR vested in the deposed materials to the Crown free of any consideration. Where commercial sensitivity requires it, the museum archive may agree to seal the record for a finite period of time.

203. The planning authorities may impose development conditions or other binding obligations, like Section 23 Agreements, to ensure such work is carried out in a timely manner and to ensure that the completion of the exercise is properly secured.

204. The Developer's archaeological consultant will produce, within three months, an interim Data Report summarising and tabulating all of the recovered data; this is not a publication in the sense required by the development condition. Accompanying this report the Developer's archaeological consultant will produce a Post-Excavation Research Design (PERD) setting out the studies proposed for the analyses of the recovered materials. The Data Report and PERD will be submitted to the CPO who will forward them to the CEO for assessment. The CEO may accept or reject the proposed Data Report and PERD or, in discussion with the developer's archaeological advisers, identify necessary amendments or extensions. The CEO's decision, issued via the CPO, in this matter is final and binding on all parties.

205. To avoid unreasonable delays to a development, the heritage development condition may be purged on completion of the fieldwork if and only if, a competent contract has been let to a suitable body to secure the completion of the post-exavagation processes specified in the PERD, and proof of this has been exhibited to the planner.

The requirement to enter into a binding contract to secure early purgation of the planning condition does not constrain the commercial freedom of the developer because it does not tie him/her into a commercial relationship with the excavating archaeologists. The developer is free to put the post-exavagation work to tender and select the most acceptable tender, compliant with the completion of the project in the terms specified in the development condition.
completion of the project; in parallel with his/her moral and professional obligations to do so (see the IfA Code of Conduct).

**Reasonability**

206. The extent of the burdens imposed by heritage development conditions should be proportionate to the nature and heritage value of the asset as determined by the Chief Development Officer, under advice from the Chief Environmental Officer with reference to the HER.

207. Where the condition imposes significant burdens on the Developer, and, or, where the latter cannot reasonably be expected to bear the burden, e.g. is a single householder, SHG will consider the potential for grant aiding the required works. Any such grant aiding would be *ex gratia* and would necessarily be limited. In exceptional circumstances, and where the cost burdens are heavy, consideration may be given to funding from the public purse but with a claw-back clause attached by lien on the property value, to secure repayment of the sums involved on sale or disposal of the property.

**Developments outwith the development control process**

208. Excavation and conservation works undertaken for academic reasons in general fall outwith the development control process. If, however, their scale is very large (close to or greater than a hectare of disturbed ground), or if they are undertaken on Scheduled Monuments or Listed Buildings of Categories 1 or 2, it is more efficient to control the changes they make to the historic fabric of the place by treating them as development applications. All such operations on or within a National Conservation Area will be treated as Development Applications.

209. The development application for any programme of works undertaken on or within a National Heritage Area will take the form of a Conservation Management Plan, in the agreed format, for all works.

210. This is necessary to preclude the pre-application clearance of heritage impediments to development by developer funded research excavations which remove or reduce the heritage value of the assets involved. In addition, successive excavations within a large site can fragment the surviving deposits or reduce its fabric to an incoherent patchwork, substantially reducing the monument's cultural value.

211. In the case of National Heritage Areas, this provision is also designed to ensure an adequate level of quality control over works undertaken and to prevent the loss or devaluing of original or authentic fabric by successive excavations or repairs.

**PART VI: Roles, powers and responsibilities in heritage management on St Helena**

212. Roles and responsibilities have been touched upon throughout this report. Here these are drawn together and where necessary expanded
upon. Recommendations are offered, again where necessary, for the smooth operation of the island's heritage management.

The Chief Planning Officer (CPO) & Chief Environmental Officer (CEO)

213. In addition to the roles defined for him/her, the CPO acts as the SHG point of contact with the potential Developer in all matters relating to heritage within the development system.

214. In all such matters, the CPO acts as a liaison officer to the Chief Environmental Officer (CEO), forward reports and other papers to, and receiving advice from the CEO.

215. The CPO’s role in determining the planning balance in re a development application is, as far as heritage is concerned, determining whether the public good is best served by the preservation in situ of the heritage remains, the principal policy of SHG, or by the loss of the heritage in balance against the greater social good of the development proposal.

216. When the latter is the case, the CPO takes advice from the CEO on the most appropriate and proportionate form of development conditioning or Section 23 Agreement required to preserve by record that which cannot be preserved in situ.

217. The CPO has no role in assessment of heritage values or significance of monuments; that is the role of the CEO and correspondingly, the CEO holds no veto over the CPO in determining development permission.

218. Together they exercise the role of SHG in facilitating development on the island whilst conserving the most important heritage remains.

The Heritage Sector

219. The Heritage Sector on St Helena is not a government agency, albeit that it is subsidised by SHG in its core functions. Clearly SHG cannot simply require the members of the heritage sector to undertake the roles and assume the responsibilities attributed to them in this report. Nonetheless, the writer has consulted jointly and severally with the proponents and believes that the necessary arrangements can be put in place reflect the desires of the protagonists.

220. As indicated, the Heritage Sector comprises the NGO and Voluntary Sector engagement with St Helena’s heritage. These have principally comprised the SHNT and the Museum, which is wholly owned by the Heritage Society.

221. Ownership of the Museum Collection and of the heritage collections stored at SHNT (including material from maritime environments) is not clearly vested in the Crown or the Island. Given that all materials arising from the application of development conditions will become vested in the museum, this ambiguity cannot be allowed to continue.
Recommendation 20

It is recommended that the Heritage Society be encouraged to write into their constitution a ‘living will’ clause that transfers ownership of all the materials over which the museum holds ownership to the Crown in the event of the dissolution of the museum from any cause. This can be made subject to conditions such as an SHG guarantee that the material will not leave St Helena other than for temporary exhibition at approved museums elsewhere in the world. Alternatively, and preferably, the museum could make the transfer of ownership now, negotiating any conditions they deem appropriate. The intention should be that the museum becomes responsible for the curation and conservation of all artefacts found on St Helena, as well as their presentation.

Recommendation 21

It is recommended, further, that the Heritage Society should reconstitute itself as a charitable trust which would achieve the substance of Recommendation 20 in that a trust necessarily defines from the outset the fate of its goods and chattels in the event of its dissolution. Furthermore, many of the international funding streams available for archaeological and conservation works are only available to trusts and are currently unavailable to the St Helena Museum.

The role of the SHG employee on secondment to the museum is an ambiguous one. Her performance reviews, for example, are performed by SHG personnel who neither directly observe her work nor have the technical skills required to evaluate it. Conversely, nobody in the Heritage Society can undertake the day to day management of the seconded employee, because they do not employ her.

Recommendation 22

It is recommended that, without loss of salary, pension and other benefits, i.e. acting as if TUPE regulations applied, provisions should be made to terminate this secondment and to fund the employment of the same employee by the Heritage Society. This will be facilitated if the HS becomes a Trust.

The Reformed Heritage Sector Group

The term ‘Heritage Sector’ used throughout this report refers to a yet to be created body comprising the SHNT, Heritage Society/Museum, an elected member of LegCO/ExCO, an ex-officio member of ESH Tourism and private individuals on St Helena.

The role of this body would be to protect and champion heritage on the island, to act as a statutory consultee on developments affecting heritage, to foster interest in heritage on and off the island and to promote the ethical use of heritage in St Helena's internal and external tourism
offer. Perusal of the paragraphs above will identify further individual roles and recommendations for the Heritage Sector group.

**Recommendation 23**

It is recommended that the directorship of the Heritage Sector Group be vested in the SHNT because of its organisational maturity and its experience in conservation and education. It is further recommended that the chair of the group should be provided by the Heritage Society, to provide long term, island based continuity of governance of the group, in contrast with the short term of office of the SHNT directors. Thereafter, its organisation is a matter for itself. Funding arrangements for statutory consultations will not be put in place until the group has been formed and its formation document has been forwarded to the CEO at SHG.

225. In the event that a Heritage Sector group cannot be convened, or having been convened fails to deliver the services required of it, SHG should outsource; contracting its Statutory Consultation procedures to an off-island archaeological expert or group.

**Museology and Archiving**

226. The writer has seen draft plans for the creation of a combined museum, archive facility and library to be housed in the PWD building. He has learned that a proposal to use this building as a bank building is also under discussion. These matters lie within the writer's remit for the following reasons. Heritage on the island is under resourced and under funded, in consequence of which it fails to make the economic contribution it is capable of making. Moving a bank from one building to another within the Conservation Area of Jamestown simply exports the ‘gap site’ from the grand parade to the upper main street with little net gain in terms of the cultural value of the NCA.

**Recommendation 24**

It is recommended that the conversion of the PWD store to an enhanced heritage facility should be undertaken and a more sophisticated design should be created for it. The latter should rely more on digital technologies so that every exhibition or publication or new project will have immediate worldwide accessibility (see ‘Profile’ below). The new design should consider the future shape of the Grand Parade as a public space, with alternative provision necessarily being made for car parking.

**Profile building**

227. The heritage of St Helena is one of the world’s best kept secrets. Islanders and visiting specialists in its heritage have carefully nourished this candle under a very large bushel. A forceful branding exercise in St Helena heritage is urgently required especially as we shall shortly be seeking funding from a variety of sources to fund projects on the island. The
following guidelines are proposed not as fixed prescriptions but as examples of a necessary mind set, if we are to place St Helena’s heritage on the agendas of funding agencies outwith the island.

Recommendation 25

It is recommended that the Library Service of St Helena should assume the role of allocating ISSN and ISBN numbers to island publications arising from all sources, but certainly from heritage projects undertaken on the island. As a necessary corollary, any development or research projects undertaken on St Helena will be constrained to publish their results on the island, if necessary in addition to peer reviewed publication elsewhere, and will be asked to undertake to provide the library service with 5 copies of the original report and any additional publications founded on or referring to St Helena materials or monuments.

Recommendation 26

It is recommended that the Heritage Sector form relationships with the major international universities that actively research issues relevant to St Helena and that it enter a close alliance with one or two of them. One of the alliance universities will be asked to provide the St Helena Library Service with an access Id and Password to academic digital resources on the net, as a contribution to the work local and visiting scholars. This would allow cost-free access to the worlds major digital libraries and help stimulate and facilitate international publication by St Helena based scholars.

Recommendation 27

It is recommended that opportunities should be sought to fund international competitions for design and build projects involving St Helena heritage assets and infrastructure. These could involve a design competition for the renewal of the heritage centre at the PSD store referred to above. The hotel design proposed for ladder hill is quite good, but it is a safe and somewhat uninspiring design. This could act as the brief for an architectural competition for something a bit more inspiring. A competition for engineering and architectural studies of an eco-friendly version of the single storey rural building of the island would also attract international interest. Reference has already been made to a design competition for a monument at the ossuary. The costs on these competitions are typically £500 to £1,000, together with an assurance on engagement, at proper fees if the designs are adopted. Their real merit would be to place the name of St Helena at the centre of international cultural studies and potentially to introduce culturally valuable structures and monuments to the island.
Recommendations 25 to 27 are offered as examples of what might be done to raise the St Helena profile internationally, and there is much more beside that could be undertaken. Perhaps the best way forward is to find a champion on the island for any one of these projects, perhaps Ian Gummery for the Ossuary Monument project, and simply create that competition now, under Ian's guidance. On the principal that nothing succeeds like success, a good, quick win would create experience, help consolidate the mental attitudes required and encourage others to follow suit.

With the allied universities (above) it would be appropriate to immediately develop a research project that can be put forward for funding. This writer will undertake to secure the funding, but the concept must originate from a collaboration of the St Helena Heritage Sector and allied universities with a track record in the subject matter of the project.

Recommendation 28

It is recommended that a project focussed on the recording and conservation of all of the cannon on the island be designed under the guidance of the Museum and in collaboration with suitable partners in the UK, USA and Europe. Again, the writer will undertake to help fund this project, as a capacity building exercise for the Heritage Sector and with a view to providing much needed conservation resources for the island.
Part VI Memorandum and Budget

This element of the report is not yet prepared and will not be submitted until the writer has received editorial input and additional guidance from SHG on this draft report. Thereafter it will be produced within 15 working days of receipt of SHG input.

Circulation of this draft report

The writer has received help and support from many people on the island and would in other circumstances circulate this draft to some or all of them. Under separate cover I have provided a list of those whom I have met on the island and with whom I have discussed elements of this draft report. I note however that under the terms of my commission, this matter is one for SHG to deal with.

It is my intention to furnish a copy of this draft report to Ben Jeffs whose work has been reviewed herein, as a matter of professional courtesy, and I beg SHG’s indulgence in this.

John Barber

April 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Where planning advice or decisions are founded on the data contained in the HER dataset, The Planning Officer will check that the details founded upon are drawn from the current, true and verified copy before issuing that advice or decision so as to ensure that they are based on the legally valid HER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is strongly recommend that SHG-IT should take over and redevelop the NHR, on the basis of inputs from the Heritage Sector, and from Tourism and Enterprise, within SHG, under the direction of the Chief Environmental Officer and that this be done immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A temporary full time assistant should be appointed to the museum for a period of up to three months, tasked with data entry for the Museum’s collection and all other mobiliary heritage artefacts on the island. The assistant should identify overlaps with the NHR and recommend their removal from the NHR/HER by the museum’s use of the change control processes set out above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is recommended that the proposed Development Conditions (below) also require quality improvements above the prevailing norms in circumstances in which the loss of some heritage value will result from Development Permissions with impacts on heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acknowledging that this is not his area of expertise, the writer nonetheless recommends that consideration be given to the following; that: i) The Director of Education and Employment in consultation with the chair of the Heritage Sector should embark on a programme of educational engagement with St Helena’s heritage ii) The museum be instructed and resourced to digitise its radio tapes archive and iii) That the museum, in consultation with the Director of Education and Employment, seek to engage some schoolchildren, with other interested parties, in the digital recording of early memories of the older generation of Saints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Collaboration should be sought with an appropriate university (or universities) in the UK and/or elsewhere to form and fund a joint University/SH Heritage Sector to undertake a systematic search for pre-colonial settlement in the deeper sediment traps of the island and including, but not limited to, palynological studies of marshy areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A professional archaeologist or archaeological group with an appropriate range of experience should be engaged for a three month period to identify and record agricultural traces on the island. This person or agency should also identify and record technological traces on the island. The data arising will be added to the NHR/HER and/or where relevant the Museum Database by the change control mechanism identified at para 41 above. The precise locations of both sets of remains will be surveyed onto the existing base maps by SHG staff and the coordinate sets will be added to the edited data set before its submission to the NHR/HER change control process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Enterprise Saint Helena, Tourism, should appoint a senior staff member to the Heritage Sector, tasked with: i. homologating the heritage offer for visitors to the island to ensure consistency of information presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. designing consistent signage to and on heritage assets throughout the island, to ensure consistency of information presentation

iii. providing editorial input to heritage offering originating from the Heritage Sector and where necessary translating ‘heritageese’ to English.

iv. Stimulating high level vision in the conservation and presentation of heritage on the island and internationally

Saint Helena should, via the Heritage Sector and SHG, embrace the meta narrative of slavery and its role in the evolution of the island, in token of which the following actions should be undertaken:

i. Appropriate scholars should be identified to help form relationships between the island and international agencies engaged in slavery studies

ii. Commitment to the creation of the ossuary should be confirmed and work on it progressed as soon as civil engineering works in Rupert’s Valley are completed.

iii. An international competition should be announced, concurrently with the announcement of the formation of the academic relationships (above), calling for designs for a monument to the memories of slaves everywhere for placement at the ossuary.

It is recommended that ENRD should become the lead organization for all heritage designations and that the Chief Environmental Officer will become the person responsible for designations within that Directorate.

It is recommended that the maximum penalties applied to such works which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a scheduled monument should be homologated with the penalties being set for cognate offences in the ‘Protection of Wrecks and Marine Archaeological Heritage Ordinance, 2014’ now in draft.

It is recommended that in all of the NCA’s the combined role of nature and humanity in the evolution and maintenance of these cultural landscapes should be identified and emphasised in the Management Plans now in draft. Further, the metanarratives of human/landscape interactions seem to this writer central to what survives on St Helena and it is therefore recommended that the relationship of people and place be given a higher prominence in all tourist-orientated writing about the island.

It is recommended that the note ‘Advice to Developers’ drafted by David Taylor (e-Appendix 5), erstwhile CPO on St Helena, be expanded to include this encouragement to early consultation on developments with heritage entailments. It should also contain the following advice:

Heritage is a competent planning matter. Planners will expect planning applicants, or their agents, to have assessed the likelihood of the existence of heritage assets on or near the development area or intervisible with it and to have assessed the likely impact of the development on these heritage assets and their settings. A larger scale of assessment undertaken at a higher quality standard[1] will be required in the case of all EIA-scale developments.
The resourcing of the Heritage Sector needs to be increased to help them provide the service of statutory consultees. Currently SHG supports both the SHNT and the Heritage Society, the latter via the Museum. A daily rate value shall be calculated from this subsidy and a fixed number of days service shall be identified, from within the existing subsidy, to provide the statutory consultation service described here, free of charge. When this fixed allotment of days is exhausted, the Heritage Sector will invoice SHG at the calculated daily rate for all subsequent consultations within that financial year. The Heritage Sector will keep an account of the consumption of the allotted days and communicate this monthly to SHG’s Chief Planning Officer.

It is recommended that the Chief Planning Officer will formulate a Section 23 agreement with the developer for action by the Attorney General (LPDCO 2014). This will take the general form:

‘[The developer] will undertake the programme of archaeological fieldwork appended hereto, complete with its written acceptance by the Chief Environmental Officer, in exploration of the development area pre-determination, to establish the absence or presence, and if present, the nature of currently unknown heritage remains whose existence is suspected because of the local presence of significant monuments [or for some other stated reason]’ and the developer will fund the field work and the analysis and publication of the results thereof regardless of whether the proposed development application is submitted or not, and regardless of the outcome of the application, if submitted. To secure this outcome, a codicil should be added to the Section 23 agreement in the following general form: ‘Before the commencement of a pre-development evaluation, the planning officer will require sight of a competent contract awarded to a suitable person or organisation and covering the costs of fieldwork, analysis, publication and archiving, in the absence of which, the planning application will not proceed to determination.’

The developer shall commission and afford access at all relevant times to an archaeologist or archaeological organisation acceptable to the development control authority, and shall allow them to observe work in progress and record items of interest and recover samples and finds as appropriate. A contract defining the nature of the brief, including the powers of the archaeologist to halt progress temporarily, and for longer intervals, and establishing the right of the archaeologist to report findings directly to the Chief Environmental Officer shall be submitted to the Development Officer for approval in writing in advance of the start of works. This contract will acknowledge the legal obligation to analyse and publish the results of the fieldwork and to archive the record in the approved manner.

No development shall take place until the developer has erected temporary fencing of acceptable type in a manner to be agreed with the planning authority, about [insert name/s of monument/s] along the line/s shown on the plan annexed; and no works, including dumping, or vehicular movement or parking, shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the prior agreement of the planning officer.

No development shall take place within the area indicated [this would be the area of archaeological interest] until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI) which has been submitted by the applicant and agreed and approved in writing by the Planning Officer acting on the advice of the Chief Environmental Officer.
It is recommended that the Heritage Society be encouraged to write into their constitution a ‘living will’ clause that transfers ownership of all the materials over which the museum holds ownership to the Crown in the event of the dissolution of the museum from any cause. This can be made subject to conditions such as an SHG guarantee that the material will not leave St Helena other than for temporary exhibition at approved museums elsewhere in the world. Alternatively, and preferably, the museum could make the transfer of ownership now, negotiating any conditions they deem appropriate. The intention should be that the museum becomes responsible for the curation and conservation of all artefacts found on St Helena, as well as their presentation.

It is recommended, further, that the Heritage Society should reconstitute itself as a charitable trust which would achieve the substance of Recommendation 20 in that a trust necessarily defines from the outset the fate of its goods and chattels in the event of its dissolution. Furthermore, many of the international funding streams available for archaeological and conservation works are only available to trusts and are currently unavailable to the St Helena Museum.

It is recommended that, without loss of salary, pension and other benefits, i.e. acting as if TUPE regulations applied, provisions should be made to terminate this secondment and to fund the employment of the same employee by the Heritage Society. This will be facilitated if the HS becomes a Trust.

It is recommended that the directorship of the Heritage Sector Group be vested in the SHNT because of its organisational maturity and its experience in conservation and education. It is further recommended that the chair of the group should be provided by the Heritage Society, to provide long term, island based continuity of governance of the group, in contrast with the short term of office of the SHNT directors. Thereafter, its organisation is a matter for itself. Funding arrangements for statutory consultations will not be put in place until the group has been formed and its formation document has been forwarded to the CEO at SHG.

It is recommended that the conversion of the PWD store to an enhanced heritage facility should be undertaken and a more sophisticated design should be created for it. The latter should rely more on digital technologies so that every exhibition or publication or new project will have immediate worldwide accessibility (see ‘Profile’ below). The new design should consider the future shape of the Grand Parade as a public space, with alternative provision necessarily being made for car parking.

It is recommended that the Library Service of St Helena should assume the role of allocating ISSN and ISBN numbers to island publications arising from all sources, but certainly from heritage projects undertaken on the island. As a necessary corollary, any development or research projects undertaken on St Helena will be constrained to publish their results on the island, if necessary in addition to peer reviewed publication elsewhere, and will be asked to undertake to provide the library service with 5 copies of the original report and any additional publications founded on or referring to St Helena materials or monuments.
It is recommended that the Heritage Sector form relationships with the major international universities that actively research issues relevant to St Helena and that it enter a close alliance with one or two of them. One of the alliance universities will be asked to provide the St Helena Library Service with an access Id and Password to academic digital resources on the net, as a contribution to the work local and visiting scholars. This would allow cost-free access to the worlds major digital libraries and help stimulate and facilitate international publication by St Helena based scholars.

It is recommended that opportunities should be sought to fund international competitions for design and build projects involving St Helena heritage assets and infrastructure. These could involve a design competition for the renewal of the heritage centre at the PSD store referred to above. The hotel design proposed for ladder hill is quite good, but it is a safe and somewhat uninspiring design. This could act as the brief for an architectural competition for something a bit more inspiring. A competition for engineering and architectural studies of an eco-friendly version of the single storey rural building of the island would also attract international interest. Reference has already been made to a design competition for a monument at the ossuary. The costs on these competitions are typically £500 to £1,000, together with an assurance on engagement, at proper fees if the designs are adopted. Their real merit would be to place the name of St Helena at the centre of international cultural studies and potentially to introduce culturally valuable structures and monuments to the island.

It is recommended that a project focussed on the recording and conservation of all of the cannon on the island be designed under the guidance of the Museum and in collaboration with suitable partners in the UK, USA and Europe. Again, the writer will undertake to help fund this project, as a capacity building exercise for the Heritage Sector and with a view to providing much needed conservation resources for the island.
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