
DUBLIN CITY HERITAGE PLAN 2002-12

REVIEW OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE PROJECTS 2002-11

Editor: Charles Duggan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors are very grateful to the many different authors and readers who contributed to this review. Thanks are extended to Patricia Hyde, Senior Planner (DCC), Charles Duggan, Heritage Officer (DCC), Sarah Halpin, Conservation Research Officer (DCC) Nicola Matthews, Conservation Officer (DCC), Susan Roundtree, Senior Architect (DCC), Carl Raftery, Conservation Research Officer (DCC), Oiseen Kelly, Architect (DCC)

**ARCHITECTURE PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN UNDER AUSPICES OF DUBLIN CITY HERITAGE
PLAN 2002-2006 (to present)**

Project	Date	Type
Dublin City Architectural Heritage Surveys	2003	Research
a) Built to Last: The Sustainable Reuse of Historic Buildings Study (published 2004)	2004-2006	Research
b) Survey of Market End Value of Reused Buildings vs. New Buildings in Dublin		
c) Enviro Study on Economic Value of heritage		
Dublin Through the Ages (Awareness-raising exhibition)	2003-2006	Awareness
Antique Pavement Survey (List 4 & 5 of the City Dev Plan)	2004	Research
Public Sculpture in Dublin City Survey	2004	Research
Dublin City Architectural Inventory Surveys (Stoneybatter spine; Harold's Cross spine; North and South Quays)	2005	Research
Henrietta Street Conservation Plan	2006	Research/ Management
Public Sculpture Conservation Programme	2006-2009	Management
Sustaining Places of Worship Study	2006-2009	Research/ Management
Traditional Building Skills Weekend (With Irish Georgian Society)	2006	Awareness
Study of Maintenance Issues in Connection with Historic Buildings in the Ownership of DCC	2006-2007	Research
3& 14 Henrietta Street Conservation Works Programme	2007-2012	Management
Historic Bank Buildings in Dublin City: Research Project and Survey	2007	Research
Historic Street Surfaces Conservation Study and Guidance Manual	2008	Research/ Management
Henrietta Street Conservation Plan: Open Ideas Competition for No.16/ Part 8	2008 and 2011	Management
Henrietta Lane: An Addendum to the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan	2008	Research/ Management
Conservation Strategy for the Follies in Saint Anne's Park	2009	Research/ Management
A Research Project on Historic Pointing Techniques and Façade Finishes in Dublin	2010	Research/ Management
Vernacular Heritage of Dublin: A Thematic Study	2010	Research
Decorative Plasterwork in Dublin 1750-1775 (the Dublin School) Phase 1 and Phase 2	2010	Research
Dublin Flats exhibition and catalogue	2010	Awareness
Pigeon House Precinct Conservation Plan (Draft Stage)	2011	Research /Management
20th Century Architecture in Dublin (Research Project and Survey) Phase 1	2011	Research
Bank Architecture in Dublin, A History to c. 1940	2012	Awareness

Blue highlight indicates those projects selected for review.

Dublin City Architectural Heritage Surveys

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Jack Coughlan Associates

STEERING GROUP: Donncha O'Dulaing (DCC), Nicki Matthews (DCC), Rob Goodbody (DCC), Catriona Byrne (DCC) Áine Doyle (DCC), Mary Hanna and Paddy Matthews (Heritage Council), Jacqui Donnelly (Dúchas)

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES: Architectural Working Group Position Paper Objective 1, target *f*, action *f*.

DATE OF STUDY: Commissioned 2002. Published 2003.

SYNOPSIS:

Devised in response to the overall aim of the architectural working position paper of the Dublin City Heritage Plan '*To promote the Awareness and Conservation of Dublin City's Architectural Heritage through Leadership and Partnership*', this desktop research study was undertaken to identify all inventories concerning the built heritage of the city and the character of areas undertaken to date in Dublin City. This study was undertaken in order to achieve the objective of providing accessible, comprehensive and consistent inventories of buildings and the character of areas. The study aimed to identify:

- The geographical extent of the areas of the city which have been covered by inventory projects
- The type of information collected.
- Where and how the inventory information is stored, and how accessible it is.
- The date of collection of the inventory information.
- Where there were critical gaps in information
- The feasibility of making all inventory information available from one digital source.

Findings:

45 Sources of Architectural heritage inventories were identified. The most significant in scale and detail: Dublin Environmental Inventory (School of Architecture UCD) and the Historic Heart of Dublin Survey (Dublin Civic Trust). Each inventory dataset is described and the extent of geographical cover is categorised as: comprehensive; selective within a defined geographical area: thematic; or selective within entire Dublin city.

Regarding accessibility 7 surveys were publicly accessible, with a further 4 published and currently in print, and so also accessible. The remaining 34 inventories are limited in their accessibility to college users or Dublin city council users.

A greater amount of the south city is surveyed when compared with the north city.

The geographical extent of the surveys has been mapped.

The main recommendations of the study include:

- A system should be developed to make inventory information from existing architectural inventories available from a single source.
- The existence of inventory information on individual buildings and streets should be mapped on a large-scale digital map.
- Make the Dublin Environmental inventory accessible (subsequently achieved by UCD).
- Dublin City Council should establish a formal link with the Master of Urban and Building Conservation studies course in UCD.

- The basic minimum level of information for all future architectural inventory projects should be derived from the Council of Europe’s Core Data Index fields.
- The creation of new inventories should be actively guided and supported by Dublin City Council, and specific funding earmarked for architectural inventories as an important source of information for informed planning and development.

The actions and recommendations within this report were implemented over the duration of the heritage plan, on a phased and in partnership with other agencies. Additional survey work includes:

- 2004: Antique Pavements Survey.
- 2004-2009 Dublin City Industrial Heritage Record. (see separate report in Archaeology Review Doc)
- 2005: Architectural Inventory of North and South Quays/Harold’s Cross/Terenure and Sundrive Spine/Church Street-Stoneybatter spine.
- 2007: Bank Architecture in Dublin. (see separate report)
- 2010: Vernacular Buildings in Dublin

WHAT NEXT?

- The National Inventory of Architectural Heritage Interim County Survey of Dublin city commenced in 2011. All survey data generated above should be made available to the NIAH to assist in the task to survey Dublin.
- Continue high-level thematic surveys

Review by Charles Duggan

WIG/TUCK A Research Project on Historic Pointing Techniques and Façade Finishes in Dublin (Draft 03)

PROJECT CONSULTANTS:

Shaffrey Associates Architects – Grainne Shaffrey & Eamonn Kehoe
Dr Gerard Lynch
Dr John Montague

STEERING GROUP: Charles Duggan, Carl Raftery, Susan Roundtree

DATE OF STUDY: December 2010 (Draft 03)

SYNOPSIS:

This is a study of the historic techniques used for pointing brickwork in Dublin. The aim of the study is to assist the City Council in implementing an evidence-based approach in guiding façade renewal and the repair of brick buildings in Dublin. The report makes preliminary conclusions and recommendations based on evidence from academic research and fieldwork. The findings will be a practical resource for anyone planning, designing or assessing brick façade repair or renewal in Dublin. The research work underpinning the document is from historical research combined with the examination and recording of over 70 building façades. The building periods of particular interest that have been examined are 1714-1830 (Georgian) and the subsequent Victorian/ Edwardian period from 1830-1914.

One of the aims of the study was to develop a renewal technique (or series of techniques) for re-pointing brickwork in façades where there is evidence that the brickwork was previously 'wigged' and colour washed. A renewal technique has been developed in consultation with Dr Gerard Lynch but the consultants feel that this may need some further refinement in consultation with a wider group of contractors.

The study recommends that:-

- 'English' tuck pointing for façade renewal should be discouraged
- Hybrid techniques which have evolved in an attempt to approximate historic techniques should generally be discouraged
- Decisions on re-pointing should be informed by surviving evidence
- Further historical research and fieldwork is necessary
- Further analytical research on historic pointing materials is needed and further project trials
- Guidance on materials is needed particularly in relation to the use of limes and sands and additives
- Further tests and samples are needed in order to develop appropriate renewal techniques for different types and ages of brickwork
- Technical guidance should be developed and published for 'wiggling' techniques
- Training in the specialist craft of brick masonry repair is needed
- Communication with building owners on the specialist nature of historic brickwork is needed
- A Dublin City Council conservation policy for historic façade renewal should be prepared

WHAT NEXT:

This is an extremely important topic for the City Council to pursue. Dublin's unique architectural heritage is intrinsically linked with its brick-faced buildings, both in the Georgian core and in the Victorian suburbs. A great deal of misguided and expensive repair and re-

pointing work to historic brick façades has been carried out in the city because of a lack of strategic policy and guidance in this area.

The next step recommendations are that the report be edited and completed and the final document circulated, presented and discussed with Dublin City Council building professionals and conservation staff and planners in the first instance.

The recommendations of the study should be pursued. In particular the further research recommended should be commissioned with an advisory document as an outcome that will give concise but appropriate guidance on the topic for the use of the conservation team and planners in Dublin City Council and to make available to building owners and professionals. The guidance should include some commentary on the statutory implications of carrying out façade works to buildings that are protected structures or located in Architectural Conservation Areas.

Review by Susan Roundtree and Nicola Matthews

(a) Built to Last, The Sustainable Reuse of Buildings, 2004
(b) Survey of the Market End value of Reused Buildings vs. New Buildings in Dublin November 2004
(c) Built to Last Report, The Sustainable Reuse of Buildings, 2006

(a) Built to Last, The Sustainable Reuse of Buildings, 2004

PROJECT CONSULTANTS

Carrig Conservation, McGrath Environmental Consultants, James P. Mc Grath & Associates, Murray O'Laoire Architects

STEERING GROUP

Mary Hanna, The Heritage Council; Dick Gleeson, Acting City Planner, DCC; Susan Roundtree, Senior Architect, DCC; Paraic Fallon, Senior Planner, DCC; Nicki Matthews, Conservation Officer, DCC; Breda Lane, Administrative Officer, DCC; Geraldine O'Mahony, Executive Planner, DCC; Donncha Ó Dúlaing, Heritage Officer, DCC

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES

Objective 6: To promote environmental economic and cultural sustainability. Under actions A: limiting of waste and action B: sustainable reuse of buildings via new build.

SYNOPSIS

The aim is to provide the data so that the many organisations and interests which constitute the Irish construction industry are made aware that re-using buildings is a viable alternative to demolition and new construction, with additional environmental and cultural benefits that translate to more profitable buildings in the long term. In the five case studies used to prepare this report, hypothetical new build scenarios were compared with actual refurbishment projects in relation to building costs, environmental analysis and whole life costs. In general, the conclusions illustrate the advantages, both economic and environmental, of re-using and extending the lifespan of the building stock.

The case studies show that constructing new buildings on brown-field sites is more expensive than retaining and re-using existing buildings *except* in situations where the extent of building repair and refurbishment required is extremely high. As the repair costs decrease, the re-use option becomes progressively more economic to a point where reduced costs of as much as 50% can be achieved. This study has shown that the re-use of buildings has greater value for the environment and cost savings over the future life of the buildings. Existing buildings can also have greater aesthetic and heritage values. The report was published

- Larger scale study in terms of building numbers for protected structures and non-protected structures with a focus on market end value of each building type, incremental impact on neighbouring buildings, adaptability and versatility of the building types.
- A sustainability conference to bring all the key stake holders together along with publication of updated advice series on conservation including sustainability, accessibility and safety.
- Targeted training for professionals, contractors and suppliers focusing on recycling materials and building components. www.ncdwc.ie
- Integrated incentive-based approach for developing the historic building through grants, and tax incentives.
- Monitoring and evaluation of initiatives for sustainable reuse of buildings.

(b) Survey of the Market End value of Reused Buildings vs. New Buildings in Dublin November 2004

PROJECT CONSULTANT: CB Richrad Ellis Gunne

STEERING GROUP: Donncha Ó Dúlaing, Heritage Officer, DCC (Other members not stated in report).

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES

Objective 6: To promote environmental economic and cultural sustainability. Under actions A: limiting of waste and action B: sustainable reuse of buildings via new build.

SYNOPSIS

Four key questions

1. Is the market value of a conserved protected structure higher or lower than that of a new building in the same location?
2. Is the market value of a protected structure enhanced by conservation of its fabric?
3. Is the cost of the conservation higher or lower than the increase in market value of a protected structure?
4. Does conservation act as a catalyst for increased market values in neighbouring properties?

65 properties were used in the survey both a mix of commercia-office and residential

The bias of the report seemed to lean towards new build with only residential occupants stating they would move to a protected structure again. The majority of office occupant would relocate to a modern build because of the flexibility of the use of the space. The only commercial occupants that favoured PS were doctors, solicitors and architects who favoured prestige addresses. Renovating a PS did not significantly improve the value of the neighbouring properties and its resale value. Only a costing for the PS was outlined the costing for the new building did not appear so comparisons could not be carried out.

(c) Built to Last 2006 Report, The Sustainable Reuse of Buildings

PROJECT CONSULTANT

Environs

STEERING GROUP: Donncha Ó Dúlaing, Heritage Officer, DCC (Other members not stated in report).

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES

Objective 6: To promote environmental economic and cultural sustainability. Under actions A: limiting of waste and action B: sustainable reuse of buildings via new build.

SYNOPSIS

Builds on the initial report Built to Last 2004 and expands on the numbers of buildings by an additional 17 studied. It contains an economic, commercial, environmental and cultural review of these 15 PS, 2 are not PS. The main finding are outlined in the table below.

Building type	Reuse cost benefit	Environmental impact
Georgian buildings	Three buildings out of nine have higher costs of refurbishment than re-development.	Environmental impact for all the examined buildings was lower in the case of refurbishment then in case of redevelopment.

Victorian buildings	Two out of four have higher costs of refurbishment than redevelopment.	Environmental impact for all the examined buildings was lower in case of refurbishment than in case of redevelopment.
Modern buildings	All of the four reviewed buildings have lower cost of refurbishment than redevelopment	Environmental impact for all the examined buildings was lower in case of refurbishment then in the case of redevelopment.

Recommendations:

- A targeted conference on the sustainable reuse of buildings to key stakeholders, i.e. Local Authorities, developers, private owners, construction supply chain, professionals.
- Existing education and training courses in related subjects should be reviewed.
- A series of simple, practical leaflets on basis methods of conservation, i.e., window repair, roof repair and weathering of buildings should be promoted.
- Special training and accreditation of the professions, contractors and suppliers should be encouraged.
- Technical Guidance on the performance aspects of DAHLG Long Term historic buildings should be prepared, demonstrating historic buildings should be prepared, demonstrating how Irish building typologies can be made conform with building regulations in terms of safety, structure and accessibility.
- Education about recycling of building components and materials is required for all those involved in the construction industry. This should be coordinated by a group consisting of the DEHLG, Sustainable Energy Ireland, and the professional and academic institutes.

The DEHLG and DAHG advice series publications includes among roof, windows and maintenance publications. The Energy Efficiency in Traditional Buildings promotes the sustainable upgrading of Protected Structures. The Access publication addresses how universal access can be accommodated. In tandem with this, the SEAI commercial and residential grants schemes to support and promote energy upgrades of buildings helps to give PS a sustainable use into the future. Dublin City Council, Heritage and Conservation sections have also partnered with the Irish Georgian Society to run the Energy Efficiency in Historic Houses and Dublin Townhouse seminars as educational and training programs to promote the sustainability of PS.

WHAT NEXT?

The following list includes some of the further research recommendations based on these studies which formed part of the research for the *Barriers and Drivers for the Energy Efficient Upgrades of Historic Dwellings in the Dublin City Council Area* thesis carried out by Carl Raftery in 2012.

1. Leading on from these three studies, the two unpublished studies should be made accessible as raw data for research purposes. There is a ready lack of case studies on the sustainable reuse and upgrading of PS.
2. The SEAI homeowners guide for the Better Energy Homes scheme should be amended to include specific reference to the DAHG *Energy Efficiency in Traditional Buildings* publication.
Reason: In order that homeowners are fully briefed and can select upgrades which are appropriate to historic dwellings prior to carrying out SEAI approved grants.
3. The information contained on SEAI grant forms should be collated in order to establish the following:
 - How many pre 1940's dwellings have availed of the scheme
 - What the grant has been used relative to the building age
 - Relate the geographical location with works and building age

- Reason:** This is an important area to address in order to assess whether home owners are carrying out appropriate work and to identify what barriers to implementation of appropriate measures exist and to look at ways these can be over come.
4. The performance and return of grant incentives must be monitored to ensure that policy is in line with home owner's attitude towards financial incentives.
Reason: Central government policy in relation to the availability of grants for energy efficient upgrades should take cognisance of the views of homeowners of historic buildings.
 5. The possibility of establishing a central database of protected structures homeowners should be investigated in order that relevant information can be disseminated widely and easily.
Reason: The high response rate from protected structure homeowners highlight the interest in gaining access to energy efficient measure related information and this should be built upon.
 6. Studies need to be carried out that can monitor and calculate pre and post installation data for historic dwellings in relation to various upgrades.
Reason: The capital cost relative to the post installation reduction in running costs can only be assessed by this means. Favourable results would encourage homeowners to carry out energy efficient upgrades.
 7. Establish an Ireland specific database of case studies and research paper for historic buildings. Best practice cases are to be encouraged with criteria and a template set out. Establish links on all the relevant websites dealing with financial assistance.
Reason: There is a deficiency in terms of a central repository of data and research in relation to historic dwellings and appropriate energy efficient upgrades in Ireland.
 8. Dublin City Council having the major urban centre in Ireland should establish a pilot project targeting varied types and ages of historic dwelling within its boundary.
Reason: As the local authority with the highest proportion of protected structures it could lead the way in assembling pilot case studies projects.

Reviewed by Carl Raftery

Public Sculpture Survey in Dublin City

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Carrig Conservation International (lead consultant)/Brady Shipman Martin

STEERING GROUP: Heritage Office, Conservation Office, Planning Dept & Arts Office, OPW.

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

Architectural Working Group Position Paper. Objective 5. *To develop a Partnership Approach with State Agencies, NGOs and community groups in relation to (a) built heritage policy and b. implementation of specific conservation projects.* Target B: *Develop a partnership Forum.* Action B: *Investigate the establishment of a community forum involving state agencies, NGOs and community groups, to draw together recommendations with regard to prioritisation and implementation of conservation projects.*

DATE OF STUDY: November 2004

SYNOPSIS: In March 2004, Dublin City Council in partnership with The Heritage Council issued an invitation to tender for a comprehensive audit of all statues, commemorative monuments and public sculpture in the public domain and in private property on public view, in the Dublin City Council area as an action of the City Heritage Plan. The intention of the study was not an art historical project but rather one aimed at addressing and improving upon maintenance and condition of the great number of public sculpture in the city.

Carrig Carrig Conservation International with Brady Shipman Martin were appointed to carry out the survey. The team undertook to present the findings of the survey in three parts. The first part is through a database, the second a report and the third through a mapping system.

The objective of the survey is to allow Dublin City Council to:

- Assess ownership, management and maintenance issues of existing statues, commemorative monuments and public sculptures
- Review the process of approval or otherwise of the installation of statues, commemorative monuments and public sculpture to ensure standards of appropriateness, ownership, management and maintenance

The brief was also required a short historical summary detailing ownership, commission, placement and design. It was also to briefly detail the condition of each monument and summarize necessary conservation work required. Included in the report are guidelines and policies for existing sculptures and monuments and considerations for the placement of new sculptures.

Findings / Outcomes

Approximately 200 pieces of public sculpture have been surveyed. An Access database has been created and data organised under a number of categories: Location / identification information (incl. Address, sculptor, title, commissioning body, owner); Condition and Maintenance (droplist of prevailing conditions identified during survey); Visual Information.

The condition of each piece of public sculpture is rated from 0 (not present)-4 (critical) and categorised from "Excellent" to "Under Threat". Prevailing condition issues include: biological growth; rust; rust staining; chipped/broken stone; vegetation; weathered metal; weathered stone and wood; graffiti; guano; dirt; and drainage. Maintenance treatments are proposed in outline for each of these prevailing condition issues.

Sections 5 (policies & guidelines) and 6 (conclusion & conservation) of the report outline recommendations, policies and guidelines. The key recommendations include a regular maintenance programme and monitoring with close liaison between DCC and other owners of public art in the city (such as OPW & TCD). Since the report was completed in 2004 A Public Sculpture Conservation Programme has been initiated and conservation works has been carried out by DCC to the public sculpture on O'Connell Street, College Green and the Meath Street Portico and Mount Street (Canal) Bridge.

Published sources for all public sculpture included in the survey has been compiled and is accessible within Dublin City Council.

WHAT NEXT?

It is recommended that Section 5 of the report be revisited and the policies and guidelines be assessed to investigate if they have been implemented and if so how successful they have been.

The guidelines themselves should also be reassessed in light of the conservation works carried out to the public sculpture on O'Connell Street, College Green and the Meath Street Portico. Continue the monitoring and carry out necessary conservation works to public sculpture in Dublin City.

Work in partnership with the Dublin City Arts Office (Ruairi O'Cuiv, Dublin City Public Art Officer) and the Public Art Advisory Group, to update the public art survey; to continue the conservation programme for public sculpture, and raise awareness of the public sculpture in Dublin; promote the rich heritage of historic public art in Dublin.

Charles Duggan, Sarah Halpin and Clare Hogan

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Shaffrey Associates Architects, John Montague Architectural Historian, Carrig Building Fabric Specialists, Dr Tracy Pickerill, Lee Mc Cullough Engineers, Boylan Farrelly, Quantity Surveyors.

STEERING GROUP: Heritage Office (DCC), Conservation Office (DCC), Planning Department (DCC), representatives of the Henrietta Street Owners Group, Department of the Environment Heritage and Local Government, Heritage Council, Dublin Civic Trust.

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

To develop a partnership approach with state agencies, NGOs and community groups in relation to (a) the build heritage policy and (b) implementation of specific conservation projects.

DATE OF STUDY: Commissioned 2004 / Published December 2006

SYNOPSIS: In 2004, Dublin City Council, in partnership with The Heritage Council commissioned a Conservation Plan for Henrietta Street as an action of the City Heritage Plan to coordinate the future conservation, rehabilitation and regeneration of Henrietta Street in a Strategic Manner.

The Dublin City Council steering group was chaired by Jim Keoghan and included the Heritage Officer, Assistant Conservation officer, representatives from the Irish Georgian Society, the Department of Environment Heritage Local Government, An Taisce, the Dublin Civic Trust and representatives of the property owners and occupants.

Shaffrey Associates Architects were appointed as lead consultants for the preparation of the plan. A significant part of the process involved consultation both with property owners and NGO organisations and representatives from the relevant departments within Dublin City Council.

The preparation of the Conservation Plan adhered to the ICOMOS Burra Charter and James Semple Kerr's Guide to Conservation Plans and the UK Heritage Lottery Fund's Conservation Plans for Historic Places (1996).

The Conservation Plan aims to provide the following:

- An understanding of an historic place and what is significant about it
- Identification of issues which threaten to undermine or devalue this significance
- Appropriate policies and recommendations to assist in: managing the site; planning repairs or restoration planning new developments and, managing a programme of regular maintenance.

The methodology applied to the conservation plan in this instance included a re-survey of the 1997 Henrietta Street Architectural Inventory Survey (Dublin Civic Trust), primary and secondary research to further develop the historic context for the construction of the buildings and the development of the street. A critical analysis of the buildings and an assessment of the cultural significance of the street and individual houses was undertaken. It was required to identify threats to its existence and develop policies so as to protect the identified significance of the street with guidance notes on their implementation. It initiated ongoing processes for the future of Henrietta Street and recommended annual reviews to chart progress in implementing the actions and recommendations.

Part Four of the Conservation Plan details Policies and Recommendations, implementation and Review.

Key objectives that underpin the policies of the Conservation Plan:

- Acknowledgement of primary role of property owners in protecting the significance houses and street
- Identification and promotion of existing and new initiatives to assist owners with maintenance of the buildings
- Improvement of public's awareness and appreciation
- Acknowledgment of the contribution of diversity of uses to the cultural significance of the street
- Ensuring condition of houses is maintained, identification of structures at risk and programmes of immediate repair works. Provision of technical guidance to property owners and planning department
- Protection against inappropriate uses and interventions to houses and context
- Consolidation and improvement of public realm and presentation of the street
- Consolidation of the historic importance of street and character in terms of its immediate surroundings and broader city context

The key policies number twenty eight and encompass many different aspects of conservation from the establishment of an endowed heritage trust for the street and implementation of the plan to more specific policies for the maintenance and monitoring of the buildings. Policies address improvements to the public realm and contextual connections, in particular in relation to the proposed Grangegorman campus, the Broadstone developments and the Kings Inns. The protection afforded by designation as an Architectural Conservation Area is identified. Policies for the improvement of the public realm and public access to individual buildings generate policies. The precarious condition of Nos. 3 and 14 and the potential reinstatement of No 16 are noted as of particular concern.

Since the Conservation Plan was completed the following has been implemented:

- Emergency structural works and security measures at Nos. 3 & 14 to ensure their survival and is currently completing a windows conservation project at No. 14. (Policy 26) (See separate report)
- Building Intervention recording all works undertaken in Nos. 3 & 14.
- Henrietta Lane, Addendum Study to Conservation Plan (Policy 18) (see separate review report)
- Façade Renewal Strategy, Pointing Master Class and Colloquium for the consolidation, repair and cleaning of the facades of Nos. 3, 13 and 14 Henrietta Street. (Policies 4 & 5)
- Further work has been done to investigate appropriate legal structures for setting up a heritage conservation fund/trust for Henrietta Street. (Policies 2 & 3)
- Design options for the replacement of the existing bollards which protect the surviving cellars. The preferred design is for a Carlow granite bollard linked by authentic wrought-iron chain work. This project has been priced and is awaiting funding and final agreement on the preferred design with Roads and Traffic. (Policy 20)
- DCC also pursued successful legal proceedings against the owners of the buildings. (Policy 26)
- Digitisation of the 1997 Henrietta Street Architectural Inventory Survey (Dublin Civic Trust). (Policy 8)
- Henrietta Street Exhibition and Book approaching completion. (Policy 25)
- Open House tours annually. (Policy 25)

- Open Ideas Design Competition for the Reinstatement of No. 16 Henrietta Street. Part VIII now exists for the winning scheme and heads of agreement are in place for the future completion of this scheme. (Policy 27) (See separate report)
- Henrietta Street Architectural Conservation Area document consolidating the conservation plan with policies arising from subsequent research is approaching completion. (Policy15)

WHAT NEXT?

It is recommended that Dublin City Council continues to implement the conservation plan in partnership with the Henrietta Street Owners Group, in a strategic manner. To identify and prioritise the policy actions that are most likely to have a successful outcome in the present difficult economic climate. Resolving temporary and long-term uses for Nos. 3 & 14 Henrietta Street and the necessary works to facilitate use must remain the priority. Policies that avail of Dublin City Council's considerable conservation expertise and resources should also be implemented, e.g. designating an Architectural Conservation Area, production of a technical guidance manual for property owners, recording and research projects, promoting public entrance to buildings.

Charles Duggan and Clare Hogan

Public Sculpture Conservation Programme

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Jason Ellis (Lead Consultant), Andrew Naylor, Brian Hall,
Contractors: Brendan Waters, Alexi Iliev, Saul Jones, Cathal Cregg, David Sweeney, Joey Dervan,
Gerry Fanning.

STEERING GROUP: Donncha O'Dulaing/Charles Duggan, Heritage Office (DCC), Aine Doyle/Carl Raftery, Conservation Office (DCC), John Cahill (OPW).

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

Architectural Working Group Position Paper. Objective 5. *To develop a Partnership Approach with State Agencies, NGOs and community groups in relation to (a) built heritage policy and b. implementation of specific conservation projects.* Target B: *Develop a partnership Forum.* Action B: *Investigate the establishment of a community forum involving state agencies, NGOs and community groups, to draw together recommendations with regard to prioritisation and implementation of conservation projects.*

DATE OF STUDY: 2005-2009

SYNOPSIS:

Following the completion of the Public Sculpture in Dublin Survey (2004) and the opening of the newly design public realm for O'Connell Street, Dublin City Council commissioned a condition report on each of the O'Connell Street public sculpture. The brief aimed for conservation reports to be prepared to preserve the monuments in the best possible condition; to arrest the causes of decay by way of specialist cleaning and consolidation; and to protect the monuments from long term damage.

The condition report was prepared in 2005 by Jason Ellis, Andrew Naylor, and Brian Hall. The report identified the following prevailing conservation issues: Atmospheric pollution; Gypsum crusts; Organic growth; Grease; Graffiti. Inappropriate past cleaning methods were also seen to contribute to the poor condition of both stone and brass elements. Cleaning trials on the four prevailing stone types were undertaken to assist in the preparation of the Conservation Reports.

The Conservation Works Programme included the following monuments:

The O'Connell Monument, John Henry Foley, 1882
Parnell Monument, Augustus Saint-Gaudens, 1911
Fr. Theobald Mathew, Mary Redmond, 1891
James Joyce, Margorie Fitzgibbon, 1990
James Larkin, Oisín Kelly, 1971
Sir John Gray, Thomas Farrell, 1879
William Smith O'Brien, Thomas Farrell, 1870
The Sheehan Memorial, WP O'Neill, 1906

The decision to conserve:

Regarding the bronzes (O'Connell, Parnell, Larkin and Joyce monuments) it was decided that given the poor surface condition and the visual disfigurement through graffiti (Joyce) it was decided to clean and conserve bronzes according to the specification developed in the Conservation Report. Regarding the stone, it was decided that considering the contraindications presented in the report (condition, longevity and appearance) intervention in order to clean and

conserve the stone according to the specification developed in the Conservation Report was considered appropriate.

On completion of the conservation works a maintenance schedule was prepared for each monument and a Frequent Cleaning Programme has been initiated, whereby designated City Council employees are instructed in using weak cleaning solutions and low water pressure to deal with the effects of overnight soiling with food and drink products.

The conservation approach developed for O'Connell Street Sculpture Conservation Project was continued in 2008 to include Thomas Moore and Henry Grattan on College Green, again under the specialist guidance of Jason Ellis and Andrew Naylor. In 2009 the Battle of Mount Street Monument on Mount Street Bridge (Grand Canal) was conserved using the same process. Carrig Building Fabric Specialists were engaged to develop a conservation works programme for the former Portico of the Meath Hospital, The Coombe, and the works programme was completed in 2010.

WHAT NEXT?

Carry out biennial inspections to ensure the treatments we applied are still working. Advocate the continued cyclical maintenance regime established for O'Connell Street public sculpture and undertake new conservation works projects in the city based on the conservation techniques developed for this project and subsequent research and learning. This must be carried out in conjunction with the Public Art Office (Dublin City Arts Office).

Charles Duggan Sarah Halpin and Clare Hogan

Sustaining Places of Worship

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Paul Arnolds Architects

STEERING GROUP: Aine Doyle, Charles Duggan, Donncha O'Dulaing & Planning Dept.

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES: Could find no actual references to churches however it may fit into OBJECTIVE 6 of the ARCHITECTURAL WORKING GROUP POSITION PAPER: *To promote environmental economic and cultural sustainability. Action b. Appoint a consultant to carry out a study on the sustainable reuse of buildings on a typological basis, including new build vs. reuse costs, taking into account environmental and heritage values.*

DATE OF STUDY: Final report May 2009 (carried out between 2006 & 2009).

SYNOPSIS: This study came about as a result of the proposal to review the implementation of the Heritage Council's policy on potentially redundant churches as it might apply to Dublin City Churches. It became clear from early discussions with stakeholders, that only one church, St. Werburgh's, was at imminent risk of redundancy as a church. Other Church of Ireland churches have a number of uses, primarily related to tourism, which have shielded them from impending redundancy. For Roman Catholic churches, the arrival of Catholic immigrants during the period of the economic boom has boosted attendances. This also assisted smaller denominations in the city. It was identified that there was potential to encourage more intense use of churches in parallel with their ecclesiastical function as a way of ensuring continuity of use and survival of fabric. Consequently, in order to identify the specific issues pertinent to sustaining Dublin churches, a questionnaire was developed which sought information related to these issues, described as follows in the invitation to participate in the survey:

1. The need for a more comprehensive financial support system for churches and cathedrals of national importance. These places of worship can be of such importance that their conservation is a matter of national interest, and therefore demands national support.
2. The need to have a system for identifying churches which for a variety of factors may be underused or which may become underused in the foreseeable future. Such places could be assisted in the process of developing other uses in tandem with worship which could help to maintain the churches in use.
3. Where the above process leads people to understand that the church is likely to become surplus to the requirements of the host denomination, development of a system to allow new uses to be identified which minimise the cultural loss.

The results of the enquiry were intended to allow a view of the current status of the churches in Dublin to be formed.

During the 2009 study a number of findings become apparent.

- The congregations of many places of worship have been bolstered by immigrant communities to Dublin. This is particularly apparent in the city centre churches where congregations were previously in sharp decline.
- A small number of churches are now used by different denominations while a larger number of churches are now used by more than one denomination.
- Perhaps as a result of the impact of immigrant populations among congregations as well as general economic confidence, there is at the present time no known imminent risk of further church closures with the exception of St. Werburgh's Church.
- The migrant population which has sustained Dublin city churches for the past number of years may be a transient phenomenon. As they settle in to Irish culture, recent immigrants

too are likely to move towards suburbia, resulting in a further cycle of depopulation or loss of inner-city congregations.

- While findings vary from church to church, there is no apparent pressure for significant physical alterations to places of worship for the purposes of providing multi-purpose accommodation or facilities.
- It is apparent that many church custodians are not aware of the different forms of grant aid which are available for conservation works to historic places of worship.

WHAT NEXT?

- **Biggest obstacle:** The lack of realistic grant support for urgent/necessary repairs. The previous small amount of grant aid available (National Conservation Grant Scheme, Civic Structures, Heritage Council Structures at Risk Scheme) are no longer available. Need to lobby government for realistic funding for significant buildings in Dublin including historic churches. With the absence of other funding mechanisms (LEADER) available in Dublin we need to investigate other sources of potential funding. Other sources of European funding need to be explored. The Department of Arts Heritage and the Gaeltacht has expressed interest in pursuing this also. In the present absence of grant support we need to investigate providing specialist professional advice for churches in Dublin. For example running an advice programme on maintenance issues for church authorities based on the SPAB 'Faith in Maintenance' programme (see section 7.6 & 7.6.2 of report) for church authorities in Dublin. This could assist denominations in carrying out a study of their church stock with a view to establishing fabric needs and necessary investment levels over the next 5-10 years.
- **Immigrant congregations:** have these reduced as part of the recent recession? This should be investigated as any reduction in congregations could result in increased risk of church closure.
- **The establishment of Historic Church Buildings Officers:** A number of dioceses in England have appointed Historic Church Buildings Officers to assist in developing a strategic approach to church buildings and to support priority parishes in the management of historic church buildings. If the Dublin diocese was supportive of such a measure these officers could assist individual churches on the sources of grant aid, advising on fund raising/business plans, commissioning architects and surveyors and liaising with local authorities and other agencies to develop community partnerships. A particularly important role of the post is to advise on maintenance and planning and prioritising of repair works.
- There are a number of further recommendations in the report which are considered unrealistic in the current economic climate. This includes:
 - * The establishment of Monument Watch programmes. This advocates preventative maintenance as a more economic and avoids large-scale intervention, which in conservation terms is highly desirable. Maintenance check lists/Plans/training have been prepared by SPAB and English Heritage which could be used as a template. Such an approach could be applied to Dublin where it could be undertaken by an organisation such as the Dublin Civic Trust.
 - * The carrying out of Conservation Plans/Significance Statements for Places of Worship in order to identify buildings of national significance in terms of architectural, historical or artistic interest. These buildings may then be considered for increased levels of funding (without grant funding available this is currently considered unnecessary).

Patricia Hyde, Sarah Halpin and Charles Duggan

Study of Maintenance Issues in Connection with Historic Buildings in the ownership of Dublin City Council

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Alastair Coey Architects

STEERING GROUP: Donncha O'Dulaing, Heritage Officer, (DCC), Charles Duggan Ast. Heritage Officer, (DCC), Clare Hogan (Acting Conservation Officer (DCC)

DATE OF STUDY: November 2007

SYNOPSIS:

The purpose of this study was to examine a selection of historic buildings and structures in the ownership of Dublin City Council to determine what, if any, repair maintenance regimes were in place and how effective they were. Fifteen buildings and structures were selected as representative of the City Council's historic building stock.

It was evident from the research carried out that effective planned preventative maintenance regimes were not in place for any of the buildings inspected. This did not mean that the buildings were being neglected but that interventions tended to be reactive rather than proactive leading to unnecessary expenditure.

A number of policies to facilitate effective maintenance were proposed. These included holding an information day on preventative maintenance for all building managers in DCC, compiling a register of all historic buildings, creating maintenance manuals for such buildings, establishing preventative maintenance working teams, providing appropriate training for those teams and ensuring safe access be provided for routine maintenance inspections.

A maintenance template was provided and it was stressed that an important next step would be the preparation of a database of all historic buildings and structures in Dublin City Council's ownership.

WHAT NEXT:

To the best of our knowledge very little has happened on a strategic corporate level in this area since this report was completed. City Architects Division has made numerous attempts to convince building managers of the benefits of adopting a more proactive approach for key historic buildings but this has largely fallen on deaf ears and been unsuccessful. Exceptions are the Mansion House and City Hall where progress in this area has been made. City Architects prepared a Conservation Plan for the Mansion House in 2009 and this has proved a very useful aid in helping to manage this key historic building. The building managers (City Managers Department) for both the Mansion House and City Hall have set up 'house' committees which meet on a regular basis to discuss maintenance and long-term upkeep and ensure that the interests of these buildings are kept to the forefront on City Council policy issues. This is a practice that should be promoted with the City Council.

Action 17 of the Government Policy on Architecture 2009-2015 suggests that an opportunity exists for government funding to undertake a pilot scheme in preventative maintenance for a building in public ownership. However, City Architects submitted a proposal for such funding to central Government for a Conservation Management Plan for the Hugh Lane Gallery in 2011 but were unsuccessful.

We strongly believe that the conservation management plan process should be adopted for all our key historic buildings, particularly in these lean financial times. As the 2007 study findings have spelled out, there is a real need for maintenance planning and great benefits in terms of

cost effectiveness in taking a proactive management approach to repairs and thus being able to budget properly for them. The preparation of such plans should be pursued as a next step of the Heritage Plan. Experience from the UK was presented at a conference at NUI Maynooth in June last year by Christopher Ridgeway. A conservation management plan prepared for Castle Howard in Yorkshire (75% funding provided by English Heritage) has proved invaluable in addressing socio-economic realities in these current challenging times and the real benefits of partnership in action.

Susan Roundtree and Nicola Matthews

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan: Essential Stabilisation Works Programme for Nos. 3 and 14 Henrietta Street.

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Shaffrey Associates Architects, Lee McCullough Engineers, Boylan Farrelly Quantity Surveyors, OLM Consultancy (PSDP), Dunwoody Dobson (Contractor).

STEERING GROUP: Donncha O'Dulaing/Charles Duggan, Heritage Officer (DCC), Patricia Wrafter, Architect (DCC), James Kennedy, Clerk of Works (DCC).

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

To develop a partnership approach with state agencies, NGOs and community groups in relation to (a) the build heritage policy and (b) implementation of specific conservation projects.

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan, Policy 26

DATE OF WORKS PROJECT:

Stabilisation Works (2007- 2009); Window and External Door Project (2011-to present).

SYNOPSIS:

Between January and March 2007 condition surveys of Nos. 3 and 14 Henrietta Street were undertaken as part of the implementation of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan. These surveys indicated that urgent structural stabilisation works were necessary to ensure the structural integrity of both buildings. Consultant Conservation Architects and Structural Engineers were appointed to begin the design of stabilisation works programme.

Substantial enabling works were required to facilitate safe access to both houses including clearance of the rear sites of both houses, removal of vast quantities of debris from the interiors, temporary stabilisation of secondary stairs. Tender documentation was issued in November 2007 under the GDLA '82 form of contract.

All works were carried out in accordance with current conservation best practice and following the relevant Department of Arts Heritage and the Gaeltacht guidelines, international conservation charters, and according to the specification and under the supervision of the consultant conservation architect and structural engineer. Reconstruction or repair works were designed and implemented with minimum impact on the historic fabric of both houses. Works were carried out using traditional or appropriate methods and natural materials.

No.3

The condition surveys indicated that significant movement of the rear and gable walls required urgent rectification. The survey identified that deflection out of vertical alignment of the upper section of gable wall due to insufficient lateral restraint from the existing floor and roof plates, as a consequence of fabric deterioration, required urgent attention. The introduction of window openings (since bricked-up) with timber heads in poor condition contributed to further weaken the wall. This movement led to a number of defects internally and externally and required immediate attention.

Localised repair was required to the external arch head to ground floor stair hall window where destabilisation of brick resulting from building movement had occurred. The insertion of helical bars between brick courses over the window was also necessary.

A number of interventions were necessary to rectify outward movement of gable wall and avoid potential collapse. Steel straps were inserted between floor joists at first, second and third floor level thus providing the necessary lateral restraint. Pre-cast corner ties were inserted at regular

intervals on each floor level carefully avoiding decorative plasterwork finishes. Pre-cast ties were also inserted where severe wall cracking was identified.

To reduce the effects on the walls resulting from the outward thrust of the roof repair/replacement and consolidation of the wall plate was required. The existing wall plate was itself already replaced and poorly connected in recent decades. Steel straps were introduced to adhere the wall plate to new concrete pads inserted into the walls beneath. Localised replacement of rafter ends was also undertaken.

To arrest further movement it was necessary to insert helical bars to the rear bow wall at each floor level.

Deterioration of decorative finishes caused by an absence of maintenance of rainwater goods was acute to the northwest corner bow room on each floor level and temporary works were required to stabilise existing decorative finishes at first floor level.

Late 20th century room partitions were recorded and removed from ground floor rooms to allow for effective monitoring. Temporary supports introduced to the coved Rococo ceiling at first floor level.

External and localised render repairs to the gable wall resulting from on-going water ingress was undertaken.

A substantial length of the calp rubble stone boundary wall, abutting the gable elevation of No. 3, the condition of which had become critical causing significant health and safety concerns, was rebuilt. Temporary steel rakers were introduced to support the shared boundary wall with No.4.

No.14

The condition surveys indicated that works were required to rectify significant defects to the rear basement wall, lateral restraint to the existing walls, timber window head repairs. The works specified are briefly outlined as follows. A comprehensive interventions record has been prepared of all interventions undertaken during this works phase.

Previous interventions to the rear basement wall undermined the stability of the rear elevation necessitating buttressing to arrest outward movement and collapse. The rubble calp wall had excessive bulging at basement level resulting in voids formed in the body of the wall. The pattern of rebuilding of the brick work on the upper levels indicated past attempts to rectify deformations resulting from these interventions. Visual evidence indicated that the buttresses were not providing the intended stabilisation. The intervention here involved the careful dismantling and reconstruction of the wall and tying the rear façade to the floor plates and party walls, requiring substantial temporary engineering works.

Original deficiency in the bonding of the external walls and deterioration of connection between the floor plates and the external walls due to joist end decay and wall fabric deterioration resulted in diminished lateral restraint of the external walls. This required the insertion of precast corner ties at regular intervals to the party wall corners carefully avoiding decorative plasterwork finishes between ground and third floor level. Precast ties were also inserted where substantial cracking was indicated, generally over openings. To improve deficient lateral restraint steel straps were inserted between floor joists on each floor level. New timber joint ends were introduced in a number of rooms on each floor level, and comprehensively introduced to reinstate the missing floor structures in the "cabinet" room at first, second and third floor level. New timber, rafter ends and wall plate were inserted to roof.

Timber window heads were found in many instances to be in poor condition and required replacement with treated pitch pine window heads. Where this was required window surrounds were carefully removed, labelled and reinstated on completion. Rebuilding of brick window arches was also required in a number of cases.

In 2010 a Future Works Strategy for both houses was commissioned to identify the next stages of works required and prioritise on the basis of necessity and practicality with the aim of allowing the house to be used on a short, medium and long-term way. The principal purpose of the strategy is to allow for Dublin City Council to plan within challenging economic climate a positive future for the houses, and in a way that meets best conservation practice by following the philosophy of approach agreed in the document.

The first stage in the implementation of the strategy was the repair/replacement of windows and external doors to No.14 Henrietta Street. This project is currently on site.

Electrical supply has been re-introduced to both houses and a monitored security alarm system put in place.

Dublin City Architect's Division carries out regular visual inspections of both houses.

WHAT NEXT?

- Continue visual inspections and carry out necessary maintenance issues identified during visual inspections.
- Seek funding to implement the Future Conservation Works Strategy for No. 14 Henrietta Street and seek to encourage the implementation of the Conservation Strategy for No. 3 Henrietta Street.
- Continue to explore the most sustainable and appropriate future uses of both houses in conjunction with all stakeholders.

Charles Duggan

Bank Architecture in Dublin, Survey and Research Project

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Richard McLoughlin, Des Byrne (Lotts Architecture and Urbanism – Lead Consultant), with Dr. Michael O’Neill and Mariam Allawerdi.

STEERING GROUP: Heritage Office

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES: Architectural Working Group Position Paper Objective 1, target *f*, action *f*.

DATE OF STUDY: 2007

SYNOPSIS:

The need for such a survey emerged from the 2003 report *Dublin City: Architectural Heritage Surveys*, which states that, in order to fill gaps in information on the building stock of Dublin City “a better use of public funding of inventory projects may be to encourage the development of *thematic* surveys [...] These could be inventories of buildings selected by type, age, materials or construction [...]”. (*Dublin City: Architectural Heritage Surveys*, Ch.4, p. 12)

It also fulfilled Objective H13 of the Dublin City Development Plan 2005-2010: It is an objective of Dublin City Council to initiate a study to determine the most appropriate new uses and innovative ways of securing the future of [...] financial buildings [...].

The brief required the following deliverables:

Identify all bank buildings in Dublin City from the 19th and 20th century and generate a concise architectural inventory (providing summary description, appraisal of building, its history, site and urban context and photographic record), compatible with the current NIAH survey format.

Provide a report to include the following sections:

An historical assessment of bank architecture in the city, and the stylistic context in which the buildings were constructed.

Analysis of the existing situation with regard to bank buildings and their future in the capital city.

Four case studies of adaptive reuse of bank buildings in Dublin (with international examples, where necessary) analysed under the following headings: Change of character and presentation; Extent of loss of architectural/historic fabric; Re-presentation of principal public spaces of bank hall; Conservation loss/gain; Suitability of use.

Identification of prevailing issues in the Dublin context and recommendations on best international practice to aid effective policy and decision making.

Provision of detailed bibliography of sources.

Findings:

Seventy-eight bank buildings were identified for this survey and research project. Of this one building predates 1820, 4 were constructed from 1820-1850; 10 were constructed between 1850-1880, 16 constructed between 1880 and 1910, 30 constructed between 1910 and 1940 and 17 constructed between 1940 and 1960.

Regarding current use profiles, in 2007, 40 buildings still used as bank branches, 10 adapted to retail use, 15 to office use, 5 adapted as pubs or restaurants, one converted to hotel use, and 4 are in alternative uses and 3 were vacant.

The research component began with production of a comprehensive bibliography. The research includes an assessment of the private banking industry in the 18th century and early 19th century which began with the dramatic adaptation of the former Parliament House to the Bank

of Ireland. The significance of the Banking Act of 1924 provided fertile opportunity to analyse the subsequent building boom that occurred in bank architecture. The Golden Age of banking in Ireland (1858-79) saw a rise in the number of branch banks from 180 to 415 reflecting a vibrant economy and intense inter-bank rivalry and the new bank architecture constructed in the aftermath of the 1916-1919 period, and up to 1940 was analysed and placed in context. A family tree of banking institutions has also been developed.

The inventory survey deploys data fields derived and adapted from the NIAH. It includes fields appropriate for location, summary description and appraisal, published/unpublished sources, and effects of adaptation. Sixty interiors were surveyed; however, in many cases the surveys are not exhaustive, often limited to the main cash offices, circulation areas and boardrooms. Where access was not permitted it was generally for security reasons, where the building was vacant, or where the interior was observed to have no distinguishing features to record.

The case studies of adaptive reuse adopted a methodology of concentrating on examples where the historic architectural quality as been perceived as a positive attribute, identifying the prevailing challenges and issues and how these have been overcome. In each case study a summary description of the building is followed by a description of new use and the spatial alterations required facilitating this use. It notes the interior finishes and fittings and assesses the impact of the changes. Fire safety and universal access arrangements are assessed, and also the installation of new services. The use/adaptation of basement and upper floors, in most cases ancillary to the new use, are also considered. Each case study concludes with an evaluation. The examples (Bank Pub and Restaurant, College Green; Habitat (former), College Green; Grand Central Bar, O'Connell Street) sought in their own way to capitalise on the setting which the architecture can provide as a suitable context for new uses. The case studies successfully bring to light the challenges and issues that arise in the context of conversion indicating successful solutions found while retaining the essential integrity of the buildings architectural heritage.

In 2009 Dr. Michael O'Neill was commissioned to extend the historical assessment for publication purposes. Bank Architecture in Dublin, A History to c. 1940, was published in 2012. (See separate report).

WHAT NEXT?

As the publication is complete, the wide dissemination of the inventory and case studies pending necessary permissions must now be considered.

Charles Duggan and Clare Hogan

Historic Street Surfaces Conservation Study and Guidance Manual

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Richard McLoughlin and Des Byrne (Lotts Architecture and Urbanism), Dr. Michael O'Neill

STEERING GROUP: Charles Duggan (DCC), Carl Raftery (DCC), Eugene O'Reilly (Roads Maintenance DCC), John McDaid (Roads Maintenance DCC), Deri Flood (Roads Maintenance DCC), Oiseen Kelly, (City Architects, DCC).

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

Architectural Working Group Position Paper. Objective 1. *The provision of accessible comprehensive and consistent inventories of a. buildings and b. character of areas. Continue inventory survey in the identified gap areas. Action f Continue inventory survey in the identified gap areas.*

In 2004 Dublin City Council commissioned a full inventory of all historic street furniture and street surfaces as the first step in assessing the important contribution they make to the public realm of the historic urban environment. Appendices 8,9 & 10 of the *Dublin City Council's Development Plan 2005-2010* identifies streets in Dublin where stone setts and granite paving and street furniture which are to be retained or restored and included in the Council's Programme for Restoration.

DATE OF STUDY: 2009

SYNOPSIS:

The maintenance of public footpaths and carriageways in Dublin has been the responsibility of the local authority since 1849. However, the introduction of paving throughout the city began in earnest with the establishment of the Commissioners for Paving the Streets of Dublin (commonly known as the Paving Board), in 1774, repealing an act from 1729 which had similar purposes. While the intention to pave the public thoroughfares of the city was undertaken for practical rather than aesthetic reasons, a basic civic objective that endures today, the surviving setted streets and granite pavements in Dublin city centre have taken on a cultural and historical resonance, going beyond mere function, as they characterise an essential component of the historic city and are intrinsic to the setting and context of the city's historic buildings and streetscapes.

What survives today of the historic street surfaces in Dublin consist primarily of Wicklow granite flagstone pavements and setted roadways of diorite and granite, but also include metal inserts such as decorative coal hole covers as well as other plainer covers and gratings. These are a heritage asset, and are largely irreplaceable.

An overview of recent inventories of historic street surfaces shows that today, only 27 streets in Dublin retain complete granite flagged pavements. Many other streets have partial retention of granite flags, sometimes located fronting major public buildings or outside the city's many public houses. On approximately 118 streets kerbstones (wide or narrow) survive intact, though many may have been lifted and re-bedded. Only 37 streets have complete setted surfaces, and a number of these are modern public realm improvement works. Setted gutters flanking carriageways and entry ways traversing pavements also survive in many instances. While systematic removal of historic paving no longer takes place today in Dublin, steady incremental decline and attrition continues, even though it is now broadly accepted that historic street surfaces are of value.

The lack of appropriate advice and guidance on achieving these aims led to the production in 2008 of *Historic Street Surfaces in Dublin: A Conservation Study and Guidance Manual*, in partnership with the Heritage Council. The document is available on the Dublin City Council website for consultation. It is in five parts:

- Part I: History, Materials and Significance
- Part II: Legislative and Administrative Responsibility
- Part III: Guidance Manual for Best Practice
- Part IV: Infrastructural Issues
- Part V: Conservation into the Future

The report provides an assessment of the significance of historic paving as being an essential element of the historic urban environment and having architectural, historical and technical significance. A distinction is drawn between three levels of significance:

1. Undisturbed areas of historic paving, which have the highest value and bear witness to the skill of the historic craftsman.
2. Areas where paving has been altered or reconfigured using the original material
3. Reinstated areas reusing salvaged material from other places

In putting together guidance for conservation, reference is made to international best practice in paving and sett-laying. For engineering questions reference was made to a guide entitled *Natural Stone Surfacing, Good Practice Guide prepared by the Society of Chief Officers of Transportation in Scotland (SCOTS)* and based on extensive testing of load-bearing performance of different construction methods. As traditional paving methods are still in use in Germany, reference was also made to a German manual entitled *Die Kunst des Pflasterns mit Natursteinen* (The Art of Paving with Natural Stones) which outlines best practice based on traditional methods gathered empirically over generations.

The document provides policy recommendations for how historic street surfaces can be better protected in the future and how reinstatement of surfaces to the correct historic detail can enhance the quality of the historic urban environment of Dublin.

In 2010 Dublin City Council undertook a supplementary (re)survey of setted streets in Dublin. 78 streets/lanes were identified. The survey captured location/identification data; sett material/joint type/bond pattern/uniformity /intactness; authenticity; condition. Each entry gives recommendations for outright protection or inclusion in a policy for general protection.

The Department of Arts Heritage and the Gaeltacht is preparing a volume for the Advise Series on historic street surfaces based on Historic Street Surfaces Conservation Study and Guidance Manual.

Dublin City Council's Roads Design Department, under the aegis of Eoghan Madden, has progressed aspects of the Historic Street Surfaces Conservation Study and Guidance Manual.

WHAT NEXT?

Continue to work with relevant departments in DCC to implement recommendations from the Historic Street Surfaces Conservation Study and Guidance Manual and 2010 Setted Streets Survey.

Charles Duggan

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan: Open Ideas Design Competition for Reinstatement of 16 Henrietta Street

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: RIAI, Assessors Panel

STEERING GROUP (ASSESSORS PANEL): Ali Grehan, City Architect (DCC), Gráinne Shaffrey, (Shaffrey Associates Architects), Dr. Edward McParland (TCD), Eric Parry, (Eric Parry Architects)

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

To develop a partnership approach with state agencies, NGOs and community groups in relation to (a) the build heritage policy and (b) implementation of specific conservation projects.

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan: Policy 27.

DATE OF STUDY: Competition 2008; Part VIII 2010.

SYNOPSIS: In 2004, Dublin City Council, in partnership with The Heritage Council commissioned a Conservation Plan for Henrietta Street as an action of the City Heritage Plan to coordinate the future conservation, rehabilitation and regeneration of Henrietta Street in a strategic manner.

Following the launch of the Plan Dublin City Council's Heritage Office progressed a number of key policies aimed at safeguarding and enhancing the architectural heritage of the street including: the infill of the site of No. 16 Henrietta Street, which was subdivided from No. 15 in 1828 and gradually demolished before being finally cleared c. 1950. This is an important aspiration of the conservation plan which aims to restore the completeness of this highly significant Early Georgian terrace.

The competition is informed by policy 27 of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan which aims to:

...explore the potential for the reinstatement of No. 16 Henrietta Street and, as appropriate, to prepare a development brief, promote the redevelopment of the site and procure a suitable use and occupant for the new building".

It was agreed to undertake a one stage design ideas competition, which was promoted by the Development Department of Dublin City Council.

The design competition brief aimed to establish a design framework for the development of the site, and to generate debate and discussion on the challenge of in-fill design in historic settings and ultimately to discuss the future of this important street.

The brief allowed for any number of approaches including: those sympathetic to the context and setting without being archaeologically correct or historically precise, but not pastiche; and one that contrast strongly with the architectural language, setting and context of Henrietta Street.

In tandem with this open ideas competition a research design process to develop, as far as the documentation allowed, an archaeologically precise reinstatement of No. 16 was undertaken. The aim of this study was to provide a control by which the competition entries would be assessed. The result of this was a series of drawings proposing No. 15 and 16 before and after the 1828 subdivision. Because of the dearth of documentary evidence there was a reliance on informed conjecture.

Jury: Dublin city architect Ali Grehan, the renowned architectural scholar Dr. Edward McParland, the conservation architect and author of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan Gráinne Shaffrey (Shaffrey Associates Architects), and the London-based architect Eric Parry (Eric Parry Architects).

79 entries were submitted. Two days were allocated to the assessment. The assessors criteria included: Clarity of concept; Specificity to context; Scale and composition; Materials and making; 3-dimensional control; Sustainability and credibility of use; Resolution of threshold; Enduring quality of architecture. Two entries were highly commended and 4 were commended.

The winning design by Ryan Kennihan Architects was the unanimous selection of the competition Jury, proposing an infill building with an open floor plan on each floor, with access from Stable Lane and through No. 15 Henrietta Street, and a free-standing theatre building for the rear site of Nos.15 and 16.

A public exhibition of all entries and the control design was held twice in the Autumn of 2008 in the Atrium of the Civic Offices and subsequently in City Hall.

Part VIII (Planning & Development Act 2000-2006, and Planning & Development Regulations, 2001-2007).

Ryan Kennihan Architects, and Brenner Consulting Engineers, were appointed to further develop the winning design and prepare documentation for Part VIII. A decision approving the Part VIII scheme was made in November 2011.

For the infill of No.16, the design attempts to complete the rhythm and structure of the streetscape of Henrietta Street by 'replacing' the missing facade of No.16 but with blind brick windows. The side and rear elevations reflect the building section and are composed of brick on a granite-faced base: a series of superimposed brick-arched openings on the side elevation; and a single large opening on each floor of the rear elevation. The scheme provides space suitable to any number of uses complimentary to the existing use of No.15: workshop; performance; learning; and exhibition. The scheme increases the accommodation available in No.15 and improves upon the existing arrangements for Parts L and M of the Building Regulations.

A new theatre building for the rear site builds on the morphology of the pre-existing mews structures, long since demolished. It is designed to a height appropriate to the traditional two storey mews buildings ensuring its visual deference to the terraced building. The theatre design is composed of brick laid in Flemish bond the aesthetic of which is a direct expression of its brick arched structure. The size and shape of the theatre space has been designed specifically to create an intimate and acoustically rich environment for the performance of solo instrument and small ensembles.

WHAT NEXT?

Continue to promote the development of this scheme in conjunction with the relevant stakeholders.

Charles Duggan

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan: Henrietta Lane, An Addendum

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Shaffrey Associates Architects, Jane O'Halloran (historian).

STEERING GROUP: Charles Duggan, Heritage Officer (DCC), Carl Raftery, Conservation Office (DCC), John Murphy, Planning Department (DCC), representatives of the Henrietta Street Owners Group, DoEHLG.

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

To develop a partnership approach with state agencies, NGOs and community groups in relation to (a) the build heritage policy and (b) implementation of specific conservation projects.

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan, Policy 18.

DATE OF STUDY: Commissioned 2008 / Completed 2009

SYNOPSIS: In 2004, Dublin City Council, in partnership with The Heritage Council commissioned a Conservation Plan for Henrietta Street as an action of the City Heritage Plan to coordinate the future conservation, rehabilitation and regeneration of Henrietta Street in a strategic manner.

Policy 18 of the Plan:

The Henrietta Lane Addendum Study is a multi-disciplinary study of the stable lane running from Henrietta Street beside No. 3 and north along the rear sites of No's 3-10. Buildings/sites facing onto Henrietta Lane (including in some instances the Bolton Street sites) have been severed from the principal house and subject to dramatic change, characterised by: early decay, dereliction and loss of the coach houses; the introduction of light industrial uses and more recently the re-development of the north side of the Lane. A disparity of land-use zoning between the Henrietta Street and Henrietta Lane compound these issues.

Although an addendum to the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan 2006, the relevant study area encompasses an area beyond that of the Conservation Plan Area i.e. the eastern part of Henrietta Lane and the premises to the rear of Bolton Street.

The study methodology involves research, condition assessment, and guidance for future development and based on this guidance a series of design scenarios for each site.

Research: The study includes analysis of the historic development of the lane, the pattern/grain of historical fabric; the tenement life on the lane from the late 19th century; and research into the coach-house typology in Dublin.

Condition assessment: Detailed analysis of condition of surviving historic fabric on the lane completed site by site.

Guidance for future development: Through the foregoing process recommendations/policies for future development have been devised to influence: appropriate materials; the potential for restoration incorporation of historic fabric; potential uses; off street parking; building height and roof profile; and public realm looking at traffic management, linkages and street surfaces / furniture. A check list or prompts to consider in future developments has been produced.

Design scenarios: Taking on board the design checklist produced in the guidance section, loosely worked up design scenarios were produced to act as a test for the guidance and it is acknowledged that there are many other design approaches which would conform to the guidance. The scenarios are site specific sketch designs (plans, sections, elevations) and show two/three storey structures achieving varied gross floor areas responding to the immediate

context of each site. Varied proposed layouts/plans and open space arrangements reflect the individual site morphology.

WHAT NEXT?

- The Guidance for Future Development and other policy recommendations on land use zoning will be incorporated within the Architectural Conservation Area currently being finalised.
- Publication and dissemination of the study.
- Use this exemplary study methodology to develop broader guidance for Georgian lane development/improvement in North and South Georgian Dublin, in the prospect of Dublin being potentially designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Charles Duggan

Conservation Strategy for the Follies in Saint Anne's Park

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Shaffrey Associates Architects, Lee McCullough Engineers

STEERING GROUP: Heritage Office (DCC), Conservation Office (DCC), Planning Department (DCC), Parks and Landscape Services Division (DCC), City Architect's Department (DCC).

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

Architectural Heritage Working Group Position Paper, Objective 4: To undertake educational/flagship training projects of buildings and groups of buildings at risk (in public ownership or non-profit organisations) of an exemplary nature.

DATE OF STUDY: 2009

SYNOPSIS:

In 1835 St. Anne's Park (then called Thornhill) was purchased by Arthur Lee Guinness & Benjamin Lee Guinness. Within two decades it developed from a modest estate in the early years of the nineteenth century to become a significant estate. Benjamin Lee Guinness died in 1868 leaving his estate to his eldest son Sir Arthur Edward Guinness (later to become Lord Ardilaun). Within the next five years St. Anne's estate changed dramatically mirroring the wealth and status of the Guinness family. The main house was fully remodelled and enlarged, and the grounds laid out with extensive radiating avenues and windings pathways. Lord Ardilaun died in 1915, and a decade later Lady Ardilaun died and the estate was inherited by Lord Ardilaun's Nephew, the Hon. Benjamin J. Plunket, who maintained the estate until the late 1930s and, after putting it up for sale it was subsequently acquired by Dublin Corporation. In 1943 the main house was destroyed by fire which was caused by the storage of air raid precaution material. After the Second World War Dublin Corporation developed housing estates, schools and playing fields on the lands located to the north and north-west of the estate and transformed the remainder of the estate into a public park, making St. Anne's the largest public park in Dublin City.

The 10 follies included within this conservation strategy include: 1. Saint Anne's Well, 2. The Roman Tower, 3. Annie Lee Bridge, 4. Herculanean Temple, 5. The Bridge and Hermitage, 6. The Yew Circle and Fountain, 7. The Rustic Grotto, 8. The Rustic Grotto/Cave, 9. Rustic Archway and Bridge, 10. Rockwork feature all dating from 1838-39 to the 1860s.

Ortho photography and measured surveys undertaken by Dublin City Council's Survey and Mapping Department, for each folly.

The conservation strategy brief required the preparation of the following:

- Write a brief summary historical analysis of the follies and associated landscape;
- Develop a conservation philosophy to guide future interventions;
- Detailed condition assessment / surveys and preparation of specifications for remedial conservation works for each folly structure and its immediate physical environment;
- Scheme of priorities for short-term and medium-term conservation measures;
- Quantity Surveyor's report on potential costs of the conservation programme;
- Recommendations for up-skilling and appropriate training for the Park's grounds staff for future management and on-going maintenance and care of the follies;

Each folly was assessed under the following headings: construction; intactness; condition; durability; functional status; constraints; landscape issues. Comprehensive photography of each

folly was undertaken and subsequently annotated with site observations. The condition survey was presented on the measured surveys (plans/sections/elevations). Proposed remedial works also annotated.

From the foregoing architectural and cultural appraisals and condition assessment of each folly a conservation strategy was developed. Underpinning the strategy is to work towards restoration of the architectural integrity and coherence of the follies and their designed landscape setting, in phases, having regard to availability of appropriate resources and with due acknowledgement of the qualities of the existing mature landscape, historic patina and associated biodiversity benefits.

The strategy identifies the works which can be undertaken by Parks staff and the works which require specialist implementation. It further identifies where further investigation is required for careful specification of repair work. The proposed schedule of works are tabulated and annotated on survey drawings.

The strategy proposing implementing a flagship conservation project that will add momentum and profile to the phased programme of works, in order to gain support and finances required for subsequent phases. A proposed sequencing of works is outlined which aims to allow for manageable implementation based on fabric need, impact and training.

Cost estimates for construction works associated with the conservation of the follies has been developed.

WHAT NEXT?

Support the Parks and Landscape Services in the implementation of the strategy.

Charles Duggan

WIG/TUCK A Research Project on Historic Pointing Techniques and Façade Finishes in Dublin

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Shaffrey Associates Architects – Grainne Shaffrey & Eamonn Kehoe; Dr Gerard Lynch; Dr John Montague

STEERING GROUP: Charles Duggan, Heritage Officer (DCC), Carl Raftery, Conservation Research Officer (DCC), Susan Roundtree, Senior Architect (DCC)

DATE OF STUDY: December 2010

SYNOPSIS:

This is a study of the historic techniques used for pointing brickwork in Dublin. The aim of the study is to assist the City Council in implementing an evidence-based approach in guiding façade renewal and the repair of brick buildings in Dublin. The report makes preliminary conclusions and recommendations based on evidence from academic research and fieldwork. The findings will be a practical resource for anyone planning, designing or assessing brick façade repair or renewal in Dublin. The research work underpinning the document is from historical research combined with the examination and recording of over 70 building façades. The building periods of particular interest that have been examined are 1714-1830 (Georgian) and the subsequent Victorian/ Edwardian period from 1830-1914.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS/ OUTCOMES:

One of the aims of the study was to develop a renewal technique (or series of techniques) for re-pointing brickwork in façades where there is evidence that the brickwork was previously 'wiggged' and colour washed. A renewal technique has been developed in consultation with Dr Gerard Lynch but the consultants feel that this may need some further refinement in consultation with a wider group of contractors.

The study recommends that:-

- 'English' tuck pointing for façade renewal should be discouraged
- Hybrid techniques which have evolved in an attempt to approximate historic techniques should generally be discouraged
- Decisions on re-pointing should be informed by surviving evidence
- Further historical research and fieldwork is necessary
- Further analytical research on historic pointing materials is needed and further project trials
- Guidance on materials is needed particularly in relation to the use of limes and sands and additives
- Further tests and samples are needed in order to develop appropriate renewal techniques for different types and ages of brickwork
- Technical guidance should be developed and published for 'wiggging' techniques
- Training in the specialist craft of brick masonry repair is needed
- Communication with building owners on the specialist nature of historic brickwork is needed
- A Dublin City Council conservation policy for historic façade renewal should be prepared

WHAT NEXT:

This is an extremely important topic for the City Council to pursue. Dublin's unique architectural heritage is intrinsically linked with its brick-faced buildings, both in the Georgian core and in the Victorian suburbs. A great deal of misguided and expensive repair and re-

pointing work to historic brick façades has been carried out in the city because of a lack of strategic policy and guidance in this area. Unfortunately the completion and circulation of Shaffrey's important study has been stalled since the end of 2010 and this is very regrettable. There is a real need to disseminate the findings and move towards an implementation phase for this project.

The next step recommendations are that the report be edited and completed and the final document circulated, presented and discussed with Dublin City Council building professionals and conservation staff and planners in the first instance.

The recommendations of the study should be pursued. In particular the further research recommended should be commissioned with an advisory document as an outcome that will give concise but appropriate guidance on the topic for the use of the conservation team and planners in Dublin City Council and to make available to building owners and professionals. The guidance should include some commentary on the statutory implications of carrying out façade works to buildings that are protected structures or located in Architectural Conservation Areas.

Susan Roundtree

Decorative Plasterwork – The Dublin School (1754-1775) Phases 1 + 2

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Frank Keohane (Lead Consultant), Paul Tierney (Architectural Photographer)

STEERING GROUP: Charles Duggan, Heritage Officer (DCC), Carl Raftery, Conservation Office, (DCC), Dr. Christine Casey, (TCD)

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

Architectural Working Group Position Paper. Objective 1. *The provision of accessible comprehensive and consistent inventories of a. buildings and b. character of areas. Continue inventory survey in the identified gap areas. Action f Continue inventory survey in the identified gap areas.*

DATE OF STUDY: 2010- to present

SYNOPSIS:

In 2010 Dublin City Council initiated a multi-phased architectural heritage research project entitled Decorative Plasterwork – The Dublin School (1754-1775) initiated under the auspices of the Dublin City Heritage Plan. It was conducted within the wider context of the nomination of Dublin to Ireland’s Tentative List of World Heritage Sites (UNESCO), which in the preliminary description notes the importance of this decorative tradition in the Dublin Georgian townhouse. It also reflects themes and policies of the Government Policy on Architecture. The project has been grant aided by the Department of Arts Heritage and the Gaeltacht Environment Fund.

The scope for Phases 1 and 2 of this study was determined by the steering group which comprises, Dr. Christine Casey, Charles Duggan-City Heritage Officer, Patricia Hyde, Senior Planner for Conservation and Carl Raftery-Conservation Research Officer. It was decided to limit this survey to the dates corresponding with the Late Baroque and Early Rococo style in Dublin, which is the Golden Period of the Irish Decorative Plasterwork tradition and more so than any other period is considered to represent a particularly Dublin style.

In total the trawl through the varied sources has identified some 309 interiors which contain decorative plasterwork which conforms to the terms of reference of this study. Of this number 65 ceilings have been lost, 17 ceilings have been salvaged and re-erected in other buildings. 125 ceilings were surveyed in this project.

Phase 1 was completed in 2010, and Phase 2, commenced in 2011. This comprehensive survey and comparative analysis of the interiors from this period has never been undertaken and surprisingly little has been published (at the time of commencement), with the exception of the seminal works by CP Curran and Joseph McDonnell.

Objectives of Decorative Plasterwork – The Dublin School, Phases 1-2

- A. To carry out a comprehensive fieldwork survey of decorative plasterwork in Dublin.
- B. To promote research into and facilitate a more complete understanding and awareness amongst a broad spectrum of society of the significance of Decorative Plasterwork in Dublin and Ireland;
- C. To create a comprehensive single-source documentary sources document of all secondary sources and where available primary sources to advance architectural heritage research in Dublin and to develop, in this instance, our understanding of the great tradition of Decorative Plasterwork in Dublin;

- D. To develop an evidence-based management and decision-making tool to advance conservation led objectives for Georgian Dublin reflected in the Dublin City Development Plan and Dublin City Heritage Plan.
- E. To develop a suite of research projects into the architectural heritage of Dublin City and to seek the advancement and promotion of high quality research on the subject of Dublin and its development.

Phase 1 and 2 was undertaken by Mr. Frank Keohane, MSCS MRICS MUBC, while Paul Tierney, Architectural Photography has completed all photographic work during phase 2. The Phase 1 desk-top report identifies all surviving and lost ceilings in Dublin that correspond to the period. A building fact sheet is compiled for each ceiling providing identification data, dates, architects, plasterer, patron, construction and decoration dates, summary description, condition and references. A four-volume sources document, arranged by building address and a definitive bibliography has is also compiled.

Phase 2, involving surveying, research, and analysis building on what has been completed in phase 1, commenced in November 2011. It involves site visits to all accessible buildings to analyse the context for each ceiling, carry out visual condition assessment, study stylistic attributes, and undertake architectural photography. To date, 123 ceilings have been fully documented and surveyed and an architectural photographic record has been completed. A number of links between ceilings, not previously identified, has been possible through this process.

The project is due for completion in July 2012.

WHAT NEXT?

- Spatially present (GIS map) location of all ceilings.
- Continue research project as recommended in phase 2 report.
- On completion of Phase 2 begin dissemination of findings including publishing, developing a Smartphone App, photographic exhibition.
- Deposit copy in Irish Architectural Archive.
- Promote continuation of the survey process.

The Architecture of the 20th century - Pilot Phase 1

PROJECT CONSULTANT: Dr. Ellen Rowley with Shane O’Toole, Paul Tierney, Natalie De Roiste, and Merlo Kelly.

STEERING GROUP: Charles Duggan (DCC), Sarah Halpin (DCC), Clare Hogan (DCC), Patricia Hyde (DCC), Carl Raftery (DCC), Colum O’Riordan (Irish Architectural Archive). Consultation at draft stage with Jacqui Donnelly and Marc Ritchie, Department of Arts Heritage and the Gaeltacht.

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES:

Architectural Working Group Position Paper. Objective 1 (d) (f):

The provision of accessible comprehensive and consistent inventories of (a.) buildings, and (b.) the character of buildings. Target *d* make relevant information available to the public; target *f* continue inventory survey in the identified gap areas.

Dublin City Architectural Heritage Surveys, (Dublin City Council, 2004, p.12), that a “ better use of public funding of inventory projects may be to encourage the development of Thematic Surveys. These could be inventories of buildings selected by type, age materials or construction, for example.”

The project fulfils actions 30 and 31 of the *Government Policy on Architecture* (GPA) in which the Heritage Council is named as a key partner.

Action 30: The Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, in consultation with the Arts Council and the Heritage Council, will develop an approach to fostering an understanding of architecture as an art form and as a component of our shared cultural inheritance by including an explicit architectural and built environment focus within the briefs of Local Authority Arts, Architectural Conservation and Heritage Officers.

Action 31: In pursuit of its remit to develop awareness of the architectural heritage, the Heritage Council in collaboration with the Irish Architectural Archive will commission and publish a guide, aimed at diverse audiences, to the source material for architectural history in Ireland.

DATE OF STUDY: 2011- to present

SYNOPSIS:

Dublin City Council initiated a survey and research project into the architecture of the 20th century in Dublin City. It was felt that sufficient time has passed to develop a full understanding of the architectural of the 20th century in Dublin and many opportunities remained for continued research and understanding of the development of architecture during the century.

Public discourse on “modern” architecture of the 20th century in Dublin has been limited to the reactionary and polemical and it was felt that greater understanding and appreciation of the built heritage of the 20th century amongst the public was required. This documentation and architectural survey project is considered an effective starting point to develop a multi-faceted and broader understanding of architectural heritage of the 20th century.

The project brief required the following strands:

Identify a representative list of 200 structures/urban and suburban interventions of the 20th century that together build a chronological and historical narrative of the built heritage of the century.

Develop a building file for each of the structures identified for documentation process and pilot

survey – to include basic identification details, representative image and rationale for inclusion in list.

Complete pilot case studies of 20 structures/urban and suburban interventions (interior and exterior, where relevant) which will establish the level and extent of architectural inventory survey possible in future phases.

Outcomes:

There are five aspects to this project: critical assessment, outline survey, case studies, bibliography and project methodology. These are organised into three separate books:

Book One, **Text:** *Executive Summary, Project Methodology, Critical Assessment, Bibliography*

Book Two, **Outline Survey:** *Executive Summary, Outline Survey*

Book Three, **Case Studies:** *Executive Summary, Case Studies, Appendices*

A starting point for the project involved the compilation of a list of buildings and sites which sought to tell the story of twentieth century architecture in Dublin city. 203 structures drawing from a “tentative list” of approximately 300, makes up the **Outline Survey** (Book Two). Each of the 203 Outline Survey entries included the following data: Building / Site / Campus Name; Former Building Name; Address; Date (Start And Completion Dates, Unless Impossible To Discern); Primary Classification (And Maybe Secondary Classification, Docomomo Convention); Primary Architect; Architectural Firm; Rationale For Inclusion; Original Brief; Current Use; representative image. The building selection is representative of building activity in the city’s administrative area, spread chronologically throughout the century. The numbers of sites in each decade are as follows: 1900s – 15; 1950s – 25; 1910s – 13; 1960s – 26; 1920s – 18; 1970s – 24; 1930s – 25; 1980s-19; 1940s – 16; 1990s – 21.

Case Studies:

From the group of 203 buildings, 20 of these were subject to detailed case study analysis. The completed case studies are listed below. For each case study detailed research, recording and professional architectural photography was undertaken. Again, a range of types was selected, spread throughout the century with at least one from every decade. More buildings were selected from decades with richer heritage, or with greater capacity to benefit from new research. The format used was a variation on the internationally recognised DOCOMOMO minimum fiche, though in many cases the volume of content delivered was greater.

Case Studies undertaken during Phase 1 are:

Iveagh Trust Bull Alley Flats, Dublin 8(1904); Ormond Market campus and sample house, Dublin 7 (1913); National Concert Hall (ex UCD), Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2 (1914); O’Connell Street Reconstruction, Dublin 1 (1919); Clery’s Department Store, Dublin 1 (1922); Church of SS Thomas and George, Dublin 1 (1931); College of Catering, Cathal Brugha Street, Dublin 1 (1939); O’Rourke’s Bakery, shop front (& interior), Parnell St., Dublin 1 (1943); Archer’s Garage, Fenian Street, Dublin 2 (1946); Cabra Grand Cinema, Dublin 7 (1949); Crumlin Local Health Centre, Dublin 12 (1955); Charleville Mall (maisonette) Flat Blocks, Dublin 1 (1960); Bord Failte HQ, Baggot Street Bridge, Dublin 2 (1961); Liberty Hall, Dublin 1 (1963); American Embassy, Ballsbridge, Dublin 4 (1965); ESB HQ, Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin 2 (1967); Connolly House, Vocational College, North Strand, Dublin 1 (1972); Central Bank, Dame Street, Dublin 2 (1978); PMPA HQ, Wolf Tone Square, Dublin 1 (1980); Irish Film Centre, Temple Bar, Dublin 2 (1992).

Critical Assessment:

A critical assessment essay designed to contextualise the Outline Survey of 203 buildings was another important output from phase 1. Like the Outline Survey, it is organised chronologically. It provides a narrative in terms of episodes, spread across the century, split into six chapters, approx. 1,000 to 2,000 words each.

WHAT NEXT?

- The Architecture of the 20th Century - Phase 2, is currently out to tender.
- Continue the work of this survey until complete.
- Disseminate the research and survey data publicly and devise creative (Smartphone technology and multi-disciplinary approaches) and conventional (publication, seminar) ways of engaging the public with the architecture of the 20th century.

Bank Architecture in Dublin, A history to c.1940

PROJECT CONSULTANTS: Author: Dr. Michael O'Neill; Designer: Environmental Publications.

STEERING GROUP: Heritage Office

HERITAGE PLAN REFERENCES: Architectural Working Group Position Paper Objective 1, target *f*, action *f*.

DATE OF STUDY: Published 2012

SYNOPSIS:

The publication follows a comprehensive survey of bank buildings in Dublin undertaken in 2007 as an action of the Dublin City Heritage Plan and part funded by the Heritage Council. (For survey see separate review report)

The publication concentrates on the architectural history of bank architecture in Dublin, not previously subject of publication. The publication is aimed at a general and scholarly readership.

The historical narrative is arranged around 12 sections. Sections 1-9 provides an introduction to the 18th-19th century private banking industry, indicating some remarkable parallels to the boom-bust cycle we are experiencing today. It concentrates on the remarkable number of impressive banking halls in the city, most of which still survive, unlike other European cities. It discusses the 'golden age in bank architecture from 1858-1897' when grandiose Victorian architecture was at its zenith and the emergence of a banking district concentrated on College Green and Dame Street. The politics of banking architecture is also presented. A detailed bibliography and Synopsis of sources relevant to Bank Architecture from the Irish Architectural Archive is included to facilitate further research.

A pictorial architectural synopsis of the study banks within the administrative area of Dublin City Council concludes the publication. This change of usage has had an effect on the prevailing character of the main banking districts.

Soft back publication, full colour illustrations, 105 pp, ISBN: 978-1-902703-38-1. The publication is distributed by Four Courts Press.

WHAT NEXT?

A further study of bank buildings between 1940 – 2000 would be a useful addendum to the book.

Reviewed by Charles Duggan