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1. Introduction

1.1 This report refers to a site at Nos 29 and 30 Fishamble Street, located right in the centre of the historic core of medieval Dublin (Figs 1 and 2). The site is within a very archaeological sensitive area, at the heart of the Zone of Archaeological Interest in Dublin (Dublin Development Plan 2011 – 2017, 7.2.5.7). At least 2m of medieval organic material is known to survive in this area, buried beneath demolished Georgian cellars. There is a Recorded Site just to the east of the site, denoting an area that was inhabited in the medieval period (DU 018 02623).

1.2 The site contains anaerobic (no oxygen) deposits, which are very rare in the archaeological record and, as a result, are very important, both nationally and internationally. This type of water-logged deposits preserves organic material perfectly, preventing any deterioration or rotting, despite the passage of time. In Dublin, these deposits contain organic remains dating from the prehistoric period onwards but with a significant concentration in the Viking and Anglo-Norman period (9th to the 13th century) at a time when all houses, paths foundations, pits, defences, etc, were made of wood. The layers also contain a wealth of artefactual material including timber implements, leather, bone, jewelry, and metals objects, all of international importance. It is national policy to preserve these types of deposits in situ, which is reflected in the Dublin Development Plan 2011 – 2017 (F.C. 64) which seeks to promote awareness of the Viking heritage of the city (F.C. 66): see below Appendix A).

1.3 This material can be identified as dense organic reclamation deposits dumped outside the Viking walled town in an area that was originally the foreshore and slob-lands of the Liffey river. This entire area was then reclaimed in the mid-thirteenth century when the original Viking wall (which extended along Essex Street West) was replaced with a new city wall further north (Fig. 3). This new wall formed the quay wall, the line of which is reflected in the modern alignment of Exchange Street Lower, to the north of the site under discussion.
1.4 In the early 18th century a terrace of brick houses was constructed along Fishamble Street and the site under discussion was originally occupied by two such brick houses, No. 29 (south) and No. 30 (north) (Fig. 4). Only one of the original houses now survives, No. 26, positioned at the junction of Essex Street West and Fishamble Street and inhabited by the Casey family. It is one of the best known architectural landmarks in Dublin and is reputedly the earliest inhabited domestic house in Dublin (Fig. 5).

1.5 The double plot site is now vacant but, until recently, contained a lean-to derelict property along the north (No. 39: Figs 9-17) and eastern boundary, flanked by a yard on the southern side (No. 29: Figs 18-26). The derelict property was in position by at least 1978 and was occupied by the Staffords who ran a photographic studio and imported salt. It was called Fishamble House.

1.6 An archaeological assessment was carried out by the writer in 2005 (Licence number 02E1725) and this consisted of single test-trench in the yard of No. 29 (see below) (Fig. 2). This established the presence of cellars infilled with rubble to a depth of 2.30m from present ground level, cut into a thin deposit of clays dated to the 17th century. This clay sealed medieval reclamation deposits directly, the upper levels of which contain some sort of a timber structure, probably a fence. The upper levels contained the demolished remains of the cellar of No. 29.

1.7 A second assessment was carried in No. 30 on the 3rd of June 2014 also by the writer (Licence number 02E1725 ext.) and this consisted of one trench (Trench 2) but lay outside the footprint of the house (Fig. 2). This confirmed the presence of rubble deposits at the eastern side of No. 30 although only to 1.70m in depth in this location. As part of this programme of works, the lean-to properties (which were furnished but decrepit) were demolished and a quantity of photographs was recovered for analysis on behalf of the DCC Heritage Officer. This collection included photographs and slides of Dublin, along with a number of photographs
related to ecclesiastical events. These are in safe storage in Dublin City Council awaiting evaluation.

1.8 There is a proposal to develop the site by Dublin City Council, to fill in the gap in the otherwise complete streetscape. This new development will be for residential buildings but the archaeological deposits on site present certain challenges and will require sensitive resolution to preserve as much material as possible. Engineering solutions on this type of site in Dublin, including at the site directly east now Smock Alley Court (formerly known as the Skelly/Kelly site, have been based on the use of large piles in conjunction with wide spans. Basements are usually excluded at this type of site.

2. Archaeological background

2.1 The site lies within the area between Essex Street West and Exchange Street Lower, in very archaeologically sensitive part of Dublin (Fig. 3). Essex Street West reflects the line of the original Viking wall, which encompassed the early settlement, replacing the original tenth-century clay banks. A significant stretch was first located further west of the site under discussion during the archaeological excavations in Wood Quay where it was dated to c. 1100 and found to survive to 2m in height in places. Subsequent monitoring works by the writer at the western end of Essex Street West (in the centre of the road) associated with the excavation site Temple Bar West site (96E245) also identified the wall below the present ground level.

2.2 The river originally lapped up against the base of this wall but reclamation began in the thirteenth-century, when it was decided to expand further north and to build a new city wall, which duly occurred, the line of which is marked by Exchange Street Lower (Fig. 3).
2.3 The reclamation was carried out by dumping in domestic waste, silt and clay on the northern (riverside) of the c.1100 wall to the required depth, which was then held in place using clays banks and/or timber fences or revetments. A section through this material was archaeologically excavated further east at Essex Street West where the reclamation deposits were found to be over 4m in depth (Simpson 1995). The upper 2m consisting of pure river silt, (presumably dredged from the Poddle river), while the lower 2m consisted of organic clays and silts, which were rich in artefacts and could be dated from the late twelfth to the thirteenth century. The original bed of the Liffey was located at the northern end of the site, contained by a flood bank at the southern end (Simpson, 1995).

2.4 A large site was also assessed directly east of the site under discussion, now Smock Alley Court, as previously mentioned. The results indicate that there were at least three retaining structures used in the reclamation process, which were orientated east-west, running parallel to the river Liffey. The two riverside structures were substantial earthen banks while the third, towards Essex Street West, was of timber and was tentatively identified as a timber revetment. The presence of post-and-wattle fences were also suggested by the recovery of several posts, which had faceted tips.

2.5 The Georgian buildings were demolished sometime before 1978 but the party walls were retained including the wall between Nos 29 and 30. This was incorporated into the lean-to property, which was occupied by the Mr and Ms Staffords until c. 1996 when both went into a nursing home. This structure was in existence by at least 1978, as demonstrated by a photograph taken of Fishamble Street, which includes the distinctive striped hoarding of the Wood Quay excavations (Fig. 31). The main house may have been demolished because it was unsafe as many were in the general area.
2.6 The street elevation is still intact and contains a low door at the northern end (no. 30), which led into the northern part of the lean-to structure and an arched gateway into a small yard at the southern end (no. 29). This wall has been remodeled but the core is original. The shop-front is somewhat similar to No. 26 Fishamble Street and part of it might be original although this is very difficult to establish at present.

3. **Cartographic sources**

   **John Rocque’s map of Dublin, dated 1756**

3.1 John Rocque’s map of Dublin, dated 1756, records the site in the mid 18\textsuperscript{th} century and reveals a complicated sequence of buildings (Fig. 4). The archway of No. 29 is shown to be an original feature but this was within the footprint of a house, roughly where the current gate exists now. No. 29 is depicted as a long building, smaller than Casey’s on the corner of Fishamble Street and Smock Alley (now Essex Street West) but with a return at the eastern end indicating the plot was the same size.

3.2 The passageway allows access to the rear of the houses where there is a small terrace of houses running east-west at the rear (south) of the main houses fronting onto Exchange Street Lower. This is a communal court yard, a common arrangement in Dublin at this time. No. 30 is represented as a large domestic building similar to No. 29 but with no return: instead there is small yard, which can be identified in the standing northern boundary wall of the site.

4. **The testing programme**

4.1 There was two phases of testing on the site, the first in 2005 and the second in June 2014, as previously mentioned. A very flimsy timber shed along the south wall was also demolished to facilitate the testing in 2005 which took place in the small yard accessed through the gate opening directly onto Fishamble Street.
4.2 Also of relevance to the site is the archaeological assessment carried out by Margaret Gowen on the site immediately east of the site under discussion, on what is now Smock Alley Court (see below Appendix B: Simpson 2000, 51). On finding rich reclamation deposits in this location, an engineering solution for this was devised combining piles measuring 900m in width in conjunction with smaller piles 600m in width. The medieval reclamation deposits presented as banded organic clays and silts, which contained numerous animal bone, shell and pottery. The typical stratigraphic sequence was as follows:

Below present ground level

- **0.0m-2.50m**: Loose brick rubble, 18th century in date
- **2.50m-3.60m**: Brown silt deposit containing shell, animal bone, vegetation, identified as refuse material
- **3.60m-4.70m**: Black/brown organic clay identified as refuse material
- **4.70m-6.30m**: Natural riverine grey/black silt (river Liffey)
- **6.30m**: Bedrock

5. **Site assessment 2005**

**Test-trench 1**

The site assessment in 2005 consisted of one large test trench, which was opened up in the central area of the yard by machine by the writer with Dr Ruth Johnson, City Archaeologist, in attendance. This measured 1.90m east-west by 1.70m wide and was 2.75m in depth (Fig. 2). The sides were slightly battered

- **0.00m–2m**: Backfill/rubble/brick.
- **2m–2.30m**: Cinders deposit mixed with rubble. This represents demolition rubble, probably from the house that was demolished.
- **2.30m**: Cellar floor and wall (see below).
2.30m–2.50m: Grey sticky clay, with rounded cobbles or stone (seventeenth-century in date: Frechen pottery).

2.50m–2.75m: Dark brown smelly organic material with shell (cockle and mussel), animal bone and birch timber posts (medieval in date). This deposit also had wattle fragments.

* Excavation halted at 2.75m below present ground level.

5.1 The cellar

The remains of the brick cellar associated with the original 18th century house was exposed but was found to have been damaged by previous excavation, possibly some sort of a refuse pit. Despite this, a cellar wall, orientated north-south, was identified extending for at least 1.2m in length and measuring 0.50m in width, probably forming the main spine wall of the cellar. The top of the wall lay 0.50m below present ground level and it extended for at least 2.60m in depth, constructed of bright red eighteenth-century brick, similar to that identified in the street elevation of No. 29, in the internal face. The cellar wall was plastered on the eastern side suggesting the cellar was used in the Georgian dwelling. In addition to this, the floor was also identified, abutting the wall on the eastern side but damaged elsewhere. This surface was composed of fine limestone flags, each of which measured approximately 0.30m square by 80mm in depth. They were set neatly and tightly together.

5.2 The organic material

The organic material located at 2.50m below present ground level contained a large number of inclusions, which included straw vegetation, wattle, small fragments of animal bone, complete small bones and shell. Seven posts, probably of birch, were also recovered, which were relatively substantial in size measuring between 80mm and 0.15m in diameter. The posts had roughly worked tips suggesting that they were driven into the underlying material, the strands of wattle suggesting they were part of some sort of post-and-wattle fence.
structure. The organic deposits had a highly obnoxious smell consistent with other reclamation deposits excavated in this area.

6. **Site assessment 2014**

6.1 The site assessment in June 2014 also consisted of the excavation of a single trench, Trench 2 in the southern plot, No. 30 against the eastern boundary wall (Fig. 2). It straddled the original line of the back wall of the house, as the plot extends 2.05m eastwards beyond the house into what would have been the yard area. Yards rarely had cellars and, as a result, the archaeology sometimes survives to a greater height, as it is not cut away by the cellar. The trench was designed to identify whether or not there was an ‘archaeological high-spot’ as had occurred at Kinlay House, also on Fishamble Street in 1995.

6.2 The trench measured 2.30m square and was located 1.60m from the east boundary wall and 1m from the north. The results of the trenching revealed several rubbish pits along the eastern side of the north plot (No. 30) dating to the post-medieval period suggested debris and refuse was dumped deliberately in this area in the 20th century (Figs 26-30). The remains of an upright stone and brick pier (although badly damaged) at the eastern side of the trench, however, suggests that there was originally some sort of a structure in this location but this may be much later as suggested by the use of the cementitious render. No firm evidence of cellar walls were found and there was no stone floor raising suspicions that there was no cellar in this location. However, the brick and mortar type is identical to that in the standing wall confirming the demolition material is likely to have originated in the standing brick houses. A number of refuse pits were subsequently identified, which were cut into this rubble deposit.

**Southern section**

**0.00m - 0.10m:** Concrete screed
0.10m - 0.30m: Dark brown organic clay: this is a small pit (Pit 3) which is cut into the loose rubble deposits. It is 0.60m in depth and has sloping sides.

0.30m - 1.70m: Loose rubble infill deposit, composed of light beige mortar and orange half bricks, 18th century in date.

1.70m: Black/grey brown silty clay with no brick. This is likely to represent a medieval reclamation layer.

* Excavation was halted at this point.

West section

0.00m - 0.10m: Concrete screed

0.10m – 1.90m: Loose rubble and clay fill, with several disused pipes. This is a large pit, similar to that identified in the south section but deeper. Finds include 19th century pottery and chamber pots.

* Excavation halted at this point

6.3 The pier

The remains of a truncated pier were identified at the eastern side of the trench, in the section and this was constructed of limestone and brick, heavily plastered in a concrete render. The top lay 0.35m below present ground level and it was faced on the western side (the trench side). It measured 0.25m in width by 0.38m in depth and contained dry rubble deposits on the northern side but was founded on rubble infill. This is some sort of structure built within a dumped rubble deposit.

7. The pits

7.1 The area was used extensively for dumping after the demolition of the houses and a total of six pits were identified within the trench, cut through the rubble deposits (Pits 1-6). The pits contained mixed fills, including dark brown organic
clay and mixed with rubble the finds suggesting a 20th century date, presumably after the houses demolished. The pits varied from 0.90m to 1.70m in depth.

**Pit 1** measured 1.50m east-west by 0.90m in depth and was filled with a mixed clay and mortar rubble (not banded).

**Pit 2** measured at 1.90m north-south by 1.70m in depth and was filled with dark brown clay containing small brick fragments and 19th century pottery (Tin-glazed earthenware and Blackware).

**Pit 3** measured 0.80m east-west by 0.35m in depth and was filled with dark organic clay with banded deposits of brick.

**Pit 4** measured at least 1.02m north-south by 1.70m in depth, filled with demolition material and loose dark grey mortar.

**Pit 5** was cut by Pits 4 and 6 and measured a reduced 0.60m north-south by 1.1m in depth, filled with a rubble layer with half bricks (18th century in date) and clay.

**Pit 6** measured 1.70m east-west by 0.98m in depth and was filled with dark brown clay and grey mortar (similar to Pit 4).

8. **Architectural description of Nos 29 and 30 Fishamble Street**

The original party walls of Nos 29 and 30 were retained on site during the recent developments on both the north and the southern side of the site. Part of the dividing party wall between No. 29 and 30 was also retained.

*House No. 29*

*South wall*

8.1 The lower levels of southern wall is constructed of brick, standing approximately 3.30m in height and this is the original party wall between Nos 28 and 29. The
brick is bright red in colour and irregular in size (0.22m by 0.07m- 0.25m by 0.08) suggesting it is relatively early, perhaps even dating to the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century. It is set in the Flemish bond and has wide joints (15mm) with a dark grey mortar with visible shell fleck. There are few features evident in this wall although the lower 2m has been rendered in concrete. However, a wall scar at the eastern end of it can be identified as the wall scar of the back (east) wall of No. 29. This was also composed of early brick and measured 0.30m in width, composed of brick but with small timbers orientated north-south. The identification of this wall indicates that No. 29 measured 10m east-west which correlates with the cartographic evidence of Rocque, dated 1756. The site continues 2.05m further east into what would have been a courtyard according to Rocque. The brick wall continued eastwards beyond the back wall for a further 1m before being replaced by modern concrete walls. At the base of the wall and corresponding to the old brick section there is a bulge at the base which probably represents limestone footings. This footing measures 0.55m in height by 1.90m east-west. The flashing scar of the southern shed can be identified in the south wall.

The west wall (street frontage)

8.2 The internal face of the western wall is also of late 17\textsuperscript{th}/18\textsuperscript{th} century brick and stands 3.30m in height with the gate in the central location. A new façade of machine brick has been added on the street side, which is clearly evident (Fig. 22). A section of the wall build was exposed where the concrete render has fallen off and this exposed a very red redbrick with few inclusions measuring, on average, 0.22m by 0.07m (Fig. 20). This is also set in the Flemish bond and is widely pointed (2mm) with a dark grey mortar, containing flecks of lime. The gate itself is a later insertion, as the jambs are of bright yellow modern brick, presumably constructed after No. 29 was demolished. However, it is likely to have replaced an earlier gate in this location.
The east wall

8.3 The east wall is composed of concrete and is very modern, associated with Smock Alley Court.

The north wall

8.4 The original northern wall of No. 29 (the party wall between No. 29 and No. 30) can be identified on site as it was retained when the northern lean-to was built, as the main south wall of that structure. At the western end, there is a fireplace which measures 1.10m in height by 1.20m in width with a high segmented brick arch, 0.90m in width. The actual fire-opening is concreted in and this, by type, is probably a later addition. It is composed of red brick with a yellow render, which measure, on average, measuring 0.25m by 0.06m. Several rectangular windows were inserted into this wall but were of modern date.

House No. 30

The north wall

8.5 This house was built of the same brick as No. 29, visible in the north wall above the plaster level of the single storey lean-to. There are two spur walls in the wall, the remains of two cross walls, which preserve the layout of the house with a front and a back room. There is no indication of any corner fireplaces in either building. The eastern spur is the back wall of the house (0.80m in length north-south) while the western spur is the main internal room division (0.30m in length, north-south). This suggests a front room, roughly 3.30m square with a larger room 4m square in width at the rear. The floor is of modern tile.

The south wall

8.6 The south wall survives in part, re-used as part of the northern lean-to, as already mentioned. There is a modern fireplace in the front room in this property wall, with a corresponding fireplace in No. 29. Both are likely to be additions to the original houses.
The east wall

8.7 The east wall is composed of concrete and is modern, associated with the Smock Alley Court development to the east.

The west wall

8.8 The west wall has had a modern brick façade added and the main shop window and door do not appear to be original.

9. The previous foundation layout for a previous DCC housing proposal in 2006

9.1 The assessment indicates that there are infilled cellars along the street frontage with rubble and pits to rear (east). On information from the Smock Alley Court site it appears this rubble seals 2m of dense organic reclamation containing medieval refuse, which represents rich archeological layers. The natural deposits lie at 4.50m below present ground but these are of soft riverine gravels and silt, sitting on bedrock lying 6.50m. Thus solid load-bearing ground is likely to lie at approximately 6.50m below present ground level.

9.2 Previous foundation design

The piles

In 2006 there were foundation plans drawn up for this site and a sympathetic piling layout was generated for discussion purposes, which might be useful in this context, as it may serve as a template (Figs 33-35). In all, the proposed foundations contained a total of nine piles, comprising a mix of 600mm and 900mm piles, on three main grid lines. The southern line (Line 1) comprised of 2 no. 900mm piles and 1. no 600mm piles, while the central line (Line 2) comprised 3 no. 900mm piles. The northern line (Line 3) comprised 1 no. 900mm and 2. no. 600mm piles. The spans between the piles were as follows:

Lines 1: spans are 5m (from centre pile to centre pile) east-west by 6m north-south (between Line 1 and 2)
Line 2: spans are 5m (from centre pile to centre pile) east-west by 3.50m north-south (between Line 2 and 3)
Line 3: spans are 5m (from centre pile to centre pile) east-west.

The piles were concentrated in the northern end of the site as this end was designed to carry the staircase and lift. The southern end of the site, which is closest to the Viking wall (which ran along Essex Street West) and, as a result, likely to have more significant deposits, has less piles to reduce impact.

9.3 The ground beams
The external ground beams carried by the piles measured 700mm in width by 700mm in depth and were designed to lie comfortably within the rubble deposit. The internal ground beams had to be larger in size, measuring 1200mm in width but were still only 700m in depth, designed to lie within the rubble deposit. Although it was not a final design, the proposed foundations were designed to carry an infill building, rafting over the archaeological deposits with a minimum disturbance to the medieval levels beneath.

10. Conclusions

10.1 The site lies within an area that is well-documented archaeologically, with significant information about the type of layers and deposits in this area. Nos 29 - 30 comprise two house plots which front onto the eastern side of Fishamble Street, a historic street within the medieval walled city of Dublin.

10.2 Nos 29 and 30 lie within the Zone of Archaeological Interest for Dublin and is also within the environs of a Recorded Monument, a statutory designation. Specifically, the site lies just north of the first city wall, dated to c 1100 (which ran along Essex Street West) and the later extension dated to c 1260 (which ran along Lower Exchange Street).
10.3 This area was originally within the river Liffey but was actively reclaimed in the late 12th century, forming solid ground by the early 13th century. This infilling was carried out by tipping in domestic waste from the city, in the form of straw, bedding, clays, ash deposits, cinders, etc to a depth of approximately 4m. These refuse deposits were held in place by a series of post-and-wattle fences along with timber revetments, which ran parallel to the river bank and made it easier to consolidate and contain the dumped material. Overtime, this has rotted down into a dark brown organic matter, which is similar to moss peat, but which contains a wealth of archaeological artefacts (anything dumped, basically), as well as possible timber structures. This ‘peat’ is anaerobic (no oxygen) and very wet, which preserves organic material (and artefacts) perfectly. Dublin is only one of eight Viking cities that have these peculiar ground conditions and, as a result, every effort is made not to interfere with the delicate layers.

10.4 The results of the testing confirm the presence of these medieval reclamation deposits in this area, sealed by a band of rubble between 1.70m and 2.30m in depth. The reclamation deposits are likely to be at least 2m in depth, based on testing in the immediate vicinity. While the natural deposits can be identified at 4.50m below present ground these are of soft riverine gravels and silt. Solid load-bearing ground (bedrock) is likely to lie at approximately 6.50m below present ground level.

10.5 The assessment also located the remains of brick houses, Nos 29 and 30 in the northern, southern and east standing boundary walls, with the remnants of the boundary wall between No. 29 and 30 re-used in a lean-to structure, which occupied the site until relatively recently. These walls survive to first floor height. The cellars of the buildings are intact in no. 29 and extend to at least 2.30m below present ground level but have been infilled with the demolished remains of the house. The assessment also established a deep layer of rubble, 1.70m in depth at the rear of No. 30, lying outside the footprint of the house in an area
previously a yard in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. This area was used for dumping in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and a series of rubbish pits were found in this location.

10.6 The general policy in Dublin when dealing with important archaeological deposits is one of ‘preservation \textit{in situ}’ or avoidance, where possible, and, as a last resort, archaeological excavation. Excavation of material such as this is very expensive and time-consuming and has to be agreed with the licencing authorities, The Department of the Environment and National Museum. The preferred option (and policy for Dublin in the Dublin Development Plan 2011-17) is for ‘Preservation \textit{in situ}, where little archaeology is actually excavated and the site is mostly preserved. This has been achieved at other important sites within the medieval core (at Smock Alley Court, Temple Bar West, and Kinlay House) by a combination of omitting basements, high ground beams and large piles (900m in diameter), which create significant spans and therefore limit impact. This strategy was employed at the adjacent site, directly east at Smock Alley Court (see below) where the piling works were monitored by an archaeologist under licence.

11. IMPACT STATEMENT

11.1 Nos 29 and 30 Fishamble Street contain very important and vulnerable archaeological deposits and the challenge is how to achieve development while preserving as much of these deposits as possible. It is also vital to minimize any interference with the water-table which may drain the surrounding waterlogged deposits causing decay in a much wider area (Simpson 2010). The preferred option is to not have a basement on this site and to pile it, using large piles and high ground beams to reduce impact. Despite these measures, however, there will be an impact on the archaeological horizon.

1) The piles will cut through archaeological material, which may include timber structures and artefacts. \textbf{Mitigating strategy:} augered piles will allow the extrusions be brought to the surface for manual examination to
help document the archaeological profile of the site and retrieve any artefacts. This is was the mitigating strategy for the Smock Alley Court site immediately east of the site under discussion (see below).

2) The piling would have to be carried out at present ground level and the rig may require a solid stone foundation or base from which to operate from. This may require the removal of some of the rubble deposits and their replacement with stone. **Mitigating strategy:** this would be carried out under archaeological supervision and reveal the layout of the cellars.

3) The piles are also likely to hit obstructions in the upper 2m as there are cellars surviving along the street frontage. **Mitigating strategy:** as these cannot be ‘grubbed out’, as it normal practice, it might be prudent to excavate a ‘pile trench’ in advance along the pile lines, under archaeological supervision. This would reduce the chances of hitting obstruction during the piling programme.

4) The services are likely to be contained within the rubble buffer zone although this is dependant on the levels of existing services in the street. **Mitigating strategy:** the construction of services would be monitored by an archaeologist.

5) The construction of a crane base is also likely to be required: **Mitigating strategy:** possibly base it on small piles monitored by the archeologist.

6) Temporary shoring along the street frontage: **Mitigating strategy:** monitored by an archaeologist.

Linzi Simpson
28\textsuperscript{th} June 2014
Appendix A

Dublin Development Plan 2011-2017: FC64:
To promote the in-situ preservation of archaeology as the preferred option where development would have an impact on buried artefacts, except where other alternatives are acceptable or exceptional circumstances are determined by the relevant statutory agencies. Where preservation in situ is not feasible, sites of archaeological interest shall be subject to archaeological investigations and recording according to best practice, in advance of redevelopment (see also Section 17.11 (Development Standards).

Appendix B

Smock Alley Court
The Smock Alley site immediately adjacent was piled and this was the solution employed on the adjoining site (on the east: Smock Alley) which consisted of large piles (900m in diameter) with wide spans. This large site was archaeologically tested in advance, after demolition of the existing structures had occurred. Several medieval revetments were found in the test-trenches, which were then avoided in the final piling layout.

At total of forty-one piles were cast of which twenty-eight measured 900mm in diameter and thirteen measured 600mm in diameter. The standard procedure for the drilling of each pile involved a 1m-long corkscrew-shaped drill or augur, boring up to 3m into the ground. A concrete casing between 6m and 8m long was then inserted into the initial 3m core, and pushed down until it was flush with present ground level. The augur was inserted into the casing and the material retrieved until bedrock was reached (this was between 5m and 5.7m below present ground level on this site. A reinforced steel cage was then inserted into the casing and the pile filled with concrete. The concrete casing was subsequently removed.

The material extruded from the augur was thoroughly examined with the objective of ensuring, as far as possible, the maximum retrieval of artefacts. It was anticipated that material at least 2.5m in depth would comprise archaeological deposits would be recovered from each individual pile. At least three insertions by the augur (extracting 1m
of material with each insertion) were necessary in order to reach such deposits but once the archaeological material was identified, it was swivelled off the augur and put to one side. It was then moved to a designated area on site for examination. However, due to the compact sod-like composition of the archaeological deposits, it was necessary to break up the material with spades before trowelling and sieving of deposits could begin. Each pile was numbered, and artefacts relating to a particular pile were accorded that feature number. The artefacts consisted of leather shoes, metal fragments, iron nails, pottery shards (local and imported ware), medieval floor file fragments, bone pins and other copper artefacts, a typical assemblage from medieval reclamation layers.
Fig. 1: Site location: in yellow Red dots are Recorded Monuments (habitation sites)

Fig. 2: The trenches: Trench 1 and 2
Fig. 3: The site and the city walls

Fig. 4: John Rocque’s map of Dublin, dated 1756
Fig. 5: No. 26 Fishamble Street (Casey’s house)

Fig. 6: The site from the south-west, after demolition (2014)
Fig. 7: North property (2014) looking west

Fig. 8: The northern and eastern lean-to, before demolition, looking north
Fig. 9: No. 30: View from the front door, looking east

Fig. 10: No. 30: Looking west
Fig. 11: No. 30 (inside the lean-to) Front door, looking west

Fig. 12: No. 30: Looking south, through eastern building
Fig. 13: The south wall of the northern lean-to after demolition

Fig. 14: The eastern boundary wall of Nos 30 and 29: note different blockwork
Fig. 15: No. 30: North wall: note old brick work and door on left

Fig. 16: No. 30: South wall of northern lean-to, looking south (note fireplace)
Fig. 17: No. 30, street elevation, internal face: note main door

Fig. 18: No. 29, looking west through gate
Fig. 19: From No. 29, looking north-west

Fig. 20: Internal (eastern) face of the street elevation, No. 29: north jamb of the gate.
Fig. 21: The fireplace in the 18th century boundary wall, between Nos 29 and 30

Fig. 22: No. 29: The fireplace of No. 29: note the new brick façade on the street elevation (left).
Fig. 23: No. 29: Wall scar of rear wall of No. 28 (in south boundary wall)

Fig. 24: No. 29: South wall of No. 29, east end
Fig. 25: The south wall of No. 29: note 18th century brickwork

Fig. 26 32: Excavation of Trench 2
Fig. 27: Trench 2, from the south-east

Fig. 28: Trench 2: North and west section (from the south-east)
Fig. 29: Trench 2: South and east section

Fig. 30: Trench 2: North-facing section
Fig. 31: Fishamble Street, looking south c. 1978 and below 2014

Fig. 32: Looking south up Fishamble Street
Fig. 33: Proposed piling layout for a 2006 DCC housing proposal: see Section 9

Fig. 34: Proposed cross section for piling layout for the 2006 DCC housing proposal: see Section 9
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