

Clontarf Flood Defence Scheme Project Inception Workshop 23rd October 2012



Report of Workshop

Facilitator

- George Ryan

Contents

List of Abbreviations	2
1. Executive Summary	3
2. Workshop Agenda	10
3. Proceedings of the Workshop	13
4. Workshop Participants	31
5. List of Presentations	32

List of Abbreviations

CRA	Clontarf Residents Association
CBA	Clontarf Business Association
DCC	Dublin City Council
CPTED	Crime Prevention through Environmental Design
OPW	Office of Public Works
S2S	Sutton to Sandycove cycling route

1. Executive Summary

The following motion was passed by Dublin City Council on the 5th December 2011:

The Council calls on the City Manager to immediately begin planning a new Clontarf Flood Defence with full consultation with the public, which will protect the area from flooding and preserve the amenity that is Clontarf Promenade.

Dublin City Council (DCC), The Clontarf Residents Association (CRA) and the Clontarf Business Association (CBA) agreed a joint mission statement on the 22nd February 2012 which states:

“The Clontarf Business Association and Clontarf Residents Association are committed to working with Dublin City Council, the Office of Public Works and all other stakeholders to protect Clontarf from flooding and look forward to working together to achieve this aim.”

Following consultations on an agreed agenda it was decided to hold a joint workshop on the 23rd October 2012. It was agreed that an independent chairperson would be sought to facilitate the workshop and George Ryan was approached by DCC, agreed to undertake the task and was subsequently briefed by DCC at a one and a half hour meeting on the 17th October 2012.

The workshop took place in the Dublin Fire Brigade conference centre at the O’Brien Institute from 9.30am until about 3.45pm and the venue was commented on by all as eminently suitable and of a high standard.

In attendance were DCC Officials and Consultants, Officers /Members of the CRA and CBA and a number of public representatives (Councillors / Senator).

The desired outcomes of the workshop were stated as:

- Shared understanding of the Clontarf “flood” risk.
- Shared understanding of roadmap and administrative and statutory process required for any potential Capital Scheme.

- Identification of nature & quality of receiving environment. Identification of design challenges required to incorporate flood defences, while maintaining public safety and accessibility and protecting the amenity.

Throughout the day there was a very significant exchange of high quality information by means of presentations from DCC Officials & Consultants and Officers /Members of the CRA and CBA. It was clear that the exchange of this information was a key factor contributing to a very successful outcome from the workshop. The process also benefited from a highly disciplined and constructive approach from all participants. The proceedings of the workshop are briefly presented in the following paragraphs and a fuller account can be found in section 3.

- **Module 1:** Presentations from DCC & Consultants addressed flood risk, the Clontarf drainage system, design of a coastal flood scheme and pluvial flooding. The CRA/CBA participants commented that good information was provided, that they were keen to listen and that they would need time to absorb and reflect on the information provided. The CRA/CBA presented the results from a 'Survey of Public Opinion' which sought to gather information on residents' opinions and priorities and to feed that information into the design planning process. DCC Parks Department expressed great interest in the findings and priorities identified in the survey.
- **Module 2:** DCC's presentation covered the identification of funding sources for capital schemes, OPW criteria re flood defence and the statutory framework. It outlined project phases and advised that we are at the Project Definition Stage. Feedback from CRA/CBA was that there was a need to get to a point of agreement on the 'shape of the project'. A scheduled discussion was postponed and instead it was agreed to break for lunch and to give CRA/CBA participants an opportunity to have a meeting to discuss/reflect on the morning sessions.
- **Module 3:** It was agreed through the Independent Chairperson to reorder the afternoon presentations so that CRA/CBA presentations took place earlier thereby facilitating a better balancing of the information flow.

- The first CRA/CBA presentation contextualised Clontarf within the bigger picture of the resource of Dublin Bay, the value of seafront promenades and the potential benefits of parallel public engagement and integrated design competitions. It proposed a 'Clontarf Flood Defences and Promenade Project Design Competition'.
- A second CRA/CBA presentation was made on its behalf by Risk Management International focusing on the safety and security of Clontarf Prom and the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). It concluded that the design of the existing Clontarf prom contributed to it being a 'safe place' and that the proposed project should incorporate a CPTED approach.
- DCC Dublin City Architect's Division presented the Interdepartmental Housing Taskforce and other examples of DCC's inter-disciplinary approach. What is needed is a coastal defence system that works and retains the amenity of a promenade. Need agreement on what is end game and what is on the table and what is not. Comments from CRA/CBA were positive and complimentary.
- DCC Parks Division gave a talk covering landscape and its management and maintenance. Clontarf Prom is green infrastructure and acts as a buffer between the sea, the community and wildlife. The proposed project could be an opportunity not just to mitigate risk but to remediate the existing signage, seating, paths, planting and car parks which could be enhanced. DCC Parks and DCC Engineering work together on a regular basis.

- **Discussion**

When all of the presentations were finished there was an opportunity for all to express their responses, to make suggestions, to share views and to engage in discussion.

CRA/CBA asked if the project could be inter departmental and a 'Promenade and Flood Defence Project' preserving the amenity of the bay. What process could advance that? Good to hear a cross range of views. Solution has to address all of the factors.

DCC explained that the perception that the project was an engineering scheme was not actually the case and that an inter-disciplinary approach is normal in these case with Engineering as the lead department and with the City Architects and Parks departments participating on the steering group. The project started off as the Clontarf Promenade and Flood Defence project – an enhancement of the prom is needed anyway.

From a DCC Parks perspective there is a need to understand the real constraints, give room to be creative. Although there is no budget in Parks we should try to push the boat out – perhaps aim to be a key piece of the Green Infrastructure project.

DCC expressed the need to ascertain what we are trying to do and what is on the table? Potential sources of funding or resources are the OPW and DCC. We must not lose the vision even if there is no short term funding. Over a longer term the S2S cycle route project could be relevant. There was now an opportunity to reflect on the workshop, maintain a degree of latitude on the solutions and come back together shortly to progress things.

CRA/CBA spoke about the findings from the survey and the value it offers to the process. There was a richness in what was expressed at the workshop and the comments about mediation and enhancement were welcome.

Independent Chair: What is the process to engage stakeholders in an inter-disciplinary way?

DCC's view was that they certainly want to engage in this process. Short term idea - maybe an environmental improvement scheme?

CRA/CBA suggested that the survey could be further developed. Every situation is different – we could combine engagement with design.

DCC Parks felt that the procurement process could make a positive contribution. DCC Consultants referred to the Duver Seaview scheme in the Isle of Wight that they were involved in and how the interaction with artist John Maine, a member of the 'Royal Academy', contributed to an award winning outcome.

CRA/CBA asked about the process going forward.

DCC suggested a continuation of regular involvement and that a process be put in place to support that.

CRA/CBA asked if we could give a title to the next meeting – perhaps scoping the brief for the project.

DCC thought it might be better to keep the agenda more open at this stage.

Wrap up of Workshop:

- The Independent Chair expressed a view that there is a need for an intermediate step.

Perhaps a smaller ‘working group’ from DCC/CRA/CBA could come together to move the process forward.

- Asked do all agree to broaden the joint mission to ‘The Clontarf Promenade and Flood Defence Project?’ ALL AGREED

CRA/CBA expressed a willingness and desire to progress the project and ‘to break new ground’.

The Independent Chair closed the workshop.

Conclusions:

The Workshop agenda listed intended outcomes. The constraints of the workshop format and the limited time available meant that it was not possible to agree in detail the extent to which each of the intended outcomes were realised and to have that ratified at the workshop itself. However it was clear that significant progress was made and that there was

an opportunity to capture that progress by means of the workshop report. The draft workshop report was circulated to DCC & CRA/CBA for review and comment prior to completion of this final version. The feedback from DCC & CRA/CBA confirmed very substantial progress and the wording used by the Independent Chair in this section of the report represents his best efforts to capture this progress but may benefit from further refinement which it is suggested can take place in the proposed 'working group'.

Referring to the DCC motion of 5th of December 2011 which calls on the City Manager to begin planning a new Clontarf Flood Defence, the report and recommendation of the City Manager and the vote of the City Council, the following conclusions are substantially agreed by stakeholders and will inform the next steps in developing a new flood defence project.

Shared understanding of Clontarf flood risk

There is a general acceptance from all participants of the risk of coastal flooding in Clontarf. The community of Clontarf values the promenade as an amenity close to the city but there is also an acceptance of the need for flood defences. The height of the flood defence must be sufficient to prevent the sea flooding the land and must also be of a sufficient height such that any water coming over the defence, due to wave overtopping will not also cause flooding damage. While minor flooding of the promenade by wave overtopping does not pose a threat, major flooding of the promenade by wave overtopping does pose a flood risk. Definitive flood defence design for the 3km stretch depends on the nature of the risk impact and the amenity value of the receiving environment.

Identification of funding sources and procurement process

OPW funding requires that certain standards of flood protection are provided and these standards are very rarely lowered. Funding for the project may need to be sourced beyond the OPW as this is likely to be limited to the cost of potential flood damage.

The procurement process is crucial to the success of this multi-disciplinary project and should not fix on one solution early but be open to creative solutions that achieve the best environmental outcome while meeting the requirements of the brief.

A design competition should be considered as a means of achieving this. All stakeholders including DCC and the CRA/CBA should be involved in all stages of the procurement process. Procurement of consultants for a design competition requires budget approval from OPW, who have indicated that they require evidence that the community will support a revised scheme and flood defence heights and that it meets OPW requirements that any scheme is cost beneficial.

The agreement to change the name of the project to the ***Clontarf Promenade Development and Flood Defence Project*** is perceived as a major step forward and it shifts the emphasis and the source of possible funding to the wider objectives of city and tourism.

Design Process:

Multi-disciplinary projects, whatever their nature, are challenging but ultimately more likely to succeed in meeting their brief and being embraced by the public. In order for the project to progress along inter-disciplinary lines and to be successful in the long term, DCC should establish the most appropriate structures involving an interdepartmental team led by the appropriate department and a strategy for continued maintenance.

The survey undertaken by CRA/CBA has enormous value, can feed into the design process and could be extended beyond Clontarf residents to include other users of the amenity such as city-dwellers and tourists.

The Clontarf Promenade has developed organically and, while it has many strong elements particularly regarding passive surveillance and security, there are issues regarding landscaping, planting, seating and pathways that could be improved. The existing conditions at Clontarf Promenade are a good example of an environment that is safe due to passive methods inherent in its layout and any future design should not lose this benefit. The Clontarf Promenade is designated as under the auspices of DCC Parks division and as such can be protected and further developed as an amenity.

2. Workshop Agenda

The following agenda was agreed in advance of the meeting by DCC and CRA/CBA. As outlined in the Executive Summary there was some reordering of agenda items which was agreed mid-way through the workshop. There were also a few changes to the planned list of presentations – see section 5 for the final list.

MODULE 1 from 9.30am

Module 1 – Intended outcome – Shared understanding of the Clontarf “flood” risk.

Presentations

9.30-9.35 Introduction to Agenda – Tom Leahy,

9.35 – 9.40 Introduction to Workshop - George Ryan, Workshop Facilitator

9.40- 10.00 Tom Leahy – Dublin Flood Initiative – Overview of City Flood Risk Strategy to set overall context within which any flood risks for Clontarf can be identified.

10.0 -10.20 DCC Consultants – Coastal Flood Risk at Clontarf Seafront.

10.20 10.40 Presentation CRA/CBA – Details of local flooding in Clontarf.

10.40- 10.55 James Murphy – The Clontarf Drainage system (Current).

10.55 Tea / Coffee

11.05- 11.25 DCC Consultants - Coastal Flooding – Design components of any Coastal Flood scheme.

11.25- 11 40 Tom Leahy - Pluvial Flooding – Briefing on Flood Resilient Cities project

11.40 -12.00 Presentation CRA/CBA

- Summary of Issues arising from flooding surveys carried out by CRA/CBA

MODULE 2 from 12.00 am

Module 2 – Intended outcome – Identification of funding sources for capital schemes and project procedures applying to any funding. Identification of the statutory framework applying to any flood scheme . Identification of the procurement process.

Presentations

12.00-12.20 Adrian Conway

- Sources of Funding (OPW and DECLG Water Services Investment Programme (WSIP).
- Project stages (Including Procurement)
- Statutory framework (Including EIS and ABP).
- Impact of Irish Water (New National Public Utility).

12.20- 12.50 Discussion modules1& 2 – In workshop format

Desired outcome Module 1– Shared understanding of Clontarf flood risk.

Desired outcome Module 2 –

Shared understanding of roadmap and administrative and statutory process required for any potential Capital Scheme.

12.50 – 13.25 Lunch

MODULE 3 from 13.25pm

Module 3 – Accessibility audits –Integrating accessibility, while providing a barrier to flooding.

Module 3 – intended outcome – identification of nature and quality of receiving environment identification of consequences of future flood relief works.

Presentations

13.30 -13.50 Brian Swan -Example of Multi-disciplinary design approach

13.50 -14.10 Security and Safety audit Clontarf Promenade (Risk Management International commissioned by CRA/CBA)

14.10 -14.30 Accessibility Audit Clontarf Promenade 2007 (Capita Symonds commissioned by DCC)

14.30 Discussion modules 1,2 &3 – In workshop format

Desired outcome Module 1– Shared understanding of Clontarf flood risk.

Desired outcome Module 2 –

Shared understanding of roadmap and administrative and statutory process required for any potential Capital Scheme.

Desired outcome Module 3

Identification of nature & quality of receiving environment. Identification of design challenges required to incorporate flood defences, while maintaining public safety and accessibility and protecting the amenity

15.00 – END Summary by Facilitator

3. Proceedings of the Workshop

This is an abridged record of the proceedings of the workshop. Where presentations are referred to more comprehensive details are contained within the presentations themselves – see section 5 of this report for a list of the presentations.

Tom Leahy

Desired outcome of the day is a shared understanding of the need for a Flood Defence scheme; the possible sources of funding and procurement issues; and the value of a multi-disciplinary approach.

George Ryan

Introduction to the group as an independent chair not affiliated to either side of the table. Welcomes Deirdre and Gus as the chairs of the CRA and CBA; reads letter of apology from the Lord Mayor. Expresses his hope that the day will move things along. Establishes that his knowledge of the subject of the workshop is based on an hour and half long briefing by DCC.

Following suggestion by Gus O Hara there is a round the table introduction from everyone.

MODULE 1

Presentation by:

Tom Leahy - Overview of City Flood Risk Strategy to set overall context within which any flood risks for Clontarf can be identified.

Spoke of the threat of flood to Dublin from rivers, dams, sea and rain. Went through the other forms of flooding before concentrating on coastal – e.g. implications of a dam-burst on the reservoirs around Dublin and the volume of water that would be emptied into the river Liffey.

Showed the historic profile of the city and how it grew towards the sea. Gave details about the flooding event of 2002 in Dublin and how it established the risk to Dublin from the sea. The highest level of still water + surge on that occasion was 2.95mODM. The defence level of the walkway (where there is no wall) is 2.65mODM and the roadway at Oulton Road is 2.2m ODM. Showed images of a wall completely knocked over by sea storm to indicate the strength of the incoming water (not Clontarf).

Since 2002 there has been a significant event at least once a year.

Gave a short summary of the different terms: flood level, flood defence level, existing defence level. Advised that the required level of flood defence at Clontarf will inevitably block views.

Gave a background to his work in Europe.

Q Gus O Hara

How many times has the water flooded the road and properties since 2002?

A Water hasn't flooded properties since 2002

Two Presentations by:

Paul Winfield, Royal HaskoningDHV (DCC Consultant) –

- Coastal flood risk at Clontarf Seafront
- Design components of any typical coastal flood alleviation scheme

Spoke about the components of coastal water levels – tide (which is predictable), waves and surge (both are dependent on the prevailing meteorological conditions). Showed a simulation of wave action against a seawall. Climate change is also unpredictable, and potentially depends on many things, e.g. such as, how much and how quickly will the ice caps melt.

There is an acceptance that different situations require different standards of flood defence – e.g. post recent Japanese incident, for nuclear power plants a ‘new rating’ of the H++ climate change scenario is deemed appropriate, which is higher than the general flood defence standard for residential, commercial and industrial areas, due to the potentially higher consequences of the effects of overtopping or failure.

It is possible to build new flood defences to a lower level initially, to provide the desired standard of flood defence, provided they have been designed for subsequent raising, to keep pace with the effects of climate change. Grassed earth embankments (sometimes referred to as a 'berm') generally have a softer visual impact on the environment, but would be more prone to erosion from wave attack and any overtopping on the Clontarf frontage.

Reinforced concrete walls ultimately have their design life reduced in marine climates, by the corrosion of the steel reinforcement after some decades.

- Showed a number of slide giving historic tide levels in Dublin.
- Showed a slide giving the predicted range of still water level for Dublin/Clontarf in the year 2050 for a 1 in 200 year event, as being between 3.73 and 3.86mODM - including an allowance for climate change.

The mouth of the bay is at its narrowest between the two lighthouses. The width of this opening helps restrict the wave energy entering the bay and thus controls the wave height/energy at the Clontarf seawall. A single vertical seawall will reflect the wave energy and require a higher crest level than a composite defence arrangement, with a lower seawall and retired secondary flood wall. Grassed earth embankments are generally more susceptible to erosion by wave action.

Described the impact of atmospheric pressure on tide levels – all tidal predictions assume a prevailing atmospheric pressure of 1013 mb (hectopascals). Any pressure above or below this pressure will modify the actual tidal level, either lower or higher, respectively, than the predicted tide level.

Generally an earth embankment would need a crest level at least 300mm higher than a concrete/masonry wall built on the same alignment. Generally, the further set back from the ‘principle’ seawall the lower the crest level of a secondary defence can be.

Flood defences that require active management during an event have an inherent risk. Last week Weston-Super-Mare flooded due to the fact that the relevant people did not shut a flood gate in the secondary defence wall. Passive defences, e.g. with no flood gates through the defences, provide a lower risk flood defence solution.

It is generally difficult to obtain permission to encroach into SACs and SPAs (Special Areas of Conservation & Special protection Areas) – it may well be challenging to propose defence structures that would impinge on these, e.g. groynes, rock structures on the foreshore, etc.

Q **Eilis O'Brien**

What is the overall height including climate change at Clontarf as two figures were given (question asked between the two presentations)

A The next presentation will be more specific

Q **Sean Mahon**

Sought clarification on the H++ figure and its relevance to Clontarf

A not relevant to Clontarf – only applies to nuclear power stations etc. just given as an indication of how high the prediction could be – the final design height would take into account the environment of the area

Presentation by:

James Murphy - The Clontarf Drainage System (Current)

Explained the drainage system in Clontarf. East of Vernon Avenue drainage system drains to the pumping station at the end of Vernon Avenue; West of Vernon Avenue drainage system drains to pumping station Fairview. Mostly the drainage system is old and combines foul water and surface water in one drain system. There is a small system of separate foul and surface water that services houses from around the 1970s.

The waste is taken from both pumping houses and pumped to Sutton and across the bay to the treatment plant in Irishtown.

There is a culvert running under the promenade that appears to have been laid down when the promenade was being developed in the 1950s it is 700mm wide and 1600mm high.

Spoke about the maintenance regime of the drains. They are cleaned 6 times a year and inspected for blockage on other occasions.

The flooding event on the 24th of August 2008 was due to pluvial flooding.

Q Gus O Hara

Questioned the drain –cleaning regime as the area has had repeated difficulty with leaves blocking drains. However, DCC and the community have very good working relationship on the ground. He commended the area office for its work

David Doran

Agreed with this and said that there was very good collaboration with DCC maintenance over the past months with various streets getting help to do clean-up of drains

A DCC drainage is aware that there are some issues regarding the drains

Q Antoinette O Neill

Where exactly is the culvert and how is it fed from the landside?

A It is under the grass of the prom and has feeds coming down the main perpendicular road arteries

Q Deirdre Heney

Sought clarification regarding the effect of high tides on the surface water drainage – specifically would the construction of flood defences improve or dis-improve the ability of the surface water to drain away

A Construction of flood defences would have little or no impact on the ability of the surface water to drain from the storage culvert. Clearly high tides do have a significant impact on the ability of surface water to drain from the storage culvert

Presentation by:

Tom Leahy - Pluvial Flooding, Briefing on Flood Resilient Cities

Cases of surface flooding are on the increase and are not restricted to Ireland – example of Denmark and Singapore.

Pluvial flooding maps of Dublin city were shown. Flooding from rain and surface water happens across the city and is quite random; it does not depend on elevation. This kind of flooding can happen very quickly as the nature of our rainfall changes and becomes more dramatic. Instances of flooding in one part of the city while another remains completely dry were given.

Surface water drains in the city are typically old (some profiles were shown) – and unable to cope with current demands. Much of the city is non-porous and this contributes to the increased volumes. We are not developing many new areas at the moment but hopefully we will soon be in a position to build housing etc again and there are some simple ways of ensuring that new developments do not generate more surface water than necessary – e.g. insisting through planning permissions that paved driveways use pervious paving. This has not been enforced yet.

Five pilot areas have been established in Dublin to look at ways of reducing the flooding impact of ‘monster rain’ by using natural soak-aways and good practice. Two maps of one of these areas were shown indicating the ‘before’ and ‘after’ of this work. The pattern was that

the 'after' map showed more concentration of water in areas where it was directed to and less flooding near properties.

Presentation by:

Eilis O'Brien, CRA/CBA - Survey of Public Opinion.

The findings from a door-to-door and online survey with 961 responses, carried out in October 2012, were presented. The objectives were:

- To gather information on opinions and priorities
- To feed that information into the design planning process

Detailed information, breakdown by theme (safety, environmental etc.) and priorities of respondents were shown. The main public priorities were:

1. Seaside walkway/view of the sea
2. Public lighting
3. View of sea from road
4. Passive surveillance
5. Safe access
6. Flat grass surface

Open responses were also presented.

Maryann Harris

Commented that the survey was fascinating from a Parks point of view. In addition to what was presented there is a need to look at the tourism aspect – Clontarf Prom is a key facility.

MODULE 2

Presentation by:

Adrian Conway

The presentation described the procurement process for projects such as the Clontarf Flood defences in individual stages. We are now at the very beginning of this process.

SAC and SPA present significant challenges and 'health and safety issues' now seem to be the only grounds on which to get permission to build on such areas.

Cost benefit on any design is crucial to getting funding. The funding would be based on the predicted level of the cost to repair damage to properties flooded and that this would be a fixed sum.

Funding for flood defence work comes from the OPW and is based on protection at a level that protects against a 1 in 200 year event.

MODULE 3

Presentation by:

Emma Curley

The presentation covered Dublin Bay as a Resource, Proms, Case Studies and a Proposal for Clontarf.

Dublin bay is a resource for all of Dublin. Reference was made to the DCC Development Plan 2011-2017. Maps were shown e.g. post 1800 infill map – the sea edge. Generally speaking people throughout Ireland like to walk beside the seafront e.g. Lahinch and other examples. There are significant opportunities associated with bays e.g. Volvo Ocean Race and with regard to Dublin the Tall Ships festival in 2012.

There are a range of projects in Dublin City e.g. S2S, LUAS, Grangegorman, Dublin Bikes, Allotments and many relate to the 'Public Realm' strategy. Working towards one goal – a better city.

The Cleveleys Sea Defence and Promenade Scheme was presented. A dual process was adopted: Public consultation about what people wanted from the promenade, Development of a parallel engineering brief for potential design companies. There was an initial open design competition. Four teams commissioned for design development and all four designs put forward for public comment.

The following '*Clontarf Flood Defences and Promenade Project*' proposal was presented.

Clontarf Flood Defences and Promenade Design Competition

- Multidisciplinary Design Team
- Integrated proposal for an Engagement process
- Project brief and design proposals set in the context of the amenity of Dublin Bay

The CRA and CBA will partner with Dublin City Council, the OPW and key stakeholders in community engagement from the outset and throughout the design process.

The CRA and CBA will facilitate this involvement through its website and other media.

Presentation by:

Cathal O'Neill

Clontarf Promenade - SECURITY AND SAFETY and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).

Principles of CPTED:

- Territoriality/Territorial Reinforcement
- Natural Surveillance
- Maintenance/Image Management
- Activity Support
- Natural Access Control
- Target Hardening

In the case of Clontarf promenade, the principles, of territorial reinforcement and natural surveillance are critical and exist today in abundance. If a design is not well considered, they

could be significantly undermined. The survey presented by Eilish O'Brien demonstrated this fact very clearly – the why people use the promenade – because they feel safe and secure. They feel safe and secure, because the underlying principles of Territoriality and Natural Surveillance are right in your face. The other principles are also present. Any really good concept does not rely on one principle but on many, and real strength in depth is created where the principles overlap and integrate.

CPTED emphasises the use of design to exploit the opportunities to naturally and routinely facilitate surveillance to reinforce positive behaviour. 90.4% of respondents to the survey rated this at the top of their needs. The principles of CPTED deserve due consideration in a revised, integrated design solution. Clontarf Promenade in its current configuration possesses to a significant degree all of the required attributes. Collaborative effort between DCC and CBA/CRA to enhance Clontarf Promenade taking above into account is needed.

Presentation by:

Brian Swan

Interdisciplinary approach is normal for architects in private practice.

Interdepartmental is how this interdisciplinary approach is handled within a local authority. There is a 'lead' department and they call in other departments and consult with them.

The first project Brian worked on in DCC was a housing project which was a failed PPS (Public Private Partnership) and it was run as an interdepartmental project.

Other examples of interdepartmental projects are the Public Realm projects some of these are led by the roads department – this means that roads have a primary role.

Clontarf is not defined as a parks project – maybe it is roads? We should establish who is leading the project.

DCC has an 'Area' division and a 'Functional' division. The Area Division looks after maintenance on the ground and the Functional Division – e.g. roads, parks – looks after projects.

When a project is finished it is important to know who is responsible for maintaining it. When Smithfield was finished ten years were spent arguing over who was responsible for maintaining it. Now the second phase of Smithfield is underway and the management of the area once the project is finished had been established from the beginning. The maintenance of a project will only work if responsibility is given from the start and proper funding is in place.

Another public realm project is Grafton Street – the necessary repair of the paviers allows other issues to be addressed. While the works on Grafton Street are happening Clarendon Street will bear much more traffic and an artist is working with DCC to upgrade Clarendon Street.

For projects such as Clontarf it is important at the outset to establish two principles:

Agreement as to the end-game; this means clarity regarding what is on the table and what is not: and this in turn depends often on the funding stream; for flood defence work in Clontarf the OPW funding will have a particular set of conditions attached; if the amenity is to be considered it must have funding from a separate source.

Secondly it is crucial to be 'dead straight' with the community – for example in the case of Clontarf, what is the required height of the flood defence project? Who is controlling this?

Regarding other drainage issues – foul sewers are the responsibility of Health and Safety department but surface water doesn't belong to any department.

Presentation by:

Maryanne Harris

Clontarf Promenade is a public park and is referred to in the current city Development Plan. It is a very good example of green infrastructure; to qualify as such there must be multi-functionality use – e.g. not simply a cycle track but a cycle track amongst other uses.

The landscape context is that it has designation under UNESCO Man and the Biosphere programme it also has RAMSAR designation and it has unique tourist value.

It is valuable not simply because of one view – it has a sequence of views and these were included in the EIS for the Dublin Port development.

The existing park acts as a buffer between the sea and the community as well as between wild life and urban development/pollution.

When considering any work to the park the site, its history and its use should be looked at and the work should be used as an opportunity to improve the existing condition.

The SAC protects the habitat and the birds and the only exceptions to developments are allowed under Annexe 1 on ground of health and safety. The SPA protects the wetlands. Clontarf fought for these protections and attained them before the European Directives.

There was an accessibility audit in 2007 the recommendations of which were not fully implemented due to funding constraints.

Issue that should be looked at in the current environment are signage, circulation, seating (the current seating is not to the appropriate standard), orientation of paths, positioning of the paths and planting.

The park evolved in a haphazard way not as a coherent design, the pedestrian cross paths are not necessarily in the best positions and the planting is often visually intrusive. A lot of the planting is not native, not biodiverse and many of the trees are sterile.

Things to consider when designing new landscape – planting can be used to frame the views, if views need to be blocked be strategic as to where.

The existing park has strong connections – e.g. the cycleway and pedestrian paths connect to the city: the start and finish of these paths and their connection to the city should be considered.

Tourism initiatives should be developed. There is hope of re-opening the interpretative centre.

The car parks could be designed better – perhaps use change of levels to screen them

The signage could be updated –the sign about the bird species that used to be at Alfie Byrne is an example of good signage that doesn't get replaced. Birds become accustomed to people when they are exposed over time.

Vistas should be considered and landscaping should enhance them. DCC have a map of the vistas.

The survey carried out by the CRA/CBA is very good and could be extended to include park-users who are not necessarily from Clontarf and tourists.

Landscape can work with engineered solutions to reduce the volume of surface water.

People should be encouraged to harvest water. The cost benefit of the works in Clontarf must include the landscape.

George Ryan

Very interesting presentations from both sides representing a lot of work. Requested CRA/CBA to address DCC directly. Invited CRA/CBA to address DCC directly.

Eilis O Brien

We would be interested in hearing the DCC response to the survey information provided by the CRA/CBA in the context of what might be included within the brief for a future design.

Antoinette O Neill

The procurement process is important – can we have a multi-disciplinary design process from the start and be inclusive – i.e. keep everything on the table. The procurement process described seems to imply that the physical outline is agreed before design team is appointed – but a more open process would help to arrive at the best solution

Sean Mahon

We are looking for a solution to address all the factors – it is an urban and a national amenity and we should develop a solution in that context.

Tom Leahy

Of the projects mentioned – the cycle track, Grafton Street Tom has worked on these and on the tall ships – and these would be multi-disciplinary. Also the people who designed Cleveleys Promenade, Scott Wilson are doing the S2S for DCC. DCC also worked on the tall ships.

George Ryan

How did the multi-disciplinary aspect of these projects work?

Adrian Conway

In the normal way with a lead department would be established – in these cases Engineering – then an interdepartmental steering group is set up with, for example,

representations from architects, parks. Also consultants in various disciplines are appointed from outside as these are needed to apply for the statutory processes.

An earlier scheme for Clontarf flood defences included the S2S. The previous Flood Defence project included Clontarf Promenade in its title.

If other elements are considered in the flood defence design we need to think about where the funding could come from. We need to reach agreement on the scope of the project.

Maryanne Harris

We should give people room for creativity and give them time to feel comfortable with change. We should also match our need for design to other funding programmes. St Stephen's Green has no funding for a proposed re-vamp. Clontarf Promenade is a key piece of infrastructure.

Tom Leahy

Firstly it is good we are talking. Secondly at the moment there is no funding and in order to target some funding we need to have a brief. As regards the flood defence design we should consider what we can do now. We have seen there is an appetite for change from the survey but also that the view is considered very valuable. The view needs to go if we are to provide protection. What we can do is get consultants to examine exactly what the impact of the flood defence design heights are on the view along the promenade as it varies along the length. This study is one of perhaps eight strands of consideration coming out of today's workshop that can be further analysed.

Antoinette O Neill

It would be disappointing after the richness of today's discussion to focus the next steps on one aspect such as the view. The view and the effect of flood defences on it, is always going to be critical. But better to consider it in the context of potential gains and enhancements of an overall project.

George Ryan

It is hard to see what written outcomes could come out of the workshop– perhaps the mission statement could be altered to better reflect the multi-disciplinary approach. Another outcome is that we are all ready to grasp the opportunity and work on the richness of information on either side and consider a multi-disciplinary design. Suggested regular interaction is required as the work proceeds. A combination of the inter-departmental approach within DCC and active community involvement.

Tom Leahy

Agreed to this and to considering a multi-disciplinary approach. He suggested that George Ryan would compile key points on the workshop and provide hooks for consideration. Engineers and environment want to continue engagement on the issue. He questioned whether there would be cash available from central government for flood defence approved by community. Expressed an interest in what George Ryan would see as the key points from the day.

Eilis O'Brien

Suggested survey could be expanded upon based on the points made by Maryanne Harris

Emma Curley

Cleveleys was a good example of the value of community engagement with design. Each environment is specific and it was not put forward as a preferred design but as an example of a good procurement process.

Maryanne Harris

Agreed that Cleveleys was an example of good procurement because it did not fix on one answer early but allowed for a number of solutions to be considered by the community

Paul Winfield

The Duver Seaview scheme is an example of a multi-disciplinary procurement that Royal Haskoning worked on. There were planning conditions that a visual artist was to be appointed. There was an interview and a sculptor who was used to working in stone was appointed. Paul and the artist discussed the technical issues of the environment and the result was very successful and popular. This area was an SAC and SPA. Such collaborations are demanding and require work but they can mean very good results. The Duver Seaview scheme won consultant of the year for the artist and for Royal Haskoning.

<http://www.royalhaskoning.co.uk/en-gb/fields/Water%20and%20Environment/Flood%20and%20coastal%20risk%20management/Pages/DuverCoastProtection.aspx>

George Ryan

Suggested changing the title of the project to Clontarf Promenade and Flood Defence Development. Commends both sides for the amount of work and commends DCC for being open to including other disciplines. Are all parties happy to exchange presentations?

Everyone agreed to this

(During the consultation and feedback phase following circulation of the Draft Workshop Report it was agreed to adopt the title of ***Clontarf Promenade Development and Flood Defence Project***)

Antoinette O Neill

Suggested we could give title to next meeting – perhaps scoping the brief for the project?

Tom Leahy

Thought it better to keep content of next meeting open

George Ryan

Said that this suggestion would be noted but perhaps better to keep agenda open.

George Ryan closed the workshop.

4. Workshop Participants

DCC

Tom Leahy - Executive Manager (Engineering)
Adrian Conway - Senior Engineer, Projects Management Office
Brian Swan - Deputy City Architect
Maryann Harris - Senior Executive Parks Superintendent
David Dinnigan - Area Manager, North Central Area
Elaine Mulvenny - Assistant Area Manager, North Central Area
Gerard Brady - Executive Engineer
Paul Winfield, Royal HaskoningDHV – DCC Consultant

CRA/CBA

Deirdre Tobin – Chairperson CRA
Ailbhe Cullen
Sean Mahon
Antoinette O Neill
Gus O Hara – Chairperson CBA
David Doran
Michelle Moloughney
Eilis O'Brien
Emma Curley
Cathal O Neill, CEO RMI – CRA/CBA Consultant

Public Representatives

Senator Averil Power (and Intern Laura O'Rourke)
Councillor Deirdre Heney
Councillor Jane Horgan-Jones
Councillor Damian O'Farrell
Councillor Neil Ring

Independent Chairperson

George Ryan

5. List of Presentations

- Tom Leahy, DCC – Dublin Flood Initiative, Overview of City Flood Risk Strategy to set overall context within which any flood risks for Clontarf can be identified.
- Paul Winfield, Royal HaskoningDHV (DCC Consultants) – Coastal Flood Risk at Clontarf Seafront.
- James Murphy, DCC – The Clontarf Drainage system (Current).
- Paul Winfield, Royal HaskoningDHV (DCC Consultants) - Design components of any Coastal Flood scheme.
- Tom Leahy, DCC - Pluvial Flooding & Briefing on Flood Resilient Cities project.
- Eilis O'Brien, CRA/CBA - Survey of Public Opinion.
- Adrian Conway, DCC - Sources of Funding, Project stages, Statutory framework(and Impact of Irish Water.
- Emma Curley, CRA/CBA – Dublin Bay as a Resource, Proms, Case Studies, Proposal for Clontarf.
- Cathal O'Neill - Risk Management International on behalf of CRA/CBA - Clontarf Promenade SECURITY AND SAFETY, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).
- Brian Swan, DCC - Example of Multi-disciplinary design approach.
- Maryann Harris, DCC – Landscape Perspective.