

ARCHITECTURAL CONSERVATION
(Arnold)

Share
copy

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION TO
AN BORD PLEANÁLA
FOR PERMISSION FOR
STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
(THE CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL OF IRELAND)**

ABP Reg. No. PL29N.PA0024

AND IN THE MATTER OF AN ORAL HEARING

Statement of Evidence of Paul Arnold Architects

1. Qualifications and Experience

My name is Paul Arnold. I am a Grade 1 Conservation Architect and hold a Bachelor of Architecture degree (B.Arch) from University College Dublin and a Certificate in Conservation from the Centre for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Buildings at K.U. Leuven. I am Co-Director of the Masters in Urban and Building Conservation at the School of Architecture, UCD

I am currently the practice principal of Paul Arnold Architects. In this role I am responsible for the management of the practice and all of the projects within the office. My experience includes a variety of challenging commissions, large and small from Bantry House, to Dublin City Hall, Leinster House and the Ha'penny Bridge with many smaller projects for houses, country mansions, public buildings, churches and cathedrals. Equally I have been responsible for the design of new buildings in an historic context including an innovative and sustainable building for the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, additions to Kilfenora Cathedral in Clare and the design of a new entrance pavilion for Dublinia. I have also provided architectural conservation consultancy advice to fellow professionals, including Architectural Heritage Impact Assessments and Strategic Planning Advice in relation to Protected Structures and historic buildings.

Representative Projects

Dublin City Hall, Dublin 2

Client: Dublin City Council

Conservation architect for the 'restoration' of the 18th C Royal Exchange to its original plan form. This involved significant historical research and detailed examination and reconstruction of components of the fabric. Awarded RIAI Triennial Medal for Conservation 2007.

Bantry House, Cork

Client: Bantry Estates Company

On-going advice and executive architect to one of Ireland's finest historic houses: recent project includes the consolidation of the west stable cupola and the preparation of a Conservation Plan for the demesne in the context of succession. An outline proposal for a new concert hall in the west stables has been prepared in response to the needs of the successful chamber music festival held here annually.

Blasket Islands Houses, Co. Kerry

Client: The OPW

Preparation of a detailed appraisal of the island's ruins with proposals for their conservation. These works commenced in 2011.

St Mary's Cathedral Limerick

Client: The Select Vestry

Responsible for a major programme of repairs and refurbishment works in the early 1990s including re-slating the entire cathedral, external repointing and internal re-ordering with the provision of a new nave altar and choir and provision of underfloor heating throughout the cathedral.

Christ Church Cathedral Dublin 8**Client: The Board of Christ Church Cathedral**

Engaged as cathedral architect since 1995. Projects undertaken have included the rehabilitation and re-presentation of the crypt as a multi-use exhibition/function space, the relighting of the cathedral, the underpinning of the Library Tower, renewal of stonework and pointing, renewal of stained glass, construction of the Cathedral Office and proposals for new landscaping

Leinster House, Dublin 2**Client: The OPW**

Three related projects in the context of advice on the master-planning of Leinster House 2000: a new office building adjacent to Leinster House alterations to the central stairs of Leinster House: Reconfiguring of the Main stairs in Leinster House, construction of new stone facades to complete the Leinster House Kildare Street entrance, refurbishment of the College of Art facade. The projects were awarded a Europa Nostra Commendation in 2000 and received an RIAI award in 2001.

Ha'penny Bridge**Client: Dublin City Council**

Conservation Architect for the restoration of this wrought and cast iron iconic structure. The project received a Europa Nostra Commendation in 2002.

Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions**Client: The OPW**

The conversion and extension of the James Gandon designed Royal Military Infirmary to provide new offices for the DPP adjoining the new Criminal Court House. The project intended the construction of a new plateau-type below ground extension which did not impact on this important georgian Building. The project secured planning permission but was suspended owing to budgetary cutbacks.

2. Role in Proposed Development

I am directly responsible for the following areas of the project, and the preparation of the corresponding sections of the Environmental Impact Statement [EIS]:

- Architectural Heritage Impact Assessment (Chapter 14)¹.

3. Key Issues in relation to Architectural Heritage

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 14 of Volume 2 of the EIS sets out the likely direct and indirect potential impacts of the proposed development of the Children's Hospital of Ireland at the Mater Hospital Campus on the Architectural Heritage within the immediate

¹ Volume 2 EIS; also based in part on historic research by Brian O'Connell of O'Connell Mahon Architects

environment and the wider context of the city. This chapter sets out the following information:

- The methodology and assessment criteria are set out in 14.2, 14.2.1 and 14.5.3² and comprise the following:

Each part or component of the receiving environment is evaluated in terms of its importance or significance and its sensitivity to change: importance or significance relates to the special architectural, historic, aesthetic interest of the part of the built fabric. Historic in this context embraces Cultural Heritage, which relates to the historic personages, real or fictive, associated with the place. Sensitivity to change relates to the component's ability to maintain its character in the face of change and relates to the degree of intactness of the building, street, or cityscape and where appropriate, its homogeneity.

Impacts are identified. Where there is an alteration to or loss of fabric, the impacts are described as direct. Indirect impacts are those which comprise a change in the context or setting of Protected Structures and historic buildings, historic streetscapes, Conservation Areas, Architectural Conservation Areas, or the general Historic Urban Landscape. Impacts, direct or indirect, are classified as beneficial or adverse, the intensity of impact being rated. This assessment is facilitated by the Verifiable Visual Images prepared by the proposers.

The appraisal addresses issues at three different scales: in increasing extent a) the site of the proposed hospital, including those buildings immediately abutting the site, b) the streets and Protected Structures in proximity to the site and c) the general Historic Urban Landscape.

- Description of the immediate receiving environment³, including an historical assessment of the cartography, topographical evolution and urban morphology of the site and a review of the status of the receiving environment with respect to the Record of Monuments and Places (RMP), the Record of Protected Structures (RPS) and adjacent Conservation Areas and Architectural Conservation Areas (ACAs).
- Review of the potential direct and indirect impacts on the immediate receiving environment⁴, including buildings and Protected Structures on the subject site; streetscapes, significant buildings and Protected Structures within the immediate vicinity of the Mater Hospital Complex; and the historic urban landscape.

² Volume 2, EIS

³ Section 14.3, Volume 2, EIS

⁴ Section 14.4, Volume 2, EIS

- Identification of possible mitigation to counteract the potential direct and indirect impact of the proposed works⁵ and residual impacts⁶.

3.2 DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

The following includes a summary description of the existing environment within close proximity to the proposed site. Descriptions of the existing environment from other specific views and locations within the wider historic urban landscape include O'Connell Street⁷, Mountjoy Square⁸, Botanic Gardens⁹, Phibsborough Road and Royal Canal¹⁰, Mountjoy Street, The Black Church and Western Way¹¹, North Great George's Street¹², Clontarf Road and Drumcondra Road¹³ and other views within the historic urban landscape¹⁴.

Site Location

The proposed site is located to the east of the 19th century Mater Misericordiae Hospital (Protected Structure), to the rear of Nos. 30 – 38 Eccles Street (Protected Structures) and the new Mater Adult Hospital currently under construction fronting onto the North Circular Road and within the existing Mater Hospital carpark on Eccles Street. The Mater Hospital complex is contained to the east by the rear boundary of the Leo Street Estate¹⁵. The site is located in what was part of the Gardiner Estate developed in the 18th century.

Mater Misericordiae Hospital

The Mater Hospital, which forms a termination to Eccles Street at its junction with Berkeley Road, is a fine well-executed stone two-storey over semi-basement mid-19th century hospital building designed by John Bourke with a central advanced breakfront¹⁶.

Eccles Street

Originally residential but now largely in office and medical use, Eccles Street retains a significant amount of its Georgian three and four-storey over basement brick terraced buildings and Protected Structures with the majority surviving on the south side of the street. A fine terrace of rendered late 18th century buildings Nos. 30 – 38 (Protected Structures) survive to the east of the 20th century hostel building adjacent to the Mater Hospital¹⁷.

Berkeley Road

A terrace of late 19th century two-storey brick houses faces the west range of the 19th century Mater Hospital on Berkeley Road¹⁸.

⁵ Section 14.5, Volume 2, EIS

⁶ Section 14.6, Volume 2, EIS

⁷ Section 14.5.3.1, Volume 2, EIS

⁸ Section 14.5.3.2, Volume 2 EIS

⁹ Section 14.5.3.3, Volume 2 EIS

¹⁰ Section 14.5.3.4, Volume 2 EIS

¹¹ Section 14.5.3.5, Volume 2 EIS

¹² Section 14.5.3.6, Volume 2 EIS

¹³ Section 14.5.3.7, Volume 2 EIS

¹⁴ Section 14.5.3.8, Volume 2 EIS

¹⁵ Sections 14.5.1, 14.5.2, 14.4.3, 14.4.5

¹⁶ Sections 14.4.5, 14.5.1.1, Volume 2 EIS

¹⁷ Sections 14.4.5, 14.5.1.2, Volume 2 EIS

¹⁸ Section 14.5.1.1, Volume 2 EIS

Berkeley Street

The western side of Berkeley Street comprises predominantly two-storey 19th century brick terraces with residential above commercial/shop premises at ground floor level, with St. Vincent Street, Sarsfield Street, O'Connell Avenue and Geraldine Street leading off to the west comprising 19th century single and two storey brick terraces¹⁹. St. Joseph's Church (Protected Structure) constructed of hewn granite in gothic revival style designed by O'Neill and Byrne and built by James McCormack in 1874 is located on the east side of Berkeley Street adjacent to the memorial park laid out in 1872²⁰. Its tower is one of the important landmarks visible in the vicinity of the site.

North Circular Road

The North Circular Road opened as a toll road in 1768, with the tolls abolished in 1856. The area of the North Circular Road within the immediate environs and to the north of the proposed site comprise two storey brick terraced buildings on the south side between Leo Street and Dorset Street to the east and Berkeley Road and Phibsborough Road to the west²¹. The terraced buildings on the north side of the street between Glengarriff Parade and Dorset Street are mainly two-storey, with some higher modern apartment buildings. Mountjoy Prison designed by Joshua Jebb between 1847- 50 sits on the north side of the North Circular Road to the north of the Mater Hospital Quadrangle²².

Leo Street, St. Joseph's Street, Josephine Avenue and Leo Avenue

A series of streets to the east of the Mater Hospital complex including Leo Street, St. Joseph's Street, Josephine Avenue and Leo Avenue retain 19th century two-storey terraced brick houses, with a number of larger terraced Protected Structures on Synnott Place²³.

St. George's Church

St. George's Church (Protected Structure) located on Temple Street designed by renowned architect Francis Johnston in 1801 is one of the most important landmarks in the vicinity of the site. Its spire is visible from many locations within the city and the church is visible from the Mater Hospital looking east along Eccles Street²⁴.

Baseline assessment

The assessment comprised an appraisal of the impact of the proposed development on the Protected Structures within the site, the adjacent historic streetscapes, landmark buildings and the wider historic urban landscape of the city of Dublin. Photographic studies were made, by ourselves and others, of each of the parts of the receiving environment, to enable a comparative 'before' and 'after' assessment to be made of the visual impact of the new building on the surrounding built fabric. Historic and cartographic research was carried out on each subject, and the significance of the receiving environment, including individual buildings and streetscapes, was set out. An evaluation system was developed following review of best practice and international guidelines and each subject was evaluated in light of the significance of and sensitivity to change of the receiving environment and impacts were assessed in terms of their being beneficial, negligible or adverse on a low to high scale. Mitigation measures and residual impacts were identified.

¹⁹ Section 14.5.2.5, Volume 2 EIS

²⁰ Section 14.5.2.4, Volume 2 EIS

²¹ Section 14.5.2.7, Volume 2 EIS

²² Section 14.5.2.7, Volume 2 EIS

²³ Section 14.5.2.6, Volume 2 EIS

²⁴ Section 14.5.2.2, Volume 2 EIS

3.3 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ARISING FROM PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

3.3.1 Construction Phase Potential Impacts

Direct and Indirect Impacts on the Architectural Heritage

The assessment identifies two categories of impacts, direct impacts which involve change to the fabric of historic buildings, and indirect impacts, which relate to change in the setting of historic buildings.

There will be a direct impact on the Protected Structures within the Mater Hospital site. Direct impacts include the demolition of Rosary House²⁵ for which permission to demolish has already been granted, and the Radiology Unit of c.1922²⁶; these two buildings merit preservation by record. In other respects the direct impact on buildings are generally beneficial, with the removal of a number of buildings of poor quality and the exposition of the east façade of the Mater Hospital²⁷ and the reinstatement of some missing features. A protocol has been set out in the structural engineer's report to address any potential direct physical impacts of the demolition, excavation and construction activities on the historic built fabric and Protected Structures in the environs of the site.

The construction of a four storey 'front' block along Eccles Street²⁸ is assessed as having a beneficial impact on the streetscape. The demolition of 'parasitic accretions' within the main hospital building and to the rear of Nos. 30 – 38 Eccles Street are also assessed as having a beneficial impact.

However, as the main large and distinctive building will be visible from many locations, there will be an adverse visual impact on key views, streetscapes and landmark buildings within the close environs of the site and the wider historic urban landscape. Graded on a scale of 1 to 5, low to high impact, most of the indirect impacts are adverse. The adverse impact on the setting of St George's Church²⁹ will be high. There are identifiable adverse impacts on some of the architectural streetscapes of the city, such as North Great George's Street³⁰ and O'Connell Street³¹.

3.3.2 We have set out the potential impacts on the Architectural Heritage in Section 14.5³².

²⁵ Section 14.5.1.3, Volume 2 EIS

²⁶ Section 14.5.1.4, Volume 2 EIS

²⁷ Section 14.5.1.1, Volume 2 EIS

²⁸ Section 14.5.2.1, Volume 2 EIS

²⁹ Section 14.5.2.2, Volume 2 EIS

³⁰ Section 14.5.3.6, Volume 2 EIS

³¹ Section 14.5.3.1, Volume 2 EIS

³² Volume 2 EIS

3.4 MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED

3.4.1 Construction Phase

A protocol has been set out in the structural engineer's report to address any potential direct physical impacts of the demolition, excavation and construction activities on the historic built fabric and Protected Structures in the environs of the site.

Possible mitigation for demolition of early buildings in the complex – Rosary House and Former Radiology Building – would be provided by the provision of a photographic record and measured survey of the subject buildings prior to demolition and the salvage of materials of high quality for reuse elsewhere where appropriate.

It is proposed to mitigate the impact of the proposed demolition and construction works by a process of monitoring of vibration and crack formation throughout the works as described in O'Connor Sutton Cronin's report on the 'Effect of Basement Construction on Protected Structures' 7th February 2011 (updated 13th July 2011).

To the extent that the formation of cracks of up to 2mm will precipitate immediate repair, the adverse impact is slight. To the extent that the formation of cracks exceeding 2mm will result in the works being arrested and the methodology of the works modified to avoid a direct risk of damage to the building, the potential adverse impact is low.

3.4.2 Operational Phase

As most of the identified impacts relate to the scale and location of the proposed development, and as neither is open to change consistent with meeting the detailed briefing and accommodation requirements, no mitigation is possible beyond that already reflected in the form and massing of the building.

3.2 PREDICTED RESIDUAL IMPACTS (i.e., POST-MITIGATION)

3.5.1 Residual impacts being those that persist subsequent to the implementation of mitigation measures, given the absence of mitigation measures beyond those already foreseen in the design, the residual impacts can be deemed to be co-extensive with those impacts outlined and assessed in section 14.5.

3.5.2 Summary

This assessment of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed development on the existing historic urban fabric includes the identification of those qualities that people value, setting out an understanding of the receiving environment, its significance, and generally identifying the elements that contribute to its special interest for the purpose of identifying the extent to which the proposed new building modifies, for better or worse, those qualities.

The city block that contains the Mater has been host to this major public building since the middle of the 19th century. Its long low form is assertive through its scale and design and the employment of granite rather than brick for the main façade.

There has been a progressive coarsening of the urban grain within the urban block which contains the site of the Mater, since the introduction of the main institutional use in the 19th century and the current proposal can be understood as an intensification of that progression. Having reinstated the streetline along Eccles Street with a granite-faced structure of a height comparable to the older buildings along the street, the remainder of the proposed development will be considerably higher and greater in mass and bulk than all of the built fabric in its vicinity, including the Protected Structures on and within the environs of the subject site, in the North Georgian Core and in the wider historic urban landscape. As this distinctive building will be visible from many locations, there will be an adverse visual impact on some key views, streetscapes and landmark buildings within the close environs of the site and the wider historic urban landscape.

4. Submissions and Responses

A number of persons made submissions or responses to the Board in relation to the issues of the potential impact of the proposed development on the architectural heritage within the context of the subject site and environs and the wider context of the historic city of Dublin.

Our response to the issues are set out below.

4.1 Issue – Inadequate demonstration of the potential impact on Dublin’s historic core and the north Georgian core and the wider district

Submission:

A number of submissions³³ raise concerns regarding the potential ‘serious’ impact of the proposed development on Dublin’s historic core and the ‘sensitive’ north Georgian core in particular with regard to properties, streets and vistas.

Response:

The Historic Urban Landscape is addressed in EIS Chapter 14.5.3. where the impact on each of the identified urban set pieces is assessed and the aggregate of impacts are identified.

In 14.5.3.7, a statement of the impact on the approach to the city along Clontarf Road, and in 14.5.3.8 in an assessment of other general views, the impact on the city as a whole is addressed.

A 3-D model of the central city has been made available by Modelworks in response to concerns raised. This model has been used to identify those locations within the city from which the proposed structure may be visible from the public domain. Based on visibility, studies have been prepared which demonstrate the extent of the building that is visible allowing an assessment of the degree to which the new building may influence the appreciation of protected structures and architectural conservation areas. Perhaps surprisingly, the visibility of the building from street level on the south side of the city is limited. As already identified, the building will be prominent along O’Connell Street.

The proposed development will not be visible from the Wellington Memorial. The city skyline as viewed from the South Bull Wall will include the new building. Its impact will be negligible.

The new structure will appear as a dominant form on the skyline as viewed from the Guinness Storehouse. It will be anomalous and of a different scale to the host landscape

³³ For example submission dated 6th September 2011 received from Dublin City Council p.33,35; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Heritage Council p.3,5; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Grangegorman Residents Alliance (GRA) p.1,2; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from Mountjoy Square Society p.1,2; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from An Taisce p.2; submission dated 14th September 2011 received The Irish Land Trust p.1,2

Additionally, English Heritage have issued in May 2011 new guidance on the assessment of new buildings on historic views. That document suggests that impacts be assessed on every historic building the appreciation of which may be influenced by the proposed structure. Our own assessment system is generally consistent with that guidance.

4.2 Issue – Potential impact on the skyline of the historic city of Dublin

Submission:

A number of submissions³⁴ raise concerns that the proposed building will dominate and have an adverse impact on the skyline of the immediate environs of the site and of the wider context of the city, including areas that are at a very considerable distance from the site.

Response:

We refer to EIS Chapter 14.5.3.7, 14.5.3.8 : we agree that the building be visible but have assessed its impact as negligible when viewed from Clontarf, Harold's Cross – Grand Canal, Finglas Road – Glasnevin Cemetery, Summerhill Parade – Clarkes Bridge; from St. John's Road West as indirect, low, adverse, from Drumcondra Road Lower as indirect, medium, adverse.

4.3 Issue – Potential impact on the architectural heritage and protected structures, including the urban set piece of St. George's Church, within the environs of the site

Submission:

A number of submissions³⁵ raise concerns regarding the impact on the 'urban set piece of St. George's Church' and that the proposed building will 'be out of sympathy with surrounding Georgian and Victorian Buildings', that 'the Georgian façade of Eccles Street will be totally destroyed' and the proposed building 'will destroy the historical Architectural character of the area'.

Response:

³⁴ For example submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Nuala, Grace and Evelyn Morris p.1,2; submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Mary Gallagher p.2; submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Terry Mallin; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from An Taisce p.14; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Berkeley Environment Awareness Group p.1; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from The Irish Land Trust p.1; submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Mac Eoin Architects p.3.

³⁵ For example submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Nuala, Grace and Evelyn Morris p.1,2; submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Terry Mallin; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from BLEND Residents' Association p.12; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from An Taisce p.1,3,4; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from Mountjoy Square Society p.2; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Berkeley Environment Awareness Group p.1

The potential impacts of the proposed development on Protected Structures, streetscapes, significant buildings within the immediate vicinity of the Mater Hospital Complex and within the wider Historic Urban Landscape have been set out in EIS Chapter 14.5.

The direct and indirect potential impacts on the urban context of Phibsborough/Mountjoy area – ‘low-rise character’ of ‘Victorian, Georgian, Edwardian and modern building stock of architectural, social or technical interest’ are set out in EIS Chapter 14.5.2.7, 14.5.3.4, 14.5.3.5 and associated views.

The potential impact of the proposed development on Eccles Street is described in 14.5.1.2 and 14.5.2.1.

The potential impacts on St. George’s Church are set out in 14.5.2.2.

4.4 Issue – Potential impact on the consideration of the Historic City Core of Dublin as a UNESCO World Heritage Site

Submission:

A number of submissions³⁶ raise concerns that the potential impact of the proposed development could ‘undermine the World Heritage Site Submission’ for the Historic City of Dublin.

Response:

Refer to EIS Chapter 14.2.1: 4.1.3 and Dublin City Council Development Plan Policy FC57³⁷ ‘*To support the designation of Dublin as a World Heritage Site*’³⁸.

The Development Plan identifies large parts of that area as the Georgian Core: the subject site lies outside of that core area, but is within the canals. In this context, the World Heritage Site concept of a ‘Buffer Zone’ is relevant.

4.5 Issue – explanation required on the weighting/scoring system in EIS Chapter 14.5 relating to impact assessments

Submission:

A submission³⁹ was received which raised concern regarding ‘how these weighted scores were arrived at... and the scores attributed seem arbitrary and open to question’.

Response:

An explanation of the scoring system employed is provided in EIS Chapter 14.5.3.

The distinction between direct and indirect impacts is also stated: where there is an alteration to or loss of fabric, the impacts are described as direct. Indirect impacts

³⁶ For example submission dated 13th September 2011 received from The Irish Georgian Society p.1; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Heritage Council p.3; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from An Taisce p.2; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from The Irish Land Trust p.2;

³⁷ DCC Development Plan 7.2.5.6 Dublin City Heritage Plan p.115

³⁸ EIS Chapter 14 p.2,3

³⁹ submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Mac Eoin Architects p.3

are those which comprise a change in the context or setting of Protected Structures and historic buildings, historic streetscapes, Conservation Areas, Architectural Conservation Areas or the general Historic Urban Landscape.

Impacts, direct or indirect, are classified as beneficial, negligible or adverse, the intensity of impact being rated between 1 (low) and 5 (high). The significance of the receiving environment is rated between 1 (low) and 5 (high). The sensitivity to change of the receiving environment is rated between 1 (robust) and 5 (sensitive). The assessment is facilitated by the Verifiable Visual Images prepared by the proposers.

4.6 Issue – non-compliance with objectives set out in Phibsborough/Mountjoy LAP relating to architectural heritage

Submission:

A number of submissions⁴⁰ have been received that raised concerns that the proposal ignores the evaluations LAP p.46 'An appreciation of context and character is at the core of good design....' and 'the Phibsborough/Mountjoy area requires additional sensitivity on account of the historic importance of the receiving environment and the area's rich heritage of protected structures, conservation areas, residential enclaves and historically significant open spaces'.

The submissions also refer to concerns regarding compliance with the following LAP objectives:

Key Building Height Objective No. 8 (Height and Massing) 05:15 p.54

Key Landmark Objective Nos. 3 & 8 (Skyline, important views and vistas) 05:16 p.55

DCC Development Plan 2011 – 2017 15.10.2 (Residential Conservation Areas) Land Use Zoning Objective Z2

The subject site 'is located in one of the most important conservation areas of Dublin City with regard to their unique contribution and importance to the heritage of the city of Dublin....the special value of conservation areas lies in the architectural design and scale of these areas.....is completely unsuitable for the scale, form, location and type of development proposed....'.

Response:

The aims and objectives of the LAP were taken into account in arriving at our assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development. Generally the impacts have been assessed as adverse.

The potential impacts of the proposed developments have been set out in EIS Chapter 14.

⁴⁰ For example submission dated 12th September 2011 received from Mac Eoin Architects p.1; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from Robert M.Foley & Associates Architects p.3; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from BLEND Resident's Association p.9; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from The Irish Georgian Society p.2,3

4.7 Issue – potential impact on Leo Street, Josephine Avenue, Joseph Street, Leo Avenue

Submission:

A submission⁴¹ has been received which states that 'we would like to retain the architectural state of the area and the construction of this building will downgrade this'.

Response:

Leo Avenue has already been compromised by the construction of the Adult hospital, as noted in 14.5.2.6, which we assessed as having a level 4 indirect adverse impact. We assess the impact of the new higher building as having a level 3 indirect adverse impact.

4.8 Issue – non-compliance with Dublin City Council Development Plan 2011 – 2017 policies regarding criteria for Tall Buildings relating to architectural heritage

Submission:

A number of submissions⁴² have been received that raised concerns regarding the potential impact of inserting such substantial building on the surrounding urban fabric, contrary to the Assessment Criteria for High Buildings (17.6.3) set out in the current Development Plan including in particular the requirement to 'successfully incorporate the building into the existing urban grain; protect important views, landmarks, prospects, roofscapes and vistas;

consider the impact on the scale and quality of existing streetscapes, spaces and buildings;

consider the impact on protected structures, conservation areas and the architectural character and setting of existing buildings, streets and spaces of artistic civic and historic importance in particular the building's relationship with the historic city centre, the river Liffey and quays, Trinity College, Dublin Castle, the historic squares and precincts, the Phoenix Park, The Royal Hospital Kilmainham and the canals.

Response:

The potential impacts of the proposed development on Protected Structures, streetscapes, significant buildings within the immediate vicinity of the Mater Hospital Complex and within the wider Historic Urban Landscape have been set out in EIS Chapter 14.5.

⁴¹ For example submission dated 13th September 2011 received from Rita A. White p.1

⁴² For example a submission dated 13th September 2011 from the Irish Georgian Society p.2; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from An Taisce p.5; submission dated 13th September 2011 received from BLEND Resident's Association p.15,16;

4.9 Issue – potential impact on Conservation Areas, Architectural Conservation Areas, and Proposed Conservation Areas

Submission: A number of submissions⁴³ have been received that raised concerns regarding the potential impact of the development on Conservation Areas, Architectural Conservation Areas and Proposed Architectural Conservation Areas.

Response: The impacts on the local context has been assessed and in that context the impact on ACA'S has been addressed.

4.10 Issue – potential impacts have not been documented....etc.

Submission: A submission⁴⁴ has been received that raised concerns that the potential impacts have not been documented in the EIS in relation to the following buildings mentioned in the nomination papers (for the World heritage Site submission): Parnell Square; James Gandon's Buildings – the Four Courts, The King's Inns, The Custom's House; Marsh's Library; Trinity College; The Phoenix Park; Henrietta Street.

Response:

Most potential impacts have been assessed. The building will not be visible from Parnell Square. The top of the building will be a distant object on the skyline when viewing the Customs House from Sir John Rogerson's Quay and will not have any influence on the appreciation of that building. The building will not otherwise be visible within the necessary setting of the Four Courts. The building will not be visible when viewing the King's Inns from Constitution Hill. The building will not be within the setting of Marshes's Library, The TCD Museum Building, Henrietta Street. While there may be glimpses of the building from within the Phoenix Park, the building will not be visible from the Wellington Monument.

4.11 Issue – non-compliance with the Venice Charter and the Granada Convention

Submission:

A submission⁴⁵ has been received that raised concerns that 'the proposed development would be contrary to Articles 1, 2, 3 & 4 of the Venice Charter... Article 6 ... states unequivocally that the conservation of buildings "implies preserving a setting which is not out of scale"'.

The proposal is 'in contravention of the Granada Convention⁴⁶ for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe'.

⁴³ For example a submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Heritage Council p.7; submission dated 14th September 2011 received from An Taisce p.3;

⁴⁴ A submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Heritage Council p.4

⁴⁵ For example a submission dated 13th September 2011 received from BLEND Resident's Association p.34; a submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Grangegorman Residents Alliance (GRA) p.3

⁴⁶ Article 7 refers: 'In the surrounding monuments, within groups of buildings and within sites, each party undertakes to promote measures for the general enhancement of the environment'.

Definition of architectural heritage includes;

Response:

Irish Planning Law reflects the State's undertakings under the Granada Convention. The Venice Charter has been taken into account in arriving at an assessment of the nature of impacts.

4.12 Issue – use of good practice methodologies

Submission:

A submission⁴⁷ was received raising a concern that 'several good practice methodologies specifically tailored for the evaluation of the impact of development on the historic environment and the character of areas, should have been provided as part of the EIS'.

Response:

The EIS has been prepared in the context of Irish legislative provisions and published Irish guidance and with reference to international guidance and best practice.

4.13 Issue – impact of proposed development on the setting of a sample of specific heritage assets

Submission:

A submission⁴⁸ was received providing a table of impacts⁴⁹ on the setting on a sample of specific heritage assets.

Response:

Locations where the building will be seen in varying degrees from the public domain at street level:

1. Prospect Square & Prospect Avenue: View 7 from Botanic Gardens is considered to be indicative of the potential impact on Prospect Square & Prospect Avenue.
5. Royal Canal Conservation Area: Views 15, 16 17 representative of the potential impact on Royal Canal in relatively close proximity to the site.
11. Synnott Place: The buildings are already compromised by the new Adult Hospital Block.
14. St. Joseph's Church, Berkeley Road: Views 29 & 31 clearly indicate the impact on the Church, and documented in 14.5.2.4.
20. Fontenoy Street & vicinity (Proposed ACA Blessington Basin & Environs: scale of potential impact demonstrated by images from Blessington Basin.

Monuments – all buildings and structures of conspicuous historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, social or technical interest, including their fixtures and fittings;

Groups of buildings – homogenous groups of urban or rural buildings conspicuous for their historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, social or technical interest which are sufficiently coherent to form topographically definable units.

⁴⁷ a submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Heritage Council p.6

⁴⁸ a submission dated 14th September 2011 received from the Heritage Council p.11-17

⁴⁹ Table A

- 21. The Black Church, Protected Structure Western Way – the building will be visible as illustrated in View 36. The impact is as indicated in EIS Chapter 14.5.3.5.
- 27. 1 – 68 O’Connell Street. EIS Chapter 14.5.3.1 sets out the significance of O’Connell Street and describes the impact on the receiving environment/setting.
- 37, 38, 39. Cornmarket, St. Audeons Church, Schoolhouse Lane West: based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping, it is possible that there will be glimpses of the building visible from these locations.
- 41. Christchurch Cathedral Fishamble Street: Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping, a small part of the building will be visible but will not detract from the Christchurch – negligible indirect impact.

Locations where (based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping the building and/or additional Photomontages provided) the building will not be visible from the public domain at street level:

- 6. St. Peter’s Church, Phibsborough (View 18)
- 24. Abbey Presbyterian Church Protected Structure, Parnell Square (View 35)
- 25. 1 – 12 Parnell Square Protected Structures
- 26. King’s Inns, Constitution Hill Protected Structure (View 37)
- 28. 77-81 Kings Street North Smithfield (View 08). Note - the building will be seen from the top of the Smithfield viewing tower, but this building is inaccessible at present.
- 29. Courthouse & former debtor’s prison, Green Street
- 31. Custom House - a small part of the building may be visible but will not detract from the Custom House – negligible indirect impact (View 39)
- 32. The Quill Arran Quay
- 33. The Four Courts, Inns Quay
- 34. 1-2 Inns Quay
- 35. Ha’penny Bridge
- 40. Christchurch Cathedral & Synod hall
- 42. The Museum Building, Trinity College Dublin.
- 43. St. Patrick’s Cathedral
- 44. Marsh’s Library, St. Patrick’s Close
- 45. 80 Aungier Street
- 46. 52-54 Grafton Street
- 48. Phoenix Park – the building will not be visible from the Wellington Monument (View 38) but it is likely to be visible from a number of other locations within the Park.

5. Conclusion

Notwithstanding the wide range of interested parties and the large number of observation made, it is asserted that all of the issues identified in third party submissions have been addressed in the EIS.

CLARIFICATIONS & ERRATUM

1.0 Additional information in relation to Architectural Conservation Areas/Conservation Areas/Local Area Plans etc. regarding Protected Structures/buildings/groups of buildings as assessed in 14.5.

14.5.1.1 The Mater Misericordiae Hospital – Protected Structure

The Mater Misericordiae Hospital is located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

The western boundary on Berkeley Road and part of southwest boundary on Eccles Street are within a designated Conservation Area.

14.5.1.2 Nos. 30 – 38 Eccles Street – Protected Structures

These buildings are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

14.5.1.3 Rosary House

Rosary House is located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

14.5.1.4 Former Radiology Building

The former Radiology Building is located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

14.5.2.1 Eccles Street (including a number of Protected Structures)

Eccles Street is located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan and the west end of Eccles Street is located within a designated Conservation Area.

14.5.2.3 Nelson Street and St. Joseph's Parade, St. Joseph's Place, Blessington Place

These streets are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

14.5.2.4 St. Joseph's Church, Berkeley Street (Protected Structure)

St. Joseph's Church is located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan and is within a designated Conservation Area on Berkeley Street/Berkeley Road.

14.5.2.5 Blessington Street and Blessington Basin; Goldsmith Street, St. Vincent Street, Sarsfield Street, O'Connell Avenue, Geraldine Street

Blessington Street and Blessington Basin; Goldsmith Street, St. Vincent Street, Sarsfield Street, O'Connell Avenue, Geraldine Street are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

The east ends of St. Vincent Street, Sarsfield Street, O'Connell Avenue, and Geraldine Street are within a designated Conservation Area (Berkeley Road/Berkeley Street).

Blessington Basin is within a designated Conservation Area.

Proposed Architectural Conservation Area to areas at the west and south sides of Blessington Basin.

14.5.2.6 Leo Street and adjacent streets including St. Joseph Street, Synnott Place, Synnott Row, De Valera Place, Josephine Avenue, Leo Avenue, Eccles Place, Dorset Street
Leo Street and adjacent streets including St. Joseph Street, Synnott Place, Synnott Row, De Valera Place, Josephine Avenue, Leo Avenue, Eccles Place, and the western side of Dorset Street between the Royal Canal and Granby Row are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

14.5.2.7 North Circular Road and Environs

North Circular Road and Environs are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan. The North Circular Road that extends between Berkeley Road to the east and Dalymount to the west is located within the Proposed Phibsborough Centre Architectural Conservation Area.

14.5.3.4 Phibsborough Road and Royal Canal

Phibsborough Road and Royal Canal are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan.

14.5.3.5 Mountjoy Street, The Black Church and Western Way

Mountjoy Street, The Black Church and the north side of Western Way are located within the Phibsborough/Mountjoy Local Area Plan and are in close proximity to the Proposed Blessington Basin & Environs Architectural Conservation Area.

14.5.3.8 Other views within the Historic Urban Landscape

1.0 St. John's Road West: The lands to the south of St. John's Road West including The Royal Hospital at Kilmainham, and Heuston Station on the north side are within a designated Conservation Area.

4.0 Harold's Cross – Grand Canal:

The Grand Canal is within a designated Conservation Area.

5.0 Finglas Road:

The north side of part of the east end of Finglas Road adjoining Prospect Way is within Prospect Square/DeCourcy Square and Environs Architectural Conservation Area.

14.5.3.9 Haymarket/Smithfield

Haymarket/Smithfield are located within a designated Conservation Area.

Cabra Road/Dalymount

Cabra Road/Dalymount (and St. Peter's Church – a Protected Structure) are located within the Proposed Phibsborough Centre Architectural Conservation Area.

2.0 Additional Impact assessments based on additional photomontages provided:

Parnell Square East and Abbey Presbyterian Church (Findlater's) View 35: the building is not visible.

Mountjoy Street/Western Way View 36: The building will be visible from this location but the impact assessment remains as noted in 14.5.3.5 (iv) 1.0

The Grounds of King's Inns, Constitution Hill View 37: the building is not visible.

Wellington Monument, Phoenix Park View 38: the building is not visible.

Custom House taken from City Quay View 39: the building is not visible.

3.0 Summary of impacts on Conservation Areas, Architectural Conservation Areas and Proposed Architectural Conservation Areas

Architectural Conservation Areas ⁵⁰	Summary of potential impacts
1. O'Connell Street	The potential impact on O'Connell Street is set out in 14.5.3.1.
2. Grafton Street & Environs	Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping, the building will not be visible from within the public domain of Grafton Street.
3. Prospect Square/De Courcy Square and Environs The majority of the buildings are late Victorian and Edwardian two-storey terraces houses with red and yellow brick facades.	View 7 from the Botanic Gardens is considered to be indicative of the potential impact on Prospect Square and Prospect Avenue. Refer to EIS Chapter 14.5.3.3.
4. South City Retail Quarter Includes William Street South, Drury Street, George's Street, Exchequer Street, Wicklow Street, Suffolk Street, Church Lane, Anne Street South, part of Duke Street and Duke Lane, Dawson Street. Grafton Street is an ACA in its own right.	Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping, the building will not be visible from the public domain within the South City Retail Quarter.
5. Dartmouth Square and Environs One of a series of formal Victorian residential squares laid out in Dublin in the 19 th century, the landscaped central area with mature planting is surrounded on four sides by two-storey over basement terraced red brick houses.	Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping including St. Stephen's Green and Merrion Square, as the building will not be visible from within St. Stephen's Green or Merrion Square (both larger spaces than Dartmouth Square), it is unlikely that it will be visible from the public domain within Dartmouth Square and the surrounding streets. If the building is visible, it will be at a distance sufficient to render the potential impact on the Square and surrounding buildings as indirect and negligible.
6. Capel Street and Environs	Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping, the building will become visible on the skyline when viewed from the junction between the north end of Capel Street and Bolton Street. The building will not be visible along the length of Capel Street itself.
7. Marino Casino	It is possible that the building might be visible on the skyline when viewed from the curtilage of the Marino Casino. The potential indirect adverse impact on the Marino Casino will be low - negligible.
8. Thomas Street and Environs	Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping, the building will not be visible from Thomas Street but will become visible on the skyline when viewed Cornmarket at the east end of Thomas Street. The potential indirect adverse impact in this location would be of a medium order, in the context of St. Audeon's Church (Protected Structure). It is unlikely that the building will be visible from Francis Street, Meath Street and The Coombe.
9. Chapelizod and Environs	It is unlikely that the building will be visible from Chapelizod.

⁵⁰ Dublin City Council Development Plan 2011-2017

Architectural Conservation Areas⁵¹ (continued)	Summary of potential impacts (continued)
10. Fitzwilliam Square and Environs	Based on Modelworks cityscape modeling/mapping including St. Stephen's Green and Merrion Square, as the building will not be visible from within St. Stephen's Green or Merrion Square (both larger spaces than Dartmouth Square), it is unlikely that it will be visible from the public domain within Square.
Proposed Architectural Conservation Areas⁵²	
1. Elmwood Ave Upper & Lower, Ranelagh 2. Colliers Ave, Ranelagh 3. Westmoreland Park, Ranelagh 4. Ranelagh Ave 5. Temple Place, Ranelagh 9. Belmont Rd./Mount Eden, Donnybrook	It is unlikely that the building will be visible from proposed architectural conservation areas 1 – 5, 9.
6. St Lawrence Rd., Clontarf 7. Haddon Rd./Victoria Road, Clontarf 8. Hollybrook Rd., Clontarf	St. Lawrence Road, Holybrook Road and Haddon Road run in a north/south direction. These tree-lined avenues comprise mainly two-storey brick terraces and semi detached late 19 th century early 20 th century houses. Victoria Road runs in an east/west direction and is also a tree-lined avenue comprising mainly two-storey brick terraces and semi detached late 19 th century early 20 th century houses. Based on View 3, the proposed building may be visible as a distant object on the skyline from within these streets, but the potential indirect impact will be negligible.
Phibsborough Centre	Refer to View 18 (Cabra Road/Dalymount) and EIS Chapter 14.5.3.4. SoE 4.13 – the building will not be visible from St. Peter's Church.
Great Western Square & Environs	It is possible that the building might be visible from within the public domain of Great Western Square and environs. The historic built fabric comprises terraces of two-storey brick houses. The potential indirect medium adverse impact would be similar to that identified in EIS Chapter 14.5.2.5 (iv) 2.0.
Blessington Basin & Environs	Refer to EIS Chapter 14.5.2.5.

⁵¹ Dublin City Council Development Plan 2011-2017

⁵² Appendix 11, Dublin City Council Development Plan 2011-2017

4. General Corrections noted

Page no.	Item	Correction
4	Conservation Areas	There are two of proposed Architectural Conservation Areas in the vicinity of the subject site.
5		Urban Form and Spatial Criteria (text emboldened)
21	14.4.5 The Record of Protected Structures	'plan form executed in and well resolved in the classic roman order...'
31	14.5.3 Historic Urban Landscape	'The appraisal addresses issues at three different scales in increasing order:
32	14.5.3 Historic Urban Landscape: Assessment Criteria	Significance of receiving environment: 1=low; 2=low-medium; 3=medium; 4=medium-high; 5=high
32	14.5.1.1 The Mater Misericordiae Hospital	Protected Structure ref. 2437
35	14.5.1.1 Western Range	'... faces the 20 th century two-storey brick façade'
38	14.5.1.2 Nos. 30-38 Eccles Street	Views 26, 28
38	14.5.1.2 Nos. 30-38 Eccles Street	Protected Structure ref. 2428 - 2436
46	14.5.2.1 Eccles Street (ii) Historic Background & Significance	'As noted in item 14.4.5 and 14.4.8'
49	14.5.2.2 St. George's Church	Protected Structure ref. 3572
51	14.5.2.2 St. George's Church(vi)2.0	'...the curvilinear modeling of the upper ward storeys'.
53	14.5.2.4 St. Joseph's Church	Views 29, 31
53	14.5.2.4 St. Joseph's Church	Protected Structure ref. 736
54	14.5.2.4 St. Joseph's Church (iv)	Views 29, 31
55	14.5.2.5 Blessington St & Basin etc.	Views 29, 31
63	14.5.3 (reference no. corrected)	Historic Urban Landscape
69	14.5.3.5 & (iv) Mountjoy Street, etc	Views 32 and 36 (additional view 36 included)
70	14.5.3.6 North Great George's Street	View 34
71	14.5.3.7 (reference no. corrected)	Clontarf Road (View 03), Drumcondra Road (View 13)
72	Page 75 - Mitigation measures proposed: Construction phase	To the extent that the formation of cracks of up to 2mm will precipitate immediate repair, the adverse impact is slight. To the extent that the formation of cracks exceeding 2mm will result in the works being arrested and the methodology of the works modified to avoid a direct risk of damage to the building, the potential adverse impact is low.

5. Appendix 14a – Extract from the Record of Protected Structures

Appendix 1 includes extracts from the Record of Protected Structures from the Dublin City Council Development Plan 2005 – 2011 Volume 3. The corresponding reference numbers from the current Development Plan 2011 – 2017 have been added to the table in the second column. (*Amendments)

Reference 2005-2011 Volume 3	Reference 2005-2011 Volume 3*	Number	Address	Description
732			Berkeley Road/Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Railings, plinth, walls and gates enclosing park at the corner of Eccles Street. Includes Celtic cross commemorating the Four Masters
733	736		Berkeley Road, Dublin 7	St Joseph's Church
734	738	1	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
735	739	2	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
736	740	3	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
737	741	4	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
738	742	5	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
739	743	6	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
740	744	7	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
741	745	16	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
742	746	17	Berkeley Street*, Dublin 7	Georgian-style house
2374	2327	4	Dorset Street Lower, Dublin 1	Licensed premises
2375	2328	23-24	Dorset Street Lower, Dublin 1	Houses excluding shopfront
2376	2329	25	Dorset Street Lower, Dublin 1	Houses excluding shopfront
-	2330	12	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
-	2331	41	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
-	2332	43	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
2380	2333	71	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Licensed premises at the corner of Hardwicke Place
2381	2334	73	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Licensed premises at the corner of Hardwicke Street
2382	2335	75	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Doorcase
2383	2336	76	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Doorcase
2384	2337	77	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Doorcase
2385	2338	78	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Doorcase
2386	2339	79	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Doorcase
-	2340	89	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
-	2341	90	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
-	2342	91	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
-	2343	131-132	Dorset Street Upper, Dublin 1	Tower and front elevations of former fire station
2462	2437		Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Mater Misericordiae Hospital, original stone buildings
2463	2428	30	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2464	2429	31	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2465	2430	32	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2466	2431	33	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2467	2432	34	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2468	2433	35	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2469	2434	36	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2470	2435	37	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House

Reference 2005-2011 Volume 3	Reference 2005-2011 Volume 3*	Number	Address	Description
2471	2436	38	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2472	2438	39	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2473	2439	40	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2474	2440	41	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2475	2441	42	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2476	2442	43	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2477	2443	44	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2478	2444	45	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2479	2445	46	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2480	2446	47	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2481	2447	48	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2482	2448	49	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2483	2449	50	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2484	2450	51	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2485	2451	52	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2486	2452	53	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2487	2453	54	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian house
2488	2454	55	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2489	2455	56	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2490	2456	57	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2491	2457	58	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2492	2458	59	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2493	2459	60	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2494	2460	61	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2495	2461	62	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2496	2462	63	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2497	2463	64	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2498	2464	65	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2499	2465	66	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2500	2466	67	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2501	2467	70	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2502	2468	71	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2503	2469	72	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2504	2470	73	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2505	2471	74	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2506	2472	75	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2507	2473	76	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	Georgian House
2508	2474	77	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2509	2475	78	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2510	2476	79	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2511	2477	80	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
2512	2478	81	Eccles Street, Dublin 7	House
3156	3122	36	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3157	3123	37	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3158	3124	38	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3159	3125	39	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3160	3126	40	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3161	3127	41	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3162	3128	45	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3163	3129	46	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House

Reference 2005-2011 Volume 3	Reference 2005-2011 Volume 3*	Number	Address	Description
3164	3130	47	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3165	3131	48	Gardiner Street Upper, Dublin 1	House
3640	3572		Hardwicke Place, Dublin 1	St. George's Church
5916	5812	9	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5917	5813	10	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5918	5814	11	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5919	5815	12	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5920	5816	31	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5291	5817	32	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5922	5818	33	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5923	5819	34	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5924	5820	35	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
5925	5821	36	Nelson Street, Dublin 7	House
8143	7976	1	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	Commercial Premises
8144	7977	2	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8145	7978	3	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8146	7979	4	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8147	7980	5	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8148	7981	6	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8149	7982	7	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8150	7983	8	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8151	7984	9	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8152	7985	10	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8153	7986	11	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House
8154	7987	12	Synnott Place, Dublin 7	House