

Minutes of Meeting of the Moore St Advisory Group (Online)

19th March 2021 @ 2.30 p.m.,

Members in attendance were:

Tom Collins (Chairman),
Thomas Holbrook,
Catherine Kennedy,
John Daly,
Brian O’Neill,
(Catherine) Carmel Smyth,
James Connolly Heron,
Aengus O’Snodaigh TD,
Senator Mary Fitzpatrick,
Councillor Donna Cooney,
Councillor Nial Ring,
Councillor Eimear McCormack,
Nessa Foley,
Coilín O Reilly

Dave Farrell – Secretariat

1. Minutes of 12th March 2021

Approved subject to inclusion of reference to Architectural Conservation Area under Green Party proposals.

2. Matters Arising

James Connolly Heron queried whether Hammerson had provided images as requested and summaries of reports to date. Nessa Foley advised that the key personnel from Hammerson are currently on leave but the request has been made.

Nessa Foley advised that she had been in contact with Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) prior to the MSAG first meeting to ask if it would be willing to engage with the Group and it had said it would so - she will follow up with it to check when it is available. Councillor Cooney offered to provide details for a contact in TII to Nessa Foley. Deputy O’Snodaigh circulated the answer to a parliamentary question he had made to the Minister for Transport on the timeframe for delivery of Metro Link to the other members by email.

3. Discussion on Presentations to date from Hammerson, Sinn Féin and the Green Party.

The Chair opened to the floor any suggestions on how the Group might best approach its report to the Minister on the various plans and proposals viewed to date. He queried if it may be of benefit to appraise them under criteria such as how well each references the events of 1916, supports the ambitions of the market and how realisable the visions are. A detailed discussion was had on the matter. Key points as follows:

- Senator Fitzpatrick did not anticipate that the Group would act in a judging capacity but, having considered the proposals and plans, would make a recommendation to the Minister on the values and objectives to be pursued.
- Brian O'Neill pointed out that the group can also point to elements of proposals it agrees on and those it doesn't. He had some issues with the presentation from Sinn Féin, namely that; it had not been circulated, the Group has still not received information on who the Moore St. Trust is and that elements of what was presented differ hugely with what has been set out in the Bill recently introduced in the Oireachtas by Sinn Féin – e.g. demolition and reconstruction of modern buildings in sympathy with 1916 appearance (presentation) versus a preservation order proposal for the whole of the terrace (Bill). Catherine Smyth expressed similar concerns, pointing out that the Relatives Association need a copy of the presentation in order to discuss it with its executive committee and there needs to be clarity about whether this is a Sinn Féin proposal or Moore St. Trust proposal and who the members of the Moore St. Trust are.
- Deputy O'Snodaigh explained that what was presented was an alternative vision against which the Hammerson proposals could be appraised and committed to follow up to circulating the presentation which he advised is viewable online.
- Councillor Cooney pointed out the importance of deciding how to structure the recommendation within the limited time available to the Group given the need to report to the Minister before Hammerson makes its planning application and suggested that the Group can point to elements it agrees on and also those where it does not –e.g. the archway, the appearance of the White House.
- James Connolly Heron felt it important that the Group have access to the images requested from Hammerson to appraise them against those presented by Sinn Féin and the Green Party. He stated that, in the campaigns view, the proposals presented by Sean Ó Múirí go further in meeting the

recommendations of Securing History 1 than the Hammerson proposals. He also said that the State has a big role in the future of the area given its property ownership and the requirement for Ministerial Consent. He suggested that Hammerson will not create a centre of cultural importance as that is not its field.

- Senator Fitzpatrick expressed reservations about giving a view on the Hammerson Presentation given that plans have come and gone before on the area. She pointed out that it is important for the Group to focus on the opportunity it has to recommend to the Minister what the State can do, given the funding now available, with the monument and the market (e.g. DCC implementation plan)
- Nessa Foley pointed out that, under the TOR of the Group, its remit is to engage with Hammerson and to provide feedback to the Minister on its development proposals and that the Green Party and Sinn Féin plans are their party's aspirations for the area rather than something that the MSAG need to consider as viable plans for the area. She suggested that members of the MSAG were free to refer to the plans in commenting on the Hammerson plans.
- Coilín O'Reilly agreed that the TOR are clear on the remit of Group with regard to engagement with Hammerson and providing feedback on same and that the Group can refer to elements of other proposals that it would like to see in Hammerson's.
- John Daly pointed out that, ultimately, the matter will be decided on by the planning authorities but that the Group has an opportunity to provide feedback to both Hammerson and the Minister and may refer to the alternative plans.
- Senator Fitzpatrick emphasised that the Group first decide on a framework for the report and suggested that be:
 1. The National Monument
 2. The future of the market
 3. Feedback on the Hammerson proposal (outlining areas of consensus and disagreement)

Ultimately there was agreement on the suggestion by Senator Fitzpatrick and the Chair requested that the secretary begin a draft of same with the aim of circulating it to the Group before next Friday (26th).

