

The Moore Street Report 2

Securing History

A Report of the Moore Street Advisory Group to the Minister for Culture,

Heritage and the Gaeltacht on Progress to Date, 31 July 2019

Table of Contents

Page 2. Foreword

Page 3. Recommendations

Page 4. Introduction

Page 6. Context

Page 9. The National Monument and the State's Involvement in the Quarter Working Group

Page 11. The Site Survey Working Group

Page 14. The Market Working Group

Page 17. The Hammerson Liaison Working Group

Page 20. The Workshop Report of Michael Donnelly, Independent Facilitator of MSAG Consultative Workshop.

Page 29. Conclusion – Moving the Process Forward

Page 30. Available Reference Documents

Foreword

Dear Minister

I am pleased to present a Report of the Moore Street Advisory Group on progress to date. The report follows on *Securing History* (2017) prepared by the predecessor to the MSAG which presented a vision for the regeneration of the Moore Street quarter that also reflected its historical and cultural traditions and provided for the continuation and development of the Moore Street market.

This report draws on the recommendations in *Securing History* and further develops and refines these recommendations in the light of developments in the area since *Securing History* was published. Key to these developments have been the advance of plans by Hammerson for the development of the Dublin Central site; the substantial differences between the Hammerson vision and the previous one for which planning was secured; the successful appeal by the Minister of the High Court judgement concerning her powers in relation to national monuments and the plans by the Dublin Transport Authority to locate a metro station within the site.

The MSAG has been cognisant of these developments in its deliberations over the past two years. In considering possible developmental options for the area, it has consulted widely with stakeholders, academic experts and statutory bodies in an effort to marshal the many elements which will need to converge and work in partnership if a shared vision for the area is to be realised.

I would like to thank all who have contributed to the work of the MSAG to date. In particular I wish to thank the members who devoted an inordinate amount of time, insight and conviction to the deliberations of the Group. I would also like to thank the secretariat to the Group and your officials in the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht for their contribution to the work of the Group.

Yours sincerely

Tom Collins

Chair

31 July 2019

Following on the Recommendations of Securing History (2017)

- 1** The MSAG is of the view that there is an urgency to securing the fabric of the national monument at Nos.14 to 17 Moore Street. The MSAG confirms its support for the OPW in carrying out this process as soon as possible and to the opening up of the houses to limited tours not later than summer 2021.
- 2** The MSAG recognises that the Hammerson plan is a significant and welcome advance on the previous plan with potential to develop a positive vision for the inter-related elements of the market, the National Monument and the Hammerson site. That said, significant issues remain and the MSAG resolves to address these issues in continuing dialogue with Hammerson.
- 3** The vibrancy of the site, particularly in terms of its historical and cultural character will require a significant footprint from the statutory and state assisted voluntary sectors in this domain. Accordingly, the MSAG recommends that the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht develops a scoping document of possible state and state supported facilities in the area. This scoping document should, inter-alia, look at extending the state footprint on the terrace through discussion with relevant parties. It is further proposed that this document be developed by the State in cooperation with the MSAG before end 2019.
- 4** There is consensus within the MSAG on the need to support the Moore Street Market as Dublin's most historic street market. The MSAG notes with approval the intention of the Hammerson plan to support the retention and development of the market and considers that a similar commitment from the licensing authority, DCC, is now required.
- 5** The MSAG recommends the appointment of an Expert Group, as a priority of Dublin City Council, to lead the urgent regeneration of the market. This Group should consist of Moore Street traders and of people in Ireland and elsewhere who have experience of other markets and who have an in-depth understanding of the quality, product range and experience which street market customers now seek.
- 6** The MSAG notes the commitment of the Office of Public Works to consult with the Traders in relation to works to the National Monument and recommends that Hammerson would also establish dedicated liaison arrangements with the Traders to ensure that their operations and welfare are fully protected throughout the construction phase of the Dublin Central development.
- 7** The MSAG recommends that the Minister would request that any planning application in this case would be subject to an archaeological and architectural assessment in accordance with regulations.
- 8** The MSAG requests that this report be considered by Government as soon as possible and that a clear indication would be given to the reconstituted MSAG as to the outline of future government and state engagement with the totality of the project.
- 9** The MSAG recommends that, as envisaged in the *Securing History* report (page 36), the present MSAG be reconfigured with representation from the Oireachtas (5), Dublin City Council (3), representatives of all the participating groups on the present MSAG (4) traders (2), and an independent chair. There should also be nominated representatives (either permanently or as required) of relevant Government Departments, state agencies and Dublin City Council.

1 Introduction

Membership and Mandate of the MSAG

The Moore Street Consultative Group was established by then Minister in September 2016. The Group had a broad mandate to consider views on the best way forward for Moore Street itself, how best to retain its historic character, how to reflect the part it played in the events of Easter 1916 and to make recommendations as it thought appropriate. The outcome was “*Securing History – the Moore Street Report*” (March 2017). That report noted that there should be appropriate recognition of the history of the street and its part in the Rising, and that these should be reflected in the re-development of Moore Street, Moore Lane and Henry Place.

The Moore Street Advisory Group was then established in May 2017 to continue the work of the previous Group with a view to implementing the recommendations of the *Securing History* report.

The Group’s task, as agreed in *Securing History*, is to achieve consensus between stakeholders, including the new owners of the Dublin Central Site, Hammerson, which would conclude with an application being submitted by the latter to Dublin City Council for planning permission for revised development proposals. The *Securing History* report recommends that a “Framework of consensus secured on alternative development arrangements for Moore St and its lanes” and envisaged that this would be achieved within a timeline of six months. (Page 37.)

The membership of the Group is as follows:

List of Members of Moore Street Advisory Group

Organisation	Nominees
Chairperson	Dr Tom Collins
Fine Gael	Noel Rock TD Colm Brophy TD (replacing Paschal Donohue TD)
Fianna Fáil	Éamon Ó Cuív TD Seán Haughey TD Darragh O'Brien TD
Sinn Féin	Aengus Ó Snodaigh TD (replacing Peadar Tóibín TD) Senator Máire Devine (replacing Mary Lou McDonald TD)
The Labour Party	Joan Burton TD
Independents 4 Change	Maureen O'Sullivan TD
The Green Party	Eamon Ryan TD
Dublin City Council	Councillor Nial Ring Councillor Micheál MacDonncha Councillor John Lyons Councillor Sean Paul Mahon (no longer a member of DCC) Councillor Ciaran Cuffe (since elected to the European Parliament)
1916 Relatives Association	Brian O'Neill Cara O'Neill Christina McLoughlin Muriel McAuley John Stephenson
Save 16 Moore Street Committee	James Connolly Heron Patrick Cooney
Save No. 16 Moore Street Committee	John Connolly John Daly John Conway
Moore Street Traders Association	Catherine Kennedy (replacing Ernie Beggs) Tom Holbrook Margaret Hanway Mary Leech
Secretary	Garry Mc Donagh, DCHG

2. Context

2.1 Building on original report – work to date since inception

The first meeting of the MSAG took place on 25 May 2017. Since then there have been a further 31 meetings including workshops, presentations and site visits. The minutes of the MSAG meetings are available on the Department's website at:

<https://www.chg.gov.ie/heritage/moore-street-advisory-group/>

The Group has been addressed by conservation consultants, conservation architects and by structural engineers. They have met with officials from the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, OPW, Dublin City Council and the Department of Business, Enterprise and Innovation. In terms of the groups' interactions with Hammerson there have been six formal meetings. Three of these meetings were plenary meetings of the MSAG with the Hammerson team. One of these involved a guided walking tour through the Dublin Central site. A further three meetings were held between Hammerson and the relevant MSAG working group. Ongoing lines of communication were maintained between Hammerson and the MSAG secretariat throughout the past two years. The MSAG has also twice met with Professor Terence Dooley and Dr Donal Hall who undertook a detailed desktop survey of the provenance of 10-25 Moore Street on behalf of the Group. The Dooley Hall report is also available at the above link.

Four working sub groups were set up from within the MSAG to lead out on specific thematic areas deemed relevant by the Group and pointed to in *Securing History*. Respectively, these addressed the issues of the potential requirements for historical/archaeological and architectural surveys of the area; the Moore Street market; the National Monument; and the Hammerson plan. The working groups were established to lead out on the consideration of their relevant themes the better to inform the thinking of the MSAG as a whole.

1. The National Monument Working Group was chaired by Deputy Ó Cuív and was tasked with developing a vision for the properties at 14 to 17 and to liaise with the relevant State bodies on plans for the area.
2. The Site Surveys Working Group was formed to consider the historical legacy of the area, including a historical survey of the provenance of the terrace in 1916. This working group was initially chaired by Deputy Tóibín, and later by Deputy Ó Snodaigh,
3. The Moore Street market working group was chaired by Deputy O'Sullivan. The purpose of this group was to advance a vision for the market as presented in *Securing History* and to assist the traders with their outstanding issues with the relevant licensing and statutory bodies. The working group comprised Councillors from the MSAG and the Traders as well as representatives of DCC and An Gardaí.
4. The fourth working group was the Hammerson Liaison Working Group. It consisted of Oireachtas members on the MSAG and the Lord Mayor and it was chaired by Dr Tom Collins. It was established to work with Hammerson and to act as a liaison between the MSAG as a whole and Hammerson.

The composition and membership of each of the working groups was as follows:

1. The National Monument Working Group:

Chair: Eamon Ó Cuív, T.D.
Maureen O'Sullivan, T.D
John Stephenson
John Daly
Cllr John Lyons
Muriel McAuley

2. The Survey Working Group:

Chair: Peadar Toibin, T.D. (replaced by Aengus Ó Snodaigh, T.D. December 2018)
Muriel McAuley
Patrick Cooney
James Connolly Heron
Christina McLoughlin

3. The Market Working Group:

Chair: Maureen O'Sullivan, T.D.
Tom Holbrook
Ernie Beggs
Margaret Hanway
Cllr Sean Paul Mahon (no longer on the group)
Cllr Nial Ring
Cllr Míchéal MacDonncha
Cllr John Lyons
Cllr Ciaran Cuffe (no longer on the group)
Dublin City Council Representatives
An Garda Síochána Representatives

4. The Hammerson Liaison Working Group

Dr Tom Collins
Lord Mayor (Nial Ring)
Oireachtas Members: Noel Rock, T.D., Colm Brophy, T.D., Éamon Ó Cuív, T.D., Seán Haughey, T.D., Darragh O'Brien, T.D., Aengus Ó Snodaigh, T.D., Senator Máire Devine, Joan Burton, T.D., Maureen O'Sullivan, T.D., Eamon Ryan, T.D.

The summary reports of each of the working groups constitute the main body of this report. These capture the deliberations of the individual working groups while the recommendations represent the agreed position of the MSAG as a whole.

2.2 New ownership of Dublin Central site

Hammerson bought the Dublin Central Development Site from NAMA as part of Project Jewel which involved the disposal of the assets of the previous owner. The Project Jewel portfolio also included the Dundrum Town Centre, the neighbouring village shopping centre and half shares in both the ILAC and Pavilions shopping centres in Dublin.

Nos. 14-17 (and part of No. 18) Moore Street are owned by the State and were purchased from the previous owner, via NAMA, in July 2015 prior to the Project Jewel sale. The other buildings in the terrace and most of the surrounding area, including the Carlton Cinema site in O'Connell Street and much of the ground in between, are part of Hammerson's Dublin Central Development site. Dublin City Council is in ownership of Nos. 24 and 25 Moore Street. The Office of Public Works owns a site on O'Connell Street and CIE is in possession of a further site on O'Connell Street. The streets and lanes are in the charge of Dublin City Council.

It is expected that Hammerson will apply for new planning permission for the Dublin Central site in early 2020.

3. The National Monument and the State's Involvement in the Quarter Working Group

Membership

Chair: Eamon Ó Cuív, T.D.

Maureen O'Sullivan, T.D

John Stephenson

John Daly

Cllr John Lyons

Muriel McAuley

In developing the proposals for the National Monument at Nos. 14 to 17 Moore Street, a number of meetings were convened, including with representatives of the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, The National Museum of Ireland and the Office of Public Works. In addition, visits were arranged to the Tenement Museum in Henrietta Street and the National Museum's 1916 Exhibition in Collins Barracks.

The purpose of the first visit was to see the portrayal in the Tenement Museum of Tenement life and how this was done in an old building and the purpose of the second visit was to look at the 1916 display in the National Museum.

Additionally, a display was arranged in the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht of the artefacts found during work in Nos. 14 to 17 Moore Street. The students from TU Dublin (formerly DIT) also contributed actively to the debate on a future vision for the Monument.

Options

Two possible options from the OPW were considered in relation to the preservation and conservation of Nos. 14-17 Moore Street and the completion of the work previously started. (See Appendix)

Option 1 consists of securing the buildings structurally and in line with their historical significance but keeping them closed to the public.

Option 2 consists of the work proposed in Option 1 but with the additional facility for limited public access to the buildings.

The working group is supportive of the second of these options, considering it important that the National Monument as a 1916 Commemorative Centre begins to insert itself into the public consciousness as soon as possible in this Decade of Centenaries. The shuttered front doors and windows of Nos. 14-17 present an un-welcoming vista to the public and poorly reflect the presence and poignancy of the buildings in the events of Easter Week 1916.

The working group has also considered how the State can further contribute to enhancing the character of the quarter as a historic/cultural attraction in the city. Preliminary engagement has taken place between the chair of the working group and the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht to scope out the possible State involvement in the projected development. These possibilities include a visitor interpretative centre, a Children

of 1916 exhibition, a reception centre for visitors, a loan of suitable 1916 artefacts from the National Museum, displays from the National Library and the National Archives.

As well as the above and, in line both with the *National Development Plan 2018- 2027 – Project Ireland 2040* - and the *Securing History* report, the possibility of a Museum, a public multiplexed cultural exhibition, traditional music and Irish language facilities, lecture and performance space, artists' workshops and Creative Commons, and a public library of Irish language literature/speech/song (including for children) is being contemplated.

4. The Site Survey Working Group

Membership

Chair: Peadar Tóibín, T.D. (replaced by Aengus Ó Snodaigh, T.D. December 2018)

Muriel McAuley

Patrick Cooney

James Connolly Heron

Christina McLoughlin

The objectives adopted by the Moore Street Site Survey Working Group, as outlined in its first report to the MSAG in December 2018, were:

- To collate all existing reports on the Moore St 'National Monument'
- To come up with terms of reference for the procurement of a historical archaeological and architectural study of the Moore St 'Theatre of Conflict'
- To develop a vision for the 1916 Cultural Quarter
- To examine the Implementation of the recommendations of the *Securing History* Report

Six meetings of the MSAG Site Survey Working Group have been held this year: February 12th, March 6th, April 3rd, May 1st, May 21st, and June 11th. These meetings added to the work of the Sub-Committee while under the chairmanship of Peadar Tóibín TD.

Having continued to review all the documentation on Moore Street, listened and received advices from experts the working group formed the view that a full multidisciplinary conservation master plan/survey of the area must be done. An outline and approximate costings of such a proposal was submitted to the MSAG by James Kelly, who also said that given work already done, it could be prepared in the space of three months.

Such a survey would give the MSAG and its individual members the tools to fully and properly evaluate proposals in relation to the Moore Street environs, including that currently proposed by Hammerson. While understanding that, in the event of a full planning application such a survey is statutorily required, that would be too late for the MSAG to carry out the evaluation that is, in the view of the Site Survey Working Group, incumbent upon the MSAG by virtue of its remit.

Following a request from the working group, the MSAG meeting of January 15th 2019, heard from Ned Kelly, formerly of the National Museum of Ireland who said that the Moore Street Battlefield was of "global significance" and that it was "the most important site in modern Irish history". He explained that: "What was required was a survey of all the buildings". He suggested that a critical review of all archaeological reports thus far completed was now desirable and that "presenting any plan for the site prior to a full archaeological survey would be premature and not seen to be best practice". He made particular reference to the important discovery of a midden on site and a report by Courtney Deery yet to be made available for consideration.

The Site Survey Working Group asked that a request be sent to OPW for a full masterplan.

Without that survey, the working group was dependent, as a working group and as members of the MSAG, for instance in attempting to evaluate the Hammerson's proposals vis a vis the *Securing History* recommendations, on the professional advice/work which was sought and received. An initial appraisal from Mr James Kelly of Kelly and Cogan Architects was received in September 2018 in which he made a number of observations including that the plan relating to the relation of fabric relating to the Easter Rising "would actually result in a loss of such fabric". It also said that the proposed new public square would involve the "removal of a significant areas of the *setting* of the national monument buildings and would eradicate the plot outlines of a number if the original 1760s houses". He further suggested that the content of the presentation would "suggest lack of awareness or understanding of the relevant ICOMOS Conservation Charters which apply to this site".

The mention of international charters led the working group to discuss the Washington Charter for the Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas (1987) and International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice Charter 1964) and the Granada Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (1985). The Chair of the group followed up by asking Parliamentary Questions of relevance to the working group's work concerning three international documents to ascertain the legal obligations of the State with regard to those international charters.

The Site Survey Working Group also took note of the provisions of The Dublin Development Plan 2016 - 2022, the statutory plan under the planning acts for the City relating to Moore Street which includes the following policies and objectives:

"CHC 20: To support the retention and refurbishment of the cultural quarter associated with 1916 on Moore Street" and "CHCO 31: To develop a 1916 Historic Quarter, including Moore Street, with its National Monument and historic terrace.... creating an integrated historic, literary and commercial focus for the north city centre providing for tourism and to prepare a Development Brief for the Moore Street Area which addresses the above".

Another key issue which would have helped the working group's work would have been an open statement of intent from the State, CIÉ and Dublin City Council regarding their property holdings which are within the curtilage of the current site. The Working Group feels that it is vital that this be pursued by the whole MSAG.

Progress of the group's work was reported to the full MSAG meetings and issues for those meetings highlighted. Verbal and written responses were made by the working group to requests for views on the April 2019 Hammerson presentation to TDs and the MSAG and also to the Shaffrey Architects Outline Scope Options document.

There is a logic to the stabilisation works being carried out on 14-17 Moore Street but clarity is required as to what exactly is to be installed before proceeding with the scope 2 works. In line with the *Securing History* Report the Site Survey Group welcomes "the direct engagement of the OPW in the management/supervision of works on site, compliance with EU requirements on procurement in future tendering arrangements for contractors, and appropriate engagement with the Advisory/Oversight Group in any such process."

At this given moment, while the Site Survey Working Group believes that substantive progress has been made since the MSAG was formed, it considers that currently the Hammerson concept does not fully meet the agreed recommendations of *Securing History*. It could though, pave the way for an agreed plan to emerge through discussion that takes on board *Securing History* recommendations. That could lead to a planning application that can be supported.

5. The Market Working Group

Membership

Chair: Maureen O'Sullivan, T.D.

Tom Holbrook

Ernie Beggs

Margaret Hanway

Cllr Sean Paul Mahon (no longer on the group)

Cllr Nial Ring

Cllr Míchéal MacDonncha

Cllr John Lyons

Cllr Ciaran Cuffe (no longer on the group)

Representatives of Dublin City Council and An Garda Síochána, Store Street, also attended these meetings.

The Moore Street tradition of trading is very long established. The market has been an integral part of the Dublin 'experience' for centuries and occupies a privileged position in the public imagination when considering what is unique and distinctive to the character of the city.

However, over recent decades but perhaps particularly over the past 10-15 years, an ongoing process of dilapidation has taken hold of the market and the area. This has taken the form of neglect, dereliction and anti-social activities. The market has fallen into a vicious circle of decline with a fall-off in customer numbers, declining numbers of stall holders and a general air of pessimism amongst all concerned with the market.

While many of the challenges facing the market were enumerated in *Securing History*, these issues have persisted and include the following:

Licences:

Need for 5-10 years lifespan when renewing/security for holder

Family tradition to be recognised

New licences to be issued

Seven-day licences to be issued

Crime:

Anti-social behaviour on the street

On street drinking

Drug dealing

Selling illegal cigarettes

Loitering – making access to stalls difficult

Homelessness – sleeping under stalls

Rows breaking out on the street

Other issues:

Power, water, lighting

Cleaning

Toilet facilities

Against such a stark background of urban decay and neglect, the fact that new trader licences have not been issued in recent years by Dublin City Council underpins an unsatisfactory relationship between the traders and the Council where the Council's long term intentions towards the market are not clear.

It is also the case that the market has been the main victim of the stalemate regarding the overall development of the quarter of the past decade. As the traders have frequently pointed out at MSAG meetings, they are the only represented group on the MSAG who must make a living on Moore Street! While competition from low cost supermarkets has affected trade, the avoidance of the area by the public is arguably the single biggest factor in the decline of the market as the usual standards in terms of personal safety, amenities and the presentation of the area, which accompany a significant customer footfall, are absent.

It is not an exaggeration to state, therefore, that the Moore Street market is facing an existential crisis. If it is not fundamentally re-imagined and re generated around a compelling future vision, it will almost certainly go under.

There is consensus within the MSAG on the need to support the Moore Street Market as Dublin's most historic street market. The MSAG notes with approval the intention of the Hammerson plan to support the retention and development of the market and considers that a similar commitment from the licensing authority, DCC, is now required.

Members of the working group have visited both the Borough Market and Spitalfields Market in London with a view to re-envisioning the Moore Street Market. These highly successful markets, together with other examples both in Ireland and abroad, demonstrate the potential viability of the Moore Street market. Similarly, the TU Dublin student project itemises a range of iconic markets in various European cities.

The MSAG recognises the role of DCC as the regulatory body of the market. It is of the view, however, that the promotion of the market as a vibrant centre of commercial activity, attractive both as a market place and a tourist attraction, will need a much more innovative and consumer-driven focus than exists currently.

Accordingly it recommends the appointment of an Expert Group, under the aegis of DCC, to lead the regeneration of the market. This Group should consist of Moore Street Traders and people in Ireland and elsewhere who have been at the heart of the emergence of country markets in Ireland and abroad and who have an in-depth understanding of the quality, product range and experience which street market customers now seek.

A key element of the work of this Expert Group should be the determination of the product mix and product range of the market. New licences should be granted with reference to the recommendations of MSAG on this matter. In the exceptional circumstances of Moore Street, Dublin City Council should establish an ex gratia compensation fund for current licence holders who wish to exit the market. New licences should be issued with reference to the applicant's capacity to move up the value chain and to provide a customer experience

which enhances the area as a visitor attraction in the city. It should be said that the working group welcomes DCC's decision to recently issue four further licences.

While the traders welcome the regeneration of the area, the process in terms of works to be done would be challenging for them. The traders are concerned about the inevitable disruption to their business during any development work phases and wish to have ongoing consultation in relation to what might happen in the area.

The Office of Public Works has confirmed that it will consult with the Traders in relation to how it will manage access to the National Monument at Nos. 14 -17 when work resumes on those buildings and in relation to any potential encroachment onto the street itself. The Dublin Central development will clearly have very significant implications in terms of construction traffic, erection of hoardings, noise and other disturbance which will need to be carefully controlled and regulated to minimise disruption to all aspects of the Traders' business and welfare and to ensure ongoing public access to the market. The MSAG recommends that Hammerson should establish a dedicated liaison structure to interact with the Traders in the lead up to, and throughout, the construction phase and that this liaison process should aim to have an agreement in place with the Traders about the main principles of the arrangements to mitigate the effects on their business well before construction begins.

The regeneration of the Moore Street market is pivotal to the future of this quarter. The MSAG believes that such a regeneration will require a profound effort at re-imagining the market from a situation of what appears to be a terminal decline currently to one in which the market becomes a vibrant centre of attraction in an historic, cultural quarter in the North inner city.

6. The Hammerson Liaison Working Group

Membership

Dr Tom Collins

Lord Mayor (Cllr Nial Ring)

Oireachtas Members: Noel Rock, T.D., Colm Brophy, T.D., Éamon Ó Cuív, T.D., Seán Haughey, T.D., Darragh O'Brien, T.D., Aengus Ó Snodaigh, T.D. Senator Máire Devine, Joan Burton, T.D., Maureen O'Sullivan, T.D., Eamon Ryan, T.D.

Six meetings took place between the MSAG and Hammerson since the MSAG was established – 3 meetings with the MSAG as a whole and 3 further meetings with the working group.

The first formal presentation by Hammerson to a plenary meeting of the MSAG occurred on 29th March 2018. At this meeting, Hammerson presented a comprehensive scheme for the Dublin Central site. The presentation explicitly addressed the historical significance of the site with particular reference to the events of 1916. Following this presentation a letter was issued to Hammerson which attempted to capture the agreed position of the group on what had been presented. The letter referred to the MSAG's consensus view that the Hammerson plan represented a step change on the previous plan for the area. Subsequent interactions with, and presentations from, Hammerson on their plan have tended to focus on aspects of the plan on which some of the group members have raised issues.

These include, in particular, the proposed break through at Nos. 18 and 19 of the terrace on Moore Street which would result in an East-West route from O'Connell Street to the terrace. While some of the group either support or are prepared to see an East West route as envisaged by Hammerson others are opposed to a breach of the terrace. The Dooley Hall report states that Nos. 18 and 19 were in ruins in 1916 and that No. 19 was not rebuilt until the late 1930s. While there is a strong belief from some voices of the MSAG that all development in the quarter should be true to what was in situ in 1916, the argument for retaining Nos. 18 and 19 (in ruins in 1916) appears to be based on a different premise.

A second issue raised by some members concerns the nature of an historic and cultural quarter and the compatibility of such an objective with the commercial considerations of the developer. Some in the MSAG point to the potential of battlefield tourism as a primary, commercial theme for the development of the area. Hammerson have made it clear that space has been set aside for cultural projects should the State or Dublin City Council wish to fund them.

A third issue of concern with the Hammerson plan raised by some MSAG members is the creation of two squares on the site and the impact that these may have on the 1916 streetscape. This view is reflected on pages 28 and 29 in "Telling the Battlefield Story". The Hammerson view here is that the squares can provide a welcoming public and celebratory space in an area which is now largely derelict and avoided by the populace at large and which also attracts anti-social behaviour. They also point to the possibilities which the squares offer for explicit and subliminal associations with 1916 though recognising that, while some of the historical accuracies might be compromised from a purist point of view,

this plan would ensure that the 1916 story is brought to a wider generalist audience, both national and international. Hammerson also points to the fact that the public squares will facilitate wider access to the National Monument, further exposing it to a wider audience.

The Site Surveys Working Group has drawn attention to the potential archaeological significance of the wider site and at its meeting of 29th March 2018 the MSAG agreed that, notwithstanding the significance or otherwise in this regard, this matter did not fall within the scope of the MSAG's remit. Indeed, the MSAG understands that the relevant statutory bodies (the planning authority and the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht) must satisfy themselves on any developer's approach to archaeology, not only in its planning application but also in the roll out of the development itself. The proposed development in this case would therefore inevitably require a full archaeological impact assessment as part of the pre-planning process. This would usually take the form in the first instance of a formal archaeological assessment that would accompany the planning application. Any subsequent approval of planning would then require full mitigation of any impacts on archaeology arising from the development.

The Minister is a statutory consultee under the Planning Acts in relation to archaeological heritage. In the absence of a request by a planning authority for a developer to carry out archaeological investigations, the Minister can recommend that such investigations are undertaken. The MSAG recommends that, if necessary, the Minister would request that any planning application in this case would be subject to an archaeological examination.

While compromise is likely to be necessary to achieve a resolution, it is important that there is a symbiotic relationship between the three components of the site, those being, Hammerson, the National Monument along with the State, and the market traders. The challenge for the quarter is one of reversing years of dereliction, decline and official neglect. This must come from effective partnership between the private owners, the state sector and the street traders who together can create an attractive, vibrant, urban quarter which celebrates the unique contribution of the quarter to the memory of the events of 1916 and equally provides a livelihood for those who live and work in the area. The interdependency between these three elements cannot be understated. In particular, as pointed out above, the traders working at the street market, which is over 200 years old, are faced with daily challenges including a lack of facilities and those of a personal safety nature. Those who run shops and businesses on the street and in the area are also affected.

It is unanimously agreed within the MSAG that this cannot and should not be allowed to continue.

It should also be stated that there is strong and widely based support for many aspects of the Hammerson plan within the MSAG. The following elements of the plan are considered to have particular merit:

- The recognition of the importance of this area in Irish history by Hammerson is a source of re-assurance to the MSAG on the bona fides of the developer on this matter

- A proposed historic trail through the site will bring the events of 1916 to everybody who enters the site
- The fact that the Hammerson vision incorporates a commitment to the continuation of the street market
- The promise of a greatly increased footfall in the area is the best hope for those currently trading there
- The squares could provide a focus for celebration, cultural activities and remembrance
- The development will spur further re-generation on the north end of O Connell street and Parnell Square
- The mix of uses in a low height setting, including some residential use, is welcomed

The job creation potential, 9500 jobs in the construction phase and 3500 thereafter, is noted. The commitment of the developer to local gain in the form of apprenticeships and other opportunities for the local community is particularly significant.

It is recognised that the Hammerson plan along with significant State input represents the current best plan for the redevelopment of the site. The MSAG is conscious of its responsibilities here to work towards a broadly shared vision even where there are differences in detail.

The unique history and resonance of the Moore Street area inevitably means that in a plan of this nature some people will be strongly supportive, some will accept the plan with reservations while others will find difficulties with some elements. This is the case in this instance as we work towards consensus.

The MSAG recognises that the Hammerson plan is a significant and welcome advance on the previous plan with potential to develop a positive vision for the inter-related elements of the market, the National Monument and the Hammerson site. That said, significant issues remain and the MSAG resolves to address these issues in continuing dialogue with Hammerson.

7. The Workshop Reports of Michael Donnelly, Independent Facilitator of MSAG Consultative Workshop. 13th June 2019

This report was prepared by Michael Donnelly. It addresses both the views of the MSAG on substantive issues and also reflects on the dynamic and structure of the Group.

Task: To get feedback from the group on the overall vision on the quarter, especially the Hammerson Plan, to inform the report to the Minister. There is a particular reference to the *Securing History* report.

Present: Éamon Ó Cuív, T.D., Maureen O’Sullivan, T.D., Muriel McAuley, John Daly, Cllr. John Lyons, John Stephenson, Cllr Mícheál MacDonncha, Cara O Neill, Christina Mc Loughlin, John Connolly, Patrick Cooney, James Connolly Heron, Tom Holbrook, Aengus Ó Snodaigh, Brian O Neill, Tom Collins (chair), Garry McDonagh (DCHG), Nessa Foley (DCHG), Michael Donnelly (facilitator).

Workshop Format: The workshop had been designed to be interactive and a mix of whole group and small group work. A late change of venue necessitated a change of meeting design and as such a round table was held with three smaller break-out sessions. The break-out sessions included an exploration of the Hammerson Plan in light of these issues:

1. How the 2016 battlefield story can best be told
2. The role of the State in Moore St Development
3. The cultural aspects of the proposals

Another important title would have been the role of traders if more had been present. It was noted that this remained a hugely significant issue and that the Traders are making their living from the site and are not available to attend many meetings.

There was not time during the workshop to have the wider group consider the feedback from the break-out sessions and for key points to be agreed as consensus. This also points to the need for any future group to have the space and time to properly discover its common ground and a collective approach to the key issues. Nevertheless the group did have a wide-ranging conversation on aspects of progress and the Hammerson Plan.

Issues Discussed:

1. Progress

The group were asked what progress they each felt had been made over the past two years. The group is largely positive about the direction of travel regarding the work of the group and the moves made by Hammerson. Hammerson’s involvement is seen as a step change. There are both a number of positives and range of concerns with Hammerson.

Firstly, regarding their engagement with the group – the group are more satisfied than before with the level and type of engagement. They do feel listened to and agree that Hammerson are more open. They wish for more engagement and with greater depth.

The Group members feel that the importance of the site is more recognised and that more of the Street is deemed important.

There are a range of concerns with the proposals and perhaps some unknowns which leave the group in a position where they don't feel able to take a strong stance on aspects of the plan. Among these unknowns are the detail of the usage, the agreement on the open spaces, and the role of the State and its intentions towards the heritage aspects of the site, its property ownership strategy, and the investment it is willing to make in the cultural aspects of the *Securing History* document. The State and its intentions, it is felt, will have a huge influence on the final feel, usage, and layout of the entire battlefield site. The absence of these insights can allow assumptions to play a bigger role in the group's interpretation of intentions.

2. Group Roles

This led onto a reflection on the role and effectiveness of the group itself. The group recognise the complexity of their brief and the difficulty they experience in arriving at consensus around how the group can best present its wishes and demands. There is a sense of urgency among the group and they are concerned to ensure that this does not encourage poor, rushed decisions.

The group recognises that it is their passion for the site that has brought them this far. There are relationships that they know they have to foster to become more effective at getting their position across including with the State and Dublin City Council. They know they must also work more with Hammerson.

- The group feels that it is important that the whole (*Securing History*) document is honoured and not cherry-picked bits.
- Timelines have been missed – somewhat due to the dynamic in the Advisory Group but also because of delays in engagement with Hammerson.
- While they feel that Hammerson have listened to their concerns some members feel like they have been placed in a “take it or leave it” position
- Some feel there is a disconnect between the senior city council officials and the work of the group
- The group have little sense of the intentions of the State for the site – in terms of direct investment, regulation, or as a property owner.

While there is acknowledgment that the group is not in a position to develop an alternative plan to the Hammerson plan and that it is the main process for the future of the site, some seem to not to ascribe to that view. The extent of that latter position is not yet clear.

Members acknowledged that it was not possible to arrive at consensus at that workshop and that to arrive at that they need a reduced group, better opportunity for exploring what is possible and desirable, but also they need to be very clear on what this smaller group recommends.

The members of the Advisory Group each want to find an agreed way forward. Most people articulated the need for compromise and consensus. It would be good to establish the red lines – but some feel that Hammerson has to be involved.

They have hopes that the place will become a world class development.

They ascribe to the area being a cultural and historical quarter although there was not an opportunity to explore what this actually means to each member and whether there is a consensus view (for example what other examples would the group point towards as being city quarters to aspire to?)

3. Role of the State in Moving Forward

Some in the group voiced their sense of the failure of the State to recognise the importance of the site. The group wants to know what the State's intentions are for the area. This includes the State's potential investment in cultural and historical celebration, the commitment the State is prepared to make towards creating buildings for cultural activities in the area, and the intentions for the buildings the State currently owns in the quarter.

Some believe that it would be helpful for the State to prepare a scoping document on how the State can either do new builds or work within existing buildings (a broad document requested).

Some members feel that the opportunity exists for the State and Hammerson to explore property exchanges that could facilitate a more cohesive treatment of the battlefield area.

With regard to the 14 to 17 Moore St proposal – the Group believe that Hammerson cannot facilitate anything within its proposals until the State shows its intentions and willingness to invest.

Dublin City Council has the key role in protecting the lanes and the buildings.

4. Group Thoughts on the Hammerson Proposals

The members of the group recognised that the Hammerson proposals mark a stepped and welcome change in the way the conversation about the heritage site has been handled. There is a group within the MSAG who are not ready to articulate agreement with the role Hammerson is playing and there are others who are able to accept Hammerson's role and wish to negotiate the aspects of the site that are most precious to them.

There are two important aspects:

The Overall Vision:

Most of the group recognise that the success of their endeavours to tell the story of the 1916 rebellion through the physical space of Moore St is directly connected to the development of the wider area and its commercial success. Some alluded to the need to facilitate a night time economy in the area with cafes and restaurants. Others are keen to

emphasise the desire for wider cultural activities and facilities being at the heart of the site (such as Irish language and traditional music).

The members of the group recognise that they are one party among several with stakes in the area and that while it is important for their voice to be heard they acknowledge the presence of other voices with their own agendas.

The group would like to feel part of creating a common overarching vision for the site ahead of being in a position of responding to proposals.

The Heritage

This group has a keen sense of the heritage of the site and its importance in the events of 1916. They have not landed on a common vision for how they would like the site to be developed in a way that tells the story and preserves a unique cultural asset. It is indeed unlikely that there is a common vision to be found, however they have established some common ground on key aspects of the site. These are emergent and need to be further elucidated and tested and this can be best done as a smaller group and in conversation and dialogue with other key stakeholders. Other aspects can be explored further as more detail becomes apparent.

Some of the common ground includes:

- Streetscape tells the story. The line of retreat tells the story of the battle.
- An independent assessment of the site has never been done and is necessary as we still don't know what is actually in the area (this will be part of the statutory planning process).
- State should capture the whole terrace block and its yards.
- Moore Lane – possibility of open space but not breaking the Lanes. There are solutions e.g. slant the Lane.
- There should be a conversation between Jury's and Hammerson to help open the space.
- The interpretation of the site should be interactive rather than a museum including a possibility of 1st floor of terrace.

Not yet common ground but necessary to explore further:

- Concerning the Moore St Terrace - the proposal to break through the terrace with a new connection to O'Connell St is controversial and some of the group are adamant that there should NOT be an opening through the terrace.
- Some feel that the entire block should be re-designated a National Monument.
- Some feel there could be a new build cultural venue to include the yards.
- Yards at back of 20 and 21 Moore St are still there and need to be surveyed – important to the story and could be lost in a public square.
- The area within Moore Land and Moore Street should be regarded as a singular unit and should include a cultúrlann, arts/music venue(s) included cafes, bookshop, shops

complementing what is being traded from the stalls and vice versa, restaurants, specialist shops, bars. Buildings and yards should be used for above.

- The whole block should be in state hands and that a state company or a commercial company on behalf of the State should administer/manage the area as a single unit.
- Shouldn't have museum per se, more of interpretative centre, experience with Irish language, Music, poetry and more.

5. Conclusions from Meeting

1. The group is disparate although much closer together than they themselves understand. Probably due to past splits over details, they are mistrustful of each other.
2. As a result of them not having coherence in how to approach their task, the group can scatter gun comments and barbs at different audiences and to also request more information in the form of meetings, surveys, and reports.
3. The group needs to spend more time in dialogue with each other about what they mean and intend. Terms like historic cultural quarter need to be unpacked so that everyone is clear what we mean when these terms are used. The group needs to establish some clear distinct positions that are presentable to the other stakeholders.
4. The group does have a sense that in the bigger picture they are one stakeholder of many and that without coherence they will not be heard as much as they had hoped.
5. The group needs to be in dialogue with other stakeholders including the State, City Council, and Hammerson.
6. There could be considerable merit in pulling together all the stakeholders into one process (whether that be for a day or longer) – including Hammerson, Govt Departments (incl Education, Heritage, Justice, OPW), Dublin City Council in various guises, private sector businesses in the area, Transport interests etc. This forum would have to have the task of arriving at consensus and constructing sound working relationships for the future.
7. There is considerable commonality of purpose among the group and this needs to be built upon. The group itself knows it needs consensus to be able to work better with Hammerson and that a smaller group is needed to reach that. The group feels that consensus from within is possible as demonstrated by the work done at this meeting. The members of the group are all trying to do their best for the area and have best of intentions.

Appendix One – Group Break Out on State Involvement in the Development

These people met as a breakout:

Éamon Ó Cuív T.D., Chair, Maureen O’Sullivan T.D., Muriel McAuley, John Daly, Cllr. John Lyons, John Stephenson.

Recommendations:

1. That OPW be asked to proceed with option 2 as proposed by them in relation to completion of the works on hand in 14-17 Moore Street and the opening up of the houses to limited tours.
2. That the Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht would be asked to provide a scoping document of possible state and state supported facilities in the development on both state lands and in association with Hammerson.
3. That on receipt of this, following discussion by the MSAG, that there would be a clear path forward outlined for the progression of this facet of the work.

Appendix Two – Group Break-Out on Telling the Battlefield Story

Sub-group to assess how the 1916 Battlefield Story can best be told.

Members present: Cllr Mícheál MacDonncha, Cara O Neil, Christina Mc Loughlin, John Connolly, Patrick Cooney, James Connolly Heron.

Approach can be summed up in one sentence: “The streetscape tells the story.”

Question: ‘Does the latest Hammerson Design Plan meet the recommendations of the *Securing History* report?’

1. Relevant sections of ‘Securing History’:

Chapter 6, page 24: “Moore Street and its laneways can be part of a larger linked historic framework to include the Cultural Quarter at Parnell Square.

“The Moore Street streetscapes and lanes should reflect its broad character at the time of the Rising. This can be done through restoration of cobbled streets, kerbing and paving, period lighting and appropriate architecture. The buildings from 10 to 25 Moore Street should be restored so as to honour their critical place in the closing stages of the Rising.

Chapter 6, page 25: “The insights and perspectives provided by experts advise as to the importance of – preserving streetscape, the historic line of the street and lanes, and the strength of argument in recapturing the 1916 moment in time.

All of Chapter 9, page 32.

Recommendations, page 35: “The Group supports the retention of Moore Street and adjacent lanes so as to broadly capture the sense of how it would have appeared in 1916 – this covers the streets and lanes, key buildings, street paving and lighting. The preservation of the existing lines of streets and lanes and the restoration of streetscapes are essential.”

2. Hammerson Concept:

The sub-group discussion considered and assessed the Hammerson concept in light of the *Securing History* report and its recommendations, the James Kelly appraisal, international best practice and relevant European charters and guidelines. In removing Moore Lane and replacing its line and form with two linked public spaces the Hammerson concept is inconsistent with *Securing History*.

Equally integral to the Battlefield as made clear in *Securing History* are yards behind 10-25 Moore Street, particularly 20-21 Hanlon’s (now Polonez) - the location of pleas made to the volunteers gathered there by Tom Clarke, Michael Collins, Joe Plunkett and Seán Mac Diarmada to accept the surrender order. Under the Hammerson concept this ground would disappear. This site in particular needs to be properly surveyed. The recapturing of this historic space is not inconsistent with the creation of a new public open space here in context with its historic importance.

The function and form of the large footprint building at the north of the site between O’Rahilly Parade and the proposed larger public square is unclear. What are the implications for O’Rahilly Parade, the corner where The O’Rahilly wrote his final note to his wife and witnessed the last act of the Battle of Moore Street?

The development at the Moore Lane intersection with Henry Place removes the ‘White House’ and creates a new walkway – an unnecessary intervention as a laneway exists there already. This is inconsistent with *Securing History*.

The opening up of a public square/space here - the location of the killing of Michael Mulvihill, Henry Coyle and young Bridget Mc Kane - is inappropriate. This would also see the removal of the Bottling Stores occupied and held by volunteers as their comrades crossed Moore Lane under heavy machine gunfire from The Rotunda. This is a crucial and critical location in the story of the evacuation.

The proposed link from O’Connell Street to Moore Lane is acceptable within the *Securing History* framework to draw people into the restored and re-developed quarter. However the breakthrough of the terrace 10-25 clearly runs contrary to *Securing History*. Footfall is cited in support of this aspect of the concept, but it is commercial footfall, whereas our remit is wider and must include the potential for an historic cultural quarter, drawing visitors on that basis, as set out in Chapter 9 of *Securing History*. In this context making the link via O’Rahilly Parade rather than the terrace breakthrough would be the appropriate approach.

In summary the approach to the site in the Hammerson concept needs to be revisited comprehensively in light of *Securing History* so that the 1916 Battlefield story can be told in the very streets and along the very laneways where it actually took place. The area has been described as ‘the most important historic site in modern Irish history’ by the National Museum of Ireland. The current Design Presentation regrettably fails to address this adequately.

It should be noted that the area has yet to be independently assessed and surveyed - a pre-requisite to the drawing up of actual plans. This is important now in light of the disparity between The Myles/Shaffrey Battlefield Report and Hammerson’s identification of 1916 elements ‘visible from the public realm’ within the site.

Appendix Three: Group Break-Out on Cultural Aspects of the Proposals

Present: Aengus Ó Snodaigh, T.D., Brian O Neill

- Discussion around the use of first floor from No. 10 to the National Monument to create an experience of the evacuation of GPO to the last Council meeting
- The area within Moore Lane and Moore Street should be regarded as a singular unit and should contain a cultúrlann, arts/music venue(s) included cafes, bookshop, shops complementing what is being traded from the stalls and vice versa, restaurants, specialist shops, bars.
- Deputy Ó Snodaigh believed the whole terrace should be in state hands and that a state company or a commercial company on behalf of the State should administer/manage the area as a single unit.
- There shouldn't be a museum per se, more of interpretative centre, experience with Irish language, Music, poetry and more.

8. Conclusion – Moving the Process Forward

The MSAG considers that it is essential that a stakeholder representative forum remains in place to shepherd the tripartite development outlined here and to bring coherence to the overall vision as it moves towards implementation. It considers that clarity on the terms of reference of such a group and realistic expectations of deliverables from the group are equally important.

It is proposed therefore that the MSAG be reconstituted with the following brief:

- To continue to interact with Hammerson with commentary and critique as Hammerson refines their vision for their planning application and beyond
- To interact with OPW on the emerging vision and character of the National Monument
- To maintain the interaction with the relevant statutory and non-statutory bodies who can individually and collectively contribute to the character of the area as a 1916 historic, cultural, street trading and business quarter
- To ensure that the expert group on the market is established and completes its work in a timely manner
- To satisfy itself that the significance of Moore Street to the events of Easter Week 1916 is continuously in focus and not lost as the plans for the quarter take shape and begin to be rolled out
- To ensure that local gain is optimised in the roll out of all elements of the vision.

In terms of composition, it is proposed that the stakeholder groups currently represented on the MSAG maintain their representation on a new Group but that the numbers from each constituency are reduced to increase the effectiveness and ease of operation of the Group. Accordingly the following is recommended:

- Independent Chair appointed by the Minister
- Oireachtas Members - 10 reduced to 5
- Dublin City Councillors - 5 reduced to 3
- Participatory Groups - 10 reduced to 4
- Traders - 4 reduced to 2
- Dublin City Council Senior Representative - 1
- Department of Culture, Heritage and the Gaeltacht Senior Representative - 1

Hammerson and other stakeholders would be invited to interact with the Group on a regular and ongoing basis.

The Group should be appointed for one year and be expected to provide a report to the Minister at the end of this period.

Available Reference Documents

Working Group Reports

Submissions by individual members of MSAG in relation to Hammerson report

Main recommendations of previous report – *The Moore Street Report – Securing History*
March 2017

Proposal of OPW to secure and open monument for limited tours

Relevant extract of (*Project Ireland 2040*) *National Development Plan 2018-2027* – Page 51,
Pages 69-70

Dooley Hall Report

TU Dublin Students' Submission

James Kelly Reports

Courtney Deery Report

Battlefield Tourism – Miles, Stephen Thomas (2012) *Battlefield Tourism: Meanings and Interpretations*. PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow