

RELATIVES OF THE SIGNATORIES TO THE PROCLAMATION OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC

Appeal to An Bord Pleanála – Planning Reference Number 2863/21 (Hammerson)


Dear Sir/Madam,

I submit this appeal on behalf of 1916 Relatives against the decision of City Planners to grant consent to the above planning application.

We support the call by other appellants that this matter be considered by way of an oral hearing given the National historical importance of the site in question and confusion raised by the applicants submission of three planning applications for the development of what has at all material times been presented as one plan for what is referred to as Dublin Central.

Since we await the results of the outstanding enquiry ordered by The Minister into the internal practice and procedures of an Bord only an oral hearing on this Appeal will ensure that its deliberations are seen to be carried out openly and above suspicion and in the planning and public interest.

Sincerely,


James Connolly Heron,
on behalf of,
Relatives of The Signatories to The 1916 Proclamation,
4 Oxford Road,
Ranelagh,
Dublin 6

mob. [REDACTED]

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
LDG-	<u>055409-22</u>
ABP-	
18 JUL 2022	
Fee: €	<u>270</u> Type: <u>Chp</u>
Time:	<u>13:34</u> By: <u>Rachel</u>

Fee paid 270 euro

Request oral hearing 50

270 euro

AN BORD PLEANÁLA	
LDG-	<u>055633-22</u>
ABP-	
19 JUL 2022	
Fee: €	<u>270</u> Type: <u>cheque</u>
Time:	<u>11:35</u> By: <u>Rachel</u>

RELATIVES OF THE SIGNATORIES TO THE PROCLAMATION OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC

Appeal to An Bord Pleanála re. Planning Application ref. no. 2863/21

Preliminary Points

The An Bord Pleanála Enquiry

No consideration of this Appeal should be undertaken by An Bord until the enquiry into the internal affairs of board members ordered by The Minister has concluded and full public confidence in the decision making process of An Bord has been restored.

Procedure

Public Participation

The timeframe for submission of Appeals is four weeks from the decision of a grant of permission. Notification of the grant of permission in this case was issued one week *after* that date leaving three weeks for Appeals to be submitted by members of the public and interested parties.

Interference in the independence of the Planning Process

In Summary

- i. The unprecedented show of support for a planning application by a sitting Taoiseach in a press release issued by the applicants prior to the submission of that application.
- ii. The letter of consent to the Hammerson applications issued by a senior official in the National Monument section of the Department expressing approval for aspects of the application including demolition of part of the declared National Monument at 14 to 17 Moore Street. This formal approval undermines the independence of The Minister in consideration of Ministerial Consent for work in proximity to the National Monument.
- iii. The decision of City Planners to grant consent without consideration of the survey reports required by the Planning Authority under the listing process.
- iv. The offer of financial compensation to traders to be paid out of the public purse by representatives of the Department, Dublin City Council and the applicants in return for support for the applicants plans and rejection of alternatives proposals for the development of Dublin Central was made in a clear attempt to influence and or undermine the outcome of deliberations of the Advisory Group to The Minister.

Grounds of Appeal

Opening Observation:

The Relatives of The Signatories to The 1916 Proclamation support the implementation of the recommendations of the two Securing History Reports of the Moore Street Advisory Group to Minister Darragh O'Brien TD and his predecessors as agreed by all participants.

The agreed recommendations are as follows:

1. The development of the Moore Street Battlefield Area as part of a 1916 historic cultural quarter.
2. The preservation of streetscapes.
3. The avoidance of demolition of historic structures.

4. The development of appropriate sympathetic architecture.
5. The retention of Moore St and adjacent lanes, street paving and lighting.
6. The preservation of the existing lines of the street and lanes and the restoration of streetscapes are essential.
7. The retention of historical structures and of the line and form of 10 to 25 is integral to this approach.
8. The Group endorses the renovation/retention of O Rahilly Parade, Moore Lane and Henry Place, the retention of the lines of the lanes and full restoration of surfaces kerbs and street furniture.

Implementation:

The Hammerson application does not meet the recommendations of the Advisory group to The Minister. This can be attributed to their failure to fully engage in meaningful deliberations with the members as stakeholders and interested parties. The purpose and founding aim of the Advisory Group was therefore never realised - that an agreed planning application would emerge from the engagement and deliberations of all interested parties.

Comments:

The National Museum of Ireland:

The Moore Street area is a 'theatre of conflict and the most important historic site in modern Irish history'.

The High Court:

Mr Justice Max Barrett held that the entire Moore Street Battleground is a National Monument since its preservation is a matter of National importance.

An t Uachtarán Michael D Higgins:

This area belongs to no one individual group or organisation. It belongs to the people.

Minister Darragh O' Brien TD:

"Moore Street is the birthplace of the Republic and it must be treasured one of our most important National Monuments" -

on introducing his Moore Street Renewal and Development Bill to An Seanad in 2015 now supported by The O Snodaigh Bill currently at Committee Stage in the Oireachtas.

Objections to the Application:

Context -

The 1916 Rising was the only land engagement of note in 20th Century British and Irish military history. The Moore Street area is the last extant 1916 Battlefield in the City. Of 31 locations in Dublin linked to The Rising 19 have been demolished or are now unrecognisable as to how that would have appeared at that time.

The Relatives of the Signatories to the 1916 Proclamation are opposed to the application submitted by Hammerson on the following grounds:

Required Consents to the Application.

Ministerial Consent:

The Moore Street Area is a National Monument since its preservation as the accepted birthplace of the Republic is a matter of National importance. Any proposed development, demolition alteration or interference with this area, therefore, requires Ministerial consent.

No such consent appears on file.

There is no Ministerial Consent on file to the applicants proposed work in proximity to the declared National Monument at 14 to 17 Moore Street as required under national Monument Acts.

There is no consent on file to the applicants proposal to remove no. 18 Moore Street part of which is under state ownership or the authority of The Minister.

Dublin City Council Consents:

There is no letter of consent on file from Dublin City Council to this application to develop, alter, remove completely or in part, or otherwise interfere in any way with the publicly owned streets, lanes and

thoroughfares that lie within the site of the proposed development that are not under the ownership of the applicants.

Demolitions:

The proposed demolition of any part of the terrace of houses that was the last headquarters of the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic is contrary to the wishes of Dublin City Councillors as the planning authority for the city who voted unanimously to add no's 10 to 25 Moore Street to the list of protected structures.

Relatives of the Signatories support the submission of The 1916 Relatives Association to the Moore Street Consultative Group in the view 'that its (10 to 25 Moore Street) partial destruction removes the footprint that existed 100 years ago and thus renders meaningless the context and setting of The National Monument'.

The proposed interference with and loss of fabric at crucial battle points where volunteers fell wounded or were killed in action most notably at Moore Lane and O' Rahilly Parade is unwarranted and unacceptable.

The proposed demolition of 1916 Monuments, buildings and structures that have yet to be independently assessed or surveyed cannot be sanctioned by City planners or An Bord acting in the public interest. The planned appropriation and invasion of the curtilage of National Monuments and protected structures throughout the site.

The proposed interference with the line of streets and lanes that form the evacuation route of volunteers fleeing the GPO under enemy artillery shell fire.

The proposed re drawing and interference with locations crucial to the story of the evacuation and ground upon which volunteers were killed in action or wounded in battle.

The proposed removal of entire plot lines to the rear of the Moore Street terrace and yards along Moore Street will result in development out of context with the declared National Monument at 14 to 17 contrary to Venice Charter principles and accepted International guidelines on the protection of history and heritage.

Conclusion:

Dublin City Planners have failed in carrying out their duty to protect and preserve this historic quarter and area of special architectural interest. They failed to consider Survey Reports required under the listing process that had commenced on foot of the vote by the elected members to add 10 to 25 Moore St to the list of protected structures.

An Bord must reject this application out of hand in the National interest, the public interest and in the interest of proper planning and development.

The application does not meet the agreed recommendations of successive Securing History Reports of the Moore Street Advisory Committee to the Minister.

The application does not meet the recommendations of the Dublin City Council Moore Street Advisory Committee chaired by Cllr Nial Ring.

The application does not meet the objectives of The Lord Mayor Forum's 'Lanes of History ' Report commissioned by Dublin City Council.

The application runs contrary to the objectives of The Dublin Development Plan.

The application does not reflect or adequately recognise Moore Street as a place or town place that is of special architectural, historical, archeological, artistic cultural, social or technical interest as a designated Architectural Conservation Area.

We trust that an Bord will, in meeting its obligations as guardian of the City, its history and heritage, and in the public interest, reject this application as an entirely inappropriate development of the most important historic site in modern Irish history.

End.

Supporting Documentation -

Professional Critique of the Hammerson Planning Application:

by Kelly & Cogan, Conservation Architects

SPECIFIC EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS:

The author : James Kelly, is a qualified Architect specialising in Conservation, a member of the Royal Institute of Architects in Ireland and of the Royal Institute of British Architects and holds a Bachelors Degree in Architecture from the University of Dublin, a Diploma in Architecture from Dublin Institute of Technology and a Master of Science Degree in Urban Regeneration and Development from Dublin Institute of Technology. He has acted as Board Member and chairman of Dublin Civic Trust, and as an Advisor and Council member to An Taisce The National Trust for Ireland.

He has extensive experience of the conservation of the built and Urban Environment and is an RIBA Accredited 'Specialist Conservation Architect' (this being the RIBA equivalent of Grade 1 RIAI Conservation Accreditation)

Appraisal:

The formatting is confusing and 'muddled' in that the overlap between historic events, proposed commemoration concepts and layouts of new structures are insufficiently delineated.

The historic adequately describes the events of Easter 1916 and gives a map and 'timeline' driven view of events in the period immediately prior to the surrender of the insurgents. It fails however to contextualise the Rising against a greater historical and geographic backdrop and tends to isolate these events to their immediate impact upon the Moore Street Area without acknowledging the global and national significance of the insurgency.

While 'correct' it does little to enhance knowledge of the events and needs considerable enhancement as against for example the standard presented in the Myles report.

In fairness it must also be added that the drawn map record of the volunteers movements and the nature of the fighting is well handled.

Strangely the manner in which commemoration of these and similar events has been addressed in Dublin and elsewhere seems to be of greater interest in the context of this report.

The manner in which commemoration has been conceptually addressed for Moore Street is problematic

in terms of both materiality and the underlying approach. These are summarised in the presentation as follows:

I. Retaining fabric related to the Easter Rising.

II. A Memorial Trail

III. Photographs etched at key locations on buildings

IV. A new public square with a pedestrian connection to the courtyard of the National Monument

V. A commemorative sculpture on the square

VI. Relocating The O'Rahilly's commemorative plaque on the correct side of the street

VII. A civic building on the square with potential uses as an Irish language centre, dance or cultural venue.

These concepts are highly aspirational and require a great deal further discussion. They seem to derive from a process more akin to advertising / public relations than to conservation or heritage management and we would also be concerned that in a number of instances they would be inappropriate or ill considered:

- Retaining Fabric:

The statement of intent to retain fabric relating to the Easter Rising is certainly correct.

Appraisal:

That said, the manner in which this is to be addressed appears to be one which would actually result in a loss of such fabric.... and would suggest that no built fabric beyond a small number of wall structures and the National Monuments themselves survive from either 1916 or earlier

This is a significant failing and our own research indicates a considerable number of built structures in some instances dating back to the 1760s and in all cases pre-dating the Easter

Rising survive on Moore Street, More Lane and in some instances in the rear halves of the existing buildings on O'Connell Street west.

Q notable failing in this regard is the failure to recognise the survival of the original 1760s building plots and their boundary / party walls – particularly in the lands to the rear of the Moore Street Houses. These have a particular significance not only in that they represent the survival of the entirety of the original 18th century urban plots but also in that one of the main impediments preventing the insurgents from progressing through the back-lands of the houses was the presence of the east – west garden and party walls

- A new public square with a pedestrian connection to the courtyard of the National Monument:

This proposal involves to removal of a significant areas of the setting about the national monument buildings and would eradicate the plot outlines of a number of the original 1760s houses.

Appraisal:

It is difficult to see how this proposal can be of benefit to the historic environment as it is of such a nature as to suggest a significant lack of awareness or understanding of the relevant ICOMOS Conservation Charters which apply in relation to this site, namely:

1. The Venice Charter (1964)1
2. The Washington Charter (1987)2

1 The Venice Charter for the 'Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites' of 1964, which

resulted in

the establishment of the 'International Council on Monuments and Sites' (ICOMOS)

2 Charter on the 'Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas' - Adopted by ICOMOS General

Assembly in

Washington, DC, October 1987

3. The Burra Charter (1999)3

This proposal alone (for the formation of a new square at the heart of the historic built receiving environment) is at odds with almost the entirety of the Venice Charter in respect of Articles 1, 3, 5, 6 and 14;

"Article 1. The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time
Article 3. The intention in conserving and restoring monuments is to safeguard them no less as works of art than as historical evidence

Article 5. The conservation of monuments is always facilitated by making use of them for some socially useful purpose. Such use is therefore desirable but it must not change the lay-out or decoration of the building. It is within these limits only that modifications demanded by a change of function should be envisaged and may be permitted.

Article 6. The conservation of a monument implies preserving a setting which is not out of scale. Wherever the traditional setting exists, it must be kept. No new construction, demolition or modification which would alter the relations of mass and color must be allowed.

Article 14. The sites of monuments must be the object of special care in order to safeguard their integrity and ensure that they are cleared and presented in a seemly manner. The work of conservation and restoration carried out in such places should be inspired by the principles set forth in the foregoing articles."

It is also in conflict with Principles and Objectives 2a, 2c, and 2e of the Washington Charter:

"2 Principles and Objectives: Qualities to be preserved include the historic character of the town or urban area and all those material and spiritual elements that express this character, especially:

a) Urban patterns as defined by lots and streets;

c) The formal appearance, interior and exterior, of buildings as defined by scale, size, style,

construction, materials, colour and decoration;

e) The various functions that the town or urban area has acquired over time. Any threat to these qualities would compromise the authenticity of the historic town or urban area."

It conflicts severely with Articles 2, 3, 8, 15, 21, 22, of the Burra Charter:

"Article 2. Conservation and Management

2.1 Places of cultural significance should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place.

2.3 Conservation is an integral part of good management of places of cultural significance.

2.4 Places of cultural significance should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

3 The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance

Article 3. Cautious Approach

3.1 Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

3.2 Changes to a place should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.

Article 8. Setting

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate setting. This includes retention of the visual and sensory setting, as well as the retention of spiritual and other cultural relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Article 15. Change

15.1 Change may be necessary to retain cultural significance, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a place and its use should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.

15.2 Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit.

15.3 Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of conservation. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

Article 21. Adaptation

21.1 Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place.

21.2 Adaptation should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.

Article 22. New work

22.1 New work such as additions or other changes to the place may be acceptable where it respects and does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such, but must respect and have minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place."

Again, it is difficult to see how this proposal can be of benefit to the historic environment as it is of such a nature as to suggest a significant lack of awareness or understanding of the relevant ICOMOS Conservation Charters which apply in relation to this site, namely:

1 The Venice Charter (1964)

2 The Washington Charter (1987)

3 The Burra Charter (1999)

This proposal alone (for a new building at the heart of the historic built receiving environment) is at odds with almost the entirety of the Venice Charter in respect of

Articles 1, 5, 6 and 14;

"Article 1. The concept of a historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time

Article 5. The conservation of monuments is always facilitated by making use of them for some socially useful purpose. Such use is therefore desirable but it must not change the lay-out or adaptation of the building. It is within these limits only that modifications demanded by a change of function should be envisaged and may be permitted.

Article 6. The conservation of a monument implies preserving a setting which is not out of scale. Wherever the traditional setting exists, it must be kept. No new construction, demolition or modification which would alter the relations of mass and color must be allowed.

Article 14. The sites of monuments must be the object of special care in order to safeguard their integrity and ensure that they are cleared and presented in a seemly manner. The work of conservation and restoration carried out in such places should be inspired by the principles set forth in the foregoing articles."

It is also in conflict with Principles and Objectives 2a of the Washington Charter:

"2 Principles and Objectives: Qualities to be preserved include the historic character of the town or urban area and all those material and spiritual elements that express this character, especially:

a) Urban patterns as defined by lots and streets;

It conflicts severely with Articles 2, 3, 8, 15, 21, 22, of the Burra Charter:

"Article 2. Conservation and Management

2.1 Places of cultural significance should be conserved.

2.2 The aim of conservation is to retain the cultural significance of a place.

2.3 Conservation is an integral part of good management of places of cultural significance.

2.4 Places of cultural significance should be safeguarded and not put at risk or left in a vulnerable state.

Article 3. Cautious Approach

3.1 Conservation is based on a respect for the existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as necessary but as little as possible.

3.2 Changes to a place should not distort the physical or other evidence it provides, nor be based on conjecture.

Article 8. Setting

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate setting. This includes retention of the visual and sensory setting, as well as the retention of spiritual and other cultural relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Article 15. Change

15.1 Change may be necessary to retain cultural significance, but is undesirable where it reduces cultural significance. The amount of change to a place and its use should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.

15.2 Changes which reduce cultural significance should be reversible, and be reversed when circumstances permit.

15.3 Demolition of significant fabric of a place is generally not acceptable. However, in some cases minor demolition may be appropriate as part of conservation. Removed significant fabric should be reinstated when circumstances permit.

Article 21. Adaptation

21.1 Adaptation is acceptable only where the adaptation has minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place.

21.2 Adaptation should involve minimal change to significant fabric, achieved only after considering alternatives.

Article 22. New work

22.1 New work such as additions or other changes to the place may be acceptable where it respects and does not distort or obscure the cultural significance of the place, or detract from its interpretation and appreciation.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such, but must respect and have minimal impact on the cultural significance of the place."

Appraisal:

There is however little in the way of a comprehensive and correct interpretation and assessment of the buildings of the east side on a building by building basis nor is there any assessment of the historic morphology of the subject lands.

In particular, there is no appraisal of the structures and plots under the relevant 'Categories of Special Interest' (Architectural, Historical, Archaeological, Artistic, Cultural, Scientific, Technical or Social) which is of relevance when one considers the overall setting of the street and its special interest.

Neither is there any coherent methodological approach in the form of a Heritage Impact Appraisal detailing the impact of the proposed development upon the Heritage Environment. In consequence the highly important process of mitigation of adverse impact of the proposed development has not been addressed.

4. UPDATED DESIGN THOUGHTS:

Appraisal:

As before the most worrying aspect of the proposed development insofar as any design intent can be determined from the presentation drawings, is the significant impact upon the More Street terrace occasioned by the formation of new link through a new square to O'Connell Street.

SUMMARY:

We would have a particular concern that notwithstanding the significance of the Heritage Environment that there is little or no awareness in the presentation proposals of the requirements of the ICOMOS Conservation Charters. This is a fundamental flaw the importance and magnitude of which is difficult to overstate.

It is difficult to avoid concluding that the development as proposed is severely lacking in insight or understanding of the heritage context either at a built or urban level and that the design response is 'internationalised' to such a degree as to erase the 'sense of place' inherent within this environment.

Neither is any great understanding evident of the principles of 'Place' 'Cultural Significance' or 'Cultural Heritage'. It is worth considering these concepts in some detail for the purposes of clarity:

Structure / Place of Cultural Significance: A structure or place perceived to be of value to

society, as a result of its continuity of presence and worth (as a synthesis of its historical, emotional, cultural and spiritual significance) which has historically established value for its social, architectural and aesthetic worth. 5

Cultural Heritage: As defined in Article 1 of 17th Session of UNESCO6

6 The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization meeting in

Paris from 17 October to 21 November 1972, at its seventeenth session:

"For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as "cultural heritage":
monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures

of an archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;

groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of

view of history, art or science;

sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view."

Against this backdrop it is clear that the goals of Urban Regeneration may not simply be achieved by the provision of accommodation, the establishment of amenity, availability of work or ease of access to services but that other issues associated with memory, (both

group and individual), identity and character in respect of place are involved.

Loss of place in the context of the loss of morphology or of heritage fabric occurs for various reasons and under varying circumstances, some traumatic some not so.

An example of the former might be the devastation caused over a short period – perhaps a few hours – as a consequence of an act of violence – naturally invoked or otherwise: The destruction of the remains at Palmyra, the fire-bombing of Dresden, the loss of Bam in Iran or the Santa Catalina Monastery in Peru, both to earthquakes or the Glasgow School of Art, lost to fire.

Equally, some loss may not be regarded as traumatic, notwithstanding the significance of the loss – historic loss over an extended period of time comes to mind, such as for example the gradual erasure of the mediaeval streets and burbidge plots of Dublin,

Norberg Schulz (1980) argues that in the built environment the concept of place has a meaning beyond the immediate accommodation provided or value of the property – he

names this phenomena the 'genius loci' or the 'spirit of the place' in which the built environment is a potentially 'meaning giving place and argues that where the 'traditional' urban structure of place is lost, the landscape is deprived of its 'meaning'.

He goes on to discuss this crisis as an urban problem and characterises the loss of built fabric as the loss to man of individuality and belonging and argues that that in such circumstances, all 'qualities' are lost and that such loss of recognisable forms of spatial structures which secure the identity of a settlement might be regarded as an 'environmental crisis'.

This is the background against which these proposals must be considered.

We would conclude that the presentation proposals do not adequately respond to these issues, that they are inadequately detailed and that in particular the Heritage Environment is not properly understood.

James Kelly BArchSc DipArch MScUrd RIAI RIBA

RIBA Accredited 'Specialist Conservation Architect'

BATTLEFIELD TOURISM : University of Glasgow.

Miles, Stephen Thomas (2012) Battlefield tourism: meanings and interpretations. PhD thesis.

Abstract

Battlefield sites are some of the most iconic locations in any nation's store of heritage attractions and continue to capture the imagination of visitors. They have strong historic, cultural, nationalistic and moral resonances and speak to people on a national as well as a local scale. They have the power to provoke contention but at the same time foster understanding and respect through the consideration of deep moral questions. Battlefields are suffused with powerful stories of courage, sacrifice, betrayal and even cowardice. They have a strong sense of place and can provoke a range of cognitive and emotional reactions. But as sites they are inherently unremarkable and rely on the incarnative powers of interpretation to inform and enliven otherwise empty landscapes.

1.2 Battlefield Tourism: the setting

1.2.1. A History of Battlefield Tourism

The attraction of battlefield sites has a long pedigree particularly as the focus for commemoration. There is evidence that Alexander the Great interrupted his invasion of Asia to pay homage to the slain of Troy (Arrian, 1958) and the commonly erected memorials to the dead at battlefield sites in Classical times would likely have been the focus for visits. In the Middle Ages battle sites were often forgotten, the results of any victory being more important than the actual site itself, and although there is no evidence of memorialisation, battles were often marked by churches or chantries (Hallam, 1985). The first firm evidence of people actually visiting battlefields comes from the aftermath of Waterloo (1815), which became a popular tourism destination in the nineteenth century (Seaton, 1999). In 1856 Thomas Cook organised his first tour to Waterloo and was taking

customers to the South African Battlefields of the Boer War even before hostilities ceased in 1902 (Lloyd, 1998)! In the American Civil War Battle of Bull Run (1861) so many local people were present as spectators that they impeded the Union forces' retreat⁴ (Piekarz,

2007b) and tourism to the Civil War battlefield sites is now extremely popular with the site at Gettysburg (1863) attracting over 3 million visits a year.

Baldwin and Sharples (2009) have argued that the First World War was a pivotal event in the emergence of battlefield tourism with ever increasing numbers of visitors wanting to visit the graves or death sites of their loved ones. In 1919 60,000 people visited the Western Front battlefields assisted by tour companies and this continued for the next 20 years (Seaton, 2000: 63). By 1930 in three months alone over 100,000 people had added their names to the Menin Gate memorial book at Ypres (Mosse, 1990: 154). The tourism hiatus of the Second World War resulted in a long period when there was reduced interest in these sites and revival only came about from the late 1960s onwards. This might have been due to the coming into retirement age of the children of those who served or were lost in the war and their interest in returning to see the graves and sites of conflict. Interest generated by several anniversaries of 1914 (the 50th in 1964, 60th in 1974 and 70th in 1984) as well as the increase in numbers of books published about the war in the 1970s could also have had an effect. By the late 1970s battlefield tours were increasing in number and the Western Front Association was founded in 1980.

There is a clear educational value of visiting battlefields and the inclusion of the First World War in the British History Curriculum has allowed thousands of schoolchildren to have the experience of visiting the Western Front every year. In 2010 over 47% of visitors to the In Flanders Fields Museum in Ypres were schoolchildren and 1,057 British schools visited which was a total of 50,320 individuals.

Additionally the training potential of battlefield sites has long been recognised by the military.

End.

Reference Documentation:

Re no 18 Moore Street -

The Shaffrey Conservation Report (Ministerial Consent Application for Chartered Land)

Local News - Front page: Re. No 18 Moore Street

The Battlefield -

The High Court Judgment of Hon. Justice Max Barrett in Moore V The Minister

The O' Muiri Masterplan for Moore Street submitted to the Advisory Group to Minister O'Brien by Aengus O Snodaigh TD on behalf of The Moore Street Preservation Trust



Comhairle Cathrach
Bhaile Átha Cliath
Dublin City Council

An Roinn Pleanála & Forbairt Maoine, Bloc 4, Uirlár 3,
Oifigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Baile Átha Cliath 8

Planning & Property Development Department, Dublin City Council,
Block 4, Floor 3, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8

T: (01) 222 2288
E. planningsubmissions@dublincity.ie

Mr. James Connolly Heron on behalf of
Relatives of the Signatories of Proclama
4, Oxford Road, Ranelagh, Dublin 6

IMPORTANT: Please retain this letter. You will be required to produce it should you wish to appeal the decision issued by the Planning Authority to An Bord Pleanála in relation to this development

PLAN NO.
DATE RECEIVED:
LOCATION :
PROPOSAL :

2863/21
01-Jun-2021

22-25 Moore Street, 13 Moore Lane, 14-15 Moore Lane, Dublin 1
PROTECTED STRUCTURE: Dublin Central GP Limited intends to apply for Permission for a period of 15 years at a site, 'Dublin Central - Site 5' (c. 0.18 Ha) at No. 22 - 25 Moore Street, No. 13 Moore Lane, No. 14 Moore Lane (otherwise known as Nos. 1 - 3 O'Rahilly Parade and Nos. 14 - 15 Moore Lane or Nos. 1 - 8 O'Rahilly Parade and Nos. 14 - 15 Moore Lane), Dublin 1 and otherwise generally bounded by O'Rahilly Parade to the north, by Moore Lane to the east, by No. 21 Moore Street and No. 12 Moore Lane to the south and by Moore Street to the west. The proposed development comprises: - A mixed-use scheme in a single building (c. 6,478 sq. m gross floor area) ranging in height from 2 - 6 storeys (top floor set back) over single storey localised basement. The building includes office space (c. 5,753 sq. m) from 1st to 5th floor with office lobby at ground floor level, with 3no. terraces at 2nd, 3rd and 5th floor respectively (c. 401 sq. m in total) and 3no. licenced restaurant / café units with takeaway / collection facility at ground floor (Unit 1 on Moore Lane, O'Rahilly Parade and the proposed new public plaza - c. 228 sq. m, Unit 2 on the proposed new public plaza - c. 271 sq. m and Unit 3 on Moore Street, O'Rahilly Parade and the proposed new public plaza - c. 179 sq. m), together with provision of a 'delivery hub' unit at ground floor level (c. 46 sq. m). All associated and ancillary site development, demolition, landscaping, site infrastructure and temporary works, including: - Demolition of all existing buildings and structures on site (c. 2,312 sq. m); Provision of part of a new public plaza (168 sq. m) and associated temporary works pending completion of the combined plaza with the concurrent planning application for the adjoining Site 4 immediately to the south (1,253 sq. m public plaza overall); 58no. bicycle parking spaces at ground floor level with associated cycling welfare facilities; Plant at basement and roof level; Building signage zone and retractable canopies; Laying of underground drainage infrastructure from O'Rahilly Parade to connect with existing drainage network on Parnell Street via Moore Street. The application site is outside the O'Connell Street Architectural



Comhairle Cathrach
Bhaile Átha Cliath
Dublin City Council

An Roinn Pleanála & Forbairt Maoine, Bloc 4, Urlár 3,
Oifigí na Cathrach, An Ché Adhmaid, Baile Átha Cliath 8

Planning & Property Development Department, Dublin City Council,
Block 4, Floor 3, Civic Offices, Wood Quay, Dublin 8

T: (01) 222 2288
E. planningsubmissions@dublincity.ie

Conservation Area. An Environmental Impact Assessment Report
(EIAR) accompanies this application.

Note: Submissions/Observations may be made on line at:

<https://www.dublincity.ie/residential/planning/planning-applications/object-or-support-planning-application>

To Whom It May Concern,

The Planning Authority wishes to acknowledge receipt of your **submission/observation** in connection with the above planning application. It should be noted that the Dublin City Council as the Planning Authority will consider this application strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Dublin City Development Plan. The contents of your submission/observation will be considered by the **Case Officer** during the assessment of the above application, and you will be notified of the decision in due course.

- All queries should be submitted to the e mail address shown above.
- Please note that a request for Further Information or Clarification of Further information is not a decision.
- **You will not be notified**, if Further Information or Clarification of Further information is requested by the Planning Authority.

Please also note that a weekly list of current planning applications and decisions is available for inspection at the planning public counter.

Opening Hours 9 a.m. - 4.30 p.m. Monday to Friday (inclusive of lunchtime)

A weekly list of planning applications and decisions is available for inspection at all Dublin City Council Libraries & on **Dublin City Council's website. www.dublincity.ie**.

Yours faithfully

For ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

