2004

Henrietta Street Conservation Plan

Shaffrey Associates (Architects)

John Montague Dr.

Carrig Conservation Ltd.

Tracy Pickerill
Dublin Institute of Technology, tracy pickerill@dit.ie

Lee McCullough & Partners (Engineers)

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://arrow.dit.ie/beschrecart

Part of the Historic Preservation and Conservation Commons

Recommended Citation
Authors
Shaffrey Associates (Architects), John Montague Dr., Carrig Conservation Ltd., Tracy Pickerill, Lee McCullough & Partners (Engineers), and Boylan Farrelly (Quantity Surveyors)
HENRIETTA STREET CONSERVATION PLAN
Plean Caomhantais Shráid Henrietta

AN ACTION OF THE DUBLIN CITY HERITAGE PLAN
Gníomh de chuid Phlean Oidhreachta Chathair Bhaile Átha Cliath

Shaffrey Associates Architects
John Montague, Architectural Historian
Carrig Conservation Ltd
Dr. Tracy Pickerill
Lee McCullough & Partners, Consulting Engineers
Boylan Farrelly, Quantity Surveyors
Henrietta Street

"Before the gorgeous Blessington was seen
Or dandy D’Orsay graced the splendid scene
Herculean chairmen bore the fair
To routs and masquerades, and the yellow flare
Of the link-boys’ torches burned away the gloom
Down Primates’ Hill, to some Palladian room
Where the rococo craftsmen set a foil
For Gardiner, Clements, Ponsonby and Boyle,
Spendthrift inheritors of the mean renown
Of archiepiscopal rakes like Stone.
Gone are their filigrane splendours: Palladio’s door
Unhinged: Tracton Apollo and his stuccodore
Alike in turf. In the street today
Poverty pullulates and the arts decay.
Down the proud steps, from the panelled hall,
The children scramble and the babies crawl.
Their swarm enjoy the franchise of the street
Skilled to avoid postprandial Benchers’ feet
And blind to the mellowed majesty of law
Pursue their wonted games of hole and taw."

C.P.C.

1 Hand-typed poem, with manuscript corrections, by C.P. Curren, date unknown. In the private collection of Edward McParland, FTCD, and included here with his permission.
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Preface

This Conservation Plan was commissioned by Dublin City Council, as an action of the Dublin City Heritage Plan, and is co-funded by The Heritage Council.

Significance

Henrietta Street ranks amongst the more important architectural and urban ensembles of this country. It is the single most intact and important architectural collection of individual houses – as a street – in the city. In the international context, the street is of unique European significance, being the single remaining intact example of an early-18th century street of houses, which was at the forefront of what was to become the Georgian style.

Henrietta Street is an entirely unique repository of historical and archaeological data about the built fabric of our early 18th-century city, which is of great rarity in the European context, as well as incorporating surviving evidence for the far more humble partitioned hovels of the late 19th-century and 20th-century poor. Notwithstanding the way that the street has continued as an authentically lived-in and worked-in quarter, Henrietta Street, as an archaeological site, is as important to the record of settlement in these islands as the preserved remains of Clonmacnoise or Wood Quay.

Henrietta Street’s historical importance stems not only from the quality and scale of its houses, but also from the singular political and social status of its residents. These included, from the 18th-century, four All Ireland Primates, including Archbishop Boulter, the first resident of Henrietta Street and Archbishops Stone and Robinson who were also Lords Justice; Luke Gardiner, the banker, large-scale property developer and administrator of the treasury, who laid out the street in the first place; Nathaniel Clements, successor to Gardiner as Deputy Vice-Treasurer and directly responsible for construction of most of the houses (save for Nos. 9 & 10); Henry Boyle, who was Speaker of the House of Commons in 1733 and served as Chancellor of the Irish Exchequer and Lord Justice and, John Ponsonby, also Speaker of the House of Commons.

Henrietta Street is also remarkable for the quality and variety of its present social character. The very survival of Henrietta Street in the recent past has been founded upon the singular commitment to the street of many of its current residents. The present residents, owners and those who work and live there, embrace a very varied range of cultural, institutional and personal approaches to their presence on, and contribution to, the street and the city as a whole, which gives a concentrated quality as well as a sense of vibrant everyday life to the area.

Today, Henrietta Street appears at first to be somewhat isolated as a cultural phenomenon, located, as it is, in an area of streets and houses which has suffered from economic neglect for many years. Henrietta Street, however, provides a unique opportunity to act as an anchor of cultural renewal in what is otherwise a fairly run-down north inner-city quarter. By recognising and consolidating the historic and spatial connection of Henrietta Street with the ancient arterial route of Bolton Street, through Capel Street and across Capel Street Bridge to the south-city historical core of Dublin Castle, Christ Church Cathedral and Temple Bar, provides an opportunity to
draw Henrietta Street back into the realm of what is culturally recognised, while re-emphasising the importance of the historically resplendent Capel Street, and giving an injection into the largely neglected streets which surround both of them.

Objectives of the Conservation Plan

The objectives behind this Conservation Plan are to re-affirm the significance of Henrietta Street, which the above paragraphs briefly summarise, to identify the issues which presently undermine the importance of the street and to set out policies — with the consensus of the various stakeholders consulted — aimed at protecting the aspects of the street which are of importance into the future. As part of the Conservation Plan, information that has already been gathered through the HARP/Dublin Civic Trust 1999 Inventory is a vital resource that has been updated to accurately chart the changing condition of buildings along the street.

Vulnerabilities

Of the various threats which presently challenge Henrietta Street, the following are of the most immediate concern and gravity:

- The current status — both physical and legal — of Nos. 3 & 14 give cause for great concern. Both buildings are in a very poor condition, both internally and externally. These buildings need urgent attention. Firstly, it is necessary to establish what works are needed to secure the buildings in the short-term and, in this regard the preliminary report on structural inspections, (ref. Appendix D), identifies the major issues of concern. In the long-term both houses need sustainable and secure uses and tenure which can be accommodated in a manner sensitive to the architectural importance of these houses and with adequate resources to ensure all necessary works are carried out to the standards their importance warrants.

- The struggle to maintain the houses in the appropriate condition places a sizeable burden on the property owners, one which has been met with heroic and remarkable commitment and steadfastness over the last thirty years. However, the challenge — indeed, since 1999 a statutory responsibility - to tackle the processes of deterioration and decay in such large and demanding houses, is substantial. The 1999 condition surveys, carried out by Dublin Civic Trust for the Historic Area Rejuvenation Project (HARP) and updated as part of the Conservation Plan process, act as a baseline for the condition of the houses. The external elements were also reviewed as part of this Conservation Plan — in general and cost terms – and the challenge today remains sizeable, if anything greater. Despite the restoration of Nos. 8 to 10, No. 11, and some remedial works to No. 15 – Na Piobairí Uíleann – the condition of the houses remains precarious. Several of the houses are in private ownership with limited, though notable and welcome, sources of public grant assistance available. The resources are simply not available in the quantity and appropriate structure required to ensure the proper conservation of these houses.

- The development boom which the country has enjoyed over the last fifteen years, has visited the Henrietta Street area in recent years. The contrast in scale and architectural hierarchy between Henrietta Street and
the urban vernacular of its environs, which has endured historically, is now under threat. Equally, the physical and visual relationship between the Street and the surviving 18th-century context, is undergoing radical change. Thus, the architectural reading of Henrietta Street is under threat if new development within the hinterland of Henrietta Street is not assessed from the perspective of its specific impact on these particular characteristics.

Equally, new development brings new uses which threaten to change the character of the Street. While it is acknowledged that among the houses’ abiding qualities is the robustness of the architecture – which has successfully accommodated many changes of ownership profile without losing the architectural significance – the impact of meeting building regulations, etc. to accommodate new uses, may have a detrimental knock-on effect on the architectural significance of the houses.

Policies

Underpinning the policies of the Conservation Plan are a number of key objectives:

- To acknowledge the primary role of the property owners in protecting the significance of the houses and the street
- To identify and promote existing and new initiatives, structures and mechanisms which will assist the property owners in the substantial task of maintaining the buildings to the appropriate standard which reflects the importance of the street and also satisfies statutory responsibilities
- To improve the wider public’s awareness and appreciation of the international cultural significance of Henrietta Street
- To acknowledge the contribution which the varied history of the street and the present diversity of uses and users makes to the cultural significance of the street
- To ensure the condition of the houses is maintained to the appropriate standards, to identify where structure and fabric is presently at risk, and, where this is the case to ensure a programme of immediate repair works is put in place
- To ensure proper and sufficient technical guidance and architectural historical information is available to both property owners and planning officials so that the appropriate standards for any building or maintenance works are implemented and to prevent inadvertent loss or damage to important building fabric, structure, historic layout and context
- To protect against inappropriate uses of, and/or interventions and alterations to, the houses on Henrietta Street and their historic context
- To consolidate and improve the presentation of the street and the public realm environment
- To protect and consolidate the street’s historic importance and its unique urban character in terms of its immediate surroundings and the broader city context
Policy 1: To recognise Henrietta Street Property Owners Group and its contribution and ongoing role in the future maintenance of the street.

Policy 2: To commission a study to recommend the appropriate legal structure, management composition and funding endowment status of the proposed heritage foundation/trust within the Irish legislative system and to identify ways to foster the endowment of a heritage conservation fund.

Policy 3: To establish an endowed heritage foundation/trust for Henrietta Street.

Policy 3.1: Under the auspices of the Henrietta Street heritage foundation/trust, to introduce a combination of specific ‘area based’ architectural heritage funding instruments, with particular regard to ownership profiles (private owners occupiers; private investors; public bodies and charitable institutions), to ensure implementation of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan.

Policy 4: To implement a programme of essential external fabric and associated structure repairs to the houses on Henrietta Street.

Policy 5: To establish a pro-active and co-ordinated ongoing maintenance strategy for Henrietta Street to benefit from the economies of scale with regard to the provision of periodic inspections to assess maintenance and monitor needs, minor repairs, maintenance and monitoring costs and associated insurance costs.

Policy 6: To compile and update on an ongoing basis, a manual for property owners and Dublin City Council, which would include building inventories, building hierarchy matrix and technical guidance manual.

Policy 7: To ensure the protection of the surviving cellars.

Policy 8: To digitise and review the HARP/Dublin Civic Trust building inventories.

Policy 9: That the proposed Framework Development Area (FDA) Plan for Broadstone, included as an objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2005-2011, has due regard for the policies of the Conservation Plan, where appropriate.

Policy 10: That the pedestrian and cycle connection between Bolton Street and Broadstone/Grangegeorman via Henrietta Street and the Kings Inns is protected within the FDA Plan to be prepared for the Broadstone FDA.
**Policy 11:** That the important historic route along Henrietta Street, Capel Street, Parliament Street to City Hall and Dublin Castle, be taken into consideration in assessing any proposed development within this area.

**Policy 12:** That the impact of new development in the area around Henrietta Street should be assessed in relation to its impact on views to and from Henrietta Street.

**Policy 13:** That any redevelopment proposals for the Kings Inns be preceded by a Master Plan which takes on board the policies of this Conservation Plan.

**Policy 14:** That the area around Henrietta Street, comprising house Nos. 3 to 15, the Kings Inns and Registry of Deeds buildings and the buildings and structures on the south side of Henrietta Lane, be assessed for suitability as an Architectural Conservation Area, as defined in the Planning and Development Act 2000.

**Policy 15:** That Henrietta Street as an entity and not just a collection of buildings is given due consideration when assessing the impact of any proposed development either within the street or the immediate surroundings.

**Policy 16:** That, as part of the Henrietta Street ACA, a use impact assessment be carried out for any proposal for change of use within the ACA and that grant of permission be based on the acceptability of any proposed interventions associated with the particular use.

**Policy 17:** That the Henrietta Street ACA identifies and acknowledges the cultural diversity which exists on the street at present, arising from the prevailing social and use mix, as an important part of the character of Henrietta Street.

**Policy 18:** That a full assessment of the structures on the former mews sites on Henrietta Lane be carried out to determine their architectural significance and, where appropriate, statutory protection be put in place.

**Policy 19:** That the ACA identifies potential uses which would facilitate public access to the building interiors without compromising the architectural integrity of the building, or uses which seek to preserve and prioritise the architectural significance.

**Policy 20:** That the bollards be removed and replaced with a more aesthetically appropriate type.

**Policy 21:** That the present colour scheme of the public lighting be retained.

**Policy 22:** All surviving granite paving flags and kerbs should be retained.

**Policy 23:** In general street furniture, signage and road markings should be kept to a minimum and, where necessary, designs should be simple, visually restrained and of good quality materials.

**Policy 24:** That a series of research and recording projects be implemented to consolidate and add to existing documented information on the street.

**Policy 25:** To facilitate better public access to and mediation of the cultural heritage of Henrietta Street

**Policy 26:** That the precarious condition of Nos. 3 and 14 be tackled as a priority, that the buildings be repaired in accordance with the conservation issues report included in Appendix F and that a sustainable new use and tenure be secured.

**Policy 27:** That the potential reinstatement of No. 16 be further explored by the Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust and a suitable mechanism for development prepared in conjunction with Dublin City Council.

**Policy 28:** To ensure a sustainability of approach in the implementation of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan.

### Implementation and Review

The context for commissioning this Conservation Plan has been the desire to reaffirm and retain the unique importance of Henrietta Street in the Irish and international architectural and urban historical context. Following on from this, the objectives are to establish the works required to protect the significance of the buildings and street and meet statutory requirements, to influence the extent and nature of future intervention and change and to explore and identify suitable mechanisms by which the immediate and ongoing actions necessary to protect Henrietta Street to the standards appropriate to its importance, can be resourced.

The Conservation Plan is not a statutory document. However, it will assist in the implementation of existing statutory policy and law. The Conservation Plan is the beginning of a long-term process and its successful implementation will depend on as wide acceptance and active support as possible. In particular it is the acceptance by the major stakeholders – namely the building owners, long term tenants/occupants and Dublin City Council – of the Conservation Plan and a shared consensus on the importance of the street, the issues which threaten its significance and the measures identified in the policies to address these issues of vulnerability.
The successful implementation of the Conservation Plan policies also depend on the action of all major stakeholders. However, the sensitive manner in which the majority of the buildings have been maintained and protected over the last 30 to 40 years, indicates the strong commitment which already exists and the sophisticated and informed understanding of these property owners of the importance of Henrietta Street.

In preparing the Plan, consultation was held with all the key stakeholders\(^2\). Further consultation and dialogue will be necessary at times during the life of the Plan.

**Immediate/Short Term Actions**

The Conservation Plan policies include specific proposals/recommendations which should be implemented at an early stage. These include:

- To commission a study to recommend an appropriate legal structure, management composition and funding endowment status for the proposed Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust (Policy 2). This study would also identify ways to foster endowment of the foundation/trust and would explore suitable ‘area based’ funding instruments which would aid the implementation of the Conservation Plan policies (Policy 3.1).
- To implement a programme of essential external fabric and associate structure repairs to the buildings on Henrietta Street (Policy 4).
- To establish a pro-active and co-ordinated ongoing monitoring and maintenance strategy for Henrietta Street (Policy 5).
- To compile a manual for property owners and planning authorities comprising building inventories, building hierarchy matrix and technical guidance manual (Policy 6).
- To commence the process of designation of Henrietta Street as an Architectural Conservation Area (Policy 14).
- To carry out an assessment of the existing structures on Henrietta Lane to determine their architectural historical importance and to make recommendations with regard to statutory protection (Policy 14).
- To review appropriate structural solutions to consolidate the surviving cellars and to facilitate removal of the existing bollards (Policy 7) and, in the short term to replace the existing metal bollards on Henrietta Street with a more appropriate type bollard (Policy 20).
- To digitise the HARP/Dublin Civic Trust building inventories (Policy 8).
- To commission and publish a number of recording and research projects to consolidate and add to existing documented information on the street (Policy 24). Specifically,
  - to record and document the considerable wealth of information and knowledge gathered by the property owners and building users over the years
  - to commission a detailed survey and record of all buildings which might continue over a number of years and would record the historic layers which are still visible in many of the houses
  - To research and document the social and cultural history of the street from its initial development to the present day
- To seek an urgent resolution to the legal injunction currently pertaining to Nos. 3 and 14 and to carry out immediate works to make the buildings safe for inspection and, following this, to carry out urgent essential repairs to halt deterioration of fabric and to protect the buildings from further loss of important historic material. To seek appropriate and sustainable uses with secure tenure (Policy 26).
- To explore the potential for the reinstatement of No. 16 Henrietta Street and, as appropriate, to prepare a development brief, promote the redevelopment of the site and procure a suitable use and occupant for the new building (Policy 27).

It is recommended that, until the Henrietta Street foundation/trust is established, that a Steering Group, which includes representatives of the key stakeholders - be appointed to oversee the implementation of the Conservation Plan. This Steering Group should consult with the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group on an ongoing basis as it is from working together that the objectives of the Plan will be achieved.

To maintain the momentum and interest generated during the preparation of the Plan, it is recommended that the above actions be implemented within 2006/2007. As some of these actions may take some time to complete, for example the Architectural Conservation Area, due regard should be given to the objectives within the relevant policies and sub-policies by the relevant stakeholders, in particular where any proposed development or works are being carried out or assessed for approval.

To assist in the acceptance and implementation of the Plan it is recommended that a number of workshops are held with the stakeholders – for example one workshop would be held with the relevant Departments of Dublin

\(^2\) Refer to Chapter 2.0 which sets out the consultation process and the key issues arising. Note also that the owners of No.4 took part to a limited extent in the consultation process.
City Council, another with the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group – in order to present the Plan and advise on how the policies might be implemented.

**Review**

The Conservation Plan will initiate and inform ongoing processes for the future of Henrietta Street and may require variation at times along the way. It should be reviewed on an annual basis to assess the continued relevance of the policies and to chart progress in implementing the actions and recommendations.

The HARP/Dublin Civic Trust building inventories were updated as part of this Conservation Plan process and these should be consulted as part of any review of the Conservation Plan.

Finally, the information contained in the Conservation Plan including the Appendices (which can be consulted in Dublin City Archives), should form part of a site archive and management document. Any new information – survey, historical, etc., – should be added to the file as it becomes available. The file should be available as a tool to those involved in the day to day management of Henrietta Street and when particular works are being planned.

---

3 A presentation of the Draft Plan was given by the consultants to representatives from the Architects, Planning and Development Departments of Dublin City Council on 7 April 2005.
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Context for Conservation Plan

The Conservation Plan for Henrietta Street was commissioned by Dublin City Council, in conjunction with the Heritage Council in March 2004 (fig. 1.1.1). The context for commissioning the Conservation Plan arises from Dublin City Council and the Heritage Council in association with key stakeholders wishing “to co-ordinate the future conservation, rehabilitation and regeneration of Henrietta Street in a strategic manner.”

There have been a number of positive developments which have taken place in Henrietta Street in the last number of years, including the establishment of the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group, the fine restoration of the Daughter’s of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul’s buildings at Nos. 8 to 10, and various conservation and restoration works to some of the other buildings on the street. The commitment of the majority of property owners on the street to a sensitive and benign guardianship of the houses has continued. This has been supported in several cases by welcome public grants through the relatively new Local Authority Conservation Grants, and continued support through Heritage Council and Irish Georgian Society grants. Indeed, in one notable instance a private benefactor has funded the restoration of the railings and external elements of the lower floors to Nos. 5, 6, and 7.

However, the enormous task of ensuring the proper protection of these important buildings remains and the existing support systems are generally inadequate to meet the challenge which exists. Equally, the importance of ensuring the buildings are maintained/repaired/conserved to the appropriate standards can only be addressed by making the necessary professional and technical support available to the property owners. While the ownership profile of the houses includes private, public and institutional, the architectural heritage belongs to all.

The development boom which has been ongoing in the country for the last 15 or so years has visited the area around Henrietta Street in recent years. With ongoing development and the relocation of DIT to Grangegorman it is likely that the near future will see continued physical

---

4 Extract from Conservation Plan Brief. The key stakeholders referred to comprise the property owners, An Taisce, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Dublin Civic Trust and the Irish Georgian Society.
change in the area and this will impact on the character of Henrietta Street.

While the architectural and historical importance of Henrietta Street is recognised by many, the general awareness of Henrietta Street is quite poor in contrast, say to other areas of Georgian Dublin such as the Squares – Merrion, Fitzwilliam, Parnell and Mountjoy. Indeed, many people living in Dublin are entirely unaware of Henrietta Street or, if aware, are not able to locate it, either in reality or within their mental map of the city. Thus one of the key objectives of the Conservation Plan is to set out concisely the nature and extent of the significance of Henrietta Street.

Other issues which the Conservation Plan aims to address are guidance for repairs and conservation of the houses, implementation of a management plan for the effective maintenance of the street, the protection of the street by influencing the nature of adjacent development and relevant policy formation within the Dublin City Development Plan.

1.2 Scope of Conservation Plan

“The Conservation Plan is a process that seeks to guide the future development of a place through an understanding of its significance”.

In accordance with the principles laid down in the ICOMOS Burra Charter, and subsequent guidance documents, including James Semple Kerr’s Guide to Conservation Plans (ibid.) and the UK Heritage Lottery Fund’s Conservation Plans for Historic Places (1996), this Conservation Plan aims to provide the following:

- An understanding of an historic place and what is significant about it
- Identification of issues which threaten to undermine or devalue this significance
- Appropriate policies and recommendations to assist in: managing the site; planning repairs or restoration; planning new developments and, managing a programme of regular maintenance.

In preparing a Conservation Plan a holistic and, often multidisciplinary examination of the site is required, to ensure that a full and broad understanding and assessment informs the policies and recommendations. As part of the Plan process, the various aspects of significance are described, in addition to any conflicts which may exist between these. Most important also is the identification of where gaps exist in the current understanding of the site, to ensure inadvertent damage does not occur as a result of this.

Finally, the Conservation Plan should enable the consequences of any specific proposal to be assessed to establish whether they will retain, or indeed enhance, the significance of the site.

1.3 Methodology and Layout

The process and general sequencing of the Plan can be summarised as follows:

- **Gathering Information/Understanding the Site**
  - Survey of the Street, the buildings and the urban context
  - Architectural Historical research; urban history and contemporary context research; legislation and statutory policy review

- **Consultation**
  - Regular Steering Group meetings
  - Meeting with Henrietta Street Property Owners’ Group
  - Meetings with property owners, building occupants, other key informants and stakeholders
  - Review of Written Submissions (The consultation process is described in more detail in Chapter 2.0)

- **Analysis and Assessment**
  - Identify significance
  - Prepare statement of significance
  - Identify threats to significance
  - Identify gaps in understanding and any conflicts between different significances

- **Prepare Policies**
  - Identify categories for the policies
  - Identify policies to guide ongoing issues

- **Set out guidance for Implementation and review**
  - Elicit from the policies what actions are to be taken, identify who should be charged to implement the action and set out time-frames for commencing/completing actions.

The above suggests a sequence of actions carried out one after the other. However, many ran concurrently and, indeed,
some of the policies were developed at an early stage in the process.

The Layout of the Plan, generally follows the above format. The Plan is divided into 4 Parts:

- Part One introduces the background and context to the Plan. It also contains a summary report on the consultation process.
- Part Two contains a chronology of the significant dates in the development of Henrietta Street. It also contains a concise history of Henrietta Street and a critical description of the street and buildings.
- Part Three sets out both what is significant about Henrietta Street and what issues put this significance under threat.
- Part Four contains the policies developed for Henrietta Street and sets out guidance for the implementation and review of these policies.

A separate volume of Appendices contain supplementary information, reports and submissions gathered as part of the Conservation Plan process.
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2.0 Consultation

A significant part of the Conservation Plan process involved an extensive programme of consultation. This primarily involved individual meetings with Henrietta Street property owners, building occupants, the Heritage Council and conservation NGO’s including An Taisce, Dublin Civic Trust and the Irish Georgian Society. In addition meetings were held with representatives from the relevant departments within Dublin City Council. Finally, the consultants met on an ongoing basis, throughout the Plan preparation period, with the Steering Group to discuss the emerging issues and policies.

At the commencement of the Conservation Plan study period the consultant team met with the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group. This was an important early meeting which identified some of the views and concerns of the Property Owners Group. While all views were not

---

6 The owners of No. 4 did not take part in the formal consultation process, however they did write to the consultants and this letter is included in Appendix H as a written submission. They also were in attendance at the initial meeting with the Henrietta Street Property Owners’ Group. The consultants also wrote to the former owners of Nos. 3 & 14, who are in legal dispute with DCC with regard to the Section 71 CPO action taken by DCC, to invite them to partake in the consultation process. There has been no response to the letter.

7 Those in attendance included: Alice Hanratty, No.4; Nuada MacEoin, Nos. 5, 6, 7; Sr. Catherine Prendergast, Daughters of Charity, Nos. 8, 9, 10; Camilla McAleese, The Honourable Society of Kings Inns, No. 11; Ian Lumley, No. 12 and Michael Casey, No. 13.
universally shared there was a common appreciation
and understanding of the great significance of the street
and its houses. There were mixed views on the value
of the Conservation Plan process, some considering it
unnecessary in the light of current statutory protection of
the houses, others welcomed the process as a means of
providing a more specific context for day to day planning
aspects and guidance of what can and can’t be done in
Henrietta Street.

As stated above consultation was carried out via individual
meetings and at an early stage of the process. In addition
to topics which were specific to the individual/group, some
common questions were discussed at each session, which
assisted in identifying where there was consensus and
where conflict. These latter questions are set out below
with a selection of the answers which illustrate the range of
views:

What is positive about Henrietta Street at present?

“Such old buildings still intact... so beautiful”

“Still there, survived – remarkable due to passionate
people... after years of everybody saying... must do
something... now [things are] happening”

“Beautiful architecture... its robustness... has survived
appalling things and still there”

“Henrietta Street [is] much better than 25 years ago”

“Henrietta Street still exists... stood test of time... intactness
and quite unique”

“Can accommodate a mix of uses... proven over the years”

“Cul-de-sac is a strength... can be contained from planning
perspective... allows sense of private and public”

“[Present] uses are a very happy mix... no awful sterile
atmosphere”

“Quiet at night... very nice because a cul-de-sac”

“The will to do something about [the street]... to change
things, is there now more than ten years ago”

“The different approaches to using street to optimum is part
of the story of the street”

“Everyone in the street is concerned that the street has a
future... all owners in street are talking – no major conflicts...
no divergence of interest”

“the diversity of uses”

“Street is quite good at present... an example of the upside
of neglect, poverty and disinterest”

Is Henrietta Street ‘at risk’/What are the challenges
facing the street at present?

“Quite at risk now... ownership issues into the future are
uncertain”

“The street will continue to muddle along... [the] individual
buildings at risk from lack of repairs... fire risk – huge
impact... risk of gentrification – public perception of what a
grand street should be”

“not particularly ‘at risk’ with a few ‘ifs’ and ‘buts’...
encroaching poor architecture... setting being eroded...
entrance to street is poor”

“Not at risk apart from situation regarding No.3 and No.14...
if houses are empty – are at risk”

“Use mix is vulnerable”

“Main challenges are how street looks and two empty
houses”

“Presentation of street is poor”

“Lack of predictability for owners with future funding”

“If owners go down route of opening to public then will have
difficulty of insurance and standards”

“challenge to make sure street is not a ‘timewarp... not just a
museum piece”

“money and different understandings”

“the street [presentation] itself... potential privatisation of
street... uncertainty over future of Nos. 3 and 14”

“Nos. 3 & 14... would be welcome to have public access to
one house”

“lack of funding mechanisms which are appropriate to the
street”

How would you like to see street into the future?

“Not a lot different... safeguard what is there, continue
maintenance”

“Have to solve cellars problems... widen footpaths”

“Allow evolution to continue”

“a friendly street, worthwhile to visit and be in... mixed nature
to continue”
“like to see a coffee shop use on street... a simple gathering place”

“continue on the way it is – patch up and repair and move on... cultural diversity is a great strength... owners are a great strength”

“all houses as living/used units... street to be alive... become more visitor friendly”

“mellow texture retained... sense of age/patina retained”

In addition to the above, other questions addressed the importance – locally, nationally, internationally, of Henrietta Street; the appropriateness of ring-fencing the street for special funding/planning control/designation, e.g., as an Architectural Conservation Area or World Heritage Site or to establish a Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust; how important is the impact of development within the area surrounding Henrietta Street, including Henrietta Lane and, should No.15 be reinstated and, if so how.

The discussions which took place during these consultation sessions have informed the consultants’ understanding of the issues and threats affecting Henrietta Street and are also reflected in the policies of the Conservation Plan. One of the principal goals of a Conservation Plan is to achieve a consensus amongst the stakeholders for a particular site. In the case of Henrietta Street, there are quite a number of stakeholders and achieving consensus is complex.

However, the following summarises the main areas where consensus exists:

- Henrietta Street is of great importance, architecturally and historically both in the history of the city of Dublin’s development and in the European context.

- Today, the street is more secure than it has been for most of the 20th century. This is primarily due to the current property owners, the new legislative protection on the houses and a general growing awareness of the importance of the street and its buildings.

- The cultural and social mix of the street today is very much part of the particular character which it has. However, this use mix is vulnerable to change, particularly in the present economic environment.

- Despite this the history of the street shows the robustness of the buildings to endure considerable changes without affecting their overall character and architectural significance.

- Perhaps the main areas of concern for the future of the street are the lack of appropriate funding and technical/ professional/craftsmanship skills to ensure that the necessary works are carried out to the right standards and in a timely way that no valuable material is lost.

- Further concern exists with regard to the poor condition of Nos.3 and 14 and the uncertainty with regard to their future.

- The impact on the character of Henrietta Street is seen as an important consideration to be taken on board when assessing any development proposals for the street and the area around it.

- The public realm of the street could be improved by replacing the present bollards with a more appropriate type.

- Improved public access to the street and the houses is seen as desirable, however the impact of facilitating this needs to be assessed with regard to the particular significance of the relevant building(s) to which access is to be provided.

- There are merits to considering a Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust as a vehicle to manage maintenance, attract and distribute funding, carry out some repair works, monitor building conditions and standards of works.

In addition to individual consultation meetings, all those consulted were invited to make written submissions to the Plan. Those received are contained in Appendix H along with a list of those individuals and groups who took part in the consultation process.

One submission which it was requested to include in the Conservation Plan is an acknowledgment of a private donation to carry out repair works to Nos. 5, 6 & 7. This acknowledgment reads as follows:

“Given the importance of Henrietta Street in the historical heritage of Dublin City and the recent upgrading of Nos. 8 – 10, a donor has enabled the owners of 5, 6 & 7 to upgrade the railings and lower floors of their premises. This in the hope that other donors will encourage the upgrading of Nos. 4, 12, 13, & 15, and also to resolve the impasses over the compulsory purchase orders on Nos. 3 & 14, and the rehabilitation of those properties.”
3.0 **Chronology** *(fig.3.1)*

**1721**  
Luke Gardiner, M.P. and Vice-Treasurer of Ireland (d. 1755), purchased a portion of what was known as Ancaster Park, formerly part of the estate of St Mary’s Abbey, from Sir Thomas Reynell. Gardiner appears to have laid-out Henrietta Street directly afterwards, and begun to build houses on it.

**1724**  
Three houses, already partially built by Gardiner, were leased by him (5th March), to Hugh Boulter, Archbishop of Armagh. The three buildings, erected by Gardiner for Robert Percival, Richard Nuttall and John Power, were replaced by a single mansion house (the present location of the King’s Inns Library). It is not known whether any fabric of the previous houses was incorporated, nor the exact form of Boulter’s House, the only evidence for which is the ground plan recorded on Rocque’s 1756 Exact Survey of Dublin, and a partial description of the materials removed by the builders of the King’s Inns Library which replaced it.

**1724-55**  
Although the street appears to have been laid out as early as 1721, it took a further thirty-four years or so before all of the house were complete. The next house was Luke Gardiner’s own, opposite the primate’s house, and thought to have been begun before 1730. The rest of the houses were built in a staggered fashion from one side of the street to the other, according to the following approximate chronology:

- Boulter’s house (south-side) 1724-1729; replaced by Frederick Darley’s King’s Inns Library 1824-32.

No. 9, for Thomas Carter, Master of the Rolls, in 1731-2 (based on 1733 lease quoted in Geo Soc Records II, 16). Built according to a design (façade and plan) which closely resembled the work of Lord Burlington and Colen Campbell on Lord Mountrath’s House in Old Burlington Street, London, in 1721.

Nos. 11 & 12 (south-side), built by Luke Gardiner as a pair between 1730 and 1733, according to the designs of Edward Lovett Pearce. No. 11 was first occupied by Rt Hon William Graham, PC, Brigadier General, while the first known occupant of No. 12 was William Stewart, 3rd Viscount Mountjoy and later 1st Earl of Blessington (Memorial of Deed 1738).

No. 8, built by Nathaniel Clements before 1735 (1735, deed of lease and release between Luke Gardiner and Clements, Reg Deeds 81.352.57859), the first known letting was from Nathaniel Clements to Lieutenant-General Richard St George in 1741 (Reg Deeds 106.230.73531).

No. 7, built by Nathaniel Clements for himself, c.1738.

No. 6 & 5 (north-side), originally a single house (divided c.1826). Built by Nathaniel Clements in 1739 for Henry O’Brien, 8th Earl of Thomond.

Nos. 13, 14 & 15 (south-side), built simultaneously by Luke Gardiner in the early 1740s, and first leased to Nicholas Loftus (from 1766 the Earl of Ely), Richard 3rd Viscount Molesworth (Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in Ireland from 1751), and Sir Robert King (Baron Kingsborough from 1748) respectively.

No. 4 (north-side), built by Nathaniel Clements c.1745 and first let to John Maxwell, Baron Farnham.

No. 3, built after 1755, on a plot of ground which was first leased to Nathaniel Clements in 1740. The house was first occupied by Owen Wynne M.P. for Sligo from c.1757.

1728 Brooking’s map of Dublin which shows the new street off Bolton Street (fig.3.2).

1743 The new Archbishop of Armagh, John Hoadley (1742-46), moved into his Henrietta Street residence.

1746 Archbishop George Stone (1746-64), formerly Bishop of Kildare, and resident in No. 5 Henrietta Street, moved into the Primate’s house on Henrietta Street.

1756 John Rocque’s plan of the street, the earliest surviving plan, with complete delineation of each house plot, garden, mews buildings and the mews lanes (fig.3.3).

1764 Although the archbishop’s house was inherited in turn by Richard Robinson (1764-94), it was no longer his principal residence, nor did he or subsequent archbishops wield the same political power as had Boulter and Stone.
1780  Richard Boyle, the 2nd Earl of Shannon purchased No. 12 Henrietta Street, and amalgamated it with No. 11, already in the possession of his family, making radical alterations to the internal plan of both houses, while transforming completely the external appearance and much of the structure of No. 12 itself. The two houses were later separated after the death of Shannon in 1807.

1800  The foundation stone was laid for the construction of a new Dining Hall and Library for the Society of King’s Inns, designed by James Gandon, on a pair of sites formerly in the possession of the archbishop and Lord Mountjoy, on open parkland directly west of, and adjacent to, the street. Work on the southern library wing was halted however due to a shortage of funds, and the northern Dining Hall wing, only, was brought to completion. The first meals were served here in 1806. The Library Wing was purchased by the government in 1814, and completed to be used for the storage or government records. It is now the Registry of Deeds.

1823  The Society of the King’s Inns purchased the former house of the Archbishop of Armagh, which had fallen into decay, and began the construction of the present King’s Inns Library there, under the direction of the architect Frederick Darley. This was completed in 1832.

1837  No.10, formerly in the possession of Charles John Gardiner, 2nd Viscount Mountjoy and 1st Earl of Blessington, was purchased by Tristram Kennedy and was converted (the ground floor façade was substantially altered) to be used as the Queen’s Inns Chambers.

1852  Death of Henrietta (Harriet) Daly. The granddaughter of Robert Maxwell, 2nd Earl of Farnham, she inherited No. 4 when she married Rt. Hon. Denis Daly in 1780, who died in 1791. Harriet Daly continued in possession of the house (the last house of the great 18th-century families on Henrietta Street) until her death. However she lived a good deal of this time at Newtownmountkennedy, while she “maintained the Henrietta Street home as a town residence and as a kind of hotel for members of her family”. She did however also lease the house in 1849 to the Incumbered Estates Court. (Geo Soc Records II) (fig.3.4).

1888  Death of Tristram Kennedy, who had spent the past sixty years purchasing properties on the street, and had campaigned, throughout these years, without success, to convince the legal profession to establish here an institution of legal education.

1891  The purchase of Tristram Kennedy’s many properties on the street (approximately three-quarters of them) by the notorious Alderman Joseph M Meade, who converted the houses to tenements, tearing out the grand staircases to make even more space, and selling off many of the valuable chimneypieces in London.

1899  Arrival of the Daughters of Charity in the street, with the purchase of No. 10 and the establishment of a rehabilitation centre for released female prisoners. Their presence in the street, as well as the remit of their work, was expanded with the purchase of No. 9 in 1908, and the purchase of No. 8 in 1913 (see fig.3.5).
1925 The Daughters of Charity set up a day nursery, one of the earliest “crèches” in the city, and one of the longest surviving.

1950 The demolition by Dublin Corporation of No. 16 (half of what was originally one single house with No. 15), which had been in a derelict condition since at least 1927. In so doing, the Corporation (precursor of the present Dublin City Council) consolidated the side and rear walls of No. 15.

1973 Michael and Aileen Casey buy No. 13 Henrietta Street with the help of an interest free loan from the Irish Georgian Society. This was the first and perhaps most dramatic (in so far as a whole family was to re-occupy the house as a single dwelling unit), of the pioneering rescues of the rapidly decaying Henrietta Street houses in the 1970s. This process of private rescue, had been preceded by the purchase of Nos. 5-7 by Uinseann MacEoin – although these houses were maintained in a stable condition, they were not consolidated into single units – and followed by the purchase of No. 4 by Sé Geraghty and Alice Hanratty, and No. 12 by Ian Lumley (fig.3.6).

1982 Dublin Corporation hand over No. 15 to Na Píobairí Uilleann for a peppercorn rent on a 99-year lease. In a co-operative project between the Corporation, and the Pipers, and through the agency of a youth training scheme, the 18th-century appearance of the interior, including much of the original joinery and plaster work, was restored (fig.3.7).

1997 Dublin Civic Trust carry out an intensive inventory of the houses on the street on behalf of Dublin Corporation (Dublin City Council). This is the most exacting of a number of such reports and studies carried out on the street in the 1980s and 1990s, which included for example the photographic inventories of some of the houses carried out on behalf of the Corporation by the Irish Architectural Archive, c.1980 and again in 1985, as well as a survey and report on the street by the students of a Property Management Course in the Surveying Department of Bolton Street, carried out in 1986. A full listing of all of these can be found in the “Schedule and assessment of archival documentation on Henrietta Street Dublin 1”, also carried out by the Dublin Civic Trust for Dublin Corporation in 1997.

2001 Dublin City Council implement Compulsory Purchase Order proceedings on Nos. 3 and 14 Henrietta Street, under the Planning and Development Act 2000. This is the first time the provision of the Act has been invoked under the State and is currently under legal appeal.

2003 Completion of an ambitious programme of conservation and restoration works carried out on Nos. 8, 9 and 10 Henrietta Street, in the possession of the Daughters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul. Part-funded by the Europa Nostra Fund, the works were carried out under the direction of Campbell Conroy Hickey Architects and Paul Arnold, Conservation Architect.

2004 Commissioning of the current Conservation Plan by Dublin City Council.
4.0 Understanding Henrietta Street

4.1 History of Henrietta Street

Introduction

Henrietta Street was a wholly new street laid out on a greenfield site off Bolton Street in the early 1720s (see fig.3.2). This short cul-de-sac came about against a backdrop of widespread development on the north of the city which had taken place during the previous fifty years or so. Most of this development was carried out in large privately owned estates, on lands formerly belonging to the Cistercian monastery of St Mary's Abbey, which had been dissolved and divested of its possessions in the mid-16th century. Land formerly in commonage around Oxfmantown Green was also developed during these years. Men such as Sir Humphrey Jervis, Hugh Stafford and Sir Richard Reynell were responsible for the creation of this new quarter on the north side of the Liffey, which included the great residential and commercial streets of Smithfield and Queen Street, as well as Ormond Quay, Capel Street, Abbey Street and Stafford Street. Capel Street was the principal thoroughfare of the new residential quarter on the north side giving access via Essex Bridge to the south city quarter of the Castle, Cathedral, the Custom House and the city Tholsel. It came at the end of a road from the north-east of the country which entered Dublin through Drumcondra Lane (Dorset Street) and Bolton Street.

The ground on which Henrietta Street was built was an area variously identified as Ancaster or Ankester Park also known as the Anchorite’s Garden (Irish Builder 1893). This had passed, by means of royal grant, from the Cistercians to John Travers of Monkstown and subsequently to Robert Piphoe of Hollywood, Co Wicklow. Later (after 1670) a portion of this parkland was purchased by Sir Richard Reynell, an English lawyer, and in 1721 his son, Sir Thomas Reynell sold the family’s interest in the area to Luke Gardiner M.P. and Deputy Vice-Treasurer, who appears to have laid-out Henrietta Street soon afterwards (Georgian Society 1910).

Luke Gardiner, who was of humble origins (reputed to have been a coachman’s son), had made his fortune as a property developer and banker and had gained respectability by marrying into the Mountjoy family. Responsible for the development of Sackville Mall (later O’Connell Street) and Rutland Square (Parnell Square), his grandson, also named Luke Gardiner, would later lay out the large suburban estate which included streets such as Gardiner Street, Gloucester Street and Buckingham Street. However the development of Henrietta Street, on the western limit of the Gardiner estate, on a tract of land ideally placed for access to Capel Street and the south-city nexus beyond, was not only the Gardiners’ earliest essay in such development but also the one in which the grandest and most palatial houses were located (see fig.3.0.3). It was in Henrietta Street too that the first examples of the new Georgian house, built with straight parapets to the street, with red-brick façades and stone detailing, according to a “modern” Palladian discipline, were built. This street was a crucial template for all future high-status housing developments in Dublin during the next one-hundred years.

Henrietta Street’s first houses

It is not certain whether it was Luke Gardiner or his predecessor Sir Thomas Reynell who first laid out the new street. However we know, from a record of the later lease between Gardiner and the Archbishop of Armagh, Hugh Boulter, that some building work had taken place there by 1724 (The Irish Builder 15 June, 1893). Boulter purchased a site from Gardiner at the top and southern side of the street, which consisted of three partially complete houses that “were originally designed by Luke Gardiner for the use of Robert Percivall Esq. Richard Nuttall and John Power Gentleman”. The lease also referred to “the new Street lately set out and called or intended to be called Henrietta-street near Bolton-street”. Female street names are a rarity in Dublin. It is thought that Henrietta Street was named after the Viceroy’s wife, Henrietta Duchess of Grafton, although Luke Gardiner’s daughter was also called Henrietta.

The bishop’s new house, which was to become the official city residence of the Archbishop of Armagh for the next seventy years, was constructed on a palatial scale (82ft wide), not to be matched by any of the subsequent houses on the street. Nevertheless it no doubt set the tone and architectural agenda for much of what was to follow. The evidence of the first lease suggests that it was the archbishop himself who set down a prescriptive agenda for what was to become an exclusive enclave. Boulter insisted that no subsequent house be built “for selling of Ale or other Liquor or for any Shopkeeper Chandler Brewer or Artificer”. Boulter stipulated that the street be “made at least Fifty foot wide, from the Railes to be set before the Houses” and that the street was “to be paved as other streets usually are”. He also made demands regarding the layout and the scale of the stable lane to the rear of the houses.

Any sense of how the archbishop’s house might have appeared has been limited to the outline plan in John Rocque’s Exact Survey of 1756 (see fig.4.1.1). However
the building accounts for the construction of the King’s Inns Library, which replaced the archbishop’s mansion in the early-19th century, list Portland stone architraves surrounding the windows of the piano nobile and the second floor of the bishop’s house as well as a stone string course between the ground and first floor, all of which, it seems, the architect Darley had at first considered retaining (McCarthy forthcoming, 2006, quoting Articles of Agreement between King’s Inns and Messrs Carolin, builders, 13 October 1825 (KI MS G/6-1)). Unfortunately no visual record of this building has come to light.

Although the street was laid out in 1721, and the archbishop’s house begun in 1724, there seemed to have been no rush to bring the street to completion. It may have been as late as 1729, before the archbishop’s house was finished (Brown 2000, 8), and it was around then (before 1730), that Gardiner’s own house opposite it was built. However by 1735, there were still only six houses on the street, of the sixteen that were to be built eventually (Cess Applotment Book for the parish of St Michans: RCB ms 276.10.2, as quoted in Brown 2000). The other houses completed by 1735 were: a “large dwelling house... with stable, coach houses and other improvements” for Thomas Carter (No.9), built by Luke Gardiner, to the east of his own house; the two houses (Nos. 11 & 12) to the east of the bishop’s house, built as a pair, which it seems certain were built by Edward Lovett Pearce before his death in 1733; and another smaller house (No. 8) built by Nathaniel Clements on land leased to him by Gardiner in 1735 (Reg Deeds 81.352.57859), and occupied by Richard St George of Kilrush County Kilkenny from 1741 (Reg Deeds 106.230.73531).

Remarkably, for a street that appears to have been conceived as a single entity, it took another twenty years approximately before all of the principal houses, as far as the two lanes giving access to the mews lanes at the rear, were complete (see fig.4.1.2). Nathaniel Clements built his own grand house (No.7) c.1738 on the north side of the street, three doors down from his mentor Luke Gardiner’s grand city palace. He was also responsible for the construction of the enormous house, later divided into two (No. 6-5) to the east of his own, for Henry O’Brien, the 8th Earl of Thomond, in 1739 (Reg Deeds 106.333.71481). The Earl, who died two years later, never occupied the house, which was subsequently leased to George Stone, the bishop of Ferns, who in turn succeeded Boulter as the primate and hence later moved to the archbishop’s residence on the opposite side of the street.

The next houses to be built were the three very large houses, with repeating or mirrored plans on the south side between No. 12 and Henrietta Place (Nos. 13-15). These were built simultaneously by Luke Gardiner on...
a speculative basis in the early 1740s. The first known lease for No. 13, was to Nicholas Loftus in 1755; that for No. 14 was to Richard Viscount Molesworth, in 1752; and No. 15 was leased to Sir Robert King (later Baron Kingsborough) c.1748.

On the north side of the street, the next house erected (No. 4) was also built by Nathaniel Clements who leased this land from Luke Gardiner in September 1744 (Reg Deeds116.46.29251). The house was in turn leased to John Maxwell M.P. (later Baron Maxwell) and in 1779 passed to his granddaughter, Henrietta (Harriet) Daly. She continued as owner (although not in continued residence) until her death in 1852. The last house to be built to the west of Henrietta Place and Henrietta Lane was what is now No. 3 on the north side of the street. The land here was first leased to Nathaniel Clements in the 1740s, although it appears that a house was not built there until c.1755, some 30 years after the construction of the first houses on the street. This house was also let to John Baron Maxwell, who leased it in turn to his son-in-law Owen Wynne, who was M.P. for Sligo.

Houses east of Henrietta Place and Henrietta Lane

The houses to the east of Henrietta Place and Henrietta Lane, which have not survived, seemed somehow, never to have formed part of the architectural ensemble of the street of palatial houses west of the lanes. On the north side, the houses were built on a plot, running parallel to Henrietta Street, a plot which properly belonged to the Bolton Street frontage (see fig.4.1.3). Consequently the only 18th-century house to have survived here (No. 2), had a depth which was less than half its own width, and had no garden to the rear. Another house built here in the 19th-century, has also long since disappeared. On the south side, to the east of Henrietta Place, a number of smaller houses of the late 19th-century had survived in a ruinous state until recently. It is thought that they were built on the site of what had been No. 14 Henrietta Street, a public house, perhaps the one known as the “Admiral Vernon’s Head”. This was built on lands understood to have been leased by Luke Gardiner in 1723 (Geo Soc Records II, 24). The agreement between Gardiner and the archbishop, not to build houses which sold ale or liquor, was not made until the following year, but the existence of this public house suggests that the ground to the east of the lanes was never considered part of the architectural ensemble. To this extent the loss of all of the historical material east of the lane may be deemed not to have compromised the historical integrity of the street unit to the west. The visual and architectural effect of the recent buildings on these sites (as discussed below) is another matter.

The King’s Inns

The physical and architectural character of Henrietta Street was altered considerably, and took on its final appearance, at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century, with the introduction at the summit of the street of the large-scale, granite, King’s Inns buildings. These provided a terminal, of great monumental character, to the vista of the street, while lending an air of institutional importance, which is retained by Henrietta Street to this day (see fig.4.1.4). Removed by the government from their riverside location, in order to facilitate the construction of the Four Courts, the Honorable Society of the King’s Inns secured a site in the open parkland at the top of Henrietta Street from Lord Mountjoy in 1794, and the foundation stone for a new dining hall and library was laid by Lord Chancellor Fitzgibbon, on the 1st of August 1800.
This new building, designed by the architect James Gandon on land secured for the society by their treasurer William Caldbeck, was laid-out at an awkward angle to Henrietta Street, turning its back to the street, and facing instead onto Constitutional Hill. The King’s Inns ran out of funds however before the completion of their library, and Gandon was requested to complete the Dining Hall alone. The partially complete library was acquired by the government in 1814, for use as a records office, and work on bringing this half of Gandon’s original scheme was carried through by Francis Johnston. Johnston also provided the grand triumphal arch at the top of Henrietta Street (see fig. 4.1.5), which brought a degree of architectural integration between the rear of the King’s Inns complex and the space of the street behind it (McCarthy forthcoming, 2006).

Finally a new library was constructed for the King’s Inns on the site of the former primates’ mansion at the south-western corner of the street, adjacent to, and so forming part of, the rest of the King’s Inns complex. Primate Robinson, the last of four archbishops in possession of the house, used the Henrietta Street house less often than his predecessors after he had purchased Belvedere House in Drumcondra in 1789. Despite this, his body was laid out in state for his funeral in the Henrietta Street house when he died in 1794. There were to be no more archbishops living on what had come to be known as “Primate’s Hill”. The house passed to Robinson’s nephew, John Robinson, and through him to the Secretary to the Society of King’s Inn in February 1823 (Irish Builder 1893). The former primates’ house was demolished and a new sober-looking building, designed by Frederick Darley, was put in its place, and was completed in 1832 (see fig. 4.1.6).

4.2 Critical description of Henrietta Street

Henrietta Street is a relatively short street of large terraced red-brick houses terminated on the western end by the monumental stone building and entrance archway of the King’s Inns. It is a vehicular cul-de-sac with limited pedestrian through-access at the west, and is entered on the east via Bolton Street, a primary arterial route from the north to the south city (fig. 4.2.1). Stable, or mews lanes at the rear of the houses, which are parallel to the street, are accessed by Henrietta Place and Henrietta Lane on the south and north sides respectively. Despite the exceptional width of the street – some 65 ft at its widest – relative to its length, the overwhelming scale of the houses themselves dominates the street and tends to contract the effect of its girth. The street is built upon a relatively steep hill ascending from Bolton Street to the monumental mass of the King’s Inns at the summit. Although the King’s Inns turns its back to the street, an entrance archway (designed by Francis Johnston) and the passageway between the two large wings...
at the rear which are parallel to the terraces of houses, tend to confirm one's sense of ascendant progress as one moves westwards.

The origins of the term terrace, it appears, had more to do with the fact that such houses are constructed upon a man-made level above the ground surface, rather than that the houses were joined together all in a row (Summerson 2003). In this way the typical approach to the construction of these houses, whereby the rear gardens and basements are at the original ground level and the roadway to the front is constructed above vaulted basements, with the valley of the railed “area” between these and the house itself, generally pertains here as it did in Georgian houses in London. On the south side of the street the rear gardens are all level with the basements and are directly accessible from them. The same appears to be the case towards the western end of the street on the north side, while there were vaulted passages underneath raised gardens in some of the houses towards the eastern end (Nos. 4-7), perhaps suggesting some kind of compensation for the downward slope of the street (fig.4.2.6).

The houses are predominantly plain red-brick, 3-4 storeys over basement, 3-5 bays wide, double and triple pile buildings, with granite detailing on some ground floor façades; string courses, parapets, plinths and area bridges to the front doors, many of which are the original elaborate Portland stone door cases of classical design. Arranged in an unbroken terrace, the houses are neither of strictly uniform design nor date, having been constructed on the basis of a series of separate building contracts for each single building or group of two to three at most, over an extended period of time from c.1730 to c.1755 (the first houses built c.1724, were replaced by the King’s Inns library in the early 19th century). However the houses observe an overall discipline of design – straight parapets parallel to the street (gables to the side), red-brick with granite details, regular fenestration arranged in an even beat on each floor with an emphasis on the first floor, and an overall modesty in regards to external display – which was typical of a Georgian style that was first essayed in Dublin on this street (fig.4.2.2). However there is a particular sobriety to these houses, which lack, in the main, pediments over windows, string course on most of the buildings, mouldings, quoins or other architectural features. These qualities combined with the run-down aspect of much of the brick-work and original wrought-iron railings to the fronts of the houses, lends a gloomy severity to Henrietta Street which is not otherwise typical of Georgian architecture in the rest of the city. There is little on the exterior of these buildings to suggest the extroverted magnificence of some of their interior display (fig.4.2.3).

The quality of the public space is mediocre. Street lighting, rubbish bins, and pastiche metal bollards are neither consistent in concept nor matched historically or in quality with the large-scale palatial houses. The limestone sets which were laid in the early 1990s, and which were perhaps intended to give an “historical feel” to the street, are not based on historical precedent. Many of the basement-level vaulted chambers beneath the roadway were filled-in with concrete when these works were carried out, for fear that the brick vaults would not be capable of withstanding the pressure of parked cars or trucks. This resulted in the loss
of important historical features, while nevertheless failing to assess or address their structural vulnerability. A temporary solution to the possibility that parked cars might cause the basement vaults to collapse, which lasted the best part of a decade, was the introduction of concrete-filled metal barrels, which significantly reduced the quality of the public realm in the mean time. Neither was the introduction of the metal bollards in their place a completely satisfactory solution. Finally, in contrast to the monumental prospect as one moves westward, the eastern terminal view across Bolton Street, of an uncoordinated huddle of utility buildings, a filling station, and the side façade of a school, diminishes somewhat the effect of the quality of the space as one looks in the opposite direction (fig.4.2.4). Of more concern, are almost all of the buildings to the east of Henrietta Lane, which include unfortunate and badly scaled Georgian pastiche on the north side (fig.4.2.5), and an overly large block of apartments, under development at the time of writing, on the south side.

Finally attempts to mediate or interpret the street to the casual visitor are minimal. One or two plaques placed by the Georgian Society, for example on No. 5-6 and on No. 9, with harsh judgments of those who had altered the buildings in previous eras, have their own historical significance at this stage. However there is a need for some more formal information, signage etc. to give a sense to the uninformed visitor of the tremendous importance and interest of the street in which they stand.
5.0 Statement of Significance

5.1 International Significance

Henrietta Street was a seminal architectural ensemble which played a crucial part in setting the aesthetic programme, in the 1720s and 30s in particular, for all subsequent architectural developments of high status housing in Dublin for much of the 18th century and beyond. The first clear and decisive articulation of the newly revised Palladian approach to terraced town houses for an elite, it is perhaps only the estate of houses planned and laid out by Lord Burlington and his circle in Piccadilly, London, in the previous decade, that bares any real comparison to the Dublin experiment (see appendix document on Early Comparisons to Henrietta Street). However sadly a great deal of the most important of the London buildings have been demolished and replaced with modern infills, or altered extensively in their interiors, so that the Burlington estate no longer provides anything like the coherent completeness, which has been for the most part sustained in the almost wholly intact Henrietta Street. Although there is no clear documentary links between Luke Gardiner and Lord Burlington (although Gardiner was a subscriber to the Burlington sponsored Designs of Inigo Jones and was also Deputy Vice-Treasurer, while Burlington himself was the Lord High Treasurer of Ireland), the deeply sophisticated and entirely unprecedented Palladian rigour displayed in the interiors especially of for example Nos. 9 and 10 Henrietta Street, as well as the early involvement in the street of Edward Lovett Pearce, point to a community of intellectual endeavour with the vanguard Palladianism essayed by Burlington in his urban estate in London.

As such the survival of Henrietta Street as an ensemble, especially in the context of the changes to much of the early-18th-century London cityscape, is of unique European significance, as the single remaining intact example of an early-18th-century street of houses which was at the forefront of what was to become the Georgian style.

5.2 Location of Henrietta Street in the Development of Dublin

Henrietta Street was the first and most important in Dublin of a type of planned exclusive residential quarter of houses of relatively uniform external appearance to have been built. As a complete ensemble it is the only one that survives. Other comparable and earlier planned streets in the city differed from Henrietta Street in significant ways. Queen Street and Smithfield, although formally laid-out on greenfield sites, involved a much greater variety of residential and commercial types. Other 17th-century developments such as Francis Aungier’s to the south-east of Dublin Castle, or the Jervis Estate on the site of the medieval St Mary’s Abbey, also involved a much less unified arrangement of buildings than those developed in Henrietta Street. Other planned aristocratic quarters on the north of the city which followed, such as Sackville Mall, or the later Gardiner Street, took their initial inspiration from Henrietta Street, but neither has survived nor indeed did they match Henrietta Street for its grandeur and architectural ambition in the first instance.

The revival of the residential square, first developed in Dublin in St Stephen’s Green in the 17th century, provided an alternative to the more enclosed and isolated exclusivity

\[8\] A Comparative Context for Henrietta Street is contained in Appendix G which refers to the British cities of London, Bristol, Bath and Edinburgh.
of Henrietta Street. Those built in the north-side Gardiner estate have been since profoundly compromised. These include a great number of losses to the interiors in Rutland (Parnell) Square as well as whole swathes of demolitions in Mountjoy Square. The survival of the south-side squares, Merrion Square and Fitzwilliam Square, of course represents one of the most important architectural riches from that era. However the street which most closely matched Henrietta Street in lay-out and scale, i.e. Upper Merrion Street, has lost all of one side to Aston Webb’s College of Science, now the Taoiseach’s Office and Government Buildings, and so lacks the architectural and historical integrity of its north-side rival. The houses on Merrion Square itself are much smaller in general than those on Henrietta Street (averaging 30ft in width, while the smallest in Henrietta Street is 37ft wide) and once again far fewer of them have retained anything like the consistency of early and later 18th-century interiors still to be found in the north side street. Henrietta Street remained the “most fashionable single street in Dublin till the Union” despite the grand developments on the south side in the second half of the 18th century. Viewed both as a street, and from the point of view of a collection of individual houses, Henrietta Street remains the single most important architectural collection in the city.

5.3 Architectural Quality of the Henrietta Street Houses

No. 3  (fig.5.3.1)

Built some time after c.1755, the plot, on which this house was built, had gone through a succession of lettings from c. 1740: from Luke Gardiner to Nathaniel Clements to John Baron Maxwell, M.P. for Cavan, before it was first occupied by the latter’s son-in-law Owen Wynne, who was M.P. for Sligo. This very large, four bay, four storey over basement house, has retained its original bright red brick which however is in poor condition. The original (c.1755) very fine Doric pedimented door case and the original wrought-iron railings have also survived. Some remnants of the rear-garden and mews, which might be re-integrated with the house, remains intact. The staircase was removed in 1830. However the first-floor eastern rear room is “of exceptional quality” containing an intact coved rococo ceiling of some importance (fig 5.3.2). Other stucco features and elements of the original joinery, such as the lugged door architraves, also survive in various locations throughout the house.

No. 4 (fig.5.3.3)

This is a substantial, four bay, four storey over basement house with a brick façade (in excellent condition) and a stone plinth at basement level which is shared with Nos. 5 and 6. Built c.1745, the house was considerably altered c.1780 in a neo-classical style that might be attributable to James Wyatt. The door case, staircase and other substantial window and interior joinery and plaster work, as well as the entire rear elevation, belong to the alterations carried out at that date. There is an elegant Portland stone Ionic aedicular door case, which retains its original door, and very fine ironwork with alternating spear and arrowheads flanking the doorway. The scrollwork at the side of the door is of a more recent date. The 1780s stair hall, with its Portland flagged floor, and 1740s chimneypiece, contains a 1780s mahogany balustraded staircase “in superb condition”. The secondary stone staircase, which also survives, is top-lit by a central compartment on the east side of the house. Suites of rooms on the ground and first floor, decorated in a consistent and
integrated neo-classical design, are amongst the very best in Dublin. They include gesso decorated skirting, chair rails, window cases, shutters, plaster decorated overdoors, elaborate frieze and cornices in contrast with fairly simple ceiling centrepieces. Some of the 1740s decoration survives on the 2nd floor to the front, while the 1780s decoration is continued at the rear.

No. 5-6 (fig.5.3.4)
Originally a five bay, four storey over basement house built by Nathaniel Clements in 1739, this house was divided in two in 1826. The greater part of the original door at the centre of the house survives, its Ionic pilastered aedicule is intact, although the segmental pediment was removed c.1800. The door to No. 6 is dated c.1830s. Its lead fanlight, recently restored, is re-used from another location. The grand staircase was removed in the early 19th century, some remaining fragments of which suggest that it was of Portland stone. Despite the loss of spatial integrity, as well as a good deal of the original decorative scheme, a considerable amount of the 1730s work has survived in the ground-floor rooms. A number of passages of original and later-18th-century joinery and plasterwork survive also in various corners of the house.

No. 7 (fig.5.3.5)
Nathaniel Clements’ own house, built c. 1738, is a four bay, four storey over basement design, with good quality brick work on both façades. Considerable alterations were made to the front elevation in the 19th century: the lowering of windows and the replacement of window sashes, as well as the replacement of the door c.1800. The original wrought-iron railings to the front of the area and to the side of the door have also survived, albeit in poorer condition. The rear garden remains intact, with some elements of the garden elevation and of an original or perhaps mid-18th-century mews. The original interior ground plan is also secure. It includes the important early-18th-century staircase with mahogany brackets, ramped handrail and Corinthian newel posts, dating to the 1730s, as well as the original plaster panelled stair hall. The secondary staircase with its Doric newels and closed-string staircase is also intact. Spread throughout the rest of the house are elements of the original decorative plaster scheme including the frieze and cornices on the first floor which continue into the remaining portion of the first-floor cabinet return.

No. 8 (fig.5.3.6)
Built by Nathaniel Clements (although commonly assigned to Gardiner, the plot of ground “wherein [Clements] had erected and built a good Dwelling House and made other improvements” was leased to him by Gardiner in 1735: Reg Deeds Memorial 81.352.57859) for a Lieutenant-General Richard St George, this three bay, four storey over basement, house is smaller in scale and in decorative ambition than Gardiner’s previous two houses on this side of the street. However the brickwork to the front, with the original stone plat-band between the ground and first floors, is in good condition. There is a very fine square-headed Gibbsian-surround stone door case, containing the lower six panels of the originally eight panelled
The house suffered a good deal of alteration in the 19th century and again in the early-20th century, losing its original stairway (illustrated in the Georgian Society Records), the chimneypieces and most of its original 1730s timber panelling and plaster decoration. The original secondary staircase, with its closed string balustrade and Doric newels, however, has survived.

No. 9 (fig. 5.3.7)
Built by Luke Gardiner for Thomas Carter, Master of the Rolls, c.1731, No. 9 is possibly the most important house from this period in the city. Although there is no documentary evidence for it, there is a strong suggestion that the architect Edward Lovett Pearce was responsible for its design. Pearce was related by marriage through cousins on his mother’s side to Luke Gardiner’s daughter Henrietta, as well as to Thomas Carter, and there is documentary evidence that he had done some survey work, at least, for Gardiner in a nearby Bolton Street house, and that he had acted as Gardiner’s agent in the purchase of the Drogheda estate in 1729 (NLI PC 253 (2); NLI PC 254 (1)). The design of No. 9 however is not bespoke, being a very close copy in the façade and in its interior planning of No. 30 Old Burlington Street in London, Lord Mountrath’s house, which had been designed by Lord Burlington and Colen Campbell in concert some ten years earlier. Although such copyism may have been reasonably common at the time, the design came about at the height of Pearce’s own period of personal creativity, engaged as he was in building the unequalled Parliament House on College Green (fig. 5.3.8). Pearce was also responsible for at least two other five-bay façades, for Christ Church Deanery, and for Bellamont Forest House in Co Cavan (as well as many sketch designs), all of which were imbued with considerable originality and conviction. However the almost unequalled sophistication of interior decoration and design in No. 9 was entirely unprecedented anywhere outside of London at this time, and it has for a long time appeared that of the architects resident in Dublin in the 1720s and early 1730s, only Pearce was capable of producing it.

While the façade is a copy of Lord Mountrath’s house in London, it lacks the stone architraves on the windows of the first and second floor which were part of the London house. Both it and No.10 are three storey over basement, and in this case five bays wide, giving both houses a more horizontal appearance than the other residential dwellings on the street. It is a red-brick façade, with a 19th-century cement-rendered ground floor. The superb door case with rusticated Ionic columns, a five-part keystone, pulvinated frieze and modillioned cornice and pediment, is perhaps the most exquisite surviving original door case on the street (fig. 5.3.9). A simple square-profiled cornice separates ground and first floor, while a typically Campbellian feature of continuous sill course sits below the windows. A large round-headed aedicular window with Ionic half-columns on a balustraded pedestal is at the centre of the façade on the piano nobile. There is a plain frieze beneath the eaves and the roof has dormer windows. The ironwork has been restored based on the original design.
A magnificent stair and entrance hall combined take up the three right-hand bays of the ground floor, where a screen of marble-simulating timber Corinthian columns supports the first floor landing (fig.5.3.10). A cantilevered Portland stone staircase in two flights is enlivened by rich wrought-iron balusters and a mahogany rail. A more low-key decorative scheme on the ground floor walls, which includes a stucco chair rail with a Greek key pattern, acts as a foil for the creative detail of the upper levels of this large double-height space, including plaster panelled walls, and the sumptuous compartmentalised ceiling which includes decorative panels representing Apollo, Mercury and Minerva. Recent restoration work has brought back into view what had survived of the important timber panelling in the front reception room, while the magnificent decoration of the rear room with its stucco wall panels, rich Corinthian door cases, over-mantels and chimneypieces, deep modillion cornice and elaborate compartmentalised ceiling, makes this one of the most perfect rooms in Dublin.

No. 10 (fig.5.3.11)
Built by Luke Gardiner as his own house some time before 1730, and the home of the Gardiner family for the next one hundred years, there is much that is still unclear about the original design and authorship of this building. However Mountjoy House, as it came to be known, is an exceptional building with an outstanding collection of early and mid-18th-century interiors. Its historical value has been greatly enhanced by recent restoration works, which brought about many discoveries regarding the original decorative schemes which had been until recently covered by 19th-century partitions and 20th-century suspended ceilings. The survival too of a manuscript inventory (NLI PC 1 (6)) of the furnishings and “goods” belonging to the house in 1772, then occupied by the second Luke Gardiner, adds considerably to its historical interest. The fact that this was the home of the man who planned and built the street as a whole only serves to emphasise even more its singular importance. In so far as much of the interior decorative approach is related to No. 9, an argument has been made that Edward Lovett Pearce was also responsible for the design of this house. However a section drawing of a town-house in Pearce's hand, which is inscribed “Mr Gardiner”, bears no relationship to the façade of No. 10 as it appears now, or as it appeared in the 1836 Dublin Penny Journal image of the house, made before the façade was given its present form (fig.5.3.12).

While the façade of No.10, which was altered considerably over the years, is of minor historic significance, the interior contains a procession of exceptional rooms on the ground and first floors. The staircase and much of the rest of the decorative scheme on the first floor belongs to a 1760s re-arrangement of the house. However the ground floor contains the wonderful “Breakfast Parlour” with its aedicular door case with fluted Corinthian columns (fig.5.3.13), a sober compartmentalised ceiling supported by the very elaborate modillion cornice and decorated pulvinated frieze, all dating to the early 1730s (fig.5.3.14). No. 10 has also retained some very fine 1730s chimneypieces of wood and black marble, with carved console brackets supporting modillion cornices.
The main staircase, a later insertion of c.1765, was built around a double-height stair hall. It retains all of its stucco panelling which was returned to its original state during the recent restoration works. Corridors on the ground and first floors are separated from the stairs by a broad arcaded screen. The corridor on the first floor leads into the so-called ante-chamber which still retains the coved and compartmentalised 1730s ceiling belonging to the earlier double-height stair hall. Fragments of Pillar and Arch wallpaper (of the kind seen in the Philip Hussey painting in the National Gallery), which belonged to the neo-classical re-decoration of the space, were discovered here during the recent works. From the ante-room one proceeded eastwards to the Blue Room (referred to in the 1772 inventory) at the front of the house, and in turn into the Yellow Room at the rear of the house. The recent restoration also uncovered fragments of blue flock wallpaper in the Blue Room and yellow “moreen” fabric in the Yellow Room, which have been faithfully restored in closely matching materials. Rare mid-18th-century papier-mâché decorations of a rococo design on a ceiling with a pulvinated frieze and modillion cornice were revealed by the removal of 20th-century partitions and a false ceiling in both of these rooms. The restoration of this ceiling was partly grant-aided by the prestigious Europa Nostra Restoration Fund (fig.5.3.14).

Although it is difficult to establish for certain whether or not the first floor Ballroom (so-called on the 1772 inventory, but since the early-20th century a chapel) existed when the house was first constructed – its existence in 1756 at least, seems to be indicated on the John Rocque Exact Survey of Dublin – the decorative scheme is of an early non-figurative rococo of a type seen in Dublin from at least the early 1750s. This room, which is dominated by the south-facing Venetian window with fluted Corinthian columns and pilasters, also has a fine modillion cornice and pulvinated frieze beneath a rococo ceiling, while oak dado panelling which was re-discovered in the recent works has been fully restored (fig.5.3.15). A stain-glass window representing the Virgin Mary in a mandorla in the western wall of the chapel over the altar was the work of the Harry Clarke studio (fig.5.3.16).

King’s Inns Library (fig.5.3.17)

The King’s Inns Library was built on the site of the former Primate’s mansion which had been demolished in 1825. The new library was designed by Frederick Darley. It was completed in 1832. The sobriety of its all-granite, eight bay (an extra bay was added in the 1890s), three storey over basement Greek revival façade, with a pedimented breakfront and a heavy tetrastyle Doric portico, belies the spacious riches of the interior. The most important of these is the library on the first floor (fig.5.3.18). Spanning the full original seven bays of the building, this is a double height space, with galleries the full length of both sides of the room supported by the bookshelves set at right-angles to the walls between the windows, and by pairs of fluted Ionic columns, all in a Greek Revival style. The library is accessed from the spacious ground floor hall by means of an “imperial” staircase, which is lit on its half landing by a large set of windows with stain-glass illustrations of the
coats-of-arms of former benchers. Sensitive refurbishment works which were carried-out in some of the ground floor rooms in 1997, uncovered fragments of important early and mid-19th-century wallpaper. The second of these, a faux-bois paper imitating an oak wood, included hand-pasted capitals and bases which simulated pilasters. This paper remained intact beneath layers of later paintwork but has been completely restored to its original state. (McCarthy Country Life, 2006)

No. 11 (fig.5.3.19)

Built before 1733, as a pair with No. 12, the elevation of No. 11 is of particular historic importance. It retains much of the original decorative scheme designed by the architect Edward Lovett Pearce which is partially documented by a pair of surviving drawings annotated by the architect (Colvin & Craig, 1964). That these drawings, of a pair of windows with rusticated architraves and a (tri-partite) Venetian doorway, relate to the surviving window and part of a tripartite door on No. 11, has been convincingly argued by Cathal Crimmins (Crimmins 1987). Handwritten notes by the architect on the drawings refer to “Mr Gardiners 2 new houses – from ye primates wall – ye 1st house in ye Clear 34-6”. This appears to refer to a measurement of the front façade of the first house, one of a pair built by Luke Gardiner, which were adjacent to the primate’s house to the west. Three and a half bays, and four storeys over basement, red brick with heavy-handed 20th-century tuck pointing, the façade is horizontally articulated by granite bands between storeys and a continuous sill course on the first floor. The third floor seems to have been a later addition to what was originally a three storey over basement façade with dormers on the roof, as in No. 9 across the street.

Much of the interior of the house, and some elements of the façade, were altered when the pair of houses was amalgamated into one by the 2nd Earl of Shannon in 1780, and again when the houses were separated in 1807. The pillared doorway and the iron work to the front of the house date to the early-19th-century. The house retains its original staircase of cantilevered Portland stone, and the stair hall with its timber raised and fielded panelling (see fig.5.3.20). Neo-classical medallions were inserted over the door heads during the 1780s separation of the two houses. The secondary staircase with its stone treads has also survived. Generally the ground floor decoration belongs to the mid-18th-century, and this includes a fine rococo ceiling in the rear reception room. The decoration on the first floor is mainly early 19th century with some surviving 18th-century timber joinery.

No. 12 (fig.5.3.21)

Although part of a pair with No. 11, designed by Edward Lovett Pearce, the façade and interior of this house bares little resemblance to the original early 1730s house. Between 1780 and 1807 the house was in the possession of Richard 2nd Earl of Shannon, who amalgamated the two houses, Nos. 11 & 12. In so doing he virtually demolished No. 12, leaving only the main structure of the front wall and the spine walls between, but removing and re-building.
the rear wall completely, while removing all previous internal wall divisions, in order to create exceptionally large grand reception rooms on the ground and first floors. A comparison between the three-storey façade of No. 12, with its greatly lowered and enlarged first floor windows, and the remains of the ordered divisions on its neighbour, gives little clue as to their shared authorship and their originally twinned façade designs. The western bays of the enlarged reception rooms on the ground and first floors were lost when the two houses were separated again in 1807. However the plaster friezes, which can be identified as the work of Charles Thorpe by a surviving construction invoice (Shannon Papers PRONI D2707-B14/8), are still in situ on the remaining walls, and re-cast on the walls which re-separated the two properties. The window cases and other timber joinery in these rooms also date to the neo-classical interventions after 1780, while some of the early-18th-century lugged doorways and raised and fielded doors, which were re-used on the 2nd floor, also survive. The combined entrance and stair hall was re-constituted after the amalgamation of the two houses, and this space retains some of the 1830s cornices and door surrounds, as well as an 1830s staircase to the rear of the house.

This house, along with its neighbour No. 13, is particularly noted for the attention paid by its most recent owner to preserving without favour as much as possible of the fabric evidence from all layers of occupation. This includes the evidence of partitioning etc. associated with the 20th-century tenement divisions. This makes the house a very rare and invaluable repository of information regarding this otherwise greatly overlooked social history. Also of historic importance is the survival of the memorial of an early lease (Registry of Deeds Memorial 89.358.63579, 1738) for this house made between Luke Gardiner and William Stewart 3rd Viscount Mountjoy, which amongst other things, confirms that the mews buildings, belonging to the main house, were disposed on both sides of the stable lane – a very unusual arrangement, long since lost by the construction there of Henrietta House. This two-sided approach to out-buildings to town houses is also confirmed by the lease map which has survived for No. 13 (Sé Geraghty private collection, see fig.5.3.22).

**No. 13 (fig.5.3.23)**

The westernmost of three houses (Nos. 13, 14 and 15) built simultaneously by Luke Gardiner in the early 1740s, this house is perhaps most notable now for its occupation as a complete home by a single family, with special emphasis by them on the preservation of the integrity of the combined interior spaces as they were conceived and used in the 18th century. Particular efforts have been made here, as they have been in No. 12, to carefully preserve as much fabric evidence as is possible of all occupation layers since the house was first built. The house is also important for its ground floor decorative scheme which is one of the finest 1740s interiors to survive in the city, and for the design of its interior suites of connecting rooms, which it has been suggested was the first in this country of an Anglo-Italian development of the French model of town house *appartements* (Michael Casey *pers comm*). The first
known occupant of the house, was a Nicholas Viscount Loftus, and later the Earl of Ely, who leased this house from Luke Gardiner in 1755. The house was later home to the peripatetic Bishop of Meath, Richard Pocock, and his successor Henry Maxwell, brother of the Earl of Farnham who lived across the street in No. 4.

No. 13 is a four storey over basement, four bay, house, with predominantly original 1740s red brick but with mainly later 18th-century window sashes to the front of the house. It has an original 1740s Doric aedicular stone doorway (fig. 5.3.24), which with the doorcase belonging to No. 14, is one of only two on this side of the street; the granite plinth and wrought-iron railings are also original. Although the staircase itself was removed in the late-19th century, the combined entrance and stair hall retains much of its original decorative scheme, including a pedimented Portland stone chimneypiece on the ground floor, and plaster wall panelling and full entablature on the first floor level. However the loss of the original stair was to a great deal overcome by the introduction of an equally important 1730s staircase that was salvaged from Lisle House in Molesworth Street, demolished in 1974 (Pearson 2000). The secondary staircase was re-built in the 1770s. This resulted in the stair compartment cutting into the space of the original closets.

The rear ground floor reception is of exceptional quality retaining its “original panelling, full embellished entablature with modillion cornice and chimney piece.” (Dublin Civic Trust Inventory 1997). Various fine survivals in other rooms include, a c.1770s rococo ceiling in the front ground floor reception, good egg and dart door and window architraves in the first floor rooms, and a large rococo centrepiece in one of the rear first floor rooms. The second floor retains most of its original plaster and joinery.

No. 14 (fig. 5.3.25)

Built simultaneously, as part of a uniform terrace, with Nos. 13 and 15, this house originally replicated the plan of No. 13. Although it has suffered considerably the depredations of vandalism and neglect, the house still retains some important original features of note. Built by Luke Gardiner, its first known occupant (from c.1755) was Richard, 3rd Viscount Molesworth, Commander in Chief of the military in Ireland. A four bay, four storey over basement house, the red brick façade retains much of its original brick work although the windows on the ground and first floors were lowered in the late 18th century. One of the finest surviving features of the house is the stone door case, consisting of an Ionic aedicule with full entablature and pulvinate frieze with a segmental pediment. The original plinth wall and wrought-iron railings have also survived. The grand staircase was removed in the late 19th-century, and only fragments of the 1740s timber panelling and some elements of the plaster decoration beneath the original first floor landing entrance hall have survived. The secondary staircase, whose fine balusters, Doric newel posts and ramped handrail were used by squatters as firewood in the 1980s, is in very poor repair. The main reception rooms were considerably altered at the end of the 18th century in a neo-classical style (frieze and cornice), with new lowered and splayed windows. While much of the plaster work has survived, a good deal of the joinery was lost, especially in the last two decades. The second floor is very badly damaged: original early-18th-century shutters to
windows with late-18th-century architraves, and doors and architraves have disappeared for the most part. The third floor is almost completely devoid of original features.

No. 15 (fig.5.3.26)

No. 15 is one of the three houses built as part of a unified terrace by Luke Gardiner in the 1740s, it being a mirror image of the plan of No. 14. However the house was divided in two in 1828, to form Nos. 15 & 16. No. 16 had become derelict as early as 1927, and was demolished in 1950, the side wall of what remained being consolidated by Dublin Corporation. The house suffered further dereliction in the 1970s and fire damage in the early 1980s. It was taken over by Na Píobairí Uilleann on a 99 year lease from 1982, and renovated with the assistance of a youth employment and training scheme. The first known occupant was Sir Robert King of Rockingham Co Roscommon from 1748 until his death in 1755. His brother, Sir Edward King, succeeded him and his descendents lived in the house until 1828 when the house was divided and used as barristers’ chambers.

No. 15 now consists of the remaining two bays of an originally four bay, four storeys over basement house, with a red brick façade, of the early 1740s. The brick work is largely intact while the rear and gable, wetdashed walls are complete reconstructions of 1950. The doorway which post-dates the 1828 splitting of the house, is a Doric columned door (without pediment): as it is in the location of the former ground floor window it is reached up a flight of steps. The windows reflect the original 1740s proportions, albeit with replaced sashes. The site of No. 16 is a footpath and an area reserved for parking cars.

The present staircase belongs to the 1828 division of the house, although it has been considerably restored (fig.5.3.27). Much of the ground floor joinery in the stair hall and the ground front reception room is salvaged work from houses on South Frederick Street (of c.1740-60). Perhaps the most important features of the house are the stucco ceilings on the ground and first floors which were restored in the 1980s. These include the figured papier-mâché ceiling from the mid-18th century in the rear ground floor reception, depicting the Four Seasons and including busts of Shakespeare and Milton. It was the “chance discovery” by David Griffin of this ceiling in 1981 that led to the first identification of other papier-mâché ceilings in the city, including those in the first floor rooms of No. 10 Henrietta Street at the top of the street. The first floor rooms are fitted out with sophisticated stucco ceilings of c.1780-90, including “a delicate oval centrepiece and in the rear a compartmented ceiling with arabesques” (Dublin Civic Trust Inventory 1997). The window cases and “embellished architraves” of the windows on the first floor room are contemporary with the ceiling. However the dado panelling here and in the rear first floor room, as well as the features on the third floor, all belong to the restoration work of the 1980s.
5.4 The Importance of Henrietta Street as Archaeological Layer

Henrietta Street represents a unique archaeological layer which is largely frozen in time. It has survived despite, or even as a result of, the neglect of the 19th century and much of the 20th century. The economic decline, suffered by Dublin in the 19th century especially, affected the very large residential buildings of Georgian Dublin, and in particular many of those that were located north of the Liffey. As a result, the houses became homes to very large numbers of families of the very poor in buildings which were re-partitioned for multiple occupancy. Despite the great human misery suffered in these houses, by people whose record has been for the most part lost to history, the effect on the houses themselves was (with the exception of the early depredations of Alderman Meade), largely benign. In contrast houses which preserved their high status, in similar residential quarters in London, or for example in Merrion Square, FitzWilliam Square or much of St Stephen's Green, were altered continually in response to the vagaries of ever-changing fashion. Many of the tenement houses of the north side of the city have been in recent years almost completely cleared away. Houses along almost the whole length of Gardiner Street, throughout much of Mountjoy Square, and, save for perhaps portions of one or two original houses on Luke Gardiner's second development of Sackville Mall, nearly all of O'Connell Street, have been lost during the past one hundred years or so.

In contrast Henrietta Street preserves a unique and exhaustive archaeological layer, which has preserved a rich variety of original interiors, some with later-18th-century and some 19th-century alterations, as well as for the most part almost the entire outer skin of the street itself (considered as a single built entity). The quality of this archaeological sample is especially acute in a number of the houses such as e.g. Nos. 12 and 13, where special attention has been placed, by the recent owners, on preserving intact as much as are possible of the stratified layers of occupation evidence. This includes the fabric remains of the sumptuous early-18th-century social and material life, as well as the surviving evidence for the far more humble partitioned hovels of the late-19th-century and 20th-century poor. All of this makes Henrietta Street an entirely unique repository of historical and archaeological data about the built fabric of our early-18th-century city, which is of great rarity in these islands. Notwithstanding the way that the street has continued as an authentically lived-in and worked-in quarter, Henrietta Street, as an archaeological site, is as important to the record of settlement in these islands as the preserved remains of Clonmacnoise or Wood Quay.

5.5 The Importance of Henrietta Street to the North Inner City

Henrietta Street appears at first to be somewhat isolated as a cultural phenomenon, located, as it is, in an area of streets and houses which has suffered from economic neglect for many years. Henrietta Street provides a unique opportunity to act as an anchor of cultural renewal in what is otherwise a fairly run-down north inner-city quarter. Considered from the point of view of the O'Connell Street hub, Henrietta Street appears remote and difficult to access for the pedestrian visitor. However Henrietta Street may be historically and spatially linked with far greater effect by means of the ancient arterial route of Bolton Street, through Capel Street and across Capel Street Bridge to the south-city historical core of Dublin Castle, Christ Church Cathedral and Temple Bar (fig.5.5.1). This re-orientation, founded on a more historically authentic reasoning, provides an opportunity to draw Henrietta Street back into the realm of what is culturally recognised, while re-emphasising the importance of the historically resplendent Capel Street, and giving an injection into the largely neglected streets which surround them.

5.6 Historical Significance

Henrietta Street was the most prestigious residential street in Dublin throughout the 18th century. This was not only for the quality and scale of its houses, but also because of the singular political and social status of its residents throughout the first century of its existence. There seemed to have been long periods of time when this extraordinary cast of primates and peers, M.P.s, Lords Justice, Speakers in the House of Commons, Deputy Vice-Treasurers and judges appeared to run the country from Henrietta Street itself, rather than from Dublin Castle or Parliament House on the south side of the river.

The high-blown and exclusive tenor of the street was established from the start by the street's two principal, and indeed earliest residents, Archbishop Boulter (Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland) and Luke Gardiner the banker, large-scale property developer, and administrator of the treasury (Deputy Vice-Treasurer), who laid out the whole length of Gardiner Street, throughout much of Mountjoy Square, and, save for perhaps portions of one or two original houses on Luke Gardiner's second development of Sackville Mall, nearly all of O'Connell Street, have been lost during the past one hundred years or so.

In contrast Henrietta Street preserves a unique and exhaustive archaeological layer, which has preserved a rich variety of original interiors, some with later-18th-century and some 19th-century alterations, as well as for the most part almost the entire outer skin of the street itself (considered as a single built entity). The quality of this archaeological sample is especially acute in a number of the houses such as e.g. Nos. 12 and 13, where special attention has been placed, by the recent owners, on preserving intact as much as are possible of the stratified layers of occupation evidence. This includes the fabric remains of the sumptuous early-18th-century social and material life, as well as the surviving evidence for the far more humble partitioned hovels of the late-19th-century and 20th-century poor. All of this makes Henrietta Street an entirely unique repository of historical and archaeological data about the built fabric of our early-18th-century city, which is of great rarity in these islands. Notwithstanding the way that the street has continued as an authentically lived-in and worked-in quarter, Henrietta Street, as an archaeological site, is as important to the record of settlement in these islands as the preserved remains of Clonmacnoise or Wood Quay.

9 The forthcoming Dublin City Council project for the renewal of Capel Street public realm offers an opportunity to acknowledge and re-emphasise the historic importance of this street in the city context.
in this city residence at the summit of the street, two more
of whom, Archbishops Stone and Robinson were also Lords
Justice. Stone in particular was to play a dominant role in
the mid-18th-century Irish political life, closely allied to the
family of his Henrietta Street neighbour, Speaker Ponsonby.

The “famous Mr Gardiner”, who, in his position as Deputy
Vice-Treasurer, was allowed considerable latitude in the
management of the monies belonging to the exchequer,
was in this way capable of exerting extraordinary political
influence in the city and the country at large (McCracken
1986). Gardiner’s legacy to the city, and that of his
descendants (also residents of Henrietta Street), stretches
across great swathes of the north city, east of Capel Street.
In terms of his impact upon the city plan, vis his setting-
out of Henrietta Street itself, the creation of the imperious
Sackville Mall, and the laying-out of Rutland (Parnell)
Square, Gardiner’s contribution was perhaps equalled only
by the speculative developments of Lord Fitzwilliam on the
south side of the river some fifty or so years afterwards.

Gardiner’s protégé, Nathaniel Clements (the ancestor of
the future Lords Leitrim), who succeeded Gardiner as the
Deputy Vice-Treasurer, was also a significant resident on
Henrietta Street. Directly responsible for the construction of
most of the houses (save for Nos. 9 & 10) on the north side
of the street, he appears to have helped Gardiner in the
furnishing and interior design of many of the others (TCD MS
1741: Gardiner letters to Clements). He was a noteworthy
amateur architect, responsible for many significant country
houses, including a hunting lodge in the Phoenix Park which
was later converted as the vice-regal lodge and is now the
home of the Irish president.

Another resident of Henrietta Street of critical historical
importance in the political life of mid to late-18th-century
Ireland, was Henry Boyle (1684-1764), who leased No. 11
from Luke Gardiner in 1740. Boyle became the Speaker
of the House of Commons in 1733, and remained in this
position until he was pensioned off as the 1st Earl of
Shannon in 1756. He was Chancellor of the Irish Exchequer
in the years 1733-35, 1739-54 and 1755-57, and served as
Lord Justice nineteen times between 1734 and 1764. He
is best remembered as the first of the great “undertakers”,
in which capacity he acted as the English executive’s chief
agent in the Irish Parliament. However he took a more
independent stance in the later part of his career, when he
led the resistance to the government’s ambitions to siphon
off the exchequer surpluses of the early 1750s.

Henry Boyle’s son Richard, the 2nd Earl of Shannon,
who was to purchase No. 12 Henrietta Street in order
to elaborately amalgamate it with No. 11, also played
an active, although less central role in Irish political life.
Perhaps ironically, he was to marry Catherine Ponsonby,
the daughter of John Ponsonby (1713-89) who was a later
successor of Henry Boyle as Speaker and manager of the
government interest in the Irish House of Commons. John
“Jack Promise” Ponsonby was also a resident of Henrietta
Street, purchasing the massive No. 5 (later 5-6) Henrietta
Street in 1772. Less successful, in terms of the extent of
his political hold over the country, than his former neighbour and opponent Henry Boyle. Ponsonby was a member of an enormously influential political dynasty which stretched back into the mid-17th century, and would continue, in one form or another, until close to the end of the 19th century.

This extraordinary galaxy of politically and socially important residents shined its brightest in the 18th century. The passing of the Act of Union in 1800 is generally accepted as marking a watershed in the history of the country as well as specifically in relation to this street. Populated during its (Dublin’s and Henrietta Street’s) prime by those whose prestige and power was centred in the Irish parliament, the demise of the parliament resulted in the loss of a whole political culture as well as the loss of the machinery of direct legislative government itself. While much of the north side estates of grand houses suffered almost immediate decline (divided into tenements with consequent poverty and squalor), Henrietta Street was given a partial reprieve by the interest in the street of the legal profession, and the location there of many independent chambers, as well as of the King’s Inns themselves. Attracted by the construction of the library in 1832, many solicitors, and barristers set up chambers (partial offices and residences) here. However Tristram Kennedy’s attempts to establish Henrietta Street at the centre of legal education, with the establishment of the Queen’s Inns Chambers in Nos. 3, 9 and 10 in the 1840s, never took hold.

Eventually even the lawyers abandoned the formerly residential houses of the street towards the end of the 19th century. All of the houses, which had been in the possession of Tristram Kennedy at the end of his life (approximately three quarters of them) were purchased by the infamous former Lord Mayor, Alderman Meade, who notoriously stripped many of these houses of their chimney pieces, which he sold in London, and removed irreplaceable staircases in order that he might fit in further partitions for extra squalid tenements (fig.5.6.1). Nearly all of the houses were in tenements by the beginning of the following century: the 1901 census listed 141 families, consisting of 897 people in total, living in Henrietta Street (Brown 2000 quoting the 1901 census returns for Inns Quay, Dublin). It was entirely appropriate then that the Daughters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul, whose principal aim was service to the poor, acquired No. 10 and established there a facility for providing education and support to ex-women prisoners, which they further expanded in 1908 with the purchase of No. 9 (fig.5.6.2). Their work with the poor of the north inner city continues to this day. However it is a reflection of the anonymity of poverty that the vast and intense history of the many hundreds of families who lived out their lives within the same walls as the Gardiners, Boulters, Boyles, Ponsonbys and Stones, has passed largely unrecorded.

5.7 Present Significance

Henrietta Street is also remarkable for the quality and variety of its present social character. The very survival of Henrietta Street in the recent past has been founded upon the singular commitment to the street of many of its current residents. Nearly all of the houses on Henrietta Street, with two significant exceptions, are currently occupied.
For whatever reason, the present residents (owners and those who work and live there), embrace a very varied range of cultural, institutional and personal approaches to their presence on, and contribution to, the street and the city as a whole, which gives a concentrated quality as well as a sense of vibrant everyday life to the area (fig. 5.7.1). However the current make-up of the street is neither permanent nor necessarily absolutely stable. A kind of delicate social “ecosystem” pertains, the vulnerability of which needs to be addressed, amongst other considerations of viability and sustainability, when any consideration is given to changes or alterations to the street.

The summit of the street is anchored by two institutions whose constituencies could not be more different. Yet the stability and respective longevity of both of these bodies lends a sense of complementary symmetry to their long-term presence opposite each other. The King’s Inns was established in this location in the late 18th century, and with a foundation date of 1542, they arguably comprise the oldest educational institution in the country. The Daughters of Charity, who came to the street in the late-19th century, have maintained an unbroken tradition of radical commitment to the poor and the underprivileged consistent with the philosophy and practice of the Ladies of Charity of St Vincent de Paul, from whom they were founded. Yet they have been ever-willing to adapt to changing conditions in society in general and to the needs of the local community. Both institutions have shown a very responsible attitude to the enormously important built heritage in their care.

However Henrietta Street is also particularly favoured by the presence there of three non-institutional or private owner-occupiers, each of whom, has made a pioneering contribution to actually saving the buildings, as well as, in establishing once again the possibility that houses such as these could be used as single residential dwellings as they were first designed. While in two of the cases, Nos. 4 and No. 12, the houses have been gradually re-converted from multiple to single occupancy, the re-possession of No.13 by Michael and Aileen Casey and their children, was as a home for a single family, from the start. In all cases, enormous sacrifices, practical and financial, were made by the owners to secure an authentic preservation of the original fabric in all of its detail, and in some cases, such as for example the staircase in No. 13, the faithful re-instatement, where possible, of lost historical material. Attempts have been made throughout, to strike a fine balance between, on the one hand, the preservation of the stratigraphy of superseding layers of history, and on the other, to establish and maintain an integrity of circulation, if not design itself, which is consistent with a single occupancy in a coherent dwelling.

In three more of the houses, Nos. 5, 6 and 7, a mostly benign, non-interventionist, approach has been taken in order to facilitate the provision of studio (and some dwelling and workshop) spaces for a very large and significant community of artists for almost thirty years now (see the submission by the artists in the appendices). This group of artists comprises some very important names from the current Irish visual arts scene, including five members of Aosdána, Fergus Martin, Mick O’Dea, Mick Cullen, Gwen O’Dowd, and Charlie Cullen. The last of these is a former Head of Painting in the National College of Art and Design, while the current Head of Painting, Robert Armstrong, also has a studio in Henrietta Street. The contribution made to the Irish arts by Uinsean and Nuada McEoin by their accommodation of these artists was deemed “outstanding” by a group of these artists when consulted for this plan (refer to Chapter 3.0 for a more detailed description of the consultation process and issues arising).

A vitally important role in the cultural life of the nation is also being played by Na Piobairí Uilleann, the Association...
of Irish pipers, who occupy No. 15 Henrietta Street on a ninety-nine year lease (begun in 1982) from Dublin City Council. Founded in 1968, NPU played a vital role in rescuing the craft of Uilleann Pipe manufacture, which was in dramatic decline at that time, and in this way was at the centre of a revival of the tradition of piping musicianship as well as its history and documentation. The Association now has in excess of 1,500 members worldwide, and is generally accepted as the umbrella organisation for piping throughout the world. No less than other organisations on the street, Na Píobairí Uilleann have also showed great care in fulfilling their responsibility towards what had remained of the last house on the south side of the street. This involved the complete rehabilitation of No. 15 in co-operation with the then Dublin Corporation, the works themselves being carried out by an AnCO Community Youth Training Programme.

Unfortunately the recent stewardship of the houses on Henrietta Street has not been universally benign. Nos. 3 and 14, have suffered considerably, in recent decades, from neglect and lack of maintenance on the one hand, and outright vandalism on the other. Purchased in 1968, these houses had been subject to a kind of late-20th-century tenemency, which has only finally ended with a Compulsory Purchase by the present Dublin City Council in 2002. This however is under a court injunction, which in the mean time prevents any remedial works on the building, or indeed any more substantial intervention.

6.0 Issues of Vulnerability

In many ways Henrietta Street is more secure today than it has been during the last 100 or so years. This is due primarily to the considerable efforts undertaken by the majority of the building owners over the last 30 years, coupled with the statutory protection which the Planning and Development Act, 2000 places on the houses. There is a general acceptance of the importance of the street which is evidenced by the number of studies and surveys – indeed the commissioning of this Conservation Plan – which have been carried out since the early 1990s.

However, there are a number of issues which threaten to affect the street in a negative way. These include immediate challenges such as building condition, the uncertain future and particularly poor condition of Nos. 3 and 14 and the paucity of suitable resources and support mechanisms to assist owners in maintaining these large buildings to the standards they require. Future areas of concern include the uncertainty of future use and ownership patterns and the impact of new development on the street. Many of the issues which one might consider as possible threats also have the potential to consolidate the street and contribute to it in a positive way. Thus, for example, while greater exposure and promotion of the street as one of the treasures of Irish architectural and urban heritage, may lead to over-intensive cultural tourism and/or gentrification of the street, it can also, hopefully, help to lever the necessary resources to maintain and protect the structure and fabric of the houses to the standard their importance warrants.

It is certain that the future will bring change and the street has withstood profound changes throughout its history. In a Street of such importance, however, even small changes can have significant impact, both positive and negative.

Among the more notable threats to the street are:

6.1 The Buildings

6.1.1 Building Condition

The Preliminary Structural Condition and External Elements surveys carried out by Dublin Civic Trust in 1999 provide a comprehensive picture of the condition of the houses. Since then a number of improvements have been carried out to some of the houses and others have deteriorated further. This survey of External Elements included estimated costs for recommended repairs to the external elements – roofs, facades (including brickwork, render and stonework repairs), external doors and windows, ironworks and stonework repairs – at IR£1.7 million (€2.15m). As part of this Conservation Plan these figures have been updated taking into account building inflation, current costs for conservation works of the standard required for such important buildings and taking account of the elements which have been repaired in the meantime. A revised estimate of €3,243,701 plus VAT for these works has been advised by Boylan Farrelly Quantity Surveyors (ref Appendix D). These works do not include any structural work, such as window and door lintel repair and renewal, which would arise as part of any external façade works.

The above figures relate only to the external repairs. The Dublin Civic Trust surveys also examined the general structural condition of 10 of the 13 houses (there was no access provided to Nos 3, 4 and 14), however these did not include cost estimates. Nonetheless, the cost estimate reviewed as part of this study indicates the scale of the challenge facing the building owners on Henrietta Street.
Of greatest concern regarding building condition are Nos 3 and 14. These houses, which are the subject of legal action at present, are in a very poor state, both internally and externally. As part of the Conservation Plan an outline condition survey and a preliminary structural assessment were prepared for No 14. These are included in Appendix D and describe the extent to which this house is at risk. Both buildings need urgent attention, firstly to establish what works are needed to secure them in the short term. To enable this, No. 14 in particular requires localised propping and stabilising to provide safe access for survey and inspection. In the long-term both houses need sustainable and secure uses and tenure which can be accommodated in a manner sensitive to the architectural importance of these houses and with adequate resources to ensure all necessary works are carried out to the required standards.

6.1.3 Inappropriate Works

Henrietta Street is fortunate to possess so many building owners who have taken a sensitive and careful approach to repairing their buildings over the years. This might not always be the case and either due to an excess or dearth of resources – resources here includes both financial and technical – inappropriate works can be carried out. The statutory protection afforded under the Planning and Development Act, 2000, may not in itself ensure the proper protection of the houses as the approaches required in their conservation, maintenance, monitoring, adaptation, etc., needs to be of a particularly high standard. Because so much of what has survived in the houses is of significance - be it original or early joinery, plasterwork, early ironwork, fragments of early wallpaper or the marks left from tenement partitions – it is important that a ‘forensic’ consideration is given to all fabric as part of any repair or ‘improvement’ works.

Further, meeting the requirements of the Building Regulations and other legislation such as the Disability Act (2004) could have destructive implications for the houses if solutions are not derived from a fully informed base or where adequate resources are not available to enable more costly mitigation measures, where necessary, to be implemented.

6.1.4 Loss of Cellars

The filling in of the front cellars under the street to a number of the houses is an example of inappropriate works being carried out in the absence of informed conservation advice. This work was done prior to the introduction of statutory protection for the architectural heritage. Nonetheless, these houses were given List 1 status in the City Development Plan at the time.

Dublin City Council, invoked Section 71 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000, to compulsorily acquire Nos 3 and 14. This is currently under appeal and the tender process which the City Council had initiated to sell both sites has also been injunction pending legal decision.
6.2 Resources

6.2.1 Insufficient Resources and support systems

Resources include financial, relevant professional and technical expertise and building/craft skills. These are all necessary to ensure appropriate works are carried out in a timely way.

Regarding financial assistance, several of the building owners, when consulted, referred to the difficulty in accessing funding, the generally low levels of funding currently available and a perception that there is considerable bureaucracy in the administration of these schemes. However, the various funding schemes which do exist have been availed of in several instances to assist owners in tackling specific conservation works.

Due to the importance of the houses on Henrietta Street, it is important that the necessary skill and expertise is available for both the specification and the carrying out of works. Allied to this is the risk that incorrect assumptions can be made with design and specification arising from a lack of full information and understanding of the building and its fabric.

While some recent initiatives improve the climate of support for the building owners, such as the Conservation Office in Dublin City Council, the RIAI accreditation scheme for Conservation Architects and, although informally structured, the establishment of the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group, there are insufficient systems to support those responsible for maintaining and repairing the buildings. This is also the case for those responsible for assessing the impact of any development and change in relation to the houses, the street and its immediate vicinity.

6.3 Development

6.3.1 Impact of new development on the street

New development can either consolidate and enhance the street’s great physical presence or diminish and weaken it. Further, new development can bring uses which support the street’s existing diverse mix or inappropriate activities which undermine and threaten it. Given the current climate of development activity, it is likely that the near future will bring considerable physical and social change to the area.

There are a number of new and pending developments which impact on Henrietta Street. The new City housing scheme on Upper Dominick Street backs onto Henrietta Lane and accommodates the city Cleansing Department. As a large building, how it is presented and maintained into the future will impact on the character of Henrietta Street. The new development in the block defined by Henrietta Street, Stable Lane and Bolton Street is currently under construction. This will also be a large structure, arguably overly so in relation to Henrietta Street. Henrietta Street has managed to retain its physical presence as ‘a street of palaces’ and this quality could be undermined by inappropriately sized new development in its immediate vicinity. The contrast in scale between the houses and the surrounding built environment, which has existed historically, is now under threat.

Henrietta Lane which currently comprises a mix of small scale light industrial and storage uses does not presently impact greatly on the street, albeit that they do contribute to the rich diversity of uses which is notable in this area. However, many of these uses are becoming increasingly rare survivals in the city centre. Uses such as car repair workshops, joinery workshops and monumental works are gradually disappearing from the historic city as the city loses its role as a place of enterprise and industry. Several of the buildings on the Lane are in poor condition and others underused, there is a strong sense that change is imminent.

How any redevelopment and new uses are stitched into the physical and cultural/social grain of the area will be important in ensuring the overall character of Henrietta Street is protected.

Further, while the mews structures have been altered and in many cases demolished (or partially so), some – in particular the mews to No 4 – retain historic fabric of note. A full assessment/inventory of the mews should be carried out to identify the nature, extent and importance of surviving historic structures and to inform where it might be appropriate to provide statutory protection. The interpretation of ‘curtilage’ in regard of a Protected Structure under the Planning and Development Act 2000, is presently unclear and therefore an assumption that the Protected Structure status on the Henrietta Street houses would extend to the mews on Henrietta Lane – being part of the historic curtilage – could be argued as being incorrect. This uncertain status places any surviving structures of architectural historical value on Henrietta Lane at risk.

The City housing scheme at Henrietta House, which replaced the original mews structures to the rear of Nos. 11 to 15, is itself a Protected Structure (fig.6.3.1.). It is a fine example of the early social housing schemes of Dublin Corporation, heavily influenced by Dutch social housing
architecture of the time. Henrietta House is generally well maintained with a settled community. Planned repair and refurbishment works will be carried out shortly.

The two large educational establishments in the area, namely DIT Bolton Street and The Kings Inns, have development plans which will impact significantly on the street. DIT’s plans to move to a new campus at Grangegorman will result in a change of use for many of their properties in the area. The Kings Inns have plans to develop partially the open grounds onto Constitution Hill. The latter institution has, however, in a submission to this study, expressed a commitment to remain on Henrietta Street. The implications of both these developments, taken in conjunction with Dublin City Council’s own proposals for a Framework Development Area at Broadstone/Grangegorman, to the west of Henrietta Street, suggest that the Henrietta Street area will continue to change both in its functional and physical character into the near future. The concern here is that the historic opportunities which now present themselves, to consolidate and enhance Henrietta Street, are taken on board as part of this development and renewal. The potential alternative scenario with Henrietta Street engulfed in poor quality, insensitive building and sidelined as an urban backwater, needs to be resisted emphatically.

6.4 Use

6.4.1 Changes of Use

The rich diversity of uses which the houses presently accommodate has been identified above as one of the more significant aspects of the street (fig.5.7.1). And, relatively speaking, the Henrietta Street ‘community’ is quite settled. However, at a time when this part of the city is experiencing profound and rapid change, the future stability of the street in terms of its functional and social character is in question. At present there are three houses in their original use – Nos. 4, 12 and 13 – namely single occupancy houses and lived in by their owners. The other buildings accommodate institutional uses, including the Daughters of Charity (Nos. 8 – 10), and the Kings Inns (the Law Library and No 11), both of which have been present on the street for a considerable time (the Kings Inns arrived at Henrietta Street in 1800 and purchased the present Law Library site in 1823; the Daughters of Charity came to the street in 1899) and, Na Piobairí Uíleann, No. 15, which was granted a lease from Dublin City Council in 1982, as well as the flats and studios in Nos. 5, 6 and 7. The remaining houses - Nos. 3 and 14 - are vacant.

The above occupancy is by no means secure into the future. There is only one family on the street with an obvious future generation which might continue to live here; the Daughters of Charity are experiencing the same declining numbers as other religious orders and, the houses at Nos. 5, 6, and 7 require repair and upgrading works which may make it difficult to maintain the current low rents which are affordable to the current artist tenants. Indeed, the availability of funds to carry out repairs and maintenance to the appropriate standard is an issue for all the street’s owners and could be one which forces some to leave the street.

The future of Nos. 3 and 14 however, is much more uncertain and insecure, pending the outcome of the legal proceedings associated with the Compulsory Purchase Order action by Dublin City Council.

It is highly likely, therefore, that the future will bring changes to the street, both to its present community and the general uses it accommodates. With a renewed interest in the housing stock of Georgian Dublin by the wealthier in society, there is a strong prospect that the street may become gentrified. Indeed, the implementation of many of the policies in the Conservation Plan may in themselves lead to some gentrification.
6.4.2 Under-use

At present there are 2 houses vacant on the street – Nos. 3 and 14. Figure 5.7.1 describes this graphically and indicates that approximately, 14 to 16% of the floor space in Henrietta Street is presently not used. It is a well established fact that buildings are at their most insecure when unoccupied. Vacant buildings are at greater risk to those occupied – risk of theft of building materials, furniture and fittings, fire damage, deterioration of structure and fabric and general vandalism.

6.4.3 Zoning

The current zoning for Henrietta Street, Z8, requires primarily residential and compatible office and institutional uses as part of the protection of the existing architectural and civic design character. Henrietta Street is also zoned Conservation Area.

6.5 The Street

6.5.1 Presentation of the street

The first-time visitor to Henrietta Street, whether architecturally informed or not, may find it difficult to appreciate the significance of the street from what they see. The street, as presented today, comprising the building facades, street furniture, signage, paving, etc., appears generally run-down – an urban backwater. Amongst the various descriptions of the street, arising from the consultation process, were “an air of dereliction”, “a dowdy old Dame”, “very poor appearance” and “presentation appalling”.

The limestone setts laid in the early 1990s lend an air of historic authenticity which may or may not be accurate (fig. 6.5.1). It is also possible that this pavement would originally have been a consolidated and well compacted earthen surface – stone setts tended to be used on the more heavily trafficked streets. The structural difficulties encountered during the recent laying of the setts over the underground cellars suggest that the depth may never have been available to lay the thickness of a stone sett and hence the greater possibility of a thinner compacted earth surface. However, and despite the rather uneven laying, the excess of tar binder and resulting darkness of the ground plane, the surface is sturdy and typical of many of Dublin’s historic streets.

The granite paths – flags and kerbs – are an important historic survival and require careful protection during any works to individual buildings and/or street improvements to ensure they are not inadvertently removed or damaged (fig. 6.5.2). Equally the impact of relaying paths and the consequential increase in levels, needs to be assessed in relation to boundary walls and railings and entrance steps. Pavement levels have gradually risen – in several instances resulting in buried or partially covered steps and wall bases.

The bollards, however, which protect the surviving cellars from vehicular traffic, are a most inappropriate style for the street.

---

11 Refurbishment of No. 11, which was vacant at the time of writing this Plan, is just complete. This will return it to use as additional accommodation for The Honourable Society of King’s Inns with residential use in the basement.
visually dominant and obstructing the fine prospect of this street of palaces from all angles (fig. 6.5.3). However, unless the street was to be completely restricted from vehicle access, some form of physical barrier is necessary to protect the cellars from excessive loads. While many of the comments during consultation referred critically to the impact of cars on the appearance of the street, this is not a significant problem as elsewhere in the city. However, if it were possible to eliminate vehicular access entirely from the street, then it might also be possible to remove the bollards.

Signage and road markings are other ‘by-products’ of facilitating the car and these also detract from the overall visual character of the street. The street lamps were painted an ‘off black’ colour in recent years as part of a film production which has reduced their impact in a positive way. Future re-decoration/maintenance should seek to retain this more muted effect.

In Henrietta Street, therefore, as in many primary streets and public spaces in Irish towns, the loss of visual and architectural coherence in the public realm is a result of a gradual erosion and cumulative breakdown of individual elements leading to the reduced aesthetic integrity of a place. Fortunately, Henrietta Street does not suffer to the same extent as other urban centres. However, this is a continual process and, unless it is addressed the general perception of the street for visitors will remain low-grade and down-at-heel.

Finally, a note of caution is required against the potential ‘prettification’ of Henrietta Street which could arise from an over-zealous approach to public realm and building façade improvements. It is important that the balance between the reticent facades and their splendid interiors, which is the quintessential quality of this Georgian street of ‘palaces’, is retained.

6.6 Access, interpretation, understanding and appreciation

6.6.1 Poor Access

For a place of such seminal importance in the evolution of Dublin’s high point of architecture and urban form, Henrietta Street offers little to the interested visitor beyond free access to the open air street. For many familiarity with the street stems from its regular appearance as an historic set for period films or documentaries. While it would be untrue to state that there is no public access to the interiors, none of the houses are obviously open to the public. Internal access is not easily achieved. The wealth of architectural grandeur and ornament and the layers of social and cultural history which the interiors reveal are therefore available only to a privileged few – those who are well informed, committed or well connected.

While it is important to acknowledge the generosity of building owners in granting access to interested visitors, it must also be noted that an ‘open door’ policy would not be acceptable or appropriate for many of the occupants and owners.

6.6.2 Poor Interpretation, understanding and appreciation

Henrietta Street is very much part of the ‘hidden’ Dublin and, as with many aspects of the street, there are positive and negative features to this. Positive in that the street does not suffer from the destructive impact which intensive cultural tourism can bring. Negative in that the poor understanding and appreciation of Henrietta Street by the general public in this country will persist as long as the street remains ‘hidden’. As such, it will continue to be less valued than other parts of our architectural and cultural heritage, with accordingly less resources made available for its protection and presentation – a potential self-perpetuating cycle.
6.6.3 Research and Survey

There is considerable information relating to Henrietta Street – principally its history and architecture – gathered over many years. Much of the available information is included in the Bibliography to this Plan. However, there are gaps. For instance, there is little knowledge or record of the tenement history of the street. There are also some conflicting readings of certain architectural historical aspects to the houses’ layouts and design which would benefit from being fleshed out and further researched.

A number of the building owners possess extensive knowledge of the street, and are intimately familiar with the buildings themselves. However, this information has not been formally compiled or recorded and therefore may be lost. The importance of a detailed knowledge and understanding of the street, noted previously in this report, is in ensuring that appropriate approaches are taken when carrying out works and that irreversible mistakes are not made.

The Dublin Civic Trust surveys and inventories of the buildings – the latter updated as part of this Conservation Plan – are an invaluable record and add to the Georgian Society Records published in 1910 and the Irish Architectural Archive photographic survey of 1985. A considered project to compile, add to and update this existing knowledge of the street is required. In short, there is a need for a Henrietta Street archive which can be continually updated as new research, surveys, building/conservation works, etc., are carried out and is made available to those planning and carrying out works and those involved in further research and survey.
7.0 Conservation Policies

This section sets out policies which are aimed at protecting the significance of the street as identified in Section 6 and which address the issues of vulnerability described in Section 7 above. These policies include both general objectives and guidance by which any proposals, changes, actions etc. may be assessed and specific programmed actions. Underpinning all policies is the ongoing protection of the street and its internationally significant cultural and architectural heritage into the future.

7.1 Existing Statutory Policy, Guidance and Legal Framework

The policies set out in this section sit within an existing framework of statutory legislation, policy plans, charters and guidance documents, the most relevant of which are listed below:

- Planning and Development Act 2000
- DoEHLG Architectural Heritage Protection Guidelines for Planning Authorities
- Dublin City Development Plan 2005 - 2011
- 1996 HARP Integrated Area Plan
- ICOMOS Charters, including:
  - Grenada Charter, 1985, Charter for the Protection of Architectural Heritage of Europe
  - Burra Charter, 1988, Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance
  - 1990 Charter for Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage

7.2 Conservation Plan Policy Objectives

Underpinning the policies of the Conservation Plan is a number of key objectives:

- To acknowledge the primary role of the property owners in protecting the significance of the houses and the street
- To identify and promote existing and new initiatives, structures and mechanisms which will assist the property owners in the substantial task of maintaining the buildings to the appropriate standard which reflects the importance of the street and also satisfies statutory responsibilities
- To improve the wider public's awareness and appreciation of the international cultural significance of Henrietta Street
- To acknowledge the contribution which the varied history of the street and the present diversity of uses and users makes to the cultural significance of the street
- To ensure the condition of the houses is maintained to the appropriate standards, to identify where structure and fabric is presently at risk, and, where this is the case to ensure a programme of immediate repair works is put in place
To ensure proper and sufficient technical guidance and architectural historical information is available to both property owners and planning officials so that the appropriate standards for any building or maintenance works are implemented and to prevent inadvertent loss or damage to important building fabric, structure, historic layout and context (fig. 7.2.1).

To protect against inappropriate uses of, and/or interventions and alterations to, the houses on Henrietta Street and their historic context

To consolidate and improve the presentation of the street and the public realm environment

To protect and consolidate the street’s historic importance and its unique urban character in terms of its immediate surroundings and the broader city context (fig. 7.2.2).

7.3 The Policies

Implementing and Resourcing the Conservation Plan Policies

Policy 1: To recognise Henrietta Street Property Owners Group and its contribution and ongoing role in the future maintenance of the street.

Despite its somewhat awkward title, this informal, ad hoc group established itself when the repaving of the street was being carried out and has continued since then. Established by the property owners themselves, it enjoys a validation which a new organisation might not enjoy and will gain strength from this genesis. Presently limited to property owners only, the question of whether it should be more broadly representative of the street – to include long-term tenants or possibly extend to include the property owners on Henrietta Lane – needs to be further explored. In this regard the Heritage Council’s policy acknowledging the role of the local community in forming and safeguarding cultural heritage, in line with the Burra Charter, is relevant.
Policy 2: To commission a study to recommend the appropriate legal structure, management composition and funding endowment status of the proposed heritage foundation/trust within the Irish legislative system and to identify ways to foster the endowment of a heritage conservation fund.

In broad terms, the proposed entity would take the form of a non-profit heritage foundation (or trust). The foundation/trust would comprise a board of independent trustees to co-ordinate management of sustainable conservation activities, fundraising and allocation of endowed funds. One of the main functions of the foundation would be to foster partnerships among the broad range of public and private stakeholders towards the implementation of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan. Given the high level of dedication by owners (and a number of occupiers) to ensuring the survival of Henrietta Street to date, it is important that the Henrietta Street property owners group (Ref Policy 1) has a role within the structure of the foundation regarding the management of sustainable conservation activities and partnership formation. A brief comparative review of international practice regarding the form and function of heritage foundations/trusts relevant to Henrietta Street is provided in the Appendix B.

Policy 3: To establish an endowed heritage foundation/trust for Henrietta Street.

While the perpetual role for such a foundation/trust would be to co-ordinate management of sustainable conservation activities within the remit of the defined ‘area-based’ boundary of Henrietta Street, the initial function of the heritage foundation/trust would be to co-ordinate the implementation of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan.

Policy 3.1: Under the auspices of the Henrietta Street heritage foundation/trust, to introduce a combination of specific ‘area based’ architectural heritage funding instruments, with particular regard to ownership profiles (private owners occupiers; private investors; public bodies and charitable institutions), to ensure implementation of the Henrietta Street Conservation Plan.

The Conservation Plan has, in preceding sections, set out the unique significance of the houses on Henrietta Street and the equally significant burden on property owners to ensure the houses are maintained and repaired to a standard necessary because of their importance. To date most of the property owners have honoured this responsibility – since 1999 a statutory responsibility – to an appropriately sensitive and high standard. While there has been some public funding, much of the cost of safeguarding this important piece of international architectural and urban heritage has been directly borne by the property owners themselves. There is a need now for more substantial and focused resourcing of the architectural heritage conservation activities required immediately and into the future. The provision of public funding for this should aim to balance market inefficiencies by making repair and maintenance a viable option for owners. Funding should be prioritised according to condition, use and occupational status, bearing in mind that commitment and continuity of ownership are key components in sustainable conservation practice. Consideration should be given to choosing a suite of financial instruments for Henrietta Street that are economically efficient, effective, equitable, manageable and politically feasible.

Building Maintenance and Monitoring

Policy 4: To implement a programme of essential external fabric and associated structure repairs to the houses on Henrietta Street.

The Condition Appraisal of Roof and External Elements, produced by The Dublin Civic Trust in 1999 provided an outline schedule, with costings, of the works required to secure the external envelope of all the houses on Henrietta Street. Since then a number of houses have undergone restoration programmes, others have deteriorated further. As part of this Conservation Plan, the 1999 costs were reviewed and revised taking into account building inflation, the works carried out to date and the implications of continuing decay in the meantime. The cost estimate for a programme of external envelope repairs is now put at €3,243,701 plus VAT (ref. Appendix E). It is recommended that these works would be carried out as a single project (Ref. Policy 10.1), with the proposed Henrietta Street foundation/trust as the suitable vehicle to fund (or co-fund) and procure the works. Due to the unique importance of the street and the relative urgency to carry out repairs if significant loss of historic/early fabric is to be prevented, it is recommended that this programme of works be advanced at as early a date as possible.

Policy 5: To establish a pro-active and co-ordinated ongoing maintenance strategy for Henrietta Street to benefit from the economies of scale with regard to the provision of periodic inspections to assess maintenance and monitoring needs, minor repairs, maintenance and monitoring costs and associated insurance costs.

Following the ‘stitch in time saves nine’ principle, pro-active systematic inspection and maintenance of architectural heritage assets is the most sustainable and cost effective
intervention in heritage conservation. There is a need to ensure adequate monitoring – security, fire, environmental conditions, etc., – for the houses where they are not currently/adequately in place. Through the Henrietta Street foundation/trust, a street-wide monitoring and maintenance programme – possibly a scaled down version of the Dutch Monumentenwacht Scheme which the Heritage Council is currently engaged in piloting – could be put in place which would avail of the benefits of economies of scale.

Building works and Interventions

Policy 6: To compile and update on an ongoing basis, a manual for property owners and Dublin City Council, which would include building inventories, building hierarchy matrix and technical guidance manual.

To ensure the relevant standard of works are carried out, be they repair, upgrading to comply with building regulations or intervention associated with a particular use, there is a need for adequate guidance and background information to ensure works are planned and assessed from an appropriately informed context. In this regard, a building hierarchy matrix should be prepared and applied in assessing the appropriateness of the works to the particular building. In addition, the inventory (updated as part of this Conservation Plan) and surveys carried out by Dublin Civic Trust for HARP between 1997 and 1999, provide a comprehensive basis for assessing and monitoring change. Further, a technical guidance manual should be prepared to provide detail information and guidance on best practice conservation works for the buildings on Henrietta Street. The report - Conservation Recommendations for individual Building Elements for Henrietta Street – also prepared by Dublin Civic Trust for HARP in 1999, could be adapted and expanded to provide such a document. This manual will assist also in developing and negotiating appropriate strategies and solutions to deal with the implications of compliance with Building Regulations and other statutory regulations, such as the Disability Act 2004.

While this is a suitable action for the proposed Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust, there is an immediate need for this resource and, therefore, it should be prioritised as an early action of the Conservation Plan.

Policy 7: To ensure the protection of the surviving cellars.

The cellars form part of the Protected Structures and therefore no alterations should be carried out without planning authority approval. However, due to the infilling of several of the cellars prior to the 1999 legislation, it is desirable that there is no further loss of these important aspects of the houses. A solution to secure the cellars structurally which would allow for the removal of the bollards (Ref. Policy 20) should be sought. It is noted that such a solution could impact on the present surface finish of the road. (Ref. Policy 22).

Policy 8: To digitise and review the HARP/Dublin Civic Trust building inventories.

These invaluable inventories provide an important and comprehensive record of Henrietta Street. The original survey is available in hard copy only, the review carried out as part of the Conservation Plan is available in digital format. The digitising of the inventories should be implemented immediately to ensure the information is accessible and easy to use. The inventories should be updated by Dublin City Council to record changes as works are carried out and, in addition all houses should be re-surveyed every 10 years, with the inventories up-dated accordingly. It is also recommended that the inventories be treated as confidential information with procedures for access to consult the inventories to be agreed with the individual property owners.

Henrietta Street in context of its immediate surroundings and the broader city context – Development Control and Use

Policy 9: That the proposed Framework Development Area (FDA) Plan for Broadstone, included as an objective of the Dublin City Development Plan 2005-2011, has due regard for the policies of the Conservation Plan, where appropriate.

The forthcoming FDA Plan should incorporate Henrietta Street within its boundary and take cognisance of the policies outlined in this Conservation Plan. In particular the implications of the re-location of DIT to the Grangegorman area on Henrietta Street and its environs needs to be addressed as part of this plan in addition to future development at Henrietta Lane (ref. Policy 14 below also). The impact of new uses in addition to the architectural/physical context should be examined, for example new residential uses should be of a type to encourage a settled community to compliment and consolidate that present in Henrietta Street.

Policy 10: That the pedestrian and cycle connection between Bolton Street and Broadstone/Grangegorman via Henrietta Street and the Kings Inns is protected within the FDA Plan to be prepared for the Broadstone FDA.

The present character of Henrietta Street is enlivened

---

13 A brief review of international strategies to foster regular maintenance of the architectural heritage to reduce the need for costly large-scale repair projects in the long term is provided in Appendix B.
14 Under the section on Significance each house is described in terms of the more notable aspects of its architectural historical importance. This could be developed into an architecture/building hierarchy matrix referred to here.
15 DIT presently owns a sizeable stock of buildings in the area around Henrietta Street and their future use and adaptation will have an impact on the street.
considerably by the calm through-traffic of pedestrians and cyclists through the gate at Kings Inns. This historic route/right of way protects Henrietta Street from the potential stymieing qualities of the cul de sac and should be retained.

**Policy 11:** That the important historic route along Henrietta Street, Capel Street, Parliament Street to City Hall and Dublin Castle, be taken into consideration in assessing any proposed development within this area.

Opportunities may arise in the context of development to enhance and consolidate this important historic link.

**Policy 12:** That the impact of new development in the area around Henrietta Street should be assessed in relation to its impact on views to and from Henrietta Street.

Henrietta Street's location on a hill – hence Primate's Hill – affords fine views both from the houses and to the houses. The impact of any development on these should be considered – note particularly fine views down Capel Street and to City Hall, with mountains in the background, from upper floors of south side buildings.

**Policy 13:** That any redevelopment proposals for the King's Inns be preceded by a Master Plan which takes on board the policies of this Conservation Plan.

In their submission to this Conservation Plan (ref. Appendix H), The King's Inns confirmed their intention to remain within the King's Inns/Henrietta Street complex. This is welcome and the King's Inns is rightly acknowledged as contributing significantly to the overall importance of Henrietta Street by way of the architectural quality of its buildings, its historic importance as well as an ongoing social, economic and cultural significance. It is likely that future expansion will require some new development of their lands and the impact of this on Henrietta Street should be addressed as part of a necessary preliminary masterplanning exercise.

**Policy 14:** That the area around Henrietta Street, comprising house Nos. 3 to 15, the Kings Inns and Registry of Deeds buildings and the buildings and structures on the south side of Henrietta Lane, be assessed for suitability as an Architectural Conservation Area, as defined in the Planning and Development Act 2000.

While the Protected Structure status pertaining to the houses on Henrietta Street and the King's Inns, affords considerable protection to the houses themselves, adopting the area around Henrietta Street as an Architectural Conservation Area – with specific design and development guidelines – would bring additional control and protection to the urban setting of the street. Specific objectives would be developed as part of the ACA which would be aimed at protecting the particular urban character of Henrietta Street which derives from the impressive scale of the houses in relation to the surrounding built environment.

**Policy 15:** That Henrietta Street as an entity and not just a collection of buildings, is given due consideration when assessing the impact of any proposed development either within the street or the immediate surroundings.

For example, where external works are carried out, they should be done in consideration of their impact on the street as an entity and the composition of the street in its totality should be taken into account. Further, the impact of development adjacent to the street should be assessed in terms of how it affects the still coherent urban set-piece of Henrietta Street.

**Policy 16:** That, as part of the Henrietta Street ACA, a use impact assessment be carried out for any proposal for change of use within the ACA and that grant of permission be based on the acceptability of any proposed interventions associated with the particular use.

The current zoning approach to controlling use can be an inappropriate and crude tool, in particular in architectural conservation areas. While it is desirable that Henrietta Street retains a residential character, the specific nature of the residential use may have negative implications. For example, the sub-division of a house into apartments will meet the current Z8 compliance zoning, however, it will also demand lobbying of stairways, upgrading of doors to provide minimum fire resistance values, etc.

**Policy 17:** That the Henrietta Street ACA identifies and acknowledges the cultural diversity which exists on the street at present, arising from the prevailing social and use mix, as an important part of the character of Henrietta Street.

The diversity of uses on the street has been noted as making a significant contribution to the cultural heritage of the street. In this regard the 'live/work' type accommodation in Nos. 5, 6 and 7, which provide homes and studios for a number of artists, is influential as are the cultural and educational activities of Na Piobairí Uilleann in No. 15. Equally relevant are the educational activities of both the King's Inns and the Daughters of Charity, allied to the important social contribution the latter institution makes
to the area. The three houses which remain as single, owner-occupier dwellings – Nos. 4, 12 and 13 – provide an important link with the original character of the street, which is further consolidated by the sensitive regard of the owners to the authentic preservation of original fabric and important historic layers. It is important that the future character of the street retains this cultural and social diversity and uses which complement this and can be accommodated within the architectural constraints already noted, should be welcomed.

**Policy 18:** That a full assessment of the structures on the former mews sites on Henrietta Lane be carried out to determine their architectural significance and, where appropriate, statutory protection be put in place.

The interpretation of the Planning and Development Act 2000, in regard to the curtilage of Protected Structures is still poorly defined. It is possible that the plots on Henrietta Lane may not be considered as part of the curtilage of the Protected Structures of Nos. 3 to 10 Henrietta Street and therefore any surviving fabric within these sites which is of architectural historical significance may not be adequately protected. The building to the rear of No. 4, for example, which is currently for sale, retains much of the historic mews structure however the status of its statutory protection is presently poorly defined. This is particularly so where a Declaration under Section 57 of the Planning and Development Act has not been issued, which is the case with many of the Henrietta Street houses.

**Policy 19:** That the ACA identifies potential uses which would facilitate public access to the building interiors without compromising the architectural integrity of the building, or uses which seek to preserve and prioritise the architectural significance.

Policy 16 above seeks to consolidate the ‘living’ character of the street. However, the limited access to the interiors has been noted as one of the drawbacks to greater public awareness of the importance of Henrietta Street and, consequently the lower than warranted value which is placed on the importance of the street. At present there are three unused houses on the street – Nos. 3, 11 and 14. There are other buildings where the continuation of current use, and/or ownership, into the future is not certain. Future uses which could comply with this policy and would bring another dimension to the experience of the street for visitors should be identified by the ACA and the Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust. The Foundation/Trust should also explore suitable incentives for such uses.

**The Public Realm**

**Policy 20:** That the bollards be removed and replaced with a more aesthetically appropriate type.

Bollards are currently necessary to protect the surviving cellars. However the type used in Henrietta Street are visually and stylistically inappropriate for such a location. While the objective to secure the structural integrity of the cellars to enable the permanent removal of bollards is enshrined in Policy 7, an interim policy to replace the existing bollards with a simple contemporary bollard should be implemented in the short term.

**Policy 21:** That the public lighting standards be replaced with a simple contemporary style light fitting of a more appropriate scale to the present.

The legacy of a film shoot, the present off-black colour of the street lighting reduces the visual impact of the tall lamp standards which are out of scale for the Street. Further, these early 20th century lamp standards do not appear to have any historic authenticity in this location. As the introduction of pastiche gas lamps would be inappropriate, it is recommended that the existing lamp standards should be replaced with a simple contemporary light fitting. In the meantime the current off-black colour should be retained.

**Policy 22:** All surviving granite paving flags and kerbs should be retained.

The early granite paving flags and kerbs are an important survival in the street. The original road surface was likely to be a form of compacted earth and the current stone setts, which were laid in recent years, are unlikely to be historically authentic.

**Policy 23:** In general street furniture, signage and road markings should be kept to a minimum and, where necessary, designs should be simple, visually restrained and of good quality materials.

To protect the character and architectural coherence of the street.

**Improving the Understanding, Awareness and Appreciation of the Street**

**Policy 24:** That a series of research and recording projects be implemented to consolidate and add to existing documented information on the street.

There are still many gaps in the available understanding of the street and issues of interpretation of the architectural
history, in particular Nos. 9 & 10. There is still much to be learned from further examination of the buildings themselves – these are the primary resource – which will both add to the documented information and will assist in assessing the implications of any changes or alterations which may be considered on the significance of the street. To further this information the following research and recording projects should be carried out:

- Project to record/document the considerable information and knowledge gathered by the property owners and building users over the years
- Project to research the varied history of Henrietta Street including the history of tenement use which has generally been overlooked

Ultimately it should be an objective to produce a publication – or a series of publications – on Henrietta street which would promote the street and its importance to a wider audience. Dublin Civic Trust’s recent publication on Nos. 8, 9 & 10 are an important contribution to this endeavour.

Policy 25: To facilitate better public access to and mediation of the cultural heritage of Henrietta Street.

For the visitor to Henrietta Street, aware and expectant of the architectural and urban treasures to be encountered, the street alone provides a limited representation of the full magnificence of these mini-palaces. There is poor access to interiors and no readily available background information on the street. Via Garibaldi (Strada Nuova) – the Genoa street of palaces with which Henrietta Street is often compared – provides considerable access to the interior of its buildings and plentiful background documentation. While public access may conflict with the nature of the existing use of several of the Henrietta Street houses – and the contribution these uses make to the overall significance of the street has already been stated in this Plan – uses for those buildings currently unoccupied, which would more readily accommodate public access, should be encouraged (ref. Policy 10.5). It is important that the desire for improved public access be weighed against the potential negative consequences of excessive cultural tourism. The impact of increased visitor numbers would require ongoing monitoring and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures where necessary.

Nos. 3 & 14 Henrietta Street

Policy 26: That the precarious condition of Nos. 3 and 14 be tackled as a priority, that the buildings be repaired in accordance with the conservation issues report included in Appendix F and that a sustainable new use and tenure be secured.

The unsatisfactory stasis associated with the current legal proceedings pertaining to these houses, has exacerbated the at risk status of these houses. Both houses are in urgent need of repairs, however No. 14 is in particularly bad condition. This policy states the imperative to seek immediate authorisation to address the urgent repair and safeguarding works and to carry out a full condition survey. Following this, the early resolution of the legal proceedings is required in order to allow a comprehensive programme of restoration works to be carried out.

At present both houses are vacant and have been so for a considerable time. Suitable and sustainable new uses are required which do not conflict with the other objectives and policies of the Conservation Plan. There are a number of possible scenarios depending on the outcome of the legal proceedings. Firstly the validity of the tender process which Dublin City Council initiated needs to be reviewed. If this is abandoned and the houses revert to public ownership, then the possibility of one of the houses being retained in public ownership remains. Suitable potential uses which Dublin City Council might consider, in this scenario, might include:

- leasing to an appropriate institutional use – such as the Irish Georgian Society – who may be well placed to secure the funds necessary to carry out the restoration works required and who may accommodate other uses, compatible with its own objectives and, in doing so, satisfy the objectives for greater public access to the buildings and improved presentation of the varied history of the street
- entering into a partnership with an organisation such as the Irish Landmark Trust who could mastermind the repair works – if funded – and run the house as a single let short term ‘holiday’ accommodation with a priority on the proper conservation of the architectural character and fabric of the house
- an alternative use could be a guest house in a similar vein, for example to Butler House in Kilkenny which is owned by the local authority and run by Kilkenny Civic Trust – a body established to run this important 18th century house as a guest house. This would offer visitors an opportunity to experience ‘living’ in Henrietta Street.
- as accommodation for one, or more, Dublin City Council departments

In the above situation, the second house could be also

---

16 The level of enquiry and investigation applied to Nos. 11 & 12 in Cathal Crimmin’s MUBC thesis has yet to be applied to the other houses, especially Nos. 9 & 10.
leased or, alternatively, sold. If put for sale, the terms of sale should address comprehensively the specific restrictions and standards which are outlined in the Conservation Plan. The selection of which house to retain and which to sell will depend on several issues. No. 3 is arguably the more architecturally important and is the only house on the street which retains its entire historic plot – albeit that the mews buildings no longer exist. This allows the possibility of developing the site in accordance with a development brief. If No. 3 is to be retained in public ownership, then it would also be desirable to retain and lease the mews site, so that the unity of the historic plot would be protected. The argument to retain No. 14 in public ownership rests on its being in the poorest condition and so may better suit some of the potential partners identified above.

If the buildings revert to their previous private ownership, then the statutory measures provided for in the Planning and Development Act, 2000, should be enforced and the conservation issues, set out in Appendix F addressed.

All other proposals with regard to new uses and associated works should conform to the statutory obligations relating to Protected Structures and the policies of this Conservation Plan.

No. 16 Henrietta Street

Policy 27: That the potential reinstatement of No. 16 be further explored by the Henrietta Street Foundation/Trust and a suitable mechanism for development prepared in conjunction with Dublin City Council.

All parties consulted during the preparation of this Conservation Plan stated that the reinstatement of No. 16 was desirable. The approach to the reinstatement, however, needs careful consideration and it should only proceed on the basis that the quality of the new building will be of a sufficient standard. If there is any uncertainty that this cannot be achieved, then it is preferable to leave the present gap site undeveloped. In this latter scenario the open area around the gable to No.15 should be improved. The method of procuring a building for this site and the issues of ownership, use, brief, etc. should be developed in conjunction with the Henrietta Street foundation/trust.

Underpinning all actions of the Conservation Plan implementation should be a commitment to sustainable goals such as encouraging the use of non-renewable heritage resources, protecting cultural identity and empowering community action.

8.0 Implementation and Review

The context for commissioning this Conservation Plan has been the desire to reaffirm and retain the unique importance of Henrietta Street in the Irish and international architectural and urban historical context. Following on from this, the objectives are to establish the works required to protect the significance of the buildings and street and meet statutory requirements, to influence the extent and nature of future intervention and change and to explore and identify suitable mechanisms by which the immediate and ongoing actions necessary to protect Henrietta Street to the standards appropriate to its importance, can be resourced.

The Conservation Plan is not a statutory document. However, it will assist in the implementation of existing statutory policy and law. The Conservation Plan is the beginning of a long-term process and its successful implementation will depend on as wide acceptance and active support as possible. In particular its the acceptance by the major stakeholders – namely the building owners, long term tenants/occupants and Dublin City Council – of the Conservation Plan and a shared consensus on the importance of the street, the issues which threaten its significance and the measures identified in the policies to address these issues of vulnerability.

The successful implementation of the Conservation Plan policies also depend on the action of all major stakeholders. However, the sensitive manner in which the majority of the buildings have been maintained and protected over the last 30 to 40 years, indicates the strong commitment which already exists and the sophisticated and informed understanding of these property owners of the importance of Henrietta Street.

In preparing the Plan, consultation was held with all the key stakeholders. Further consultation and dialogue will be necessary at times during the life of the Plan.

8.1 Immediate/Short Term Actions

The Conservation Plan policies include specific proposals/recommendations which should be implemented at an early stage. These include:

17 Refer to Chapter 2.0 which sets out the consultation process and the key issues arising. Note also that the owners of No.4 took part to a limited extent in the consultation process.
To commission a study to recommend an appropriate legal structure, management composition and funding endowment status for the proposed Henrietta Street foundation/trust (Policy 2). This study would also identify ways to foster endowment of the foundation/trust and would explore suitable ‘area based’ funding instruments which would aid the implementation of the Conservation Plan policies (Policy 3.1).

To implement a programme of essential external fabric and associate structure repairs to the buildings on Henrietta Street (Policy 4).

To establish a pro-active and co-ordinated ongoing monitoring and maintenance strategy for Henrietta Street (Policy 5).

To compile a manual for property owners and planning authorities comprising building inventories, building hierarchy matrix and technical guidance manual (Policy 6).

To commence the process of designation of Henrietta Street as an Architectural Conservation Area (Policy 14).

To carry out an assessment of the existing structures on Henrietta Lane to determine their architectural historical importance and to make recommendations with regard to statutory protection (Policy 14).

To replace the existing metal bollards on Henrietta Street with a more appropriate granite type bollard (Policy 20).

To digitise the HARP/Dublin Civic Trust building inventories (Policy 8).

To commission and publish a number of recording and research projects to consolidate and add to existing documented information on the street (Policy 24). Specifically,

- to record and document the considerable wealth of information and knowledge gathered by the property owners and building users over the years
- to commission a detailed survey and record of all buildings which might continue over a number of years and would record the historic layers which are still visible in many of the houses.
- to research and document the social and cultural history of the street from its initial development to the present day.

To seek an urgent resolution to the legal injunction currently pertaining to Nos. 3 and 14 and to carry out immediate works to make the buildings safe for inspection and, following this, to carry out urgent essential repairs to halt deterioration of fabric and to protect the buildings from further loss of important historic material. To seek appropriate and sustainable uses with secure tenure (Policy 26).

To explore the potential for the reinstatement of No. 16 Henrietta Street and, as appropriate, to prepare a development brief, promote the redevelopment of the site and procure a suitable use and occupant for the new building (Policy 27).

It is recommended that, until the Henrietta Street foundation/trust is established, that a Steering Group, which includes representatives of the key stakeholders - be appointed to oversee the implementation of the Conservation Plan. This Steering Group should consult with the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group on an ongoing basis as it is from working together that the objectives of the Plan will be achieved.

To maintain the momentum and interest generated during the preparation of the Plan, it is recommended that the above actions be implemented within 2005/2006. As some of these actions may take some time to complete, for example the Architectural Conservation Area, due regard should be given to the objectives within the relevant policies and sub-policies by the relevant stakeholders, in particular where any proposed development or works are being carried out or assessed for approval.

To assist in the acceptance and implementation of the Plan it is recommended that a number of workshops are held with the stakeholders, – for example one workshop would be held with the relevant Departments of Dublin City Council, another with the Henrietta Street Property Owners Group – in order to present the Plan and advise on how the policies might be implemented.

8.2 Review

The Conservation Plan will initiate and inform ongoing processes for the future of Henrietta Street and may require variation at times along the way. It should be reviewed on an annual basis to assess the continued relevance of the policies and to chart progress in implementing the actions and recommendations.

Finally, the information contained in the Conservation Plan including the Appendices, should form part of a site archive and management document. Any new information – survey, historical, etc., – should be added to the file as it becomes available. The file should be available as a tool to those involved in the day to day management of Henrietta Street and when particular works are being planned.
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