

OBJECTIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE LIMERICK CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN 1980

Objection 1:

To the proposals to construct a new road from Thomond Bridge to Baal's Bridge and to reserve land for that road.

Reason (a)

The proposal involves the demolition of houses of architectural merit and interest in Limerick including one of the few remaining XVII Century structures still standing.

Reason (b)

The road would endanger the stability of the important North Wall of the Dominican Priory at St. Mary's Convent.

Reason (c)

The proposal involves the demolition of the part of the historic Walls of Limerick between the Sallyport and the East Wall of the Priory.

Reason (d)

The proposed road passes through the probable site of St. Francis Abbey, for the excavation of which site no provision has yet been made in the Plan, and which may contain remains of sufficient value to merit their retention in situ.

Reason (e)

That such a road is not required by the traffic volume which can be carried by Thomond Bridge. Such a volume of traffic can easily be carried by a road much less drastically conceived, and there is no proposal in the Plan to modify or replace the bridge. If the bridge is adequate, such a road is not required. If the bridge is inadequate, the obvious answer is a new bridge, preferably sited upstream of the present bridge and carrying the traffic from the Island Road, north of Villiers Alms Houses, to Old Thomondgate.

Representation 1:

That the proposal be abandoned or modified so as not to interfere with buildings or monuments worthy of preservation.

Objection 2:

To the proposal that Ellen Street be widened and re-aligned from Carr Street to Mungret Street as shown on map D.P.2. [p. 134, Chapter 3, 4th par., head. (b)].

Reason:

The proposed re-alignment as shown on the map involves the demolition of the north range of buildings in the Milk Market and the effective destruction of the market as an architectural entity.

Representation 2:

That the line of the road be carried along the road at present bounding the market on the north and be continued into Sean Heuston Place over the vacant ground on the east side of Mungret Street.

Objection 3:

To the proposal to "demolish the structures in the Potato Market" [p. 145, Chapter 6, par. 7(2)].

Reason:

Such a proposal should only be considered in the context of plans for the development of the market, which might better require the retention of all or part of the present structures.

Representation 3:

That the proposal be deleted and a proposal be added in the appropriate place:- "in developing the Potato Market to open the view to the Abbey River and form a continuous riverside park with the Custom House Park".

Objection 4:

To the proposal to demolish houses at Merchant's Quay and Bridge Street [p. 145, Chapter 6, par. 7(1)].

Reason:

The houses at Merchant's Quay were demolished some time ago. Some ruined walls of the house in Bridge Street remain.

Representation 4:

That "ruinous walls at the corner of Merchant's Quay and Bridge Street" be substituted for "houses at Merchant's Quay and Bridge Street".

Objection 5:

To the wording of the objectives for the preservation of buildings, etc. [p. 147, Chapter 6, 1st paragraph on page].

Reason (a):

The objectives are subordinated to the other objectives of the Plan in a manner not to be found elsewhere in the Plan.

Representation (a):

That the words "in so far as they may be compatible with the other objectives in the plan" be deleted.

Reason (b):

That no provision is made for consultation with interested local and other bodies.

Representation (b):

That after the words "historical interest in the city" the following be inserted: "in consultation with the prescribed authorities under Section 21 (1)(a) of the 1964 Act and with local archaeological, historical, and other interested societies and institutions".

Reason (c)(i)

The proviso would appear to operate to make the study a precondition to preservation and to exclude buildings from the plan unless such detailed studies are made, whereas the intention would seem to be that protection would not be removed without such studies first being made.

Reason (c)(ii)

As detailed studies of all buildings in the care of the Commissioners of Public Works or listed as National Monuments have not necessarily been made, their exclusion from the proviso does not appear warranted.

Reason (c)(iii):

As the objective is merely to "endeavour to protect", the proviso appears to be unnecessary.

Representation (c):

That the proviso be omitted.

Representation 5: (including (a) to (c) above)

That the objectives for the preservations of buildings, etc., be reworded as follows:

1. The Corporation will endeavour to secure the preservation of buildings of artistic, architectural or historical interest in co-operation with the owners and occupiers of same and in consultation with the prescribed authorities under Section 21(1)(a) of the 1964 Act and with local archaeological, historical, and other interested societies and institutions, and in particular the Corporation will seek to secure in co-operation with the Commissioners of Public Works, the owners and the occupiers of the following buildings, the preservation of such buildings:

Objection 6:

To the second list of buildings to be preserved [p. 147, Chap. 6, 2nd par. on page].

Reason:

As listing in paragraph 1 does not appear to put any obligation on the Corporation to incur expense, there does not appear to be any reason why all the buildings should not be on the first list.

Representation 6:

That there be only one list of protected buildings in paragraph 1, and all the buildings in the list in paragraph 2 be included in it.

Objection 7:

To the list of such buildings [p. 147, Chapter 6, first paragraph on page].

Reason:

The list omits important buildings and does not accurately describe all the buildings.

Representation 7(i):

That the following buildings be added to the list:

30. The Milk Market.
31. The Potato Market.
32. The Bishop's Palace, Church Street (St. Mary's).
33. Nos. 2, 3 & 4 Church Street (St. Mary's).
34. The facade of No. 7 Rutland Street (formerly Bruce's Bank).
35. Thomond Bridge.
36. All other buildings of similar interest or merit.

Representation 7(ii):

That the description of the buildings at the following references be amended to read:

2. The wall of the Exchange, Nicholas Street.
3. Kilrush Church at Old Church, North Circular Road.
22. St. John's Temperance Society House, Upper William Street.
23. The toll house at Thomond Bridge.
27. Any building which lies within a line drawn from Henry Street through Cecil Street, Dominick Street, Baker Place, Pery Street, Pery Square, Barrington Street, Newenham Street and Henry Street to join the commencement of the line and including both sides of the streets on the perimeter.

Objection 8:

That in the preservation of buildings insufficient attention is had to the feeling and atmosphere of the city.

Reason:

While few buildings of great age are to be found in the formerly walled parts of the city, these parts retain in the style and scale of the streets and buildings something of the feel and atmosphere of the medieval town which it would be undesirable to lose.

Representation 8:

That the following paragraph be added after the list of buildings at page 147:

2. In regard to the buildings and structures contained within the line of the old city walls, any proposal to alter or demolish or develop shall be considered in the light of their contribution to the distinctive atmosphere of the old city in so far as it is still representative of the medieval town and be subject to an application for permission, in which event the Corporation will seek the preservation of that atmosphere and as far as it is consistent with that aim will seek the preservation of the buildings or structures.

Objection 9:

To the statement of policy at page 66 of the Plan regarding such of the listed buildings as are not in the care of the Commissioners of Public Works, viz.,

In regard to such other buildings the Corporation will by all means at its disposal encourage the owners or occupiers to keep the buildings in good state of preservation.

Reason:

The policy is inadequate to secure the Corporation's stated objectives for the preservation of such buildings.

Representation 9:

That the policy be restated as follows:

In regard to such other buildings the Corporation will by all means at its disposal ensure that the owners and occupiers keep the buildings in a good state of preservation.

Objection 10:

To the wording of the objectives for the preservation of caves, etc. [p. 148, Chapter 6, second paragraph].

Reason:

The plan does not adequately protect archaeological sites which have not yet been excavated.

Representation 10:

That the paragraph containing the objectives be numbered "1" and the following paragraph be added after the list of objectives:

2. The Corporation will secure the preservation and conservation of monuments and sites of archaeological interest by requiring the proper investigation and excavation of such sites before procuring or permitting any development affecting them and will in particular secure such investigation before any development which might injure or reduce the archaeological content of the following sites:

- (a) The site designated for Civic Offices at West Watergate.
- (b) The site of the Franciscan Friary at St. Francis Abbey.
- (c) The site of the Dominican Priory at St. Mary's Convent.
- (d) The site of the Augustinian House of St. Mary at Fish Lane.
- (e) The site of the Tholsel, Mary Street.
- (f) The site of the old harbour at Merchant's Quay and the Potato Market.
- (g) The site of the former Courthouse and Town Hall at Bridge Street.
- (h) King John's Castle, inside a line drawn 10 metres outside the line of the curtain wall.
- (i) The Citadel at St. John's Hospital and the surrounding area.
- (j) The City Walls and in particular the sites of the parts of the walls now demolished together with the ground for 10 metres on either side.
- (k) All the area bounded by the line of the City Walls or within 100 metres of the line on the outside.
- (l) All the area within 100 metres of the Clare bridgehead of Thomond Bridge.
- (m) All the area within 100 metres of the Limerick end of the Lax Weir.
- (n) The area known as Ireton's Fort, Singland.
- (o) The area within 50 metres of St. Patrick's Churchyard, Fair Green and of St. Patrick's Well, Singland, and the said churchyard.

Objection 11:

To the list of such objects of archaeological, etc., interest [p. 148, Chap. 6].

Reason:

That the list is inadequate.

Representation 11(i):

That the description at reference No. 2 be altered to read:

2. All remaining sections of the Walls of Limerick as shown on the map by H. G. Leask published in the *North Munster Antiquarian Journal*, Volume 2, No. 3, Spring 1941'

Representation 11(ii):

That the following be added to the list:

12. All plaques and carved stones on buildings or structures indicating the nature, date or use of the building.
13. All carved stones and signs on the list prepared by the Limerick Corporation National Monuments Advisory Committee.
14. The gateway into the garden of St. Mary's Parochial House, Athlunkard Street.
15. All other monuments, sites, features and objects of similar interest in the city.

Objection 12:

To the failure to indicate any development objectives under heading 5A of Part IV of the Third Schedule of the 1964 Act as amended by the 1976 Act.

Reason:

Without such an objective in the plan, objects of the type indicated in the heading are inadequately protected.

Representation 12:

That the following be added to the Plan:

The Corporation indicates the following development objectives for the preservation of plasterwork, staircases, woodwork or other fixtures or features of artistic, historic or architectural interest and forming part of the interior of structures.

The Corporation will endeavour to secure the preservation of plasterwork, staircases, woodwork and other fixtures and features of artistic, historic, architectural or archaeological interest forming part of the interiors of structures.



The Thomond Archaeological Society was started in 1929, as a successor to and in continuation of Societies dating back to 1892, to encourage an interest in the study and preservation of all aspects of our past, with special reference to that of North Munster. Its horizons are wide, embracing archaeology, history, folklore, folklife studies, numismatics, onomastics, and other kindred subjects. Membership is open to all, and entitles to notice of and attendance at all lectures and excursions organised by the Society, and also to a free copy of the Society's annual JOURNAL.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Honorary Treasurer, Captain Frank Parker, "Asgard", North Circular Road, Limerick, Subscription rates: Ordinary Members £6 per annum (Family Members, £1 extra per person); Junior Members, £2.50 per annum.

Material intended for publication in the JOURNAL should be sent to The Honorary Editor, Professor Etienne Rynne, Department of Archaeology, University College, Galway.

All other correspondence, including requests for back-numbers of the JOURNAL, should be sent to the Honorary Secretary, Rev. John D. Leonard, 9 Castletroy Heights, Limerick. *phone 45764*