

# Liverpool Planner's Meeting

---

## General

Date and Time: 21 June 2007

Minutes Taken By: DR

Venue: Liverpool Vision Offices

---

## I. Attendees

Steve Barnes – Langtree Group PLC

Barry McGorry – Liverpool Vision

Martin Wright – Liverpool Vision

David Rolinson - Spawforths

Nigel Lee – Liverpool City Council

Glynn Marsden – Liverpool City Council

Barbara Kirkbride – Liverpool City Council

Topic	Discussion	Action...	...By
<b>2. Explanation of scheme proposal</b>	DR explained the nature of the problems with Frenson and the rights to light and explained the nature of the options evaluation and viability assessments which resulted in the preferred scheme. All agreed that the deletion of the residential component and the pursuit of an employment only scheme was the right approach. NL confirmed that the Council wish to work constructively with the Developer to find a solution to the problem.		
<b>3. Frenson Right of Light</b>	NL questioned the nature of the Right to Light issues and SB confirmed that the rights are injunctable (rather than compensatable) and hence must be taken account of. All agreed that the planning approved scheme was acceptable to build in planning an design terms but not capable of implementation.		
<b>4. Façade Retention</b>	NL raised concerns over the façade retention proposal and GM raised concern over the ability to physically retain the façade through a construction process. BK indicated that the concern was that the façade had no activity or purpose. Second concern was the bringing forward of the upper floors (glazed) accommodation towards the road frontage and the impact of this on the street scene.		
<b>5. Options Consideration</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NL requested that the façade be tied into the building fabric by retention of approx 10m of the wall next to the alleyway and that the upper glazed accommodation be set back. SB / DR indicated that this would adversely affect the viability and preclude delivery of the scheme.</li> <li>NL then considered whether 86 Duke Street could be demolished with only 88/90 retained and 86 replaced by a glazed building. GM indicated that 86 is the best building and 88/90 is a Georgian building with Victorian modifications.</li> <li>GM indicated that it may be preferable to demolish the whole frontage; though he wanted to consider this view further</li> </ol>		

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action...</b>	<b>...By</b>
<b>6. English Heritage</b>	<p>GM indicated that English Heritage had asked to look at 46 buildings in World Heritage Area which included the application site. GM indicated that he did not expect EH to seek to list the buildings. Meeting on site on 9<sup>th</sup> July.</p> <p>DR requested that the Council seek to ensure that no impediment is put in front of the scheme (listing) that would preclude the delivery of an appropriate (and viable) scheme.</p>		<b>DR</b>
<b>7. Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. BK to contact DR to arrange a further meeting between those present before the 9<sup>th</sup> July site visit with EH</li> <li>2. NL/BK/GM to review the above options (in conjunction with English Heritage and Rob Burns) to come to definitive view on an acceptable solution for the site</li> <li>3. GM requested a copy of the Nuttalls Report for the earlier scheme</li> </ol>	<p>Meet before the 9<sup>th</sup></p> <p>SB to provide</p>	<p><b>BK</b></p> <p><b>NL/BK /GM</b></p> <p><b>SB</b></p>