

Minutes of Meeting with Council  
25/10/2007

DUKE STREET, LIVERPOOL.

Present

Barbara Kirkbride – Liverpool Planning Officer  
Glynn Marsden – Liverpool Conservation Officer  
John Tweed – Tweed Nuttall  
Joe Bennett – Langtree  
Andrew Wolstenholme – DLA  
David Rolinson – Spawforths

1.	All agreed that retention of the warehouse was a positive step forward.	
2.	All agreed that No 88-90 could be demolished if sufficient justification can be established. Glynn Marsden agreed that No 88-90 demolition is part of the trade off to retain No 86 Duke Street.	
3.	JT indicated that in urban design terms, the removal of No 86 can be supported to make the redevelopment of the urban block more coherent and to provide a better entrance into the courtyard. He recognised however that No86 has some historical value.	
4.	GM confirmed that support from Nigel Lee for the demolition of No 88-90 Duke Street was on the basis that No86 was retained. English Heritage (EH) also supports this pragmatic approach but want to see the retention of the warehouse. Both GM and EH supported a more modern contemporary approach to the corner building.	
5.	In respect of the scheme to retain No86, GM commented as follows :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to move the upper floor (new build) bulk away from No 86 to corner with Suffolk Street.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could extend the length of that upper floor accommodation along Suffolk Street to increase the floor area.</li> <li>• Happy to see the height of the retained warehouse increased by two floors (contemporary approach). Noted that this affects the right to height issues. JB to assess whether right to height relates to the building as they were when the agreement signed or their original form i.e. if in different ownership (no agreement), could the warehouse be rebuilt to their original height?</li> <li>• Happy to support an extra bay on the internal elevation of No86 into the courtyard.</li> <li>• Happy to see a blend of materials – stone, brick, terracotta, glass.</li> <li>• Need to reclaim the frontage set back to ensure the settings of No 86 is not compromised.</li> </ul>	JB
6.	<p>GM confirmed that if the above still do not make the scheme viable then he would not want to go back to the façade approach of the previous scheme. If above scheme not viable, then consider two options</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Add a further storey of accommodation (set back from frontage) however concerns rose over dominance of this.</li> <li>b. Remove No 86 and have to justify its loss in terms of PPGIS advice, viability and quality of replacement. This is GMs least favoured approach. Comment on such a new build scheme would have to come from the Council Urban Design Team and EH.</li> </ol>	
7.	<p>The listings request for the building was not put in by the Georgian Group in 2004. It requested a review of 46 buildings of which 12 have been promised (not the Langtree buildings) EH are working through the rest of the buildings but no timescale has been set.</p>	
8.	<p>JT agreed to provide photographic appraised report to EH and GM next week.</p>	