

37-45 High Street, Staines, Staines-Upon-Thames, TW18 4QU

DESIGN NOTE ON FACADE RETENTION

Prepared by Corstorphine & Wright on behalf of Future High Street Living Ltd. (the Appellant)

MAY 2023 – Revision P-00

Planning Reference (Original Application): 21/01772/FUL

Appeal Reference (in progress): 22/00067/REF

Planning Reference (Demolition): 22/00299/DEM

Planning Portal Reference Number: PP-10343925



Prepared by Tony Mead – Director, Corstorphine & Wright

1.0 My name is Tony Mead. My qualifications and experience are set out in my Design Report; which can be found at Appendix 2 of Colin Pullan's Proof of Evidence (CD11.16)

2.0 Introduction

2.1. Corstorphine & Wright have been requested to outline design considerations that were given to facade retention during the design process.

3.0 FACADE RETENTION

3.1. The constraints and limitations identified in the conversion of the existing building are identical when considering facade retention. The planning and organisation of spaces behind the retained facade would be determined by the floor heights of the existing building, together with the location of the window positions in the existing facade.

3.2. Due to these constraints the retention option would yield a similar number of units to the conversion option (identified as 54 units for conversion without extension (option A) and 88 units with a two-storey extension (Option B), as shown in the Conversion Feasibility and Viability Appraisal, CD11.3), despite having significantly higher construction costs for demolition and structural stabilisation of the facade during the works.

3.3. The floor heights in the existing building (circa 4.1m) were designed for retail use. Residential floors would normally be 3000mm, and any additional ceiling height would be considered as adding very limited value. Any value would be offset by the restricted daylight and aspect offered by the existing windows, where spacing and cill height were not designed for visual amenity.

3.4. Facade retention would therefore not deliver any additional density beyond that of the conversion option. The apartments on a facade retention scheme would also be compromised with single aspect and have a poor visual outlook (at first floor level) towards Goodman Place, similar to the conversion option.

3.5. It would be possible to reduce the depth of the building in a solution that retained the existing facade, although the linear form of the building would still result. This could potentially generate a roof terrace for residents. However, this would be of limited amenity value as it would be restricted to an outlook towards Goodman Place only.

3.6. A potential benefit of retention would be that a new structure could support additional floors. However, the conversion option would also support additional floors and would not incur the additional expense of demolition and stabilisation works.

3.7. The height of the existing facade is approximately equivalent to 5 new residential storeys. A new build option could provide both improved density and quality on the site when compared to a similar volume of the existing building. The additional cost and complexity of facade retention would be an expensive and unviable option for consideration, given the compromises on both the layouts and outlook for change to residential use.

Corstorphine & Wright