

105553
July 9, 2007
Ms. Joan Albright, Clerk/CAO

Page 2

2.2.3 Upper Floor Structure

It is my understanding that the 10" deep joists run east/west. This should be clarified.

3.0 Inspection

As stated, the report is limited by the fact that significant portions of the northwest wing are presently hidden by finishes or are otherwise inaccessible. This includes the crawlspace area beneath the main floor, and the main floor itself lying west of the diningroom. The condition of these areas would have to be confirmed by opening up areas to gain access.

3.5 Roof

It is our understanding that there is no ridge beam at the top of the roof to take out the tendency for horizontal thrust of the rafters. This item should be commented on. The sag in the roof is identified and the eight (8) inch lateral movement of the wood plate on the north wall is described. Based on his observations, the author states that it is his impression that the structure of the roof structure is "quite light".

3.5.5 The sag in the purlins, the displacement of the wood plates on the north wall, the opening up of the birds-mouth connections on the plate, and the fact that three (3) of the heavy rafter pieces are broken are indications of structural distress and failure of items noted in the report.

3.5.6 The condition of the brick at the top of the north wall is identified, noting that some bricks have "been lost to the outside". Mr. Knight indicates that the "The roof thrust is presently resisted by cables." I have not received any engineered drawings detailing the design or adequacy of these cables. It is my recommendation that you request confirmation from an engineer that these cables are adequate on a temporary basis. In relation to the north brick wall, we note that there is a significant sag in the brick wall and apparent distress and settlement in the foundation. This item is not commented on in the report and should be addressed.

4.0 Structural Analysis

We note that ground snow load in the current Building Code for areas such as Chesley, Walkerton, Kincardine, Walkerton and Port Elgin is higher than the assumed ground snow load of 2.48, and we recommend this be reviewed by the engineer. We note that this interim report, as stated by the engineer, does not allow for snow load buildup, but that a final design would have to include this.

4.3 Findings

The report confirms that major replacement and/or repair is required to the roof and areas of the floor. The scope of work is so significant that replacement of the entire roof and the main floor structure west of the dining room (see 3.7 - Main Floor) are recommendations given by Mr. Knight in the report.