

Our Ref: MD/J039

23rd October 2020

Care of EPML

Proposed Conversion of Roof:

Singleton Court,

Bury Old Road, Prestwich

Manchester M25 0FW

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The owners of the above property are applying for planning permission to convert the roof space into five flats.
- 1.2 As part of the application a report is required from a suitably qualified Structural Engineer commenting on the structural feasibility of the work.
- 1.3 This report is therefore prepared on the instruction of Mr M Moore, to comment on the structural feasibility of the proposals.

2.0 Proposals

- 2.1 The proposals are detailed on drawings prepared by the Client's Architects, Gold Sketch Studios Ltd.
- 2.2 Singleton Court is a mid-20th century residential apartment building, with two storeys above ground level at the front (facing Bury Old Road) and three storeys at the rear. The upper two storeys are split into three separate blocks. The bottom storey runs across all three blocks and comprises garages/stores to the right and centre blocks and apartments to the left hand block.
- 2.3 The proposal for which planning permission is sought is to add dormers to the full width of the rear slope to the right and centre blocks, and to the right hand side of the rear slope to the left hand block. Five residential flats are to be constructed; two each in the left and centre blocks and one in the left hand block.
- 2.4 External access staircases are to be constructed between the blocks and to the right hand side of the right hand block.

3.0 Site Inspection

- 3.1 The write made a preliminary visit to site, in the company of Sam Golding of Gold Sketch Studios Ltd, on Tuesday 13th October 2020. The inspection was visual and no exploratory investigations were undertaken.

- 3.2 Comments on the inspection are as follows, handing being expressed throughout this report as viewed facing the front elevation (from Bury Old Road):
- 3.2.1 The external walls are faced in brickwork and the roofs are pitched, with a tile covering. There are projecting bays above ground floor level, to the rear elevation.
- 3.2.2 An internal inspection of the roof confirmed it to be of conventional construction, with timber rafters, purlins, hips, valleys, ceiling joists and hangers etc. No evidence of significant structural distress was noted in connection with the existing roof structure.
- 3.2.3 The roof space to each block is subdivided by a central brick party wall, which runs from front to rear, for the full height of the building. Additional loadbearing masonry walls run front to back and left to right; some full height and some supported by steel beams at ground floor level.
- 3.2.4 The internal floors are suspended timber. The external deck areas between the blocks at ground floor level appear to be beam and block, with an asphalt covering.
- 3.2.5 No evidence of significant structural distress was noted in connection with the superstructure walls.

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 4.1 Our examination of the proposals, in conjunction with our site inspection, leads us to the opinion that the proposed scheme is achievable from a structural perspective.
- 4.2 The proposals will result in additional dead and imposed loading being applied to the loadbearing walls and foundations. The additional loading is likely to constitute an increase in the order 10%. Whilst we do not have any details with regard to the existing foundation construction, the apparent absence of structural distress to the existing superstructure leads us to conclude that it can safely accommodate the required level of additional loading.
- 4.3 In order to verify these assumptions we recommend that as part of the structural design remit the foundation construction, nature of the underlying ground and integrity of steel beams at ground floor level be verified, and any necessary strengthening works incorporated as found to be necessary. We would not however expect such works, if any, to be extensive.
- 4.4 This report is confined to the matters mentioned in section 1 and no opinion is expressed or implied on matters not specifically mentioned.

We have not inspected woodwork or other parts of the structure which are covered, unexposed or inaccessible and we are therefore unable to report that any such part of the building is free from defect.



M. DAVENPORT
I.Eng.,A.M.I. Struct.E.