# CLOSE, GRANGER, GRAY & WILKIN

BUILDING AND CIVIL ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS, SURVEYORS AND ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGISTS

28 MARKET PLACE, GUISBOROUGH, CLEVELAND, TS14 6HF

# STRUCTURAL APPRAISAL REPORT

Spring Farm, Little beck, Whit by.

Ref: 16/058/gh.

Tim Close MA, CEng, MInstRE, MRICS, MCInstCES, MCIAT Jeff Granger ICIOB Geoff Hodgson BSc(Hons), ICIOB Emma Taylor BA(Hons) Arch, TCIAT Robert Bateson BEng(Hons), ICIOB

Consultants:- Colin Fenby CEng, FICE, MIStructE Paul West MRICS Dave Leighton BEng(Hons), Tech lOSH Ian Wilkin ACIOB

CLOSE, GRANGER, GRAY & WILKIN Ltd. Registered Office:- 28 Market Place, Guisborough, Cleveland, TS14 6HF Registered in England No. 2754571 V.A.T. Reg. No. 602 1705 91

## THE REPORT



#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 A structural survey was carried out to outbuildings at Spring Farm, Littlebeck, Whitby on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> March 2016 for Mr. & Mrs. Percival of the same address at the request of Mr. & Mrs. Percival.
- 1.2 The property is a single storey outbuilding, constructed in a traditional manner, i.e. timber roof structure bearing on to masonry walls. The building was once a cow byre for the farm and is now used primarily for storage.
- 1.3 The purpose of the survey is to inspect the property for any evidence of structural distress, record any distress noted and produce recommendations for structural repair if necessary. This is required as part of a planning application to change the outbuildings into a 4 bedroom unit for bed & breakfast purposes and this application requires that the building be suitable for the use without major demolition.
- 1.4 For the purpose of this report, the front elevation of the building (that which faces the main dwelling) is deemed to face north. This position is for reference within the report only and may not bear any resemblance to the actual position of the building on the site.
- 1.5 Weather on site was cold but sunny at the time of the inspection.
- Our structural survey is based on the elements of the property that can affect the structural stability of any part of the construction only. We have not inspected woodwork, or other areas that were covered, unexposed or inaccessible and have not inspected for damp or asbestos. Any areas of such that are noted during the course of the survey however has been reported on.

### 2.0 INTERNAL OBSERVATIONS

- 2.1 Internally, property consisted of three separate units within the main building with a smaller end unit which appears to be of a more recent nature. The end unit appears to have once been a garage and is now currently a small WC with a stud wall splitting the unit into 2.
- 2.2 The roof timbers appear to be in a good condition with evidence noted that the building has been watertight for a substantial amount of time.
- 2.3 Inspection of the walls internally has revealed no evidence of structural movement with all mortar joints being intact. Some slight separation of the cross walls with the front and rear walls has occurred in places however this is only slight and has not affected the structural stability of the building.
- 2.4 The walls internally have in the past been raised using blockwork to the top 2 courses of the wall. All wallplates, timbers etc appear to be in a good condition to the top sections of the wall. External leaf of the wall is stonework to full eaves height.
- 2.5 Floors to the building are concrete and include the original cow stalls along the rear and front walls. These floors are in a good condition.



#### 3.0 EXTERNAL OBSERVATIONS

- 3.1. Externally, the building is stonework to all elevation with pantile roof covering to half of the main unit. The remaining half of the unit is steel sheet roof covering. Windows are PVC units and doors are timber frame and appear to be in a relatively good condition.
- 3.2 The building is raised up from the hardstanding by approx. 400mm and a raised walkway runs along the front of the building. Foundations to the building are located approx. 400mm down from ground level.
- 3.3 To the stonework to the external elevations, very minor cracking was noted to a couple of sections in places. This cracking was very slight and did not constitute any structural instability.



#### 4.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 The building is in a very good condition and has been kept watertight over the years. It is obvious that some maintenance works has been carried out to preserve the structure and this has secured the stability of the building.
- 4.2 Due to the above findings and comments, we would confirm that the building is in a very god condition structurally and will require no demolition of the structure in order to carry out the conversion. As such we can confirm that the building is suitable for conversion within the policies of the N. Yorkshire Moors National Park Authority planning policy.

11.1

Date 1 6 2016