

STRUCTURAL INSPECTION REPORT.



***Calliards Mill,
Stubley Mill Rd,
Littleborough,
Lancs.
OL15 8HP.***

On behalf of Seed & Co Properties Ltd.



Client Name: Seed & Co Properties Ltd, Name / No / Street Belfry House, Vicarage Dr, Area Town / City Rochdale Region Lancs, Postcode OL16 2RQ	Date of Inspection: 4 th Aug 26.
	Time: 11.30 to 13.00.
	Description of the weather: Warm, dry.
Property Address: Calliards Mill, Name / No / Street Stubley Mill Rd, Area Smithybridge, Town / City Littleborough, Region Lancs. Postcode OL15 8HP.	Other Agents or Advisers: n/a. .
	Surveyors Name : Tim Booth BSc (Hons), C Eng. C.Env. MICE.

Type of Survey and Limitations:

Structural Inspection and Appraisal of **the building** as required by RMBC Planning.

Ref: *Structural report is required to establish whether the existing building can take the additional loading as well as to identify necessary repairs.*

Visual inspection only without comment on building services, drainage, outbuildings, boundary fences and adjoining properties. Did not include the disruptive opening up of fixings or finishes.

Type of Structure and Materials of Construction:

Load bearing masonry construction, detached flat roofed two storey dwelling, rectangular on plan, integral garage on the LHS, large front right single storey conservatory.

Use of Structure:

Old former mill building converted to Residential use.

Age and Alterations:

Appears to date from c 1800's, with substantial internal alteration and addition of conservatory extension to the front RHS.



Inspections and Observations:

Discussions with the Owners / Occupiers.

Not used.

Initial Inspection.

The property is located along a partially made road off Smithybridge rd. in the valley bottom to the River Roch, orientated approx. SW facing.

The property was unoccupied and unfurnished partially boarded, unlit and subject to obvious water ingress from the roof areas.

The initial inspection did not reveal significant distortion or misalignment of the elevations or openings within them.

Exterior.

Roof.

The roof was not accessible or visible so the condition was assessed internally. It was surrounded by a stone & concrete parapet ring beam to the edges.

Elevations.

Front.

Plain two storey elevation of coursed sandstone construction and had a shallow pitched pike to the mid front of the elevation mostly obscured by ivy growth, a mid-entrance door with a stone arched garage door to the LHS and a row of FF windows with stone surrounds and cills over. Some windows had replacement concrete lintels and cills. On the RHS was a single-story timber framed conservatory covering 40% of the elevation.

The elevation masonry was weathered with varying state of pointing, but mostly absent, it exhibited a bulge of 5-10 / 600 at mid height, with fine to med highly weathered sub vert cracking noted to the upper RH corner of the upper RH window extending to the roof verge. Repaired subvertical cracking was noted to the RHS of the garage arch extending to the FF window reveal over which had an open joint to the side reveal stone. There was no evidence of significant recent or ongoing cracking noted.

The conservatory was of part timber & masonry elevations, timber & steel roof with a lightweight plastic glazing and appeared to be used as part greenhouse / garden shed. The roof timbers exhibited significant sags in places, timber cladding was decayed, steel beams were poorly connected and masonry was often in poor condition. The rear part of the roof (adjacent to the main building) had a timber roof deck used as a FF roof terrace. The rc lintol had exposed reinforcement on the soffit, with poor original cover.

L H Side.

Plain elevation of similar construction to the front, the lower part of the elevation was partially underground with FF access only, a pair of FF windows each side of mid doorway accessed via clay brick work steps. The upper and LHS side was covered with ivy growth.

The elevation masonry was weathered with varying state of pointing, as per the front, it exhibited a bulge of 5-10 / 600 at mid height. There was recent repair pointing to the doorway reveal, but no evidence of significant recent or ongoing cracking noted.

**Rear.**

Plain elevation a row of FF windows with concrete lintels, partially below ground to the RHS with an arched double width doorway to the mid GF and a pair of windows to the LHS. Much of the elevation was obscured by ivy growth on the LHS and lower parts.

The elevation masonry was weathered with varying state of pointing, as per the others. There were areas of render application and a substantial concrete lintel over the GF windows, but no evidence of significant recent or ongoing cracking noted.

R H Side.

Comprised a plain elevation of similar construction to the others, 4 rows of F & GF windows and 90% obscured by ivy growth. The elevation was inaccessible.

Interior.**Ground floor**

Comprised a mid-entrance hallway with stair to the FF with a garage area to the LHS and former accommodation to the RHS. Floors to the areas were at differing levels and types of construction.

Construction was principally solid internal walls, solid floors (concrete, stone, tile etc) and suspended timber ceilings. Most superficial finishes had been removed exposing the underlying structure. In the garage the ceiling (FF) was of joists spanning side to side between principal timber beams spanning front to rear with cast iron posts at mid span and in the accommodation a grillage of steel beams (occasionally assisted with 'acrow props') supported the floor joists in the ceiling. Areas of the FF floor decking was absent in the accommodation part with moisture related decay noted locally.

The inspection noted that the principal beams were often decayed in their seating to the front elevation and were reinforced with timber / steel corbels. Areas of long-term moisture ingress were noted and localised decay observed in joists and beams. Most internal elevations were of stone construction with parts of the accommodation dry lined (or remains of) with a lightweight aerated concrete block skin.

The front elevation of the accommodation part had introduced windows and patio type door with an insitu reinforced concrete lintol over the full width supported off dense concrete blockwork piers which in turn supported steel ceiling beams from the rear.

Overall the external walls were free from significant structural movement. The presence of DPC / DPM's could not be validated in the inspection.

First floor

Comprised a mid-landing with two principal areas each side and multiple windows along all elevations. Floors to the areas were at generally the same level with some local raised floors to former room areas. As per the GF accommodation most of the room partitions had been removed leaving open areas.

Construction was principally solid internal walls, suspended timber floors and suspended timber roof. Most superficial finishes had been removed exposing the underlying structure. In the LHS the roof was of joists spanning side to side between principal timber beams spanning front to rear with timber posts at mid span and in the RHS a similar configuration (occasionally assisted with 'acrow props') supported the roof joists in the ceiling. Areas of the FF floor decking was absent in the RHS with moisture related decay noted locally.

The inspection noted that the principal beams were often decayed in their seating to the front elevation and were reinforced with timber corbels / posts. Areas of long-term moisture ingress were noted and localised decay observed in roof joists and beams. Most internal elevations were of stone construction with parts of the RHS dry lined with a lightweight aerated concrete block skin. The timber roof beam to the RHS side landing was severely decayed at its mid span (note that dense concrete blockwork walls were provided each side of the hallway & landing beneath the principal beams).



A similar set of windows and patio door was added to the front elevation to the RHS with an insitu reinforced concrete lintel over. The three principal beams junctions to the rc lintol were provided with inclined steel brackets bolted to the timber and cast into the concrete.

A hole was noted in the roof to the RHS allowing water ingress and much of the timber roof decking exhibited evidence of long-term moisture ingress and areas of severe decay.

Discussion.

The property is proposed to be developed as eight self-contained dwellings over three levels by the addition of a second-floor storey and dual pitched roof. The units will be divided in keeping with the layout of the existing principal beams in the FF & roof. Thus the main elevations are to be extended upwards from the existing walls. Also the raised ground levels on the LHS and part rear will be reduced to GF level.

The inspection revealed minor historic cracking and movement of the elevations, the internal structure was in varying condition states suffering from historic as well as more recent moisture ingress.

The GF will probably need to be replaced with a new insulated and moisture resistant construction.

The conservatory is at the end of its serviceable life and if it was to be retained in any part would require substantial repairs.

The walls will need DPM's installed and to be restrained to the floors and roof in accord with modern building standards as well as localised repairs undertaken as minor defects are exposed. The concrete ring beam to the roof parapet can be removed to prepare for the second-floor extension. The existing elevations will need to be repointed and cracks stitch repaired.

The majority of the principal beams could be incorporated into the new layout subject to being cleaned and re-inspected in more detail. The present FF floor joists to the LHS could be retained subject to minor replacements to localised defects. To the RHS the FF decks will need general replacement. The roof deck is recommended to need complete removal due to the amount of suspected damp related decay.

Removal of soil to the LHS and part rear will reduce pressure on the GF wall and remove penetrating damp issues.

The reinforced concrete lintols added to enlarged openings on the front and rear appeared to be serviceable but low cover and corrosion of the rebar was noted so they will require some remedial repair work.

The original mill was of three levels with a dual pitched roof, so the foundations will have been adequate. Consideration could be made of using a timber frame for the upper extension to reduce additional dead loading to the lower walls.



Recommendations:

The following works are recommended immediately:

- ❖ Not used.

The following works are recommended in the short term (12 months):

- ❖ If development is not forthcoming in this period, take measures to prevent water ingress through the roof.

The following works are recommended in the longer term (next 5 years):

- ❖ Nothing essential from a structural perspective.

Signed.....

Date 21st Aug 26.

Tim Booth, BSc (Hons), C. Eng, C.Env. MICE.

T J Booth Associates.

Damage category.

Ref table 1 BRE Digest 251, classification of damage based on crack widths.

Description	Category	Damage degree	Damage amount (mm)
Hairline (v fine)	0	Negligible	< 0.1
fine	1	Very slight	0.1 – 1.0
Fine - medium	2	Slight	> 1.0 < 5.0
	3	Moderate	> 5.0 < 15.0
	4	Severe	> 15.0 < 25.0
	5	Very severe	> 25.0