

LONDON LOCATION 1599 Adelaide St. N., Units 301 & 203 London, ON N5X 4E8 P: 519-471-6667 KITCHENER LOCATION

1415 Huron Rd., Unit 225 Kitchener, ON N2R 0L3 P: 519-725-8093

www.sbmltd.ca

sbm@sbmltd.ca

August 13, 2021 SBMW-21-0274

Attn: Ms. Stephanie Saliba

Re: 47 Whitcombe Way (66 Queen Street), Morriston, ON

Stephanie;

Following the August 6, 2021 structural review and subsequent report, Eric St. Pierre, EIT of Strik Baldinelli Moniz attended site again on the afternoon of August 12, 2021 to complete a follow up review of the additional damage reported. This report is based on a visual review only from the outside of the construction fencing. Due to safety concerns the building was not entered.

In preparation of the site visit and report we have reviewed the following documentation:

- The structural inspection report for 33 Queen Street (incorrect address) by SBM regarding the partial failure of the rear field stone wall dated August 6, 2021.
- The peer review report issued by GM BluePlan Engineering Limited (GMBP) dated August 11, 2021.
- Structural Condition Assessment for 66 Brock Road prepared by Tacoma Engineers dated February 8, 2018 (report number TE-28727-16)
- Heritage Impact Assessment for 66 Queen Street, Moriston prepared by McCallum Sather dated March 2018.

The original structural report from SBM concluded that due to the partial failure of the rear exterior wall observed on-site and the imminent risk of future failure the building is structurally unstable, unsafe for occupancy and unsafe for temporary shoring. In the interest of public safety, it was recommended that the north most 75% of the building be demolished immediately. Further, the report by SBM recommended actions to provide additional construction fencing, or hording around the property to completely block public access to the building and noted that no person shall enter the building for any reason until the unstable portion of the building is demolished under a valid demolition permit. Upon demolition of the north section of the house, temporary soring will be required to support the remaining walls on the open (north) side of the house.

The peer review report issued by GMBP, clarified some of the SBM recommendations and also recommended that demolition be carried out under the supervision of a structural engineer to ensure that only areas requiring demolition due to public safety be demolished and that the property continue to be completely barricaded from the public until remedial actions are completed or the building is completely demolished.

Below is a summary of the observations, conclusions and recommendations as a result of the current re-inspeciton.

OBSERVATIONS:

- 1. Additional temporary construction fencing and signage has been installed around the perimeter of the building (see photo 1).
- 2. An additional section of the rear (west) exterior field stone wall has failed and fallen away from the structure. At the time of review approximately 50 percent of the west stone wall and foundation are missing leaving a larger section of the main floor, second floor, and roof framing further unsupported (*see photo 2*). The mini-excavator bracing the wall has been removed.

- 3. Where the additional wall sections have fallen, a portion of the remaining wall does not provide constant full height bearing to the founding soil (*see photo 3*).
- 4. Due to the larger section of unsupported roof framing, the roof structure has lifted from the top of the stone wall at the north west corner of the building, leaving the wall unsupported (*see photo 4*).
- 5. Where the roof structure is unsupported, it appears to be have sag/deflecting and is out-of-plumb.
- 6. At the face of the existing exterior concrete slab-on-grade at the west wall, there appears to be a near vertical crack extending for approximately the full height of the exterior stone wall (*see photo 5*).
- 7. Additional photos of the wood framing were provided by the owner and show severe moisture damage to the wood framing throughout, including the south end of the building (*see photo 6*). These photos support the conclusion of the poor framing described in the structural condition assessment from Tacoma Engineers.
- 8. The north, south, and east stone walls appear to be in fair condition with hairline cracks noted in the parging only. The walls appeared to be plumb and did not show signs of deflection.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the revised conditions observed during the site visit, the conclusions and recommendations outlined in our first report remain unchanged.

- There are large sections of roof, second floor and main floor framing which are unsupported and are therefore structurally unstable and not suitable for any occupancy. It is our opinion that it is not even safe to enter the building to attempt to install shoring.
- There are missing sections of rubble stone foundation wall which leave the load bearing exterior field stone wall unsupported.
- There are shear cracks in the remaining exterior field stone wall which indicate further partial failure of the wall is still possible.

It is our recommendation that demolition proceed under a valid demolition permit under the supervision of a structural engineer to ensure that:

- a. Demolition is completed in a safe sequence.
- b. only areas requiring demolition due to public safety concerns be demolished.
- c. Adequate shoring is installed to the remaining structure (if any).

LIMITATIONS:

- This report is intended exclusively for the Client(s) named in the report. The material in it reflects our best judgment in light of the information reviewed by Strik Baldinelli Moniz at the time of preparation. No portion of this report may be used as a separate entity, it is written to be read in its entirety.
- Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties.
- Only the specific information identified has been reviewed. The consultant is not obligated to identify mistakes or insufficiencies in the information obtained from the various sources or to verify the accuracy of the information. The Consultant may use such specific information obtained in performing its services and is entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness thereof.
- This assessment does not wholly eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for existing or future costs, hazards or losses in connection with a property. No site inspections, physical or destructive testing and no

design calculations have been performed unless specifically recorded. Conditions existing but not recorded were not apparent given the level of study undertaken. We can perform further investigation on items of concern if so required.

• We accept no responsibility for any decisions made or actions taken as a result of this report unless we are specifically advised of and participate in such action, in which case our responsibility will be as agreed to at that time. Any user of this report specifically denies any right to claims against the Consultant, Sub-Consultants, their Officers, Agents and Employees in excess of the fee paid for professional services.

We trust this report meets your satisfaction. If you need further clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

Strik, Baldinelli, Moniz Ltd.

Planning • Civil • Structural • Mechanical • Electrical

Prepared By



Eric St. Pierre, EIT



Associate





Photo 1: Additional construction fencing and signage is installed.



 Photo 2: Rear elevation (west wall).

 <u>Note:</u> Large sections of the existing foundation and above grade stone wall are missing.

 Large piles of field stone on the ground below the opening. The roof and second floor framing are unsupported.

 Circled area shows additional wall section that has failed and fallen away.



Photo 3: Rear Elevation. <u>Note:</u> The foundation wall is not adequately providing bearing to the stone wall above.



Photo 4: Photo of north west building corner. <u>Note:</u> The roof framing has separated from the top of the wall, indicating the wall is not adequately braced. Note also the additional shear cracks in the field stone wall.



Photo 5: Rear elevation (west wall). Photo of near vertical hairline crack extending approximately full height of stone wall.



Photo 6: Photos of interior wood framing at south end of building (*photos provided by owner*). <u>Note:</u> Severe moisture damage on wood floor joists and window headers.