

It is considered that some element of repair and replacement is justified on the basis that the area was significantly flooded which will have caused short to long term issues. However it is disappointing that the works didn't immediately follow the inspection made in 2018, thus resulting in matters getting worse (if we have read this correctly).

- Can we clarify if there is a proposed DPC as this is mentioned in the PRS document but doesn't seem to have come through in the final proposals. We would question the use of an injected DPC if it was being proposed.
The floor level in the basement is approximately 4m below ground level. A DPC would therefore be largely redundant and is not proposed to be installed. Further, there is no evidence that the existing building has been subject to rising damp, which the introduction of a DPC would look to resolve.
- Can it be confirmed if the proposed work has been carried out or is being proposed? Is the work being applied for retrospectively? If it is a mix then this needs to be clarified.
Mix. A large amount of the work has been carried out.

The Rose report identifies that 'The original floor represents a total area of approximately 120m². Approximately 30m² has been able to be saved through a course of localised repairs and treatments against further decay. This includes the primary timber structure (beams between the cast iron columns) and the secondary floor structure. Like for like resin-jointed repairs have been adopted on the primary structure. Fungicidal and boron-paste treatments have been applied to the retained secondary structures'.

This loss seems excessive and we need to see on plan exactly which areas have been lost and which areas have been salvaged. A fully independent survey carried out by surveyor who specialises in historic building conservation so that they can work alongside a conservation accredited engineer to ensure that the best conservation repair techniques have been used that use the correct conservation methods and materials and retain as much original fabric as possible but are also structurally sound will need to be carried out. The use of resin does not seem to be conservation led and as such the justification for its use is queried. A more traditional way of repairing joist / beam ends needs to be looked at as an option including the splice repair technique proposed in certain cases.

The resin repairs have only been adopted in the splicing of new timber to old, on the primary, structural beams. These beams are large in cross section and resin repair ensured a maximum amount of original timber could be retained. The repairs are a timber splice joint, but with resin used between the connection to glue the splice together.

The removal of the insitu flooring was agreed via email with A. Leckie of Manchester City Council on 20 July 2018 (attached for reference).

- Can we see examples of the type of splice and resin repairs proposed by PRS and can it be clarified which one is proposed in each case. The following needs to be clarified:

These repairs have been completed. Photos to follow.

- Has a final survey been done or will this be a judgement call on site - if so who makes this call and who determines how much fabric is to be lost;
Please refer to email thread. The make up of the insitu, failed floor construction precluded being able to work on it insitu. It was therefore agreed that the flooring could be removed, stored and worked on prior to reinstallation. In the time that has elapsed, the stored timber has suffered irreparable damage owing to further flooding.
- What is the reporting mechanism and supervision? The former may be difficult if the full extent of any deterioration is not known. There may need to be a working brief to determine the extent of repairs when the works are on site.

There needs to be good evidence that timbers are beyond salvage or repair and photo evidence of their condition is required- this also applies to the unusable original timbers that are now being stored, but are being proposed for disposal.
The original timbers are still on site and can be viewed.

The Rose report states that *The main issue is the request not to reinstate the original timbers which are now considered to have deteriorated due to wet and dry rot.* But there doesn't seem to be the evidence to justify this and this is required. If agreed then there will need to be a full recording of the existing timbers if they are to be lost.
A digital, survey of the site exists.

The Rose report adds that *Some of the original timbers will remain in situ as an historic record of the original floor. It is maintained that the loss of the original timber would not significantly affect the historic significance or understanding of the building and hence would not cause significant harm to the building.* The aim should be to minimise the loss and retain as much as possible as each individual loss will cumulatively impact on the original fabric.

The Rose report states: There are six elements to the proposal:

- i. A series of timber treatments and repairs. See [query on this above](#)
- ii. Fungicidal treatment applied to masonry and remaining timber to combat the wet and dry rots. Following the timber preservation works, new intermediate joists are proposed to be added to the 'new' apartment floors, which are currently undersized. [This seems fine provided it is not injected and does not negatively impact on the original fabric both visually and technically- can this be confirmed](#)
- iii. New pumping apparatus to maintain the water levels, discharging through the existing drainage. [This seems acceptable](#)
- iv. Ventillation through existing openings in the buildings fabric and in to the car park area, to maintain moisture levels and new fire detection and lighting systems [This seems acceptable](#)
- v. A new permanent access through the existing floors from the communal corridor over the basement. [This seems acceptable but we need detailed sections showing the opening up and new elements.](#)

vi. A new, demountable MF ceiling is proposed below the ground floor construction to create a fire break between the basement area and the habitable spaces above. Is this below the existing original floor or below the modern floor - if its the latter then fine but if it's the former then i'd like to understand why it is necessary especially when the floor above is protected. Is there a section showing the location of the new ceiling.

This is not the proposed/adopted solution. Following dialogue with Building Control and T.Dust (Architect), it has been determined that no products exist that would facilitate the vertical fire compartmentalisation required in order to ensure life-safety measures between the apartments and between the aprtments and protected means of escape above the basement. As such, a floor upgrade detail was agreed which includes the addition of insulation, chicken wire and 2 layers of plasterboard to the suspended timber floor (the floor of the apartments and corridor) over the original floor.

Please see the attached detail.