



Stanford Heritage Committee

PO Box 539 STANFORD 7210 stanfordheritage@gmail.com 072 796 7754

www.stanfordconservation.co.za

14 June 2018

Proposed Plan of Works for Renovations and Repairs to the Buzzy Beez building, Erf 101, Church Street, Stanford

The Buzzy Beez building on Erf 101, Church Street Stanford is one of the village's few Grade 3a buildings. It was originally a *nagmaalhuisie*, and has social historical interest, in addition to the charm of its simple construction (Baumann et al 2009). Until recently it served as the preschool for the adjacent Okkie Smuts Junior School, though it has recently been used only for storage, and new classrooms have been built on the property.

Due to deterioration of the thatching, and failure of the plaster, urgent repairs are necessary to the structure to prevent rain damage to the fabric of the walls and further failure of the plaster.

A preliminary site visit was conducted by the current Chair of the Stanford Heritage Committee, Ms Katie Smuts, the previous Chair, Mrs Liz Hochfelden, a local civil engineer, Mr Louis Roodt, heritage architect, Mr Gregg Goddard, and builder, Mr Andrew Williams.

The following was observed:

- The outside walls are thick (500 mm +).
- The gables from roof line upwards are of lesser thickness (230 mm).
- The out of plumb gable on the southern end leans to the inside and is supported by the roof purlins. There is no horizontal crack at the transition from the wall to the gable. By cross bracing the roof trusses, additional, stability can be provided against inward rotation.
- The cracks on the southern gable end run up-down with no apparent cause, apart from the cracks at the eastern end that may have developed due to settlement of the foundation on the south west corner.
- A crack on the north west facade, from the first roof truss (pole), seems to run from the pole to the foundation. This may have been due to bad building: the two walls not properly tied in. The metal sheeting that was put up to waterproof the roof is unsympathetic, but was a necessary interim protection of the walls: water ingress into the mud brick would be fatal.
- It is obvious that the use of the building has changed with the new classrooms provided. If it is confirmed with the school that there is no need for water supply and the sink in the store room, the pipes on the northern wall can be removed.

As this inspection revealed that there are no significant structural issues with the building, and that rethatching, repairing elements of the roof structure, replastering and painting the exterior will be sufficient intervention to ensure the continued preservation of this building.

To this end, the following interventions are proposed:

1. **Repair of the roof structure at the northern end of the building.** The northern end of the building originally had a hearth/fireplace with a flue that exited through the roof below and west of the ridgeline (Figure 1). To accommodate this flue, the northern end tie beam, collar tie and rafter were truncated (Figure 1, 2 and 3). This flue has subsequently been dismantled, and these three elements of the roof structure need to be repaired, in the case of the tie beam, and replaced, in the case of the collar tie and rafter.
2. **Repair of the southern tie beam.** The southernmost tie beam was truncated by the later installation of a fireplace in the southern end of the building (Figure 4). The chimney of this fireplace was built up through the ceiling, blocking a small window, door or ventilation aperture in the southern gable end. The exit point through the roof is no longer apparent as the fireplace was dismantled and the the structure reroofed subsequently.
3. **Cross bracing of roof trusses.** Additional stability will be ensured by cross bracing the roof trusses at the southern end of the building where the gable appears to be leaning inwards. According to the assessment by both the engineer and architect, this intervention will be sufficient to prevent further movement of the gable. The contractor will be instructed to keep the purlins in contact with the gable at all times.
4. **Rethatching.** Funds are currently being raised to allow for the rethatching of the building. Should fundraising efforts not be successful, the thatch will be patched rather than completely replaced (Figure 5). The existing metal ridge capping to be replaced with appropriate plaster capping (Figure 6). The thatching is to be done by a local thatcher with experience of similar structures in Stanford Village.
5. **Replastering of failed exterior plaster.** Where plaster has failed on the structure (Figures 7 and 8), this will be repaired or replaced as necessary. External plaster is to be two coat, wood float finished, and to be kept damp or wetted for one week to reduce risk of wind cracks. Plaster mix to be 1:1:8 (1 part cement, 1 part lime, and 8 parts sand). An approved waterproofing compound (e.g. Congrim powder) is to be added to the mix in proportion as specified by the manufacturer.
6. **Repainting of external structure and windows.** The exterior of the building will be repainted, and all windows will be repaired and repainted (Figure 9). Funds do not currently extend to replacement of the existing steel framed windows with timber, but should money come available that would be desirable.

Photographic Record



Figure 1: Truncated tie beam at northern end of building where original fireplace was located.



Figure 2. Damaged collar tie at northern end of building. Blackened plaster shows location of original chimney.



Figure 3. Truncated rafter at northern end of building.



Figure 4. Truncated tie beam at southern end of building. Brick-built chimney of later fireplace visible.



Figure 5. Degraded thatch to be replaced or patched.



Figure 6. Metal ridge capping to be replaced with cement/plaster capping.



Figure 7. Cracks in plaster at southern end of building requiring repair and repainting.



Figure 8. Plaster at northern end of building failing due to moisture seepage.



Figure 9. Metal frame windows in poor repair.