



2870 Scherer Drive
Suite 200
St. Petersburg, FL 33716

Phase 1 Milestone Inspection Summary

**On Top of the World Clearwater
Building 73
2294 Swedish Drive and 2295 Americus Boulevard
Clearwater, Florida 33763**
ESi Project No: 98508

Report Prepared For:

Parkway Maintenance & Management Pinellas, LLC
Management Company to:
On Top of the World Condominium Association, Inc.
2069 World Parkway Blvd. East
Clearwater, FL 33763

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John P. Zietkiewicz", is written over a horizontal line.

John P Zietkiewicz, AIA, NCARB
Senior Consultant
Florida Architecture License No. AR100117
Expires: February 28, 2025

4/19/2024

Date

This report and its contents are the Work Product of Engineering Systems Inc. (ESi). This report should only be duplicated or distributed in its entirety. This report may contain confidential or court protected information; please contact an authorized entity prior to distributing. Conclusions reached and opinions offered in this report are based upon the data and information available to ESi at the time of this report, and may be subject to revision after the date of publication, as additional information or data becomes available.

Copyright ESi © 2024 - All Rights Reserved

Phone: 727-290-3776 | Fax: 727-677-0018 | Toll Free: 866-596-3994

www.engsys.com



Introduction and Background

In response to the passage of Senate Bill 4-D, Building Safety Law (SB 4-D), Engineering Systems Inc. (ESi) performed Phase 1 inspections of the 91 residential buildings in the property. This document represents a summary of the investigation report.

Building 73

Building 73 is named Cordoba and the addresses are 2294 Swedish Drive and 2295 Americus Boulevard, Clearwater, Florida 33763 for even and odd units respectively. The records indicate that its parcel number is 31 28 16 64111 000 0001 and was built in 1988.

Investigation and Findings

The first part of the Phase 1 inspection entailed non-destructive and non-intrusive visual inspections and documentation of the existing conditions of the exterior elevations and appurtenances, the roof covering, and common areas of the subject building. Upon completing this step, a selection of units was inspected at the subject building. The units were selected either 1) at random, 2) through volunteered owners, or 3) by selection from ESi. The inspections were performed visually and were of the exposed primary structural elements of the subject building.

No substantial structural deterioration as defined by the Building Safety Law (SB 4-D) and the Florida Building Code were observed in this building.¹

Evidence of deterioration of the decorative railings in the form of cracking was observed throughout the building, this falls under the category of dangerous as defined by the Florida Building Code. Localized repairs or replacement are recommended.²

No areas requiring a Phase 2 inspection were identified.

Investigation – Exteriors and Common Areas

Please reference ESi's investigative report for a summary of observations and recommendations for repair and monitoring of the observations for the building exteriors, common areas, stairways, and storage and electric rooms.

¹ According to SB 4-D and SB 154 Substantial Structural Deterioration is defined as: Substantial structural distress or substantial structural weakness that negatively affects a building's general structural condition and integrity.

² According to the Florida Building Code 2020 Dangerous is defined as: Any building, structure or portion thereof that meets any of the following: 1) the building or structure has collapsed, partially collapsed, moved off its foundation or lacks the necessary support to the ground, or 2) There exists a significant risk of collapse, detachment or dislodgement of any portion, member, appurtenance, or ornamentation of the building or structure under permanent, routine, or frequent loads; under actual loads already in effect; or under wind, rain, flood, or other environmental loads when such loads are imminent.



Typical observations in the subject building include: stairstep cracks in CMU walls, cracking on the exterior hallway concrete slab, deterioration of the railing, and cracking on the slab at the storage rooms located in the building's core.

Stairstep cracks, both previously repaired and those appearing to be recent, on the CMU bearing walls of the wings particularly below windows and near the core were typically observed throughout the elevations of the building. The observed width and location of the cracks represent typical movement from a structure and do not appear to be indicative of structural damage.

Cracks on the exterior hallway floor slabs were observed perpendicular to the length of the slab and the supporting wall. The frequency and spacing of these cracks were not uniform. The observed cracks in the subject building are likely due to the expansion and contraction of the materials where control joints were not observed or due to the deflection of the slab at support locations and do not represent a structural damage or substantial deterioration.

Vertical and horizontal cracking was observed on the building's core on the CMU walls of the storage rooms. CMU and mortar are brittle materials and are likely to crack when subjected to expansion and contraction and differential movement. The observed cracks are due to the movement of the core throughout its life. Similarly observed, were cracks on the concrete slab on grade on the first-floor electrical and storage rooms. The observed cracks are due to the expansion and contraction of the slab and typical settlement of the soils below the structure.

Investigation – Interiors

Typical observations in the units of the subject building include moisture staining in the ceiling drywall finishes, and hairline cracks and separation of the drywall finishes of the walls and ceilings. Hairline cracking in the drywall finishes is not uncommon and result from typical movement of the building likely due to the expansion and contraction of the materials, natural settlement and movement of the structure and do not represent a structural issue. The moisture staining does not represent structural damage or a deterioration issue. It was also observed that some of these stains were historical, and that the source of the moisture had been repaired. At areas where the moisture source is unknown, it is recommended that the location is investigated and that the source be repaired.

≡ **End of Summary** ≡