

Agenda Item #	Page #

Item #
Page #

D. Menard:

TO:	CHAIR AND MEMBERS LONDON ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HERITAGE MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 2016
FROM:	JOHN M. FLEMING MANAGING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER
SUBJECT:	HERITAGE ALTERATION APPLICATION BY: H. BEUKEBOOM 516 GROSVENOR STREET

RECOMMENDATION

That, on the recommendation of the Director of Land Use Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, consent **BE GIVEN** for the Heritage Alteration Permit Application for the replacement of the present cedar roof of the residential property located at 516 Grosvenor Street with a rubber composite material providing the same appearance; it being noted that the Heritage Planner has reviewed the proposal.

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER
--

None

PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approval of the recommended action would authorize the changes as described to the designated property in accordance with the provisions of Section 34 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

BACKGROUND

The Property

516 Grosvenor Street is located on the north side of Grosvenor Street in the block between Maitland Street and William Street. (Appendix 1) The property, a two storey Tudor Revival brick residence built in 1931, is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law L.S.P.3232468. (Appendix 2) The by-law specifically refers to “extensive use of wood shingling” as one of its heritage attributes.

The Application

The owner has submitted an alteration application seeking approval to replace the existing cedar shake roof material on the roof with a substitute “Euroshield Eurolight Shake” material. The current cedar roof material was installed in 1996 and the owner has indicated the portion on the roof has deteriorated to the point where it is leaking and needs replacement. The previous roof had only a ten year warranty. The replacement proposal is for the roof elements only and does not include the mansard wall at the rear of the house where the cedar shingles are in better condition.

The owner has provided a contractor’s quotation for the removal of the present cedar shakes, repairs as needed to the roof deck, installation of an ice and water shield membrane, eave starter, supply and installation of Weather Pro vents (at the existing locations with two new

Agenda Item #	Page #

Item #
Page #

D. Menard:

vents added to the rear as described), ice and water shield membranes at valleys, metal valleys and additional waterproofing underlayment surrounding the chimney.

The desired roofing material is a Trademark product – Euroshield. Euroshield is a rubber roofing product, manufactured from used tires, which was created over 13 years ago according to the manufacturer’s brochure. The Eurolite Shake is new to the Euroshield line and provides a thinner profile (1/2 inch at the butt edge, compared to 3/4 inch of the Euroshake product) The product is warranted for 50 years on material and five years on labour and the contractor will provide an additional warranty on labour from year 5- year 20.

Analysis

In recent years, following consultation with the LACH, approvals have been given to replace more traditional roofs, slate, specifically, with different materials, sometimes with asphalt shingles in the cases of 869 Dundas Street (Hayman House) and 49 Ridout Street South and sometimes with metal roofing. In this case, the request is for an alternative to cedar shake currently in place on the residence.

While the price differential for the replacement product compared to the reinstallation of cedar shake roofing (\$23,800 compared to \$31,600) is not as dramatic as a replacement of a slate roof, a more significant concern may be the longevity of cedar compared to the requested material. The durability of old-growth cedar shingles no longer seems to be matched by modern cedar shingles. This seems confirmed by the experience of the applicants with respect to their cedar roof which was installed in 1996 (and only provided a ten year warranty.)

In looking for guidance on this application, the Town of Cobourg recently permitted the use of a product, Enviroshake, another composite material made from recycled plastic and hemp, for use on historic Trinity United Church. Built in 1852 the Church featured a cedar roof which had reached the end of its lifespan.

In both Kitchener and Stratford in recent years, both municipalities allowed the use of a non-traditional replacement for cedar roofing. In Stratford, the Ontario Heritage Trust supported the use of Enviroshake roof cladding for St. James Anglican Church stating that “The Trust finds the proposed cladding system to be consistent with the terms of the easement agreement in maintaining a level of visual continuity with the historic roof cladding while being fully reversible and is therefore an acceptable substitute for cedar shingles in this case.”

In its analysis, Cobourg heritage staff noted the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sports *Eight Guiding Principles for the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties*, specifically:

Respect for Historic Material

- Repair or conserve rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where absolutely necessary.
- Minimal intervention maintains the heritage content of the built resource.

Respect for Original Fabric

- Repair with like materials
- Repair to return the resource to its prior condition, without altering its integrity

Parks Canada’s *Standards and Guidelines* note:

4.5 Guidelines for Materials

“In kind materials should be used whenever possible. Sourcing materials for repair and replacement can be challenging, especially if materials are from an historic source that no longer exists, such as ...an old-growth forest.”

“Substitute materials: Substitute materials should be explored only after all other options for repair and replacement have been ruled out. They should only be used when the original materials or craftsmanship are no longer available, when the original materials are of poor quality or damage adjacent character-defining materials, or whenever

Agenda Item #	Page #

Item #
Page #

D. Menard:

specific regulations rule out using hazardous materials. Because there are so many unknowns about the long-term performance of substitute materials, their use should not be considered without a thorough investigation of their composition, compatibility, durability and installation. The importance of finding visually and physically compatible substitute materials cannot be overstated.”

22. Recommended: Select replacement materials for character-defining old growth, exotic, or otherwise unavailable wood, based on their physical and visual characteristics.

It is noted that the discussion in Cobourg related to the Enviroshake product, while the request in this application is for a different product – Euroshield Euroshake. Both, though, respond to the change in performance of cedar shake shingles which use newer growth wood. Both the MTSC principles and the Parks Canada standards urge repair with “like materials” but if such materials are no longer available, then, replacement materials should be selected based on their physical and visual characteristics.

It is further noted that, with respect to the roof of the residence at 516 Grosvenor Street, the current roof is not original in that it is a replacement installed in 1996. Further, it is noted that the existing cedar shingles on the mansard roof wall at the rear of the residence will be retained. In this, then, the replacement of the roof materials is somewhat of a minimal intervention.

Recommendation

It is recommended that consent be given to the alteration to replace the existing, deteriorated, cedar roof shingles with the requested option, a composite rubber product, Euroshake.

PREPARED BY:	SUBMITTED BY:
DON MENARD HERITAGE PLANNER URBAN REGENERATION	JIM YANCHULA, MCIP, RPP MANAGER URBAN REGENERATION
RECOMMENDED BY:	
JOHN M. FLEMING, MCIP, RPP MANAGING DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND CITY PLANNER	

April 6, 2016

dm/

Y:\Shared\policy\HERITAGE\Heritage Alteration Permit Reports\Grosvenor Street, 516\HAP Application, LACH April 2016.docx

Agenda Item #	Page #

Item #
Page #

D. Menard:

Appendix 1- Location Map- 516 Grosvenor Street



Appendix 2: Statement of Significance –Schedule B - 516 Grosvenor Street

Architectural Reasons

The two and a half storey Tudor Revival house at 516 Grosvenor was built in 1931. The house is asymmetrical with sweeping and complex rooflines and extensive use of wood shingling. The most noteworthy characteristic of the front façade is the turreted bay projection, which gives the house its whimsical aspect. The window headers and sills, quoins around the front entrance and the block foundation are all made of concrete. Tudor inspired features include windows with leaded panes, half-timbering, a substantial plank board front door with iron strap hinges, and decorated chimney pots.

The garage at the back of the house compliments the main house.

Appendix 3: Photo (Google Street Map – 2016- front and west side facades)

