

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE – NOVEMBER 21, 2005**

### **THE GRAHAM HOUSE, 9933 DUFFERIN STREET**

#### **Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Community Services, in consultation with the Director of Recreation & Culture recommends approval of the following Heritage Vaughan recommendation:

1. That the request to designate the William Graham House, 9933 Dufferin Street, be withdrawn due to the deteriorated condition of the building.

#### **Economic Impact**

This request has no financial impact.

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to seek Council approval of the Heritage Vaughan recommendation that the designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act of the Graham House, 9933 Dufferin Street, as previously requested by Heritage Vaughan committee, be withdrawn due to the deteriorated condition of the house.

#### **Background - Analysis and Options**

The designation of the Graham House at 9933 Dufferin Street under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act was recommended in a Committee of the Whole report to Council in June 2005. The structure is located at the south-east corner of Major Mackenzie Drive and Dufferin Street (Block 11) and was identified by Cultural Services staff and Heritage Vaughan committee as having cultural heritage value. At the June 20, 2005 Committee of the Whole meeting, the consultant representing the owner requested to Council that the Designation review of the subject structure be referred to a future meeting of Council to allow the owner to present and discuss a number of issues/concerns with Heritage Vaughan committee.

At the request of the owner, Heritage Vaughan committee members conducted a site meeting at the subject property on August 4, 2005 to review for themselves the current condition of the house. The "Built Heritage Evaluation Form", as found in Attachment 1, was used to numerically evaluate the condition of the Graham house. In May 2005, this "Evaluation Form" was approved by Heritage Vaughan committee, as the standard evaluation criteria for Culture staff to use when evaluating the City's heritage buildings.

This complete report was presented to Heritage Vaughan members at the site meeting for review. The resulting evaluation score of the house was poor due to the extensive water damage that had occurred to the house and the resulting deterioration of the exterior trimwork, eaves and window/door openings.

As a result of the poor condition of the house, Heritage Vaughan committee at its meeting of August 24, 2005 passed a motion that recommended to Council a withdrawal of the previous request for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act and furthermore that the Committee had no objection to the demolition of the subject building. It was acknowledged by the Committee that due to the extensive damage to the house, it would be difficult to support the request for designation of the house. As a result the building has since been demolished.

The Ontario Heritage Act allows municipal councils to designate individual buildings and or property or cultural heritage significance under Part IV of the Act. The Designation of property

under the Ontario Heritage Act would require that no changes, additions or demolition to a designated property take place without Council's approval.

### **Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007**

Section 4.6 of the Vaughan Vision encourages the preservation and enhancement of the natural and built heritage environment and encourages the preservation of significant historical structures and communities.

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources to implement all points outlined in this report have been allocated and approved.

### **Conclusion**

Since the June request for Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act of the Graham House, located at 9933 Dufferin Street, Block 11, at the south-east corner of Dufferin Street and Major Mackenzie Drive, the structure underwent considerable deterioration due to extensive water damage to the exterior of the house. As a result, Heritage Vaughan committee recommends withdrawal of its previous request to designate the structure under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Furthermore, Heritage Vaughan committee approved the demolition of the house at its August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting and the building has since been demolished by the owner.

### **Attachments**

1. Report on the Graham House

### **Report Prepared By**

Diane LaPointe-Kay, Director of Recreation & Culture, ext. 8117

Angela Palermo, Manager of Cultural Services, ext. 8139

Respectfully submitted,

Marlon Kallideen  
Commissioner of Community Services

**HERITAGE BUILDING EVALUATION  
9933 DUFFERIN STREET, WILLIAM GRAHAM HOUSE**

---

Background

Staff conducted a site visit at 9933 Dufferin Street, known as the William Graham House on July 29, 2005 to assess the condition of the house at that location. The purpose of this inspection was to assess the current condition of the house. The house was vacated in May 2005. At that time extensive interior damage was reported to Culture staff by the owner and at the request of Culture staff and By-law Enforcement, the building was boarded and secured.

The Designation of the Graham House under the Ontario Heritage Act was recommended to Council at the Committee of the Whole meeting on June 20, 2005, in an effort to secure the preservation of the building. Council deferred the item at the subject meeting at the request of the owner to further review the matter with Heritage Vaughan Committee.

The owner appeared at the Heritage Vaughan meeting on June 22, 2005 and presented a report by Picco Engineering that found the building to be in a deteriorating condition due to extensive water damage, mould and insect infestation, brickwork deterioration, and a "failure" of architectural features.

The purpose of the site visit by Culture Staff on July 29, 2005 was to verify the current condition of the Graham house and verify the deteriorating condition of the structure as identified in the report by Picco Engineering.

Evaluation of the Main House at 9933 Dufferin Street (Graham House)

General Condition Due to Water/Moisture Damage

- The eavestrough around the entire structure has been removed, thereby allowing extensive water damage to approximately 90% of the cornice of the building, (at the eaves, soffit and fascia areas). The cornice/eaves on the gables of the building are the only areas not damaged due to the slope of the gables.
- The lack of eavestrough around the structure has caused water damage and deterioration to the wood moulding found at the soffit area of the building (underside of the eaves).
- The entranceway areas at the east and west elevations show extensive water damage to the wood building parts as found on the bay of the east elevation and the door surround, including the portico roof and supporting treillage posts.
- Water damage has caused extensive deterioration (spalling and mortar cracking) to the brickwork at the entranceway areas of the east and west elevations.

Foundation

- The stone foundation, as visually inspected, shows no signs of deterioration. The supporting sills of the house show no signs of wet or dry rot. The main damage to the house, therefore, is from the lack of eavestrough around the house, which is causing severe damage to brickwork and wood trim around entranceway area and bay on east elevation.
- An interior structural wall located at the basement shows extensive spalling and at a near collapsible state.

### Brickwork

- Brick shows extensive spalling and mortar cracking on south west and east elevation. The entire brickwork of the house was painted and the paint is now peeling away from the brickwork (this has no structural ramifications, and is only a cosmetic detail).
- The two brick chimneys on the roof show severe spalling and is missing some supporting bricks.

### Interior

- Stair balustrades have been removed throughout house. Mantels have been removed in house. Doorways have been removed from house.
- The interior of the house shows signs of extensive water damage around the semi-circular dormers found on the west and north elevations. Other areas of the top floor ceiling do not show interior water damage.
- Interior of house has extensive garbage (cosmetic only).
- Evidence that someone was trying to remove baseboards and wainscoting. Some have already been removed.

### Insect/Bird Damage

Eaves on east elevation have remnants of a bee hive. Bird nests likely present or at one time present in the interior roof of the house from evidence of large holes in eaves at various spots.

### Other

- Most shutters, except for a few have been removed.

### Conclusion

The house has undergone extensive water damage from the lack of eavestrough, and disrepair of roof (no shingles) evident especially on the roof above the east elevation. Damage to the building from the direct contact to water and the penetration of moisture will continue to damage the interior and exterior of the house. The house is structurally intact, however, if left in this state for an extensive period of time the water damage to the house will continue downward and the house will be structurally compromised.

Severe damage to the house appears along the eaves and the structural openings of the building on the west and east elevations. The trimwork throughout the entire exterior of the house has been damaged by water. Brickwork appears in a relatively stable state, however, shows some spalling on the east, west and south elevation.

The current condition of the house has been compromised since the May 2005 inspection. A Built Heritage Evaluation Form as found attached shows a numerical evaluation of the building. While the original evaluation of the structure had placed the building in Group B (Significant), the revised grading of the building's significance places the structure in Group C (Modest Significance).

In light of this current evaluation, Staff does not recommend pursuing Designation of the structure under the Ontario Heritage Act. The current condition of the building would not withstand a critical review of the Designation by the Ontario Conservation Review Board, if the Designation was appealed to the Board by the property owner.

Attachments

Photographs of the House  
Built Heritage Evaluation Form at July 29, 2005

Report Prepared By

Angela Palermo  
Manager, Cultural Services

Chimney (Brickwork spalling and missing bricks)



Wood deterioration by water/moisture at east elevation



Brickwork Spalling at East Elevation



Wood deterioration by water/moisture at east elevation



Damage  
eaves

to

returned



Damage to trimwork on west elevation



# BUILT HERITAGE EVALUATION FORM

**BUILDING/STRUCTURE ADDRESS:** 9933 Dufferin Street  
**LOT:** 20      **CON:** 2

**COMMUNITY:** Maple

**COMMON NAME OF BUILDING/STRUCTURE (IF KNOWN):** The William Graham House

<b>ARCHITECTURE</b> (Maximum 80 points)			<b>TOTAL ARCHITECTURE:</b> 36
<b>STYLE</b>	<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>GRADING</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of a particular architectural style or type. Exterior architectural style only should be evaluated. (I.e. change in roofline, skylights, additions, or removal of features, etc. that have changed the style of the building.)	E-Excellent to very good or extremely early example of its style.	E – 20	Style is notable. Georgian northern portion and compatible addition in the 1920s to this original portion.
	VG-Good example of its style with little to no changes to the structure.	VG – 15	
	<u>G</u> - Good to fair example of its style (e.g. style evident in structure, however changes have occurred to building).	<u>G</u> - 8	
	F/P- Style is not evident or considered a good example.	F/P – 0	
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>GRADING</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Good, notable, rare, unique, or early example of A particular material or method of construction. (i.e.) log construction, pre-1850, stone, board on board construction, etc.)	E-Excellent or early example of its construction method.	E – 10	Good example of the construction method.
	VG- Good or early example of its construction method.	VG – 8	
	<u>G/F</u> - Good to fair example of its construction method.	<u>G/F</u> - 5	Basic framing of house.  Stone foundation/supporting timbers as sills.
	P- Construction method is not significant in nature nor is it of particular interest.	P – 0	
<b>AGE</b>	<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>GRADING</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Comparatively old in the context of the City of Vaughan's architectural history.	E- Built between dates 1790-1820.	E – 5	Original portion is from 1860s.
	VG- Built between dates 1821-1910.	<u>VG</u> – 3	
	G- Built between dates 1911-1939.	G- 2	
	F/P- Built since 1940.	F/P – 0	
<b>INTERIOR</b>	<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	<b>GRADING</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
Integrity of interior arrangement, finish, craftsmanship, and/or detail is particularly attractive or unique and/or still exists.	E- Excellent interior (80-100%intact).	E – 5	Interior mantels, balustrades, some wainscoting and baseboards removed.
	VG- Very good interior (70-79% intact).	VG – 3	
	G- Good interior (50-69% intact).	<u>G</u> - 2	Garbage extensive throughout house.
	F/P- Fair or poor (0-49% intact).	F/P – 0	



ALTERATIONS/ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GRADING	COMMENTS
<p>Building has undergone minor exterior alterations, and retains most of its original materials, architectural details, and design features.</p> <p>Checklist includes:            Original Exterior Siding 30%            Windows/doors 30%            Verandahs/trim 30%            Foundation/location 10%            Structural Plan (no modern or sympathetic additions) 10%</p>	<p>E- Exterior of building is unchanged. (90-100% intact)</p> <p>G- Exterior of building has changed somewhat, but character retained. (61-89% intact)</p> <p>F- Exterior of building has changed somewhat and original character compromised and architectural details have been removed. (40-60% intact)</p> <p>P- Original exterior character destroyed. (0-30% intact)</p>	<p>E – 20</p> <p>G- 15</p> <p><u>F- 8</u></p> <p>P - 0</p>	<p>Exterior of building has changed but character retained, however architectural elements have been compromised through water/moisture damage.</p>

CONDITION	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GRADING	COMMENTS
<p>Exterior/interior of building is in good structural condition (i.e. evidence of decay in exterior siding, roof, or interior basement, wall surface, flooring, or ceiling, suggesting structure to be unsound.)</p> <p>Checklist:            Exterior Siding/Gutters (cracks, spalling)            Roof/Interior Ceiling/Gutters            Flooring, unstable, depressions            Interior Wall surface, cracks, etc            Basement (leaks mold, dry or wet rot on beams)</p>	<p>G- Good structural condition. (No evidence of decay)</p> <p>S- Somewhat good structural condition. (Minor/little evidence of decay)</p> <p>F- Fair structural condition (Some ( i.e. 2 from adjacent list) evidence of decay).</p> <p>P- Poor structural condition. (Significant/considerable evidence of decay.)</p>	<p>G- 20</p> <p>S – 15</p> <p><u>F- 10</u></p> <p>P- 0</p>	<p>Exterior brickwork has some spalling. Removal of gutters has caused extensive damage to eaves (fascia and soffit trim), entranceways at east and west elevations show signs of extensive damage from water to wood trim. Interior walls have been punctured, but in fair condition. Basement foundation appears in sound condition</p>

**HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE**  
**(Maximum 5 points)**

**TOTAL HISTORY: 5**

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GRADING	COMMENTS
<p>Structure is associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or event significant to the City of Vaughan, or illustrative of the community's cultural social political, economic or industrial history.</p>	<p>E- Individual, group, event or site of primary significance to the surrounding community. (Political official, prominent community member, religious leader, significant site/landmark in history of Vaughan.)</p> <p>VG -Individual, group, event or site of some significance to the surrounding community. (Owner /family were long-standing member/s of community.)</p> <p>M -Individual, group, event or site of minor or little significance to the surrounding community. (No historical background on structure or individual that built structure or family.)</p> <p>F/P-Site, structure, has no significance to Vaughan's history.</p>	<p><u>E- 5</u></p> <p>VG- 3</p> <p>M-2</p> <p>F/P- 0</p>	<p>Graham family. Known as "Folly Farm" in Rural Roots. Locally significant.</p>

**ENVIRONMENT**  
**(Maximum 15 points)**

**TOTAL  
ENVIRONMENT: 0**

ENVIRONMENT/STREETScape/COMMUNITY	EVALUATION CRITERIA	GRADING	COMMENTS
Structure contributes to the continuity or character of the street, community, or area.	E- Of particular importance in establishing the dominant/historic character of the area, community, or streetscape.	E – 15	Part of Block 11 development. Due to the architectural grading of the building it has a Fair to Poor environmental grading.
Heritage buildings in a rural areas (i.e. former farm buildings), not yet developed or part of a Block Plan development, that have a good architectural rating should be rated for its community significance based on the criteria defined.	VG- Of importance in establishing or maintaining the dominant/historic character of the area, streetscape, or significant to the community for its architectural value (i.e. received a 79+ rating under the architectural evaluation portion of this form).	VG –10  G –8  <u>F/P – 0</u>	
	G- Compatible with the dominant character of the area or streetscape or considered of some significance to the rural architectural history of the area/community (i.e. building is not part of historic streetscape, but an architecturally good building, based on a high evaluation under the architectural evaluation section of this form/64-79 total.)		
	F/P- Incompatible with the dominant character of the area, streetscape and of no particular significance architecturally to the community, based on its architectural evaluation in the first section of this form/0-64 total.		

<b>TOTAL GRADING: 41</b>
--------------------------

**KEY TO GRADING**

**80-100 = GROUP A –VERY SIGNIFICANT**

**65-79=GROUP B- SIGNIFICANT**

**40-64 =GROUP C- MODEST SIGNIFICANCE**

**0-39= GROUP D – LITTLE OR NO SIGNIFICANCE**