Metropolitan Bible Church Façade 453 Bank Street Ottawa, Ontario



Metropolitan Bible Church [JCAL 2008]

JCAL Project No. 08024 July 2009

Prepared By:



Table of Content

Section 1.0	Executive Summary	1
Section 2.0	Existing Conditions	2
Section 2.1 Section Section		2
Section 2.2 Section Section		10
Section 2.3	Letter from Doran to Metropolitan Bible Church	15
Section 3.0	Existing Building Façade Conservation Options	17
Section 3.1	Dismantling and Reconstruction (Option A)	17
Section 3.2 Section	Underpinning of Building Façade (Option B) 3.2.1 Conceptual Drawings (SK-SA, SK-SB and SK-SC1 to SK-SC5)	17 17
Section 3.3 Section	Temporary Relocation of Building Façade (Option C) 3.3.1 Conceptual Drawings (SK-SD to SK-SE)	
Section 3.4	Assessment and Recommendation	28
Section 4.0	Action Plan	29
Section 4.1	Preparation of Building Façade for Temporary Relocation	29
Section 4.2	Relocation Procedures	29
Section 4.3 Section Section Section Section Section 4.4 Section Section	 4.3.2 Reconstruction of the Upper Wall Section	30 30 30 30 30 31 31
Section 5.0	Disclaimer and Limitations	43

Section 1.0 Executive Summary

As a condition for the development of the site at 453 Bank Street, the City of Ottawa requires that the street façade of the Metropolitan Bible Church building be retained as part of the new development, due to its heritage designation.

This report outlines the nature of the wall construction, observations on the wall condition based on our site investigations, details of the three options we studied in order to incorporate the façade into the new building, and our assessment of each of the three options.

Based on our study of the three options, we made our recommendation which is presented to the City of Ottawa in this report.

Section 2.0 Existing Conditions

Section 2.1 Exterior Masonry Condition Survey

In early May 2008, John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. arranged with Doran Residential Contractors Ltd to supply a man-lift in order to closely inspect the brick masonry exterior face of the Bank Street façade. As noted, in our letter of May 8, 2008 (see section 2.1.1), the existing brick is in relatively good condition. The joints are raked joints and the mortar is a lime mortar. The main issues noted at the time where along the condition of the brick behind the metal feature strip below the head of the third floor windows, and the condition of the mortar joints for several courses below the roof line and at the two chimneys.

At the metal feature strip, it was noted that the detail was poor. The metal did not finish into a reglet. Instead, it finished flush with the wall and was caulked. The detail subsequently failed, allowing the metal to pull away from the wall. Moisture could infiltrate the brick behind the flashing. As can be seen from the photographs (see sections 2.1.2), the brick is of inferior quality to the exterior brick, and is badly deteriorated, thus weakening the wall at this location.

At the chimneys, and along the roof line, the mortar joints have deteriorated, and some of the brick is loose.

Based on our experience, due to the lack of gravity load, it can be assumed that the brick masonry of the two chimneys and a portion of the upper walls at roof level will have to be dismantled and rebuilt.

Given the serious defect in the brick masonry wall behind the metal ledge, the unknown condition of the backup concrete block, and the extent of dismantling required at the top of the wall, we are recommending that the upper portion of the wall must be dismantled, regardless of the selected option to incorporate this heritage façade into the new development.

During the reconstruction, a similar compatible historic brick will be used to replace the damaged brick behind the metal ledge. Brick will also be salvaged from the backside of the chimney to replace brick damaged during dismantling of the upper wall.

Section 2.1.1 Letter dated May 8, 2008.

This section includes a letter sent to Adjeleian Allen Rubeli Ltd. from John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. describing the conditions of the exterior masonry with recommendations of the required actions.



Adjeleian Allen Rubeli Limited 75 Albert Street, Suite 1005 Ottawa, ON K1P 5E7

Attn: Garry Vopni e-mail gvopni@aar.on.ca

RE: 453 Bank Street – Façade Brick Condition

Dear Garry,

This is a brief report on my observations of the façade condition as observed May 7 from the man-lift on Bank Street.

My observations are as follows:

- .1 At the metal cornice, the metal is rusting and is in poor condition. The detail is very badly done, with the upper horizontal surface of the cornice terminating at the face of the brick, with no reglet of any kind. The weather seal is totally dependent on the sealant which has failed. The water infiltrates behind the metal cornice, so the poorer quality brick used behind the cornice is deteriorating, and mortar in the brick joints is eroded. The metal cornice is pulling away from the wall but is not in danger of falling at this time.
- .2 At roof level, for several courses below roof level, and at the small parapet each side of the chimneys, the outer portion of the joints is eroded, but in general, the mortar is still bonded to the brick.
- .3 At the large south chimney, the brick joints are in poor condition for the extent above the roof, with mortar cracked, debonded or eroded. Some of the brick is bulging. Many bricks appear to be loose. This chimney is still in use so it is not capped. The brick liner inside the chimney is in very poor shape. Most of the brick mortar joints are void, and some brick is deteriorated. Some attempt to repoint brick joints was made on the north east, and south sides of the chimney on the exterior face.
- .4 The north chimney is capped, but the brick condition is similar to the south chimney, with poor condition of mortar joints, and deteriorated brick. On the east face, there is a noticeable bulge in the brick face.

May 8, 2008 Project No. 08024 Our conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

.1 The metal cornice will have to be replaced. Ideally, it should be replaced with copper for longevity and minimum maintenance. The metal must be properly detailed to finish into a reglet in the brick above the ledge.

During the shoring, this cornice, which is loose, will have to be removed. The profile of the cornice must be accurately recorded. The brick band behind will have to be repaired by replacing deteriorated brick, and repointing joints, before the building is demolished, as this band is creating a weakness in the wall at this point.

.2 Given the condition of the brick parapet and the chimneys in the centre, the brick construction above the parapet will largely have to be reconstructed. In light of this condition, I would recommend careful demolition of the brick above roof level, and possibly even several courses below roof level (this will depend on the condition of the upper brick courses after the cap flashing is removed), prior to building demolition.

All of this exterior brick should be salvaged and cleaned for reconstruction later. This will reduce the height of wall to be shored and braced, thus introducing some savings into the cost of this work.

Please contact me if you have questions on the above. I am sending a CD of the photographs I took by courier.

Yours truly,

JOHN G. COOKE & ASSOCIATES LTD.

John Cooke, P.Eng., RSW President

JC/kh

08024/ltr_1

cc: Jean-Michel Carrier – Adjeleian Allen Rubelj Limited Marty Lockman – John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd.

Section 2.1.2 Photographs



Picture 1 Exterior Façade: View from the north west corner of the building



Picture 2 Exterior Façade: View from the south west corner of the building

453 Bank Street – Metropolitan Bible Church Façade Project No. 08024



Picture 3 Exterior Façade: Bottom of the north elevation



Picture 4 Exterior Façade: Bottom of the south elevation



Picture 5 Metal feature strip at third floor windows



Picture 6 Metal feature strip at third floor windows



Picture 7 Metal Feature Strip at third floor windows



Picture 8 Metal feature strip at third floor windows







Picture 10 Ch

Chimney

Section 2.2 Interior Masonry Condition Survey

John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd arranged with Doran Residential Contractors Ltd. to core some areas of the building to determine was wall assembly and condition of the backup block structure. The observations are noted in the letter dated May 30, 2008, included in section 2.2.1. Photographs of the cores are shown in section 2.2.2.

Section 2.2.1 Letter dated May 30, 2008.

This section includes a letter sent to Adjeleian Allen Rubeli Ltd. from John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. describing the conditions of the interior masonry with recommendations of the required actions.



Adjeleian Allen Rubeli Limited 75 Albert Street, Suite 1005 Ottawa, ON K1P 5E7

Attn: Jean-Michel Carrière e-mail jcarriere@aar.on.ca

RE: 453 Bank Street – Block Backup Condition

Dear Jean-Michel,

We prepared a draft wall section based on the core made. Three cores were made in the basement, one core was made at ground level and one core was made at the second floor level. One core was also made through the ground floor.

Our observations of the cores are has follows:

The three cores in the basement:

The same wall construction was noted at all three core locations. The wall is $16\frac{1}{2}$ " thick. It is made of either two 8" concrete blocks or a 12" and a 4" concrete block with a $\frac{1}{2}$ " thick parging/plaster on the inside face. The concrete block units and the mortar were found to be in good condition.

The core at ground level:

The core was made through the chimney. The wall construction at the chimney is as follows: $3\frac{1}{2}$ " brick, 2" space, 12" concrete block, 18" space, 12" concrete block and $\frac{1}{2}$ " thick parging/plaster on the inside face. The concrete block units and the mortar were found to be in good condition.

The core at the second floor level:

The wall construction is as follows: $3\frac{1}{2}$ " brick, $\frac{1}{2}$ " space, 8" concrete block, and $\frac{1}{2}$ " thick parging/plaster on the inside face. The concrete block units were found to be in good condition. The mortar was found to be weak and easy to debond.

The core through the ground floor slab:

The floor slab is 5" thick with a 3" topping.

As additional recommendations from the letter of May 8, 2008, which addressed the exterior brick, an allowance should be provided to repoint a portion of the block. The condition of the concrete block units and mortar need to be re-assessed once the wall finishes are removed. For pricing purposes, an allowance for repointing of 10% of the block joints should be included in the bid documents. Also, an allowance will need to be carried to infill any mechanical openings or pockets found in the wall.

Please contact our office if you have questions on the above.

Yours truly,

JOHN G. COOKE & ASSOCIATES LTD.

Marts Loonan

Marty Lockman, P.Eng., Ing. ML/ml 08024/ltr_2 John G. Cooke, P.Eng., RSW, President Grazyna A. Materna, M.Eng., P.Eng., Vice President John D. Barton, C.E.T., Vice President Mary Cooke, Partner Elizabeth Kisilewicz, M.Eng., P.Eng., Associate

> May 30, 2008 Project No. 08024



Section 2.2.2 Photographs



Picture 11 Core sample at the second floor



Picture 12 Core sample at the ground floor



Picture 13 Core sample in basement



Picture 14 Core sample through ground floor slab

Section 2.3 Letter from Doran to Metropolitan Bible Church

This section includes a letter sent to Metropolitan Bible Church from Doran Residential Contractors Ltd. The letter was informing Metropolitan Bible Church on the condition of the masonry.



June 30, 2008

Metropolitan Bible Church, 453 Bank Street, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1Y9

Attention: Mr. Wayne Webster

Re: Church Façade

Dear sir.

As you are aware, we recently completed an investigation of how the façade was built to help determine how we would go about supporting it during the construction of the Central condominium development.

In the process of determining the structural details of the building and the façade, we noted several areas where deterioration had taken place. We feel you should be aware of our findings.

Attached are copies of reports prepared by John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. dated May 8 & May 30, 2008.

Yours truly, Doran Residential Contractors Ltd.

Louis A. Dugas Senior Construction Manager

cc; Jeff Parkes, Taggart Realty Management David Wex, Urban Capital (Gladstone) Inc.

Section 3.0 Existing Building Façade Conservation Options

Section 3.1 Dismantling and reconstruction (Option A)

This option involves the complete dismantling of the masonry walls, after first recording all aspects of the construction using photographs, measurements, recording and detailing of features. The masonry, where feasible, would be salvaged. All concrete blocks and portions of brick masonry would have to be replaced with compatible material, leaving little heritage significance other than a replica of the façade.

The wall would be reconstructed following the construction of the new building. Mortars similar to the original mortars would be used. Replacement historic brick would be used on the upper portion of the wall and at the door recesses at ground level. It would be difficult to match the existing brick in size, colour and finish.

This option would allow for conventional shoring and foundation construction. It would also allow to fully incorporating the façade into the new building, including seismic upgrade into the wall. Furthermore, this option would minimize sidewalk closure and street interference.

Section 3.2 Underpinning of Building Façade (Option B)

This option involves keeping the façade in place. It conforms to the historic guidelines for minimum intervention. Full conservation of the façade, both interior and exterior would be required. The dismantling and reconstruction of the upper façade as described in section 2.1 would still be required. Full repointing of both faces of the masonry and repairing of any damage on the concrete block masonry would be required.

A permanent steel frame to provide lateral support to the wall in its finished location would be installed. This will strengthen the wall during demolition and reconstruction of the new building.

It would be necessary to erect a very complicated shoring system to support the wall on both sides, with a steel framing tower on the street side, to support the wall during demolition and reconstruction. The process will be complicated due to the prior foundation condition in this area, and the need for deep piling to support the shoring structure. This option would require unconventional shoring wall to support the weight of the façade and maintain earth stability under Bank Street. The shoring construction and dismantling must be closely coordinated with the excavation of the foundations for the new building. Also, a concrete pile shoring wall would have to be constructed on the street side of the wall prior to erecting the shoring and proceeding with excavation on the interior of the site. This will be an extremely expensive operation, and the risk of damage to the wall is high. This option would also require closure of the sidewalk and part of the street for an extended period of time.

Section 3.2.1 Conceptual Drawings

This section includes conceptual drawings of this option.







AINARY FACADE SHORING ATIC PHASING OF WORK N.T.S. JUN 12/08 08024 SK-SC1	CAPITAL (GLADSTONE) INC.							
--	--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



AINARY FACADE SHORING IATIC PHASING OF WORK N.T.S. JUN 12/08 08024	C. 400	FACADE SHORING FOR 453	
dwg. no. SK-SC2		⊼ ^ 	



I CAPITAL (GLADSTONE) INC. MATIC PHASING OF WORK Gate SHORING JUN 12/08 Project no. JUN 12/08 08024 JUSS	
--	--



NATIC F		IRY F		
Ĭ		FACADE		
ASING (date JUN 12	(GLAD			
OF WORK	(GLADSTONE)	SHORING		
ORK project 08(E) INC.	FOR		
<u><</u> ودر no. 08024		453		
- SK-	dwg.	BANK		
SK-SC4	no.	ST.		



MINARY FACADE SHORING AATIC PHASING OF WORK e date project no. N.T.S. JUN 12/08 08024 SK-SG	CAPITAL (GLADSTONE) INC.	NRY FACADE SHORING FOR 453 BANK ST.	Ō	
\mathbf{V}				

Section 3.3 Temporary Relocation Underpinning of Building Façade (Option C)

This option involves full conservation of the façade, after dismantling of the upper portion, as discussed in section 3.2. Following this, a permanent steel frame for lateral support of the wall will be added as described in section 3.2.

A temporary steel frame will then be erected on both sides of the wall, interconnected through the windows, at each end, and top and bottom, to provide two way trusses, ensuring the necessary stiffness to support the existing masonry façade. The wall will be systematically separated from the foundation wall. With the use of two large cranes, the wall will be lifted and lowered into the already excavated basement close by. Once the foundations under the wall are reconstructed, along with the structure at the back of the wall, the wall will be relocated into position, and the upper portion of the wall will be reconstructed. The temporary bracing frame will be disconnected, and the steel backup frame will be fastened to the new structure, leaving the existing façade to act similar to a curtain wall. This option in our view, conforms to the historic requirements of minimum intervention while minimizing the risk of damage to the wall.

This option allows for conventional shoring and foundation construction. It also allows making minor adjustment to the façade location and elevation. This option requires delicate hoisting operation to move the façade away and back to its final location. There are some risks of damaging the façade during the hoisting operations. The full closure of Bank Street will be required during the two hoisting phases.

Section 3.3.1 Conceptual Drawings

This section includes conceptual drawings of this option.





Section 3.4 Assessment and Recommendation

Our assessment criteria in selecting a preferred option are as follows:

- .1 The safety to the structure during construction, and after, including risk of collapse.
- .2 The preservation of the heritage value of the wall.
- .3 The risk factor (safety) in executing the project.

Option A is not recommended. In this option, the historic integrity of the façade will be lost. It will be very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain sufficient replacement brick in order to restore the façade. Essentially, this option would reproduce a replica of the façade. The risks related to this option are low, and would simplify construction. The dismantling process would be slow due to the need to salvage as much existing material as feasible.

Option B is not recommended. It has a very complicated shoring system. Option B also has a high risk of damage to the façade and can be unsafe to carry out the foundation work underneath the existing façade. Maintaining earth stability under Bank Street with the façade in place is a major concern. Due to the very poor foundation conditions on this site, and the depth of the rock, deep piling is required. There is a concern that the vibration of the piling will damage the wall. There is also the difficulty of getting piling rigs close enough to the wall in order to drive the piles without damaging the wall, and the complexity of driving piles inside the existing building prior to demolishing of the structure adjacent to this façade. The shoring system required to retain the soil during the basement excavation would have to be installed outside the properly line under the sidewalk.

Option C is the recommended option. It is the best option based on the combination of overall safety, feasibility and heritage value. With this option, the façade will be safely packaged and moved while the construction of the foundation and structure behind the wall proceeds.

Section 4.0 Action Plan

Section 4.1 Preparation of Building Façade for Temporary Relocation.

Before the temporary relocation of the building façade can take place, substantial preparation work to the façade is required. The following work is required:

- Record the brick pattern, flashing details and other information on the façade required to rebuild the upper portion of the wall.
- Rake-out and repoint brick joints below flashing band.
- Dismantle existing canopy.
- Remove all interior finishes and repoint backup blocks as required.
- Install permanent steel frame on lower portion of wall.
- Install interior portion of temporary hoisting frame.
- Demolish building and dismantle upper portion of wall and door recesses. Salvage as much bricks as possible from upper wall section and door recesses.
- Complete installation of hoisting frame.

Drawings SK-SF0 to SK-SF3 in section 4.4.1 show the conceptual sequence of this work. Drawings H1 to H4 in section 4.4.2 show more technical information of this work.

Section 4.2 Relocation Procedures

In general terms, the moving procedures are as follows, after the preparation outlined in section 4.1 is complete:

- Excavate the south west corner of the site and install shoring wall along Bank Street and McLeod Street.
- Drive the piles and construct pile caps for the south west corner foundation of the new building.
- Hoist the façade from its original location to its temporary location on the pile caps (in the excavation) at the south west corner of the building. The hoisting will be done using two cranes simultaneously located on Bank Street. Bank Street will need to be completely close during the hoisting.
- Excavate and install shoring wall at the original location of the façade.
- Construction the new building foundation and structure.
- Hoist the façade from its temporary location to its final location. The hoisting setup will be the same as per the first hoist. Bank Street will be completely closed again.
- Connect façade to the new building structure.
- Remove temporary shoring frame.

Drawing H2 in section 4.4.2 shows the calculated weight of the façade including the permanent and hoisting steel frame. The hoisting contractor will prepare a detailed hoisting procedure for both hoisting phases.

Section 4.3 Post Relocation Interventions

Section 4.3.1 Inspection of the Masonry

After the façade is hoisted back into its final position, a condition survey of the brick and backup block will need to be carried out. This will allow verifying if the masonry has been damaged during the hoisting. An inspection report with required actions will be prepared.

A condition survey of the permanent steel structure will also be carried out. This will allow verifying the condition of the steel and determine if paint touch-up or other interventions are required prior to completing the construction of the wall on the interior façade.

Section 4.3.2 Reconstruction of Upper Wall Section

Prior to the dismantling of the upper portion of the wall, all the existing details shown as brick pattern and flashing details must be recorded. During the dismantling process, as much brick as feasibly possible most be salvaged. The back of the chimneys will not be reconstructed and the bricks that can be salvaged can be reused to reconstruct the upper portion of wall. Also the bricks from the door recesses at ground level could be use as well, if the door recesses are reconstructed with new bricks. Even with the additional bricks from the back of the chimneys and door recesses, it is very likely that not enough bricks will be salvaged to fully reconstruct the upper portion of the wall. New bricks matching as close as possible the size, colour and composition of the existing will need to be found. The existing bricks on the remaining portion of the backup wall would be reconstructed using new concrete blocks. After the reconstruction of the masonry is complete the permanent steel structure and connection to the building structure would be completed.

Section 4.3.3 Reconstruction of the Door Recesses

Similar to section 4.3.2, all existing details most be recorded prior to dismantling the door recesses. If the salvaged bricks are used to reconstruct the upper wall section, the recesses will need to be reconstructed entirely with new bricks. If the recesses are reconstructed with salvaged bricks, it is very likely that not enough bricks will be salvaged to fully reconstruct the recesses.

Section 4.3.4 Reinstatement of bottom row of stone

There is approximately 150mm difference in the grade elevation between the north end and the south end of the façade. There is a row of stone at grave level that is partially below grade at one end of the façade and almost totally below grade at the other end. During the needling operation, the row of stone must be removed. Since portions of the stones are below grade, it is likely that the stones are decayed from years of exposure to deicing salts and the stones may not be salvageable. To protect the bottom of the façade, the façade will be raised approximately 150mm from its current position. A recess will be provided in the new concrete foundation too allow the installation of a row of face stone (artificial) to duplicate the original appearance.

Section 4.3.5 Reinstatement of Flashings

The existing flashing will be reinstated to match the existing appearance. The flashing details would be modified to provide a better protection against water infiltration. Given the failure of the existing detail, it is an acceptable conservation procedure.

Section 4.4 Drawings

Section 4.4.1 Schematic Procedure Drawings

This section includes drawings SK-SF0 to SK-SF5 showing the conceptual sequence of work.





MILE UPPER PORTION OF WALL, REMOVE CANOPY AND M ROW OF STONE. NRY FACADE SHORING FOR 453 BANK ST. N CAPITAL (GLADSTONE) INC. ORARY RELOCATION OF FACADE MATIC PROCEDURES MATIC PROCEDURES N.T.S. OCT 6/08 Project no. OCT 6/08 08024 SK-SF1	
MMG. NO.	



N.T.S. OCT 6/08 08024	RARY RELOCATION OF FACADE	CAPITAL (GLADSTONE) INC.	RY FACADE SHORING FOR 453 BANK ST.	
SK-SFZ	dwg. no.		NK ST.	







RARY IATIC N.T.S.	CAF	RY F	TE INS									
	CAPITAL	FACADE	⁵ TALLAT	۰								Ш
LOCAT DCEDU date OCT	(GL/		IO NOI		2		-		-		2	-
RELOCATION OF FACADE dwg. no. PROCEDURES date OCT 6/08 project no. 08024 SK-SF5	(GLADSTONE) INC.	SHORING FOR 453 BANK ST.	ete installation of Permanent Frame on Upper Portion L.					•				

Section 4.4.2 Permanent Frame and Hoisting Frame Drawings.

This section includes drawings H1 to H4 showing the technical information for the permanent steel frame and the temporary hoist frame.









FLASHING

CONTINUOUS CLEAT PREFINISHED METAL FLASHING. Record existing profile Prior to demolition and Duplicate.

PRESSURE TREATED WOOD BLOCKING ATTACHED WITH STAINLESS STEEL SCREWS LAP IN FLASHING . SEE DETAIL 2

MODIFY FLASHING PROFILE TO INCLUDE RETURN ABOVE FLAT SURFACE AND TERMINATION INTO A REGLET

BRICK FACE REGLET. SEE DETAIL 1 -----





Section 5.0 Disclaimer and Limitations

This report is based on and limited to observations made during walk-through inspections and minimal test openings of Metropolitan Bible Church located at 453 Bank Street, Ottawa, Ontario. Only those items that are capable of being observed and are reasonably obvious to John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. or have been otherwise identified by other parties and detailed during this investigation can be reported.

There is no warranty expressed or implied by John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. that this investigation will uncover all potential deficiencies and risks of liabilities associated with the subject property. John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd. believes, however, that the level of detail carried out in this investigation is appropriate to meet the objectives as outlined in the executive summary. We cannot guarantee the completeness or accuracy of information supplied by any third party.

This report has been produced for the sole use of Urban Capital (Gladstone) Inc., and cannot be reproduced or otherwise used by any third party unless approval is obtained from John G. Cooke & Associates Ltd.

We trust that this report covers the scope of work as outlined in executive summary. Should there be any questions regarding this report, or if we can be of any further assistance to you, please contact us.

Please contact the undersigned if there are any questions. I remain,

Yours truly,

JOHN G. COOKE & ASSOCIATES LTD.

John Cooke, P.Eng., RSW President

ML/ml 08024/Proposal for Façade 07-Jul-2009

Marty Lorman

Marty Lockman, P.Eng., ing