

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF AUGUST 5, 2020

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Randy Scott, Tana Toly

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Caitlyn Barhorst, Hannah Tyler, Mark Harrington

The Historic Preservation Board meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom. The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Vice-Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Doug Stephens, who was excused.

Determination of the Health and Safety Risk under the OPMA

Vice-Chair Scott read the Determination of Health and Safety Risk under OPMA. Notice of electronic meeting and how to comment virtually. The meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act Section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020 adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) attached as Exhibit A.

The Historic Preservation Board Members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on HPB meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to [www.parkcity.org](http://www.parkcity.org)

Vice-Chair Scott read from Exhibit A, Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk. On August 5, 2020, the Board Chair determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include the percent of positive Covid-19 cases in Utah has been on the rise since May 27, 2020. Positive cases from testing have increased from 4.96% to 9.23% during the month of June, and COVID-19 patients in Utah hospitals have increased during the same time period. As of June 25, 2020, there have been 158 deaths in Utah due to COVID-19. Summit County has the third highest case rate of COVID-19 in the state.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on October 2, 2020.

Dated August 5, 2020.

## ADOPTION OF MINUTES

July 1, 2020

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the minutes of July 1, 2020 as written. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

## PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

## STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Barhorst provided an update on the 1162 Woodside Avenue HDDR. The Staff was still working with the designer. The applicant had personal issues and the application was currently on hold. Planner Barhorst noted that they were still refining the details, and nothing had been approved at this point. When there is final action, she will update the Board with that information.

## REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.A. Daly-West Mine Headframe - 9100 Marsac Avenue - Historic Preservation Board Review for Relocation of a Significant Historic Structure – The Applicant is Proposing the Relocation of the Historic Mine Headframe Structure Approximately 150 feet South West of the Historic Site.  
(Application PL-20-04572)

Planner Barhorst reported that the HPB was being asked to review the relocation of the Daly West Mine Headframe structure.

Planner Barhorst presented a slide showing the submitted application with photographs of the current conditions. She reported that the headframe toppled in 2015 after the mine shaft collapsed. The applicant was proposing to re-erect the structure at a site approximately 150' further up the hill to allow for proper structural repairs and footings. The hoist equipment will remain in its existing location, and the applicant was proposing to construct a weather structure over the top to protect it from the elements. Planner Barhorst noted that the weather structure was not part of this application. The Staff will review that proposal when it is submitted.

Planner Barhorst pointed to the site at the top of Marsac at the Montage. The applicant had submitted a site plan showing the current site, as well as the proposed location up the hill. Planner Barhorst indicated two historic fire hose sheds that will remain and be kept intact.

Planner Barhorst reported that the Staff will review the actual structural repairs once that portion of the application is submitted. The structural engineer was still working with the applicant on a plan. That plan will be reviewed under the Material Deconstruction Code that was reviewed and updated in February 2020, which allows the Staff to approve these types of repairs.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board review the proposal, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the relocation of the Daly West Mine Headframe, a significant historic site, located at 9100 Marsac Avenue, based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval in the Staff report.

Planner Barhorst presented a series of historic photographs. One showed the site before the circa 1914 fire where the entire site was destroyed. The site was rebuilt and the headframe came into play. Another photo was part of the 2009 Historic Sites Inventory. Planner Barhorst presented a photo of the headframe after it collapsed in 2015.

Director Erickson gave credit to Deer Valley for purchasing this site and to those who were funding this work.

Doug Ogilvy, representing the Empire Pass Master Owners Association, reported that Deer Valley acquired the last a couple of months ago. Empire Pass entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the City to undertake a number of historic preservation projects in the Empire Pass area with funding coming from both the City and various sources in Empire Pass. Mr. Ogilvy stated that rebuilding the roof on the Judge Mining Building was substantially completed. The next project on the priority list was the Daly West Headframe. Deer Valley secured ownership of the headframe and they were now proposing to shift it 150' up the hill to place it on solid ground. Mr. Ogilvy noted that when the headframe collapsed, the mine shaft collapsed dramatically. Neither the structural engineer, Deer Valley, nor Empire Pass thought it was a good idea to put the headframe back over that mining shaft, and instead recommended moving it up the hill to solid ground.

Mr. Ogilvy stated that he was onsite this week with the structural engineer and a steel contractor to discuss repair methodology. They intend to meet with the City shortly to talk about the repair method.

Vice-Chair Scott thanked Mr. Ogilvy for his involvement. He also thanked everyone at Deer Valley who was involved in the decision to purchase the land. He noted that the headframe has needed attention for a long time, and he was pleased they had taken action on it quickly.

Board Member Holmgren remembered when the headframe collapsed, and she was very positive on this project.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the new location was being proposed because it is a flatter site. Mr. Ogilvy explained that they were looking for a site that was as close as possible to its historical location, but also structurally sound. He noted that the historic location is more than 20' of uncompacted fill, which is problematic. There is a small historical retaining wall indicating some fill on the site; however, after doing several test holes, it was determined they could hit native soil at a reasonable depth. Mr. Ogilvy stated that taking it up the hill will better stabilize headframe. They believe the view from the Montage pool deck or the patio at the Empire Day Lodge will be similar to what it was prior to the collapse of the structure. Mr. Ogilvy commented on how they intend to move the headframe to its new location and which components are badly damaged and need to be replaced. He anticipated retaining approximately 80% of the original structure with the proposed rebuild.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked what was being proposed for the existing location once the headframe is moved. Mr. Ogilvy replied that the land is now owned by Deer Valley. He pointed to a couple of electrical boxes in the foreground that power the Empire Lift and the Ruby Chair Lift. Directly behind those is the historical hoist equipment. Mr. Ogilvy thought it made reasonable sense to create a pole barn to cover that equipment, but still leave it exposed so people could see it. He stated that they were looking for guidance from the historic community on the best way to address that space. Mr. Ogilvy emphasized that the immediate challenge is how to get the headframe standing up and in an appropriate location close to its historical location. In addition, they were scheduling meetings with the Historical Society regarding interpretative signage on the site. Mr. Ogilvy stated that his personal perspective would be to have a simple pole barn over the hoist equipment that provides visibility but is not climbable. However, he did not believe that would be a 2020 project. The goal for this year is to repair the headframe and stand it up. Mr. Ogilvy recalled that the stop work date at Deer Valley is October 31<sup>st</sup>. If they move quickly, they should be able to at least do the repair work and pour the foundations and stand it up in the Spring.

Steve Issowitz, with Deer Valley, stated that this headframe was a hot issue for a long time that no one wanted to touch primarily because of the 2,000-foot hole below it. He remarked that Deer Valley purchased it because there was no movement on doing anything with the headframe until someone was willing to

sign documents and work with the Master Association and the City to stand it back up. Mr. Issowitz remarked that the Master Association immediately got involved and started with structural engineers and geo-tech consultants. He noted that there were 10 structural opinions on the soils. One opinion was to build floating foundations and try to re-erect the headframe over the existing hole. The other nine opinions, as well as their legal team, went against that option. Mr. Issowitz credited Mr. Ogilvy for finding another site that was close to the historical site.

Mr. Issowitz stated that they were open to any ideas on what to do with the ground where the headframe is currently located if the headframe is moved up the hill. They would like to fence the area that is currently fenced with a different fence. They were also open to suggestions regarding the hoist equipment and how they can safely make it visible. Mr. Issowitz pointed out that the number one goal is to operate the mountain and to keep people safe, whether they are skiing or looking at historical structures.

Vice-Chair Scott recalled an earlier conversation where Mr. Ogilvy talked about the intent of allowing people to walk around the headframe once it is re-erected securely. He asked if that was still in the plan for Phase I. Mr. Issowitz remarked that there were several phases. Phase I is whether everyone agrees with the relocation. Phase 2 would be discussing the structural repair. Phase 3 would determine the type of fence and how close people can get to the structure. Mr. Ogilvy stated that Deer Valley and Empire Pass share the goal for this site to be accessible and visible to the general public as much as possible, with the caveat to maintain skier safety and the safety of people visiting the historic site.

Board Member Hodgkins wanted to know the historic significance of this mine headframe, and whether the historic significance stands alone no matter where the headframe is located. He personally thought it would look strange if people can see where it is attached to the ground.

Planner Barhorst understood that the headframe was used to hoist things in and out of the shaft. It had big rigs and it was attached to the hoist equipment. The actual mined materials were lifted out of the shaft using the headframe. Planner Barhorst stated that the headframe does have a connection to the actual shaft, and the question for the HPB is whether or not relocating the headframe from the historic site is appropriate.

Board Member Beatlebrox was not opposed to moving the headframe. She noted that the site was chosen 100 years ago, and since there are miles and miles of tunnel, she thought they could have easily picked the proposed site. Given the constraints, Ms. Beatlebrox thought moving the headframe 150' was reasonable.

Mr. Issowitz stated that 100 years ago the headframe was made of wood. It burned down and was replaced by the steel structure. It was used for moving men up and down the shaft to the mines, as well as pulling out the ore.

Board Member Holmgren noted that Planner Barhorst provided a detailed explanation of the function and use on page 55 of the Staff report.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that the pictures presented this evening shows the headframe as being the last structure standing from the mining community. He agreed that ideally it would be great to keep it in its original location, but there is no firm ground to keep it up safely. Vice-Chair Scott felt the two choices were to leave it in its current location in its current condition; or allow it to be moved and to work closely with those involved to make sure it is interpreted the best way possible.

Planner Barhorst stated that the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official have determined that the structure is threatened in its present setting because the shaft was capped in 2015 using polyurethane foam. It was a cap rather than a structural fix. Planner Barhorst noted that the Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, was on the line if the Board had questions.

Board Member Hodgkins asked how they were locking it into place, and whether it would prohibit the headframe from being moved back to its original location. Mr. Ogilvy replied that the headframe would be placed on new concrete foundations and moved onto those foundations using the largest crane available. If they stand it up on new foundations, it could theoretically be placed on top of the hole in the future, but it would be costly. The challenge is that there is nothing structural sound in the existing location to place it on. There is 20' of foam sitting on loose compacted fill on top of native soil that is unraveling into 120' of mine shaft. Mr. Ogilvy stated that if the headframe is relocated onto the new site, he did not believe it would be moved again.

Board Member Hutchings was comfortable with the relocation. However, in spite of the challenges, he asked if the current site could be built upon in the future. Mr. Ogilvy stated that there is a requirement to maintain the air duct. He noted that a significant portion of Park City's drinking water comes out of that mine, and the miners are in and out of there as necessary to maintain the mines. The galvanized culvert shown in one of the photos is the air shaft that allows for air to get into the mine below. It is ringed by 20' of styrofoam.

Planner Barhorst explained that not just any building can be erected on a historic site. Any proposal would be required to go through a HDDR. She noted that once the site planning is done with regards to the hoist equipment and the interpretative signage, the historic sites inventory form will be updated to include this new 2020 project. The site will still have historic significance.

Vice-Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Sally Elliott stated that on half of the Friends of Ski Mountain Mining History, she wanted to thank Steve Issowitz at Deer Valley who took significant risks to acquire this site. She pointed out that no one wants to own a structure 1600 feet deep that will cave. It is a problematic site. Ms. Elliott appreciated the Empire Master Owners Association and Doug Ogilvy for listening to public comment. Ms. Elliott stated that she and Jack Hodgkins have chaired Preservation Utah, and both of them are preservation purists. They would prefer to see the project done exactly as it was historically, but at the same time they realize that it could not safely happen. Ms. Elliott felt they owed a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Issowitz, Mr. Ogilvy, and the City for coming up with a location that is proximate and safe and as historically accurate as possible. Ms. Elliott was excited about the location. She was thrilled that she did not need to raise money for this project because Empire Pass and the City were funding it. Regarding historic significance, Ms. Elliott stated that the Daly West was an enormous money generator for Park City, and they employed many people. In order of importance, the Ontario, the Silver King, and the Daly West/Daly Judge/Judge area, were the three most significant mining areas in Park City in terms of revenue generated. This is an important site to preserve and she would like to see as much public access to the site as possible, while at the same time precluding anyone from climbing on anything, including the relocated headframe and the hoisting machinery.

Ms. Elliott expressed deep gratitude to everyone who was involved. It was the best possible solution. She particularly liked the notion that structural members would be added to the frame to allow it to stand straight up. She noted that the frame was significantly compromised when it fell, and it needs modern steel to help it stand up. Ms. Elliott was also pleased that they were not cutting or removing the bent members. Preserving the site is wonderful and limiting public access is necessary. She was certain that the shaft at 1600 feet deep will cave in perpetuity. Ms. Elliott stated that Daly West is one of only three headframes remaining. On August 14<sup>th</sup>, The Friends of Ski Mountain Mining will evaluate the shafts of the Silver King and the Thanes and decided how best to preserve the structures that surround them. She noted that Doug Ogilvy and Steve Issowitz will participate on a zoom call on August 17<sup>th</sup> to talk about ideas for interpretation. Ms. Elliott thought the Staff report offered excellent ideas for how to interpret the site and what the public might be interested in. When they talk about interpretative signage on August 17<sup>th</sup>, they will also look at including some of those great idea.

No e-comments were submitted and no one else raised their hand on zoom.

Vice-Chair Scott closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Scott referred to the criteria listed on *page 28* of the Staff report and called for Board members questions or comments.

Board Member Holmgren was comfortable that the criteria had been met.

Board Member Hodgkins asked Planner Barhorst to walk through the ands and or of the criteria. He understood that it does not need to meet all the criteria, but it did need to meet several. Planner Barhorst referred to the page in the Staff report that highlights all of the criteria. All criteria under A and B must be met for either a Landmark or Significant site. Item 2 applies to Landmark sites only. At least one of the criteria under Item 3, either a, b, or c, must be met. She noted that b) applies because the Planning Director and Chief Building Official have determined that the structure is threatened, and that preservation of the building will be enhanced by relocating it. However, the HPB still needs to find that the project complies with the said criteria.

Planner Barhorst noted that she had analyzed the criteria that apply in the next section.

Board Member Hodgkins thought 3 a) could apply because they could leave the structure where it is. Planner Barhorst replied that the Staff's analysis is that under Item 3, criteria b) has been met. Mr. Hodgkins clarified that he was trying to make sure he understood how it meets the Code criteria. He believed there was agreement that relocating the structure was a good idea, but he was concerned about setting precedence.

Board Member Hodgkins asked for the definition of a Landmark site. Planner Barhorst explained that historic sites are designated as Significant or Landmark. Mr. Hodgkins asked if the only designation of Landmark is through the National Parks Service. Planner Barhorst replied that the designation is through the Park City Historic Sites Inventory process. A site is designated either Landmark or Significant.

Planner Tyler recalled that in order to be a Landmark structure it must be eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Board Member Hodgkins understood that eligibility for National Landmark status was the City's definition of a Landmark Structure. Significant sites are the inventory of sites in Park City and other determinations. A Significant structure is not eligible for National Landmark Status, but they contribute to the historic nature of Park City. Planner Barhorst stated that a Landmark site, per the LMC definition, is any site, including building, main, attached or detached, or public accessory buildings and/or structures that is determined by the HPB to meet the specified criteria set forth in 15-11. A Landmark must be at least 50 years old, retains its historic integrity, and is significant in a local regional or national history, architecture, engineering, or culture, or associated at least with one of the following: historic era, persons of

significant history, or distinctive characteristics of type. Planner Barhorst clarified that Landmark definition is linked to the National Register criteria.

Board Member Hutchings appreciated the justification that was written into the hazardous conditions and why the structure cannot be rebuilt in its current location. He found it helpful to have the justifications and analysis included in the Staff report.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the proposed relocation of the Daly West Mine Headframe, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Holmgren remarked that this is one of the most significant things the HPB has done, and she was proud of everyone. The Board thanked Mr. Ogilvy and Mr. Issowitz for acting quickly to move forward on these projects.

#### Findings of Fact – 9100 Marsac Avenue

1. The property is located at 9100 Marsac Avenue.
2. The legal description of the property is Lot B Empire Village Subdivision Parcel B-2. Parcel Number EV-B-2-B.
3. The property is located in Flagstaff Mountain Resort Master Planned Development.
4. The Daly West Mine Headframe and Fire Hydrant Shacks located at 9100 Marsac Avenue is designated as Significant on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
5. On July 20, 2020 the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review application.
6. The Applicant is proposing the Relocation of the Daly-West Mine Headframe approximately 150 feet south west from the Historic Site.
7. The 2019 SWCA Historic Preservation Plan Update for Flagstaff Mountain Resort highlights recommended work to be done to the Daly-West Mine Headframe in addition to the 2001 recommendation to install interpretive signage. This includes re-erecting the structure to the original upright configuration.
8. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-13(B) Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure, including:
  - LMC § 15-11-13(B)(1)(a). Per Exhibit D, a Paul W. McMullin, a licensed structural engineer, states the following:  
“After observing the Daly Headframe, and reviewing the geotechnical recommendations, it is my opinion that it is necessary to relocate the

headframe from the existing site. This will allow a new foundation to be poured that will adequately support the headframe and eliminate potential problems from the mine shaft.

Lifting the structure with the crane will be feasible, and can be done by a qualified crane and rigging company, without causing undue distress.”

Staff finds this structural engineer report, along with the other analyses done for the site (Exhibit D) demonstrates, along with the fact that the structure was temporarily moved from the site while the mine shaft closures were taking place in 2015, that the headframe structure can successfully be relocated to the proposed new site.

- LMC § 15-11-13(B)(1)(b). The proposed relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the building or structure; The headframe was temporarily relocated in 2015 while the mine shaft was closed and set back to where it is currently. No further structural damage was incurred during this process; the structural members were damaged during the collapse in 2015 as seen in Image 4 and 5. The new site will allow the necessary structure/ foundation to be installed for the headframe to be re-erected and repaired.

- LMC § 15-11-13(B)(3)(b). The collapsed mine shaft was closed in 2015 using a combination of polyurethane foam, a concrete cap, and a corrugated metal pipe (CMP) to allow airflow to the Park City water supply tunnel located in the Ontario tunnel below the shaft. The structural stability of the closed shaft at the current site was not designed to incur the load of the re-erected structure (estimated weight of 80,000 pounds). The proposed Relocation is necessary in order to re-erect the Structure with proper structural foundations that will not compromise the mine shaft. Per Exhibit E, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official find the proposed site does not negatively impact the historic character or context of the Structure, as the proposed site is within the Historic context of the Daly-West Mine complex.

9. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code pursuant to LMC § 15-13-4 Design Guidelines for Relocation and/or Reorientation of Intact Building Or Structures, including:

#### **A. Protection for the Historic Building and Site**

1. Relocation and/or reorientation of a historic building shall be considered only after it has been determined by the Historic Preservation Board that the integrity and significance of the historic building will not be diminished by such action.

#### **Analysis of Proposal**

Under review by the  
Historic Preservation  
Board with this application.

2. Relocation and/or reorientation of a historic building shall be considered only after it has been determined that the structural soundness of the building will not be negatively impacted. A professional structural analysis shall be conducted in order to minimize any damage that may occur during the relocation/reorientation of a historic structure.

Complies; The structural soundness of the headframe structure will not be negatively impacted upon relocation. A professional structural analysis shall be required upon Building Permit review. Condition of Approval (COA) #4

3. Hire licensed professional building movers to relocate a historic building.

Complies as conditioned. COA #5.

4. A historic structure shall be secured and protected from adverse weather conditions, water infiltration, and vandalism before, during, and after the relocation/ reorientation process.

Complies as conditioned. COA #6.

5. When rehabilitation of the historic structure is delayed, temporary improvements, such as roof repairs, secured and/or covered windows and doors, and adequate ventilation shall be made to the structure to protect the historic fabric until rehabilitation can be accomplished.

Complies as conditioned. COA #7.

6. A written plan detailing the steps and procedures for relocation or reorientation of a historic building shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building

Departments. This plan shall outline, step by step, the proposed work to relocate and/or reorient the building to ensure that the least destructive method of moving the building will be employed.

Complies as conditioned.  
COA #8.

7. Relocating and/or reorienting a historic building of which the location contributes to the character of the Historic District shall be avoided.

The Structure is not located within the Historic District.

8. A historic building shall be moved in one piece whenever possible. When problematic structural or relocation route conditions preclude moving a building as a single unit, then partial disassembly into large sections may be acceptable. Total disassembly of building components shall be avoided except under extreme situations.

Complies as conditioned.  
COA #9.

9. Buildings and their components shall be protected from damage during the moving process by adding bracing, strapping, and by temporarily infilling door and window openings

Complies as conditioned.  
COA #10.

10. The setting for a relocated historic building shall be selected for compatibility with the character of the structure and with the character of the original site.

Complies; The proposed new site is compatible with the character of the structure and the character of the original site, as the site 150 feet south west of the historic location still remains within the

historic Daly-West within the context of which the headframe structure contributed to.

11. A relocated/reoriented historic building shall be sited in a position similar to its historic orientation. The relocated/reoriented historic building shall maintain its relationship with the street and shall have a relatively similar setback. Relocating a historic structure to the rear of a parcel to accommodate a new building in front of it is not appropriate.

Complies; The proposed orientation of the headframe will be sited in a position similar to the historic orientation on the original site. COA #11.

12. When a historic building is relocated to a new site, the building shall be placed on the new lot with the same orientation and (if consistent to the District) with the same setbacks to the street as the placement on the original site.

Complies; the headframe will maintain the same orientation as the historic site upon placement on the new site. COA #11

10. Per LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(1) Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction, the Planning Director or their designee shall review the proposed Routine Maintenance of the repair of the Historic Structure.

11. Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice to the property on July 22, 2020. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on July 22, 2020. The Park Record published notice on July 22, 2020.

12. The Design Review Committee, Development Review Committee, and Planning and Legal Departments reviewed this application.

13. Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

Conclusions of Law – 9100 Marsac Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code (LMC) pursuant to LMC § 15-11-13(B) Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure.
2. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code (LMC) pursuant to LMC § 15-13-4 Design Guidelines for Relocation and/or Reorientation of Intact Building Or Structures.

Conditions of Approval – 9100 Marsac Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Relocation site plans approved August 5, 2020 by the Historic Preservation Board.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Building Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to construction. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved Relocation that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
4. In order to minimize any damage that may occur during the relocation/reorientation of a historic structure, a professional structural analysis shall be conducted and submitted for review and approval by the Planning Director and Chief Building Official upon submittal of the Building Permit.
5. The applicant shall hire licensed professional building movers to relocate the Historic Structure.
6. The historic structure shall be secured and protected from adverse weather conditions, water infiltration, and vandalism before, during, and after the relocation/reorientation process.
7. When rehabilitation of the historic structure is delayed, temporary improvements, such as roof repairs, secured and/or covered windows and doors, and adequate ventilation shall be made to the structure to protect the historic fabric until rehabilitation can be accomplished.
8. A written plan detailing the steps and procedures for relocation or reorientation shall be completed and approved by the Planning and Building Departments upon submittal of the Building Permit. This plan shall outline, step by step, the proposed work to relocate and/or reorient the building to ensure that the least destructive method of moving the building will be employed.
9. The Historic Structure shall be moved in one piece whenever possible. When problematic structural or relocation route conditions preclude moving a building as a single unit, then partial disassembly into large sections may be acceptable. Total disassembly of building components shall be avoided except under extreme situations.

10.The Historic Structure and its components shall be protected from damage during the moving process by adding bracing, strapping, and by temporarily infilling door and window openings for structural rigidity.

11.The relocated structure shall be sited in a position similar to its historic orientation.

12.When a historic building is relocated to a new site, the building shall be placed on the new lot with the same orientation as the placement on the original site.

13.The applicant shall submit a cribbing and excavation stabilization shoring plan reviewed and stamped by a State of Utah licensed and registered structural engineer prior to issuance of a building permit. Cribbing or shoring must be of engineer specified materials. Screw-type jacks for raising and lowering the building are not allowed as primary supports once the building is lifted.

14.Per LMC § 15-11-9 Preservation Policy, the Planning Department is authorized to require that the Applicant provide the City with a Financial Guarantee to ensure compliance with the conditions and terms of the Historic Preservation Plan.

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas Stephens, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board