

City of Round Rock, Texas

Historic Resources Survey Project

for use in the implementation
of the Downtown Master Plan

Phase III: Relocating Local Landmarks

Spring 2012

Resource Document



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PHASE III MEETING #1 SUMMARY 2

PHASE III MEETING #2 SUMMARY 5

PHASE III MEETING #3 SUMMARY 10

A HISTORY OF HOUSE MOVING IN AMERICA 14

METHODS FOR MOVING A BUILDING 15

CASE STUDIES 17

NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA FOR MOVED PROPERTIES 20

STRUCTURAL MOVERS 25

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION 28

GUIDELINES FOR DOCUMENTATION 29

PHASE III MEETING #1 SUMMARY

On Monday, February 6, 2012, the Round Rock Historic Resources Survey - Phase III subcommittee met in its first of three meetings. The purpose of the subcommittee meetings is to consider the possibility of a City program to allow the relocation of designated historic Local Landmarks in extreme situations where the building is imminently threatened by demolition.

In attendance were City Council member Kris Whitfield, Historic Preservation Commission members Jerry Hodges and Billy Huggins, Senior Planner Joelle Jordan, and Associate Planner Bradley Dushkin, and historic preservation consultant Steph McDougal. Council member John Moman was absent but will be brought up to speed in a separate meeting with Ms. McDougal on February 7.

The Agenda for this meeting included:

- Briefly review work to date, purpose of worksessions, and desired outcome(s)
- Introduce building moving concept, pros and cons, costs involved
- Introduce alternatives for a "Preserve and Move" program in Round Rock
- Discuss subcommittee's initial thoughts, questions, concerns

Ms. McDougal provided a draft report containing background information and an outline of possible criteria when considering a proposal for relocating a Local Landmark. The subcommittee discussed the report and made the following comments.

GENERAL

- It would be helpful to have an alternative to demolition. That is not available now.
- The ability to relocate Landmarks will depend on the availability of vacant lots.
- If we want to relocate a building but there is no lot available immediately, would there be some sort of storage option, with the building on steel I-beams in a secured lot?
- Council is not aware of how the Historic Preservation Commission works on a case-by-case basis.
- Keeping a Local Landmark in the same general part of town would be a preference, but will depend on the availability of infill lots.
- We need to figure out a way to balance the preservation of the Landmark's original setting and compatibility of setting in the destination neighborhood.
- The construction plans and drawings (including site plans, building height/elevation, etc.) need to be presented for consideration as part of the relocation proposal.

- We need to discuss moving things that are not already designated. For example, would the City need to designate the property as a Local Landmark first, or could it consider designation and relocation at the same time?
- Is there a difference between relocating a Local Landmark or other historic building to an historic district, versus an individual property? Obviously any rules about this would not apply until an historic district is established, but we should know how that would work.

ORDINANCE

- We need to have an ordinance ready to present/consider at the end of Phase III.
- Look at the existing ordinance for demolition and documentation language. Try to use what already exists instead of having slightly different rules.
- The ordinance needs to be written to include a way to grant exemptions or variances.
- We need to figure out how to enforce changes to the ordinance related to a program like this, perhaps with a fine for violations, which could be used to pay for the program.
- Ms. Jordan will ask the City Attorney to attend the second and/or third meeting(s) to advise the subcommittee on any potential legal issues.

ZONING, BUILDING CODE, AND ADA REQUIREMENTS

- Don't use the term "new construction" to describe a relocated building.
- How will the City apply building code and zoning requirements to relocated buildings?
- What does the applicable Building Code say about rehabilitations?
- Ms. McDougal will ask the Preservation Forum listserv for examples of how other cities deal with building code requirements for relocated buildings.
- Ms. Jordan will invite a building official (Mark) to our next meeting on Thursday, February 9.
- We also need to know how the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) will be applied. Ms. McDougal will send Ms. Jordan information about ADA's applicability to historic buildings.

INCENTIVES

- We need to come up with some incentives to encourage these activities if we want them to actually happen; for example, waive fees for rezoning the destination site, or something similar.
- The Phase III report needs to include information about the existing demolition process for Local Landmarks. Many people do not realize that there is a process in

place for that. The property owner only has to wait 120 (180?) days after being a demolition permit is denied by the Historic Preservation Commission, in order to proceed.

INTERPRETING A MOVED BUILDING

- Interpreting the building on its new site could include some kind of signage, possibly with several options for displaying the sign (on the building, on a post, in a permanent fence or stone marker, etc.)
- There is some precedent for interpreting a relocated building on Chisholm Trail, where a building was moved in from Indiana and is not original to the property.
- Does the original location need to be signed too?
- What are the penalties for not meeting requirements for signage?

On February 7, Ms. Jordan and Ms. McDougal met with John Moman and building official Mark Remmert. Mr. Remmert provided the following information:

- The City of Round Rock uses the International Building Code, which addresses historic buildings.
- When citizens convert residential buildings to commercial uses, they do not always pull permits as they should.
- Any time you move a structure, that requires a building permit.
- The Building officials need to know what kind of permanent foundation the building will rest on in its new location; this should be a slab or pier and beam. Ms. Jordan and Mr. Moman commented that the new foundation should be the same type as the original foundation.
- The City cannot make a property owner update their electrical, plumbing, etc. to meet current codes unless (a) the cost of remodeling exceeds 50% of the building's value; or (b) the type of occupancy or use changes.
- Building officials will usually look at a building's structural integrity themselves prior to permitting a move. If necessary, they will call in a structural engineer for an assessment, but they try to avoid any unnecessary costs to the building owner.
- Once a property has been moved, more requirements kick in on the Building department's end.

During Meeting #2, on Thursday, February 9, the subcommittee will delve further into the Criteria for Consideration and possibly begin to draft ordinance language.

PHASE III MEETING #2 SUMMARY

On Thursday, February 9, 2012, the Round Rock Historic Resources Survey - Phase III subcommittee met in its second of three meetings. The purpose of the subcommittee meetings is to consider the possibility of a City program to allow the relocation of designated historic Local Landmarks in extreme situations where the building is imminently threatened by demolition.

In attendance were City Council member John Moman, Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) members Jerry Hodges and Andreea Hamilton, City attorney Charlie Crossfield, Senior Planner Joelle Jordan, and historic preservation consultant Steph McDougal. Council member Kris Whitfield and HPC member Billy Huggins were absent. (Ms. Hamilton attended in Mr. Huggins' place.)

The agenda for this meeting included:

- Provide information regarding initial questions, concerns from Meeting #1
- Discuss criteria for relocation
- Discuss potential application of "Preserve and Move" concept and alternatives to favorable and unfavorable situations
- Discuss what other groups need to be notified of a potential move
- Discuss input from Building Official, City Attorney, etc.
- Identify any other issues to be addressed in meeting #3

During this meeting, the subcommittee discussed criteria to be used for decision-making when an application is submitted for a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) for relocating a Local Landmark. Ms. Jordan indicated that it is her intention to come up with these criteria and then draft a standalone section to be added to the existing Historic Preservation Ordinance, which would then be brought forward for consideration by the HPC, Planning & Zoning Commission, and City Council at the same time as the Phase III report.

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERING A RELOCATION C OF A

The subcommittee discussed each of the following criteria, which pertain to the decision-making process to grant or deny a C of A for relocation.

"The building is recommended for relocation in an adopted report that has been recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission."

The initial idea behind this criterion was to acknowledge any previous identification or recommendation that previously had been reviewed and vetted by the HPC, as this would likely give that property a head start on the C of A process. After discussion, the subcommittee determined that the application would go through the same process regardless of any previous recommendations and so this did not belong in an ordinance. It will be mentioned in the Phase III report.

“There is a compelling reason for the proposed relocation, such as infrastructure improvements,” and “(t)he project that would cause the proposed relocation of a historic building primarily and directly benefits the City of Round Rock and its residents.”

The subcommittee and Mr. Crossfield agreed that it would be easier to approve relocation of a Local Landmark that is caused by a public works project than if the proposed relocation was to be caused by the private redevelopment of a parcel. However, the group acknowledged that it would be difficult to determine what constitutes a “public benefit”.

Ms. Jordan stated that she wanted to make sure that something would be built on the vacated lot if a relocation were allowed to go forward. She cited the Adams Garage as an example of a speculative demolition that has resulted in the loss of an historic landmark with no redevelopment of the site. The group engaged in a long discussion about what would be legally possible and enforceable.

Currently, the only options for redevelopment of a property with Historic (H) Overlay District zoning are demolition or the removal of the (H) Overlay. This proposed ordinance amendment is intended to provide an alternative to demolition.

The group agreed that the relocation alternative will be available for all properties, although owners whose properties are separately designated as Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks or listed on the National Register of Historic Places will be required to contact the Texas Historical Commission (THC), in addition to pursuing a C of A for relocation at the City level, since the RTHL designation gives THC legal oversight for changes to a building’s exterior (including relocation) and moving a National Register-listed building is likely to result in its de-listing. The HPC would not approve the relocation of a National Register or RTHL property unless THC had also approved.

Mr. Moman asked for a map showing the location of all National Register-listed and Recorded Texas Historic Landmark properties in the Downtown Master Plan area. Ms. McDougal will create a map.

“All reasonable alternatives have been explored to mitigate the threat to the historic resource, and no other option is viable,” and “The public has been given the opportunity to comment on the proposed project.”

Ms. McDougal stated that making these steps mandatory would help to assure that the relocation was truly a last resort for historic preservation, which the subcommittee has identified as one of their goals for this process.

Ms. McDougal also stated that it would be proactive to build these two steps into the process, since they are included in Federal historic preservation laws. In particular,

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) regulates the treatment of historic properties that are determined to be threatened by projects that utilize Federal funds or require Federal permits. Mr. Crossfield mentioned a project, with which he had been involved, that had been delayed significantly because the project managers were aware of their responsibilities under the National Environmental Protection Act, but not NHPA. Ms. McDougal stated that these legal requirements related to historic preservation do not cause delays unless one is unaware of them or (less commonly) attempts to skirt them, and that building Section 106 compliance into the project plan from the beginning would help to prevent such delays.

In addition, Ms. McDougal recommended these two steps in order to give residents the opportunity to be heard and to identify alternatives to demolition/relocation that otherwise might not be considered. This will ensure that City officials have as much information as possible when they consider a relocation application.

The remaining criteria, which pertain to requirements for moving, siting, and interpreting the relocated resource, were not discussed in depth during this meeting since they had been discussed during the first subcommittee meeting.

ZONING ISSUES

The group then discussed how the City would address the application of zoning regulations for relocated Local Landmarks, if relocation is approved. Key points during this discussion included:

- Historic (H) Overlay District zoning would convey with the relocated building to its new location.
- The Code of Ordinances may have to be amended to ensure the designation of a “structure”.
- Prior to the relocation C of A, the property owner would not be required to request re-zoning of the property to change the (H) Overlay so that it applies to only the structure, not the entire lot. That process would take at least three months. Instead, the relocation C of A would go to the HPC and, if approved, re-zoning would take place later.
- If the originating property (lot) itself is worthy of Local Landmark status, the (H) Overlay would remain on that property. The HPC would make that determination. Otherwise, the (H) Overlay would be removed from the originating property.
- The destination property, if in a designated Historic District, would retain its existing (H) Overlay.
- If the destination property is not already in a designated Historic District, the property owner could also request that (H) Overlay be applied to the entire property.
- Mr. Crossfield said that moved buildings might be styled as a Special Exception in any zoning district to address nonconformity. (A Special Exception usually applies to uses

and not development standard exceptions.) This would be a slightly different situation, and he will have to investigate how it would work.

- In order for the relocation to work, how/whether to waive certain zoning requirements on the destination property needs to be determined.

PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

The group discussed the public notice options that could be required as part of a relocation C of A. These might include posting on the City Hall bulletin board and City website, publishing an notice in the local newspaper, mailing notices to nearby residents, and/or posting signs on the originating and destination properties.

Ms. Jordan noted that zoning application fees currently cover required notification costs.

FEES

Ms. Jordan asked Mr. Crossfield to determine how waiving fees associated with zoning and relocation could occur. This removes a financial obstacle that could otherwise deter such applications.

In addition, the City may decide to pay for the required interpretive plaque, since otherwise it may be difficult to enforce that requirement.

ASSISTANCE FOR PROPERTY OWNERS

The City needs to create instructions for how to apply for a relocation C of A, to include a list of items which must be submitted in order for the application to be complete.

Applications must be complete before an application for C of A for relocation can be considered. If not complete, the application could be tabled until such time as it is complete.

Ms. McDougal will put something together that includes sample sketch plans, etc., but will not include examples of City forms, since those change frequently and would become out of date quickly.

The grant contract for Phase III includes a public open house, which will be held prior to the April HPC meeting in order to share information about the City's historic preservation programs in general and the proposed new historic districts in particular.

* * *

Additional discussion needs to occur on potential incentives for property owners wishing to relocate Local Landmarks as an alternative to demolition or the removal of (H) Overlay District zoning. This will be discussed at the final meeting.

During Meeting #3, on Thursday, February 16, the subcommittee and Mr. Crossfield will review and discuss a proposed ordinance amendment, drafted by Ms. Jordan and Ms. McDougal, which would add a section about relocation to the existing Certificate of Appropriateness section of the Code of Ordinances.

PHASE III MEETING #3 SUMMARY

On Thursday, February 16, 2012, the Round Rock Historic Resources Survey - Phase III subcommittee met in its third of three meetings. The purpose of the subcommittee meetings is to consider the possibility of a City program to allow the relocation of designated historic Local Landmarks in extreme situations where the building is imminently threatened by demolition.

In attendance were City Council member John Moman, Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) members Jerry Hodges and Billy Huggins, City attorney Charlie Crossfield, City building official Mark Remmert, Senior Planner Joelle Jordan, and historic preservation consultant Steph McDougal. Council member Kris Whitfield called into a portion of the meeting from her office.

The agenda for this meeting included:

- Discuss draft ordinance language, including potential program incentives
- Seek input from City Attorney and Building Official

MEETING #2 REPORT

The meeting began with a discussion of the Meeting #2 Summary report.

- Ms. Jordan talked about the public notice requirements (use of signs, size of signs, mailings) that she and Ms. McDougal had discussed separately after the second meeting.
- Ms. Jordan also noted that, should a relocation be approved, the originating property would have to be rezoned at some point afterward to remove the Historic (H) Overlay, but that might not happen right away. Mr. Crossfield suggested that the rezoning would be best completed when the developer and/or property owner decided on a new use that would require rezoning. Therefore, it might not be practical to waive the rezoning fee for the originating lot; that needs to be discussed further.

BUILDING CODE ISSUES

Mr. Hodges asked Mr. Remmert to explain what is required from the Building department in order to move a building. Mr. Remmert stated that the applicant would need a moving permit, foundation permit, electrical permit, and plumbing permit. In addition, if the applicant plans to change the use from residential to commercial, and therefore the building will have public accommodation, the building must be brought into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Mr. Remmert reminded the group that the applicant would not be required to bring the building up to code unless he or she elected to change the interior. He also noted that, once a building goes to a commercial use, parking and related exterior requirements could apply, so the applicant should indicate their plans for the site in

their Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) application for relocation. Mr. Remmert added that water detention/retention requirements will apply to all buildings with commercial use, including relocated ones.

Mr. Moman stated that new revised ADA requirements are scheduled to be released soon, and that the Texas Accessibility Standards will adopt those immediately.

Mr. Moman and Ms. Jordan asked Mr. Crossfield if the introduction of the Unified Development Code into the City Code of Ordinances would cause a problem with the proposed new section on Certificates of Appropriateness for Relocation, but they felt that this would not be an issue.

NEW ORDINANCE LANGUAGE

Ms. Jordan discussed the proposed new section of the ordinance and went item by item through the draft language. The group identified several places where duplicative language could be deleted. Other comments and questions included:

- How will the applicant prove that he/she has notified the Texas Historical Commission of the proposed relocation, for Recorded Texas Historic Landmark and National Register properties? Ms. Jordan and Ms. McDougal noted that THC Project Reviewers will automatically respond in writing to such a notification. After the meeting, Ms. McDougal requested more information on THC's process and schedule for a response and will provide that to the City for its future reference.
- Should we use the word "justification" to describe the reason for relocation in the C of A application? Mr. Crossfield is concerned about this word. The group agreed that the terminology needs to be consistent with other sections of the ordinance.
- Mr. Crossfield stated that the use of the word "district," to describe a Zoning District applied to a single property or part of a property, is confusing and needs to be changed throughout the preservation ordinance. Ms. Jordan indicated that this is one of the changes that she is planning for the entire ordinance, but she was not planning to bring forward those revisions at this time — only a new relocation section. Mr. Crossfield stated that that change should happen now. He also advised the group to avoid saying that this would change zoning because that would require public hearings before the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. A relocation would not affect the base zoning.
- The group discussed changing the word "structure" to "designated historic resource," to reflect the inclusion of buildings, structures, and objects under the general term "resource."
- Mr. Crossfield said that he is comfortable that the resource could continue to be designated once relocated, and therefore certain density, development, and design standards in the base zoning requirements could be exempted.

- There is no way to rezone the originating lot administratively. However, the City may be able to offer discounted rezoning fees for relocations.
- Mr. Moman discussed his concern about the different setback requirements for commercial and residential buildings. Mr. Remmert indicated that that was being resolved in the new zoning ordinance, which will measure all setbacks from the overhang (eave) rather than from the face of the building. He also noted that that applies to new development rather than existing. Ms. Jordan stated that the historic preservation ordinance allows the Historic Preservation Commission to deal with setbacks contextually and in accordance with adopted design guidelines.
- Ms. Whitfield asked whether Mr. Remmert thought any building code issues would prevent the proposed relocation program from working, and Mr. Remmert answered that he did not.
- Ms. Jordan discussed her previous conversation with Ms. McDougal about allowing accessory structures/resources to be relocated either along with or separately from a primary resource.

INCENTIVES

Finally, the group discussed the incentives that the City might offer a property owner to encourage them to consider relocation of a Local Landmark instead of demolition or removal of the H Overlay. Ms. McDougal reviewed the list of incentives in the report.

- Ms. Jordan stated that incentives probably would be necessary in order to make sure some things take place, such as the installation of an interpretive plaque on the relocated building. The group discussed the need to have an attractive plaque design and to give the property owner several options for its placement (on the building, on a post near the sidewalk, etc.). Mr. Moman noted that the cost of the plaque could come out of the general fund, and Ms. Jordan stated that she believed there would be little impact to the City financially, since relocations will not be common or frequent.
- Ms. Jordan stated that there are currently no application fees for Certificates of Appropriateness. Because the new ordinance section would allow the relocation of a designated resource and the H Overlay would convey with that resource, without affecting the destination lot's base zoning, no fees would be associated with this since no rezoning would be necessary.
- The City would also pay for the public notice sign and mailings associated with the relocation C of A application.
- Mr. Moman asked about tap fees. Mr. Remmert said that if the property owner already has a water bill, they do not have to pay an impact fee unless they are

planning to upgrade their service. The group agreed that there was no reason to waive or discount impact fees for service upgrades.

- Mr. Remmert suggested that the City could also waive the \$50 moving permit fee and/or the \$150 building permit fee.
- Ms. Jordan and Ms. McDougal explained that the City could assist a property owner to market a building that he or she wanted to move off a lot, and that that could be accomplished without much, if any, additional cost.

The subcommittee agreed that the City should consider waiving moving permit fee and building permit fees; pay for the cost of public notice signage and mailings; pay for interpretive signage, such as a plaque; and assist with marketing of a relocateable Local Landmark.

CONCLUSION

As the meeting concluded, Ms. Jordan indicated that she and Ms. McDougal and Mr. Crossfield will work out the final version of the proposed ordinance language and send that to subcommittee members for review and approval.

One item that remains to be addressed by the City Attorney is the ordinance language concerning base zoning requirements for exemptions on the destination lot after a structure with H Overlay is relocated.

Ms. McDougal will amend the report's Incentives section to include a list of fees waived and the provision of interpretive signage, such as a plaque; the report will also note that the subcommittee discussed other incentives not listed in the ordinance.

The proposed ordinance language will go to the Historic Preservation Commission in April, Planning and Zoning Commission in May, and City Council in June.

A HISTORY OF HOUSE MOVING IN AMERICA

The moving of houses from one place to another was once a commonplace event in America, and it was made possible by advancements in construction technology in the mid-1800s.

Until the early 1800s, American house construction primarily relied on the materials available on site – timber, stone, and bricks fired from local clay. Wood-framed houses were built using the post-and-beam construction today seen primarily in barns, which required a skilled carpenter to make the precise connections between massive timbers.

Around 1800, inventions such as the steam engine, circular saw, and machine-made nail led to the development of “balloon-frame construction,” in Chicago around 1830. This new technology used milled dimensional lumber rather than timber beams. Dimensional lumber could be produced by a sawmill far away and shipped to the construction site. The steam locomotive was also introduced in 1830, further facilitating the rise of balloon-frame construction, and because the lumber was held together by mass-produced nails, rather than complicated dovetail or mortise-and-tenon joints, anyone could build a house. As the railroads pushed westward, so did balloon-framing. By the mid-1800s, it had become the primary form of new house construction.

In the mid- to late 1800s, the amount of money and effort invested in the construction of a house made it more economical to move the building than to demolish it and build new. Houses were relatively small in those days, and — without overhead utility lines, plumbing connections, and traffic to get in the way — relatively easy to move.

The island of Nantucket was said to resemble a chessboard in the winter, so many houses were moved around. According to the *Encyclopedia of Chicago*, house moving in that city “was such a nuisance by 1846 that a group of Chicagoans asked that the city council not permit more than one building to stand in the streets of any block at the same time, or permit any one building to stand in the streets for more than three days.”

Over the course of the 20th century, modern families began to demand larger homes. Today, rising real estate prices mean that land is often worth more than the home that sits on it, and a new house can be constructed fairly quickly. As a result, house moving has become less common, although it is still done regularly enough to keep hundreds of American house-moving companies busy. Since the relocation of a building is a newsworthy event, it is easy to find information about this activity from around the country. Other sources of information include house moving companies, city planning offices, and historic preservation professionals.

METHODS FOR MOVING A BUILDING

Moving a building can be accomplished through one of three methods:

1. **Complete disassembly** meant that the building is taken apart, piece by piece, and each piece numbered so that the house can be reassembled later, like a kit of parts.
2. **Partial disassembly** involves removing the roof and/or a portion of the house, and possibly taking apart some or all of the walls. This method is less time-consuming than complete disassembly.
3. **Moving intact** means that the house is separated from its foundation, but otherwise left in one piece. This is most expedient method for moving a house.

The methods for moving a house intact have changed remarkably little in the past 200 years. First, the house is raised off its foundation with a series of jacks. Once raised, it is then slid or rolled to its new location on a system of gas-powered carriage wheels or a truck and trailer. After the house reaches its destination, it is maneuvered over a new foundation and lowered into place.

Keith Cherry of Cherry House Moving in Alvin, Texas, has been moving historic buildings for more than 40 years and provided valuable technical information for this report.

House moving requires a substantial amount of planning. The building owner must work with a qualified house-moving company that can help them plan and execute a successful move. Many house-moving companies are members of the International Association of Structural Movers.

The components of a house-moving plan typically include:

- Documentation of the house in its original location for the City's files.
- Site plans (original site and new site)
- Foundation plan
- Route of the move
- Contact and approval by state and local highway authorities
- Traffic control by local or state police officers, possibly including police escort, road closures, detours, etc.
- Utility companies
- Tree trimming and/or obstruction removal along the route, if necessary

Prior to the move, the new site must be graded and prepared with an age-appropriate, level foundation and a way for the moving truck/trailer to access the foundation. Cherry notes that the foundation should be designed so that the mudsill of the relocated house is centered on the concrete beam, rather than placed on its outside edge; otherwise, the foundation is likely to shift (and potentially fail) over time.

Although Cherry states that “any building can be moved,” he recommends that all structural repairs should be completed first. In particular, any rotten or deteriorated floor sills or joists must be repaired or replaced since they will support the house once the moving company’s steel beams are placed underneath it for the lift. Wooden bracing also can be constructed within or around the building to help provide additional stability during the move. Houses on pier and beam foundations are relatively easy to move, but even houses built on slabs can be lifted and moved.

The moving route is determined by the number and location of overhead utility lines and other obstructions, and may not be direct from the original site to the new site. In order to determine how much “airspace” will be required to move a house, measure the building’s footprint and height. (The moving company will be able to provide a “loaded height” for the house on its trailer or roller wheels.) Houses are often moved at night in order to minimize disruptions to local traffic as utility lines are lifted or lowered to make way for the truck, trailer, and house. Ingress and egress of the originating and receiving sites must also be determined.

The roadway must be able to handle the weight of the load. A wood frame house on pier-and-beam is usually about 70 pounds per square foot, and the truck, trailer and wheels will add an additional 50,000 pounds.

Cherry states that the time required for a move is generally about three days to put the house on wheels, one half day or full day to move it, and three more days to place the house on its new foundation and remove all of the structural beams and wheels provided by the moving company. Utility connections and additional repair work are then the responsibility of the property owner.

A house moving company should provide:

- Moving permits
- Escorts
- Workman’s compensation insurance
- Liability insurance
- Insurance for the building while it is on the moving company’s steel
- Auger-type tie-downs to the client’s specifications

Cherry reiterated several times the need to have the moving company write the specifications for the move. He also suggested that it would be beneficial for all parties to have the project architect who is designing the foundation work with the moving company during the design process to ensure that the site is ready for the house when it arrives.

NOTE: Please consult the Texas Department of State Health Services to determine whether asbestos testing will be required before moving houses within the City.

CASE STUDIES

Galveston, Texas

The following information was provided by Lori Feild Schwarz, the City of Galveston's Assistant Planning Director/Historic Preservation Officer, and by Brian Davis, Preservation Services Director for the Galveston Historical Foundation.

House moving is common on Galveston Island, even within the East End Historic District, which is recognized as a National Historic Landmark. The City considers a relocation out of the district using criteria for demolition, and treats a house moved into the district as new construction. The district's design guidelines, building codes, and zoning apply.

The Galveston Historical Foundation, one of the nation's largest and oldest historic preservation organizations, uses its Revolving Fund Program to acquire and renovate historic houses, which are then sold with protective covenants (deed restrictions) that allow the Foundation to monitor any changes to the exterior of the buildings. GHF purchases, renovates, and sells two or three houses each year, focusing on properties that are in a condition most homeowners would find intimidating.

Following Hurricane Ike, GHF moved four properties that were at risk of demolition due to hurricane damage, such as being shifted off their foundations. One of those became the Green Revival Cottage, which is now used to educate the public on how to rehabilitate a historic house to be environmentally friendly while respecting and maintaining its architectural character.

Neither the City nor GHF currently require the use of signage to indicate a moved house's previous location or the circumstances and year when it was moved, but Schwarz and Davis both state that such interpretive signage is important, would aid their work greatly, and will likely be considered in the future.

Ybor City, Florida

The following information was provided by Jo-Anne Peck at Preservation Resource, Inc.

Beginning in 1987, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) developed a master plan for much-needed interstate system improvements in Hillsborough County. After every effort had been made to minimize and avoid adverse impacts, 10% of the nearly 1,000 historic buildings within the Ybor City National Historic Landmark District had to be cleared to widen I-4. The City of Tampa insisted on relocating as many of the buildings as possible.

After almost three years of research and negotiations between federal, state and local agencies, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed in late 1996; it included the relocation of 64 historic buildings (mostly small bungalows).

At the beginning of the project, a team including architectural historians, a structural engineer, and other consultants surveyed each building within the right of way and ranked them based on architectural integrity and structural condition to determine priority for relocation. Quite a few buildings were torn down based on poor condition or loss of architectural elements. Before tearing down any building, FDOT offered it for relocation, including paying the price of demolition towards the move. However, no private individuals moved any buildings.

The City, FDOT and FHWA shared the responsibility for the program. The City provided all lots needed for the project, most of which were already in its possession due to liens. The City also tore down the ruins of an old convent/school that it owned, creating nearly a full block of vacant land.

During Phase I of the project, FDOT/FHWA coordinated the moves of 33 buildings and paid all relocation and renovation costs. The moves were contracted through an RFP bid process in which FDOT pre-qualified the renovation contractors to ensure that they were experienced in working on historic buildings.

After the homes were renovated, they were deeded back to the City, then sold through the City's Real Estate office, allowing buyers to use incentives for first-time home buyers and other programs the City already had in place. The homes were sold to private individuals for appraised value. As a result of the project improvements, there has been a noticeable increase in private investment in the surrounding area, both from long-time owners now choosing to improve their homes and rental units, and from outside investors purchasing vacant commercial and residential property.

Preservation Resource, Inc. (PRI) was hired as the Historic Preservation Design and Construction consultant, responsible for the relocation and rehabilitation plans for the 33 buildings; coordination with state and local preservation agencies; construction administration during the relocations and renovations; HABS documentation of all impacted historic buildings; and architectural salvage from non-contributing demolished buildings.

Design plans were reviewed by both the Florida Division of Historic Resources and the local Barrio Latino Commission and typically included rebuilding of deteriorated front porches, replacement of inappropriate windows and doors, new metal roofs, and structural repairs. Low walls, typical of the area, were constructed at each relocated site with plaques stating the building's original location and date of relocation. Interiors renovations removed modifications that had subdivided many homes into multi-resident units and to accommodate contemporary living requirements for kitchens, baths and closets.

Phase II of the Tampa Interstate Study consists of relocating up to 29 additional historic buildings. During Phase II, the City is responsible for relocating the homes but is not rehabbing them. The City will sell these homes through an RFP process, with the provision that the exterior is rehabbed within two years and the interior within three years. A qualification process ensures financial ability and experience with previous rehabs; the property does not always go to the highest bidder.

Prior to relocation in both Phase I and Phase II, each house is documented to HABS standards. PRI prepares site and foundation plans for each relocation to maintain setting, orientation, setbacks, and foundation type and height. Once relocated, the buildings are deeded to the City of Tampa and then sold via RFP to individuals with the stipulation that the exterior must be rehabilitated within two years according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. Grants and loans are available through the City of Tampa's Interstate Historic Preservation Trust Fund Loan and Grant Programs, which were created in Phase I of the project.

The Interstate Historic Preservation Trust Fund Loan Program is a revolving loan fund established from the proceeds generated from the sale of historic buildings impacted by Interstate-4 and Interstate-275 expansions. The Trust Fund Loan Program enables the owners of historic properties to preserve the character and structure of those historic properties by providing exterior preservation funds for eligible owners and projects. Funds are provided through loans with reasonable terms to all owners.

Photos from the project are available online at <http://www.flickr.com/photos/historicshed/collections/72157608482911846/>.

The preferred response to a threat such as this one is never relocation, but in this case, it was the only alternative to demolition since the highway had already been constructed through the heart of Ybor City in the 1960s and avoidance was not an alternative. When representatives from the National Park Service toured the project, they were impressed by how seamlessly the relocated homes integrated into the streetscape since the setbacks and orientation of the homes were kept consistent with the neighborhood. (This required special provisions in the zoning code to allow the buildings sited properly; otherwise, the consultant would have had to ask for a variance for every move.)

The relocated buildings were allowed to be considered contributing to the National Landmark District and were added to the local historic district as well. Each prospective relocation is presented as an application to the City Landmark Review Board, which applies its standards per the City's preservation ordinance. The City's preservation guidelines regarding relocation, which were in place prior to the project, did not change. The City is very happy with the end result, particularly since it has breathed life into a previously ignored part of the City.

NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA FOR MOVED PROPERTIES

The criteria applied to evaluate properties (other than areas of the National Park System and National Historic Landmarks) for the National Register are listed below. These criteria are worded in a manner to provide for a wide diversity of resources. The following criteria shall be used in evaluating properties for nomination to the National Register, by the National Park Service (NPS) in reviewing nominations, and for evaluating National Register eligibility of properties.

Guidance in applying the criteria is further discussed in the “How To” publications, Standards and Guidelines sheets, and opinions of the Keeper of the National Register. Such materials are available upon request from National Register of Historic Places Publications.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and

- (a) **that are associated with events** that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- (b) **that are associated with the lives of persons** significant in our past; or
- (c) **that embody distinctive characteristics** of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- (d) **that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information** important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations

Ordinarily cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years shall not be considered eligible for the National Register. However, such properties will qualify if they are integral parts of districts that do meet the criteria or if they fall within the following categories:

- (a) **A religious property** deriving primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance; or

- (b) **A building or structure removed from its original location** but which is significant primarily for architectural value, or which is the surviving structure most importantly associated with a historic person or event; or
- (c) **A birthplace or grave** of a historical figure of outstanding importance if there is no appropriate site or building directly associated with his productive life.
- (d) **A cemetery** which derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events; or
- (e) **A reconstructed building** when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived; or
- (f) **A property primarily commemorative** in intent if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance; or
- (g) **A property achieving significance within the past 50 years** if it is of exceptional importance. [This exception is described further in NPS's "How To" booklet No. 2, entitled "How to Evaluate and Nominate Potential National Register Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Last 50 Years," available from NPS.]

CRITERIA CONSIDERATION B: MOVED PROPERTIES

A property removed from its original or historically significant location can be eligible if it is significant primarily for architectural value or it is the surviving property most importantly associated with a historic person or event.

Understanding Criteria Consideration B: Moved Properties

The National Register criteria limit the consideration of moved properties because significance is embodied in locations and settings as well as in the properties themselves. Moving a property destroys the relationships between the property and its surroundings and destroys associations with historic events and persons. A move may also cause the loss of historic features such as landscaping, foundations, and chimneys, as well as loss of the potential for associated archeological deposits. Properties that were moved *before* their period of significance do not need to meet the special requirements of Criteria Consideration B.

One of the basic purposes of the National Register is to encourage the preservation of historic properties as living parts of their communities. In keeping with this purpose, it is not usual to list artificial groupings of buildings that have been created for purposes of interpretation, protection, or maintenance. Moving buildings to such a grouping destroys the integrity of location and setting, and can create a false sense of historic development.

Applying Criteria Consideration B: Moved Properties

Eligibility for Architectural Value

A moved property significant under Criterion C must retain enough historic features to convey its architectural values and retain integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Examples of Properties that MUST Meet Criteria Consideration B: Moved Properties

- A resource moved from one location on its original site to another location on the property, during or after its Period of Significance.
- A district in which a significant number of resources have been moved from their original location.
- A district which has one moved building that makes an especially significant contribution to the district.
- A portable resource, such as a ship or railroad car, that is relocated to a place incompatible with its original function.
- *A portable resource, such as a ship or railroad car, whose importance is critically linked to its historic location or route and that is moved.*

Examples of Properties that DO NOT Need to Meet Criteria Consideration B: Moved Properties

- A property that is moved prior to its Period of Significance.
- A district in which only a small percentage of typical buildings in a district are moved.
- A moved building that is part of a complex but is of less significance than the remaining (unmoved) buildings.
- A portable resource, such as a ship or railroad car, that is eligible under Criterion C and is moved within its natural setting (water, rails, etc.).
- A property that is raised or lowered on its foundations.

Eligibility for Historic Associations

A moved property significant under Criteria A or B must be demonstrated to be the surviving property *most importantly associated* with a particular historic event or an important aspect of a historic person's life. The phrase "most importantly associated" means that it must be the single surviving property that is most closely associated with the event or with the part of the person's life for which he or she is significant.

Eligible

- A moved building occupied by an business woman during the majority of her productive career would be eligible if the other extant properties are a house she briefly inhabited prior to her period of significance and a commercial building she owned after her retirement.

Not Eligible

- A moved building associated with the beginning of rail transportation in a community is not eligible if the original railroad station and warehouse remained intact on their original sites.

Setting and Environment

In addition to the requirements above, moved properties must still have an orientation, setting, and general environment that are comparable to those of the historic location and that are compatible with the property's significance.

Eligible

- A property significant as an example of mid-19th century rural house type can be eligible after a move, provided that it is placed on a lot that is sufficient in size and character to recall the basic qualities of the historic environment and setting, and provided that the building is sited appropriately in relation to natural and manmade surroundings.

Not Eligible

- A rural house that is moved into an urban area and a bridge that is no longer situated over a waterway are not eligible.

Association Dependent on the Site

For a property whose design values or historical associations are directly dependent on its location, any move will cause the property to lose its integrity and prevent it from conveying its significance.

Eligible

- A farm structure significant only as an example of a method of construction peculiar to the local area is still eligible if it is moved within that local area and the new setting is similar to that of the original location.

Not Eligible

- A 19th century rural residence that was designed around particular topographic features, reflecting that time period's ideals of environment, is not eligible if moved.

Properties Designed to Be Moved

A property designed to move or a property frequently moved during its historic use must be located in a historically appropriate setting in order to qualify, retaining its integrity of

setting, design, feeling, and association. Such properties include automobiles, railroad cars and engines, and ships.

Eligible

- A ship docked in a harbor, a locomotive on tracks or in a railyard, and a bridge relocated from one body of water to another are eligible.

Not Eligible

- A ship on land in a park, a bridge placed in a pasture, or a locomotive displayed in an indoor museum are not eligible.

Artificially Created Groupings

An artificially created grouping of buildings, structures, or objects is not eligible unless it has achieved significance since the time of its assemblage. It cannot be considered as a reflection of the time period when the individual buildings were constructed.

Eligible

- A grouping of moved historic buildings whose creation marked the beginning of a major concern with past lifestyles can qualify as an early attempt at historic preservation and as an illustration of that generation's values.

Not Eligible

- A rural district composed of a farmhouse on its original site and a grouping of historic barns recently moved onto the property is not eligible.

Portions of Properties

A moved *portion* of a building, structure, or object is not eligible because, as a fragment of a larger resource, it has lost integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship, and location.

STRUCTURAL MOVERS

MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF STRUCTURAL MOVERS IN CENTRAL TEXAS (As of August 2011)

A-Bargain, Inc.

Contact Name(s): Keith Nelson

Office Number: 281-447-6323

Fax Number: 936-321-9019

Email: abi@consolidated.net

Website: www.Abargainhousemoving.com

Mailing Address: 1219 Honea Egypt Rd., Magnolia, Texas 77354

A-OK Housemoving Contractors

Contact Name(s): Vincent P. Harris

Office Number: 210-649-1878

Fax Number: 210-649-1783

Email: aokhm@yahoo.com

Mailing Address: 3899 E. Loop 1604 S, Adkins, Texas 78101

Bachmayer Equipment

Contact Name(s): Carrol Bachmayer

Office Number: 512-365-9617

Fax Number: 512-352-5400

Email: clb9617@yahoo.com

Mailing Address: 1902 Old Coupland Rd., Taylor, Texas 76574

Billingsley House Moving

Contact Name(s): Oliver Billingsley

Office Number: 512 448-9147

Fax Number: 512 448-9147

Email: billingsleydemo@austin.rr.com

Mailing Address: 2502 Side Cove, Austin, TX, 78704

Brown & Sons Housemovers

Contact Name(s): Junior Brown

Office Number: 512-247-3901

Fax Number: 512-247-3222

Email: jrbrown63@yahoo.com

Mailing Address: 14307 B Larkdale Ln, Del Valle, TX, 78617

Cherry House Moving

Contact Name(s): Keith Cherry

Office Number: 713-941-2924

Fax Number: 713-941-8932
Email: cherryhousemoving@yahoo.com
Website: www.cherryhousemoving.com
Mailing Address: 19235 Edgebrook, Houston, Texas 77075

Come & Take It Structural Movers

Contact Name(s): Chris Kappmeyer / Rhett Hoestenbach
Office Number: 512-328-MOVE (6683)
Fax Number: 512-328-6911
Email: rhett@328move.com
Website: www.328move.com
Mailing Address: 2901 Bee Cave Road, Suite I, Austin, TX, 78746

Eaton House Moving

Contact Name(s): Clinton Eaton
Office Number: 254-629-2463
Fax Number: 254-629-8043
Email:
Mailing Address: 330 CR 534, Eastland, TX, 76448

Faglie House Moving

Contact Name(s): Roger Faglie
Office Number: 512 355-3941
Fax Number: 512 355-3941
Email: rogerfaglie@aol.com
Mailing Address: 2821 Hwy 29 E, Bertram, Texas 78605

Just Right Transportation Service, Inc.

Contact Name(s): Randy Martin
Office Number: 817 444-6516
Fax Number: 817 270-2712
Email: randymartin@peoplepc.com
Mailing Address: 14400 FM 730 N, Azle, Texas 76020

Kana Bros. Inc.

Contact Name(s): John Kana
Office Number: 979-247-4583
Fax Number: 979-263-5151
Email: rodkana@cvctx.com
Mailing Address: 5927 FM 3233, La Grange, Texas 78945

River City Structural Movers

Contact Name(s): Jerry Edgett
Office Number: 254 793-3595
Fax Number: 254 793-2649
Email: jery@rcsmllc.com
Website: www.rcsmllc.com

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 511, Florence TX, 76527

Temple Housemoving

Contact Name(s): Dan Kacir

Office Number: 254-493-1307

Fax Number: 254-773-2173

Email: joey36tx@yahoo.com

Website: www.templehousemoving.com

Mailing Address: 1304 N 1st St., Temple, Texas 76501

The Sipe Boys

Contact Name(s): Clint Sipe

Office Number: 713 672-1797

Fax Number: 936-894-9881

Email: thesipeboys@yahoo.com

Website: www.thesipeboys.com

Mailing Address: 5540 CR 302, Navasota, Texas 77868

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION

For more information about house moving, please consult the following resources.

International Association of Structural Movers and The *Structural Mover Magazine*

P. O. Box 2637
Lexington, SC 29071-2637
803-951-9304

Texas Association of Structural Movers and *Texas Mover Magazine*

12155 Bus. Hwy. 287 N.
Fort Worth, Texas 76179
(817) 439-1999

Moving Historic Buildings, by John Obed Curtis.

This 54-page document, published originally by the United States Department of the Interior, presents examples of buildings moved in Philadelphia in 1799, a brick house in New York in the 1830s, a seven-story hotel in Boston and a Courthouse in Nebraska in 1869. These and countless other examples are contained in the publication. Contents include: Community and Federal Involvement, Selecting a Moving Contractor, Specifications and Licenses, Selecting the Best Procedure for the Move, Planning the Route, Documentation, Interim Protection Prior to the Mover, Selecting and Preparing the New Site, Preparing the Structure for the Move, and a case study of the Relocation of the Gruber Wagon Works in Berks County, Pennsylvania. Available through IASM.

Moving a House with Preservation in Mind, by Peter Paravalos.

This book was written by a structural engineer specializing in building relocation projects with a background and active role in historic preservation, and published by the American Association for State and Local History. The book examines the process of moving a house step by step, from the planning stage through cost analysis, funding availability, moving options, and the physical move. It includes a detailed case study as well as several additional examples of house moves across the U.S.

GUIDELINES FOR DOCUMENTATION

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY (HABS)

The standards and guidelines for documenting historic properties according to the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) are provided on the following pages.