

**SALT LAKE CITY
HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Minutes of the Meeting
Held at 451 South State Street, Room 126
November 1, 2006**

A field trip preceded the meeting and was attended by Commission Members David Fitzsimmons, Esther Hunter, Paula Carl and Creed Hammond

MINUTES FOR THE FIELD TRIP (3:00 P.M.)

A quorum was not present; therefore, minutes were not taken.

Historic Landmark Commission Members present at the meeting were:

Paula Carl, David Fitzsimmons, Warren Lloyd, Creed Haymond, Esther Hunter and Scott Christensen.

Planning Staff present were:

Cheri Coffey, Deputy Planning Director; Elizabeth Giraud, Senior Planner and Louise Harris, Secretary.

Chairperson Fitzsimmons called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Work Session (4:00 P.M.)

Commissioner Fitzsimmons stated that the Commissioners had sent e/mails relating to topics of discussions at work sessions. Commissioner Hunter had put together a list of items to discuss as a Commission in terms of the advocacy roll that is approved for the Commission. There are a number of current major planning projects in Salt Lake City that the Commission could weigh in on. She further explained that perhaps a small amount of time could be set at each meeting for discussion.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that he had spent some time with Cheri Coffey and Joel Paterson to get ideas what the Commission can do in terms of meetings. If a quorum is present, then the meeting has to be advertised because the meetings are public. He indicated he could call a special meeting, but it would need to be advertised 24 hours in advance and published in three public places. Commissioner Fitzsimmons suggested that perhaps a retreat would be helpful for the Commission to obtain additional training and direction from Staff.

Commissioner Hunter voiced that the Deseret Building (First Security Bank Building) under potential demolition was an important issue because of time urgency.

Commissioner Haymond expressed that if a statement may help preserve the building, then they should submit one.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that the "Inn at Temple Square" was another important building. Both the Inn and the Deseret Building are scheduled for demolition.

Ms. Coffey indicated that the only item on the City register for the City Creek Center Project is the ZCMI storefront. The property owner will petition the Historic Landmark Commission to allow them to remove and restore the storefront once the City Creek Center Buildings are rebuilt. It would be a relocation project that the Historic Landmark Commission would review.

Commissioner Hunter asked if the Desert Building would go to another meeting of the Planning Commission after the issues only meeting.

Ms. Coffey replied that the Planning Commission would hold formal public hearings as well as the "issues only" hearings. The Applicant has removed the Desert Building (the First Security Bank Building) from any phasing at this point. It has not been included in their project, but maybe reconsidered. The Planning Commission has jurisdiction over what is built if it doesn't comply with the underlying zoning regulations but not demolition. Most of this project meets the zoning codes and doesn't need to go to the Planning Commission. They are looking at amending the Master Plan for a sky bridge on Main Street. In the D-1 Zone, there are regulations governing the height of buildings in the middle of the block which the proposed project does not conform with. This would require that they go to the Planning Commission for approval. Buildings in the middle of the block can only be 100 feet high and this project identifies higher buildings. The property manager is also proposing to build a parking structure on Social Hall Avenue on the first floor of the building. They are asking for the regulations to be waived that require pedestrian orientation and commercial development on the first floor. There is also a percentage of glass that has to be on the building as well.

Commissioner Carl suggested that if a statement were made, it would be made directly to the owner rather than the Planning Commission.

Ms. Coffey gave direction how a statement could be made. The Historic Landmark Commission could write a letter, the Commission Chair would then sign it on behalf of the Commission. They would also pass a resolution in the minutes and forward it to the Applicant.

Commissioner Christensen asked if a letter would be better.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that if a letter was written, it should encourage the owner to consider more carefully the demolition of the First Security Building because of its historic importance to Salt Lake City even if it isn't designated.

Commissioner Hunter suggested both a resolution and a letter that could be given to the owner or read at the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that the draft letter could be distributed to each of the Commissioners for comments. He also thought that the demolition of the "Inn at Temple Square" was probably already ordered, but to include a statement in the resolution regarding the thoughts and feelings of the Historic Landmark Commission relating to that building.

Commissioner Christensen moved that the Historic Landmark Commission, both in the minutes of this meeting and in a letter to be drafted under the signature of the Chair, reflect great regret and disappointment over the loss of the "Inn at Temple Square" and the "Amussen Jewelry Store" façade (Key Bank entrance) which would both be demolished to make way for the City Creek Center. He also wanted to include expression of Historic Landmark Commission great interest in rethinking the demolishing and considering the importance of the Deseret Bank Building, also know as the First Security Bank Building, because of the architectural significance of this building and its importance in the downtown fabric. The Commission hopes that it can be retained as part of the development that would be happening on that block.

Commissioner Hunter seconded and all voted “Aye”. The motion passed. Commissioner Hunter will draft the letter.

Ms. Coffey agreed that this would be appropriate.

Because this is Ms. Giraud’s last meeting, the Commission thanked her for all the hard work she has given to the Commission through the years. Commissioner Hunter asked when was her first Historic Landmark meeting. Ms. Giraud replied it was May 6, 1992. She indicated that Cheri Coffey was a great inspiration to her as well as the Commissioners that were on the Historic Landmark Commission at that time. Things were very different back then. The meetings had a different format and less staff which forced the Commission and staff to work more closely together. She has seen many wonderful changes with the historic houses in Salt Lake City and she is very proud of the Commission. She stated, as a staff person, this is the best Commission to work with.

Ms. Coffey indicated that when Ms. Giraud first got to the Planning Department she discovered that the preservation program needed to be more formalized and restructured to better conform to nationally recognized presentation practices and standards. She worked with the State and made the preservation program more formal.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then presented Ms. Giraud with a small token from the Commissioners as well as a card they all signed.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked the audience if they had any remarks for the Commission that aren’t related to the cases on the agenda.

Hearing none, he closed that portion of the meeting.

A break was taken at 4:20 and special refreshments were then served.

The meeting was called back to order at 4:30.

Report by the Planning Director

Ms. Coffey reported that she and Deputy Planning Director Doug Wheelwright will work to run the Division for now, but she indicated that Mayor Anderson will try to find a replacement for the Director.

Approval of the Minutes

Chair Fitzsimmons asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of the October 4, 2006 meeting.

Commissioners Hunter and Fitzsimmons presented corrections and additions to the minutes of the October meeting.

Commissioner Carl moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Commissioner Haymond seconded. Commissioner Christensen abstained. All voted “Aye”. The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARING

(This item was heard at 4:31)

Case No. 470-06-34 at approximately 715 North West Capitol Street by Wayne Harrier to construct a single-family house in the Capitol Hill Historic District. (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

Ms. Giraud indicated that because she was absent at the October 4th meeting, Mr. Wayne Harrier e/mailed his site-plan with the revised scheme. Mr. Harrier was encouraged to move the door to the north-face instead. He added two vehicular doors. The east elevation has a bump-out of 2 feet 4 inches and three windows. The east wall with the bump-out would be clad entirely with cultured stone. The east and north walls of the garage would have a cultured stone wainscot with EIFS. Street entrance to the house has been changed to a diagonal.

The proposed change to the garage expands the total length of the house from 67 feet to 71 feet. In order to meet the setback requirements, the Applicant will need to modify the rear deck.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons invited the Applicant to come forward.

Mr. Wayne Harrier came forward and introduced himself. He indicated that his Engineer, Mr. Larry Johansen, made the changes by turning the entrance of the garage to the north. They added two pillars in front and reduced the size of the home. The rear balcony will not be changed and will not impede into the set-backs in the rear.

Commissioner Carl thanked Mr. Harrier for making the changes.

Commissioner Christensen talked about the fenestration pattern of the windows. The frame will be thick wood and the window sashes will be set back into the wall.

Mr. Harrier remarked that the hung windows can be changed to double-hung and he has already discussed this with Ms. Giraud. The frames will be thick wood and will fit into the historical style.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak to this case.

Mr. Paul Evans of 707-711 North West Capitol Street came forward and stated that he is very excited to see the change on the street with this home.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Commissioner Carl moved that in Case No. 470-06-34 that the Historic Landmark Commission accept the revised design as presented and that the Applicant work with staff to provide double-hung windows primarily on the front and where feasible on the remaining façade.

Commissioner Haymond seconded. All voted "Aye". The motion passed.

A copy of the Staff Report is filed with these minutes.

(This case was heard at 4:42)

Case No. 470-06-47 at approximately 78 "Q" Street by Michael R. Conn requesting approval to construct a detached, one and a half story two-car garage in the rear yard of the property. The property is zoned SR-1A and is located in the Avenues Historic District. (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

Ms. Giraud presented the Findings of Fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report. The garage is accessed from Second Avenue as there is an 8 ½ foot right of way in the rear of the property. The height is 21 feet of which the Ordinance only allows 14 feet. The square footage is limited to 672 square feet; the building coverage shall not exceed 50 percent of the building footprint. This principal structure has a footprint of 970 square feet. The proposed garage does not meet the Compatible Infill Ordinance. If the Commission finds that it is within the character of near-by structures in the Historic District, the Commission can waive the requirements. The proposed garage is within the Ordinance regarding scale and form, and would not be seen from the streetscape. Access to the garage is through a right-of-way and not an alley. It does meet the first standard in scale and form.

The proposed construction complies with the Composition of Principal Facades. The use of single doors provides a "breaking up" of the wall on the east elevation so that an expense of garage doors would not predominate. The other openings would correspond to the typical visual relationship between solids and voids seen on residential structures throughout the Avenues Historic District. The proposed materials would be consistent with the primary structure and similar accessory structures found in the Avenues.

Based on the findings of fact, Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve this application including exceeding the base zoning height, size of the accessory structure and the fact that the proposed accessory structure exceeds 50 percent of the footprint of the house. The project substantially complies with the applicable standards of the ordinance and adopted design guidelines. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. This approval is for design only; all other zoning/building requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.

A Copy of the Staff Report is filed with these minutes.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners for Ms. Giraud.

Commissioner Hunter asked how typical carriage houses were the Avenue's and if the garages were usually 1 1/2 story?

Ms. Giraud indicated it varies. She did not have exact figures.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if larger prints were submitted.

Ms. Giraud indicated that she had Mr. Conn resubmit several plans. He made changes to the tresses. She passed the new plans to the Commissioners to review. There is no bathroom, but plumbing for a sink and toilet and there is space for a hobby shop. Mr. Conn has received a Routine and Uncontested application for the hobby shop.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then invited the Applicant to come forward and introduce himself.

The Applicant, Mr. Michael Conn of 78 North "Q" Street, came forward.

Commissioner Christensen asked what type of materials the windows will be made of.

Mr. Conn indicated that on the elevation drawings submitted separately it shows them as one-over-one. The windows will be functional wood with vinyl coating. The siding will be smooth Hardi-plank. The garage door will be a roll-up panel door without windows.

Mr. Conn remarked that the original floor plans that are stock plans, showed an apartment with a kitchenette which will be eliminated.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if anyone in the audience had comments. Seeing none he closed the public hearing and called for a motion.

Commissioner Haymond asked if having plumbing is allowable.

Ms. Giraud indicated that a sink and toilet are permissible.

Commissioner Carl moved that in Case No. 470-06-47 that approval is given for the plans as submitted and that the applicant meets all other applicable City requirements and the applicant work with staff for final details. Approval is given including the excess height, square footage, and exceeding 50 percent of the footprint of the house, because it complies with the applicable preservation standards of the ordinance and it is compatible as outlined in the Staff Report.

Commissioner Christensen seconded. All voted "Aye". The motion passed.

(This case was heard at 4:57)

Case No. 470-06-46 at approximately 390 North Wall Street by Jeffrey Landry, represented by Kimble Shaw, architect, requesting approval to construct a second-story addition to the rear of the residence. The property is zoned SR-1A and is located in the Capitol Hill Historic District. (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

Ms. Giraud presented the Findings of Fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report. This home was built in 1908 and is an Arts & Crafts one-story bungalow. The Applicant is proposing to construct a second-story addition at the rear of the house about halfway back from the front wall plane. The height of the existing house at the lowest point of the grade is 17 feet; the proposed height of the addition at its highest point would be 28 feet. The roofline of the new addition would mimic the roofline of the house. The walls will be stucco to match. The Applicant will need a Routine and Uncontested approval for an inline addition because the house already encroaches into the corner side yard. The proposed addition does not meet the requirements of the Compatible Residential Infill Development Ordinance. The new ordinance states that the maximum building height can only be 23 feet measured to the ridge and this is 28 feet. The Ordinance also states that the exterior wall can only be 16 feet high. The Historic Landmark Commission must determine the compliance of the proposed addition with the requirements of Section 21A.34.020 "H" Historic Preservation Overlay District. The proposed work meets the standard in the Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City.

Based on the analysis and Findings of Fact listed, the Planning Staff recommends that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the request as presented with the following conditions:

1. Review of the final details of the design of the proposed project including any concerns or suggestions expressed by the Commission shall be delegated to Planning Staff.
2. This approval is for design only. The project must meet all other applicable City requirements.
3. The applicant must successfully resolve the issue of the in-line addition through the routine and uncontested process as an encroachment into the corner side yard.

Ms. Giraud indicated that she had already approved the garage administratively.

A copy of the Staff Report is filed with these minutes.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if the Commission had any questions. Hearing none, he invited the Applicant to come forward.

Jeff Landry of 390 Wall Street came forward and he did not have anything more to add.

Commissioner Christensen asked about the stucco matching the existing house and about the windows.

Mr. Landry indicated that the stucco does match the house and they had not made a decision on the windows. He wanted to approach this Commission first and see what the approval process would be.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked about the type of roofing material proposed.

Mr. Landry indicated it would be asphalt shingles.

Commissioner Hunter asked about the chimney on the side of the house and if the owner was continuing with the rock or would it be stucco.

Mr. Landry indicated that it is brick and he would continue with brick if he is able to find a match.

Commissioner Carl observed that the existing house charm is asymmetry and the west facing façade looks symmetrical.

Mr. Landry indicated that the windows on the second floor could be changed. The window on the southwest corner is necessary for the bedroom and the window on the northwest could be easily eliminated or changed.

There being no further questions for the Applicant, Commissioner Fitzsimmons closed the public hearings and asked for a motion.

Commissioner Hunter expressed a concern that the new construction may over-power the existing house.

Ms. Giraud indicated that the comments from Commissioner Carl were good. The fenestration and west elevation is asymmetrical with the openings and the approach on the porch. Maybe

the northwest corner could have something done that is more horizontal like a band of windows. Anything so the wall is not left blank.

Commissioner Christensen moved that in Case No. 470-06-46 that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the addition to the existing residential structure at 390 North Wall Street specifying that all applicable City requirements be met. The fenestration for the new addition matches as close as possible in form and materials as the fenestration on the original structure. This motion recognizes that the applicant must also resolve the issue of the inline addition before the permit is issued. The approval includes exceeding the maximum height limit, which is found to be in keeping with structures in the immediate neighborhood. Also that the increased wall height 4 feet over the current zoning limitation be allowed as an exception to the standard rules in order for the design of the structure to be compatible with the original structure.

Commissioner Hunter seconded. All voted "Aye". The motion passed.

At this time (5:10) Commissioner Lloyd joined the meeting.

(This case was heard at 5:12)

Case No. 470-06-45 at approximately 350 South 600 East by Salt Lake City Apartment Builders, represented by Cooper Roberts Architects, requesting approval of Phase II of the Emigration Court project to construct an 118-unit multi-family condominium development. The property is zoned RMF-35 and is located within the Central City Historic District. (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com)

Ms. Giraud presented the Findings of Fact and Staff recommendations as outlined in the Staff Report. The proposal is the second phase of the Emigration Court Development. The Applicant and former owners have worked with the City Council to approve the request to rezone the property to RMU once certain conditions are met. This project involved demolition of fourteen contributing buildings and one noncontributing building for the three phases. The third phase will be along 300 South 600 East. In the East Downtown Master Plan, the entire block straddles two sub areas:

The Brownstone Apartment Mixed Use Area and the Bryant Residential Area. The goals for the Bryant Residential Area in the East Downtown Master Plan are to remain as a medium density, high quality residential neighborhood with large distinctive late 19th Century residential structures that should respect that area.

On March 20, 2003, the City Council approved the re-zoning request from RMF 35 to R-MU with conditions that re-zoning could not take effect until a building permit had been issued. The proposed development must meet the following stipulations:

- The re-zoning will not take effect until a building permit has been issued.
- The proposed development along 600 East must meet these stipulations:
 1. New commercial development is required along the 600 East frontage.
 2. A 15-foot landscaped front yard setback is required.
 3. The height of the buildings along 600 East is limited to 45 feet unless the Historic Landmark Commission approves an alternative design.

- A mid-block walkway between 500 and 600 East would be approved with landscaping and pedestrian oriented amenities.
- The Planning Commission shall approve the proposed development as a planned development.
- The Planning Director and Historic Landmark Commission must approve the final design.

The proposal is to construct a 118-unit condominium building consisting of 9 two-story townhouses, 30 one-bedroom units, 79 two-bedroom units and 229 parking spaces. The parking is accessed from 600 East. The proposed roofline is flat, interspersed with curved roofs at various points. The materials are brick, large Hardiboard panels and Hardiboard lap siding. No E.F.I S. material is proposed. The Applicant is proposing double hung windows.

The Commission purview is to review in terms of Scale and Form, Composition of Principal Facades, Relationship to Street and not the subdivision of the lots.

The Staff finds that the proposed development meets the standards specified in the ordinance, and recommends approval of this project with the following conditions:

1. This approval is for design only; all other City requirements must be met prior to obtaining a building permit.
2. If the Planning Commission proposes alterations that deviate substantially from the proposal reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission, Staff recommends that the proposed construction return to the Historic Landmark Commission.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons then invited the Applicant to come forward to present his power point presentation.

Mr. Søren Simonsen with Cooper Roberts Simonsen Associates came forward. A presentation of slides showing similar but different architectural style apartment buildings was shown. Most have the real deep red brick with two or three double hung windows with a larger panel in between or double hung windows with single windows. He indicated that the apartments would be tucked in mid-block behind the Burger King Restaurant, a flower shop and a credit union. This building would be a level lower than Phase I. One portion of the building is six stories with the top recessed and another wing with five stories. Small courts will be articulated off of 600 East. There will be three levels of parking, two below grade. None of the parking levels are interconnected. A one-way street system around the parking levels would have their own separate access. All of the parking stalls in the two levels below grade will be assigned parking. There will be two parking spaces per unit. Parking for Phase I will match up with level one and is already constructed. There will be a limited amount of parking for guest. The sixth level is a pent-house level that fronts 600 East. These units have 2 or 2 ½ bedrooms with large sun patios. The south elevation will be a concrete podium that continues around the building where the driveway drops down and comes back up. Bays will pop-out with ship-lap hardi-plank siding. The roof deck will not be landscaped, but may have potted plants. The useable section may be the first 10 feet of the deck between the face of the larger building and the roof surface. The rest of the deck may have rock ballast or something more attractive.

At this point and time (5:39 p.m.), Commissioner Haymond left the meeting.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked about the construction schedule.

Mr. Simonson replied after the Historic Landmark Commission has approved the development, they will go to the Planning Commission. They are anticipating that sometime in late January all the necessary approvals will be completed. The developers would like to start construction in late spring.

Ms. Giraud asked about the floor plan on the third level. The units that face 600 East open to a balcony on top of the townhouses, but not the entire roof.

Mr. Simonson replied the plans are not finalized. It is a small area covered by a porch patio covering.

Commissioner Christensen asked about the windows.

Mr. Simonson indicated that windows have not been finalized. They are looking at fiberglass or vinyl. They would like to do something that is paintable so they could use a color that would be a sharper contrast to the stone. They do want to use a double hung with heavy frames and sashes. They are not anticipating using a grid. There will be a full reveal on the windows where they are set into the brick with a 3 or 3 ½ inch setback to have a heavy shadow line. All units are accessible at grade from the parking level with handicapped parking spaces and access from the west side of the building.

Commissioner Lloyd asked about the relationship between Phase I and Phase II.

Mr. Simonson replied that the developer is the same. Phase I has recently been sold. It is managed by a new apartment manager and all the units are apartments. Phase II will be entirely owner-occupied condominiums. The large deck on top of the parking structure is owned by the same owners that manage the apartments of Phase I. There are some agreements that will be shared as this will be a community gathering space.

Commissioner Hunter indicated she lives in the neighborhood and is appreciative of the changes from Phase 1. She thought they could be more of a townhouse design or soften to be into the design of the residential neighborhood. This design is very square. She asked whether the design relates to cost issue or was it the intent to have it square.

Mr. Simonson indicated that the developer is amenable to making the changes if there is an interest.

Ms. Giraud said that the first two story townhouses are similar to the multi-family houses found on 5th East that are now demolished. Salt Lake City does not have a strong row house or townhouse history in the City, but there are a lot of condominiums. She wondered if a porch would make the appearance more like the homes in the area.

Commissioner Hunter offered that she had recently taken pictures of walk-ups in the area that showed the type of details in the brick, porches or soffits with crown molding, etc. She indicated that Phase I has not had good comments.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons asked if there are any other questions. He then asked if anyone in the audience had questions. Hearing none he closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Carl asked if this is a preliminary approval or actual design approval.

Ms. Coffey said that Staff is asking approval for design.

Commissioner Lloyd talked about the Commission being careful to only comment on the design and the limits of historic styles.

Ms. Giraud suggested a subcommittee to get more expertise advice from the architects for the Applicants. She said that maybe this could be continued to the next meeting. This does need to go to the Planning Commission as a planned development. Her concern was that since the Commission has expressed ideas about the roofline, it should not be left to the Planning Staff to decide.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons thought the Commission could follow up with giving general approval except with the final design approval for the townhouses.

Ms. Giraud suggested that the case be continued to the next meeting for final approval. During that time the applicant would have met with a subcommittee. This should not be left to the Planning Commission to make the decision. She also suggested that it should be included in the motion because the major decision is the roof line.

Ms. Coffey indicated that a subcommittee was not necessary. It would be helpful to specify all specific items to be looked at and revise the townhouse unit plans.

Commissioner Lloyd moved that in Case No. 470-06-45 that general approval is given for the application and request they return to the Historic Landmark Commission with a design resolution on the following items:

- **The two-story townhouse roof condition is clarified including proposed use of roof top terraces extent.**
- **Materials in the fenestration of that elevation.**
- **Articulation of the front façade.**
- **Clarification of the design of the 60s façade and elevation including roof and roof top surfaces.**

Commissioner Christensen seconded. All voted "Aye". The motion passed.

Mr. Simonsen asked for clarification. Did the Commissioners want to look for a way to bring more individual identity and if the general approval would allow them to proceed to the Planning Commission?

Commissioner Hunter indicated that the identity should show detail, set backs, something that would make the neighborhood more walking-friendly.

Commissioner Fitzsimmons indicated that was their intention.

Ms. Coffey asked Mr. Simonsen if they had submitted a Planned Development Application.

Mr. Simonsen replied that an application was submitted but did not know if it was for Planned Development but would check into it.

OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Fitzsimmons thanked Elizabeth Giraud again and indicated she had been a joy to work with. Thank you was also extended to Mr. Ikefuna.

Ms. Coffey expressed that more Historic Landmark Commissioners were needed and for everyone to please try and submit names. At this time, representatives for the historic districts are:

- Central City
- University District
- Exchange Place

Representatives needed are:

- Avenues
- South Temple
- Capital Hill
- Historical Society, Heritage Foundation, AIA

General discussion followed on names to be submitted and those staff has already spoken with.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Fitzsimmons called for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Christensen moved to adjourn at 6:20 p.m.

Louise Harris, Secretary

David Fitzsimmons, Chairperson