CALL TO ORDER
Meeting was called to order at 10:32 a.m. Roll was taken. Davison, Wilkosz, Granacki, O'Rourke, Kindelin, Zimmerman, and Torrez were absent.

READING OF THE MINUTES
The minutes were approved. Roll was taken.
CHAIR REPORT
Chair Monroe welcomed everyone to the Council meeting and went over the procedures for the day.

STAFF REPORT
Leibowitz gave a staff report and talked briefly about the division being consolidated with the Department of Natural Resources beginning on July 1. She introduced Director Wayne Rosenthal of DNR. Mr. Rosenthal stated that he fully supports the sites and the public will see no changes.

Granacki, O’Rourke, and Kindelin arrived at 10:40 a.m.

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
LISTINGS

Francis E. Bryant House, Bement
Karen Pecoraro gave the presentation. Granacki had a technical question regarding the 2004 metal roof that was switched out for wood shingles. Which was original? Wood or metal? Pecoraro confirmed that wood was the original. Tatum asked whether the HABS date (1925) was incorrect. Hathaway confirmed it was a typographical error. Tatum asked to specify in the narrative that Aaron Yost was a local carpenter, since the HABS named Jost, which is a similar name. Tatum asked whether the property is the only hall and parlor in the structures survey in the entire state or just Bement. Hathaway explained that it is Bement. Monroe recommended removing the quotes around “restores.” Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Hathaway thanked Pecoraro, who was the intern working on the nomination, and Mark Johnson, the state historic site historian. Hathaway mentioned that the property has been very well maintained and there was nothing comparable in the community. Motion to recommend was made by Euer and seconded by Kindelin. Kindelin stated that it was well presented. Hathaway explained that it was a complicated property; up until 2004-5 the site was interpreted as a hall and parlor with the Lincoln-Douglas debates considered lore. Motion carried.

Granite City YMCA, Granite City
Karen Bode Baxter gave the presentation. Granacki commented that the nomination provided a very thorough context and extensive coverage of social history-extensive. Cullen agreed that the form had a great narrative. Monroe found it interesting to see the ads for swimming included boys and girls segregated. Kindelin was glad the date of significance was extended to include the social history. Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Kindelin. Motion carried.

Torrez arrived at 11:05 a.m.

Zenas Aplington House, Polo
Hathaway gave the presentation. Granacki thought the property could be nominated as Greek Revival, or at a minimum, an Upright and Wing with Greek Revival features. Hathaway explained how the nomination evolved. The property was once covered with non-historic siding and the restoration occurred so long ago that staff was not sure which features were original and which were replicated. The Polo Historical Society did an excellent job with the property. There were no comparable examples of Upright and Wing houses in the community. Staff would be happy to add more about the Greek Revival features and will seek further clarification on what is original. Granacki asked
whether the infill with shed roof was a later addition. Hathaway believed so. Hathaway explained that social history was removed as an area of significance because although the effort to save the property was part of the social history of the community, it happened after the 50 year cut-off for significance. Staff also removed a significant date, since it was regarding Abraham Lincoln’s visit. Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Sundquist and seconded by Euer. Monroe agreed that what Granacki suggested should be added. Motion carried.

**Buffalo Creek Bridge, Long Grove**
Underwood gave the presentation. Sundquist asked whether Joliet Bridge & Iron Company still exist. Underwood replied no. Granacki asked whether the roof detracted from the integrity of the bridge. Euer thought that too, but believed the nomination did a good job of explaining the uniqueness of the bridge construction. Monroe stated that the roof doesn’t hide the bridge, so the historic nature not completely masked. Torrez stated that the decking looked recent. Underwood said it was replaced in the 1920s and probably every 20-30 years since. Torrez asked whether the metal tracking should remain. Underwood answered that engineers have said you need more metal than the wood. Granacki offered if you change the period of significance, you could incorporate the metal tracking. Torrez asked whether it sustained the bridge longer. Underwood said he would have to defer to the experts. O’Rourke asked if there was any intention of interpreting it. Underwood affirmed that they have interpreted it using an audio tour a couple of years ago and would like to do more. Monroe stated that making an effort to interpret it explaining that the covering is not original but the bridge itself is important. Staff opinion (Heckenkamp) was positive. Heckenkamp explained that he checked with IDOT staff who said this is a rare type of bridge, especially with the pedestrian walk. The covering has been a symbol for the city of Long Grove since about 1972. Motion to recommend was made by Tatum and seconded by Lawrence. Monroe stated that the covering is overwhelming but the iron bridge is visible. The Village interprets and explains the significance. Granacki believed that the significance of the iron bridge outweighs the detraction of the roof. Kullen liked that the wood is protecting the iron. Frank Butterfield from Landmarks Illinois spoke on behalf of the bridge, adding that Landmarks placed historical bridges on the endangered list in 2017 and believed this bridge merits listing. Kullen asked how it is endangered. Butterfield explained that Landmarks highlighted bridges across the state; this one was potentially marked for replacement. Leibowitz said it was proposed for a road widening project.

**James B. Irving House, Evanston**
Christopher Enck gave the presentation. Frank Butterfield from Landmarks Illinois spoke on behalf of the property. Granacki asked for clarification on Criteria Consideration B. Discussion followed regarding the property’s current setting vs. its original location. Enck explained that it was a challenge to find a lot to fit the house; the ultimate configuration will be closer to the original. The current lot is 57’ wide and he couldn’t really do 50’ like the original lot. Both have the same alley access. O’Rourke said the nomination does not include a plan showing the original lot. Enck said originally, the Ivirs had a temporary residence built in 1918 and then this house was built in 1928. In 2012 the 1918 house was removed and is now in storage. Members noted that they would like to see photos or more documentation of the two houses together. Monroe asked whether Criterion B could be added for the architect, Van Bergen. Heckenkamp said why Criterion C was used and explained that the property had local architectural significance for Evanston. Tatum agreed with Granacki that he wanted to see more information in the nomination as to why this meets Criterion B consideration and asked to include the National Register Bulletin language. Would like Heckenkamp said staff will work with the applicant to strengthen the argument.
Council broke for lunch at 12:05 p.m. Meeting resumed at 12:42 p.m.

**Shoreline Apartments, Chicago**
Cramer gave the presentation. Granacki asked how Chicago took over the building. Cramer responded possibly through eminent domain. Cullen asked where the property was in location to the proposed Obama library. Cramer explained that it was south of the Obama library. Tatum pointed out corrections. Granacki asked for a summary paragraph at the end of the statement of significance that has the status of other buildings and an explanation of why the property is significant. Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Hathaway explained that the property was assessed within the Community Area, it was orange-rated in the Chicago Survey, and a good example of the style and comparable to other building types. Motion to recommend was made by Kindelin and seconded by Mann. Motion carried.

**Covent Hotel, Chicago**
Fiergens gave the presentation. Granacki asked whether the room configuration was retained or altered. Fiergens explained that they were slightly enlarged to provide for bathrooms. Tatum wanted to know about the decision-making process regarding the property’s integrity, since it seemed like a big change to lose the theater. Hathaway offered to answer that during staff opinion. O’Rourke mentioned that in discussion, it was originally listed as a different name. The nomination needs a current map to show that the street is now Drummond Avenue, and there needs to be a North Arrow on the existing map. O’Rourke also asked whether there was any information on the first floor businesses. Fiergens mentioned there was a Western Union office. Torrez asked whether the configuration of the retail space changed. Kindelin inquired about the loss of the theater. Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Hathaway explained that staff considered the theater, and it would have been an issue, but now the property is being evaluated under the Multiple Property Document (MPD) for Residential Apartment Hotels in Chicago. The requirements for listing are based on the MPD. The retail and theater space are not considered under the MPD. The questions to answer now are: is the property made for medium-to-lower income residents, does it have shared spaces -- reception, common areas, and check-in --, does it have small apartments, and are the corridors intact? If it were evaluated on its own, staff would have a big issue with the loss of the theater. Granacki mentioned that the property has two end-bays. The theater end matches the other end. The architectural intent was to look residential. Hathaway explained that within the context of MPD, the property has very good integrity. It has all of the features we expect it to have when evaluating within the context of the MPD. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Tatum. Motion carried.

**John Lothrop Motley School, Chicago**
Cramer gave the presentation. Granacki asked whether the maps legible could be made legible. Granacki also said the nomination offered good comparisons and made a case for the prototype. Granacki complimented the summary at the end of the nomination. Kindelin added that the nomination was nicely tied together. Granacki asked how the classrooms will be dealt with in the renovation. Torrez explained that there were many prototype schools. This falls in place in the context of the Board of Education creating these schools. Motley School is a good one to highlight. Discussion followed about changes in school regulation. Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Motion to recommend was made by Lawrence and seconded by Tatum. Motion carried.
Baptist Retirement Home, Maywood

Ramsey gave the presentation. Kullen told Ramsey that he believed she made the case for Criteria A, questioned whether the property retained enough material to tell the story physically, since there has been a lot of wreckage. Ramsey explained that this nomination has been a question of integrity. Ramsey reasoned that the property was the only example of its type in Maywood and the region. The nominated was vetted through the Part 1 process at the National Park Service. Granacki believed that the Tudor façade was significant and impressive enough for Criterion C. Granacki continued that the property expressed enough integrity but the nomination needed more discussion of Mid-Century Modern. Ramsey agreed to add to the narrative calling out these features. Torrez has how much of the interior finishes were intact. Ramsey said she viewed the interior as a hierarchy. The ground floor has primarily public spaces that are more ornamented. The 1930s section had more Tudor Revival intact. The north lobby had an open floor plan which would still be seen as similar to the historic space. The corridors are the same throughout – a repetition. Ramsey believed that there was enough remaining in the two upper floors to show what the typical layout looked like. In the center of the building the 1930s corridors remain. The walls are gone on 2nd and 3rd floors, but the exterior and primary interior spaces, though altered, still read as they were and together have enough integrity. Cullen questioned whether this was the case with the walls out. Ramsey replied that the ground floor has demarcation as spaces, center dining room, chapel, etc. The upper floors are not all intact but there are representative examples. Granacki asked what was in the wings on the first floor. Ramsey answered that there were no special places in the wings. There were units with corridors and on the north side there was a kitchen, library, and offices. O’Rourke as if the roof had been repaired from the fire. Ramsey affirmed that it had. Granacki reiterated that she thought there was enough interior integrity. Monroe asked to explain the NPS Part 1. Staff opinion (Hathaway) was positive. Hathaway explained that staff had similar concerns and went to see it. Hathaway clarified that she won’t give a positive opinion to any property she cannot argue in favor of. Hathaway continued that staff had concerns about the missing elements that were caused by a bad rehab in 2014. Within the community, the home is an excellent example of Tudor Revival, but in the 1960s almost an identical amount of space was added. This was a significant change but also significant in the property’s history. If the office receives a Part 1 for tax credit, the property is not listed or in a historic district. Staff reviews the Part 1 to see if it is eligible. Normally we add a staff opinion when sending this to the NPS but this time staff sent it without comment. We wanted their opinion. We asked for their advice, which was to argue both Criterion A & C. The Tudor architecture is exceptional. The property also shows two distinct patterns in care of the elderly and how it changed over time. It starts looking more like a hospital in the later addition. There were no architectural comparable properties. The property was the only Baptist retirement home in a five-state region. Monroe asked whether the damage was limited to the upper floors. Ramsey said no, some partitions were removed but the spaces still retained their finishes, volume, and details. The 2nd and 3rd floors did not. Zimmerman asked whether the home had a chaplain. Ramsey responded that sometimes the space was referred to as a chapel and sometimes meeting room. The local Baptist Church was involved with the home. Motion to recommend was made by Granacki and seconded by Euer. Cullen believed that if it was being nominated under Criterion A, there should be something intact on interior. Monroe was concerned about Criterion A but persuaded by the narrative. Ramsey said historically, the exterior does reflect the history of retirement homes. The 1930s portion was designed to look residential and not look like a hospital to persuade people to feel at home. The later 1960s addition looks -- and was -- more institutional. Zimmerman asked whether it become a nursing home. Ramsey explained
that later on, it had more intensive options. Torrez concurred with the point about interior integrity and asked what percent was still in place. Kindelin believed it was an important building for Maywood and asked whether there would be a benefit to talk about 1930s section only. There is nothing remaining in the modern part. Ramsey said the chapel block in the addition remains. Granacki thought the whole building should considered. Hathaway added that the newer part was modernized in the 1980s. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

The next meeting is October 27 in Springfield.