Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
August 17, 2023

Members Present:	Katie Moor, Chairperson Fritz Duda Paul Konstant Maggie Meiners Heather Niehoff
Members Absent:	Michael Ritter
Village Staff:	David Schoon, Director of Community Development Davorka Kirincic, Building and Code Enforcement Manager

Call to Order & Roll Call:
Chairperson Moor called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Ms. Kirincic took a roll call of the Board Members present.

Public Comments:
No comments were made at this time.

Approval of July 20, 2023, Regular Meeting Minutes:
Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the July 20, 2023, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the July 20, 2023, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Neihoff and seconded by Mr. Duda. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:
AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff,
NAYS: None

Chairperson Moor then requested a motion to take the agenda out of order and consider the Lakeside Foods agenda item as agenda item No. 1 and the BP Gas Station agenda item as agenda No. 2. A motion was made to take the agenda out of order was made and seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:
AYES: Duda, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff, Konstant,
NAYS: None

Continued Applications:

a. **Case No. 23-15-DR: 800 Elm Street – Lakeside Foods: An amended Application for a Sign Permit to allow the installation of window signs on the storefront of the building located at 800 Elm Street and a Sign Code Variation to allow the installation of window signs that exceed 10% of their respective window area. This item was continued from the July 20, 2023, Board meeting.**

Chairperson Moor stated that the applicant submitted an application and presented at the July 20, 2023, meeting to allow the installation of window signs on the storefront of the building located at 800 Elm Street and a Sign Code Variation to allow the installation of window signs that exceed 10% of their respective window area. Ms. Kirincic provided a staff presentation to the Board.
Ms. Kirincic emphasized that the applicant has provided the attached revised storefront elevation renderings in the Agenda Packet, which was sent out and posted on the Village website. The primary changes include removing posters of food and banners with black backgrounds and food items listed in

white text from all windows previously proposed at the DRB meeting on July 20, 2023. She summarizes which window signs exceed the max. allowed 10% of sign coverage of the window area and explained that the doorway signs comply and do not exceed an allowed 50% of the door sign coverage. Also, the proposed signs comply with the maximum allowed sign area street exposure allowance.
Ms. Kirincic notified DRB that the applicant proposed a different design since the Agenda Packet went out and would like to represent it to BRD tonight. She summarized that the applicant requests additional signs on the back doorway/Chestnut Court Elevation with the new proposal. These doorway signs were not included in the original Agenda Packet for this meeting. Additionally, she stated that the staff briefly reviewed the new proposed signage and concluded that Variation is still needed for window signs exceeding 10% of the respective window area but also needs a Variation exceeding 15 % of the Sign Street Exposure on the Elm Elevation (16%). Front entrance doorway signs at Elm Elevation comply and do not exceed the max. 50% sign coverage of the door glass area. The back doorway signs/Chestnut Court Elevation comply and do not exceed the max. 50% sign coverage of the door glass area. Also, the total sign area on Chestnut Court Elevation complies and does not exceed 15% of the allowed Sign Street Exposure. I would ask the Applicant to represent their new proposal.
Afterward, Ms. Kirincic asked the Applicant to represent the newest proposed signage.

Kevin Janke, Sign Company Representative/Applicant, represented the newest sign proposal.
He referred to the Board to an illustration of the windows and color change being proposed. Chairperson Moor commented that the proposal is an improvement over the prior submission and would prefer the image at the bottom not to be red. She then asked the Board Members for their comments. Ms. Meiners described the proposal as sophisticated and agreed with Chairperson Moor's comments with regard to the red color. Mr. Fritz, Mr. Konstant, and Ms. Niehoff agreed with the comments made. Ms. Niehoff added that she preferred the wine glass image at the bottom. The Board Members thanked the applicant for making the changes.

Additional information was provided with regard to the request. The initial presenter identified an image that would also be part of the project. Ms. Kirincic identified the signage's percentage coverage in the windows, noting that the windows would exceed the maximum by 10% and that the door signage is compliant. Chairperson Moor suggested that the images be reduced by 20% in order to be compliant and would look better. The Board Members discussed image alternatives. The applicant asked if seating could be added to the front. Mr. Schoon responded that there would have to be enough pedestrian clearance, and a permit would need to be obtained. The applicant stated that the image placement was intentional in order to allow visibility. The Board Members agreed that the imagery should be removed from the window sign panel.

Chairperson Moor asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Konstant asked the applicant if they would consider leaving the wine bottle imagery from the original presentation on the window on Elm. The applicant referred to an image in the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Schoon then provided the applicant with information regarding outdoor seating requirements.

Chairperson Moor then requested a motion to approve the request contingent on removing the red color and the imagery underneath the Panini soup and salad bowl wording, along with a slight reduction in the imagery size in the window. A motion to approve the request, as stated by Chairperson Moor, was made by Mr. Duda. The motion was seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed,
5 to 0:

AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff
NAYS: None

b. **<u>Case No. 22-10-DR: 1025 Tower Road – BP Gas Station</u>: An amended Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow exterior alternations to the main building and gas canopy at 1025 Tower Road. This item was continued from the April 21, 2022, Board meeting.**
Chairperson Moor stated that the applicant submitted an application presented at the April 2022 meeting to allow exterior alternations to the existing gas station main building and gas canopy.

Ms. Kirincic provided a staff presentation to the Board. The Applicant provided the revised site plan, visuals, elevation renderings, and proposed building lighting specifications and came to represent a revised design incorporating DRB suggestions at the April 2022 DRB meeting. The primary changes include adding sconce lights on the white stucco fascia, removing the arched stone-clad gable at the parapet horizontal ends of the building previously proposed at the DRB meeting on April 21, 2022, and replacing it with arched thin stone veneer, which matches the existing stone base of the building, only above the entrance door. The proposed large canopy columns would have the same thin stone veneer at the base and white stucco at the upper portion of the columns to achieve a cohesive look with the main building.

Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions. Ms. Niehoff referred to the applicant's company colors and questioned how green and white would be incorporated into the proposal. Saab Akhtar, General Contractor of the project, provided the Board with information relating to the color choices for the application. Mr. Nick Panchal, the owner of BP Gas Station, informed the Board that they are leasing the gas station and identified the current sign and location approved by the Village. He confirmed they did not want the BP sign or logo with the only BP sign included on the pricing signage. Mr. Akhtar referred to the maximum sign allowed on the pump, which was approved, and noted that promotional signage is also not allowed on top of the pumps. He then informed the Board that the canopy color was previously black, and the colors were changed during the remodel. Mr. Akhtar confirmed that everything else would remain the same. The second presenter identified the finish to be used on the band and canopy.

Ms. Niehoff questioned the stone piece size. The first presenter stated it would be custom work and estimated the size to be between 4x6 or 4x8 inch pieces. He also stated that red brick and a slab would go on top of the stone. He noted that stucco would remain at the top. The Board Members commented that the area above the entry door appeared plain. Mr. Akhtar stated that a sign over the door could be added.

Chairperson Moor stated that the revised request is a big improvement over the previous proposal. Ms. Niehoff agreed with Chairperson Moor's comments.

Chairperson Moor asked if there were any other questions. No additional questions were raised at this time. She then asked for a motion to approve the request as presented. A motion to approve the request as presented was made by Mr. Duda, and Ms. Niehoff seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion passed 5 to 0:
Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff
NAYS: None

New Applications:

a. **Case No. 23-16-DR: 1083 Gage Street – Northshore Barbershop: Sign Permit to allow existing window and door signs to remain at the storefront of the Northshore Barbershop and a Sign Code Variation to allow installation of window signs that exceed 10% of their respective window area.**

Ms. Kirincic provided information regarding the request to the Board. She stated that the applicant has three additional locations and identified the image for their trade sign, which exceeded the requirements by 10%. Ms. Kirincic also stated that the signage would extend across the mullions and would be located on the upper 1/3 of the window, which needed to meet administrative approval requirements. She also mentioned that the signage would be applied to the glass's exterior.

Chairperson Moor asked if the wording on the awning was compliant. Ms. Kirincic confirmed it is 5 inches, within the Sign Code requirements, and is consistent with the building. Chairperson Moor commented that the fact that the applicant has other locations is unacceptable and suggested that the logo be reduced in size. Mr. Duda stated that the signage is fine and referred to the 10% size limitation as a problem for many retailers. He stated that they should be consistent in their application of the requirements. Mr. Duda stated that the mullion affected its appearance and would have been fine if it had not been there. Ms. Meiners referred to the issue of the Board's consideration of various logos and the fact that it is an existing sign done during COVID-19. She suggested approval only be given due to the fact that it existed during Covid circumstances and to confirm it is not because of their logo. Ms. Meiners then stated that in terms of consistency, she would prefer to see similar signage in the Village and referred to the sign's aesthetics and font. She commented that consistency is difficult since each store and brand is different, which is problematic. Ms. Meiners concluded they should note in the record the Board's reasoning for approving the request.

Chairperson Moor stated the Board could approve the request since it was installed during Covid and referred to the mullion, which affected the design. She then asked for a motion to approve the request. Mr. Duda moved to approve the request as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Meiners. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff
NAYS: None

b. **Case No. 23-17-DR: 80 Green Bay Road – John Plunkett Interiors: Sign Permit to allow installation of wall and glass door signs at the building located at 80 Green Bay Road and a sign Code Variation to allow a non-street exposure wall sign to exceed twenty square feet in area.**

Chairperson Moor stated the application would be continued to the September 21, 2023, meeting and asked for a motion to continue the request. Ms. Meiners moved to continue the application to the September 21, 2023, meeting. Mr. Duda seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff
NAYS: None

Other Business.

a. September 21, 2023, Meeting – Quorum check.

The Board Members discussed their availability.

Public Comment.

No comments were made at this time.

Adjournment:

Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Konstant and seconded by Mr. Duda. A vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Duda, Konstant, Meiners, Moor, Niehoff

NAYS: None

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson
Recording Secretary