Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
May 15, 2025

Members Present:	Fritz Duda Colin Kennedy Paul Konstant Heather Niehoff
Members Absent:	Katie Moor Michael Ritter
Village Staff:	Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:
Chairman Duda called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Public Comments:
No comments were made at this time.

Approval of Minutes:
Chairman Duda asked if there were any comments or for a motion to approve the April 17, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the April 17, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Konstant and the motion was seconded by Ms. Niehoff. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:
AYES: Duda, Kennedy, Konstant, Niehoff
NAYS: None

Continued Application:

a. **Case No. 25-03-SU: Hubbard Woods Train Station (1065 Gage Street): Certificate of Appropriateness to allow renovation of the existing train depot and train platform, and construction of a new pedestrian bridge, new accessible ramps, new stairs and elevators to the train platform, and new warming shelters. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. This item was continued from the April 17, 2025, Design Review Board Meeting.**

Ms. Klaassen summarized the continued application with regard to the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed improvements. She also summarized the applicant's response to the requested changes. Ms. Klaassen then provided a summary of the ZBA's consideration of the application and its recommendation of approval noting that the Plan Commission is to consider the request at their May 22, 2025, meeting. She referred to the Certificate of Appropriateness standards the Board is to consider to determine if the proposed renovation and site improvements comply with those standards. Ms. Klaassen noted additional public comment was received and stated following the applicant's presentation and Board deliberation, the Board may either continue the matter to a date certain or make a recommendation to the Village Council with draft language of a motion included on page 12. She asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

Patricia Davidson, TYLin International design consultant, Glen Peters, Metra Senior Director of Capital Projects, Roya Basirirad, Metra Project Manager, and Christopher Meyers, Metra Senior Historic Preservation Specialist introduced themselves to the Board. Ms. Davidson referred to their responses to the Board's prior comments relating to the elevator towers, railing designs, signage and speaker volume which are included in the application materials.

Mr. Meyers described the SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) review process undertaken in connection with the elevator tower design and referred to illustrations for the Board's review. He identified the consulting parties who reviewed the 2021 design as FTA and SHPO along with several members of the Village including Brian Norkus, Mary Trieschmann and Meaghan McChesny of the Winnetka Historical Society. Mr. Meyers stated the 2021 plan presented imitated the station base along with various elements including the roofline, coining and window separation via muttons which SHPO determined to be too much of a copy of the original station and not in line with the Secretary of the Interior Standards with regard to the treatment of historic property rehabilitation standards. Mr. Meyers then described the changes made to the revised proposal which included a larger brick portion and a limited amount of stone on the facade to differentiate between the depot and elevator towers, different aluminum frame windows along with the installation of historic plaques which identify the construction date.

Ms. Davidson referred to the prior discussion relating to the color scheme for the railings with a color palette similar to the windbreaks. Mr. Meyers also referred to the prior discussions with SHPO relating to color. Ms. Davidson then stated the signage size was reduced as requested by 75% and described the proposed signage lettering and color. She stated the speaker volume would also be reduced. Mr. Meyers asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Konstant asked if the signage would be illuminated. Ms. Davidson confirmed it would not. Ms. Davidson stated the signage would be aluminum pin lettering. She stated a variance would be requested with UP in connection with the railing height on the pedestrian bridge and updated renderings were provided in the bronze color as well as the light fixtures. Mr. Meyers referred to standard no. 9 and explained how the proposal complied with the design guidelines. Ms. Niehoff commented that the quality has not been met with regard to the towers. Mr. Meyers explained the reasoning behind the manner in which the towers were designed.

Mr. Konstant suggested the limestone plinth as an element that can be used in a way which would support the building as opposed to the long brick shaft. He commented he liked the initial design better. Mr. Meyers responded if they attempted to delineate the recessed area of the depot, it would result in replacing the base of the depot. He also stated any major change in the design element would reopen Section 106 which would extend the project timeline out possibly a year or more. Mr. Meyers stated he did not believe they would get approval from SHPO.

Chairman Duda commented on the difficulty of making elevator towers look good and suggested coming up with ideas to make the blank brick walls look better. Mr. Meyers referred to an illustration which showed full brick at Elm Street and the attempt to make it consistent. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Duda then called the matter in for discussion. He referred to the process starting in 2020 and the input received from the Village and the three bodies that have to consider the request. Chairman Duda stated he would be in favor of recommending approval of the request with conditions.

Ms. Niehoff stated while she appreciated the long process the applicant has endured, the request must be considered in a manner that met the Village’s standards. She then suggested something more happen within the brick to provide an additional sense of quality. Ms. Niehoff stated the proposal did not fit in the Village and she hoped a compromise can be reached that did not require them to go back before SHPO or the FTA. Mr. Meyers responded adding coins would be considered a change and would require approval from the consulting parties since it represented a change from the agreement.

Ms. Klaassen advised the Board of their options. Chairman Duda suggested a motion for approval be made with recommendations. He then asked for a motion to approve the application as presented. A motion to recommend approval was made by Mr. Kennedy and seconded by Mr. Konstant. A vote was taken and the motion failed, 2 to 2:
AYES: Duda, Kennedy
NAYS: Konstant, Niehoff

Chairman Duda then asked for a motion to approve the request with conditions which did not require the applicant to re-present to SHPO and the FTA. He asked the applicant if changes such as that on the brick on the east and west sides at Elm Street would represent a major change. Mr. Meyers confirmed that is correct and explained the change in the Secretary of the Interior architectural standards. He identified certain aspects of the design which reflect the design guidelines. Mr. Peters provided a further explanation as to why they are limited in terms of what can be done from an historical perspective. Ms. Niehoff suggested more modern articulation methods be used. The Board Members discussed options at length which would provide articulation.

Chairman Duda asked for a motion to continue the matter based on the Board's feedback or to recommend approval with conditions or denial. A motion to deny the request was made by Ms. Niehoff and seconded by Mr. Konstant. A vote was taken and the motion was passed, 3 to 1:
AYES: Duda, Konstant, Niehoff
NAY: Kennedy

Chairman Duda suggested there be constructive dialog with the Board Members and the applicant in compliance with the Open Meetings Act prior to the next meeting. The Board Members and the applicant decided to hold a workshop at this meeting in order to come to a consensus. A motion was made by Ms. Niehoff to reconsider the matter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Konstant. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:
AYES: Duda, Kennedy, Konstant, Niehoff
NAYS: None

The Board Members and the applicant then discussed several design options in detail. Chairman Duda closed the public work session and asked for a motion to continue the matter to the June 19, 2025, meeting. A motion as stated by Chairman Duda was made by Mr. Konstant and seconded by Ms. Niehoff. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:
AYES: Duda, Kennedy, Konstant, Niehoff
NAYS: None

Other Business.

a. June 19, 2025, Meeting – Quorum Check.

The Board Members discussed their availability. Ms. Klaassen informed the Board they hoped to have a new Board Member and that they would have to determine if there would be a quorum for the June meeting or if there would need to be a special meeting.

Adjournment:

Chairman Duda asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Duda, Kennedy, Konstant, Niehoff

NAYS: None

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

Recording Secretary