

Minutes Adopted September 18, 2025

Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes
September 18, 2025

Members Present:

Katie Moor, Chairperson
Chris Baggett
Wesley Barker
Fritz Duda
Peter Evanich
Heather Niehoff

Members Absent:

Colin Kennedy

Village Staff:

Davorka Kirincic, Building and Code Enforcement Manager

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairperson Moor 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:

Chairperson Moor asked if there were any comments or corrections or for a motion to approve the July 17, 2025 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the July 17, 2025 meeting minutes was made by Mr. Barker and seconded by Mr. Baggett. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff

NAYS: None

New Applications:

a. **Case No. 25-13-DR: 933 Green Bay Road - Visual Comfort & Co.: Sign Permit to allow a new wall and double-faced projecting signs, all of which will be on the new building's Green Bay Road elevation of the Subject Property.**

Ms. Kirincic summarized the application in detail for the Board, identifying the property's location and zoning classification. She also referred to the Village's Sign Code as well as to Village Design Guidelines the Board is to consider.

Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions. Ms. Niehoff referred to the backlit lighting and questioned how it would operate. Frank Lambert, representing the applicant from the design sign company, responded that it would be halo or reverse backlit lighting. Ms. Niehoff also asked for the reasoning for the 18-inch size. Ms. Kirincic explained in terms of the design guideline recommendations. Mr. Lambert explained the limitations of how the letters are fabricated and noted the lower-case lettering would be smaller, with only a few letters measuring 18 inches. Ms. Niehoff described it as massive. Mr. Lambert estimated the smaller letter height to be 14 inches and stated that samples were previously provided to the Board for their review. He also described the LED wattage that would be used. Ms. Kirincic provided the Board with additional information.

Chairperson Moor asked if there were any other questions. She indicated the letter size appeared to be a manufacturing issue. Ms. Niehoff commented that the letter size did not seem appropriate and referred to its scale in relation to neighboring buildings. Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the application as submitted or for the applicant to conduct further investigation to determine whether the sign could be scaled to meet the design guidelines, along with an alternative method of backlighting. A Board Member commented the sign is nice, but the Board Members are wrestling with the width. Another Board Member agreed with the comments made and added that it would embrace the Hubbard Woods business district. Another Board Member agreed with the comments made and that the size should be reduced.

1
2 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the request. A motion to approve the request was made by Mr.
3 Duda and seconded by Mr. Baggett. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 5 to 1:

4 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor

5 NAYS: Niehoff

6
7 **b. Case No. 25-14-DR: 191 Linden Street - Saints Faith Hope & Charity Parish: Certificate of**
8 **Appropriateness to allow the replacement of the existing roof on the south wing of the school at the Subject**
9 **Property.**

10 Ms. Kirincic summarized the application in detail for the Board, identifying the property's location and zoning
11 classification. She stated the applicant also provided site plans and referred to the Certificate of Appropriateness
12 Standards and Village Design Guidelines recommendations for the Board's consideration. Chairperson Moor asked
13 Board members if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

14
15 Chairperson Moor asked for the applicant's presentation. Dennis Levin, the church's general contractor,
16 introduced himself to the Board and explained the reasoning for not using clay tile for the roof replacement as
17 opposed to the metal roof used on other buildings in the surrounding area of the school campuses. Mr. Levin
18 explained the reasoning behind their selection, which included cost and the fact that the proposed roof would
19 match the other roof elements. Chairperson Moor asked if they had considered using different roofing materials.
20 Mr. Levin responded that they did and explained their choice, which included the length of time the roof would
21 last.

22
23 A Board Member asked if there is a history regarding other metal roofs. Ms. Kirincic explained that the special use
24 previously requested for the Parish Center included specifications for a metal sheet roof. Chairperson Moor
25 referred to a 2005 GIS image, which showed a metal roof for the church and gym buildings. Ms. Niehoff agreed
26 with Chairperson Moor that it would be better to use higher-quality materials, while acknowledging the complexity
27 and budget concerns. She then stated consistency would be provided on the campus. A Board Member asked if it
28 would be prefinished metal and for the warranty information. Mr. Levin confirmed that it is correct and that it
29 would have a 25-year warranty.

30
31 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the request as presented. A motion to approve the request as
32 presented was made by Mr. Evanich and seconded by Ms. Niehoff. A vote was taken, and the motion was
33 unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

34 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff

35 NAYS: None

36
37 **c. Case No. 25-15-DR: 520 Green Bay Road - BMO Bank: Certificate of Appropriateness to allow exterior**
38 **building and landscaping alterations on the Subject Property.**

39 Chairperson Moor noted that the applicant asked to withdraw. Ms. Kirincic confirmed that the applicant had
40 withdrawn the application and provided a summary of the request to the Board.

41
42 No vote was taken at this time.

43
44 **d. Case No. 25-16-DR: 847 Elm Street - Little Elm: Sign Permit to install window and projecting signs, and**
45 **Certificate of Appropriateness to allow storefront improvements and removal of the existing awning and awning**
46 **valance sign from the previous business on the Subject Property.**

47 Ms. Kirincic summarized the application in detail for the Board, identifying the property's location and zoning
48 classification. She also referred to the Village's Sign Code as well as to Village Design Guidelines that the Board is to
49 consider. Additionally, Ms. Kirincic brought to the Board's attention that the PowerPoint Applicant submitted to be
50 present at the meeting includes additional door window signage, decal updates regarding (including a change of
51 the color), and a different entrance door color than submitted initially with their applications

52

1 Chairperson Moor asked for the applicant's presentation. Kittie Brandtner introduced herself to the Board and
2 stated that they planned to have one large windowpane instead of two aluminum windows. She also mentioned a
3 side divert near the front door, where the logo decal would be placed, making it visible from the sidewalk. Ms.
4 Brandtner noted that there would be no logo on the main window to elevate the space and add charm. A Board
5 Member asked if the blade sign was fixed or on chains. Ms. Brandtner confirmed the blade sign is fixed. He then
6 referred to the design guidelines, which recommend against swinging signage. A Board Member questioned the
7 material to be used. Ms. Brandtner provided a sample to the Board for their review. She also referred to the
8 limestone, which would remain with the brick above. Ms. Brandtner then confirmed that the door would change,
9 along with the quartz on the bottom.

10
11 Ms. Niehoff commented that it looked great. Chairperson Moor agreed with Ms. Niehoff's comments. Chairperson
12 Moor suggested that the Board approve the request, conditional upon the applicant resubmitting it with the decal
13 positioned on the side, featuring new text at the door window, and a different text and door color.

14
15 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the request with a condition. A motion was made by Mr. Baggett,
16 conditional upon the applicant's submission of a revised rendering that includes the decal and updates the
17 proposed signage materials with new text colors and door window signage, as presented in the meeting's
18 PowerPoint. Mr. Duda seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

19 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff

20 NAYS: None

21
22 e. **Case No. 25-17-DR: 555-557-559 Chestnut Street: Certificate of Appropriateness to enable the**
23 **sandblasting, tuckpointing, re-painting, and replacement of two existing windows on the alley elevation of the**
24 **Subject Property.**

25 Chairperson Moor identified the property owner for the commercial building and stated the request is to allow
26 exterior repair and alterations to the existing structure and that the applicant is seeking approval to enable
27 sandblasting, tuckpointing, repainting, and replacement of two windows on the alley elevation. Ms. Kirincic
28 provided additional information to the Board.

29
30 Chairperson Moor stated that the two windows are shown on page 92. She then asked for a motion to approve the
31 request as presented. A motion to approve the request as presented was made by Mr. Baggett and seconded by
32 Mr. Barker. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

33 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff

34 NAYS: None

35
36 f. **Case No. 25-18-DR: 914 Green Bay Road - Sante Integrated Health and Wellness: Sign Permit to install**
37 **door window and projecting signs at the first-floor entrance of the Subject Property.**

38 Chairperson Moor stated the applicant is requesting that the Board consider a sign application as the commercial
39 space lessee as well as a proposed door window and projecting sign at the entrance.

40 Ms. Kirincic summarized the application in detail for the Board, identifying the property's location and zoning
41 classification. She also referred to the Village's Sign Code as well as to Village Design Guidelines that the Board is to
42 consider.

43
44 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the request as presented. A motion to approve the request as
45 presented was made by Ms. Niehoff and seconded by Mr. Barker. A vote was taken, and the motion was
46 unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

47 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff

48 NAYS: None

49
50 g. **Case No. 25-19-DR: 560 Chestnut Street - Neapolitan: Certificate of Appropriateness requesting**
51 **approval to paint portions of the exterior storefront on the Subject Property.**

52 Chairperson Moor stated the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for recent storefront painting
53 changes. Ms. Kirincic summarized the application in detail for the Board, identifying the property's location and

1 zoning classification. She also referred to the Village's Sign Code as well as to Village Design Guidelines that the
2 Board is to consider.
3
4

5 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions. Ms. Niehoff questioned the difference between the blush
6 and brighter pink colors. Ms. Kirincic explained to the Board and stated that the applicant was asked to provide
7 additional information. A Board Member noted that the rendering seemed to include more painted areas than the
8 current storefront photos, which reflect recent paint changes. Ms. Kirincic provided clarification to the Board.
9

10 Chairperson Moor asked for the applicant's presentation. Kelly Golden, the owner, provided a paint sample to the
11 Board. She stated they intended to paint the metal, which she described as dark, along with the door entryway to
12 the pink color they use for their store branding. She referred to the attempts made regarding the paint having
13 different shades and asked if there were any questions.
14

15 Chairperson Moor described the color as very bright, and per the design guidelines, she read from the design
16 guidelines: "Colors shall be used with restraint. Excessive brightness should be avoided." She commented that she
17 preferred the pale pink color, which would still complement the brand well. She noted that the elevation on the
18 rendering, which shows a pale/blush pink color, looks so beautiful and elegant. Ms. Niehoff asked if the color is
19 used throughout the store. Ms. Golden responded to the Board. She confirmed that the limestone and columns
20 would not be painted. Ms. Golden also stated that the color has been tested in terms of its appearance. The Board
21 Members then discussed the shade of pink colors and their intended uses in detail. They liked the pastel
22 pale/blush pink shade shown on the proposed renderings and directed the applicant to get as much of that shade
23 as they could on the storefront. Ms. Neihoff stated that with bright pink color and white limestone columns, the
24 overall appearance looks choppy. It was also concluded that board members would not mind all limestone
25 columns to be painted as shown on the rendering, as mentioned earlier, if the applicant can match that pale/blush
26 shade of pink. It would give a cohesive look to the storefront.
27

28 Ms. Niehoff suggested that if one bright shade of pink is vital to the applicant, it should only be done at the
29 entrance door and the recessed portion. She also stated it is essential to the building as a whole; a lighter
30 pale/blush pink color should be used in order to make it more contiguous. Chairperson Moor agreed with Ms.
31 Neihoff's suggestion and referred to several public comments she had received. Ms. Golden stated that she
32 appreciated the Board's comments and is willing to return to the Board with a lighter pink color. The Chairperson
33 emphasized the importance of reviewing a paint sample before approval, noting that a photo of the paint does not
34 do justice. Mrs. Kirincic suggested that applicants can paint one smaller portion of the storefront to try to match
35 the preferred pastel pale/blush pink color and present it at the next DRB meeting for approval. The applicant
36 agreed to match the pale/blush pink color from the application material's rendering as closely as possible.
37 However, she requested that the approval process be expedited to avoid a one-month delay in painting the
38 storefront. She is embarrassed by the storefront's current appearance and would like to paint it as soon as
39 possible. Members discussed how to expedite approval without waiting for next month's DRB meeting, while still
40 checking and approving a new shade of pale/blush pink that matches as closely as possible, as shown on the
41 application elevation rendering applied to the storefront.
42

43 It was decided that the Board will approve the application with the condition that a paint sample of the desired
44 pale/blush pink color be applied to a portion of the façade, in a couple of areas with different materials (limestone,
45 metal, fascia, and wood), to see how the paint takes to other materials. Also, it was concluded that staff will share
46 by e-mail a photo with a color paint sample applied on the storefront with Board members, get approval of the
47 color shade electronically (that way get back quickly to the Applicant and not postpone the project). After approval
48 of the specific color shade, the Applicant would be able to proceed with painting the whole storefront.
49

50 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to approve the request with a condition. Mr. Duda moved to approve the
51 Applicant application, conditioned on approval of the specific color by staff and committee, which will be
52 conducted electronically in some fashion. Mr. Barker seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion was
53 unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

1 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff
2 NAYS: None

3
4 **Other Business.**

5 a. October 16, 2025, Meeting – Quorum Check.
6 The Board Members discussed their availability.

7
8 **Adjournment:**

9 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Niehoff and seconded by
10 Mr. Duda. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

11 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Evanich, Moor, Niehoff

12 NAYS: None

13 The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

14
15 Respectfully submitted,

16
17 Antionette Johnson

18 Recording Secretary