

**Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals Special Meeting Minutes
March 26, 2026**

Members Present:

Katie Moor, Chairperson
Chris Baggett
Westley Barker
Fritz Duda

Members Absent:

Peter Evanich
Colin Kennedy
Heather Niehoff

Village Staff:

Davorka Kirincic, Building and Code Enforcement
Manager
Scott Mangum, Community Development Director

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 February 19, 2026, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the February 19, 2026, meeting minutes were made by member. Baggett and seconded by member Barker. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Moor

NAYS: None

New Applications:

a. **Case No. 25-28-SU: 225 Sheridan Road - Centennial Beach: A Certificate of Appropriateness to allow installation of fencing on the existing beach. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. On March 17, 2026, the Winnetka Park District submitted a request that the Design Review Board continue the public hearing to April 16, 2026, Design Review Board meeting. At its March 26, 2026, meeting, the Design Review Board only intends to continue the item to its April 16, 2026, meeting and will not be accepting public comment.**

Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to continue the matter to the April 16, 2026, meeting. A motion to continue the matter to the April 16, 2026, meeting was made by member Baggett and seconded by member Duda. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Moor

NAYS: None

b. **Case No. 26-02- DR: 1050 Scott Avenue — Hubbard Woods Public Parking Structure: Sign Permit to allow installation of a new externally illuminated wall sign above the entrance of the public parking structure.**

1 Ms. Kirincic identified the property's location, zoning classification, and existing signage and
2 measurements. She summarized the proposed wall sign request and described the wording, logo, and
3 measurements. Ms. Kirincic referred to an illustration of the existing and proposed signs, along with the
4 design guideline recommendations. She also referred to the application materials and the sign code
5 requirements, which were met. Ms. Kirincic noted that the sign exceeds the recommended height per
6 the Village's Design Guidelines and cited instances in which approval was granted. She referred to the
7 applicable sections of the Village's Design Guidelines that the Board is to consider, and stated Ms.
8 Niehoff provided her comments on the application, which Chairperson Moor read into the record.

9
10 Ms. Kirincic stated that, following the applicant's presentation, public comment, and Board discussion,
11 the Board may either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or
12 comments or make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the request. She then asked if there
13 were any questions.

14
15 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

16
17 Tom Powers, Director of Public Works, summarized the history of how the request came about, which
18 resulted from the public's lack of awareness of public parking. He stated they attempted to match the
19 district's wayfinding, street signage, and street lighting and offered to consider the Board's suggestions.
20 Mr. Powers also stated the request would be done in conjunction with the public garage repairs and
21 referred to the feedback they received from the Village Council. He identified the design company that
22 did the streetscape signage standards with whom they are working.

23
24 Michelle Forsys from the Parvin Clauss sign company stated that their presentation would align with the
25 original design intent and explained the comparison to the current signage. She also explained that the
26 sign's size was due to the font and the number of light fixtures. A Board Member questioned the 14-inch
27 height limitation and the sign band measurements. Ms. Kirincic provided clarification to the Board and
28 noted that the design guidelines are recommendations and not code requirements.

29
30 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any other questions. She commented that the sign appeared
31 large, not proportional to the building, and suggested that it be made less bulky in terms of its
32 appearance, and referred to examples from other locations. Chairperson Moor also stated she agreed
33 with Ms. Niehoff's comments. A Board Member questioned the cost difference. Michelle responded that
34 the letters and emblem are dimensional and explained how the concept was addressed in terms of
35 visibility. She suggested using a thicker font and explained the need for the backing on the sign band.
36 Chairperson Moor suggested reducing the number of lights to three. Ms. Kirincic questioned whether
37 the drawings are drawn to scale and accurately reflect the proportions of the lights relative to the
38 proposed wall sign. Michelle agreed with the suggestions made. Mr. Powers informed the Board that he
39 spoke with the electrical engineer regarding the light fixture's spread. Chairperson Moor suggested and
40 demonstrated a sample of three-dimensional individual pin-mount letters and changed the letter color
41 for better visibility. She also mentioned that it would be nice to have a backlit sign.

42
43 A Board Member suggested that the other letters on the proposed plaque wall sign be lowercase and
44 asked whether the proposed font is consistent with the current Winnetka font. Mr. Powers confirmed it
45 is the same font. A Board Member agreed with the comments made and confirmed they required Metra
46 to scale down their signage.

47

1 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to continue the matter to allow the applicant time to present
2 other options, or to approve the request with conditions, including direction from the Board. A motion
3 was made by member Bagget to continue the request to the April 16, 2026, meeting, with the Board's
4 recommendations to provide a few options for the wall sign for review, and the motion was seconded
5 by member Duda. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

6 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Moor

7 NAYS: None

8

9 **Other Business.**

10 a. April 16, 2026, Meeting – Quorum Check.

11 The Board Members discussed their availability.

12

13 **Adjournment:**

14 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Duda and
15 seconded by Mr. Baker. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

16 AYES: Baggett, Barker, Duda, Moor

17 NAYS: None

18

19 The meeting was adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

20

21 Respectfully submitted,

22

23 Antionette Johnson

24 Recording Secretary

25