

**Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals Special Meeting Minutes  
May 7, 2026**

**Members Present:**

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

**Members Absent:**

Colin Kennedy  
Heather Niehoff

**Village Staff:**

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

**Village Attorney:**

Peter Friedman

**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 April 17, 2026 meeting minutes. A motion to approve the April 17, 2026 meeting minutes was made by Mr. Baggett and seconded by Mr. Barker. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Baggett, Barker, Evanich, Moor

NAYS: None

**Recommendations and Determinations:**

**a. Case No. 25-28-SU: 225 Sheridan Road — Centennial Beach: Consideration of approval of findings and recommendation of the Design Review Board on the Certificate of Appropriateness application to allow installation of fencing on the existing beach at 225 Sheridan Road. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Mr. Friedman stated the Board could make a motion to approve the Findings and Recommendations for a Certificate of Appropriateness in Case No. 25-28-SU. Chairperson Moor asked for a motion. A motion as stated by Mr. Friedman was made by Mr. Baggett and seconded by Mr. Barker. Chairperson Moor asked if there were any comments or corrections. No comments were made at this time. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Baggett, Barker, Evanich, Moor

NAYS: None

Mr. Duda arrived at the meeting at this time.

**New Applications:**

1 a. **Case No. 26-04-DR: 562 Lincoln Avenue — Kaage Homes: A Sign Permit to allow installation of**  
2 **a double-faced projecting sign on the existing frame on the street frontage of Subject Property.**

3 Ms. Kirincic identified the property's location and the applicant's lease of the commercial space which  
4 contained an oval projecting sign which she described for the Board. She stated the applicant has changed  
5 their branding and would like to update the signage. Ms. Kirincic stated the Village staff administratively  
6 approved the window signage which she identified for the Board. She then identified the sign's location  
7 and the proposal of a double faced projecting sign on the existing frame and noted the frame was  
8 previously approved for the entire building. Ms. Kirincic described the proposed signage and referred to  
9 the sign code regulations and general sign provisions.

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

15  
16 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. She then  
17 asked for the applicant's presentation.

18  
19 Casey Kaage stated the request is to replace the sign decal in the same location with the same dimensions  
20 with the verbiage and name of the property. Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions. No  
21 questions were raised at this time. Chairperson Moor commented that it looked great and asked for a  
22 motion.

23  
24 A motion was made by Mr. Evanich to issue a Sign Permit to approve the projecting sign as presented. Mr.  
25 Barker seconded the motion. A vote was taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

27 NAYS: None

28  
29 b. **Case No. 26-05 DR: 385 Winnetka Avenue — New Trier High School: A Certificate of**  
30 **Appropriateness to allow multiple directional signs on the existing building and the property.**

31 Ms. Kirincic identified the property's location, zoning classification, site improvements, as well as  
32 illustrations of the seven proposed multidirectional and wayfinding signs. She referred to several statutes  
33 and the exemption from Sign Code regulations, which is the basis for the applicant's submission of a  
34 Certificate of Appropriateness of Design application. Ms. Kirincic stated the applicant must also follow the  
35 Village's design guideline recommendations and building signage general provisions.

36  
37 Ms. Kirincic stated that following the applicant's presentation, public comment, and Board discussion, the  
38 Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or  
39 comments or make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness. She  
40 also referred to the public comment received and provided to the Board and asked if there were any  
41 questions.

42  
43 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. She  
44 asked for the applicant's presentation.

45  
46 Jim Maile, the Physical Plant Director, introduced himself and Mike Fess, the Winnetka Campus Facility  
47 Manager. Mr. Maile referred to the amount of construction on campus and to complaints regarding  
48 wayfinding, parking, etc. He stated that the proposal would include adding four major signs to match

1 those on campus, with the same design. Mr. Maile also referred to the proposed building signage  
2 regarding dock signage and delivery and stated that the request would also unify the door signage. Mr.  
3 Tess stated the dock signage would help alleviate truck traffic in terms of deliveries, which would address  
4 neighbors' concerns relating to traffic.

5  
6 Chairperson Moor questioned the signage's material, which Mr. Maile described to the Board, stating that  
7 it would align with other signage in the community. He then stated that wooden material would have  
8 created maintenance issues. Chairperson Moor asked for the Board's comments. A Board Member stated  
9 the request is fine. Another Board Member stated he appreciated the proposal's consistency with other  
10 signs. Mr. Baggett added that traffic concerns would be addressed. Mr. Evanich agreed with the comments  
11 made.

12  
13 Chairperson Moor asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time.

14  
15 Chairperson Moor then asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Barker to issue a Certificate of  
16 Appropriateness to approve the request as presented. Mr. Barker seconded the motion. A vote was taken  
17 and the motion was unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

19 NAYS: None

20  
21 c. **Case No. 26-06-DR: 547 Chestnut Street — The Lake Effect: A Sign Permit to allow replacement**  
22 **of the awning valance and valance sign on the existing awning at Subject Property.**

23 Ms. Kirincic identified the property's location and existing improvements with two awnings. She stated  
24 the applicant is only looking to replace portions of the valance. Ms. Kirincic described the proposed awning  
25 and referred to material samples provided by the applicant. She also referred to illustrations of both signs  
26 and temporary posters to be removed. Ms. Kirincic summarized the prior approval in September 2023 as  
27 well as the details of the proposed awning request. She noted while the existing frame did not comply  
28 with the code requirements, a variation is not required due to the request to only change the valance.  
29 Ms. Kirincic then identified the text size and referred to the design guidelines with regard to colors,  
30 awnings and materials with which the request complied.

31  
32 Ms. Kirincic stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the  
33 Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or  
34 comments or make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness for  
35 the sign permit together with conditions if appropriate. She asked if there were any questions.

36  
37 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. She then  
38 asked for the applicant's presentation.

39  
40 Allison Cassato of The Lake Effect stated they were formally Chestnut Street Flowers and would begin  
41 construction tomorrow with an estimated completion date of June 10, 2026. She stated the request is to  
42 change the name on the valance. Chairperson Moor questioned the reasoning for the color change which  
43 Ms. Cassato explained to the Board. Chairperson Moor asked for the Board Members' comments.

44  
45 A Board Member commented it would better if it was all navy blue and it would look more intentional.  
46 Mr. Duda stated either option is fine. A Board Member stated he preferred either blue or black with the  
47 old color. The Board Members discussed color alternatives. Ms. Cassato stated they cannot afford to do

1 another awning. Mr. Evanich stated he would be fine with the navy color and that there is no cohesion of  
2 awnings on the street and that he is fine with the request as proposed.

3  
4 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Barker to issue a Certificate of  
5 Appropriateness to approve the request as presented. Mr. Duda seconded the motion. A vote was taken  
6 and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

8 NAYS: None

9  
10 d. **Case No. 26-07-DR: 902 Green Bay Road — Found by Steph: A Sign Permit to allow installation**  
11 **of a window, door, and double-faced projecting sign on the existing frame on the street frontage of**  
12 **Subject Property.**

13 Ms. Kirincic identified the property's location, zoning classification, and referred to storefront views. She  
14 explained the request is for the window and door signs and the projecting sign, which are all code-  
15 compliant. Ms. Kirincic summarized the code requirements for the application components in detail, as  
16 well as the design guideline requirements.

17  
18 Ms. Kirincic stated that following the applicant's presentation, public comment, and Board discussion, the  
19 Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or  
20 comments or make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the requested Certificate of  
21 Appropriateness for the sign permit and any conditions if appropriate. She asked if there were any  
22 questions.

23  
24 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. A Board Member asked whether the mounted  
25 signs needed to be fixed so they don't swing. Ms. Kirincic confirmed that it is correct, and the applicant  
26 can confirm further. Chairperson Moor then asked for the applicant's presentation.

27  
28 The business owner confirmed the sign would not swing and explained how it would be mounted, noting  
29 that it would be similar to their Lincoln Park location. She also clarified that the logo is white and the  
30 vintage is black, because they planned to install café curtains, which would provide some pop. She added  
31 that the vendor did the same for their location in Lincoln Park and for another business in Winnetka. She  
32 confirmed it would be painted on the outside with a sealant.

33  
34 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions and commented that it looked nice. No other  
35 comments were made at this time.

36  
37 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Baggett to issue a Certificate of  
38 Appropriateness for the request as presented. Mr. Duda seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the  
39 motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

41 NAYS: None

42  
43 e. **Case No. 26-08-DR: 1010 Green Bay Road — Bank of America: A Certificate of Appropriateness**  
44 **to replace the existing exterior light fixture at the main entrance of the Bank of America building on the**  
45 **Subject Property.**

46 Ms. Kirincic identified the property's location with Bank of America as the primary tenant and summarized  
47 the request to replace the external light fixture. She identified the proposed light fixture's location,

1 dimensions, and specifications. Ms. Kirincic referred to the design guidelines for building lighting and  
2 stated that the request complied.

3  
4 Ms. Kirincic stated that following the applicant's presentation, public comment, and Board discussion, the  
5 Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or  
6 comments or make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness for  
7 the design as presented, along with any conditions if appropriate. She asked if there were any questions.  
8

9 Chairperson Moor also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. She then  
10 asked for the applicant's presentation.

11  
12 Greg Parcel identified himself as the general contractor representing Bank of America. He stated the goal  
13 is to replace the existing small pendant fixture, which did not emit enough light to enter the vestibule,  
14 which he described as a safety issue. He stated the new fixture would provide a larger light circumference.  
15

16 Chairperson Moor asked if there were any questions. A Board Member asked if the light in the fixture  
17 would be softer or a stark LED light. Mr. Parcel stated the light would be adjusted accordingly. No  
18 additional comments were made at this time.

19  
20 Chairperson Moor asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Duda to issue a Certificate of  
21 Appropriateness to approve the request as presented. Mr. Baggett seconded the motion. A vote was  
22 taken, and the motion was unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

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

24 NAYS: None

25  
26 **Other Business.**

27 a. May 21, 2026 Regular Meeting – Quorum Check.

28 A Board Member noted that agenda items (a), (d), and (e) were routine in nature and suggested

29 expanding Village staff authority to either approve such items administratively to improve  
30 efficiency for applicants. Chairperson Moor responded that granting Village staff such approval  
31 authority would require an amendment to the Sign Code by the Village Council. The Board  
32 Members concurred and agreed to develop proposed language for consideration as a Sign Code  
33 amendment.

34 The Board then discussed member availability and scheduling matters.

35  
36 b. June 3 or 4, 2026 Special Meeting – Quorum Check.

37 The Board Members discussed their availability for the special June 4, 2026, meeting and the meeting  
38 agenda items.

39  
40 **Adjournment:**

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

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

44 NAYS: None

45  
46 The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

1  
2 Respectfully submitted,  
3  
4 Antionette Johnson  
5 Recording Secretary