



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

Project Address: 4702 Verona Road
Application Type: Major Amendment to a Planned Development (PD)
UDC is an Advisory Body
Legistar File ID #: [81425](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Marvin Keys, First Midwest Group

Project Description: The applicant is proposing a major amendment to an existing Planned Development to expand the existing permitted use list to allow for the reuse of the existing building as a coffee shop.

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **advisory body** on the Planned Development request. For Planned Developments the UDC is required to provide a recommendation to the Plan Commission with specific findings on the design objectives listed in Zoning Code sections 28.098(1), Statement of Purpose, and (2), Standards for Approval (PD Standards Attached), including, more specifically:

PD Standard (e), which generally speaks to coordinating “...architectural styles and building forms to achieve greater compatibility with surrounding land uses and create an environment of sustained aesthetic desirability compatible with the existing or intended character of the area and the statement of purpose of the PD District.”

Summary of Design Considerations

Staff requests that the UDC review the proposed development, provide feedback and make findings regarding the aforementioned standards related to the items noted below.

- **Building Design and Materials.** As noted in the application materials, the proposed changes to the building exterior are primarily limited to painting the existing masonry, adding composite wood siding in various locations on the building, and adding a window on the west elevation.

As noted by the UDC in their Informational Presentation comments, the Commission requested that consideration be given to:

- Utilizing an alternative to painting the masonry, noting that a stain or coating would be preferable, and
- Incorporating storefront windows near the main entrance versus adding windows as proposed in a hallway.

Staff requests the UDC provide feedback and make findings on the proposed exterior building modifications, especially with regard to the painting of masonry, and as it relates to PD standard (e) as noted above.

- **Landscaping.** Staff notes that while there are various site improvements being proposed as part of this application, including relocating the site access and expanding the drive-thru use, full compliance with the

landscape requirements enumerated in the Zoning Code is not being triggered. That being said, the site is required to be brought into compliance, if not already, with the landscape plan on file, which is included in the plan set as Sheet L101.

In addition, new landscape improvements are also reflected on Sheet L100, which show the areas that are to be replanted as a part of the proposed site improvements. With regard to the proposed new landscape, consideration should be given to the use of stone mulch versus hardwood bark mulch, providing adequate year-round screening for the drive-thru, parking areas, especially those fronting the street, above-ground utility boxes, refuse area, etc. In addition, consideration should also be given to the proposed plant selection in terms of heartiness, quantities, etc. Staff requests the UDC's feedback and findings on the proposed new landscape.

- **Lighting.** Staff notes and the applicant is advised that there appear to be discrepancies between the lighting plan and MGO 29.36, including average light levels in parking and pedestrian areas, as well as vehicle use areas (driveway and drive-thru). Plan revisions will be required as part of the Site Plan Review Process.

Summary of Informational Presentation Comments

As a reference, the Commission's discussion from the January 10, 2024, Informational Presentation are provided below.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- Can you confirm this is a paint and not a coating?
 - I believe the original intent is a paint, it's just that narrow strip of red brick that runs along the building. I believe that is intended to be a paint.
- Would you be willing to look at something that is more of a system coating product that will have a longer life cycle than paint?
 - We've gotten feedback like that and addressed that with the folks at Starbuck's.
- Sometimes those paints aren't as long lasting as maybe a Nichiha stain but you can still get the effect you want.
- I'm assuming you're trying to do as little as possible since this is an existing building?
 - Yes, that was the draw to the building.
- I'm thinking about Starbuck's, when I go to coffee shops you don't really see these punched openings, it's more floor to ceiling that lets light in. It looks like the windows are higher than desk height.
 - I know what you're saying. There is a wall where we'll be adding a window but the intent is to keep the windows as they are.
- That would be my only comment, if you could make those bigger windows and lower to the ground, it would help with the experience.
- Even in that one area to the right of the big icon.
- The window you said they're going to add, I would put my money into enlarging the existing windows. You don't need to add a window into a hallway.
- You're right, they'd have to put a header in and everything else.
- Because it's a Planned Development it seems different. The drive aisle isn't in front of the building, I think that's good. I know it's not our purview, but why would a PD have only one allowed use?
 - That's the way the bank set it up. We learned that after acquiring the building.
- (Secretary) The drive-thru is already there, but in terms of these improvements, if this wasn't a PD a lot of these things would be done administratively. This is outside of the TOD, so we're left with what is on file in the PD and it was written specifically for this bank and their use. Since this is a major amendment,

it really is just for this user to locate here. The shift in access point was driven by Traffic Engineering to not interrupt the flow of traffic around the site, and for providing additional space in the drive aisle as well.

- Couldn't they have rezoned to something that would allow this?
- (Secretary) That's a good question. Ultimately, I don't know if that's possible here because it is a triangular shaped lot with multiple sides of frontage and makes it more difficult from a zoning perspective. They look for things to be compliant when they move away from Planned Development zoning.