

PLAN COMMISSION

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE – STORAGE CENTERS IN THE OFFICE DISTRICT

January 22, 2024

Title

PC 24-01

Petitioner

Village of Lombard
255 E. Wilson Avenue
Lombard, IL 60148

Property Location

Village-wide

Approval Sought

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting a text amendment to Section 155.412(C) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for “storage center” to be listed as a defined conditional use in the O Office District.

Prepared By

Anna Papke, AICP
Planning and Zoning Manager

DESCRIPTION

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting a text amendment to Section 155.412(C) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for “storage center” to be listed as a defined conditional use in the O Office District.

Currently, storage centers are not allowed in the Office District. The proposed text amendment would make storage centers conditional uses in the O District, subject to the Plan Commission/Village Board approval process. The Plan Commission conducted a workshop on this topic in November 2023, at which time the Plan Commissioners expressed support for allowing storage centers in the O District as conditional uses.

APPROVAL(S) REQUIRED

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting a text amendment to Section 155.412(C) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for “storage center” to be listed as a defined conditional use in the O Office District.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW

Building Division:

The Building Division has no comments regarding the proposed text amendment to the Village Code.

Fire Department:

The Fire Department has no comments regarding the proposed text amendment to the Village Code.

Private Engineering Services:

Private Engineering Services has no comments regarding the proposed text amendment to the Village Code.

Public Works:

The Department of Public Works has no comments regarding the proposed text amendment to the Village Code.

Planning Services Division:

Planning staff proposes to add storage centers to the O Office District as a conditional use. Storage centers are not currently allowed in the Office District in any form. Permitted uses in the O District include office space, medical offices, and personal care services. Conditional uses include day care centers, hotels/motels, restaurants, and schools.

The majority of Office District property within the Village is located near the Butterfield Road and 22nd Street corridors. Much of this property is developed with traditional office buildings. Staff is aware that the market for traditional office space has shifted in recent years. Many companies have transitioned to remote or hybrid work models, resulting in a surplus of vacant office space in many communities. Anecdotally, staff has heard from owners of traditional office buildings that they are having difficulty filling vacancies. Staff has also noticed an increase in inquiries about potential uses in the Office District other than traditional office tenants, including schools (which are a conditional use) and data centers.

Staff has received several inquiries in recent months seeking to convert vacant office buildings to storage centers. In response to these inquiries, staff conducted a workshop with the Plan Commission in November 2023 to gather feedback on the possibility of amending the Office District to allow for storage centers. During the workshop, Plan Commissioners signaled support for adding storage centers to the Office District as a conditional use.

Storage centers are currently permitted uses in the I Limited Industrial District and conditional uses in the B4 and B4A Districts. Several new storage centers have been built in the Village in the last 10 years, including Public Storage at 880 E. Roosevelt Road and Extra Space Storage at 1125 E. St. Charles Road. Both developments are located along commercial corridors where they are adjacent to other commercial and residential uses. Staff observes these storage centers have been quiet land uses without adverse impacts to neighboring properties. The amount of traffic generated by storage centers has been equal to or less than the traffic generated by other uses allowed in commercial districts.

Based on experience with existing storage centers in the Village, staff finds storage centers to be compatible with the other permitted and conditional uses in the Office District. Further, as a conditional use, each potential storage center in the O District will be subject to review by the Plan Commission and Village Board. This process allows for consideration and mitigation of potential impacts associated with the unique circumstances of each proposed storage center in the O District.

The Village Code definition of “storage center” is below for reference. Staff is not proposing any changes to this definition. Note that storage centers are distinguished from mini warehouses by the presence of a central internal entrance. Mini warehouses are typically fenced properties with external access to storage units. The proposed text amendment relates only to storage centers. Mini warehouses would not be allowed in the O District.

Storage center is a structure containing individual storage units with access to individual units provided only through a central internal entrance and is intended for warehousing of personal property, as opposed to commercial inventory. Storage centers may also include as an ancillary use, the retail sales of related storage items, rental and/or storage of vehicles in conjunction with storage.

EXISTING & PROPOSED REGULATIONS

The proposed text amendments are as follows. Additions are denoted by **bold and underline**. Deletions are denoted by a ~~striketrough~~.

§ 155.412 - O Office District requirements.

(C) *Conditional uses.*

(24) Storage centers.

STANDARDS FOR TEXT AMENDMENTS

For any change to the Village Code, the standards for text amendments must be affirmed. The standards are noted below:

1. *The degree to which the proposed amendment has general applicability within the Village at large and not intended to benefit specific property;*
The proposed text amendment is applicable to all properties in the Office District. It would not benefit a specific property.
2. *The consistency of the proposed amendment with the objectives of this ordinance and the intent of the applicable zoning district regulations;*
The proposed text amendment is consistent with the objectives of the Village Code.
3. *The degree to which the proposed amendment would create nonconformity;*
The proposed amendment would not create any nonconformities.
4. *The degree to which the proposed amendment would make this ordinance more permissive;*
The proposed amendment will add storage centers as a conditional use to the Office District. While it expands upon the potential uses in the Office District, the text amendment would not inherently make the Zoning Ordinance more or less permissive.
5. *The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan; and*
Staff finds that the proposed amendment would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
6. *The degree to which the proposed amendment is consistent with village policy as established in previous rulings on petitions involving similar circumstances.*
The Village has a history of amending the Village Code to address changing circumstances or to provide clarity. The proposed amendment is consistent with established Village policy in this regard.

FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee has reviewed the petition and finds that it meets the standards required by the Village Code. As such, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending approval of this petition:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested text amendment **complies** with the standards required by the Village of Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings and recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 24-01.

Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report approved by:



William J. Heniff, AICP
Director of Community Development