

December 6, 2007

Mr. William J. Mueller,
Village President, and
Board of Trustees
Village of Lombard

Subject: PC 07-39: Text Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance – Collection Centers

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The Village of Lombard requests approval of text amendments to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to establish definitions and regulations for collection centers as a conditional use within the B3, B4, B4A and I Districts.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on November 19, 2007. William Heniff, Senior Planner, presented the petition and submitted the staff report to the public record. He stated that as a companion to the requested actions associated within PC 07-40, a text amendment is requested to establish regulations for attendant collection centers. The amendments are intended to allow for such facilities as conditional uses in the B3, B4, B4A and I Districts. This amendment establishes definitions for such centers, which would distinguish it from recycling centers or other outdoor sales and service activities.

The Zoning Ordinance currently does not have any regulations pertaining to such collection centers, per se. The closest existing regulations for the business district is the “outdoor display, sales and storage of items, the sale of which is permitted in the district”, which is listed as a conditional use. Within the I District, recycling collection centers is listed as a conditional use.

In consideration of this amendment, staff is proposing a new term associated with collection centers, to distinguish it from traditional recycling centers. The amendment will establish “Collection Center, Attendant” to define the clothing drop-off activity typically done by non-profit entities. As it could be argued that attendant collection centers are a type of recycling, the recycling collection center definition is being modified to strengthen the difference between the two uses.

December 6, 2007

PC 07-39

Page 2

He then discussed the proposed language. The definition provides for collection centers that are manned (either in the form of volunteers or staff). This would preclude drop boxes that are arbitrarily dropped off on properties. Attendant facilities are desired over remote drop boxes as the staffing helps minimize impacts of fly-dumping and help ensure that its operation will be compatible with adjacent land uses. He also noted the term “manned” was meant to reflect an on-site person managing the premises, but would also find the term “staffed” acceptable. He stated that attendant collection centers are proposed to be listed as conditional uses within the B3, B4, B4A and I Districts. These districts provide the greatest compatibility with the proposed use.

He then noted the “collection center, recycling” amendment is intended to help further distinguish it from attendant collection centers. The current definition also includes a number of regulations associated with the operation. As it not good practice to include regulations within definitions, this struck language is being inserted into the listing section of recycling collections in the I District. It is also intended to address issues raised in a recent appellate court decision. The definitional amendment to “collection center, recycling” section is being added to place the regulatory provisions with the use listing, rather than the definitions section. It also is intended to clarify the provisions associated with the use operation.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. There were no comments relative to the petition. He then opened the hearing for discussion by the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the staffing provisions associated within the proposed definition and noted that the regulations do not define the level of staffing required for the facility. Mr. Heniff noted that each operation may be a little different, but the actual staffing level can be considered as part of the conditional use application.

Tom Foley, petitioner for Amvets International, stated that their operations are intended to have regular on-premises staffing. Chairperson Ryan noted that the Commission is only considering discussion on the text amendments at this time and will consider the Amvets petition (PC 07-40) after the hearing on the text amendments has concluded.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the petition complies with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 4-0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of the petition associated with PC 07-39.

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald F. Ryan
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Lombard Plan Commission

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2007\PC 07-39\ReferralLetter 07-39.doc