



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

VILLAGE HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS 200 E. WOOD STREET
PALATINE, IL 60067-5339 – (847) 359-9050
<http://www.palatine.il.us>

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES • MAY 27, 2025

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Patrick Noonan	Commissioner	Present	
Cindy Roth-Wurster	Commissioner	Present	
Eric Friedman	Vice Chairperson	Present	
Jan Wood	Chairperson	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Commissioner	Absent	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Commissioner	Present	
Tim Schubert	Commissioner	Absent	

II. MEETING MINUTES

1. Planning and Zoning Commission - Regular Meeting - May 13, 2025 7:00 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Noonan, Roth-Wurster, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Cavanaugh, Fedota
ABSENT:	Kolososki, Schubert

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 501 N. Hicks Road - SU Dental Office

SU-000172-2025 - 501 N HICKS RD

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on May 8, 2025 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **AERIAL MAP**
2. **PLAT OF SURVEY**
3. **PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN**
4. **BUSINESS PLAN**
5. **ORDINANCE O-208-04**
6. **PUBLIC NOTICE**

Staff - Mr. Auer Provides Background:

The Subject Property is zoned B-1 - Shopping Center business and was most recently operated as a medical office. The Petitioner is proposing to operate a dental and dental cosmetics practice. Pursuant to 11.02(d)(15) of the Palatine Zoning Ordinance, the "B-1" zoning district requires medical office uses to be reviewed through the special use process.

Sworn in petitioner:

Balaji Singamsetti - 241 Taylor Court - Buffalo Grove, IL - Owner

Sharon Bogetz - 7300 N Western Avenue- Chicago, IL - Business Consultant

John Mazr - 3100 Dundee Road - Contractor

Ms. Bogetz states they have a contract for this property and plans to convert it into a dental office. The owners currently operate another office in Mundelein and anticipates hiring an associate. The doctor will work part-time at both locations. The practice will offer general and specialty dentistry, treating patients of all ages, with or without insurance. Services will be affordable for most patients and will include preventive and emergency care.

Ms. Bogetz provides details of the services to be offered: dentures, partials, crowns, fillings, and more. They will also offer clear aligner braces and have a specialist on staff for orthodontics.

The clinic will have 7 treatment rooms and a large reception area. It will include a business area and a lab at the first floor and the basement will be used for storage. There will be a private office for staff and doctor discussions. The practice will have 2 dentists, both CPR-certified and trained in OSHA and HIPAA regulations. Ms. Bogetz presents a floor plan. Chairman Wood notes that the layout allows for future growth.

Ms. Bogetz anticipates seeing 10-14 patients initially and expects the practice to grow. She plans for 3-5 chairs to start, with additional chairs to be added as the practice expands. The clinic will be fully built out and ready to accommodate future growth.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed use is contemplated as special use in the current “B-1” zoning district and is consistent with the previous medical office use and the envisioned business/commercial use of the property by the Comprehensive Plan’s future land use map. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the special use application. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the Floor Plan and Business Plan submitted by Balaji Singamsetti, except as such plans may be changed to conform to the Village’s Codes and Ordinances.
2. In conjunction with the building permit review for the dental office, a landscaping plan/narrative and a pavement maintenance plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cavanaugh Made a motion to approve subject staff’s conditions; seconded by Commissioner Noonan.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Noonan states that the request is straightforward.

Commissioner Fedota notes that there are no parking issues.

Commissioner Fedota inquired about the previous special use conditions and if there was any applicability to the proposed use and any storage of narcotics for use in the dental office.

Staff responded that the proposed conditions for the current use would apply, notwithstanding any medical licensure requirements or protocols.

Chairman Wood states that dental offices typically do not have high demand for parking during late hours and do not generate noise. She adds that the practice will include an experienced dentist, and the proposal meets the required standards.

Chairman Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday, June 9, 2025.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Noonan, Roth-Wurster, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Cavanaugh, Fedota
ABSENT:	Kolososki, Schubert

2. 605-619 E. Dundee Road

VAR-000124-2024 - 605-619 E DUNDEE RD.

Notice was published in the Journal & Topics on May 9, 2025 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **SITE PLAN/SURVEY**
2. **ELEVATIONS**
3. **NARRATIVE**
4. **VARIATION JUSTIFICATION**
5. **REAL ESTATE DISCLOSURE**
6. **PUBLIC NOTICE**

Staff - Mr. Vyverberg provides background:

The Subject Property is the Deer Grove Centre shopping center on E. Dundee Road. The Petitioner, USAgain is proposing to locate a 160 square foot donation bin in the Deer Grove shopping center parking lot along Dundee Road. While the zoning code does only allow donation bins to be located on properties used for educational, institutional, religious, or not-for-profit uses, the Petitioners are requesting to locate the bin at a commercial shopping center and a variation and planned development amendment for the site plan changed proposed. The Petitioners are requesting a variation to allow a donation bin on a commercial shopping center property and not on a property used for educational, institutional, religious, or not for profit uses, as required by Code and a Planned Development Amendment to allow a site plan change to allow the donation bin to be placed in the shopping center parking lot (west of the Wells Fargo bank), which includes the removal of approximately 2-3 parking spaces.

Sworn in petitioner:

Andrew Proctor - 1555 W Hawthorne Lane., West Chicago, IL - Director of Government Relations - USAgain, LLC.

Mr. Proctor explains that the company operates in 15 states and 500 cities. He highlights growing issues with textile waste-17 million tons are disposed of annually-and a rising trend toward recycling. This year alone, they have collected 6.2 billion pounds of textiles.

He notes that their operation addresses many of the concerns municipalities have with collection bins, such as overflow and leftover garbage. The industry is at a reflection point, as smaller collection sites can no longer handle the volume of donations. With people purchasing more clothing, the need for efficient collection is increasing.

They currently collect 5,000 lbs. of textiles weekly. All drop spots are monitored, and staff receive alerts (pings) when bins are nearing capacity. Staff can verbally instruct individuals not to leave excess items, and personnel can be on-site within

an hour to remove overflow. The company is based in West Chicago.

Mr. Proctor states they have collected 260,000 pounds of textiles-equivalent to the weight of eight school buses or a blue whale. Collected clothes are distributed to thrift shops around the world, and the company incorporates a charitable component. Although it is a for-profit organization, they have planted 1.7 million trees in Africa for agricultural purposes, through donating a tree, every time the bin is filled.

Textiles are the fastest-growing category of waste. The company has been working in Palatine for about a year, aiming to establish a viable operation. It has already proven successful in other states such as California, Colorado, and New York, where similar initiatives are underway.

He explains that clothing producers will soon be required to fund systems for take-back and reuse, although demand for recycling is not yet sufficient. Reuse remains the most effective solution. Through their work, 14.8 billion tons of carbon dioxide and significant amounts of water have been saved.

The company is proposing a lease arrangement for a drop-off spot in partnership with Kimco, who owns the Deer Grove Centre shopping center. This could increase foot traffic and benefit the site. They currently operate 10 locations in the Chicago area, including Arlington Heights, with no reported issues.

The site in question is zoned as a Planned Development, which promotes flexibility and permits this type of land use. Mr. Proctor notes they are not attempting to establish this use in a residential area and believes this location is ideal. He is asking for flexibility and states their desire to be good stewards in the community, providing residents with a responsible place to dispose of textiles.

He references a letter of recommendation to include in the file from a trade organization, of which USAgain is a member. The letter reiterates the growing demand and rising costs of labor and fuel, and explains why it's no longer economically sensible to maintain many small standard collection points. A single, larger site makes more sense.

They are requesting use of three parking spaces. The building is already over-parked, so there are no concerns with the request. Mr. Proctor adds that any issue would fall under the property owner's responsibility, not the Village. The container has a 160 sq. ft. footprint and will not be visible from the main thoroughfare. A tree line on the property helps to conceal the container, so it does not detract from the overall aesthetics. The exterior of the container is white and sleek. He notes they have received many compliments and testimonials about the design.

USAgain recently attended a conference in Las Vegas, where there was strong interest in the concept, and he expressed a desire to expand its use. He emphasized that the initiative benefits public welfare by diverting textiles from landfills. Security is not an issue with the proposed setup.

Mr. Proctor states that launching the program on a test pilot basis would be ideal and is requesting initial approval. He notes that there is no legal precedent being set-it is a site-specific request.

Commissioner Friedman states that Mr. Proctor mentioned the desire for a larger-scale collection point and asks about the distance between the proposed Palatine location and the existing Arlington Heights site. Mr. Proctor responds that it is approximately 20 minutes away. He adds that they

are targeting sites with approximately 100,000 visits per month.

Commissioner Friedman inquires about lighting at the bin site. Mr. Proctor states that lighting is built into the unit. He mentions that the company has spent thousands of dollars on the design and presents a brochure as reference.

Commissioner Friedman then asks whether the bin is handicap-accessible and how an individual with impairments would be able to use it. Mr. Proctor replies that the bins do not currently include accessibility features, but signage would be posted offering a curbside collection option for individuals who need assistance.

Chair Wood notes that the application states the company also has other locations in Oswego, Chicago, and Skokie. Mr. Proctor confirms that is correct.

Chair Wood inquires if the company also offers smaller bins currently placed at approved Palatine locations and asks whether those would be removed if the larger bins were installed. Mr. Proctor states they would not remove the smaller bins as they still serve a purpose. The large bin would likely be the only one of its size in Palatine.

Chair Wood comments that the commercial center site is much larger than typically allowed and asks if the Illinois locations are situated in commercial corridors and if the bin sizes are similar. Mr. Proctor confirms yes and explains other areas where these bins are installed. He further explains that the smaller bins lead to higher maintenance costs, including expenses related to emptying them once or twice a week, fuel costs for large box trucks, and employee labor costs. Overall, the smaller bin model is less efficient compared to the larger bins. They anticipate relying more on larger sites going forward.

Chair Wood asks if other sites have security features such as cameras and if that is standard across their locations. Mr. Proctor states that security is a standard feature for the larger bins, while the smaller models do not include these features.

Chair Wood asks whether other areas have been considered in Palatine for charitable or similar collection spaces.

Mr. Proctor explains that Kimco requested the property, noting that it makes more sense to place the bins in large commercial centers. Commissioner Roth-Wurster mentions the location of the existing site in Arlington Heights.

Mr. Proctor states that the donation program currently operates about 450 smaller bins successfully. The larger monitored bins provide a better solution and benefit both Kimco and the location itself. Logistically, this program has been established for some time. Code standards for the units date back to 2012. The bins are solar-powered and monitored to ensure proper use.

Mr. Proctor adds that demand for clothing and shoes is evolving and increasing. He notes that curbside collection does not work well as items get mixed in with regular trash, and that this drop-off system is the better solution.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks if the company appeared before the Arlington Heights board.

Mr. Proctor replied that the bin location was placed, prior to his involvement with

USAgain.

Chair Wood clarifies that the bins are for clothing only. Mr. Proctor confirms they accept clothing, shoes, books, and other miscellaneous items.

Commissioner Fedota expresses some confusion about the larger units being serviced daily and questions the profitability of servicing them. He expresses mixed feelings about sending staff to each large facility every day.

Mr. Proctor explains that a separate team handles the drop boxes. They visit approximately 20 sites per day. It is not feasible to monitor smaller bins individually, but the larger bins have technology that alerts staff when they need servicing. Although visiting 20 sites daily is costly, the system is more efficient because smaller bins require weekly visits that add up in expense.

Commissioner Fedota asks if the major tenants or big box stores on the property have been contacted.

Mr. Proctor responds that they would not do anything to jeopardize relationships with existing tenants.

Commissioner Fedota asks whether the notice of the request goes to the lessee. Staff member Mr. Vyverberg explains that, per Village Code, property owners are notified via Public Notice and certified mailings and the public hearing sign was placed along the frontage.

Commissioner Bettenhausen inquires whether, out of the 100 properties used since 2020, any bins have been removed. Mr. Proctor replies that approximately 20-25 bins have been removed for a variety of reasons, including ownership changes, code changes, or low usage (bins not filling up).

Chair Wood asks whether the company offers any bin sizes between the 5-foot and 20-foot models.

Mr. Proctor states they do not. The larger units are modified shipping containers, manufactured by a contracted company.

Commissioner Noonan asks whether it would be possible to rent vacant storefronts or small interior spaces instead.

Mr. Proctor states that doing so would be significantly more costly due to staffing and utility expenses. He mentions that they have considered expanding into thrift store operations but have not done so yet.

Commissioner Noonan comments that such an approach could be groundbreaking.

Commissioner Friedman asks if the camera system on the larger bins records activity and whether it is effective as a deterrent.

Mr. Proctor confirms that it does record and has been successful. They are able to provide footage to police if needed.

Commissioner Bettenhausen notes that there are a lot of malls in the Chicago area.

Mr. Proctor responds that their business development team is actively working on expansion. Currently, about 80% of their operations are in California, but they are pursuing opportunities in other states as well. He mentions they often structure their placements as part of a package deal. USAgain has been involved and

participated in policy level discussions on textile waste in California, with additional such discussions in New York, Washington state and Colorado. USAgain helped author and contribute to a bill that will create the first textile extended producer responsibility program. This requires that the producers of the clothes have to take responsibility for recycling them. Such things as carpet padding and home insulation purposes.

Chair Wood asks if the Deer Grove property owners approached them. She comments that the process is ongoing and notes that Village staff and ordinance requirements are not currently in favor. She references another nearby town and asks if they are still pursuing the Palatine location and what their current thinking is.

Mr. Proctor responds that they have met with the Palatine Chamber of Commerce and are still very interested in this site. He expresses a strong desire to be part of the Palatine community and does not want to give up on the location, believing it is a good fit.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that the original ordinance was put in place due to repeated complaints about donation boxes on commercial properties. The issues involved aesthetics and property owners being unaware of bins placed on their sites. These concerns led to staff drafting the current regulations. He also notes that running a storefront is often not profitable for textile collection. He discusses the environmental impacts of textile waste and mentions that the Village of Palatine currently offers curbside textile recycling through a program called Simple Recycling.

Chair Wood acknowledges that much has changed since the ordinance was first created and notes the presence of vacant storefronts. Mr. Vyverberg reiterates that the guidelines were established in 2012 due to bins being illegally placed on commercial properties and zoning enforcement complaints, without oversight. He clarifies that the petitioner is requesting a variance from a 13-year-old code. While he understands their business model, he emphasizes that staff must consider the full context of the regulations and ordinance limitations. Chair Wood inquired about the other USAgain bins in Palatine and whether those would be maintained. Mr. Proctor confirmed that those boxes would be maintained. He also referenced USAgain worked with a similar ordinance and municipal resistance in Oswego.

Mr. Fedota asked if the Petitioner has spoken with any of the tenants.

Mr. Proctor indicated that they have not, but did send the required certified mailing.

Staff also outlined the notice to the property owner and post public hearing sign.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The donation bin ordinance regulations were established in 2012 to delineate the appropriate land use locations for such donation bins. Commercial shopping centers were excluded from the eligible locations, due to potential conflicts with the underlying legislative intentions. Additionally, the Village began experiencing specific zoning enforcement issues created, which were created with the illegal locating of donation bins throughout the commercial shopping centers along the Rand Road and Dundee Road corridors. Additionally, stand-alone commercial uses were also having donation bins “dropped” at various locations in the Village.

As the subject property is a commercial shopping center, the proposed location is in direct conflict with the ordinance requirements and the size of the bin is significantly larger what is allowed by Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends denial of the requested variation and planned development amendment. If the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval, Staff recommends that the approval is subject to the site plan, business plan and elevation. Staff would also recommend that a business license would be required.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster asks if a six-month review would be possible and whether the Village still allows that type of conditional review. She inquires if it would be considered in this case.

Mr. Vyverberg explains that a six-month review has been used in other situations-such as restaurants requesting extended hours-but in this case, staff would not recommend it, as the request does not comply with current code requirements. He also summarized that there is the ability to request textile recycling through a curbside pick-up program for Village residents.

Chair Wood asked if Staff anticipated any changes to the current ordinance requirements. Mr. Vyverberg indicated that he is not anticipating any changes to the donation bin Code.

Mr. Proctor states that he would be open to a six-month test pilot. He is willing to return for review or allow the variance to expire. He acknowledges the opposition but emphasizes that the industry is changing. He believes this is a valuable service and reiterates that curbside collection is ineffective. Their model offers a better, proven method for textile recycling.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cavanaugh Made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Commissioner Fedota.

DISCUSSION:

Chair Wood comments that this is a tough decision because there is a noble cause behind the effort to reduce textile waste. There is clearly a need, and this proposed solution would address that problem. The applicant has explained how the bin is monitored and already operating at other locations, which seems to resolve many of the common concerns. However, the proposal does not meet code requirements and is not operated by an institutional or nonprofit entity. She acknowledges the merits of the idea but emphasizes that the two main issues are its size and the fact that it does not comply with the ordinance. She states she is not satisfied with the proposal and reiterates that it is not located in a designated commercial corridor. She inquired if the Petitioner looked elsewhere in Palatine for a compliant site, recognizing the Staff recommendation and ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Cavanaugh states that, taken as a whole, the reason the bins are so large is because storefront operations are not economically viable. While it is a well-intentioned effort and seems successful in California, he believes the

economic model doesn't make sense within the Village of Palatine.

Mr. Proctor indicated that they did not, as this was a package deal with Kimco.

Commissioner Friedman says the potential for success is a factor in their consideration.

Chair Wood adds that the applicant is pursuing the concept as a for-profit venture.

Commissioner Friedman continues, noting that the ordinance, as currently written, was designed for smaller, unmonitored, non-powered bins. There was a reason for those restrictions regarding use and placement. While the proposal offers enhanced features like monitoring, the current location-right at the front of the lot-is not appropriate. He suggests that placing the bin on the side of the property would be more acceptable, and that a shipping container should not be positioned as it currently is on this property.

Commissioner Roth-Wurster states that she appreciates the monitoring component of the proposal. She agrees that smaller bins fill quickly and are unattractive. The 2012 ordinance was written for those smaller bins, and in her opinion, that part of the code is outdated. She believes the standards for granting a variation should evolve. She references standards such as reasonable return, business license, and the plight of the owner, though notes that "plight of the owner" is not typically included in the standard for donation bins. Regarding locality, she feels this is a good location for consumer access and is not concerned about the size of the bin. With the built-in security and monitoring, she is more inclined to support the proposal. She indicates that the donation bins are a solution to the textile waste circumstances, with a monitored bin that is solar powered and maintained. Mr. Proctor indicates that the industry is evolving.

Mr. Proctor discussed curb side textile recycling and that it does not work for textile reuse donations. Things get mixed in and contaminated and has to be recycled. The industry is not there yet.

Chair Wood asked if only clothes are accepted. Mr. Proctor indicated that clothes, shoes. If miscellaneous items like books and Tupperware are included, USAgain would accept and then sell them.

Chair Wood compares the request to one for a larger sign, asking if it should be treated the same way. While she acknowledges the benefits of reducing waste, she points out that the request is for a for-profit operation, which makes the decision more difficult.

Commissioner Fedota comments on the signage, stating that the bin includes illuminated signage, but no sign permit is required since it is a freestanding box. The signage is therefore unregulated. He adds that the Village has already adopted a residential curbside textile recycling service, which currently exists and is being utilized. In his view, there is already a viable solution in place.

Commissioner Noonan commends the petitioner for the effort and innovation, stating that the proposal is no different in purpose than residential street recycling. While he supports the overall concept, he concludes that the proposed location is not the right fit at this time.

A motion was made by Commissioner Cavanaugh to approve the request for a donation collection center. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fedota.

The motion failed with a vote of (1) in favor and (6) opposed.

A second motion was made by Commissioner Cavanaugh to Deny the request for a donation collection center.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Noonan.

The motion was approved to Deny with a vote of (6) in favor and (1) opposed.

This item will tentatively go to Village Council on Monday June 9, 2025

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [6 TO 1]
AYES:	Noonan, Friedman, Wood, Bettenhausen, Cavanaugh, Fedota
NAYS:	Roth-Wurster
ABSENT:	Kolososki, Schubert

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. ADJOURNMENT