

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
March 15, 2023**

Member Giltner called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order on Wednesday, March 15, 2023 at 6:30 p.m. in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

**1. ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Members Gary Moberly, Gannon O'Brien, Keith Giltner, Tom Murphy, Leslie Lee, and John Podliska. Chairman Neiman attended the meeting electronically.

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner Robb McGinnis

Due to Chairman Neiman attending the meeting virtually, Member Podliska made a motion, seconded by Member Moberly, to **appoint Member Giltner as Chairman Pro Tem**. The **motion carried** with a unanimous voice vote.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**a) February 15, 2023**

Member Moberly moved, seconded by Member Murphy, to **approve the minutes of February 15, 2023** as amended to correct the typo on page two (2), line two (2).

**AYES:** Members Moberly, O'Brien, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, and Chairman Neiman

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** Member Podliska

**ABSENT:** None

**Motion carried.**

**3. APPROVAL OF FINAL DECISIONS OR FINDINGS OF FACT - None**

**4. RECEIPT OF APPEARANCES –** The court reporter administered the oath to all persons intending to speak at the scheduled public hearing (s).

**5. RECEIPT OF REQUESTS, MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, OR REQUESTS TO MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT OF A GENERAL NATURE – None**

**6. PRE-HEARING AND AGENDA SETTING - None**

1 **7. PUBLIC HEARING**

2 **a) V-01-23, 2 Salt Creek Lane, Mouse Motors**

3  
4 Please refer to **Attachment 1** for the transcript for Public Hearing Case V-01-23

5  
6 Chairman Pro-Tem Giltner opened the public hearing.

7  
8 Anastas Shkurti, attorney for the applicant, provided background on the need for  
9 relief from parking requirements in order to construct a new luxury automotive  
10 dealership, specifically a reduction of 73 spaces. Mr. Shkurti stated that the  
11 indoor and outdoor parking included in the site plan exceeded what would be  
12 needed for projected sales due to the large amount of on-line sales,  
13 appointment based in-person sales, and truck haulers used for vehicle service.  
14 Mr. Shkurti discussed the conformity of the property and each of the variance  
15 standards. He explained that the business practices utilized and sales  
16 projections support a very low intensity dealership and believed all the of the  
17 variation standards to support a reduction of required parking spaces are  
18 satisfied.

19  
20 For the purpose of clarification of this case and future cases, it was stated that  
21 the unique nature of this business model was driving the variance request, not  
22 the age of the code. Discussion followed that included an estimate of the  
23 number of indoor spaces utilized daily, details of the on-line sales process, and  
24 the plan for overflow parking, if needed, would be addressed with indoor stalls  
25 and the second business location.

26  
27 To address the concerns of the Members, staff stated that specific language  
28 would be included in the ordinance related to this variation application to protect  
29 the Village interests if/when the property would be vacated by Mouse Motors.  
30 Mr. McGinnis shared that the language generated by the Village attorney would  
31 include the phrase “intensity of use” which is already part of the code. It was  
32 explained that if the “intensity of use” changes in the future, the Village would  
33 have the opportunity to re-evaluate. Approval of the variance application would  
34 not be directly related to the automobile brand or the property ownership.

35  
36 A motion was made by Member Podliska, seconded by Member O’Brien, to  
37 **close the public hearing. The motion carried** with a unanimous voice vote.

38  
39 **DELIBERATIONS**

40 Discussion followed by members that included the unique nature of the business  
41 model being a good fit for this particular location and that it would enhance the  
42 area. Comments also included the appreciation for a detailed, informative  
43 presentation of the application that included thoughtful considerations.  
44 Members were in favor of the approval of the request provided it included  
45 language to address any change to “the intensity of use” negatively affecting the  
46 area.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

Member Podliska made a motion, seconded by member Murphy, to recommend the approval of the variation based upon the intensity of use and the business model presented by the applicant. The motion carried by a roll call vote as follows:

- AYES:** Members Moberly, O'Brien, Giltner, Murphy, Lee, Podliska, and Chairman Neiman
- NAYS:** None
- ABSTAIN:** None
- ABSENT:** None

**8. OLD BUSINESS**

**9. NEW BUSINESS**

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Member Podliska made a motion to **adjourn the Zoning Board of Appeals of March 15, 2023.** Member Moberly seconded the motion. Motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jennifer Spires

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_