



OFFICE OF  
**VENTNOR CITY ZONING BOARD**  
**VENTNOR CITY PLANNING BOARD**

CITY HALL  
VENTNOR CITY, NEW JERSEY 08406  
(609) 823-7987

Ventnor City Zoning Board

Minutes

Wednesday April 16, 2014 – 6:30 PM

1. Call to Order: 6:30 PM
2. Flag Salute
3. Roll Call

Present

Absent

Lorraine Sallata

Greg Maiuro  
Dan Smith  
Mike Weissen  
Clyde Yost  
Stephen Rice  
Bert Sabo  
Frank Cavallaro – Alt # 1

**Professionals:**

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates  
Rebecca Laferty, Esq.

4. Adoption of Minutes of March 19, 2014 meetings  
Motion: \_\_ Clyde Yost \_\_\_\_\_  
Second: \_\_ Greg Maiuro \_\_\_\_\_  
Approval: All in favor

5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions

**Z-5 of 2014: Arthur & Dorothy Ponzio – 808 N Sacramento – Blk. 319, Lot 15.01**

Requested “C” Variances – Approved

**Z-6 of 2014: Christina Vitale – 313 N Suffolk – Blk. 211, Lot 7**

Requested “C” Variances - Approved

Motion: Greg Maiuro  
2<sup>nd</sup>: Clyde Yost  
Approval: All

6. Applicants

*Frederick Thorpe*

306 N Dorset Ave. – Blk. 216, Lot 11

Requesting “C” Variances

Represented by Brian Callaghan

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Sandy Damaged home – Raise with 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and additional items

Exhibits

A1 – Variance Plan

A2 – Colored rendering

Plan to raise and spend – do it right

From a 2 BR bungalow to a nice house

Various variances

Sworn in: John Barnhardt – Planner & Engineer

Reviews site

Currently a 1 story bungalow

Flood damaged – substantially damaged

Chose to elevate and expand

Proposal – Designed self – nice appeal

Elevated

Ground floor – storage

Existing porch – will enclose – living area

Rear and side will expand 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

Side yard deck – off kitchen

“L” shaped area

2 sets of stairs

3<sup>rd</sup> floor will have a deck

Existing shed will stay

Existing garage will be reduced to fit

Front porch and stairs – Governor’s executive order

May not be variance relief

Currently 6’x6’ – better ask for variance relief

Reviews rendering

- Ground floor storage
- Existing porch – closed – building space
- 2<sup>nd</sup> floor deck – to kitchen – also acts as carport

Side yard – 15.9’ – main part of building – allows open air

Variances

- Front yard – 10.3’ vs 20’
  - Landing – 4’ vs 20’
  - L shaped stairs – 0.3’ or better
- Bay Windows – adds about 18”

- Side Yard – Existing Non-conformity – 5.8’ vs 8’
  - Elevate & expand
- Other side yard – all good
  - Deck – 3.3’ vs 8’
    - Open for all access
  - Impact on neighborhood – look at bye-right
  - Easily justified by hardships – damaged – had no options
    - Keeping same as previous
- Coverage – building in compliance – 34.8% vs 40%
- Lot Coverage – 67.7% vs 65% - driveway
  - Majority there

Grass in rear and front yard

- Stone in side areas
- Maintain 1 street tree and add one

- Height – max height ok
  - Not sure on eave height
  - Difficult to apply to this type of building – 22’ required
- Board discusses all
  - Wings on side do not meet
  - An esthetic thing

Negative criteria –

- Elevate and flood requirements
- Matching existing setbacks
- Did good job to minimize effects
- Public good
  - Win for all
  - Something had to happen

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Clyde Yost** – porch size

10.3'

**Steve Rice** – dimension of deck around back

Deck to stairs to 3<sup>rd</sup> floor deck to stairs down

**Steve Rice** – questions deck on first floor

Discusses what thought of it

How far to neighbor

About 6.6' – talked to neighbor – no issue

Both neighbors split cost for soil testing for pilings

Not sure what neighbors will do –

**Greg Maiuro** – driveway cut

No plan to expand driveway cut

Will there be an access door

Yes

**Frank Cavallaro** – truly not a 2 car

Can do 3 lined up

Board & Applicant discusses deck & garage area

**Craig Hurless** – Sworn in

Reviews Engineer report

Initial application contained inconsistencies

Plan has addressed all of the concerns

Reviews variances

Front – 20' vs 10.3' – principal

Porch – 15' vs 4'

Steps – 15' vs 0.3'

Side

8' vs 5.8'

8' vs 3.3'

Max eave height for wings

Building coverage – not needed – 34.8%

Lot coverage – 67.7% vs 65%

Technical issues

2 & 4 addressed

Encroachment into right of way – City or county approval needed

Variance plan update

For landscaping

**PUBLIC:**

None

Motion:

For variances as noted, engineer report, a single motion

Conditions – update plan - approvals

Motion: Greg Maiuro

2<sup>nd</sup>: Mike Weissen

**VOTE:**

**Frank Cavallaro:** Yes

Variances of note

**Clyde Yost:** Yes

Nice plan – good for neighborhood – no negative

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

Added architecture – nice plan -

**Mike Weissen:** Yes

Saw how deep the water was – happy to see done – may spark others – good plan

**Steve Rice:** Yes

Same as others

**Greg Maiuro:** Yes

Asset to Ventnor and Dorset

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Fantastic design – new energy to neighborhood

**Approved 7 in Favor, 0 opposed**

---

Applicant:

*Jacqueline Polimeni*

6814-6818 Ventnor Ave. – Blk. 77, Lot 11

Requesting CNC

Represented by self

Sworn in: *Jacqueline Polimeni*

Owner of 6814-6818 Ventnor Ave.

Late husband & I purchased some 30 years ago

He was dentist in Ventnor

Put up for sale – told need a CNC

Zoned residential

Shocked – was an ACME in the 60's – made to individual stores

October 1977 – was 4 stores

Discussed all owners

In 1978 was the same

*Allen Coric* – Real Estate agent – assisted with evidence

Discusses Polk Directories

1941 – Multiple commercial tenants

1946 – Multiple commercial tenants – American Stores – ACME

1955 – ACME

1965 – Multiple Commercial Tenants

1967 - Multiple Commercial Tenants

1968 - Multiple Commercial Tenants

On Sale – here to prove

Now White Star Liquors & others

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Clyde Yost** – how many units

4 – 6814A – Wissahickon side

6814, 6816, 6818 – Newark side

What was 6820?

Was a 2<sup>nd</sup> entrance to same 6818 building – now gone

**Bert Sabo**: what did City tax as? – Not here – for how long?

Tax bill – 6816 – bills as 4 fronts – merge bill

**Dan Smith**: Does tax office do as incomes and expenses

No

**Mike Weissen**: Rental license for each? Have for property?

No, not sure if tenants do – never seen

**Clyde Yost**: Separate meters for each?

Yes

**Mike Weissen**: When did know converted to residential?

Few months ago

**PUBLIC:**

*Lauren Eher* – 10 S Newark

Reads letter

Around corner – 4 commercial in place

Want to sell and keep – why keep in place when changed 30+ years ago

Diminishes quality of life

Traffic issues and parking

Garbage often ends up in our areas

Object to commercial in a residential area

**Mike Weissen**: How long owned

Since 2008

When aware changed to residential

Soon after we bought – was grandfathered when sold

**Dan Smith**: Bought in 1977 – test year is 1978

Certain proofs exist prior to test year

*Laura Ether*: understood in 1978 changed to residential – our appeal is to why it is not right

*Anthony Passalacqua*: 5 S Newark

Like to see a change in area

Want to look nicer – a fire hazard now

Great change for Ventnor

We put up with a lot

**Dan Smith**: When you purchased property, was it commercial

Yes

*Darryl Schall* – 10 S Newark

Retired & moved here

Did considerable renovations

Disappointed by traffic commercial area – trash issues

Nice Street & neighbors

Never seen owner do anything to fix

Why go back on residential plan

Applicant: liquor store is not a tenant – a separate building – not part of this

So sorry trash and stuff on property – can't control weather

Will speak with tenants to keep in barrels

New store front coming to 6814A

Sensitive to issues – not an uncaring landlord

Always been commercial

**Mike Weissen**: How does a business change to residential?

Craig Hurless: not a change of use

Does this property exist prior to test year – cannot adjust Zoning

*Mr. Schall*: if zoned residential, how change?

A CNC – is an existing non-conformity & has shown as such

**Dan Smith**: Discusses what has been presented

Board & residents discuss

No variance relief – have they proven test year

No relief – facts only

**Rebecca Laferty**: Reviews exhibits – Polk Directories

A1-A7 – Polk Directories

**Dan Smith:** There were other items – do you wish to enter them  
Settlement sheet – A8  
List of tenants – A9

**Motion:** CNC

Motion: Greg Maiuro  
2<sup>nd</sup>: Bert Sabo

**VOTE:**

**Greg Maiuro:** Yes

Was a patient – always commercial

**Mike Weissen:** Yes

Remember bike shop – always commercial – test year ok – listened to neighbors

**Steve Rice:** Yes

Satisfied evidence

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

Shown test year – always commercial – encouraged neighbors to take care of

**Clyde Yost:** Yes

Always commercial

**Frank Cavallaro:** Yes

Also encourage neighbors to correct

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Knowledge of tenants – Code and police enforcement needed

**Application Approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed**

---

Applicant:

*Sue Ann Mammucari*  
20 S Troy Ave. –  
Requesting “C” Variances  
Represented by self

**Dan Smith recuses self – was noticed – Greg Maiuro acting Chairman**

Sworn in: *Sue Ann Mammucari*

Live at 20 S Troy Ave

Variance needed to build a master bath  
Currently have 3 bedrooms and 1 small bath

Will make better for us

Added to front of house over existing porch  
Will be in same footprint

A1- Aerial photo – reviews  
Not infringing on neighbor

Variance needed – front 12’ required – 5.2’ requested  
Same as first floor

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Mike Weissen:** Anything else being done?  
No

**PUBLIC:**

None

**Greg Maiuro:** Just going up, not out or forward  
No

**Craig Hurless:** Reviews Engineer report  
Simple addition to single family home  
Front porch – porch and bedroom  
5.2’ proposed – 12’ required  
2<sup>nd</sup> story deck – 8’ required – 5.2’ requested  
Recommend landscaping – condition that landscaping unchanged  
Street trees – no area to do – tree on property – waive

Motion: Variance 5.2’ vs 12’ – deck 5.2’ vs 8’  
Conditions: Landscaping keep  
Waiver street trees

Motion: Greg Maiuro  
2<sup>nd</sup>: Steve Rice

**Vote:**

**Greg Maiuro:** Yes  
No issues – in line

**Mike Weissen:** Yes  
Well presented

**Steve Rice:** Yes  
No negative impact

**Bert Sabo:** Yes  
No increase in foot print – simple plan

**Clyde Yost:** Yes  
No Hardship – good for house

**Frank Cavallaro:** Yes  
In compliance – with conditions

**Application Approved 6 in favor, 0 opposed**

---

7. Other Business

- a. May meeting is May 28<sup>th</sup> due to school concert
- b. Read Letter – City Generator
  - i. **Dan Smith** – what is Municipal requirement
    - 1. **Craig Hurless** – do informal review – City not subject to zoning

Motion to adjourn: \_\_Greg Maiuro \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_\_\_\_ Bert Sabo \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting adjourned at \_\_8:15 \_\_\_\_\_ PM