



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 15, 2015 – 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  
Stephen Rice

Bert Sabo

Tim Kriebel

Leonard Mordell – Alt #1

Marie McQueen – Alt # 2

**Professionals:**

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates  
John Rosenberger, Esq.

4. Adoption of Minutes of March 18, 2015 meetings  
Motion: \_\_\_\_\_ Marie McQueen \_\_\_\_\_  
Second: \_\_\_\_\_ Steve Rice \_\_\_\_\_  
Approval: All in favor
5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions
  - a. **Z-8 of 2015: Michael Shepard**  
110 N Dorset Ave, Blk. 156, Lot 16  
Requested CNC- Approved
  - a. **Z-9 of 2015: James & Regina Kocher**  
602-604 North Harvard Ave.  
Block 317, Lot 1 & 2  
Requesting "C" variances - Approved
  - a. **Z-10 of 2015: Timothy Kelly & Catherine Lamkin**  
303 N Somerset Ave, Blk. 212, Lot 7  
Requesting "C" variances – Approved

Motion: \_\_ Greg Maiuro \_\_\_\_\_

2<sup>nd</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_ Marie McQueen \_\_\_\_\_

Approval: All by roll call vote

■ Note: Lorraine Sallata abstains from Z-9

---

6. Applicant

a. **Morris & Tami Starkman**

116 S Sacramento Ave, Blk. 24, Lot 12

Requesting "C" variances

Represented by Self

Carried over from March Meeting

Sworn in: *Morris Starkman*

*Joe DeAngelos - TBS Services*

Submits 3 photos

A1 - Side

A2 - Street in

A3 - Rear

Submitted revised drawing of site

Partial east elevation

Shows 2 Ford Explorers in parking stalls

Space for landing

Not encroaching on apron

Turned side stairs from east to north

Primarily safety

Only occupied during summer

Requested variances as requested

Also own 112 S Sacramento

**Lorraine Sallata** - there was discrepancy on driveway

Corrected it

Have smaller vehicles

Large pickup can fit as shown in photos

**Craig Hurless** – Sworn in

Review 3/31/15

Carryover – additional info submitted

Plan & section view to show vehicles

Question – width of landing – is 2'6" adequate

Believe 3' is minimum by code – off by 6"

Would decrease each space by 3"

If granted – change sizes

Total of 3 undersized spots

*Morris Starkman* – would it be better to approve a landing variance?

Cannot grant code issues

**Lorraine Sallata** – taking the landing into account – how is the right away affected?

If go based off cars, about 4" – each shifts by 4"

Have a problem with landing

Have 2'6" probably

**Dan Smith** – a code issue not variance issue

Believe what is needed by code

Math shows parking spots would be 16'4"

*Morris Starkman* – still adequate – willing to live with the spaces – still 2'10" from property line to sidewalk

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Greg Maiuro** – if neighbor to beach side puts up a fence – how would you open cars

Good question – would accommodate

**Mike Weissen** – brick is raised – if slip on brick – what point does City take responsibility – do we look at it

Craig Hurless – look at from a grading standpoint

**Lorraine Sallata** – Looking at photos – back to stairs – measured or just for view

Not to scale – just for show

Question – can you open the doors?

That is the configuration of the stalls – just to show scale

This is the hardship

How was hardship created – an unapproved plan?

Plans were approved

Not our understanding that this is right

No question it was approved by Building Department

**John Rosenberger** – plans changed in course of construction

**Craig Hurless** – Was earlier plans submitted with the old stairs

Yes

Issue with aisle width always occurred

As soon as discovered it was sent to Board

After 2<sup>nd</sup> plans approved

**John Rosenberger** – cannot determine what was done in Building Department

Can present case – each space is undersized – can approve by municipal land use

Board discusses size and space issues

**Marie McQueen** – what happens if don't get the 3 spaces

Would have to redesign steps

**John Rosenberger** – how do you get out of cars on own property and get to next

Board discusses these issues

**Greg Maiuro** – if address steps – still have a width issue

**Dan Smith** – How many bedrooms

6

*Morris Starkman* – used last August – No issues with parking – appreciate concerns – practical – not an issue

**Lorraine Sallata** – Want to help – problem with parking – hard to look past – not meeting requirements – not to impact neighbors

Heavily invested in community – it works

**Steve Rice** – is it new construction?

Yes

How did get here?

It was approved – build until some issues

**PUBLIC:**

None

**Dan Smith** – Can't envision previous steps – what if back to old  
Wouldn't impose on length  
Said it was a hazard  
Facing Boardwalk Felt turning better & safer

**Mike Weissen** – Is length the real issue – How many inches  
**Lorraine Sallata** – width as well – fence could be an issue

**John Rosenberger** – Street tree waiver  
**Craig Hurless** – Fine with it – waiver ok – does have landscaping

Motion: \_2 parking – 16'4" & 8' x 18'  
Waiver street trees  
Motion: \_\_Greg Maiuro\_\_\_\_\_  
2nd: \_\_\_\_\_Dan Smith\_\_\_\_\_

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith:** No  
Tough situation – wanted to find a way to work – just won't work

**Mike Weissen:** No  
Same

**Greg Maiuro:** No  
Supposed to have 3, not 1

**Steve Rice:** No  
Same

**Tim Kriebel:** No  
Difficult to do

**Marie McQueen:** No  
Extreme – don't see how can do

**Lorraine Sallata:** No  
Wanted to find a way – difficult to turn down – not in best interest

*Application approved 0 in favor, 7 opposed*

---

7. Applicant

- a. **Carl Erlandson**  
209 N Sacramento Ave, Blk. 164, Lot 9  
Requesting "C" variances  
Represented by Charles Gemmel

Sworn in: *Charles Gemmel*

R7 Zone – a duplex – designed to raise house – to FEMA regulations  
Raise about 9'  
Certain non-conformities

Either a C1 or C2 requirement –  
C1 – modest size – no way to comply with setbacks – existing building  
C2 – Purposes – minimize flood issues

Sworn in – Rami Nassar

Exhibits

A1 – Site plan  
Hired to look at

BFE – 9' – raise 3' without variances – but lose garage – raise about 1.5' more to keep garage

Reconfigure 1<sup>st</sup> floor – about 16' from line – reconstruct 1<sup>st</sup> floor – shrunk a little

Front, side, rear porch, building elevation, lot coverage – staying the same

Justification – quotes codes  
By raising – safe from flood – extra parking

No way to construct to conform without tearing down

Variances – from existing non-conformities

Benefit – keep garage

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**John Rosenberger** – How much elevating  
Raising to 13.48' – almost 9'

**Lorraine Sallata** – enough parking for 2?  
Yes, 1 in garage and one outside

**Craig Hurless** – Is outside spot conforming?  
No, short by 2'

**Craig Hurless** – Plan shows side yard that changes  
Currently wood structure – now block wall  
Actually taking off siding of building – reduces each side by a couple of inches

**Craig Hurless** – review of 3/24/15

Is a duplex

Waiver for street trees

Variances

Front – Sacramento – principal – 12' vs 0' vs 0'

1<sup>st</sup> floor porch – 7' vs 0' vs 0'

1<sup>st</sup> floor stairs – 0' vs 0'

Side – principal – 4' vs 2.7'/2.8' vs 3'/3'

Porch/deck – 4' vs 3'

Rear deck – 12' vs 8'

Building coverage – 55% vs 70.8% vs 70.8%

Lot Coverage – 75% vs 100%

Parking – 3 vs 1 conforming – 2 under size – 9'x16'

Recommend – take some lot coverage down – need to discuss

Clean up plans

Support waiver tree – have 1 existing tree

Can have governor strip in front

**Lorraine Sallata** – Lot coverage – what is back yard

AC units small planters – grass won't grow –

Back yard – only 8' – small planter – houses all over

**Steve Rice** – Empty lot right behind

Yes

**Lorraine Sallata** – Less concrete in back – can do something

**Craig Hurless** – Similar to last month – idea

Whole back – 30'x2' – planter

**Dan Smith** – planter in front staying?

Remove for stairs

Didn't include # of bedrooms – parking over existing

Yes

**PUBLIC**

None

Motion: \_Reviews Variances

-Conditions – 30'x2' planter – governor's strip

Motion: \_\_Mike Weissen\_\_\_\_\_

2<sup>nd</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_Steve Rice\_\_\_\_\_

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Good job – good model for others

**Mike Weissen:** Yes

Good presentation - hardship

**Greg Maiuro:** Yes

Hardship – do best can

**Steve Rice:** Yes

Good proposal

**Tim Kriebel:** Yes

Same – good model

**Marie McQueen:** Yes

Same

**Lorraine Sallata:** Yes

Lots of obstacles – good plan - catalyst

*Application approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed*

---

10 Applicant

**b. 5105 Winchester Bayfront, LLC**

5105 Winchester Ave.

Block 100, Lot 12

Requesting “C” variances

Represented by Brian Callaghan

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Construct a new single family home

C1 & C2

Only measure to bulkhead – at 44’ lot

Weird shape bulkhead

It is a contemporary design on bay

Something new for Ventnor

Sworn in: Dan Borkson

Christina Buendicio

Arthur Ponzio



Arthur Ponzio  
Exhibits

A1 – Aerial View

Reviews property  
In 2006 – approved a duplex  
Drove pilings  
Has sat since

Blended in neighborhood – duplex and single family

A2 – Site plan

Reviews  
Lot is 75'x80' – deeded  
To bulkhead – about 44'

Current bulkhead is substandard

At DEP – remove to correct – to requirements

4' from east property line – side – ok

Variances:

Front to building – require 12' vs 4' proposed  
Have to pull to front because of bulkhead  
Similar to others in neighborhood

Front main wall – 4'

Feature – ledge – 18" – 2.5' to lower

Porch – entry – grade level – 4'

Porch – 7' required – 5' proposed

Garage – left

Right

Parking – on site

2 driveways – 1<sup>st</sup> – 10'

2<sup>nd</sup> – 21'-9"

Roof layout – A3 – roof elevation

Discusses roof slope

Overall height – meets

Area falls outside the envelope

Deck side – bulkhead return next to – 4' vs 0'

12' to bulkhead – 11'-2"

Positive – vacant lot to a positive home

Bulkhead issues – fixing it

Improves flood issues

Negatives

None – will improve

Some negatives with any variances

**Craig Hurless** – fine with all variances – except for parking – outside – why not use garage – 40' wide  
Inside garage – will use – home of this size – anywhere add parking – should be done – parking is  
at a premium – do you want friends to use garage – this is extra – it fits

*Christina Buendicio* – Architect

- A4 – ground floor plan
  - Garages – about 36' & 37'
- A5 - -1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> floors
  - 1<sup>st</sup> – living areas
    - Reviews
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> – 4 bedrooms
    - Reviews
- A6 – Upper Floor
  - Master Bedroom
- A7 – Architectural Views
  - Reviews
  - Ledges create variety
- A8 – Elevation view
  - All glass on bay

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Mike Weissen** – type of design – future look – very California look

More of a personal preference

How many square feet?

About 5000'

**Craig Hurless** – review of 3/20/15

- R7 district
- New single family home
- Ask to waive street trees – discusses
- Grass governor strip
- Lot depth – to bulkhead – 62.5' vs 44.75'
- Front – Winchester – principal – 12' vs 4' – 2.5' for ledge
- 1<sup>st</sup> floor porch – 7' vs 5'
- 1<sup>st</sup> floor steps – 7' vs 4'
- Side – deck – 4' vs 0' – waterway
- Rear – principal to bulkhead – 12' vs 11.17'
- Max roof slope – meets intentions
- Curb width – 2 – 10' -2<sup>nd</sup> – 21.75' – for extra parking

*Brian Callaghan* – did add 2 street trees and governor strip

- Did ask for some landscaping
- Area pulled forward – not a lot of area
- That's why concerns for extra parking

Technical comments – grading and drainage

Normal items

**Dan Smith** – legal to drain storm water into bay?  
Don't see why not

**Lorraine Sallata** – put on plans for parking  
Need to show 4 in garage

**John Rosenberger** – Variances – questions  
Reviews

**PUBLIC**  
NONE

**Lorraine Sallata** – Most variances created by hardship except curb cut – bundle together – have an issue with that

Motions will have 2 votes

1<sup>st</sup> – all without driveway cuts  
Reviews all variances  
Conditions – technical comments

Motion: \_\_Mike Weissen\_\_  
2<sup>nd</sup> – \_\_Greg Maiuro\_\_

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith** – Yes  
Well thought out – no negatives – curb cut ok - bay

**Mike Weissen** – Yes  
Excellent – like new modern look

**Greg Maiuro** – Yes  
Asset to all – well thought out

**Steve Rice** – Yes  
No negatives

**Tim Kriebel** – Yes  
All Same

**Marie McQueen** – Yes  
Wonderful

**Lorraine Sallata** –Yes  
Project beautiful

*Application approved – 7 in favor, 0 opposed*

Motion #2 – Curb Cuts

Motion: \_\_Mike Weissen\_\_  
2<sup>nd</sup> – \_\_Greg Maiuro\_\_

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith** – Yes  
No Negatives

**Mike Weissen** – Yes  
Same

**Greg Maiuro** – Yes  
Same

**Steve Rice** – Yes  
Same

**Tim Kriebel** – Yes  
Same

**Marie McQueen** – Yes  
Same

**Lorraine Sallata** –No  
Not reasonable

*Application approved – 6 in favor, 1 opposed*

---

Other Business

- **Lorraine Sallata** – Landscaping – pulled from Planning Board
  - Mayor looked at – some groups had issues with plants
  - Green Team – next Planning Board Meeting
  - Need a good & bad list
  - Some salt water friendly
- **Mike Weissen** – Landscaping – House lifting
  - If ordinance on books, can get money for landscaping

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

Second: \_\_Tim Kriebel\_\_

Meeting adjourned at \_\_8:20\_\_ PM