



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 August 21, 2013 – 6:30 PM

1. Call to Order
2. Flag Salute
3. Roll Call

Present

Lorraine Sallata  
Greg Maiuro  
Dan Smith  
Mike Weissen  
Clyde Yost  
Stephen Rice  
Bert Sabo

Absent

Mike Einwechter – Alt # 1

**Professionals:**

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates  
John Rosenberger, Esq.

4. Adoption of Minutes of July 17, 2013 meetings  
Motion: \_\_ Steve Rice \_\_\_\_\_  
Second: \_\_ Clyde Yost \_\_\_\_\_  
Approval: All in favor
5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions  
**Z8 of 2013 – Robert & Wendy Heller**  
105 S Pittsburgh Ave  
Block 38, Lot 3  
Requested various “C” Variances – Approved  
  
Motion: Dan Smith  
2<sup>nd</sup>: Bert Sabo  
Approve: All

6. Applicants

***Peter Rapetti, Sr.***

6401-6405 Ventnor Ave

Blk. 121, Lot 1

Requesting CNC

Represented by Len Mannos

Sworn in: *Len Mannos, Attorney*

Application is for 6401-6405 Ventnor Ave

Requesting a CNC – Currently a mixed use unit of 2 commercial & 6 residential  
2 on first floor, 4 on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

In City Commercial District – use not allowed

Prior to 1978, use was allowed

Exhibit A2 – letter with test date

At time ordinance was changed – same mixed use, and same today

Sworn in: Jean Rapetti, Owner

Asked questions about property

Parents acquired in 1947 – was deeded over in June 1995

Describes 1958 uses

2 commercial – deli until 1987 and a jewelry store

6 residential

In 1978, the use was the same – Floor plan of units did not change

Reviews documents submitted to Board

Exhibits submitted to Board:

A1 – Series of photos

A2 – Letter from Building Dept. with Test year

A3- Polk Directory – 1970, 1978

A7 – Additional Polk Directory – 1958

1978 Polk – confusing items in directory – 6405 does not mention apartment

A4 – Letter from Fire Dept. stating 6 units

A5 – Certification from resident – in audience

A6 – Pest company letter stating 6 units

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

None

**PUBLIC:**

*Peter Karabashian* – Neighbor  
Testifies always had 6 units

Motion: CNC

Motion: Greg Maiuro

2<sup>nd</sup>: Bert Sabo

Vote:

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Well documented

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

Presented lots of evidence – have lived in the area

**Steve Rice:** Yes

Well documented

**Greg Maiuro:** Yes

Remember the area – know it has been this way

**Mike Weissen:** Yes

Presented well

**Clyde Yost:** Yes

Had enough evidence

**Lorraine Sallata:** Yes

Evidence was well done – provided test year

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

---

***Applicant:***

***David & Jeannine Wyke***

106 N Martindale Ave

Blk. 193, Lot 14

Requesting various “C” variances

Represented by Self

Sworn in: *Jeannine Wyke*

Flat garage roof currently – want to put a new pitch roof with gutters

Leaks into the home

Reviews submitted documents

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Craig Hurless:** reviews Engineer’s report

It is an addition to an existing attached structure

The vertical expansion to the side yard which requires 4' setback which the existing is 0.7" and will be maintained.

Only Engineering issue is the potential run-off of water

Applicant submitted revised gutter plans

Would require that downspouts not face the adjacent property

Landscaping – Grass strip and Street trees – existing area is concrete

Gathers Board consensus

**Lorraine Sallata**: Concern for the run-off. Is this plan OK?

Craig Hurless: Yes – concern is for downspouts

**PUBLIC PORTION:**

*None*

**Lorraine Sallata**: Believe there is need for the grass and trees – what does Board think?

Mrs. Wyke – City just repaved and put concrete in – never had before – but will do

What Board wants

Board is just trying to get more greenery

Ok

Motion: **Dan Smith**

2<sup>nd</sup>: **Bert Sabo**

Vote:

**Clyde Yost**: Yes

With Conditions set

**Mike Weissen**: Yes

With conditions set

**Greg Maiuro**: Yes

Was a hardship – this corrects it

**Steve Rice**: Yes

With conditions

**Bert Sabo**: Yes

Solves a problem and will look better

**Dan Smith**: Yes

Solves a problem and will look better

**Lorraine Sallata**: Yes

Improvement – practical and looks good

**Motion approved 7 in Favor, 0 opposed**

---

**Applicant:**

Barny Investments  
11 S Weymouth Ave  
Block 53, Lot 11  
Requesting "C" Variances for Lot Width and Side Yard  
Represented by Brian Callaghan

Dan Smith & Mike Weissen recuse themselves from the application

Sworn in: Brian Callaghan

Plan is to tear down and build a new 2 family duplex

Board approaches and discusses in side bar as to whether variances are needed

Brian Callaghan: Reason here – City passed ordinance – 2 family homes can be demolished and rebuilt  
The new ordinance has issues of 2 family vs. duplex verbiage  
The new ordinance left out duplex requirements  
Discussions the ordinance and the issues with it  
Discussions issues of variance vs. no variance

Here to ask the Board based on the originally planned ordinance

Exhibits:

A1: Existing Photo  
A2: Variance Plan  
A3: Rendition of new home

Sworn In: Arthur Ponzio – Planner

Discusses existing building and what it is like  
Plan to demolish – build new 2 family – will do the following  
Reduce Lot coverage  
Reduce building coverage  
Increase the Side yard  
Increase Rear yard  
Increase front yard  
Decrease height  
Decrease Bedroom count  
Increase onsite parking

Making better use of bulk standards

Asking for Lot Width where 32' is required and 31.03' is actual  
Asking for Side Yard where 4' is required and 3.75' is actual  
This is to get a standard size out without issue.

Discusses rendition of new home  
Elevating to meet FEMA requirements

Parking is in the rear  
4 total spaces under the building  
There will be storage in the front  
There will be 2 showers under the porch

Promotes zoning as it eliminates many non-conforming items  
Believes this is important to the City  
No detriments  
It is a positive improvement to the area

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Steve Rice:** What is existing and planned heights?  
Will have 35; above base flood limit

**Bert Sabo:** Is there any 2<sup>nd</sup> means of egress on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor?  
There is no 2<sup>nd</sup> means of egress  
Believe would have to have a 2<sup>nd</sup> means of egress  
Will put in if needed  
It is a code issue

**Craig Hurless:** Did not prepare a report as I thought it would be tabled  
Reviews new ordinance and the issues in it  
Meant to eliminate a Use variance – makes easier to redevelop  
It indicates they may not need a variance  
There are 2 deviations – side yard and lot width

Technical requirements – Grass strip on other side and street trees

**PUBLIC:**

*Frank Lindato* – 13 S Weymouth  
11 S has been an eyesore – nothing has been done to it  
Should be demolished but should have changes  
Object to the parking in back because of the other yard  
It is so close to the house

Daughter  
Lives in home at 13 S – new design would have porches looking into BR  
View to Ventnor would be blocked  
Parking area would be a fire hazard and generate pollution

**Lorraine Sallata:** Anything demolished would be done to code – we do not control that

Want the variances to meet all codes – should stay if can't do that  
Discusses the issues  
Blocks view, violations that could be brought up  
Would like to know how much the units are selling for

If can't sell, would it be rented?

*Mike Weissen* – Public

Have property across the street  
Currently it is 8 bedrooms  
It could have more than 4 parking spaces  
When would the start date be?  
September tear down – construction start October  
Discusses insurance issues  
Don't see any real negative

*Susan Smith* – Dan Smith Real Estate

Been involved with this for many years  
Has always been an eyesore  
Need this to happen – a value to the neighborhood

*Brian Callaghan* – Ponzio

Existing Building 4.8' Need is 10' plans to meet ordinance

Parking is required under the structure for the ordinance

**Lorraine Sallata**: Frankfort Ave side – what is the plan

Shrubs in the center to separate the parking – lawn & street trees

*Brian Callaghan*: 1<sup>st</sup> project under the new requirements – Great for the City

Motion: 2 side yard setbacks – 3.75' and 3.34', lot width of 31.03'

Conditions – grass strip and street trees

Motion: Bert Sabo

2<sup>nd</sup>: Clyde Yost

Vote:

**Bert Sabo**: Yes

Well thought out – jump start from code requirements – changing a lot

**Steve Rice**: Yes

Positives outweigh the negative

**Greg Maiuro**: Yes

Asset to neighborhood and Ventnor

**Clyde Yost**: Yes

Very Nice plan – a great improvement

**Lorraine Sallata**: Yes

As close to a perfect new development that you can get

Neighbors have need – applaud the changes

Application approved 5 in favor, 0 opposed

---

Applicant:

N. Canuso Company  
5301-5303 Atlantic Ave  
Block 55, Lot 1  
Requesting a CNC  
Represented by Anthony Canuso

Sworn in: *Anthony Canuso*

Owner and Attorney

Sworn in: *Joseph Canuso*

In 1970 – Worked for Farley Real Estate at that location  
Test Year is 1978  
Prior to 1978 – 3 Commercial – 5 residential  
3 on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, 2 on 3<sup>rd</sup> floor  
In 1978 – Same structure  
Present – Same Structure

No Change or suspension of use

**Lorraine Sallata**: Back in the 1970's, there were 3 commercial and now there are 2

Questions the configuration of units

Reviews how set up is done

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

Mike Weissen – Why are you here for a CNC

Property is up for sale and told had to get CNC – no certificate was ever issued

**PUBLIC:**

None

Motion: CNC

Motion: Mike Weissen

2<sup>nd</sup>: Greg Maiuro

Vote:

Dan Smith: Yes

Well documented – ownership consistent

Bert Sabo: Yes

Sufficient evidence

Steve Rice: Yes

Documents all in place

Greg Maiuro: Yes

Documents provided sufficient

Mike Weissen: Yes

Well documented

Clyde Yost: Yes

Records support application

Lorraine Sallata: Yes

Supports test year

Application approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed

7. Other Business

- a. Steve Rice: CNC's – Board discusses options and how they are done
- b. New TV – Introduce new TV in court room

Motion to adjourn: \_\_Bert Sabo \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_\_\_\_Steve Rice \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting adjourned at \_\_8:00 \_\_\_\_\_ PM