



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 19, 2015 – 6:30 PM

1. Call to Order: _6:30_ PM
2. Flag Salute
3. Roll Call

Present

Lorraine Sallata

Dan Smith

Mike Weissen

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 July 15, 2015 meetings

Motion: ___ Mike Weissen _____

Second: ___ Bert Sabo _____

Approval: All in favor

5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions

Z-22 of 2015: Danielle Manera

105 N Suffolk Ave, Blk. 151, Lot 4.01

Requested "C" variances-Approved

Z-23 of 2015: Rosemary Sarno

111 N Somerset, Blk. 152, Lot 6

Requested "C" variances - Approved

Z-24 of 2015: Two Pioneers, LLC

25 S Little Rock Ave Blk. 54, Lot 6

Requested "C" variances - Approved

- a. **Z-25 of 2015: Allen Gilber**

23 N Cornwall Ave, Blk. 117, Lot 7

Absent

Greg Maiuro

Requested "C" variances- Approved

Motion: ___ Dan Smith _____

2nd: _____ Marie McQueen _____

Approval: All by roll call vote

6. Applicant: 109 N Wissahickon Ave.

Brian Callaghan

Asking to adjourn application until next month

Applicant is considering changing the rear yard setback based off of neighbor input

If change rear yard setback, the "D" variance may go away and the application may have to go to the Planning Board

Applicant has not decided as of yet

John Rosenberger

You will decide

You have made request

No new notice will be made for application to be heard at September 16 Board meeting

If have to go to Planning Board, new notices will be needed

Brian Callaghan

If not coming back, will send letters to notify

7. Applicant

a. Ilysa Lapidis

6806 Winchester Ave. /29 N Newark Ave, Blk. 127, Lot 10

Requesting "C" variances

Represented by Eric Goldstein

Sworn in: *Eric Goldstein*

Ilysa Lapidis

Don Zacker

Don Zacker

Reviews plan

1 over 1 duplex – corner lot

Unit on Newark has 2 parking spaces

Unit on Winchester – no garage presently

Have a spiral staircase

There is 14' available

Putting in a single car garage

Need a side yard setback

Rear yard for garage – 12' vs 3.3'

Side yard – 4' vs 1.5'

To squeeze in a walkway

Plan to give 2 cars – 1 in garage and one out

Eric Goldstein – now have one off street

Don Zacker – now need stairs to access 2nd floor

Door to traditional stairs

Shingles and roofing to match rest of house

Will meet all requirements

No detriments – advantages outweigh the negatives

Ilysa Lapides – purpose to use for a garage – no accessory use

Craig Hurless – review of 7/2/15

2 “C” Variances

Demolish shed, garage & Stairs

All total 4 parking will be in place – making compliant

Asking waiver of detailed landscaping & street trees

Will not reduce any existing landscaping

But should have 2 street trees

Variances – attached garage – part of principal structure

Side – 4’ vs 1.5’

Rear – 12’ vs 3.3’

Due to closeness of neighbor

Discharge of water to neighbor

Condition not to discharge

Trees – one on each street

Applicant accepts

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Lorraine Sallata – no issue with garage – issue with side yard – to 1.5’ –concern for emergency personnel – ask Bert Sabo for input

Bert Sabo – 1.5’ is small – adjoining building in set back some – can go onto other property - no issue

Bert Sabo – looking at vinyl siding – would like something better – can do “hardy board” – cement fiber

Applicant has no issue with this

PUBLIC:

NONE

Eric Goldstein – accepts trees and hardy board

Motion: ___ Side Yard – 1.5’ vs 4’
Rear Yard – 3.3’ vs 12’
Waiver of detailed landscaping plan
Conditions – Engineer report
Cement fiber board
Trees – 1 on Newark and 1 on Winchester_

Motion: ___ Bert Sabo _____
2nd: _____ Dan Smith _____

VOTE:

Dan Smith: Yes

Lovely corner property –garage sits back

Tim Kriebel: Yes

With conditions

Mike Weissen: Yes

Great using the hardy board – good material

Bert Sabo: Yes

No negative – agreeable with trees and board – spiral stairs gone good

Leonard Mordell: Yes

All Same

Lorraine Sallata: Yes

Good plan – appreciates help

Application approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed

8. Applicant

a. **Mary Buckley**

305 N Oxford, Blk. 213, Lot 2

Requesting “C” variances

Represented by Self

Sworn in: *Mary Buckley*
Mr. Schaffer

Plan to raise home – have grant funds
Plan to keep garage

Mr. Schaffer –

Raise house - >3.67' to 14.67'

Plan to give additional room in house and raise garage

Add additional room – expand house

No horizontal difference – except stairs

Variances:

Roof gables facing wrong way

No detriments

Craig Hurless – review of 8/4/15

Expansion of existing dwelling

Variances:

Front – principal – 20' vs 16.8'

Overhang – 20' vs 14.8'

Side – principal – 8' vs 5.8'

Gable – not oriented – eave height

Requested to waive landscaping plan

There is existing in plan – replace any damaged

Will do 1 street tree

Believe can do other

Require not to change any runoff drainage

John Rosenberger – need to express roof slope right

Max. Eave height – 19.67' vs 23.6'?

Craig Hurless – should state exceeded maximum roof slope greater than 23'

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Marie McQueen – issue with 2nd tree – if another, can hurt sight – not necessary

Craig Hurless – distance is 75' from Calvert

Bert Sabo – with lifting – could bring some of the siding down to soften look - getting a 9' foundation – could bring some more down – if funding permits

Sworn in: *Mr. Buckley*

Describes how it works

Will still have some amount of foundation showing as it is

PUBLIC

NONE

Mike Weissen – instead of looking like a block – bring some down – if in budget – everything is changing

Have a glass block window that would cause a problem

Tim Kriebel – raising causes the roof slope issue?

Yes

Motion – Front to principal – 16.8’ vs 20’
Front – roof overhang – 14.8’ vs 20’
Side - principal – 5.8’ vs 8’
Maximum roof slope exceeding envelope >23’
Conditions of review

Motion: ___ Dan Smith _____
2nd – ___ Tim Kriebel _____

VOTE:

Dan Smith: Yes

All worked hard – budget & hardship issues – good job

Tim Kriebel: Yes

Makes sense

Mike Weissen: Yes

Nice project

Bert Sabo: Yes

Well thought out – keeping people in town good

Leonard Mordell: Yes

FEMA issues make this

Marie McQueen: Yes

Good luck on job

Lorraine Sallata: No

Sandy put in a hard position – good job

Application approved – 7 in favor, 0 opposed

Other Business

- Landscaping Ordinance
 - Board Secretary reviews position of Commissioners
 - Street Trees & Governor strip is optional
 - # of shrubs too high, but # not determined
 - Board Discusses
 - Misc. Comments
 - If exists should stay
 - Lot coverage often high
 - Does governor strip count
 - No it doesn't but can be taken into account to soften
 - If request, can either agree or not
 - Can conclude variances over –develop the property
 - Should keep street trees in and can give option or not

- Number of discussions
 - Talked about scaling
 - Talked about governor strip
 - Talked about trees
- Reviewed general consensus
- Discussed zones & density
- 2nd meeting possibility
 - Currently have 16 pending applications – not all deemed complete
 - Discussions
 - Can we streamline process
 - Cannot circumvent the law and the process
 - When deemed complete have to schedule
 - Fees will be added for all to do more meetings
 - Scheduling an issue
 - Plan – schedule 6 applications next month and see where Board is at
- Bert Sabo – reviewed 2nd set of stairs issue with multi-unit homes
 - State does not demand 2nd means of egress

Motion to adjourn: ___Marie McQueen_____

Second: _____Leonard Mordell_____

Meeting adjourned at ___7:30___ PM