



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 December 16, 2009 – 6:30 PM

1. Call to Order: 6:35 PM
2. Flag Salute
3. Roll Call

Present

Jim Reynolds
Lorraine Sallata
Dan Smith
Mike Weissen
Clyde Yoste
Stephen Rice

Absent

Michael Conte
Greg Maiuro

Professionals:

John Matthews, Esq.
Dick Carter, Engineer

4. Adoption of Minutes of November 18, 2009 meeting
 - Motion: Lorraine Sallata
 - Second: Dan Smith
 - Approval: All in favor
 - Adoption of the Following Resolutions
 - Z-29: Angelico Perez
 - 107 North Troy Ave.
 - Block 175, Lot 4
 - "C" Variance for Porch
 - Z-30: Diane Richards
 - 130 N. Richards Ave.
 - Block 177 Lot 9
 - "C" Variance for Fence

- Z-31: Clementine Camp
 - 18 N. Cambridge Ave;
 - Block 119, Lot 24
 - Certificate of Non-Conformity for Duplex

Motion to Approve All: Lorraine Sallata
 2nd: Mike Weissen
 All in Favor

5. Applicants:

Ian & Sharon Modelevsky
 5 S. Cambridge Ave.
 Block 64, Lot 8
 Represented by John Scott Abbott
 Requesting Interpretation and possible Use Variance

Carried over from November Meeting

Scott Abbott- Were here last month – Board commented that 2nd floor was acceptable but 1st floor should stay as garage. Re-submitted plans that show such. We are asking for an interpretation of the use and a variance if one is needed.

Todd Miller – Architect – Revised plans showing changes requested from last meeting
 Abandoned occupied use of first floor and kept as a garage

Jack Matthews – Is there a kitchen on 2nd floor, and a bathroom
 Only a wet bar, and yes a bathroom with 2 sinks and a shower

Lorraine – Unsure if a wet bar was acceptable on the 2nd floor
 Scott – Were told anything was ok on 2nd floor but only a garage on the 1st floor

Mike Weissen – questions what a wet bar is defined as
 Todd Miller – it is a 5' counter with sink and small refrigerator under counter

Dan Smith – was understanding there was to be no kitchen at all
 Thought 2nd floor was acceptable

Jack Matthews – if Board interprets 2nd floor as living area, also needs to interpret if there is a kitchen

Marc Modelevsky – will eliminate sink at wet bar if needed

Jack Matthews – What Board needs to do is issue interpretation – Based on interpretation, would not need a use variance – gives a base interpretation based on new plans

Lorraine – would need a relief for the Bathroom
 No, there is no expanded use

Dick Carter – Ok with changes and interpretation – conditions to be met are removal of sink and microwave, and that all utilities come from main house.

Public Discussion: None

Motion to accept Interpretation and conditions as stated by Jack Matthews and Dick Carter:
Mike Weissen.

Second: Lorraine Sallata

Vote:

1. Lorraine Sallata: Yes
 - i. Modifications and adjustments are satisfactory
2. Stephen Rice: Yes
 - a. Agree with all changes and compromises
3. Clyde Yost: Yes
 - i. Not using 1st floor and agree with all compromises
4. Mike Weissen: Yes
 - i. Applicant got all they wanted
5. Dan Smith: Yes
 - i. Same result and compromises acceptable
6. Jim Reynolds: Yes
 - i. Completely agree with all changes and compromises

Variance Approved: 6 in favor, 0 opposed

Applicant: Christopher A. Brown
15 South Somerset Ave.
Block 58 Lot 6
Requesting: Minor Site "C" Variance for Lot Coverage

Chris Brown sworn in

Gives history of work done. A little over a year ago, submitted plans. Person who submitted plans never submitted plans for the pavers with the Building Office. The person then disappeared and has also been arrested for theft. They never pulled paver permits, and since work has been done, have to request a variance. Now believes there is more landscaping than before since a deck was removed. Whoever did the cement work should have gotten permits at that time.

Discussion with Board and Mr. Brown in regards to permits and work done:

Dick Carter – The plans showed the work to be done and the person who pulled the permits were told of issues and this info was not relayed to Mr. Brown. This is then a misrepresentation of facts:

Yes, I was unsure of what conversations had transpired and if had known, could have done something about.

Dan – 1st contractor left and then another put in the pavers

Yes, a sub-contractor

Dick – the question is; would the Board approve this if it had been put in before the work was done. The circumstances cannot be an issue. Question as to whether any pavers can be removed.

No, they cannot

Dan – Do you think there is more coverage then compared to now

As a lay person, yes

Dick – the pool itself does not constitute run-off, but the Board can look at concrete v. bricks. Could look at the coverage and see as a run-off issue.

Lorraine wonders why pavers just cannot be removed

There is no good place to remove. All landscaping is new.

Dick Carter sees no engineering issue with the Coverage.

Public Discussion: None

Motion to accept variance for lot coverage of 67%: Mike Weissen

Second: Dan Smith

Vote:

1. Lorraine Sallata: Yes
 - a. Conflicting thoughts. If had asked for previous, would have asked for 60% coverage, but because of issues, will accept
2. Clyde Yost: Yes
 - a. Didn't like the way things went down, but it looks nice
3. Mike Weissen: Yes
 - a. Tough to do a project when you are gone and have to rely on others
4. Dan Smith: Yes
 - a. Circumstances dictated this, coverage looks less than prior, and it is a nice addition
5. Stephen Rice: Yes
 - a. Beautiful landscaping job – nice improvement
6. Jim Reynolds: Yes
 - a. Beautiful job done

Variance Approved: 6 in Favor, 0 Opposed

6. Other Business:

None

Motion to adjourn: Mike Weissen

Second: Lorraine Sallata

Meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM