



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 February 18, 2015 – 6:30 PM

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

Present

Lorraine Sallata
Greg Maiuro

Mike Weissen

Tim Kriebel

Marie McQueen – Alt # 2

Professionals:

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates
John Rosenberger, Esq.

Absent

Dan Smith

Stephen Rice
Bert Sabo

Leonard Mordell – Alt #1

4. Adoption of Minutes of January 21, 2015 meetings
Motion: _Greg Maiuro _____
Second: _Mike Weissen _____
Approval: All in favor
5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions
 - a. **Re-Organization Resolution**
 - b. **Z-1 of 2015: Scott & Alyssa Bannett**
107 S Sacramento Ave., Blk. 23, Lot 5
Requested "C" Variances- Denied
 - c. **Z-2 of 2015: Ross Miller**
2 N Richards Ave., Blk. 125, Lot 24
Requested "C" Variances- Denied
 - d. **Z-3 of 2015: Harvey Mendelsohn**
310 N Oxford Ave., Blk. 214, Lot 17
Requested "C" Variances- Approved

Motion: __Greg Maiuro _____

2nd: _____Marie McQueen _____

Approval: All by roll call vote

6. Applicants

a. **Kurt & Beth Kwart**

125 N Derby Ave, Blk. 156, Lot 6

Requesting "C" Variances

Represented by Self

Sworn in: *Beth Kwart*

Variances needed Front, Side, & Parking

Lift house to meet FEMA requirements - +1' allowed by FEMA

Currently a 2 unit duplex – 2 bedroom per unit

Keeping the footprint the same

It is a non-conforming property

Parking – need 3 parking – 1.5 per unit

Currently have 0 – proposed 2

Lot is 25' wide – 32' minimum lot size

If had the size would conform

Sworn in: **Craig Hurless**

February 4, 2015 review

Existing duplex – raising to conform

New curb cut & driveway

Parking will be under – both under

Expanding rear deck & modify front deck

R7 Zone

Variances

Front – Derby – 1st & 2nd deck – 7' required vs 5.7' proposed

Side – 4' required vs 2' proposed

Even with parking improvement – still need – 3 required

Provide clarity – show parking on plan

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Lorraine Sallata – Rear yard deck – chimney on left side

Yes

What is space to property line for it?

Might be about 1.5'

Concerned a small lot – increasing a non-conformity is a concern

Greg Maiuro – Is chimney coming staying?

Coming down when lifted

Safety concern for fire

Direct vents – yes, should be gone

Not required to change footprint – would not change

Marie McQueen – Rear deck at 5.7' now

Could show plan

Actually going down in size?

Yes

Could flip deck to gain more space?

Smaller not bigger

Lorraine Sallata – Landscaping or system – explain

Drip irrigation system – funneled by rain – not a lot of room now – not a final plan –

Need more specifics

Lorraine Sallata – front – currently stone

Want to put native plant garden – plants in ground

Mike Weissen – Landscaping – best in a while

Thanks

Board talks about irrigation system

Mike Weissen – Parking – one in & one out?

No, amend plan – both will be under house – proposed driveway no long enough

Craig Hurless – parking not delineated – need to show on plan

PUBLIC:

None

Beth Kwart – not changing footprint – narrow lot – if had, would conform better – doing best can with parking – making more beautiful

Motion: Front for decks – 5.7' vs 7'

Side – 2' vs 4'

Parking – 2 vs 3

Compliance with review

Motion – Mike Weissen
2nd Greg Maiuro

Vote:

Mike Weissen – Yes

No changes footprint – hardship – excellent landscaping

Greg Maiuro – Yes

Hardship lot size – relief for parking

Marie McQueen – Yes

Like plans

Tim Kriebel – Yes

Same – best of difficult situation

Lorraine Sallata – Yes

Like plans – some concerns on setbacks – hardship

Motion Approved 5 in favor, 0 opposed

7. Applicant

a. Alfred & Theresa Longmore

517 N Cornwall Ave, Blk. 289, Lot 8

Requesting “C” variances

Represented by Self

Sworn in: *Alfred & Theresa Longmore*

Reads statement in regards to house and size of property

October 2011 bought house

Plan to elevate home above sea level

Deck is still entertainment area

Proposed deck

Keep same dimensions – on top level

Only 10’ on lower deck with 4’ stairs

Place new deck on same footprint as old deck

Ask for approval on deck plan

Cannot access home until deck is done

Ask for immediate approval to do work

Craig Hurless: February 4, 2015 review

Already raised dwelling

1 variance for rear deck – 15’ required vs 10.5’ existing vs 10.5’ planned

Technical comments

Waiver for street trees

Did not provide landscaping plan

Recommend trees

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Mike Weissen – on last plan – landscaping plan

Did submit

Lorraine Sallata – replicate front yard – would suffice

Yes, want to re-establish – deal with street trees

Only Irrigation is on grass bay

On both sides

Craig Hurless – could relocate to accommodate

Will put in

PUBLIC:

None

Motion: Variance for rear yard – 10.5’ vs 15’

All technical comments

Motion: Greg Maiuro

2nd: Marie McQueen

VOTE:

Mike Weissen: Yes

Clear Hardship

Greg Maiuro: Yes

Tough to raise – have to have deck

Marie McQueen: Yes

Same

Tim Kriebel: Yes

Triggered by raising

Lorraine Sallata: Yes

No Negatives

Application denied 5 in favor, 0 opposed

8. Applicant

a. Dudley Street Trust

102A S Dudley Ave, Blk. 17, Lot 6.022

Requesting "C" variances

Represented by John Scott Abbott

Sworn in: *John Scott Abbott*

Architect – Craig Dothe

Currently under construction – Joe Verne

Wants pool in back yard

2 car wide driveway on Dudley Ave.

Exhibits:

A1 – Site Plan

A2 – Landscaping Plan

A3 – Photos – back yard – decking

A4 – Parking & Accessibility Lanes

A5 – Photo plans

Variances

Driveway Width – 20'

Lot Coverage -60% required vs 69.03% planned

Accessory Pool Equipment – 3' required vs 0' planned

Pool & hot tub is about 8%-9% of coverage

Decking at grade level

Craig Dothe

Reviews site plan – lot is 50' x 125'

In St. Leonard's Tract

Heavily landscaped – front – grass on sides – vegetation along back

Parking – 2 in garage – one outside

Pool & raised whirlpool in back

HVAC – wide side of property – as far front

Outside shower under deck

Proposed – expand curb cut to 20'

Parking cars side by side

Provide 3 additional cars off street over and above what is needed

Focus on driveway

Discusses A4 on parking

Not taking away any on street parking

Reviews plans, parking, & neighbors

About 40' from curb cut to neighbor's curb cut

Instead of a 50' difference – 2 cars to 40' – still 2 cars

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Lorraine Sallata –Questions distance to curb cuts

Reviews curb cuts

Craig Dothe -

Lot coverage –

Reviews definition of lot coverage

Building plus all impervious items

Discusses pool & coverage issue

Pool accounts for about 8% of coverage

Pool decking also counts

Reviews decking in rear

Reviews how water run-off is done with pavers

Pavers account for 2%

Reviews water fall and need for it

Reviews landscaping plans

Provide as much green as possible

Reviews rear & front vegetation

Pool accessory –built above flood elevation - +/- 2' above grade

Locate along back of fence

6' vinyl fence

Equipment height – lower than fence

Reviews plans with Board

Required 5' vs 3.5' planned

Distance to fence to neighbor garage – 4.6'

Discusses benefit of placement – helps to hide & screen

Increase setback from neighbor & hide from others

Surrounded by landscaping & wall

Lorraine Sallata: what was other possibilities for equipment?

Board discusses other options

Still keeps it on property line

Yes – tried to locate best for all neighbors

Concerned with locating on or near line

Siteliness of equipment an issue

Justification & no detriment

Craig Hurless – review of January 13, 2015

R1 district

Variances – all relate to pool & parking

Rear – Pool equipment – 3' required vs 0' planned

Curious to hear neighbors

Noise issue

Max lot coverage – 60% required vs 69.03% planned

No concern with storm water run-off

Limit intensity land use

Not above and beyond issues

Max width driveway allowed – 10' vs 20' planned

Additional 3 off street parking

A net surplus

Technical issues

Tim Kriebel – height of pool equipment & water falls?

2' above pool deck

Pool equipment about 2'-3' higher – below the 6' fence

Only in summer will grow tall enough to cover

Yes, but have a fence also

PUBLIC:

Louis Selgrath – 6001 Ventnor Ave. – St. Leonard's Tract

Opposed to some of requests

Land coverage, curb cuts, pool equipment

Land coverage – is pool an afterthought

A timing issue – want to get going

Parking – too many to add – a parking lot – not appropriate

Doubling curb cut – too much

Ask for pavers instead of concrete

Pool Accessories – no more than 3' or a sound barrier

Mike Weissen – Is it A or B?

2 lots – sub-divided

How do you feel about it?

Need to be within boundaries

Had concerns before meeting – any changes now?

A little bit – parking still an issue

Just don't want a 20' cut

Dr. Elaine Francis – 104 S Dudley

Believe in all other concerns

Extended parking issue – concrete

Placement of equipment – concerned with noise

Want same type of sound reduction

Mike Weissen – if took it & moved it in – how much less noise would there be?

Not sure – 3’ might not make much difference

Noise is line of sight

Moving away from fence – could be more noise

Lorraine Sallata – If any relief – could be louder if moved

Would like some kind of sound barrier

Board cannot tell what have to build

Scott Abbott – Design was to minimize noise

Craig Dothe – have moved further – also add more vegetation – still need access to it – do not want to get away from opposite garage – could put another side wall – did best we could

Lorraine Sallata – this is a neighbor thing – Board has info it needs

Greg Maiuro – are there other curb cuts that is 20’

Yes, many of them – also Planning Board worked to allow

Motion: Variances

Accessory pool – 3’ vs 0’

Driveway – 10’ vs 20’

Lot coverage – 60% vs 69.03%

Conditions

Technical comments

Motion: Marie McQueen

2nd: Greg Maiuro

VOTE:

Mike Weissen – Yes

Did have concerns – did good job explaining – pool – no loss of street parking – to get 3 off street – a benefit – pool equipment – could be noisier

Greg Maiuro – No

No hardship here – curb cut an issue

Marie McQueen – Yes

Same

Tim Kriebel – Yes

Same concerns – net is equal for curb

Lorraine Sallata – Yes

1st glance had doubts – requirements not outrageous – parking cleared up – pool is best

Application approved 4 in favor, 1 opposed

9 Applicant

a. **5001 Ventnor Ave LLC**

5001 Ventnor Ave,

Mike Weinraub – Owner 5001 Ventnor Ave
Requests carryover until next month
Request waiver of notices

John Rosenberger – appropriate to make this request

Next meeting March 18th

10 Applicant

a. **Susane McGinty**

6301 Monmouth Ave, Blk. 166, Lot 14

Requesting “C” variances

Represented by Brian Callaghan

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Amend application – eliminate rear deck variance – make a 5’ deck – no variance

Property on corner of Monmouth & Sacramento

Lifted house – on same footprint – eliminate garage in rear

1st floor deck – 7’ required vs 0.5’ planned

2nd floor deck – 8’ required vs 4’ planned

Top of roof

1st floor deck – side – 8’ required vs 0’ planned

Exhibits

A1 – Variance Plans

A2 – Elevation plans

Sworn in: *Jon Barnhardt*

Previous – 2 story – single family

Sacramento – on line

Monmouth – 4’ off

Entrance on side

Had existing garage on property line

Now – house raised to FEMA requirements
Also to gain access and outside living space

Rear deck – along Sacramento
Along house on Sacramento side

Create access point – stairs covered – no rear yard or side yard

Front decks – maintain old porch – now raised – about 4' off property line

Also deck on 1st floor & then stepped deck off bedroom

Reviews all variances – needed for decks

Tried to respect neighbors
Remove old garage
Eliminate a curb cut on Monmouth
Remove impervious coverage from 93% to 85%

Benefits outweigh the detriments

Requesting waiver for street trees
Also request waiver of governor's strip

Brian Callaghan – discusses governor strip issues & issues with grass in areas – salt water & flooding – plan has 3 trees on side – neighbor wants shrubs instead

Plan to create shrub bed & greenery in area – discuss landscaping

Craig Hurless – Review of 2/14/15

R7 district – did not have a “D” variance
Amended to eliminate rear yard deck variance
Variances
Front yard – 1st – Monmouth – 7' vs 0.38'
Front yard – 2nd – Monmouth – 8' vs 4.78'
Front yard – Sacramento – 7' vs 0'
Technical issues – curb cut
Landscaping – did recommend trees & shrubs
No issue waiving this

Mike Weissen - Substantial or non-substantial damage
Substantial – total hardship

Lorraine Sallata – Also asking row of trees to become shrubs
1st tree stays then a shrub pattern

PUBLIC:

NONE

Motion: Variances as noted by Engineer
Waive street trees, governor strip, add shrub line

Motion: Greg Maiuro
2nd – Marie McQueen

VOTE:

Mike Weissen – Yes

Clear hardship – commend to listen to neighbors

Greg Maiuro – Yes

Hardship – a corner lot

Marie McQueen – Yes

Hardship

Tim Kriebel – Yes

Thank for effort

Lorraine Sallata – Yes

Big issues

Application approved 5 in favor, 0 opposed

Other Business

Greg Maiuro – Can do astro-turf instead of grass?

Not clear

Working on plan

Opinion that turf would not count

Brian Callaghan discusses some issues with landscaping – existing vs new

Motion to adjourn: __Mike Weissen ____

Second: _____Greg Maiuro _____

Meeting adjourned at __9:00 _____ PM