



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 July 17, 2013 – 6:30 PM

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

Present

Lorraine Sallata

Dan Smith
Mike Weissen
Clyde Yost
Stephen Rice
Bert Sabo
Mike Einwechter – Alt # 1

Absent

Greg Maiuro

Professionals:

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates
John Rosenberger, Esq.

4. Adoption of Minutes of June 17, 2013 meetings
Motion: __Steve Rice _____
Second: __Clyde Yost _____
Approval: All in favor

5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions

Z6 of 2013 – Van Duyne LLC

115 N Dudley Ave

Block 154, Lot 6

Requested “C” Variances for Lot Width & Side Yard– Approved

Z7 of 2013 – Arthur & Sandra Mattia

229 N Surrey Ave.

Block 149, lot 18

Requested “C” Variances for Rear Yard & Dormer – Approved

Motion: Clyde Yost

2nd: Dan Smith

Approve: All

6. Applicants

Peter Rapetti, Sr.

6401-6405 Ventnor Ave

Blk. 121, Lot 1

Requesting CNC

Represented by Self

Sworn in: *Peter Rapetti*

Reads advertisement/letter stating application

Built in 1920 – 2 stores and 6 apartments

In a commercial district – residential not allowed

John Rosenberger: Tells applicant what he needs to do

Peter Rapetti: Require a change in zoning for the building – told the apartments cannot be renovated

There are 2 apartments on the ground level and 2 apartments. Originally when built there were 3 store fronts.

Parents bought in 1946

Lorraine Sallata: Have you ever altered anything?

In 1950, there was an antique shop

Lorraine Sallata: In the packet, there are photos of the commercial units, but only 1 of the residential units

Board discusses with applicant what and how the application process works

Sworn in: *Jean Rapetti*

Applicant and Board Members discuss the application process and what is needed

Dan Smith: Your packet has several entries from the Polk directory and you highlighted several entries. Why did you do that?

Directory is confusing with addressing. Reviews apartments and addresses

Lorraine Sallata: Board wants to help but this is a legal matter; may want to postpone and come back

John Rosenberger: Discusses options and legal options

Applicant requests postponement until August 21st meeting. No additional noticing will be needed.

Board approves postponement

Applicant:

Robert & Wendy Heller

105 S Pittsburgh Ave

Blk. 38, Lot 3

Requesting various "C" variances

Represented by Nick Talvacchia from Cooper Levenson

Sworn in: *Nick Talvacchia*

This is a continuance from last month

Met with neighbors – asked and had to change a number of things

3 rear decks were removed and rear moved back 11" to conform to setbacks

Moved the shed

Reduced the impervious coverage

Sworn in: *Christina Bonnadichio* – Architect

Reviews exhibits:

A1: Floor plans

A2: 3rd floor plan

A3: Building Elevations

A4: Colored rendering of front elevation

Reviews changes made in rear

Shed: Moved to 3' off line which now conforms

Sworn in: *Tom Days* – Planner

Reviews additional exhibits:

- A5: Aerial photo of area
Reviews site plan
- A6: Existing conditions – photos
Shows tree to eliminate for view
- A7: Footprint of existing and proposed
Maintaining a 9.5' front setback for bay windows
- A8: Existing and proposed plans
Reviews all setbacks

Porches and decks – 7' required and asking for 3.5'

Building coverage: 51.7% existing – 50% required – asking 50.8%

Lot Coverage: 77% existing – 75% required – asking 80.2%

- A3: marked up elevation plan
Max height allowed is 35' and asking for 38.5'
Eave height asking for 36'
Very small amount of encroachment
About ½ way down the building
No impact on any views

Reviews variance benefits:

- Front stays the same as the current bay windows
Neighbor near the ocean has a 0' setback
Ours in planned for 3'
- Removing the current tree to help with views
Plan is consistent with neighbors and their schemes
Rear is now totally conforming

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Lorraine Sallata: review neighbors setbacks once again

- No front setback
- Principal structure is 6.8'
- Our plan has greater setbacks

Are their steps encroaching on City right of way?

Yes

Accessory building is currently on the property line?

- Tonight we are moving it 1' off the line
 - Issue is with the size of the building to allow for proper storage
 - Neighbor only had an issue with the rear location – wanted off the line so we put at 3'
- Issue is a safety concern with accessibility

Craig Hurless: Sworn in

Reviews Engineer's report

Ask to clarify the shed – is it the same size but just shifting 1' in?

Yes

Reviews variances needed – required vs. requested

There are no other technical issues

On Beach Block – Board has waived the street tree requirement

Any issues with complying with report items?

No

John Days: Discusses eave height issues

Works esthetically with the house

Only the stairwell roof is above the requirement

Nick Talvacchia: request waiver for street trees

Dan Smith: Areas shown in pink on the plan shows the non-conforming areas – how does neighbor compare?

A10: Photos of neighbor to the South

Plan is very similar to their heights

PUBLIC PORTION:

None

Motion: to grant variances –

- Side yard – 1' requested with 5' required
- Front yard – 9.5' requested with 12' required
- Porch – 3' requested with 7' required
- Building Coverage: 50.8% requested with 50% required
- Lot Coverage: 80.2% requested with 75% required
- Roof Height: 38.5' requested with 35' required
- Eave Height: 36' requested with 23' required
- 1st story steps: 1.2' requested with 7' required
- Waiver of street trees

Board discusses landscaping plans

Applicant OK with amended landscaping plan to include year round shrubbery

Motion: **Mike Weissen**

2nd: **Bert Sabo**

Vote:

Dan Smith: Yes

No negative impact –vast improvement – nice to work with neighbor on issues

Mike Weissen: Yes

Great Plan – beneficial to all – all concessions made to all

Clyde Yost: Yes

Very nice design – enhances the area – good adjustment to rear

Steve Rice: Yes

No negative impact – consistent with the block

Bert Sabo: Yes

Well thought out – esthetically pleasing – good to work with neighbor

Mike Einwechter: Yes

Keeps the coastal heritage – major improvement to block

Lorraine Sallata: Yes

Good willing to work with all – very nice plan

Motion approved 7 in Favor, 0 opposed

7. Other Business

- a. Bert Sabo – Discusses St. James plan and how it looks like it is jamming too much into block
 - i. Craig Hurless: Planning Board to discuss all other church lands
 - ii. Board discusses these plans
- b. Atlantic Ave properties before the Board in the past
 - i. What is the status?
 - ii. Unsure
- c. Board discusses the Waves and their requests

Motion to adjourn: __Mike Weissen _____

Second: _____Steve Rice _____

Meeting adjourned at __7:31 _____ PM