



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 June 18, 2014 – 6:30 PM

1. Call to Order: 6:30 PM
2. Flag Salute
3. Roll Call

Present

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

Absent

Frank Cavallaro – Alt # 1

Professionals:

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates
John Rosenberger, Esq.

4. Adoption of Minutes of May 28, 2014 meetings

Motion: __ Clyde Yost _____

Second: __ Bert Sabo _____

Approval: All in favor

5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions

Z-10 of 2014: Michael Csuy & Linda Bronson - 110 S Washington Ave. – Blk. 43, Lot 12

Requesting “C” Variances - Approved

Z-11 of 2014: John & Kathleen Irons - 106 S Derby Ave. – Blk. 19, Lot 7.02

Requesting “C” Variances - Approved

Z-12 of 2014: Kelli Beirne - 114 N Suffolk Ave. – Blk. 152, Lot 12.01

Requesting “C” Variances – Approved

Z-13 of 2014: Lin & Ong, LLC - 29-31 S Weymouth Ave. – Block 53, Lot 2

Requesting “C” Variances & “D” Variance - Approved

Motion: Bert Sabo
2nd: Dan Smith
Approval: All

6. Applicants

Gaetano Muzio Family Trust
115 S Troy Ave. – Blk. 30, Lot 2
Requesting clarification of Resolution Z-10 of 2013
Represented by John Scott Abbott

John Rosenberger: There is a disagreement from the resolution

Became a permit issue – construction was stopped
Complaints about the railings – may be contrary to the Board’s wishes
Jimmie Agnesino contacted – looked at resolution
This is a public hearing – but no public comment – can have but don’t have to –this is to clarify action

Look at page 4, paragraph 9 of resolution
Side railings – north side
Discusses resolution and what it says

Believe took only north side, not others
Looked at minutes
Discussed minutes
All noted for railings not just north side

Believe have to amend resolution to capture conditions

If consensus, ask for motion to approve

Lorraine Sallata: Not here, not privy to info – looked at minutes and resolution – Board sensitive to beach views – intent – not able to vote, but clear intent

Mike Weissen: Opinion – blocking of a beach view is a big issue with Board – went to property to take some pictures – noticed that the neighbor is 4’ above the porch in question – trouble that this would block any beach view – think we may be nitpicking a bit – stop work order

John Rosenberger – not really discussing that here – Board made an agreement that night – here to re-address that would be a re-hearing. – Based on the condition – was it supposed to be on one side or all

Greg Maiuro – did we make a mistake – tried to do the right thing – don’t see the issue here

Mike Weissen – I brought it up – maybe shouldn’t make suggestions – tried to get both parties together – not all John Rosenberger’s fault

Lorraine Sallata – we try to appease all

John Rosenberger – But it might not be totally clear

Clyde Yost – thought only the bump would be clear and not all of it

John Rosenberger – thought the return was supposed to be transparent – is that different than the bump out – not sure

Lorraine Sallata – have to look at the minutes and understand the intent

Bert Sabo – it is pretty clear and should be followed

Lorraine Sallata passes minutes to members to review

John Rosenberger – does resolution require amending or not – if not, then stop order could be lifted – and Jimmie Agnesino would have to review

Mike Weissen – what does applicant want to do – what is going on there

John Rosenberger – on the north side – transparent

If stop work, then why

John Rosenberger – was based on conversation to get clarification – looked for guidance – Board to review question

What was he putting there?

John Rosenberger – whatever was there was meeting terms of resolution – but complaints believed it was inaccurate

Lorraine Sallata – Familiarize with minutes and what took place

John Rosenberger – looked at plans – north return is glass – balance is solid and then railings above

Lorraine Sallata – need to see what Board wants

Mike Weissen – Is there reason Mr. Abbott cannot speak

John Rosenberger – if hear from one side, then should hear from Mrs. Johnson

Lorraine Sallata – should put to a vote and put to rest

John Rosenberger – a motion for no further clarification – if vote down, then another vote and discussion

Greg Maiuro – clear that the north side is glass, but not of the rest

Scott Abbott and Board discuss issues

Motion to enforce resolution as adopted

Greg Maiuro

2nd - Steve Rice

Dan Smith – not there that night – how many for majority
All discuss who was there

Mike Weissen – if voted as stated, then has to put up glass
Glass or transparent on north return only

What is transparent?

As per Mr. Agnesino

VOTE:

Mike Weissen: Yes

With same idea – little vague – believe owner chose materials already

Clyde Yost: Yes

As stated – it is how I voted

Steve Rice: Yes

Self-explanatory

Greg Maiuro: Yes

As written – with reservations

Approved 4 in Favor, 0 opposed

North return is the only transparent part

Scott Abbott discusses his issues with the process – inappropriate – not right – may take to court
– looks horrible – not right that could not speak

Applicant:

Donald & June Kulick
5403 Calvert Ave. – Blk. 211, Lot 1
Requesting “C” Variances
Represented by Self

Sworn in: *Donald Kulick*

Raise home damaged by Sandy

Sworn in: *Craig Dothe*

Sandy damaged home
Hired to raise house
Beautify as much as can

Eliminate as many non-conforming items, including parking – reduce lot coverage

Eliminate redundant items

Storage under home – 1 for car and 1 for storage

Eliminate accessory use structure

Classic hardship – FEMA issues and lot size
4800' is required – most at 4000'
Consistent with others

It is a 3 bedroom – WWII house – 24' deep
Reviews existing house

Currently a single floor – 1400 sq. ft. home
Fills the envelope

If 2 story, could be built larger

Reviews rear and side diagrams
Actual vs possible

Exhibits:

- A1 – Site Plan
- A2 – Aerial Photo
- A3 – Side Yard diagram
- A4 – Rear Yard diagram

Currently rather low – after raise – 14'-8"
Eave height – 8'-11" vs 20'

Reviews neighborhood and other setbacks

Plan to keep consistent with neighborhood

Not adding square footage – just elevated
Went a bit more than 13' to get parking and storage

Diminish impact to neighbors and others

Projected into front yard for Calvert – deck
Providing same size deck – just elevating – still exists just higher

Craig Hurless – Sworn in

Reviews Engineer review
Relate to raising of structure

Front – Calvert – 20' vs 14.83'

Front – Suffolk – 20' vs 14.71'

Rear – existing & proposed – 15' vs 8.92'

Side – 8' vs 6.23'

Lot Coverage – 65% required vs 66.53% existing vs 67.4% proposed

Address some additional concrete for lot coverage
Does have landscaping plan
Irregular location of car – centered garage door – how get car in – possibly shift door over
Has addressed street trees – 2

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Lorraine Sallata: Trees – planning only 1 tree
No, revised – shows 2

Clyde Yost: Being built on existing foundation?
No, additional load – encapsulating block – expand
Material – 1st level block?
Yes, with stucco – as colored rendering

Lorraine Sallata: Concrete for lot coverage – what can do to bring down
Found a mistake – existing showed 66.53% is actually 68.8%
Proposed is 67.4% - dropping some – took away part of driveway area

Lorraine Sallata: Removing shed – concrete slab – can you get to 65%
Hard to do – in side & back – other need
Whatever we can eliminate, we need to do
If remove shed slab – can keep extra slab by driveway?

Craig Hurless: are you planning to park up?
Probably not
Irregular way to get in
Board discusses garage area

Lorraine Sallata: Going above in order to park – but basically on an angle – not going to park there

Craig Hurless: if leave existing concrete, can get to 65%
Yes, with shed and back slab

Lorraine Sallata: Landscaping – beef it up – put in more shrubs
Raised yard up 4' to keep out minor flooding

PUBLIC:

None

Motion: “C” Variances

Front Yard – 14.83' vs 20'

Side Yard – 6.28' vs 8'

Rear Yard – 8.29' vs 15'

Conditions – Lot Coverage at 65%

Landscaping Plan

Motion: Greg Maiuro

2nd: Clyde Yost

VOTE:

Dan Smith: Yes

Negotiated – all happy – classic hardship

Greg Maiuro: Yes

Hardship

Steve Rice: Yes

With conditions

Clyde Yost: Yes

Hardship – nice plan – no negatives

Bert Sabo: Yes

Well thought out

Mike Weissen: Yes

Exceeds present

Lorraine Sallata: Yes

Appreciate compromise

Application Approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed

7. Other Business

- a. **Mike Weissen** – what is time frame to raise house?
 - i. Unsettled law on if variance expires
- b. **Steve Rice** – Reviews Planning Board plans for house raisings
- c. Board discusses sound issues
 - i. Asks about Ventnor Coffee

Motion to adjourn: __Steve Rice _____

Second: _____Greg Maiuro _____

Meeting adjourned at __7:40 _____ PM