



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 May 28, 2014 – 6:30 PM

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

Present

Lorraine Sallata

Dan Smith

Clyde Yost

Stephen Rice

Bert Sabo

Frank Cavallaro – Alt # 1

**Professionals:**

Craig Hurless, Polistina & Associates

John Rosenberger, Esq.

Absent

Greg Maiuro

Mike Weissen

4. Adoption of Minutes of April 16, 2014 meetings

Motion: \_\_ Clyde Yost \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_ Dan Smith \_\_\_\_\_

Approval: All in favor

5. Adoption of the Following Resolutions

**Z-7 of 2014: Frederick Thorpe – 306 N Dorset – Blk. 216, Lot 11**

Requested “C” Variances – Approved

**Z-8 of 2014: Jacqueline Polimeni – 6814A-6818 Ventnor – Blk. 77, Lot 11**

Requested CNC - Approved

**Z-9 of 2014: Sue Ann Mammucari – 20 S Troy – Blk. 74, Lot 25**

Requested “C” Variances – Approved

Motion: Bert Sabo

2<sup>nd</sup>: Steve Rice

Approval: All

6. Applicants

*Michael Csuy & Linda Bronson*  
110 S Washington Ave. – Blk. 43, Lot 12  
Requesting “C” Variances  
Represented by Eric Goldstein

Sworn in: *Eric Goldstein*

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Proposed 3 story dwelling  
Demolish – does not meet FEMA requirements  
Lot coverage will go to 74% from 90%  
Multiple Variances  
Side yard and height not needed

Sworn in: *John Barnhardt*  
Ocean front – 110 S Washington – South Side  
Currently a 2 story home – needs work  
Does not meet FEMA Requirements or Building Requirements  
Want to demolish – to a 3 story home

Exhibits

A1 – Aerial View  
A2 – Variance Plan

Minor Deviations from Land Use

Variances

Front Yard – 12’ required – most of house meets  
One projection – 11.5’ – architectural feature  
Existing setback is 11.1’ – setback further  
Better than existing  
Front Yard – Decks – 1<sup>st</sup> level & then upper  
Allowed up to 5’ into setback – to 7’  
Proposed is 6.5’  
Existing encroachment – greater  
Front Yard – Steps – coming off decks – 7’ required  
Final is 3.3’ – against bulkhead  
Existing is greater – will be better  
Side Yard – Left Side – 5’ required – ground is 9’ to 6’  
All compliant  
Side Yard – Right Side – 12’ required – 10’ proposed  
Decks – 1.5’

Most of main building come close to compliance but decks come close to bulkhead and property lines

Building Coverage – 50% required – 60% proposed

Exhibit A3 – Neighborhood plans

Surveyed all other on block to see if consistent with others

Reviews comparisons

Front 11.5'

1.7' to 11.9' – some very close

Sensitive to view blockage

Coverage – 10% over

Only 4 of 12 meet coverage

Nearly identical to block

Counts decks

If take decks out 43% is main house

Ocean front decks – consistent with same in area

Lot coverage is going from 94% to 70%

Waivers –

Street trees – beach block area

View blocker and hard to keep

**Craig Hurless**: Issue with building height and eave height – may be incorrect in thought

Reviews thoughts

Believe variance is needed

Reads section into record – 102-118B

How come up with building height and eave height

Believe cannot take into account with heights

Table in memo is correct

Reviews items from review

Height variance – 31' required – 33' proposed

Eave – 22' required – 27.2' proposed

**Steve Rice**: New based on flood elevation

10' allowed to get to 14'

**Lorraine Sallata**: Craig Hurless will explain

Sworn in: Craig Hurless

**Craig Hurless**: Section mentions controls for heights

Further section in widths

Reviews all areas

If deny side yard – then need variance – if grant – do not need height variances

**John Rosenberger** – depending on how vote goes – would need additional variances  
If don't grant – house won't work

*John Barnhardt* – Positives and negatives

- Old home
- Brings up to code
- Deviations very minor – well thought out
- Match or exceed block

Negative criteria

- All consistent with area
- Public good – great length taken to see what others do
- Modest in nature
- C2 variance request – outweigh negatives

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**John Rosenberger** – only 1 side yard setback – 1.5'  
Second part – decks  
Building – 9.9'

*Eric Goldstein* – minor issue with neighbor – have been resolved – want read into record

**Lorraine Sallata** – any additional areas from Engineer review  
Street trees

**PUBLIC:**

*Chris Vasenda* – for neighbor next door  
Had discussions – worked closely  
Would like 5 items if approved

- Low growing shrubs on Washington Ave – 1<sup>st</sup> floor deck
- Parking – Ventnor City ordinance
- Rear Yard – fence and landscaping – sea wall fence
  - Same height – about 50"
  - Posts a few inches higher
- No free standing shed except for existing & on plan
  - Will be removed
- Deliver resolution with conditions – to any new purchaser

*Eric Goldstein* – no deed restrictions

Motion:

- Front – 11.5' vs 12'
- Deck – 6.5' vs 7'
- Steps – 3.3' vs 12'
- Side decks – 1.5' vs 12'
- Side building – 9.91' vs 12'
- Building coverage – 60% vs 50%
- Conditions – waiver street trees
  - Notes as per public notes

Motion: Bert Sabo  
2<sup>nd</sup>: Frank Cavallaro

**VOTE:**

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

Consistent with Beach block – like survey done – worked with neighbor

**Frank Cavallaro:** Yes

Conditions as noted

**Clyde Yost:** Yes

Enhances – no negative – nice plan – worked with neighbors

**Steve Rice:** Yes

With Conditions

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Ocean front – commendable - fits

**Lorraine Sallata:** Yes

Like plan – well thought out – need to work with conditions

**Approved 6 in Favor, 0 opposed**

---

Applicant:

*John & Kathleen Irons*  
106 S Derby Ave. – Blk. 19, Lot 7.02  
Requesting “C” Variances  
Represented by Brian Callaghan

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Prior sub-division in 2013  
Will be a new single family home

Variances needed

Eave height – 23’ vs 26.4’  
Lot coverage – 35% vs 37%  
Building Coverage – 60% vs 63.8%  
Curb Width – 10’ vs 12’

Sworn in: *Terri Cummings*  
*John Irons*

Exhibits:

A1 – Aerial Photo  
A2 – Landscape plan – around pool  
A3 – Elevation Site plan

*Terri Cummings:*

New construction – 3 story home  
Now a vacant lot  
Took into account the neighborhood

Ground floor – garage – some finished area – at ground level  
Reviews parking – 4 off street parking  
Large amount of landscaping

2<sup>nd</sup> floor – various rooms – decks  
3<sup>rd</sup> floor – Bedroom and baths

Make architecturally interesting  
Roof – done in metal roof  
Variance other items

Variances:

Eave height – 3<sup>rd</sup> floor space – needed more  
Does not go all the way back  
Lot coverage & Building Coverage  
Minimal for pool and landscaping  
Curb cut – for parking

This home would be one of the smaller homes on the block  
Nice architecture

### **BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Lorraine Sallata:** Lovely plan – landscaping plan not here  
Will review with all

*John Irons* – walk through landscaping  
City Engineer wanted to see types and kinds  
Reviews all types of landscaping – front and rear

*Brian Callaghan* – to rear of property – right up to line  
About 3' – building fence with landscaping

*Brian Callaghan* – some AstroTurf – why?  
State approves – 100% permeable  
Only sprinklers for drippage for landscaping  
New and Nice

Curb widths – how compare  
Most new construction – some 19'-26'  
Built some of houses on block – how does yours compare  
Yes – lot smaller – modest  
Stayed under 35' mark  
Kept to front, side, and rear yard setbacks  
Back rear deck – probably and open deck

Kept as permeable just in case  
Eaves – gives options

**Lorraine Sallata** – landscaping looks sufficient – first hearing of artificial turf – seems to defy going green- never had requested this – seems to contradict

Curb cut – in beach block – difficult – is this the way to go with parking premium

*Brian Callaghan* – Turf is green – gives look – issues with fertilizers and drought conditions – reduces water usage – planting substantial items

**John Rosenberger** – we grant variances – don't have right to demand some things – landscaping plan given as a courtesy – don't think we are approving a landscaping plan

**Craig Hurless** – typically triggered by a site plan  
Variance – usually used to mitigate others  
Just had symbols – turf is something never dealt with  
Don't really have issue with turf  
In front – softens a bit with landscaping

**John Rosenberger** – do we have authority to require grass – don't think we do – if site plan, then can

*John Irons* – Still a waiver for trees – on property

**Frank Cavallaro** – concern where rain water will go – how address run off  
Lot coverage – properly graded – turf is permeable  
Asked for grading and drainage plan

**PUBLIC:**

*Pat Gallagher* – 107 S Dudley  
For St. Leonard's Association  
In favor of proposed plans and drawings  
Variances reasonable  
Planting – back end – pool machinery – should be high plants  
Glad AstroTurf – how about porous pavers by pool  
No gutters on plan  
Craig Hurless – as condition of site plan – drainage and run-off plan

*Nicholas Tzimoulis* – 103 S Cornwall Ave  
Concern for pool  
Neighbors did not know  
Increased noise – parties  
Parking issues  
If comply with regulations can build pool

**Craig Hurless** – Reviews Engineer Report

Dealt with landscaping  
Signature spaces  
Technical issues – reviews  
Waiver for street trees

*Brain Callaghan* – conditions ok

**Frank Cavallaro** – Pool equipment – elevated – what are plans

Enclosed in separate detached building – for noise  
Build only as high as need be

*John Irons* – Gutters will be there

*Brian Callaghan* – Exhibit A4 – Photo of rear yard – by neighbor garage

Closing – was a sub-division  
Did great job – in character with neighborhood  
Nice architectural plan  
Key West design  
AstroTurf – way of the future  
Meet FEMA requirements

**Motion:** “C” Variances

Eave Height – 26.84’ vs 23’  
Building Coverage – 37% vs 35%  
Lot Coverage – 63.8% vs 60%  
Curb width – 12’ vs 10’  
Conditions – A2 – Landscaping plan  
Technical issues  
Waiver street trees

Motion: Clyde Yost  
2<sup>nd</sup>: Bert Sabo

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Well presented – good structure – St. Leonard’s ok

**Steve Rice:** Yes

Consistent with all

**Clyde Yost:** Yes

Great plan – attractive to neighborhood – conditions – well done

**Frank Cavallaro:** Yes

Well presented - consistent

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

Nice to see developed – Turf issue – but ok – good plan

**Lorraine Sallata:** No

Like plan of house, see negative impact, curb cut – landscaping – trees – turf is synthetic - defies

**Application Approved 5 in favor, 1 opposed**

---

Applicant:

*Kelli Beirne*  
114 N Suffolk Ave. –  
Requesting “C” Variances  
Represented by Brian Callaghan

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Raise home – damaged

Variances:

Side Yard 4’ required – 3’ requested  
4’ required – 3.58’ requested  
Curb Cut – 2 cuts – 10’ required – 12’ requested

If raised to elevation – going higher to put garage over – triggers side yard setback

2<sup>nd</sup> curb cut – one is for enclosed garage – one is for open area

Sworn in: Mr. Addison

Exhibits:

A1 – site plan  
A2 – Photo  
A3 – Photo

Photo of front and rear elevations

House flooded – bare studs on side right now

House going to be in same footprint  
Added a master bath and family room  
Lengthens side yard

Shed being demolished

2<sup>nd</sup> curb cut – to add area for 2<sup>nd</sup> car – a storage area – will get one vehicle on other side

Detriments – none – with lift, get some things under house – height is under 24’

Sworn in: Kelli Beirne

Not much of street parking  
Most park in yard  
No impact  
Gives secure area for stuff

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Dan Smith** – garage is actually a breakaway wall?

Yes, but still a garage

Could put block walls

Did soil inspections – very poor

Looked at multiple options

**Clyde Yost** – what are breakaway walls made of?

Wood, but screwed in – not bolted – won't be noticeable

**Bert Sabo** – on open area – exposed pilings – encapsulating

Yes, not intent

Concern something done with

Could do something

**John Rosenberger** – Something to cover exposed pilings

Brian Callaghan explains

Area designated as open will have decorative lattice or similar

**Craig Hurless** – Area with variances

Technical requirements – curb cuts

Street trees – detail of them

Put in street

Any other landscaping

None but trying to salvage

**Lorraine Sallata** – want something in place

Try to salvage what can

Condition to have landscaping plan at permit process

**PUBLIC**

None

Motion: Variances

Side Yard – 3' vs 4'

3.58' vs 4'

Curb Cut – 2 cuts

Curb Cut – 12' vs 10'

Conditions: Open area – decorative treatment

Technical Comments

Street trees

Landscaping plan

Motion: Clyde Yost

2<sup>nd</sup>: Bert Sabo

**Vote:**

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

Piling issue – could happen a lot – soften look

**Frank Cavallaro:** Yes

Good plan – good luck

**Clyde Yost:** Yes

No negative impact – Sandy Hardship

**Steve Rice:** Yes

No Negative impact

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Hardship – good to see staying in town

**Lorraine Sallata:** Yes

Appreciate addressing issues – good project

**Application Approved 6 in favor, 0 opposed**

---

Applicant:

*Lin & Ong, LLC*

29-31 S Weymouth Ave. – Block 53, Lot 2

Requesting “C” Variances & “D” Variance

Represented by Brian Callaghan

Sworn in: *Brian Callaghan*

Was a Remax office and also a Doctor office and other offices

Owns Mega Sushi across street

No cooking or exhaust

Some outdoor seating

Variances

Use variance

Zoned R-7 single family – this one only

Going from real estate office to restaurant

Parking – will address

Canopy – over seating area – 7.5’ vs 6’

Sworn in: *Craig Dothe*

Exhibits:

A1 – site plan

A2 – Elevations

A3 – Existing conditions

A4 – photos

Reviews plans

- Corner Weymouth and Atlantic
- 2 town house building on one building
- Back is residence
- Front is real estate with office above

Was consistent for many years

- Pattern of commercial use

Has a raised patio – currently no awning or rail

Needs additional landscaping and awning

Reviews existing conditions

Proposed use

- Back half stays as is
- Front half – modify
  - Move side down
  - Turn stairs
- Atlantic Ave. – make open area
  - Put in Sushi bar
- Area for prep
  - Kitchen area along back part
  - No cooking on premises
  - All fresh – refrigerated
- Eliminates a lot of trash
  - Little trash
- Small trash area – front corner – fenced in

Use Variance – now R7 – single family

- Well suited for new use

Reviews City Zoning Map

Within a Commercial Mixed Use area

- Works well within this area

Positive criteria – good make for area

Negative – none

Parking – presently a 14 car deficiency

- Proposed – add 8 more – for a 22 car deficiency

Hours of operation – 4:30 – 10:30 – summer – 7 days a week

- Play for May 15 – October 15

Consolidate vacant lot with property –no plans

Concerned with where Ventnor is going  
Not looking at lot consolidation  
Plan to use vacant lot as parking – gravel lot

May look at other options  
Probably get 8 cars on it  
Not sure what else looking at doing

Other parking – variances given by Planning Board

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Lorraine Sallata** – Trash & Concrete incline  
Yes, will fix that

**John Rosenberger** – did not know of parking  
Asking for site plan option for temporary parking  
In choose to develop – will come back  
Site plan waiver and parking waiver – lot 1  
Utilized for parking until development of discontinue of use

Canopy – front Atlantic and Weymouth  
Vinyl rails and awning – soften area  
Allows for outdoor seating  
Landscaping – fill in along both frontages

**Lorraine Sallata** – New sod on Weymouth?  
Yes

Plan to paint and clean up  
Size of Awning – 7'-9" on Weymouth – 7'-4" on Atlantic  
This is so no one runs into posts

**Dan Smith** – what doing with rest of façade  
Clean up and paint  
Tremendous visibility and character

**Lorraine Sallata** – trash treatment?  
Fence enclosed and swinging gate  
Residential trash – same as City trash  
Business – daily pickup  
Can you do something for the residential trash?  
Yes

**Dan Smith** – trash cans or dumpster?  
Cans at this location –on parking lot side

**Lorraine Sallata** – 2<sup>nd</sup> floor – lot of office space – what doing with?

Will have own office

No other offices or living facilities?

Yes

**Craig Hurless** – reviews Engineer report

Use variance

Parking

Worsening parking – 22 deficiency – 8 more

Reviews variances

Lot 1 – like temporary parking – and cleaning up

Would like review for safety issues

Submit for review and approval

Technical issues – have dealt with

Outdoor seating – no impact

Addressed landscaping issues

**PUBLIC:**

NONE

**Clyde Yost** – address Fire Dept. conditions – separation and fire alarms

Change use – fire rating – separations

Probably 1 hours

Now make to 2 hour

Fire alarm system

Discusses possible systems

Don't have cooking – if building dept. says yes, then in, if not won't

Motion – 2 votes

1<sup>st</sup> – use variance

Motion: Clyde Yost

2<sup>nd</sup>: Dan Smith

**VOTE:**

**Bert Sabo** – Yes

Consistent with area – a plus

**Frank Cavallaro** – Yes

**Clyde Yost**: Yes

Nice Addition

**Steve Rice** – Yes

Consistent

**Dan Smith** – Yes

Strengthens Zone Consistency

**Lorraine Sallata** – Yes

Advances Code

**Approved 6 in favor, 0 opposed**

2<sup>nd</sup> motion –

Parking – 22 deficient

Canopy – 7'-4" vs 6' - Atlantic

7'-9" vs 6' - Weymouth

Waiver site plan

Waiver – permit lot 1 to parking – temporary – submit site plan to Engineer – 8-10 parking Spots

Conditions

Matching trash enclosure for residential

Not use offices for other than own

Comply technical comments

Hours 4:30 to 10:30

Board discusses length of operation

Decide on full year

Motion: Bert Sabo

2<sup>nd</sup>: Clyde Yost

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith** – Yes

With conditions – smart to allow open all year – temporary parking is plus

**Steve Rice** – Yes

No Negative – good for area

**Clyde Yost** – Yes

With conditions

**Frank Cavallaro** – Yes

With conditions

**Bert Sabo** – Yes

With conditions – parking a plus

**Lorraine Sallata** – Yes

Good use – neighborhood will support

**Approved 6 in favor, 0 opposed**

7. Other Business

a. Lorraine Sallata

i. Plans not sufficient

ii. Size of plans an issue

iii. Board Size

1. Under site plan, there is a size

iv. Will submit a letter for size

b. Brian Callaghan

i. Discusses issues with Board

ii. Landscaping from other towns

Motion to adjourn: \_\_ Bert Sabo \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_\_\_\_ Clyde Yost \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting adjourned at \_\_9:35 \_\_\_\_\_ PM