



2<sup>nd</sup>: Tim Kriebel  
Approval: All by roll call vote

---

6. Applicant

**a. Patricia O'Neil**

122 N Bryant Ave, Blk. 173, Lot 20  
Requesting "C" variances  
Represented by Charles Gemmel

Sworn in: *Charles Gemmel*

Attached single family home – to 124 N Bryant

Plan to elevate home  
In R7 Zone

Attached home – conditional use  
Permitted with conditions – 11 conditions

Existing home – doesn't abide by any – by raising will comply with many

Currently no off street parking – proposed 2 spots

Lot coverage – 100% - dropping some

Sworn in: *Patricia O'Neil*  
*Rami Nassar*

*Rami Nassar* – Engineer & Planner  
Reviews current conditions  
2 attached homes

122 – 6.88' elevation – BFE – 9'  
Raise to 14.65'

2 parking – garage

Current no off street parking – will accommodate

Conditions to meet – none met now

Lot size – 60' total – 30' each  
18'x30' – cannot do

Lot area – 2000' required – have 1125'

Zero setback on common lot line

Side – 3.50' or 7' for both – staying 3.50'

Front & Rear – not complying

Current 0.2' off

11.8' vs 12'

Staying

Adding steps and landing – will encroach

Lot coverage – 75% required – have 100% - looking to take some away – about 2'

Building Coverage – 60%

Cannot take anything from side – only way to get to the back

Parking – none current – proposed 2 – 9'x18'

Accessory structure – none allowed – have a shed – will stay

Building needs to be symmetrical – almost now – doing same look

Detriments – none

Bettering conditions – no flooding

Street trees – did not propose –

By time with driveway – about 3'x4.5'

Not a good idea – nowhere to add

**Craig Hurless** – sworn in

Review of 5/6/15

Reviews conditions

Agree with testimony except 1

Symmetric design

By both not being raised – making worse

Variances

Conditional Use

Front – Bryant – Principal – 12' vs 11.8'

Side – 3.5' vs 4'/7'

Rear – Both – 12' vs 11.8' – principal

12' vs 8.3' – deck

Building Coverage – 55% vs 61.7% existing – 65.8% proposed  
Lot Coverage – 75% vs 100% existing – 97.8% proposed

Did recommend 1 street tree – left side – smaller  
Grass governor strip – right garage door & parking not lined up – ask to fix

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Lorraine Sallata** – governor strip – is it included in lot coverage?

In right of way – no credit

On side could do

Yes, but want access to rear

**Craig Hurless** – proposing to keep shed or lose

**Lorraine Sallata** – 2' walk & Shed – can do anything?

*Charles Gemmel* – Get rid of shed & add 3' strip in back – to 95.2%

**Dan Smith** – waiting until other property approval?

On deadlines – have to start by October

Neighbor on wait list

Will probably be here as well

Period of time different

**Lorraine Sallata** – how does it work with attached houses?

Will detach – marriage wall will not be impacted

**Dan Smith** – Symmetry of roof – discuss with neighbor?

At this point – no – to Board – will have to match

**Stan Bergman** – Conditions of general comments – any issues

If want 1 street tree – will put in

Common Wall – if raise will match?

Yes

**PUBLIC:**

None

**Dan Smith** – Where is landscaping left?

Suggest keep 1 tree – proposing landscaping

On tight street – depending on where – could create issues

**Craig Hurless** – if look at Bryant – lots of right of way – could move back some

Ok to do

Motion – “D” conditional use  
“C” multiple –reviews  
Reviews conditions – common & issues

Motion: \_\_\_\_\_  
Motion: \_\_\_ Bert Sabo \_\_\_\_\_  
2<sup>nd</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_ Dan Smith \_\_\_\_\_

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith:** Yes

Greatest hardship seen – bring in compliance with FEMA – a plus

**Tim Kriebel:** Yes

Common differences to improve

**Bert Sabo:** Yes

True hardship – nothing to give up

**Leonard Mordell:** Yes

Only work with what have

**Lorraine Sallata:** Yes

Lots of hardships – nice plan

Application approved 5 in favor, 0 opposed

---

7. Applicant

a. **Steve Fishman**

5806 Boardwalk, Blk. 17, Lot 1.02

Requesting “C” variances

Represented by Keith Davis

Sworn in: *Keith Davis*

Planning for an in ground pool – 8.5’vs 18’ pool

Providing landscaping to buffer pool

An existing easement – for access purposes

No other area on site to place pool

2 variances –

2 front yards – pool not allowed in front yard

Impervious coverage – 69.2% current – 71% proposed

No impediment to views – no adverse impact

Sworn in: Bill Burress

Thomas Days – Arthur Ponzio office

Exhibit A1 –Aerial photo of area  
Reviews area

Exhibit A2 – Site plan  
Reviews

Variance – describe pool location  
Pools not allowed in front  
Technically Boardwalk is a front yard

21.7' vs 24.5' of front yards –

Pool adds additional 153 sq. ft. - +1.8% impervious coverage

Any other areas for pool – rear only has 2.5' – side has 15' access easement – no other area

Meets setbacks – centered on lot

Additional landscaping – maintain existing – add some Leyland Cyprus – side to front to cover  
equipment – fence – replace to 4'

Advances zoning purposes  
No impact – only because no side yard to put in

Storm water impact – none

**Craig Hurless** – review 5/7/15

Recommend approval signatures  
Waive street trees & full landscaping plan  
Gave notes – ok if Board ok

Variations

Front – pool & equipment – not allowed  
From fronts – 21.5' & 27.0'

Lot Coverage – 60% vs 69.2% vs 71.0%

Look for opportunities to reduce

**BOARD QUESTIONS:**

**Lorraine Sallata** – try to reduce impervious coverage

Have looked at – driveway

*Tom Days* –

Easement – don't want to touch  
Paver area – most in right of way  
If eliminate some paver area – could lose some parking

Easement area – narrower – not sure what contract shows – could eliminate parking  
Could install pervious pavers for credit

**Lorraine Sallata** – Easement – don't touch

Pavers – overhang from deck

Make a smoother arc

**Craig Hurless** – like pervious paver idea – don't think Ventnor gives credit – wouldn't reduce but intent is there – free form paver

*Bill Burris* – Contractor

Solution – pervious paver – along side

**Craig Hurless** – still granting variance – but can give thought as credit

**PUBLIC**

Michael Zibbick – 808 N Victoria

In favor – no public harm – enjoyed by family

**Lorraine Sallata** – Is Board in agreement with pavers

Board agrees

Motion – “C” variance – front yard – pool & pool equipment

Reviews all

Lot coverage – 60% vs 71%

4'x65' area – easement – pervious pavers

Landscaping

Motion: \_\_\_ Dan Smith \_\_\_\_\_

2<sup>nd</sup> – \_\_\_ Bert Sabo \_\_\_\_\_

**VOTE:**

**Dan Smith** – Yes

No negative – try to appease concerns

**Tim Kriebel** – Yes

With addition of pavers – keep character of other lots

**Bert Sabo** – Yes

Shown no other area – good work with pavers

**Leonard Mordell** – Yes

All Same

**Lorraine Sallata** – Yes

Placement of pool hardship – thanks for work

*Application approved – 5 in favor, 0 opposed*

Applicant asks for immediate start of work

Discusses – directs to talk with Jimmie Agnesino

If approved to start – know of appeal process

---

Other Business

- Lorraine Sallata
  - Landscaping – Planning Board approved - on June Agenda
    - Will let all know
  - Idea of 2 meetings per month
    - Felt a backlog of cases
    - Spoke with Jimmie Agnesino about
    - Seems like not a back log issue
    - Board discusses
    - Will do on a case by case basis
- Bert Sabo
  - 5313 Atlantic – working on
  - Mega Sushi – now an ice cream stand

Motion to adjourn: \_\_\_ Leonard Mordell \_\_\_\_\_

Second: \_\_\_\_\_ Bert Sabo \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting adjourned at \_\_7:35\_\_ PM