

**Ventnor City Planning Board  
Minutes  
October 10, 2007**

1. Call to order (6:41 p.m.)
2. Flag Salute
3. Roll Call

**Present**

Commissioner Vespertino  
John VanDuyne  
Bob Gross(arrives at 7:10 pm)  
Julie Mealo  
Dennis Lott  
Burt Sabo  
Jay Cooke  
Mayor Kreischer

**Absent**

4. Adoption of resolutions: none
5. Informal presentation: By Bellevue Properties, 5000 Wellington Plaza. Informal discussion in reference to pad site plans. Charles Kemmell attorney to represent this application.. He states 10 months ago his clients purchased the Ventnor Plaza. They are here for 3 reasons – 1.plans raise questions about closing 1 driveway and create new access at the light. 2. Proposed use at the sites. 3. Familiarize you with what we would like to do with property. There are no applications just here to throw about some ideas and get feedback from the board.

Pad site #1 is 6,800 sq ft- n/w corner- 1 way access into the plaza. Removed entrance and improve Little Rock Ave, extend Ventnor right of way into driveway down and a sweep turn and enter into the site—county is in favor of this. They are looking at an “Auto Zone”--

Pad #2 adjacent to main entrance- 966 sq feet. Proposed a checkers rest. Drive up- double drive through—second option if walk in and pick up. Proposed outside eating- not enclosed.

Pad #3- 8,000 sq feet..

They state if looking for input from the board. Of course all these would be landscaped. All parking issues are address. There are 697 spots that are stripped, they need total 901—they have that area but would need to strip these spots.

Questions were brought up about the “bradless” building. They will be 1 story and the facade will be upgraded, a Peebles and a Dollar Tree to far will occupy this space.

The promenade factor originally presented is no longer an option Bellevue Properties stated.

Board Engineer stated the board has historical concerns—he thinks a traffic engineer report is absolutely needed for this project.

Mr. Carter stated that the Bellevue Prop. They need to be definite as of what they want to present to the board.

Commissioner Vespertino in his opinion they were going to present an “upscale” plan not very happy with these ideas.

John Santoro agrees with the Commissioner—stated that the city is moving upward and these ideas seem to be taking the city backwards.

Comment made was that if the Auto Zone is a definite, the board would like to see it t flipped and put at the other end of the plaza away from the street.

Board engineer stated that if variances are needed as they proceed it is usual that the developer foots the bills for on site retention needed. Meaning if any city official needs to go to the state with them—that city official’s salary for time is to be paid to the city for reimbursement... Mr. Kemmell their attorney stated that this is not a problem and they would certainly amend their plans and put these as conditions.

Fencing off the area, trash receptacles all are concerns of the board.

Brief break 7:24pm--- back on record 7:30pm

6. Sub Committee presentation:

Julie Mealo and Burt Sabo did a power point presentation on redevelopment plan.

Brief History-

1989 quality of life issues.

1999 Shorr Deplama did a study to determine if area needed to be redeveloped

2001-2005 in court

2004- Pulte chose to do redevelopment project

2006 project withdrawn- real estate values sky rocketed.

2007 city going to down size

Parcel 1- remains the same—new recommendation – new use- no age restriction- have residential over commercial use.

Parcel 2 & 3.new recommendations are to get tax abatements, include street scape, and improve parking.

Parcel 4- Leave in the plan but include tax abatements, rehab the commercial and residential properties.

Parcel 5- Leave in the plan-but offer tax abatements- include new construction for residential and commercial uses

Parcel 6 – leave in the plan but include rehab to residential and commercial properties - include new construction if meets the plans objectives - include streetscapes and landscaping.

Parcels 7- REMOVE from the plan

Offer tax abatements to residents but include a street scape plan

Parcel 8- leave in the plan- allow new residential and commercial

Parcels 9- REMOVE from the plan. Allow all rehab to residential and commercial properties.

Parcel 10- leave in the plan- the rr1 zone is owned by some utilities, Gas & Electric companies. Possibly the city could approach these owners and they would donate the land as a park or something.

Parcels 11- REMOVE from the plan- rehab the existing residential and commercial properties. Offer tax abatements and must have a street scape.

Parcels 12- REMOVE from the plan-offer tax abatements and must include street scaping—improve the parking.

Parcel 13 &14- REMOVE from the plan- same as parcel #12

Parcel 15- leave in the plan—rehab residential and commercial properties- include new construction for both comm. & residential.

Parcel 16- Leave in the plan- rehab comm. & residential- new construction—mixed of both.

Parcel 17-leave in the plan- residential & commercial- offer tax abatements.

The goal of the sub committee is to clear up and confusion or misconceptions or false rumors out in the public. The redevelopment goal on the remaining parcels is to develop and encourage new construction. If the particular property, lot and

block meet these requirements then they would be released from the plan.  
Housing codes would be enforced to maintain these properties.

Congratulations to Burt and Julie, John VanDuyne on great job.

Board would need to make a recommendation to the Governing body and then that would have to come back to the board for a motion to adopt.

Julie Mealo also stated that she has a press release to be put out on regards to the new proposals--- would like to get it out—remembering these are “just” recommendations- nothing guaranteed yet. Yes to go ahead she was told to do it.

Motion was made to adjourn meeting by John VanDuyne and seconded by Burt Sabo.