

Ventnor City Planning Board

May 23, 2022

- Start of Meeting: 6:35 pm
- Flag Salute
- Roll Call

<u>Name</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Jay Cooke	X	
Roman Zabihach	X	
Commissioner Landgraf	X	
Commissioner Kriebel		X
Thomas Halpin		X
Lorraine Sallata	X	
Dan Smith III	X	
Mike Weissen	X	
Peter Tocco	X	
Tim Koob	X	
Greer Glaskill	X	
Don Siglin		X
Wendy Bartlett		X

- Adoption of Minutes: 5/11/2022
 - Motion: Roman Zabihach
 - 2nd: Peter Lorraine Sallata
 - Approve: All
- Adoption of Resolutions
 - P22-2022: 912 N Harvard Ave - Kanigowski
 - P23-2022: 29 N Martindale Ave – Tanli, LLC
 - Motion: Tim Koob
 - 2nd: Peter Tocco
 - Approve: All
- Postponement of Applications:
 - Leo Manos reviews and explains
 - 103 S Newport Ave
 - Will Re-notice
 - Possibly June 27

Applicant: 20 N Lafayette Ave

Block 131, Lot 17

Andrew & Cami Berg

C Variances Front Yard – Building, Front Yard – Deck, Side Yard

For 2nd floor addition

Represented by Self

*** Note: Peter Tocco Recuses self as knows the architect of applicant***

Sworn in: Andrew Berg

Cami Berg

Bradley Barker

Rommie Nassar

Sworn in Engineer Roger McLarnon

Engineer review:

- C variances
- R4 single family district
- Elevation 9'
- Substantial benefit variance
- Plan to elevate single family home
- Triggers variances
- Plan to demolish existing garage
- Variances: Required – Existing - Proposed
 - Front – 12' vs 11.8' vs 11.8'
 - Deck – 7' vs 2.7' vs 2.7'
 - Side – 4' vs 3.3' vs 3.3'
 - Side – 4' vs 0.6' vs 0.6'
 - Side – 4' vs 3.2' vs 3.2'
 - Landscaping – 5% vs 1.6% vs 1.3%
 - Shrubs – 19 vs 0
 - Curb Cut – 18' vs 20'
 - Length to curb – 30' vs 29'
 - Wave of landscaping plan
 - 1 street tree
 - New concrete – so maybe wave

This is not an unusual application with house raisings

Rommie – Concurs with Engineer report

Andrew Berg – Bought in 2013

Plan for addition to back of home and elevation

Raising – most issues existing

Raise to make more parking

Brought lot coverage into compliance

Landscaping in front an issue because of need for driveway

Steps are needed to get into house – causes left side variance

Right side – steps are needed to get to 2nd floor

Rear- majority will be open space

Curb Cut – can reduce curb cut to 18' to comply

Distance to next curb – 29' vs 30' needed – still want to keep

Landscaping – 19 shrubs needed – want to do on side – no room in front

Roger – Shrubs can be anywhere, but need ½ in front

Board discusses – OK with doing on side

Variance goes away

OK with, but keep as a variance

No negatives to project

Not increasing anything

Increases the purpose

Roger McLarnon – Status of old garage in back

- Currently storage
- Will be taking down

Parking – have 4 spaces now – only need 3

Public – None

Board Questions:

Lorraine Sallata: Side yard setbacks – accessibility issues

- Need stairs on both sides
- Can walk under and around

Commissioner Landgraf: Shower location? – Can't walk around

- Under stairs – landing
- Will move shower – to back or shrink down

Dan Smith III – Explain Landscaping – not sure of fit

- Right side – small planter
- Left side – more shrubs
- Whole back will be landscaped

Leo Manos – Attorney

- Prepares vote resolution
 - Reviews variances
 - Comply with shrub total
 - Wave landscaping plan
 - Move shower location
- Motion: Roman Zabihach
- 2nd: Dan Smith

- Vote:
 - Jay Cooke – Yes
 - Fits Master plan – many minimal variances – worked with situation
 - FEMA compliant
 - Commissioner Landgraf – Yes
 - Saving a home – good plan – thank to work with access
 - Roman Zabihach – Yes
 - Appreciate FEMA compliance – thanks to make concessions
 - Mike Weissen – Yes
 - Flood compliant – positive plan
 - Lorraine Sallata – Yes
 - Understand limitations – FEMA compliant
 - Dan Smith III – Yes
 - Good to work with – good for the City – positive parking
 - Greer Glaskill – Yes
 - Great Project – not asking for much

- Application approved 7 yes, 0 no

Applicant: Joel & Tammy Port

6801 Atlantic Ave

Block 76, Lot 1

Represented by Eric Goldstein, Esq.

R4 Zone

“C” Variance for 3rd floor eave height

Sworn in: Mike Marino

Joel Port

In late 2020, came before Board for extensive renovations

Today here for an eave height variance that was not gotten

To fix a problem once construction was started

A mistake was made – Once construction started – if built to plan would be less safe

Did apply for but was not granted the variance – needed for the fix

Roger McLarnon:

- Plans were revised to comply with ordinance
- Plans are different now
 - Plans are same but markups done

Commissioner Landgraf – do we have a copy of the old resolution

Jay Cooke – Believe only an Architect or Engineer can modify a plan

Mike Marino:

- Explains 2020 to now
- When Harry Harper looked at – thought there were 2x12 joists to support the load
- But there were only 2 2x6 joists going N to S and 1 2x6 going E to W
- Would not support the load
- New plan to move the exterior walls over the 2nd floor exterior walls to support the load
- The inside is done to what was approved
- Discusses 2nd and 3rd floors
 - Did not go back to the Architect
- Change was made and needed on site
- Stopped as per Code Enforcement
 - Held up until Board decision
- Would not have been a safe house as drawn
 - Would not be able to support the load
- When doing renovations, not as simple as new construction

Board: why didn't you come in and get permission

Believed the Board was concerned with space

Variance – from 2' to 7'

Ramifications if Board does not approve

Take the 3rd floor down and change the load

As per Board – worked to make some of 3rd floor space dead – built interior walls

Roger McLarnon:

- Was the architect consulted
 - After the work was changed and done
 - He was busy

Jay Cooke:

- Why not wait
 - House was open – nothing holding it up
- Why not use Blue tarps
 - Problem with the sequence and dealing with architect
 - Agree a mistake was made – thought was doing right

Lorraine Sallata –

- Shocked – just went and changed plans
 - Eric – point well taken – does sound fishy
- Saw it was wrong – why not wait
 - Problems were real – what was planned
 - Took upon self to make the change
 - Done in good faith – was an exception
- Would we have approved on initial application
 - Wanted to make it work and get into house

Tim Koob – go to architect and ask what is needed to fix

Commissioner Landgraf

- Is there a fix on the 2nd floor to fix this
 - Nothing on floor to hold the load
- Architect or structural engineer should have said what the fix was

Shows plans to Board as a whole

Explains the plan -asking if not already done

Why the fix is better

3rd floor

Put existing walls over existing 2nd floor walls – discusses walls

Jay Cooke:

- Don't understand the whole thing – why not turn roof 90 degrees
 - Roof is ok, not the walls
 - 2nd floor joists won't hold the load

Board discusses load bearing walls

Discusses where the bearing walls are

Should have stopped before went ahead

Eric Goldstein – Solution if not obtained would have been less safe

Commissioner Landgraf:

- Why is the architect not here
 - Have no answer
- Do not feel comfortable voting unless someone tells us this is the way to fix it
- Need someone who has background

Eric Goldstein – can possibly get the right personnel here to agree on the fix

Joel Port: Explains how this affects family

- Intentionally delayed work from last Spring – parts and people issues
- Want to spend 5-6 months per year here – can't – house unusable
- Already have water damage from weather
- Hard to get info from architect – has taken months

Eric Goldstein – will get someone here to discuss

Commissioner Landgraf: Need someone to tell us this is what's needed – would be more comfortable

Peter Tocco:

- The plans we have are the right ones
 - They are notes from the architect

Roman Zabihach:

- Descriptions not shown on the drawings
- Board reviews and discusses plans again

Eric Goldstein:

- Time is of the essence
- June 8 is soonest date to reappear
- Can owner proceed at own risk
 - NO
- Propose:
 - Testimony of builder and owner already in place
 - Will bring professional to next meeting
 - Will give possible best fix

Mike Weissen: If Harry Harper can't come, plans must be changed to reflect needs

Board agrees to continuance to June 8th, 2022, meeting – 6:30 pm

No need to re-notice

Other Business:

- Lee Manos
 - May have issue with June 8th meeting – if need will have someone cover

Motion to Adjourn: Roman Zabihach

2nd: Dan Smith III

Approve: all

Meeting Adjourned at 7:45 pm