

## Ventnor City Planning Board

June 8, 2022

- Start of Meeting: 6:30 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: 5/23/2022
  - Motion: Roman Zabihach
  - 2<sup>nd</sup>: Peter Lorraine Sallata
  - Approve: All
- Adoption of Resolutions
  - P24-2022: 20 N Lafayette Ave - Berg
    - Motion: Lorraine Sallata
    - 2<sup>nd</sup>: Peter Tocco
    - Approve: All

**Applicant: 21 S Newark Ave**

**Block 77, Lot 3.01**

**George & Cathy Sweeney**

C Variances Front Yard – Pool Fence

Represented by John Scott Abbott, Esq.

Sworn in: John Scott Abbott

Robert Kiejdan – Architect

George Sweeney

Cathy Sweeney

Sworn in Engineer Roger McLarnon

John Scott Abbott

- Architectural plans – Board has
- What has been done
  - Used to be a house – torn down for a pool
- Is a corner lot
  - Added a pool and a casita (a pool house)
- Would not be 12' back from Newark Ave
  - Would pose a hardship
- Great landscaping in place

Robert Kiejdan

- Discusses the Casita
- The pool and plans are designed for the son to use the pool
- The original wall was part of the fence line
- Discussed plans to move the fence forward
  - Does not affect anyone
- Did a general setback survey of the other properties
  - Asking for similar to what is on the rest of the block
  - No impact to the neighborhood
- Discusses landscaping
  - Very lush and nice

- Continuous landscaping throughout
- Fence – a 4’ high ornamental fence
  - Similar to others in the area
- Will conform to pool requirements

Roger McLarnon

- Front Yard setback – 12’ required 5’ requested
- Will amend the fence from 6’ high to 4’ high – no variance needed – part open

From front curbing to the fence will be about 16’

Will keep esthetics of the neighborhood

Lorraine Sallata – How much is the setback

- 6’ from the property line – 12’ is required
- Was approved prior for the pool at 12’
  - Now asking for change of the fence

Board discusses plans and setbacks

Board Questions:

Peter Tocco

- Does the plan have significant planting
  - Will have various – not a wall, but a textured landscape

Dan Smith

- Is the landscaping shown
  - A continuation of existing
  - Discuss landscaping

**Public** –

- Samantha Wolf – 20 S Wissahickon
  - Support of application – am the most affected – rear of property
  - Excellent project – no negatives – great improvement

Roger McLarnon – a good application

Kristopher Facenda – Attorney

- Prepares vote resolution
  - C variance for a pool fence 6' requested vs 12' required
  - Fence height will be 4'
  
- Motion: Roman Zabihach
- 2<sup>nd</sup>: Dan Smith
  
- Vote:
  - Jay Cooke – Yes
    - Minimal request – asset to City – Raising the bar
    - Quality of City – fits master plan
  - Commissioner Landgraf – Yes
    - Seen a couple of these – best seen – softer look – set back more
    - Not impactful to roadway
  - Roman Zabihach – Yes
    - Minimal request – asset to street
  - Mike Weissen – Yes
    - Impressed by landscaping – have seen house for years - beautiful
  - Lorraine Sallata – Yes
    - No negatives – like plan – open and airy
  - Dan Smith III – Yes
    - Same as all else – trade off by removing old structure – nice show piece
  - Peter Tocco – Yes
    - Light and airy feel – no negatives
  
- **Application approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed**

**Applicant: Joel & Tammy Port**

**6801 Atlantic Ave**

**Block 76, Lot 1**

Represented by Ray Wentz, Esq. for Eric Goldstein, Esq.

Carry over from May 23, 2022, meeting

Sworn in: Harry Harper, Architect

Harry Harper:

- 1 ½ - 2 years ago – before board to build home
- Add a 3<sup>rd</sup> floor
- Designed to meet all conditions
- All approved – plans in place and approved
- Needed to rate the new 3<sup>rd</sup> floor for fire rating
  - 1 hour fire rated
- Was at the end of my part of this project at this point
- Then received call from Code Official – asking what happened
- During construction there was a problem with the structure
- Builder made changes
  - Height and setbacks remained the same
- Went out to do and “As-Built” inspection and plan
- Was told to go forward and at least close the house in so no more damage
- Problem – talks about it now
  - There would be a lot to be done to conform
- No excuses
  - Fix is reasonable
  - Does not affect zoning or setbacks
  - But does affect the look

Jay Cooke

- Any new walls – going beyond any other wall?
  - No – added false walls – same as 2<sup>nd</sup> floor walls - for structure

Mike Weissen

- Builder took upon himself to change plans?
  - Is happening more often
  - Shortage of supplies causing issues
  - Have to get creative

Lorraine Sallata

- Told the changes were made by Harry Harper
  - I made “As-Built” corrections
  - Code Enforcement insisted upon it
  - Had to get enclosed – to protect from elements
  - Drew “As-builts” – dotted in original approvals
  - Plans show blind spots – after work done

Commissioner Landgraf

- Told joists ran the wrong way
  - Appears there is a maze of framing
  - In many places, went front to back and not side to side
  - The changes made were good
  - To take down now would be a problem
- What is new Eave height
  - 7’ vs 1.5’

Jay Cooke

- Is it now safe
  - Yes, it is
  - Over did it a little but it is good

Ray Wentz – attorney

There are no negative impacts

Asking for mercy

**PUBLIC: None**

Kristopher Facenda – Attorney – drafts resolution

- “C” variance for eave height of 7’ vs 1.5’

Motion: Roman Zabihach

Second: Dan Smith

**VOTE:**

- Jay Cooke – Yes
  - Fits within community – no more hardships – not an eye sore
- Commissioner Landgraf – Yes
  - Not ideal way to be heard – needed to be heard – architecture fits
  - No negatives – no height issues
- Roman Zabihach – Yes
  - Appreciate clarification – understand issues
- Mike Weissen – Yes
  - Not best how came to be – but needed corrections made
- Lorraine Sallata – Yes
  - Appreciate clarity on safety – feel bad for homeowner
- Dan Smith III – Yes
  - Heard input – clearer mind – concerned with structural issues
  - Cleaned up – no negative issues – looks better
- Peter Tocco – Yes
  - Not happy needed to be heard – poor planning – but happened

**Application Approved 7 in favor, 0 opposed**

Other Business:

- None

Motion to Adjourn: Mike Weissen

2<sup>nd</sup>: Roman Zabihach

Approve: all

**Meeting Adjourned at 7:15 pm**