

Ventnor City Planning Board

October 24, 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: 9/14/2022 and 10/12/22
 - Motion: Lorraine Sallata
 - 2nd: Greer Gaskill
 - Approve: All
- Adoption of Resolutions
 - P35-2022: 6506 Ventnor Ave – Megu Sea Isle, LLC.
 - P36-2022: 25 N Newark Ave – Karen Gottfried
 - P37-2022: 6904 Monmouth Ave – Gustavo & Susan Does
 - Motion: Dan Smith
 - 2nd: Tim Koob
 - Approve: All

Postponement of Application

- Stanley Sloan
 - 6701 Monmouth Ave
 - Block 172 lots 11 and 11.01
 - Reschedule to November 9, 2022
 - Will not re-notice

Applicant:

Hristos & Virginia Kolovos

103 S Newport Ave

Block 27, Lot 6.02

Represented by Robert Baranowski, Esq.

“C” Variance for Building Height, Side Yard, 3rd Floor wall Left – flat roof, 3rd Floor right, 3rd Floor Wall, Flat roof, right,

To create a flat roof portion

Wendy Bartlett recuses herself

Sworn in:

- Peter Lozoropolis – Architect, Engineer, Planner
- Tiffany Morissi – Planner

Roger McLarnon sworn in

Report – April 8, 2022

- R3 District
- Been before Board before – Front Deck
- Here to add 3rd floor deck and flat roof
 - Expand the 3rd floor deck
- Flat Roof
 - Side – Right – 5’ required – 4.7’ in place – 4.7’ requested
 - Rear – 5’ required -0’ requested
 - Left & Right
- Height Changed – Based on 2019 ordinance – Variance not needed
- No waivers requested
- Most is in rear – not seen from street

Robert Baranowski

- Had discussions with neighbor in rear – Ok with plan

Peter Lozoropollis

- Review of existing property
- Currently 10' from rear of property line
- Built about 30 years ago
- Have existing variances asking to expand
- Want to make Bedroom more functional
- About ¼ of building at 10' – now want expand remainder to same
- Building footprint stays the same
 - Just extending walls to make bedroom better
- It is an expansion of the existing building
- No other proposed improvements

Roger McLarnon

- Confirm the size of the 3rd floor
- Not exceeding the 2nd floor?
 - Will be same as the 2nd floor
 - Will be less than 50% of the 2nd floor

Jay Cooke

- Board will need the numbers

Tiffany Morissi

- Variance for 3rd floor walls
- Since it is a flat roof – proposed to match the rest of the building
- Upgraded a 30+ year old building
- 3rd floor is small
 - Plan to raise walls to make rooms better
- Will not affect the front
 - Not seen from the front
- It is more a C 2 variance
 - Allows for adequate light
 - Allows a better visual environment
- Keep flat roof in rear – more usable space
- Current encroachments – just expanding what is already there
- Keep current roof in front – only flat in rear
- No increase in building or lot coverage

Architect

- Shows Board exterior views
- Dimensions
 - 1st – 1600
 - 2nd – 1800
 - 3rd – 820
- No variance needed

Jay Cooke: How many feet being added to building

- About 420' on 3rd floor
- Basically doubling 3rd floor living space

Commissioner Kriebel

- 3 parking spaces – where are they
 - Garage and 1 on each side of door
- Sworn in: Kristos Kovolos

PUBLIC:

NONE

Jay Cooke: Flat Roof – any habitat area

- No

Roger McLarnon:

- Drainage on roof
 - Maintain same pattern
 - Drain to street
- Piped or directed
 - Directed
- Pipe if possible
 - Ok

Resolution: Leo Manos

- “C” variance as noted

Motion: Roman Zabihach

2nd: Tim Koob

VOTE:

- Commissioner Kriebel: Yes
 - Maintain visual appearance – keeping under Lot coverage – improving existing – worth the effort
- Tom Halpin: Yes
 - Design works well
- Jay Cooke: Yes
 - Effort works with master plan – visual environment – expansion is about 10% of building – rear yard is double others
- Roman Zabihach: Yes
 - Expanding usefulness of 3rd floor – warranted
- Dan Smith III: Yes
 - Sufficient for needs – flat roof minimum by design – meets requirements
- Peter Tocco: Yes
 - Was concerned of mass of 3rd floor – but satisfied
- Lorraine Sallata: Yes
 - Concerned massive Structure – only impacts rear

Application Approved: 7 in favor, 0 opposed

Applicant:

Dr Ronald Plotka
108 S Victoria Ave
Block 12, Lot 8

Represented by Brian Callaghan, Esq

- Micheal Learn, Esq. for Brian Callaghan

Requesting extension of Resolutions Z-12 & Z-13 of 2011

Sworn in: Michael Learn, Esq.

James Vernile:

- 104 S Victoria Ave
- David Kramer also present – also 106 S Victoria
- Requesting to postpone
- Reason- application was made 10 years ago
 - Said would build but 10 years have passed
 - No one has received service
 - Only aware of this last week
 - Not enough time to understand relief
- May not oppose
 - Just need time to understand
 - Want to discuss
 - Want to examine with a professional
 - Possible dispute of representation of any changes

Michael Learn:

- Assure relief is what was in notice
- Only change is FEMA compliance
- Leave postponement to discretion of Board
- There has been a lapse of time – some have expired
- It is a circumstance of time and changes

Jay Cooke: Were notices sent

- Yes, discuss what was sent
- Site plan was never reviewed
 - Was previously here in 2011- discuss resolutions

Roger McLarnon:

- Board never received any site plans

Jay Cooke: Suggest Postpone to next month

Board needs a complete package

Michael Learn: if Board thinks they do not have enough and need site plans, will have Ponzio tweak as needed

- Ask for November 9 unless no room

Officially postponed to November 9, 2022

Applicant:

Ventnor Plaza LLC

5000 Wellington Ave

Block 304, Lot 1

Represented by Patrick McAndrew, Esq.

Requesting Major Site plan approval

Peter Tocco Recuses himself from application

Sworn in:

- Dan Ponzio – Architect
- Matt Duran – Engineer
- Mark Greco – Owner

Redevelopment plan – Ventnor Plaza

Review of site plan:

- 1st pad – Burger King
 - Revision to gradient
- 2nd pad – Starbucks
 - Basic Site plan
- Open of entrance

Added a road on the side – 2nd entrance

- Storage area for City

3rd pad site – no tenant yet

- Hope to have soon

Widen planter area to 10'-15'

- Upwards of 500 trees and bushes

10 Park style lamps

- Large white oak tree between each

Charging stations

- 8 throughout the plaza

Re-grade the entire lot

- Re-asphalt the entire lot

Little Rock Avenue

- Improve entrance and exit
- Deliveries will be able to go directly behind

Addition to restaurant building

- Add 25' to existing
- Could be fully enclosed or 2 decks

Signage

- Main Sign – entrance way
 - Header with LED and Façade
- Size of package
 - 6'x5'

Variances needed for Free standing sign and other signs

Each of National franchises need a sign

- Partially in planter area and partially in lot

Plan to match stone façade along whole property

Acme has a new image for how the building will look

Mark Greco:

- This area means a lot to me
- Needs so many things
- Working to extend leases
- Bringing in new tenants
- Want to modernize
- Plan for solar panels

Lorraine Sallata:

- Board gave existing approvals
- Wanted shrubs – got rocks
- Concern want to make safer – possible elevating – something to offer height

Jay Cooke: suggest solution

- Answer is freshwater irrigation

Greer Gaskill:

- How high will the lot be raised
 - Some 2'-3'
 - Pad sites
 - 1'-2' higher than Sandy

Jay Cooke: Trash has been an issue along the plaza

- Not a center issue, but it is a problem
 - There is currently a sweeper service
 - Not doing the best of job
- Specialty ideas for parking
- What about Little Rock Ave
 - Paving to Fulton Ave

Roger McLarnon:

- Redevelopment Zone allows this to happen
- Want to expand pump station
- Add truck route to back
- Have discussed landscaping quite a bit

Jay Cooke: Little Rock neighbors - Need buffering

- Planting going in

Tim Koob: When plan to start and complete

- ASAP and by next summer

Commissioner Kriebel: Some suggestions

- Should list be upgraded to determine uses

Mark Greco:

- Restaurants – Need liquor license – none available
 - Have one with 2 floors – restaurant and special events area
 - Liquor license is by population
 - We are governed by this
 - Board discusses liquor options

Matt Duran:

- 4 variances
 - Signing:
 - Sign height: 30' vs 34'
 - Sign height: 200' vs 320'
 - Monument sign: was 7' now 6' – so no variance needed
 - Last sign is 40' vs 24'
- C2 criteria – promotes general welfare
- Negative criteria: public good – safer environment
- Promotes redevelopment plan
- Agree with engineer report
 - Spoke with and agree in full

PUBLIC:

- Lou Widman
 - Concern about diversity of plants
 - Will use native plants
 - Will create a barrier

Leo Manos – Attorney

- Resolution
 - Major Site plan
 - Signage variances

Motion: Roman Zabihach

2nd: Dan Smith

VOTE:

Commissioner Kriebel: Yes

- Many positives – bringing a new face – parking improvements – nuisance parking

Tom Halpin: Yes

- Huge project – will be gateway to City

Jay Cooke: Yes

- Traffic – Pad Sites – fresh look – taken redevelopment plan to heart – more thought to parking – sign variances are small – adding direction

Roman Zabihach: Yes

- Redevelopment plan fulfilled – gateway to City – more activity – enthused.

Dan Smith: Yes

- No negatives – lucky to have – compassion to make a real gateway

Lorraine Sallata: Yes

- More businesses – more upscale and friendly – checked all boxes

Tim Koob: Yes

- Exceptional plan – variances minimal

Greer Gaskill: Yes

- Variances minimal – main artery – looks great

Wendy Bartlett: Yes

- Thank for all doing – variances minimal –

Application Approved: 9 in favor, 0 opposed

Applicant:

New Heights VC, LLC

111 N Dorset Ave

Block 155, Lot 5

Commercial District

Represented by Michael Siligato, Esq.

Requesting "C" Variance for Maximum Lot Coverage, "D" Variance for a two-unit dwelling

Commissioner Kriebel Recuses self – "D" Variance

Tom Halpin recuses self – "D" Variance

Sworn in:

- Michael Siligato – Attorney
- Andrew Bechtal
- Ralph Pappos
- George Ray Thomas

Roger McLarnon:

- Report of 9/5/22 – Commercial Zone
- C2 & Use Variance
- Existing mixed use with 2-unit dwelling
- Using R7 criteria
 - Lot Coverage: 60' vs 74.5'
 - Building height: 35' vs 36'
 - Possible elimination
 - No Waivers
- Vacant since 2020 from fire
- Existing structure – several non-conforming items
 - Have eliminated all but 2
- Couple of quick changes
 - Removing Bedroom – now each has 3 bedrooms
 - Reduced height by 1'
 - Added street trees

Andrew Bechtal:

- Issue of use – satisfied here
- More attractive plan

Positive:

- Adding 8 off street parking
 - That plays into the height – for parking
- Securing safety from flood
- Promotes population density

Negative:

- No Detriment
- Parking is taken care of

“C” Variances

- Removed 1 bedroom off back – added a den
- Height – measure from curb because of Commercial District
 - 37’ based off curb

Current condition – 73% to 71% lot coverage

R7 Zone is behind – single family allowed – not duplex

Applicant owns 2 other commercial properties in City

Property has been sitting since 2020 – not commercially viable

Jay Cooke: what do you mean by Commercially Viable

- If a commercial wanted to come in, they would have by now

Roger McLarnon: What height is needed for parking

- Recommend conforming with R7 allowances
- Have to get higher – total height is 37’-6”

Jay Cooke: Deviating from pattern of the block

- Mixed use and commercial
- Location is difficult to have mixed and parking

Dan Smith: reducing 1 Bedroom in each and other to a den?

- Reducing each by 130’

Could convert den area to a bedroom?

- No – no closet

Tim Koob: Curb cut

- 30' – already one there – takes 1 parking spot away from street

Peter Tocco: What is bedroom configuration

- Removing 1 to 3 and reconfiguring for a den area

PUBLIC:

- Brenda Dowd – Ventnor VBA
 - Opposed to any loss in business
 - Squeezing out other business causes potential issues
 - Dan Smith – Board discusses issues
 - Adding 2 homes takes out street parking

Jay Cooke: How many commercial in last 3 years – at least 3 as of now

- George Mochi
 - Moved for market area
 - For this lifestyle – vibrant commercial marketplace
 - This will forever change the face of the area
 - Profits ahead of the citizens of Ventnor
 - Loss of life blood and vitality
 - What can the City do – discuss issues
 - No commercial has parking anyways
- Kevin Depotry
 - Familiar with the builder and owner
 - Nice blend of business and homes is good
 - Will be a continuation of the gateway
- Joann Liccio
 - Owner of the Dorset
 - Think it is unusable as a commercial property
 - Will make the street look nicer
- Anthony Miranda
 - Property not best for anything
 - Does not have a commercial there
 - This will make the area look good

Leo Manos – Attorney

- Resolution
 - Use Variance
 - “C” Variances

Motion: Lorraine Sallata

2nd: Roman Zabihach

VOTE:

- Jay Cooke: No
 - If ever, this is one to disagree with planners – watched block – can walk to anywhere – traffic counts – business is improving – if we give away will be a fool – bad mistake – parking not an excuse – not R7 there – does not meet the needs of the neighborhood
- Roman Zabihach: No
 - Specifically, a use change – maintaining a commercial or mixed use in area – scale out of character – no variance is great.
- Dan Smith: Yes
 - Have a healthy environment – lays stagnant – find something to do with it – might be best use
- Peter Tocco: No
 - Applaud building – but loss of commercial space – able to walk
- Lorraine Sallata: No
 - No reason to take commercial space – space on Dorset – need to protect commercial – other have been successful
- Tim Koob: No
 - Loss of commercial in the middle of commercial – is a challenging block – does not fit
- Greer Gaskill: Yes
 - Know others there – none made it- if it had any value

Application fails: 2 in favor, 5 opposed

New Business:

- Lorraine Sallata
 - People not reading and following resolutions

Motion to Adjourn: Roman Zabihach

2nd: Greer Gaskill

Approve: all

Meeting Adjourned at 9:20 pm