

North Wildwood Planning Board
Regular Meeting: October 12, 2022
6:30 p.m.

The regular meeting of the North Wildwood Planning Board (Board) was held on the above date & time. Adequate notice of this regular meeting was submitted to the official newspaper of the City of North Wildwood (AC Press) & local newspapers. An Agenda was posted on the main bulletin board at City Hall, well in advance of the meeting date & on the City web site.

A) CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order.

B) OPEN PUBLIC MEETING STATEMENT

Chairman Davis read the Open Public Meeting Act statement.

C) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Davis led the audience in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

D) ROLL CALL

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| Chairman Robert Davis | Present | Mayor Patrick Rosenello' | Absent |
| Vice Chair Jodie Di Eduardo | Present | Mayor's Designee Mr. Doug Miller | Present |
| Chief John Stevenson | Absent | Mr. William Green | Present |
| Mr. John Harkins | Present | Councilman David Del Conte | Absent |
| Mr. George Greenland | Present | Mr. Bill O'Connell | Absent |
| Mr. Bill Auty (Alt. 1) | Present | Ms. Valeria DeJoseph (Alt. 3) | Present |
| Mr. Ron Peters (Alt.2) | Present | Vacant (Alt. 4) | |
| | | Mr. Robert Belasco (Board Solicitor) | Present |
| | | Mr. Ralph Petrella (Board Engineer) | Present |
| | | Eric Gundrum, (Board Secretary) | Present |

The Board Solicitor announced that the Board quorum has been established.

E) SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS:

The Board Solicitor did conduct the truth swearing of the Board's professionals as it was necessary for tonight's meeting.

F) MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENTS:

Application No. P-22-7-1 Joseph M. & Eileen E. Conroy

500 Atlantic Avenue

Block 246; Lot 11

R-1 Zoning District

Multiple “c” variance(s) – installation of shed in three (3) possible locations in frontyard setback

Jeff Barnes, Esq., appeared on behalf of the Applicant & requested adjournment of the application to next month’s meeting.

The Board Solicitor announced adjournment of the above referenced application by request of the Applicant’s attorney/agent. The request for adjournment also provided for time limit wavier under the NJ Municipal Land Use Law {NJ-MLUL} (NJSA 40:55D-1 et. seq.) & the Ordinance (Chap. 276-1 et. seq.) as announced by the Board Solicitor. The Board Solicitor announced to the public that this application will be adjourned to the November 9, 2022 meeting & no further public notice will be or is required to be provided. With that being said, the application was adjourned.

G) MEMORIALIZATIONS:

Application No. P-22-7-2 MW of Wildwood, LLC (aka 800 NY Ave LLC)

802 New York Avenue

Block 150; Lot 9

R-2 Zoning District

Minor subdivision approval with “c” variances

The Board heard & considered the application of 800 New York Avenue, LLC (Applicant), owner of the property located at 802 New York Avenue, a/k/a Block 150, Lot 9 (Property), seeking minor subdivision approval, and ‘C’ variance relief in relation to minimum lot depth – lots 9.01 & 9.02 (100ft. is required whereas 80ft. is proposed), and minimum frontyard setback – on proposed Lot 9.02 (10ft. is required whereas 6.17ft. is proposed), in order to create two (2) 50ft. x 80ft. lots suitable for the development of single-family dwellings.

The Board Solicitor called for a motion to approve the memorialization of the Resolution as discussed. Motioned by Mr. Miller & 2nd by Mr. Mr. Green. The Board Solicitor called for any discussion or corrections to the motion. The Board proposed no corrections, additions or comments to the motion. Based on the majority roll-call vote being affirmative, the memorialization was approved by the Board. Board members Mr. Greenland abstained from the vote.

H) NEW BUSINESS:

Application No. P-22-8-1 Nicholas Rotandi

208 W. Chestnut Avenue

Block 158; Lot 10

R-2 Zoning District

‘c’ variance relief for sideyard setbacks, lot area, lot frontage/width. Siteplan approval required for Chap. 276-34(B)(9)(d).

The Board heard & considered the application of Nicholas & Carolyn Rotandi (Applicant), owner of the property located at 208 West Chestnut Avenue, a/k/a Block 158, Lot 10 (Property), seeking 'c' variance relief in relation to minimum lot area (4,000SF is required whereas 2,500SF is existing & proposed), minimum lot frontage/width (40ft. is required whereas 25ft. is existing & proposed), to demolish an existing single-family dwelling & accessory structure in order to construct a new single-family dwelling on site.

John Amenhauser, Esq., appeared on behalf of the Applicant & outlined the nature of the application & the relief sought in connection with same. Mr. Amenhauser advised the Board that the Property is an undersized 25ft. x 100ft. lot that is currently developed with a single-family dwelling & an accessory rearward shed. The Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structures located on site in order to construct a new single-family dwelling. Pursuant to City Ordinance 276-34(B)(9)(d), in light of the fact that the Property contains less than 30ft. of frontage/width the Applicant must obtain Board approval in order to develop the Property. Mr. Amenhauser indicated that the proposed single-family dwelling will meet all of the R-2 bulk requirements whereas the existing structure does not.

Pamela Fina, R.A., a registered architect, with Fine Architecture, P.C., appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant. Ms. Fine was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture & she was placed under oath & she testified from the proposed architectural plans, consisting of two (2) sheets, dated April 10, 2022 and last revised October 11, 2022, which were received by the Board & which are incorporated herein as fact. Ms. Fine distributed a revised set of floor plans which were received by the Board & which were marked as Exhibit A-1. She indicated that the proposed floor plans were revised in order to address a comment within the Board Engineer's September 30, 2022 Review Memorandum in regards to the location of a mechanical platform & the fact that same was originally proposed to be located below the base flood elevation (BFE). Ms. Fine reviewed the existing & proposed site conditions for the benefit of the Board. Ms. Fine testified that the existing single-family dwelling located on site is a non-conforming structure that encroaches in to required setbacks. Ms. Fine advised the Board that the single-family dwelling proposed by the Applicant will conform to the R-2 Zoning District bulk requirements. The proposed structure is below maximum building height, it conforms to all required setbacks, and the development will not exceed maximum permitted lot and/or building coverage. The structure will contain a total of four (4) bedrooms necessitating a total of 2.5 off-street parking spaces. Ms. Fine noted that the NJ Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS), N.J.A.C. 5:21-4.14, provides that the Board has the ability to disregard a fractional parking space, and in the event the Board elected to do so, the Property would provide compliant off-street parking. Ms. Fine testified that a total of three (3) off-street parking spaces are provided on site; however, in light of the fact that the parking spaces are proposed in a stacked configuration, one (1) in the driveway and two (2) in the garage, only two (2) spaces can be counted.

The Board did not take an issue with the Applicant's request to disregard the required fractional off-street parking space. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will maintain the 3rd off-street parking space within the garage, and same shall be reserved exclusively for off-street parking purposes. Ms. Fine opined that the Applicant is experiencing a hardship relative to the fact that the Property is an undersized lot in the R-2 Zoning District which presents practical difficulties in complying with the City's Ordinance. She noted that despite the fact that the Property is an undersized lot, the Applicant designed a dwelling which conforms to all of the bulk requirements of the R-2 Zoning District. Ms. Fine further opined that the application can be granted as there are no substantial detriments to the public good & the application does not substantially impair the intent or purpose of the Zoning Map & Ordinance. She also indicated that the Applicant's proposal is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood as single-family dwellings are common throughout same. Ms. Fine opined that several of the purposes of zoning, outlined within NJ Municipal Land Use Law (NJ-MLUL)

N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2, are advanced in connection with this application and support the relief sought by the Applicant as it:

- a. Provides adequate light, air & open space;
- b. Secures safety from fire, flood, panic and other natural & man-made disasters;
- c. Provides adequate light, air & open space;
- e. Promotes the establishment of appropriate population densities & concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities & regions and preservation of the environment; and
- i. Promotes a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques & good civic design & arrangement.

The Board was in receipt of a review memorandum prepared by Board Engineer Ralph Petrella, P.E. P.P., P.L.S. of Van Note-Harvey Associates, Inc., dated September 30, 2022, which was received by the Board & which is incorporated herein as fact. Mr. Petrella reviewed & confirmed the relief sought by the Applicant for the benefit of the Board. He advised the Board that the revisions made to the architectural plans adequately addressed the concern raised in relation to the proposed location of a mechanical platform & the fact that same was originally proposed to be below the BFE.

Chairman Davis then opened the application for general public comment. No further public members wished to speak on behalf of the meeting or to the Board at this time. No comment was offered. Chairman Davis closed the public portion of the meeting.

The Board members then discussed & summarized the application as presented. The Board then discussed the finding of facts on the variance/minor subdivision approval. Each Board member gave reasoning for their view of the facts & the application as it relates to the application. Mr. Greenland “volunteered” for the finding of facts. Mr. Greenland reiterated to the address and Block & Lot of the property as stated in the application. The property is located in the R-2 Zoning District on an undersized 25ft. x 100ft. lot, and it is currently developed with a single-family home. The Applicant is before the Board requesting ‘c’ variance relief to demolish the existing structures located on site in order to construct a new single-family dwelling which will conform to all of the R-2 bulk requirements governing same. Ms. Fine reviewed & confirmed the variances sought in connection with this Application & she confirmed that the proposed single-family dwelling will conform to all of the R-2 bulk requirements. Variance relief is required due to the fact that the Property is an undersized lot. She testified that the Applicant is experiencing a hardship due to the narrowness of the Property which supports the variance relief requested by the Applicant. Ms. Fine provided testimony in regards to the need for a parking variance & the Board determined that a de minimis waiver was appropriate as three (3) parking spaces are provided on site even if only two (2) can be counted. The Applicant’s willingness to agree to a condition of approval to maintain the 3rd parking space provided additional support to justify waiving the required fractional parking space. Ms. Fine’s testimony was deemed credible by the Board. The Board finds that the Applicant has presented special reasons which advance the purposes of zoning which justify the granting of the aforementioned variances. In addition, the Board finds that the fact that the subject property is an undersized, narrow lot, the Applicant is experiencing a hardship which provides additional justification for granting the requested variance relief. The Board found that the Applicant did establish that granting the requested variance relief would advance the purposes of Zoning, to the public good, to the City’s municipal Land Use Ordinances & to the City’s Zoning Map. The Board finds that the Applicant has satisfied the requirements for variance/siteplan approval. No additions or correction to the finding of facts. No discussion on the facts.

The Board Solicitor called for a motion to approve the of the Resolution as discussed. Motioned by Mr. Green & 2nd by Mr. Greenland. The Board Solicitor called for any discussion or corrections to the motion. The Board proposed no corrections, additions or comments to the motion. Based on the majority roll-call vote being affirmative, the Resolution was approved by the Board.

Application No. P-22-7-1 Joseph M. & Eileen E. Conroy

500 Atlantic Avenue

Block 246; Lot 11

R-1 Zoning District

Multiple “c” variance(s) – installation of shed in three (3) possible locations in frontyard setback

The next application was adjourned to the November meeting as previously announced.

Due to the nature of the next application requesting a Use variance & the regional Board format, Mr. Miller as Mayor’s designee & Vice Chair DiEduardo identified she had a conflict with the application, for she resides within 200 feet of the property, stepped down for the next application(s) & took a seat in the public seating area.

Application No. Z-22-2-5 Anthony Viscusi

3 Mace Avenue

Block 6.04; Lot 5

R-2 Zoning District

“d(3) Conditional Use Variance/Use Variance siteplan approval

The Application submitted by Anthony Viscusi was originally presented to the Board in September’s meeting & requested a “d(3) Conditional Use Variance in order to permit the construction of a single-family semi-detached dwellings at the property located at 3 Mace Avenue, a/k/a Block 6.04, Lot 5, in the City’s R-2 Zoning District, for a property that does not meet the Conditional Use requirements of the Ordinance. The application also requests a “c” variance for a roof-top deck which was prohibited by recently adopted City Ordinance. Board members had several questions regarding the project. There were some inconsistencies discovered by the Board members & the Applicant’s experts.

At the September meeting, Jeff Barnes, Esq., appeared on behalf of the Applicant & outlined the nature of the application & the relief sought in connection with same. After seeking a five-minute recess, Mr. Barnes requested tabling the application till next month’s meeting. Applicant & his attorney, the Applicant requested tabling the application till the October meeting to work out details regarding same. Board members were almost united that the roof-top deck location was problematic & was not the aesthetic vista thought to be harmonic to the neighborhood. In an informal poll, it was desirable to the most of the Board that the roof-top deck be eliminated.

Upon presenting the revised application at the October’s meeting, Mr. Barnes informed the Board that the Property is currently developed with an older duplex in need of renovation. The proposed new construction of a duplex would modernize the property functionally & efficiently. The proposed roof top deck was eliminated from the design with the revised application, based on initial comments of the Board.

The Property is an undersized 48ft. x 100ft. lot located in the R-2 Zoning District, and it is currently developed with two single-family semi-detached dwellings containing a total of two (2) units each, for a total of four (4) units on site. The Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structures located on site in order to

construct a single-family semi-detached (duplex) dwelling, pursuant to the Conditional Use Standards, which will be designed to appear as if it were a single-family dwelling. Mr. Barnes stated that the existing structures located on site do not provide compliant off-street parking, they have fallen in to a state of disrepair, and they do not comply with the R-2's bulk standards.

Mr. Barnes advised the Board that the City's R-2 Zoning District allows for the construction of duplexes on 50ft. x 100ft. lots provided the proposed development conforms to specific conditions outlined within the Ordinance. Mr. Barnes indicated that the Applicant is requesting a D(3) Conditional Use Variance in connection with this proposal as the Property does not meet the required minimum lot area, lot frontage/width conditions. The Applicant originally proposed a rooftop deck in connection with this application; however, the Applicant elected to eliminate same as rooftop decks were recently prohibited by an Ordinance enacted by the City.

Brian Newswanger, RA of Atlantes Architects, record architect for the application, could not attend tonight's meeting due to Covid-19 exposure. In lieu of Mr. Newswanger, John Halbruner, P.E., R.A. with the Hyland Design Group appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Halbruner was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of land surveying & he was placed under oath & testified from the proposed plan for the construction of the duplex, which received by the Board & which is incorporated herein as fact. Mr. Halbruner reviewed the proposed development plans for the benefit of the Board.

John Halbruner, R.A., P.E., of the Hyland Design Group, appeared on behalf of the Applicant & he was recognized as an expert in the fields of architecture & engineering. Mr. Halbruner was placed under oath & he testified from the proposed site & architectural plans, consisting of six (6) sheets, dated January 2022, and last revised September 29, 2022, which were prepared by Brian Newswanger, R.A., & which were received by the Board & which are incorporated herein as fact. Mr. Halbruner reviewed the existing & proposed site conditions for the benefit of the Board. Mr. Halbruner reviewed the conditions governing the development of a duplex in the R-2 Zoning District on a 50ft. x 100ft. lot. He confirmed that a D(3) Use variance is required as the Property does not meet the required lot area, lot frontage/width associated with conditional duplex development in the R-2 Zoning District. Mr. Halbruner testified that the structure proposed by Mr. Newswanger was designed so as to appear as if same were a single-family dwelling, it maintains a traditional seashore design, it has an asymmetrical façade, it is limited to two (2) habitable floors, and it meets all other applicable conditions. Mr. Halbruner testified that that the Applicant's proposal will include compliant off-street parking whereas the existing development does not. Mr. Halbruner reviewed the D(3) Conditional Use standard for the benefit of the Board, noting that the Applicant's burden is not as significant as that in a D(1) or D(2) variance application. He indicated that a duplex is a permitted conditional use in the R-2 Zoning District on a 50ft. x 100ft. lot, and provided all conditions are met, the same is essentially a permitted use. In the event the Applicant does not meet all required conditions the Board must determine whether or not the property in question can accommodate deviations from required conditions. Mr. Halbruner opined that in the instant case, the Property can in fact accommodate the proposed duplex use as the deviations from the applicable conditions are de minimis. Mr. Halbruner testified that the proposed duplex complies with all applicable bulk requirements, and the deviation is simply tied to a slight deficiency of lot size which has no impact on the proposed structure or the surrounding properties/neighborhood. He indicated that the lot itself is undersized by approximately 4%, or 200SF. Mr. Halbruner reiterated that the Applicant's proposal would eliminate a non-conforming use in a zone that is limited to single-family dwellings & duplexes, it provides compliant off-street parking, and the proposed structure meets applicable bulk requirements whereas the existing structures do not. In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Halbruner confirmed that one (1) unit will contain a total of three (3) bedrooms & the other unit will contain four (4) bedrooms. Mr. Halbruner reviewed the revised proposed renderings & building elevations for the benefit of the Board. Board Members expressed concerns in relation to the design of the

structure & the fact that same did appear to be a single-family dwelling. The Applicant had presented revised architectural elevations & a revised rendering for the Board. The Board commended the Applicant on taking the time to address the Board's concerns, and the Board unanimously agreed that the new design satisfied the condition that the structure be designed to appear as if it were a single-family dwelling. Board Members expressed additional concerns in relation to a rooftop deck that was originally proposed as a part of this application. In response to the concerns raised by the Board the Applicant elected to eliminate the proposed rooftop deck with the revised plans.

The Board was in receipt of a review memorandum prepared by Board Engineer Mr. Petrella, dated September 1, 2022, which was received by the Board & which is incorporated herein as fact. Mr. Petrella reviewed & confirmed the relief sought by the Applicant for the benefit of the Board.

Chairman Davis then opened the application for general public comment. One (1) member of the public addressed the Board in connection with the application:

Jodie DiEduardo, owner of the property located at 22 Taylor Avenue, was placed under oath & was sworn in to testify before the Board. Ms. DiEduardo questioned whether the HVAC location has been corrected on the siteplan, with Board Engineer Petrella answering yes to the question.

No further public members wished to speak on behalf of the meeting or to the Board at this time. No comment was offered. Chairman Davis closed the public portion of the meeting.

The Board members then discussed & summarized the application as presented. The Board then discussed the finding of facts on the variance/minor subdivision approval. Each Board member gave reasoning for their view of the facts & the application as it relates to the application. Chairman Davis "volunteered" for the finding of facts. Chairman Davis reiterated to the address and Block & Lot of the property as stated in the application. The property is located in the R-2 Zoning District & it is currently developed with a four-unit residential structure. The application before the Board requests preliminary & final siteplan approval & a D(3) Conditional Use variance to permit the construction of a duplex on a 48ft. x 100ft. lot in the R-2 Zoning District. The Property is currently developed with two duplexes containing two (2) units each. The Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structures located on site in order to construct a duplex which is designed so as to appear as if it were single-family dwelling. Duplexes are permitted on 50ft. x 100ft. lots in the R-2 Zoning District as conditional uses. In light of the fact that the subject property is a 48ft. x 100ft. lot, the Applicant requires a D(3) Conditional Use Variance for the application does not meet the statutory requirements. The Applicant meets all required conditions with the exception of minimum lot area, lot frontage/width. With respect to the 'D(3)' Conditional Use Variance, the Board finds that the Applicant has established that the Property can accommodate the proposed use thereby justifying the granting of the D(3) Conditional Use Variance sought by the Applicant. The Board finds that the Applicant has presented special reasons which advance the purposes of zoning which justify the granting of the aforementioned variances. Furthermore, the Board finds that the Property can accommodate a deviation from the required conditions regulating the development of a duplex on a 50ft. x 100ft. lot as the structure meets all applicable bulk requirements. Mr. Halbruner's testimony was deemed credible by the Board. The Board did receive public comment due to the HVAC location on the siteplan. The Board determined that the Applicant's proposal presented limited substantial detriments to the public good & would not impair the intent & purpose of the Zoning Map & Ordinance. The Board found that the Applicant did establish that granting the requested variance relief would advance the purposes of Zoning, to the public good, to the City's Ordinances & to the City's Zoning Map. The Board finds that the Applicant has satisfied the requirements for variance/siteplan approval. No additions or correction to the finding of facts. No discussion on the facts.

The Board Solicitor called for a motion to approve the of the Resolution as discussed. Motioned by Mr. Peters & 2nd by Ms. DeJoseph. The Board Solicitor called for any discussion or corrections to the motion. The Board proposed no corrections, additions or comments to the motion. Based on the majority roll-call vote being affirmative, the Resolution was approved by the Board.

After the application(s) was concluded, Mr. Miller, Mr. Greenland & Vice Chair DiEduardo, returned to their seats on the Board's dais to partake in Board business.

I) ZONING OFFICER REPORT:

Dan Speigel, Zoning Officer/Construction Official, had nothing to report for tonight's meeting.

J) PUBLIC PORTION:

Chairman Davis then opened the meeting for general public comment.

Beth Davidson of 506 Atlantic Avenue, had a question regarding the process of submitting applications & requesting the number of adjournments for the same. Board Solicitor Belasco answered her question in that applicant is entitled to request adjournment at any time & that are not traditionally denied. The applicant is preparing new revision to the plan & application. The revised application has not been presented to the Board at this time. Ms. Davidson was concerned that attending the Planning Board meeting without advance notice of the adjournment, is burdensome upon the public, by not knowing. She also was concerned about impervious coverage for her own property & how the property next to her would affect her plans for a new driveway. The Board Chairman & Solicitor informed her that impervious coverage must be calculated within the individual property lines. She was advised to contact the Construction Office for further details.

No further public members wished to speak on behalf of the meeting or to the Board at this time. No comment was offered. Chairman Davis closed the public portion of the meeting.

K) APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Board Solicitor presented to the Board the approval the September 14, 2022 Board regular Meeting Minutes. The Board Solicitor called for any discussion or corrections to the minutes. No discussion or corrections proposed. Mr. Green commended the preparation of the meeting minutes. Motioned as proposed by Mr. Miller & 2nd by Mr. Harkins. Based on the affirmative majority roll-call vote of the Board members to memorialize the Meeting Minutes, the Meeting Minutes were approved.

L) UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Land Development Ordinance amendments – Chap. 276-34(A)(2)
Expansion of non-conforming structure

The Board Secretary reminded the Board of pending amendments to Chap. 276-34(A)(2) - Expansion of non-conforming structure. The Board last month discussed several possible amendments to the section based on livable square footage criteria triggering an expansion under the Ordinance or based on volume criteria triggering an expansion. Both amendments are subject to City Administration review as proposed by the Board. The Board decided that no amendments were necessary after debating the pro's & con's of the amendment. The Board Solicitor did discuss comments from City Administration & further review is not warranted by both

the Board, Board Chairman & active commentary with City Administration. The Board decided that the amendment was not needed at this time. The amendment will not go forward. The Board consented in favorable majority that the amendment will not proceed.

Land Development Ordinance amendments – Chap. 276-12(G) & Chap. 276-12(F)
Stair landings & open-air decks

The Board Secretary reminded the Board of pending amendments to Chap. 276-12(G) & Chap. 276-12(F) - Stair landings & open-air decks. The Board discuss eliminating this section as it contradicts the individual zoning district bulk requirements. This section poses a confusing contradiction between the two sections. The interpretation of whether an open deck includes a roof-over deck/porch was discussed. It was the Board’s understanding that open deck, to the air, built prior to 1986, was permitted. All construction in the frontyard setback should be adhered to the 10-foot frontyard setback. The Board Secretary & Board Solicitor to work on the amendments & propose same as the minimum of 10-feet setback. The Board reviewed the history of the questionable section on how it was adopted. The Board Chairman desires to have a very clear understanding & interpretation of the section so that there is “no play” in the understanding of the Ordinance.

The Board Secretary stated the two sections are in contrary to the individual Residential Zoning Districts (R-1, R-1.5, R-2 & OS Zoning Districts). The Board Secretary recommended that Chap. 276-12(G) & Chap. 276-12(F) - Stair landings & open-air decks be deleted.

The Board Chairman stressed that bump-outs/overhangs shall not be deleted due to its architectural advantage in building design. It should be duplicated in the individual residential zoning districts to make sure the language is clear & not contradictory.

The Board Secretary contacted the Land Development Ordinance amendment sub-committee of the Board, who granted their consent with the drafted amendment should go forward with Board adoption of the amendment as drafted.

Land Development Ordinance amendments – Chap. 276-35(B) - Property line parking/Driveway
Parking

The Board Secretary presented to the Board of pending amendments to Chap. 276-35(B) Property line parking/Driveway Parking. Board member O’Connell requested the driveway amendment. Several Board members brought attention the parallel parking of vehicles next to the property line and/or on the sidewalk. Several Board members presumed this practice as unsafe & aesthetically displeasing. Several Board members brought up the concern of golf carts & Low Speed Vehicles (LSV’s). The appearance of the parking in the frontyard and/or on the grass of the frontyard, would be prohibitive. Draft amendments were presented to the Board for their consideration.

The Board Secretary contacted the Land Development Ordinance amendment sub-committee of the Board, who granted their consent with the drafted amendment should go forward with Board adoption of the amendment as drafted.

The Board Engineer stated the Chapter 276-35 provide for at least 50% of the curb frontage for landscaping. The Board Secretary will contact the Board Engineer for clarification.

Mr. Green mentioned the greater concern of golf carts & LSV's traversing the City's streets & the allegedly unsafe operation of the same. Several Board members did state the City collectively needed to enforcement of the operation of same, however, these vehicles are regulated by State of NJ under the motor vehicle code of State regulations. The golf carts & LSV's also create an on-street parking problem where the golf carts & LSV's are "stored in the garage, while the car/motor vehicles are parked on the street." Mr. Green highly recommended that a Task Force be created by the City to see what can be done about the golf carts & LSV's and the Planning board should be part of the discussion of same. The Board Chairman will contact the City Administration.

In another matter, Mr. Greenland brought up the shed located at 10th & Delaware Ave(s) that was approved by the Planning Board in a previous meeting. Several Board members inquired if the shed was properly moved as per the approval the Board granted. The Board Secretary stated he would look into the matter.

M) COMMUNICATION(S):

Atlantic City Electric – installation of smart meters flyer

The Board Secretary announced the installation Atlantic City Electric of electric service/house smart meters for all City structures. Several Board members presented their "sentiments" regarding the smart meters. This was for informational only purposes for the Board.

The Board Secretary announced Planning & Zoning educational courses at the NJ League of Municipalities convention.

The Board Secretary announced the adoption City Ordinance to prevent unregulated "PODS" & storage container Ordinance.

N) REPORTS: None presented

O) MEETING ADJOURNED:

Meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm, on motioned by Ms. DeJoseph & 2nd by Mr. Greenland. Based on the affirmative roll-call vote of the Board members, the motion to adjourn was approved.

APPROVED: _____
Date

J. Eric Gundrum
Board Secretary

This is an interpretation of the action taken at the meeting by the Secretary, and not a verbatim transcript.