

BOROUGH OF WILDWOOD CREST
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes – 5 April 2023 5 p.m.

The following are the minutes of the Wildwood Crest Planning Board as held on Wednesday April 5, 2023, at Borough Hall. The proceedings of the meeting are recorded and available for public inspection.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Mr. Davenport called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m., lead the Pledge of Allegiance and read the statement of compliance with the open Public Meetings Act.

ROLL CALL:

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Patrick Davenport: present | Barbara Hunt: present | Brian Melchiorre: present |
| Don Cabrera: present | Joe Franco present | Angela Daniels: present |
| Gerry D'Antonio: present | Fred Mettler: absent | Pete Cava: absent |
| William Bumbernick: absent | Brian Stuart: present | Vince Tenaglia: present |
| Bradley Vogdes: present | | |
| Board Secretary Pamela Riper: present | | |
| Solicitor Rob Belasco: present | | |
| Engineer Joe Mohnack: present | | |

MINUTES:

Ms. Daniels moved to dispense with the public reading of the minutes of the meeting of 21 February 2023 and approve as distributed, Mr. Tenaglia second, minutes approved as distributed.

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Patrick Davenport: yes | Barbara Hunt: yes | Brian Melchiorre: yes |
| Don Cabrera: yes | Joe Franco: abstain | Angela Daniels: yes |
| Gerry D'Antonio: abstain | Brian Stuart: abstain | Vince Tenaglia: yes |
| Bradley Vogdes: yes | | |

Mr. D'Antonio moved to dispense with the public reading of the minutes of the meeting of 1 March 2023 and approve as distributed, Mr. Stuart second, minutes approved as distributed.

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Patrick Davenport: yes | Barbara Hunt: abstain | Brian Melchiorre: yes |
| Don Cabrera: yes | Joe Franco: absain | Angela Daniels: yes |
| Gerry D'Antonio: yes | Brian Stuart: yes | Vince Tenaglia: yes |
| Bradley Vogdes: abstain | | |

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING BOARD ACTIONS:

Resolution PB-23-05 for Application PB-22-15 for 213 E Columbine Road a/k/a blk 42.01 lots 7 & 8 in Zone R-2 owner Allen E. Hirschmann and Susan Fox Hirschmann; seeking minor site plan approval.

Mr. Tenaglia moved to approve, second by Ms. Daniels

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Patrick Davenport: yes | Barbara Hunt: abstain | Brian Melchiorre: yes |
| Don Cabrera: abstain | Joe Franco: abstain | Angela Daniels: yes |
| Gerry D'Antonio: yes | Brian Stuart: yes | Vince Tenaglia: yes |
| Bradley Vogdes: abstain | | |

Resolution PB-23-06 for Application PB-22-16 for 204 E Primrose Road a/k/a blk 68.01 lots 17 & 18 in Zone R-2 owner HK NJ Ventures LLC; seeking "D" Variance relief for expansion of a non-conforming use; seeking "C" Variance relief for side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks, max. building, deck and/or open porch coverage and minimum parking requirements.

Ms. Hunt moved to approve, second by Mr. Vogdes

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Patrick Davenport: yes | Barbara Hunt: yes | Brian Melchiorre: yes |
| Don Cabrera: yes | Joe Franco: abstain | Angela Daniels: yes |
| Gerry D'Antonio: abstain | Brian Stuart: abstain | Vince Tenaglia: yes |
| Bradley Vogdes: yes | | |

Resolution PB-23-07 for Application PB- 22-12 for 7202 Seaview Avenue a/k/a blk 101 lots 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12.02, 20, 22, 24 in Zone R-2 owner Gem Crest Condos; seeking "D" Variance relief for expansion of

non-conforming use; seeking "C" Variance relief for side yard setback, rear yard setback, minimum habitable floor area, modulation of building walls, minimum roof pitch, front yard landscaping, minimum amount of raised curb, minimum parking spaces, minimum parking space size, shared parking setback from swelling units, maximum building height shall be two stories

Mr. Tenaglia moved to approve, second by Mr. Hunt

Patrick Davenport: yes

Barbara Hunt: yes

Brian Melchiorre: yes

Don Cabrera: yes

Joe Franco: abstain

Angela Daniels: yes

Gerry D'Antonio: abstain

Brian Stuart: abstain

Vince Tenaglia: yes

Bradley Vogdes: yes

APPLICATIONS:

Joe Franco recuses himself from the application hearing.

Application PB-22-08 for 6501 Ocean Avenue a/k/a blk 50.04 lots 3, 4, 7 & 8 in Zone M-1A owner Mahalo Wildwood Crest LLC; seeking "C" Variance relief, preliminary site plan approval and final site plan approval.

The taxes are current on the subject property.

The application was deemed complete by the Administrative Officer of the Planning Board and therefore the Applicant has standing to proceed.

The subject property is located at 6501 Ocean Avenue, a/k/a Block: 50.04, Lots: 3, 4, 7, and 8, in the M-1-A (Hotel, Motel, and Multi-Family) zoning district, and same is currently developed with an existing hotel which is in the process of being renovated.

The Applicant was represented by Frank Corrado, Esquire who outlined the nature of the application and the relief sought in connection with same.

Mr. Corrado advised the Board that the Applicant is the owner of the subject property which was formerly known as the Ocean Holiday Hotel. He indicated that the Applicant is proposing to renovate and upgrade the existing hotel in order to create a "first class resort."

The Applicant received prior approvals back in 2020, as memorialized in Resolution PB-19-11-01.

The prior approvals were subsequently appealed/challenged by neighboring property owners in the Cape May County Superior Court under docket CPM-L-160-20. The Court upheld the approvals granted by the Board, and the matter was subsequently appealed to the New Jersey Superior Court Appellate Division; however, said appeal was ultimately withdrawn in light of required revisions to the Applicant's prior site plan in response to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's review of the project and CAFRA permitting process.

Mr. Corrado acknowledged that the application before the Board amounts to a new application in light of the modifications made to the approved site plan.

He compared the previously approved site plan to the proposed site plan; noting that the Rosemary Road setback is proposed to be 11ft. whereas the Board previously approved a 0ft. setback. The proposed setback complies with the NJDEP's view corridor requirements; however, same does not meet the Borough's 30ft. required setback, necessitating variance relief.

Mr. Corrado advised the Board that the Applicant has elected to reduce the number of proposed hotel units from 70 to 66, and the parking ratio has improved from 66 parking spaces to 70 parking spaces.

He reviewed and confirmed the variance relief sought in connection with this application for the benefit of the Board.

Mr. Corrado asserted that the Applicant's proposal is consistent with the Borough's Master Plan which calls for the maintenance of a hotel district, and the provision of 1st class hotel rooms within the Borough.

The Master Plan identifies concerns related to the conversion of existing hotels/motels to the condominium form of ownership, and speaks to a need to provide flexibility to hotel owners in an effort to allow for the renovation of existing hotels in an effort to maintain same to support the Borough's tourism industry.

Steven J. Tomasetti, R.A., was present at the meeting on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Tomasetti was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture and he was sworn in to testify with respect to the proposed architectural plans, consisting of two (2) sheets, dated September 19, 2022, which were received by the Board, and which are incorporated herein as fact.

Mr. Tomasetti distributed the following exhibits which were received by the Board and which are incorporated herein:

Exhibit A-1 – Floor Plans of the ground floor depicting the proposed parking arrangement and each proposed floor of the hotel.

Exhibit A-2 – An enlarged Floor Plan of the proposed pool deck.

Exhibit A-3 – Proposed Architectural Elevations.

Exhibit A-4 – Proposed 3D rendering of the subject property from Beach Avenue.

Mr. Tomasetti reviewed the proposed floor plans for the benefit of the Board. He indicated that the floor plan layouts are substantially similar to what was proposed and approved back in 2020.

A total of 55 hotel units currently exist on site and the Applicant is proposing to renovate these rooms, and to construct 11 additional hotel units on site.

The renovated hotel will contain a total of 16 oceanfront units, 4 per floor, to take advantage of beach and ocean views, and each room is approximately 305SF in size. There are 32 existing hotel units which will be renovated that are approximately 437SF in size, 4 ADA accessible rooms are provided, 1 on each floor, measuring approximately 534SF, and 3 existing units on the top floor will be renovated and maintained which measure approximately 257SF.

The Applicant is also proposing to construct a 40ft. x 40ft. addition to the existing hotel which will contain 11 new units which measure approximately 505SF each.

Mr. Tomasetti testified that the proposed hotel units exceed the minimum hotel unit size requirements, and he indicated that the only units which do not comply with the requirements are pre-existing units.

Mr. Tomasetti reviewed the proposed architectural elevations for the benefit of the Board. He discussed the design of the structure and the architectural features which will be incorporated into the redesign of the existing structure.

The renovated structure will contain building offsets in an effort to create a desirable visual environment, and to provide contrast for the building, and to provide backdrops for proposed signage.

Mr. Tomasetti indicated that increasing the Rosemary Road setback from 0ft. to 11ft. resulted in a reduction in the size of the proposed second floor pool deck.

The proposed pool deck will contain a 2,000SF pool, lounge areas for hotel guests, and a small wading pool for children.

Mr. Tomasetti testified that the former Ocean Holiday Hotel previously had a pool located in the front yard of Rosemary Road on the ground floor. That pool has been eliminated and the Applicant is proposing to install the new pool on the second-floor pool deck in order to allow the Applicant to utilize the ground floor area for parking purposes.

A concession stand is proposed to be located within the pool deck area which will serve as a 'grab and go' amenity for guests.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Tomasetti testified that no cooking will take place within the concession stand, and all available food will be prepackaged.

Mr. Tomasetti testified that all parking is proposed to be interior parking underneath of the existing hotel structure.

Mr. Tomasetti advised the Board that the existing and proposed structure does not exceed maximum building height. The Applicant is proposing to maintain the existing 5-story hotel whereas a 6-story hotel would be permitted by right.

He indicated that the Applicant evaluated possibly constructing another floor on the existing structure, but determined that, structurally, the existing structure could not accommodate an additional floor. Moreover, the construction of an additional floor would not be compliant with current construction codes. He further indicated that the only viable option was for the Applicant to renovate the existing structure and expand horizontally within the Rosemary Road setback.

With respect to signage, Mr. Tomasetti testified that the Applicant is proposing to install 3 signs which consist of scripted lettering referencing the Mahalo Hotel brand. The proposed signs are backlit and will not be illuminated with building or internal lighting.

Vincent Orlando, P.E., P.P., L.L.A., C.M.E. with Engineering Design Associates, P.A. appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Orlando was accepted by the Board as an expert in the fields of engineering and land planning and he was placed under oath and testified from the proposed site plan, consisting of seven (7) sheets, dated August 15, 2022, and last revised December 21, 2022, which was received by the Board and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Mr. Orlando discussed and identified modifications to the proposed site plan in comparison to the site plan which was approved by the Board back in 2020.

Mr. Orlando advised the Board that, after receiving Board approval back in 2020, the Applicant submitted required permit applications to the NJDEP and was advised that the proposed/approved 0ft. Rosemary Road setback did not comply with the NJDEP's requirement to maintain a view corridor.

The Applicant ultimately revised the plans and the size of the proposed pool deck, resulting in a 11ft. setback to Rosemary Road which has been approved by the NJDEP.

Mr. Orlando noted that the Applicant is reducing the number of units that were previously proposed and approved from 70 to 66, which in turn will improve the off-street parking ratio provided on site.

Mr. Orlando distributed the following exhibits which were received by the Board and which are incorporated herein:

Exhibit A-5 – A Site Plan comparing the previously approved plan to the proposed plan.

Exhibit A-6 – A second-floor Site Plan comparing the previously approved plan to the proposed plan;

Exhibit A-7 – A proposed Site Plan depicting both the 1st and 2nd floors.

Exhibit A-8 – A handout depicting the proposed site plan.

Exhibit A-9 – A packet containing five (5) photographs depicting hotels within the Borough which do not provide the required 30ft. setback to maintain view corridors.

Mr. Orlando advised the Board that the subject property is 20,000SF in size and is developed with an existing 5-story hotel.

He indicated that the Applicant is proposing to renovate the existing structure, and is also proposing to construct a 40ft. x 40ft. addition in order to create 11 additional hotel units on site. All of the new hotel units are proposed to be approximately 505SF in size.

Mr. Orlando confirmed that a second-floor pool deck is proposed to be constructed adjacent to Rosemary Road, and the pool will be elevated and located within same.

The proposed pool deck and relocation of the pool from the ground floor to the second-floor pool deck will facilitate off-street parking and improve the overall parking arrangement on site. A total of 70 off-street parking spaces are proposed whereas 79.2 off-street parking spaces are required.

Mr. Orlando noted that the modified site plan will result in the elimination of all backout parking along Rosemary Road. There are two access points to facilitate ingress and egress, and the majority of the proposed off-street parking is located internally underneath of the structure. Minimal backout parking will be maintained along Beach and Ocean Avenues.

Mr. Orlando testified that the majority of the off-street parking spaces measure less than the required 9ft. x 18ft. He indicated that the majority of the spaces measure 8ft. x 18ft.; however, there are spaces that are proposed which measure 7.5ft. x 16ft.

Mr. Orlando indicated that the proposed parking arrangement is consistent with parking provided by neighboring hotels, and he indicated that nearly all hotels/motels located within the Borough provide deficient off-street parking.

Mr. Orlando testified that the Applicant is proposing a full-time valet service to park vehicles on site in an effort to maximize off-street parking and to ensure safety within the parking area. There are two parking spaces provided for "queueing" purposes to facilitate the proposed valet parking service.

Mr. Orlando opined that the proposed parking arrangement is the best parking alternative for the site. He indicated that the plan is functional and safe, and it is a significant improvement over the parking arrangement that was previously provided.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Orlando indicated that proposed drive aisles are 16ft. wide and the access points to the parking are 9ft. wide.

Stacked parking is proposed within the parking area; however, the stacked parking spaces are ADA parking spaces which will be serviced by valet parking attendants.

Mr. Orlando reviewed and confirmed the variance relief requested by the Applicant.

He reviewed provisions of the Borough's current Master Plan and prior Reexamination Reports, noting that the Borough has consistently identified a need to maintain the existing hotel industry, while promoting the renovation and enhancement of existing hotels.

He indicated that the Borough has consistently discussed preservation of existing hotels as a planning objective, and, in 2012, saw fit to include provisions within the Reexamination Report calling for flexibility in connection with area and bulk regulations to facilitate and allow for the renovation and upgrade of existing hotels.

Mr. Orlando testified that the Applicant has the right to add an additional floor to the existing structure; however, the existing structure cannot safely accommodate a vertical expansion. He indicated that the proposed horizontal expansion of the existing structure fits within the Master Plan's objective to allow for flexibility in connection with the renovation and preservation of existing hotels.

Mr. Orlando recognized the number of objectors in the room, and indicated that the primary objection is related to the 11ft. Rosemary Road setback and the intrusion within the required 30ft. view corridor. He reviewed five (5) photographs depicting existing hotels/motels which encroach significantly more into the required 30ft. view corridor than what's proposed by the Applicant.

Mr. Orlando opined that the Applicant's proposal is a better zoning alternative for the site compared to what could be constructed on site as the Applicant's proposal is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Borough's Master Plan.

He indicated that an individual could not construct a viable, functional hotel at the subject property without variance relief due to the required setbacks, and he indicated that renovation is the only option for the site and existing structure.

With respect to the variance relief sought by the Applicant, Mr. Orlando opined that several of the purposes of zoning, outlined within N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2, are advanced in connection with this application and support the relief sought by the Applicant as it:

Encourages municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in this State, in a manner which will promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare;

Provides sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, commercial and industrial uses and open space, both public and private, according to their respective environmental requirements in order to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens;

Encourages the location and design of transportation routes which will promote the free flow of traffic while discouraging location of such facilities and routes which result in congestion or blight; and

Promotes a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangement.

Mr. Orlando further opined that the application can be granted as there are no substantial detriments to the public good and the application does not impair the intent and/or purpose of the zone plan or zoning ordinance.

In response to a question posed in relation to signage, Mr. Orlando testified that the proposed signs are proportionate to the structure, and he indicated that there is ample space on the façade to facilitate the signs proposed by the Applicant. As a condition of approval, all building mounted signs will be backlit and dimmed at night to mitigate ambient light and impacts to neighboring properties.

Mr. Orlando opined that the proposed signs serve a wayfinding purpose and serve to identify the proposed hotel.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer's Report dated January 19, 2023 which was received by the Board and which is incorporated herein as fact. Joseph Mohnack, P.E., a professional engineer and employee with Mr. DeBlasio's office, appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board, and he note the conditions outlined therein. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with any and all comments/conditions set forth within the Engineer's Report.

Mr. Mohnack advised the Board that there are no improvements proposed within the Borough right-of-way; however, he advised the Applicant that reconstruction of existing sidewalk and curbs will be required.

Mr. Mohnack indicated that sewer and street opening permits will be required.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Mohnack confirmed that the Applicant's proposal will not impact existing site triangles, and he confirmed that off-street loading is proposed to occur underneath the existing structure.

Mr. Mohnack discussed the parking arrangement and parking space dimensions for the benefit of the Board. He confirmed that a parking variance is required and acknowledged that one parking space is provided for each proposed unit.

Eustace Mita, the principal of Mahalo Wildwood Crest, LLC, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board.

Mr. Mita discussed his family and business history and ties to the community. He indicated that he has owned and operated a number of hotels over the years, and he discussed the Icona Hotel brand which he established years ago and which currently operates hotels within adjacent municipalities.

Mr. Mita discussed his vision to create the Mahalo Hotel brand and indicated that same would be an offset of Icona, and is akin to a "select service brand." He opined that the proposed development will advance tourism objectives within the Borough and provide a renovated, first-class resort as envisioned by the Borough's Master Plan.

Mr. Mita discussed the prior approvals received from the Board, and the subsequent appeal that was filed by the neighboring owners of the Compass Family Resort, and the number of objections that he received in connection with the proposal presently before the Board.

Mr. Mita advised the Board that the proposal before the Board provides an 11ft. setback to Rosemary Road which complies with the requirements of the NJDEP.

He reviewed and discussed the provision of off-street parking and the valet service which he intends to provide on site to ensure that provided off-street parking is safe and functional.

Mr. Mita confirmed that 11 additional hotel rooms are proposed to be constructed on site. He indicated that these hotel units exceed the minimum required size of hotel units within the Borough.

In response to a question posed by the Board with respect to landscaping, Mr. Orlando testified that shade trees could be added to the site plan and he indicated that a landscaping plan will be prepared and provided to the Board. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will prepare and submit a detailed landscaping plan, subject to the review and approval of the Board Engineer.

Board members questioned the proposal to increase the Ocean Avenue setback, and Mr. Tomasetti testified that maintaining the existing setback would impact parking and the size of proposed hotel units. He opined that the proposed Ocean Avenue setback presents no detriments to Ocean Avenue as the adjacent property is the public beach.

Board Members questioned the proposed building façade all Ocean Avenue. Mr. Tomasetti testified that the Applicant is proposing Juliet balconies and fenestration to create a desirable visual environment.

A discussion ensued between the Board and the Applicant's professionals regarding the 30ft. Rosemary Road view corridor. The Applicant reiterated that it was not feasible, due to structural issues, to add an additional floor on to the existing structure.

The Meeting was opened to the public for comment. A total of twenty-three (23) individuals addressed the Board in connection with this Application. A total of eight (8) individuals spoke in support of the Application; however, a majority of these individuals, approximately fifteen (15), expressed significant concerns and objections to the Application. The objectors raised concerns in relation to:

The impact that the proposed development would have on the surrounding neighborhood.

The number of variances sought in connection with the Applicant's proposal, and specifically in relation to the proposed intrusion into the required 30ft. Rosemary Road setback.

Impacts that the proposed development would have on the required view corridor and adjacent property's ability to "view" the ocean.

Concerns in relation to the proposed off-street parking arrangement, the size of proposed off-street parking spaces, and the ability to safely access off-street parking spaces in light of the size of proposed drive aisles and access points.

The overdevelopment of the site itself.

Deviations from the goals and objectives of the Borough's Master Plan and the impact that the proposed development would have on the development/renovation of hotels in the future.

No additional members of the public addressed the Board in connection with this application.

Accordingly, the public portion of this application was closed.

One (1) objector, The Compass Family Resort, was present at the meeting who was represented by Nic Talvacchia, Esquire.

Mr. Talvacchia advised the Board that his clients were opposed to the Application and development proposed by Mr. Mita.

He indicated that the objectors' concerns were primarily related to the proposed Rosemary Road setback and the significant deviation from the goals and objectives of the Borough's Master Plan and the preservation of a 30ft. view corridor.

Mr. Talvacchia advised the Board that the governing body has elected to maintain the 30ft. required view corridor over the years and the Board has repeatedly included reference to the preservation of same within its Master Plan and subsequent Reexamination Reports.

Mr. Talvacchia reviewed and discussed the variance relief requested by the Applicant. He noted that many of the required variances were self-created by the Applicant in connection with the decision to renovate the site without obtaining final approvals.

Mr. Talvacchia discussed the required view corridor, noting that the NJDEP previously requested an 8.5ft. Rosemary Road setback in order to comply with its view corridor regulations. He indicated that a 0ft. setback was previously approved by the Board and the Applicant is now proposing 11ft. which still

necessitates variance relief in light of the fact that the Borough's setback requirements are more stringent than the NJDEPs.

He indicated that the Applicant's proposal and requested variances amount to an overdevelopment of the site which presents substantial detriments to the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

Mr. Talvacchia compared the provisions of the Borough's 2005 Master Plan and subsequent 2012 and 2020 Reexamination Reports. He indicated that the view corridor concerns and goals were carried through to each document and still applies to the development and renovation of existing hotels/motels.

Mr. Talvacchia expressed additional concerns in relation to the proposed off-street parking arrangement. He advised the Board that the parking proposal was not functional and is unsafe regardless of whether or not hotel guests or valet parking attendants are parking vehicles.

Mr. Talvacchia proceeded to cross-examine Mr. Orlando in relation to the testimony that he provided in support of the Applicant's proposal and the relief sought in connection with same.

Mr. Talvacchia distributed a photograph of the existing site which was received by the Board and marked as Exhibit O-1.

Mr. Orlando acknowledged that the prior pool deck has been demolished and he confirmed that the Applicant is proposing to construct a new pool deck within a small footprint than previously existed.

Mr. Orlando disagreed with Mr. Talvacchia's assertion that the elimination of the pool deck and the proposed construction of a new pool deck was not a pre-existing non-conforming condition, and he pointed to a provision of the Borough's Ordinance which allows for the reconstruction of non-conformities within the Borough.

Mr. Orlando confirmed the variance relief requested by the Applicant and the proposed setbacks at Mr. Talvacchia's request. He indicated that many of the variances sought by the Applicant in relation to setbacks are the result of pre-existing non-conforming conditions and he opined that many of the proposed dimensions are being improved in comparison to what previously existed on site.

Mr. Talvacchia raised a concern in relation to proposed building coverage, and the fact that no variance was identified as needed in connection with the Applicant's proposal. Mr. Orlando conceded that a building coverage variance is in fact required, and he indicated that his initial calculation did not include the proposed pool deck due to the fact that same is elevated above the ground floor.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Talvacchia, Mr. Orlando conceded that the Applicant is not experiencing a hardship which would provide justification for some of the variance relief requested.

Mr. Orlando disagreed with Mr. Talvacchia's contentions that the Applicant's proposal was contrary to the goals and objectives of the Borough's Master Plan. He indicated that the Master Plan allows for the vertical expansion of existing hotels, and he reiterated that the Master Plan also calls for greater flexibility to maintain hotels and to allow for the renovation and expansion of same.

In response to a question posed by Mr. Talvacchia, Mr. Orlando testified that the proposed parking arrangement was functional, and he indicated that the provision of a valet parking service was suitable to address concerns in relation to parking access and undersized parking spaces.

On redirect, Mr. Corrado asked Mr. Orlando to confirm the provisions of the Master Plan in question. Mr. Orlando reiterated his prior testimony, and advised the Board that the Applicant's proposal advances several purposes of zoning which supports the requested relief.

David Shropshire, P.E., P.P. of Shropshire Associates, LLC, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Shropshire was accepted as an expert in the field of engineering, specifically traffic engineering, and he provided testimony in relation to concerns associated with the Applicant's proposed off-street parking arrangement.

Mr. Shropshire advised the Board that he evaluated the Applicant's proposed off-street parking arrangement and the variances associated with tandem parking, backout parking, proposed parking space dimensions, the drive aisle, and driveway dimensions.

He opined that the Applicant's proposal is untenable and will not adequately service the needs of the Hotel.

Mr. Shropshire testified that there are several solutions that could be implemented to improve the proposed parking arrangement; however, they would result in the loss of a number of off-street parking spaces requiring a more significant off-street parking variance.

Mr. Shropshire raised a number of concerns in relation to the size of proposed drive aisles and parking space dimensions which he opined were problematic and detrimental to the site and its patrons.

Mr. Shropshire identified concerns in relation to the fact that two ADA parking spaces were proposed to be tandem parking, and he discussed deficiencies associated with ADA parking requirements; noting that the Applicant's proposal does not comply with required cross-hatching and ADA parking space clearances.

Mr. Shropshire testified that the parking arrangement creates a number of maneuverability issues which significantly impact access, and the ability to utilize proposed undersized parking spaces. He identified several parking spaces which would require drivers to back out the full length of the drive aisle out onto the public right-of-way.

Mr. Shropshire raised concerns in connection with the proposed valet parking service and stated that valet parking does not address or mitigate the parking deficiencies created by the undersized drive aisles and undersized parking spaces.

Mr. Shropshire opined that the parking proposal will not meet the needs of the site and he argued that same is not the best alternative to address parking on site.

Mr. Shropshire identified areas of the off-street parking area which provide limited clearance and which render certain parking spaces unusable for larger, oversized vehicles.

On balance, Mr. Shropshire opined that the proposed parking arrangement is not functional, it is unsafe, and it presents substantial detriments to the public good, the zone plan, and the zoning ordinance.

Application PB-22-08 for 6501 Ocean Avenue will reconvene Wednesday June 7th. No additional notice will be required.

Joe Franco returns to the meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTIONS: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

OPEN TO PUBLIC COMMENT: None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: The next regularly scheduled meeting is 3 May, there are two applications scheduled at this time to go before the board on that date.

ADJOURN: On motion of Mr. Vodges, second by Mr. D'Antonio and unanimous voice vote, the Chairman adjourned the meeting 9:35pm.

Pamela Riper
Planning Board Secretary