

BOROUGH OF WILDWOOD CREST
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes – 3 September 2025 5 p.m.

The following are the minutes of the Wildwood Crest Planning Board as held on Wednesday September 3, 2025, 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: absent	Brian Melchiorre: present
Don Cabrera: absent	Joe Franco: present	Angela Daniels: present
Fred Mettler: present	Brian Stuart: absent	Vince Tenaglia: present
Bradley Vogdes: present	Jane Reynolds: absent	Alexa Alverado: present
Joe Viscomi: present		
Board Secretary Pamela Riper: present		
Rob Belasco: present		
Jacob Wright: present		

MINUTES:

Mr. Mettler moved to dispense with the public reading of the executive session minutes of the meeting of 6 August 2025 and approve as distributed, Ms. Daniels second, minutes approved as distributed.

Patrick Davenport: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes	Joe Franco: yes
Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes	Vince Tenaglia: abstain
Bradley Vogdes: yes	Alexa Alverado: yes	Joe Viscomi: yes

APPLICATIONS:

Application PB-25-08 for 119 E. St. Louis Avenue a/k/a blk 166 lots 7 in Zone R-1A owner Norman and Gloria Stinger; seeking "C" Variances.

Applicant requests to adjourn application to October 1, 2025 meeting with no additional notice required.

On Motion of Ms. Daniels and second by Ms. Alverado to adjourn application:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes	Joe Franco: yes
Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes	Vince Tenaglia: yes
Bradley Vogdes: yes	Alexa Alverado: yes	Joe Viscomi: yes

Application PB-25-09 for 8606 New Jersey Avenue a/k/a blk 147 lots 3, 4 & 5 in Zone B-1 owner Delfna, Inc.; seeking Minor Subdivision & "D" Variance.

Applicant requests to adjourn application to October 1, 2025 meeting with no additional notice required.

On Motion of Mr. Vodges and second by Mr. Tenaglia to adjourn application:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes	Joe Franco: yes
Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes	Vince Tenaglia: yes
Bradley Vogdes: yes	Alexa Alverado: yes	Joe Viscomi: yes

Mr. Tenaglia and Mr. Vodges recuse themselves from meeting.

Application PB-25-07 for 115 E. Miami Avenue a/k/a blk 115.02 lots 7.02 & 8 in Zone R-2 owner Seashore Island Investors, LLC; seeking Minor Subdivision & "C" Variance.

The Applicant was represented by Andrew Catanese, Esquire who outlined the nature of the application and the relief sought.

The Subject Property is located at 115 E. Miami Avenue, a/k/a Block 115.02, Lots 7.02 & 8, in the Borough's R-2 zoning district.

The Subject Property is currently developed with a one-story single-family dwelling that contains a number of pre-existing non-conforming conditions.

Mr. Catanese informed the Board that the Applicant is proposing to demolish the existing single-family dwelling in order to subdivide the Subject Property to create two (2) 32.5ft. x 90ft. lots to be developed with single-family dwellings rather than develop the existing property with one (1) large duplex. He advised the Board that the proposed single-family dwellings will conform to all applicable bulk requirements of R-2 zone.

Mr. Catanese stated that the Applicant believes that two (2) single-family dwellings are a better fit for the neighborhood and the dwellings were designed to be proportionate to the size of the proposed lots.

Mr. Catanese advised the Board that the variances requested by the Applicant are associated with the fact that the proposed lots are undersized.

The Applicant distributed the following exhibits which are incorporated herein by reference:

Exhibit A-1: A color rendering depicting the proposed single-family dwellings inlaid with the existing neighborhood;

Exhibit A-2: An aerial photograph depicting existing conditions;

Exhibit A-3: An overlay of the existing single-family dwelling depicted on the site compared to the proposed single-family dwellings; and

Exhibit A-4: An elevation comparison of a permitted duplex compared to the proposed single-family dwellings.

In connection with this Application, the Board received the following plans, which are incorporated herein as fact:

Plans titled "Plan of Minor Subdivision, Block 115.02, Lots 7.02 & 8, Borough of Wildwood Crest, Cape May County, New Jersey," prepared and signed by Mark G. Devaul, P.L.S., of Devaul Survey, LLC, dated 6/6/2025.

Architectural Plans titled "Proposed Single Family Re-Development Plans for #115 E. Miami Avenue, Block: 115.2, Lots 7.02 and 8, Borough of Wildwood Crest, Cape May County, New Jersey," prepared and signed by William Haryslak, R.A., of Architecture by Haryslak, LLC, dated 7/23/25, revised 8/21/25.

William Haryslak, R.A. with Architecture by Haryslak, LLC appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Haryslak was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture, and he was placed under oath and testified before the Board.

Mr. Haryslak reviewed the existing site conditions for the benefit of the Board, confirming that a one-story single-family dwelling is currently developed on site.

He testified that the existing single-family dwelling contains several non-conformities consisting of the side yard setbacks, rear yard setback, and building coverage.

Mr. Haryslak advised the Board that the existing single-family dwelling is also below the base flood elevation.

Mr. Haryslak testified that the existing single-family dwelling is at the end of its useful life and renovating the structure is not feasible from a financial perspective.

He advised the Board that the Applicant evaluated developing a conforming duplex on site, but determined that same would be inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood which is comprised primarily of single-family dwellings.

Mr. Haryslak further testified that the Applicant is proposing to subdivide the property to create two (2) 32.5ft. x 90ft. lots whereas the R-2 zone requires a minimum lot frontage of 40ft. for the development of single-family dwellings.

Mr. Haryslak reviewed the design of the proposed single-family dwellings for the benefit of the Board.

He advised the Board that all bulk conditions are met. The dwellings will contain a 20ft. front yard setback measured to the face of the structures. Covered front porches are proposed which maintain a 10ft. front yard setback which complies with the R-2 bulk requirements.

With respect to the floor plans, Mr. Haryslak testified that the ground/first floors will consist of a garage, two (2) bedrooms, and a utility room. The second floors will contain living space and an additional bedroom.

A half-story is also proposed which will contain an additional bedroom.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Haryslak confirmed that the dwellings will contain four (4) bedrooms, and he indicated that the proposed half-stories will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Haryslak reviewed the proposed architectural elevations for the benefit of the Board, noting that building wall modulation is provided on all sides of the dwellings.

He reviewed and confirmed the exterior materials that will be utilized to construct the proposed dwellings, consisting of varying types of siding and textures to create a desirable visual environment and aesthetically pleasing structures that will complement the neighborhood.

A total of two (2) off-street parking spaces are proposed for each unit whereas the New Jersey Residential Site Improvement Standards require a total of two and a half (2.5) parking spaces for a four (4) bedroom single-family dwelling.

A discussion ensued between the Board's Professionals and the Applicant's Professionals concerning the potential to disregard the half parking space.

The New Jersey Residential Site Improvement Standards specifically provide at N.J.A.C. 5:21-4.14(C):

(c) Table 4.4 specifies the maximum number of parking spaces planning boards and other local reviewers shall require. The number of parking spaces is based on the number, size, and type of dwelling.

1. Reviewers may allow fewer parking spaces, when warranted.

The Applicant contended that the Applicant had the right to disregard the half space whereas the Board determined that the applicable standards afford the Board with the ability to disregard the half space if deemed appropriate.

Mr. Haryslak testified that 10ft. wide curb cuts are proposed to access off-street parking spaces, and a distance of 17ft. is provided between the curb cuts proposed for each single-family dwelling.

He indicated that the space between the curb cuts is sufficient to accommodate an on-street parking space.

Mr. Haryslak advised the Board that a third off-street parking space could likely be provided on site to eliminate the need for variance relief; however, the curb cuts would likely need to be widened resulting in the loss of the on-street parking space.

Mr. Haryslak compared the size of a by-right duplex to the proposed single-family dwellings.

He indicated that the proposed single-family dwellings provide substantial light, air, and open space, result in less building mass, provide less bedrooms, and larger side yard setbacks.

He opined that the proposal to develop two (2) single-family dwelling is a better zoning alternative than constructing one (1) large duplex.

Mr. Haryslak 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;

Secures safety from fire, flood, panic and other natural and man-made disasters;

Provides adequate light, air and open space;

Promotes the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities and regions and preservation of the environment; and

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

Mr. Haryslak reviewed Exhibit A-2 noting that the neighborhood contains lots that are predominantly 40ft. x 90ft., and there is only one (1) duplex that exists which is also on a 40ft. x 90ft. lot.

He opined that a duplex on the existing 65ft. x 90ft. lot would be out of character with the neighborhood.

Mr. Haryslak testified that given the size of the existing lots it is likely that when they are redeveloped, they will be developed with single-family dwellings rather than duplexes.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Haryslak acknowledged that there are no existing 32.5ft. x 90ft. lots that exist in the neighborhood.

Mr. Haryslak opined that the Applicant's proposal presents no substantial detriments to the public good nor does it in any way impair the intent or purpose of the Borough's zone plan or zoning ordinance.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer's Report dated July 15, 2025, which was received by the Board, and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Jacob Wright, P.E. appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board, and he noted 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. Wright confirmed that the variances requested are tied to the size of the proposed lots, and that the dwellings conform to all bulk requirements of the R-2 zone.

He confirmed that the proposed minor subdivision will create two (2) 32.5ft. x 90ft. undersized lots. As a condition of approval, the Applicant must confirm the new property addresses and lot numbers with the Borough Tax Assessor and reflect same on a revised plan of minor subdivision.

As a condition of approval, the Applicant will be required to pay a tax map maintenance fee of \$100.00 per lot.

At the conclusion of the Applicant's presentation, the Meeting was opened to the public for comment. Two (2) members of the public addressed the Board in connection with this Application, namely: *Michael Mercincavage*, owner of the property located at 117 E. Miami Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Mercincavage expressed concerns about the impact that the proposed development would have on parking in the neighborhood. He raised additional concerns about the proposal to create undersized lots. He noted that the Applicant could construct one large single-family dwelling or a duplex essentially by-right without requiring variance relief. *Lawrence Brown*, owner of the property located at 119 E. Miami Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Brown raised concerns regarding traffic and parking impacts. No additional members of the public addressed the Board in connection with this application. Accordingly, the public portion of this application was closed.

During deliberations, Board Members expressed significant concerns in connection with the proposal to create two (2) undersized lots.

Board Members expressed concerns that the neighborhood contains conforming 40ft. x 90ft. lots and the Applicant's proposal to create two (2) 32.5ft. x 90ft. lots is inconsistent with same.

Board Members indicated that off-street parking should be prioritized and that the Applicant should revise the plans to depict a third parking space based upon the architect's representations that additional parking could be provided.

Board Members raised additional concerns about the mass of the single-family dwellings and the proposed half story.

After hearing the concerns raised by the Board, Mr. Catanese requested that the Application be tabled to the Board's September meeting to afford the Applicant with an opportunity to evaluate the proposal to determine if the Board's concerns could be addressed.

The Application was continued to the Board's September 3, 2025 meeting.

In advance of the September 3, 2025 Board Meeting, the Board received revised Architectural Plans. Mr. Haryslak reviewed the revisions made to the plan for the benefit of the Board.

He indicated that the side yard setbacks were increased to 5ft. to proposed bump-outs; however, the setback to the structure measures 7ft.

Mr. Haryslak distributed two (2) additional exhibits which were received by the Board, and which are incorporated herein:

Exhibit A-5: A revised aerial photograph depicting a conceptual duplex in comparison to the proposed single-family dwellings.

Exhibit A-6: A revised site plan depicting the existing single-family dwelling superimposed over the proposed single-family dwellings.

Mr. Haryslak reiterated that the proposal to develop two (2) single-family dwellings promotes light, air, and open space between the dwellings whereas a duplex would not provide an open area.

Mr. Haryslak testified that additional off-street parking has been provided so that each dwelling now provides three (3) off-street parking spaces.

He indicated that the additional off-street parking space triggers the need for an additional variance associated with the amount of contiguous raised curb.

Mr. Haryslak reiterated that the Applicant believes that two (2) single-family dwellings are a better zoning alternative for the Subject Property and the surrounding neighborhood as a duplex would be out-of-character with same.

In response to a question posed by the Board regarding the decision to maintain the half-story, Mr. Haryslak testified that the proposed dwellings do not exceed the maximum permitted building height of 32ft.

A discussion ensued between the Applicant and the Board about what could be developed by-right on site.

Board Members continued to express concerns about the size of the dwellings given the size of the undersized lots.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared a revised Engineer's Report dated August 29, 2025, which was received by the Board, and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Jacob Wright, P.E. appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board, and he noted 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. Wright confirmed the need for an additional variance tied to the proposed contiguous raised curb.

At the conclusion of the Applicant's presentation, the meeting was reopened to the public. A total of six (6) individuals addressed the Board, namely:

Michael Mercincavage, owner of the property located at 117 E. Miami Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Mercincavage questioned the proposed side yard setbacks, and he questioned the proposed location of HVAC mechanical equipment. He was advised the HVAC mechanical equipment is located between the proposed dwellings.

Karen Lopresto-Arbaugh, owner of the property located at 105 E. Miami Avenue appeared, and she was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Ms. Lopresto-Arbaugh advised the Board that she was in favor of the Applicant's proposal. She indicated that the neighborhood consists of single-family dwellings and the Applicant's proposal preserves the character of the neighborhood.

John Raffanello, owner of the property located at 124 E. Miami Avenue, appeared, and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Raffanello advised the Board that he was in favor of the proposed development.

Andrew Kosara, owner of the property located at 109 E. Miami Avenue, appeared, and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Kosara advised the Board that he was in favor of two (2) single-family dwellings rather than one (1) large duplex or single-family dwelling.

Gary Fox, owner of the property located at 114 E. Miami Avenue, appeared, and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Fox advised the Board that he was in favor of the proposed development. He agreed that the proposal to develop two (2) single-family dwellings is more consistent with the neighborhood.

Jen Frascella, owner of the property located at 421 E. Miami Avenue, appeared, and she was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Ms. Frascella advised the Board that she was in favor of the proposed development.

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

Accordingly, the public portion of this application was closed.

On Motion of Ms. Hunt and second by Mr. Mettler for approval:

Patrick Davenport: no

Brian Melchiorre: no

Joe Franco: yes

Angela Daniels: no

Fred Mettler: no

Vince Tenaglia: abstain

Bradley Vogdes: abstain

Alexa Alverado: no

Joe Viscomi: no

Mr. Tenaglia and Mr. Vodge return to the meeting.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING BOARD ACTIONS:

None

ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTIONS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OPEN TO PUBLIC COMMENT:

Michael Gericke, owner of property located at 5501 Pacific Avenue. Questions if there are different regulations for turf in the front vs. side yard.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: The next regularly scheduled meeting is 1 October, there are two applications scheduled at this time to go before the board on that date.

ADJOURN: On motion of Mr. Vodge second by Mr. Tenaglia and unanimous voice vote, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 6:24pm.

Pamela Riper

Planning Board Secretary