



Casino Reinvestment Development Authority
Land Use Regulation and Enforcement
Division

Review Memorandum

TO: Lance Landgraf, AICP,PP, Land Use Hearing Officer

FROM: Robert L. Reid, AICP, PP, Land Use Regulation Officer

COPY: Applicant, Scott Collins, Esq., File

SUBJECT: Certificate of Nonconformity Request
Review Application and Support Documents
Application #2015-07-1573
REM Real Estate, LLC, Applicant/Owner
14 Belle Haven Court
Block 126, Lot 67
Atlantic City, NJ

DATE: July 20, 2015

The applicant, REM Real Estate, LLC has submitted an application requesting a Certificate of Non-Conformity for an existing single family dwelling at 14 Belle Haven Court, Lot 67 in Block 126. The Applicant seeks a Certificate of Non-Conformity pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-68) for the existing single family residential dwelling on the property where such use is no longer permitted. The Certificate of Non-Conformity would certify that the use existed lawfully prior to a zoning change that rendered the use non-conforming, and permit it to continue on the property.

The existing use as a single family dwelling does not comply with the permitted uses listed on Schedule III, 163 Attachment 8 of the Atlantic City Land Use Development Ordinance.

Schedule III, 163 Attachment 8 permits Multiple-family dwellings in the Resort Commercial District (RS-C). The purpose of the RS-C zoning is intended to apply to established resort areas in the City. Its purpose is to provide for the City's main industry, consisting predominantly of transient and tourist-oriented uses, at such intensity as is justified by the City's limited land resources, high land values and infrastructure capacity. Residential development is also encouraged for the purpose of preserving and enhancing the family-resort character of the City and integrating the specialized activities of the Resort Commercial District with the rest of the community. [163-58 A]



Casino Reinvestment Development Authority Land Use Regulation and Enforcement Division

The Municipal Land Use Law provides in part that any nonconforming use or structure existing at the time of the passage of an ordinance may be continued upon the lot or in the structure so occupied. (NJSA 40:55D-68) The existing single family use was permitted up until March 31, 1979 when Ordinance 27 of 1979 was adopted. The owner at that time was to submit an application to the City for a Certificate of Land Use Compliance within one year of the adoption of the ordinance that rendered the use nonconforming in accordance with NJSA 40:55D-68. A nonconforming use is one which existed on the property prior to the adoption of a zoning ordinance but which the ordinance does not now permit in the particular zone. (NJSA 40:55D-5)

Evidence List / Documents submitted to support the request for Certificate of Non-Conformity:

Application Form for Certificate of Non-Conformity, dated 7/15/15;

1961 Property Record showing single family use;

1981 Property Record showing single family use;

1992 Property Record showing single family use;

Deed dated 3/20/15 evidencing site control;

1961 Polk Directory showing occupancy;

1965 Polk Directory showing occupancy;

Portion of Plate 39 depicting brick row home fronting on Belle Haven Court from Sanborn Map Company, NY from 1952

Public records show the current owner purchased the property on March 20, 2015. The tax records state the brick row home was constructed in 1924. The applicant asserts that the single family use has existed since 1924, and desires to continue the single family use.

At the hearing, the Applicant has the obligation to present evidence and testimony to explain the history of the use. Specifically, the Applicant must provide evidence and testimony that the single family residential dwelling lawfully existed prior to the adoption of the current zoning ordinance, and that such use has been continuous and was not abandoned. The Applicant must meet the burden of proof for the relief requested under the Municipal Land Use Law in order for the Hearing Officer to recommend that the application be approved by the Authority.

The documentary evidence provided by the Applicant appears to be sufficient (subject to testimony by the Applicant at the hearing) to grant the requested relief.