

**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
March 10, 2021**

The regular meeting of the Point Pleasant Zoning Board of Adjustment was called to Order by Chairman Schroeder at 7:00 P.M. Mr. Schroeder led the Salute to the Flag. He proceeded to open the meeting in compliance with the “Open Public Meetings Act”.

Roll Call Vote

Members Present: Mr. Shrewsberry Mrs. Masterson Ms. Coulson
Mr. Veni Mr. Coleman Mr. Hutchinson (arrived 7:30)
Members Absent: Mrs. Petrillo Mr. Nikola Mr. Giordano
Attorney: Mr. Gertner

New Business/Unfinished Business

21-01- Fontanez- Block 279 Lot 226- 1700 Bay Isle Drive- Rear Yard Setback & Lot Frontage - Seeking an adjournment until April 28, 2021.

20-25 Hogan- Block 111 Lot 6- 1113 Trenton Ave- Building Coverage & Side Yard Setback
The applicant is looking to construct a covered porch. Relief is needed for the following variances:

Building Coverage – 30% permitted, where 38.3% is proposed.

Front Yard Setback- 19’ permitted, where 12.4’ is proposed.

Lot Coverage- 50% is permitted, where 50.5’ is proposed.

A-1 – 37 pages were marked into evidence.

Victoria Hogan, owner was sworn in.

Mrs. Hogan testified they are looking to construct a covered porch. The porch will greatly improve the esthetics of their home. The porch will also help protect them from the rain and sun. Ms. Hogan’s mother is allergic to the sun. The home is set very far back making the back yard more of a narrow alley way. Not leaving much room to enjoy the area. The side yard is not easily accessible, they would have to go through bedrooms to access the outside. Most houses on this side of Trenton Avenue have front porches. They are also willing to remove the concrete in the rear of the yard, which will allow them to comply with lot coverage. The area will be replaced with grass. The angle of the house is creating the front yard setback. The shallowness of the lot is also a hardship. The ranch style of the home takes up more room on the lot.

Public questions/comments: None

Mr. Veni questioned if the grading drains to Trenton Ave.

Mrs. Hogan replied yes.

Mr. Veni would like a condition that the down spouts down to the front of the property towards Trenton.

Mr. Shrewsberry made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Veni.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes

Mrs. Masterson- Yes

Ms. Coulson-Yes

Mr. Veni- Yes

Mr. Coleman- Yes

Mr. Hutchinson arrived.

Mr. Coleman recused himself for the next 2 applications. Mrs. Masterson was acting Chairperson.

21-02- Sambataro- Block 226 Lot 13- 2434 Dwight Ave- Building Coverage, Front Yard Setback & Parking Spaces for a 5-bedroom house- (7:32-7:57)

The applicant is looking to construct an addition on their existing home.

Building Coverage 30%, where 36.8% is proposed.

Front Yard setback 25', where 22.52' is proposed.

Parking spaces for a 5-bedroom house 3, proposing 2.

Michael & Melanie Sambataro were sworn in.

Mr. Sambataro testified they previously resided on Sunset Avenue, since 2003. Later moving to Dwight Avenue, due to an expanding family. There is no storage, only a small shed. They are looking to construct a front porch & a small 100sq ft garage.

Mr. Marc Nemergut, architect was sworn in. The Board accepted his credentials.

A-1 was marked into evidence.

Mr. Nemergut testified this is a 7800 sq ft lot with 65' of lot frontage. The proposed building coverage is 36.8%, where 30% is allowed. They comply with impervious coverage. The side yard setbacks are pre-existing 7.5' & 4.8'. The existing home is 5 bedrooms, 2 baths. The proposed garage/storage is 99sq ft and the porch is 311 sq ft. They are seeking a waiver for parking. The front yard setback for the porch complies with 19'. The garage needs a front yard setback variance proposing 22.5ft, where 25ft is allowed. Architecturally, this works. They did make some compromises to minimize the variances.

Mr. Hutchinson questioned if the trees will be removed.

Mr. Nemergut replied they are getting close to the trees, but they are not planning on removing any.

Mr. Gertner questioned the gravel in front of the home. Can they use the gravel portion for parking?

Mr. Nemergut replied yes. Therefore, making the request for parking waiver diminimus. The Board can stipulate that the gravel area cannot be paved. The leaders will drain onto Dwight.

Public questions/comment :

Mr. Craig Veprek, 2431 Dwight Ave has lived on Dwight Avenue for forty-five years. They are making the home more modern and enhancing the esthetics of the home. The gravel area in question has been there for at least forty years.

A motion to approve the application was made by Mrs. Coulson subject to previous testimony, seconded by Mr. Hutchinson.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes Mr. Hutchinson- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes
Ms. Coulson- Yes Mr. Veni- Yes

21-04- Courtney- Block 260 Lot 6- 1404 George St- Front Yard Setback Principal Structure, Front Yard Setback Porch & Habitable Attic (8:01- 8:45)

The applicant is seeking to construct an addition on their existing home. The footprint will be expanded, and the front addition and the porch are proposed within the front yard setbacks.

Front yard setback dwelling 25' allowed, proposed 15.'

Front yard setback porch 19' allowed, proposed 13.'

Building stories 2 ½

Mr. John Jackson, attorney

Mr. March Nemergut, architect was sworn in.

Mr. Jackson went through his power point presentation, marked A-1. The applicants now have a baby, and they need a larger home. They are proposing 2 ½ stories.

Mr. Nemergut testified they are working with a 5,000 sq ft lot. The existing structure is 3 bedrooms and 2 baths. The home is modest. They are removing the front porch and replacing it with a functional front porch, withing the existing setback of 13'. They tried to keep as many existing walls as possible on the 1st floor, while obtaining an open concept. The addition on the side of the house is for a mudroom, which complies. The covered porch proposed in the rear, complies as well. The addition to the front porch allows for one or two chairs. The second story addition will not extend past the current 20' front yard setback. The first story only is proposed at the 15'. The second story and the ½ story. They are proposing a nice master suite, very modest bedrooms. They did expand over the mudroom area for the master bathroom. The 1/2 story complies with the 500 sq ft in the floor area ratio.

Mrs. Masterson questioned if there is going to be separate access through the side of the home.

Mr. Nemergut testified one of the things his client wanted was to have was a door on the side of the building to get into the basement. That is no different than houses are having a garage

entrance on side of the home. This way visitors can enter and exit through this door without going through the house. They are also proposing a home office. The applicants want to stay in the town and the existing home can support 2 ½ stories. The proposed addition is very much in context with the neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson questioned under C1 or hardship, the structure on the premises will enhance an upgrade.

Mr. Nemergut replied, yes. We want to use the existing house and foundation and maintain existing setbacks.

Mr. Jackson added under C2 is it your opinion that the proposed structure is an aesthetic upgrade over the existing structure. Do you believe that modernizing a house like this providing modern electric, efficient heating and cooling, plumbing, better insulation, etc. we are promoting the public safety health and morals and welfare?

Mr. Jackson asked if relief is appropriate under C1 and C2.

Mr. Nemergut replied yes.

Mr. Jackson has no problem with a condition pertaining to the access into the basement, that there shall be no kitchen, no bathroom, strictly have a little hangout space. I think there is a wood stove down there now. They do need a variance for parking. They have 2 parking spaces on the site and it's a 4-bedroom home. There are required 2 1/2 however, the ordinance does make exceptions for utilizing on street parking. Mr. Jackson questioned Mr. Nemergut in his opinion, looking at the site, is there ample space on the street parking for car in front of their property.

Mr. Nemergut replied correct. They will also be upgrading the sidewalk and curbing as required.

Mrs. Masterton questioned if there any plans for additional landscaping to further soften the encroachment into the front yard setback.

Mr. Nemergut replied he would say that at some point there is going to be mild planting. No hardscapes are represented here.

Mr. Gertner stated if the board is so inclined as part of resolution compliance perhaps providing a just a brief landscaping plan.

Mr. Veni would like to see edging on the east side of the driveway just to run water towards the road and not onto the neighbor's property.

Mr. Nemergut replied yes, we could put some curbing of some sort, paver curbing or Belgian block.

Public comment/questions : None

Caucus

Mr. Hutchinson is worried about the crowding.

Mrs. Masterson is looking at this plan and comparing it with at the other houses on the street.

There are a few that are close as well.

Mr. Veni thinks they did a very good job with keeping it within the same footprint. They are getting a lot and they are really maximizing their space. It is going to be a very nice addition to the neighborhood.

Mrs. Masterson replied there is a lot of house here and it is really done well. If we can overlook that little bit in front. She thinks that they have done their due diligence in keeping it as close to the setbacks as they possibly could.

Mr. Gertner stated the argument would be the 1st story is 15’ and the 2 ½ story is 20’. Possibly a landscape plan to soften the front would help. Also, there is to be no bedroom or kitchen in the basement. They are proposing new sidewalks, curbing, and edging along the east of the driveway.

Mr. Hutchinson questioned if they needed to appear again for the landscape plan.

Mr. Veni suggested 3ft or lower landscaping, not 10-12 ft evergreens.

Mr. Gertner replied no that can be done administratively through resolution compliance.

Mr. Coulson a motion to approve with the conditions discussed. Seconded by Mr. Hutchinson.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- No

Mr. Hutchinson- Yes

Mrs. Masterson- Yes

Ms. Coulson- Yes

Mr. Veni- Yes

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45pm. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Morgan

Zoning Board Secretary