

**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

March 13, 2024

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

Members Present: Mrs. Schlapfer Mrs. Masterson Mr. Guetzlaff Mr. Stevenson
Mr. McConnell Mr. Coleman Ms. Smith Mr. Giordano Mr. Coppolino

Members Absent: Mr. Frisina Mr. Shrewsberry

Board Attorney: Mr. Zabarsky

Board Engineer: Mr. Savacool

Minutes

01-10-2024

A motion to approve was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mr. Guetzlaff.

Roll Call Vote

Mrs. Schlapfer- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Mr. Stevenson- Yes
Mr. McConnell- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

Resolution

03-24 - KMS Construction Consultants LLC- 1609 Beaver Dam- Conditional Use & Bulk Variances

A motion to memorialize was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mr. Guetzlaff.

Roll Call Vote

Mrs. Schlapfer- Yes Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Giordano- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Mr. Stevenson- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

Unfinished Business/ New Business

14-23- Block 279 Lot 182- 1702 Rue Mirador- Side Yard Setback- Withdrawn

01-23 – Block 20 Lot 8- 4 Dunham Lane- Impervious Coverage & Side yard setback (7:05-7:20)The applicant is looking to remove pavers from the rear yard next to the swimming pool and relocate the pavers in front of the garage, reducing impervious coverage, previously approved, 61% to 53.2%

Mr. Josph Michelini, attorney for the applicant. Mr. Michelini stated this a simple application. The applicant is proposing to remove pavers from the inground pool, which were previously approved, and relocate the pavers to the front of the garage area. This change will reduce the previously approved lot coverage.

Mr. Burdick, PE PP, was sworn in. See testimony

R.C. BURDICK, P.E. P.P. P.C.

1023 OCEAN RD. PT. PLEASANT, N.J. 08742

PHONE 732-892-5050

FAX 732-892-5888

TESTIMONY

4 Dunham Lane

Lot 8, Block 20

Borough of Point Pleasant

Project No. 21-8241

February 15, 2014

4 Dunham Lane is an undersized lot within the R-1 zone. It is at the northeast corner of Dunham Lane, a 20' lane which services seven single family homes, three including this lot which front on the Manasquan River.

In 2021 the applicant received board approval for the reconstruction of their home and variances were granted for lot width and frontage, side yard setback, use of a habitable attic on a non-conforming lot and lot coverage. This application seeks to amend the approved resolution to revise the plan by constructing pavers within the driveway in front of the house and to amend the record regarding the side yard setback to the eastern property line.

The first issue is that our surveyor believes that the side setback to the dwelling is 2.7' whereas the surveyor for the original plan believed it was 2.85'. The home hasn't moved, and this is a discrepancy between surveyors amounting to 2". We request that the approval be amended this diminutions amount so that issues don't arise when the home is eventually sold.

The second variance is for impervious coverage. The 2021 approval allowed an impervious coverage of 61% but additional calculations were to be provided to the board. The Engineer's review letter indicates that a total of 58.9% was approved. We do not have the benefit from those plans or calculations, so our plan is based on the existing conditions at the site as documented by our survey.

Our plan provides a side-by-side depiction of what was previously approved vs. what we are proposing. Regarding impervious coverage the plan has changes for:

- 1) The pool and spa are 20 sf smaller than the approval plan, slightly reducing coverage.
- 2) The pool patio has been repositioned and reduced by 208 sf and since it is pavers, which reduces coverage 104 sf.
- 3) The paver walk along the side of the home has been reduced 12' for a 6-sf reduction in coverage.
- 4) The gravel and earth driveway and parking areas have been repositioned and a portion of the driveway is now proposed to be pavers while a portion of the grass south of the garage is now gravel and earth. The net reduction in coverage for that change is 259 sf

- 5) Overall, the plan and construction reduce impervious coverage 682 sf bringing proposed impervious coverage to 53.2% vs the previously approved 61%

The applicant seeks to provide a more durable surface for their parking area. She has reduced the size of the improvements from those previously approved resulting in a project which is closer to compliance with the ordinance than originally anticipated and approved by the board. I believe that the revisions are minimal and have no adverse effect on surrounding properties.

In its original approval resolution, the board opined that the applicant seeks modest relief to make improvements to the property and to make the best use of it. The board found that the project creates minimal disturbance to the existing space and to the neighboring properties and that granting of the variances would not impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and ordinance. The board also agreed that the plan promotes general welfare, reduces safety concerns, provides adequate air, light and open space and provides a desirable visual environment.

I believe that the proposed changes to the plan continue and enhance the previously approved resolution and that the changes do not negatively affect adjacent properties and bring the site closer to compliance with the ordinance than originally anticipated.

The site is unique in the zone, being 38' wide by 230' deep and is accessed through a 20' lane and shared access easement.

Given the uniqueness of the property, the lack of impacts on adjacent properties or the zoning ordinance and the boards previous approval of a plan with even more impervious area than proposed, I believe that the variances can be granted without substantial impact on the borough ordinance, master plan or public good. I also believe that the advantages of bringing the site closer to the ordinance and reducing coverage far outweigh any potential disadvantages of the proposal.

Based on this we would request the board's approval of the application.

The other unique characteristics of the property is that there is a 38' garage access easement along the south of the property. That easement is for the benefit of the owner of the adjacent lot 7 and lines for it are shown on the plan. The adjacent owner has exclusive rights to the garage.

That portion of the lot is 1444 sf of which 1197 sf almost 83% is the garage and gravel driveway. You will note that one of the changes made from the previous plan is that the areas south of the garage will be gravel drive instead of sand and stone to enable better access for the property and the applicant.

If that garage access area was removed from the impervious calculations, impervious coverage for the lot would be decreased to about 48%, a conforming condition.

The purpose of this application is to reposition some of the pavers which had previously been approved by the board. Pavers which were previously proposed adjacent to the pool are proposed to be repositioned in front of the garage which is part of the single-family home constructed at the site and are marked on the plan. The overall effect of this change is that impervious coverage at the property will be reduced from the previously approved 61.0% to 53.2%. It is also important to point out that since the previous plan was approved the interpretation of pavers within the driveway

On 7/26/21 this board memorialized the approval for the reconstruction of a single-family home, in ground pool, walls and paver patios at this site. The board granted bulk variances for lot frontage and width, use of a habitable attic, side yard setback and impervious coverage at that time.

The lot is at the end of Dunham Lane which is a 20' wide land serving 7 single family homes between River Ave. and the Manasquan River. It is within the R-1 zone and is a preexisting undersized lot in the zone. For the application, the applicant sought to make the best use of this property by creating minimal disturbance to the existing space and neighboring properties and the board found that the proposal had no substantial detriment to the public good nor did it create any substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the one plan. This is primarily due to the preexisting narrowness and shape of the lot.

Public

No Comments or Questions

Mr. Micheleni believes the Board can grant this application as presented.

A motion to approve the application was made by Mr. Giordano, seconded by Mrs. Masterson.

Roll Call Vote

Mrs. Schlapfer- Yes Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Giordano- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Mr. Stevenson- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

**04-24- Block 306 Lot 115- 1688 East Drive- Building Coverage, Lot Coverage, Side Yard Setbacks, Front Yard Accessory Structure Side Yard (7:21-7:31)
This is a continuation from February 14, 2024.**

Mrs. Masterson recused herself

Mr. Angowski, attorney for the applicant. The applicant heard the Boards concerns and made the necessary changes for the Board to approve this plan.

A-7 revised plan

A-8 revised engineer review letter

Patrick Laudisi, PE, Morgan Engineering testified the shed and bathroom were removed, and the pool equipment has been relocated. The building coverage is now 39.6% and the impervious coverage will be 56.1%. The shed will be replaced with a planter. The artificial turf details have been revised. The outdoor kitchen has been removed.

Mr. McConnell questioned if the sanitary lines have been cut and capped properly for the removal of the toilet.

Mr. Angowski replied that is a good point and yes.

Public

No public questions or comments.

Mr. Colman stated he believes the owner made satisfactory changes after hearing the Boards concerns.

A motion to approve the application was made by Mrs. Schlapfer, seconded by Mr. Stevenson.

Roll Call Vote

Mrs. Schlapfer-Yes Mr. Giordano- Yes Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Mr. Stevenson- Yes
Mr. McConnell-Yes Ms. Smith -Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

Mrs. Masterson returned to the dais

02-23 -Block 37 Lot 19- 2104 River Road- Building Coverage (7:32-8:00)

The applicant is looking to construct a one-story addition.

Mr. Timothy Middleton, attorney for the applicant. The applicant is proposing to add a master bedroom and master bath on the first floor.

The applicant was sworn in. She has lived her entire life in Cranford. She is now the primary caretaker for her father. They purchased this home as a second home. They have now sold their primary home to pay for renovations. They are trying to make the home functional for her father and for them, as they age. They kept the look of the old-world cottage home.

Architect, Scott Nicholl, Teckton Architecture Studio, LLC Hazlet NJ was sworn in. The character of the home matches the surrounding homes. The design is aesthetically pleasing.

Matthew Hockenbury, MCH Engineering. The home is an L shaped ranch three houses before the canal with three bedrooms, one bath, breakfast nook and an open style pergola. Mr. Hockenbury went through the bulk variances. They are proposing building coverage of 38.98%. They have been planning the proper location for a master bedroom and bathroom. The building coverage is meant to control density and this location is in a more than conforming location. The renovated dwelling has a positive impact for the neighborhood.

Public

Neighbor, 2108 River Rd is in favor of the application.

A motion to approve the application was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mr. Giordano.

Roll Call Vote

Mrs. Schlapfer- Yes Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Giordano- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Mr. Stevenson- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

08-24- Block 275.01 Lot 13- 705 Mount Place- Front Yard setback & Fence Height(8:00-8:17)The applicants are looking to construct an inground pool and install a fence. The pools is 21ft, where 25ft is required for the front yard setback. They are seeking to install a 4ft fence where 3ft is allowed.

The applicants were sworn in.

A-1 Application

A-2 Review letter

The applicants testified, their lot is a non-conforming and they are looking to construct an inground pool for their children and a fence.

A-3 photo

Public

No public comments or questions

A motion to approve the application was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mr. Giordano.

Roll Call Vote

Mrs. Schlapfer- Yes Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Giordano- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Mr. Stevenson- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Giordano, seconded by Mrs. Masterson, all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:19PM

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Morgan

Sharon Morgan
Board of Adjustment Secretary