

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

August 14, 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: Mr. Coleman Mr. Coppolino Mr. Guetzlaff Ms. Smith

Members Absent: Mr. Shrewsberry Mr. McConnell Mrs. Schlapfer
Mrs. Masterson Mr. Giordano Mr. Frisina Mrs. Schlapfer
Mr. Stevenson

Board Attorney: Mr. Zabarsky

Board Engineer: Mr. Savacool

Minutes

07-10-2024

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. Coppolino, seconded by Ms. Smith

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Coppolino- Yes Ms. Smith- Yes Mr. Coleman-Yes

Resolutions

12-24 Block 112 Lot 56- 435 Lincoln Avenue- Side yard setback, off street parking, side yard patio

13-24- Block 281 Lot 12- 1825 Bay Boulevard- Mechanicals within side yard set back

15-24- Block 300 Lot 27- 2104 Glenwood Drive- Elevated deck side and rear yard, In-ground pool rear yard, fence height

A motion to memorialize was made by Mr. Coppolino, seconded by Mr. Coleman

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

Unfinished/New Business

17-24- Block 271 Lot 15- 815 Partridge Run- Side Yar Setback-(7:05-7:16)

The applicant is proposing an air conditioning condenser within the side yard setback 2.8ft, where 5’ is required. There is a pre-existing non-conformity of a detached garage 4.5ft, where 5’ is required from the side yard setback.

Applicants/ owners 815 Partridge Run were sworn in.

A-1 application

The applicant testified they are proposing an expansion of their home, which complies with all setbacks. They are seeking relief to add an air conditioning condenser on the side yard of their home, next to the existing condenser. It is an ideal location close to the electrical panel. The current condenser is on the east side since 2017. The detached garage has been on property since approximately 1958. The unit will comply with the BFE.

Public- No public questions or comments.

Mr. Savacool stated the BFE requirements are 2.8ft

A motion to approve the application was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Guetzlaff.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes Ms. Smith- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

18-24- Block 228 Lot 44- 2423 Hemlock Lane- Fence Height-(7:11-8:11)

The applicant is proposing a 6ft fence along the front property line, where only 3ft is allowed.

A-1 Application

A-2 Engineer letter

A-3 photo cedar horizontal

A-4 photo cedar vertical

The applicant/owner was sworn in, 2324 Hemlock Lane. The applicant is looking to install a fence along Wooddale Ave. The fence is proposed on the property line of a corner lot.

The applicant submitted photos of the proposed wood fence, which she feels is more natural and it would add to the aesthetic of the home.

Public questions/comments

Objector 1215 Wooddale, aesthetically he does not think it would fit with the neighborhood.

Does it meet the required site triangle setbacks? Nice to hear it was wood not vinyl.

Objector,2428 Dwight Ave, the height is wrong for that area.

Mr. Zabarsky stated the applicant has the burden to meet the criteria, C1 reason of exceptional narrowness or shallowness. This house is on a corner and the lot is conforming.

Caucus

Mr. Coleman is thinking in his mind the drive by test, thinking will he say how did this happen after it is completed. He does not think having a 6ft fence so close to the street is a good idea.

The public safety concerns are concerning to him. At the same time, he understands the applicants need for a 6ft fence.

Mr. Coppolino would like to see the fence off the property line. He does not think it will be an obstruction if the fence is bumped in. He also understands the want for a 6ft fence.

Ms. Smith aesthetically it is fine, but at the expense of safety.

Mr. Guetzlaff suggests if the applicant tries to balance it with both sides, not such a solid fence. Bringing the fence in from the property line.

Mr. Zabarsky stated the Board is supposed to decide the application before them. There is an issue to meeting positive criteria, the lot is conforming.

Mr. Coleman would like to provide the applicant a chance to consider a different plan.

The applicant is willing to redesign her plans and understands the aesthetic and safety concerns.

The applicant requested the application to be carried to September 11, 2024. She will be submitting a revised plan.

A motion to carry the application was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Guetzlaff.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Guetzlaff-Yes Ms. Smith-Yes Mr. Coleman-Yes

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Coppolino. The meeting was adjourned at 8:16PM

Respectfully submitted by,

Sharon Morgan
Board Secretary