

**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
June 25, 2025**

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. Shrewsberry Mr. Coppolino Ms. Smith Mrs. Masterson
Mr. Smith Mr. Coleman Mr. Giordano

Members Absent: Mr. Frisina Mr. Guetzlaff Mr. McConnell
Mrs. Schlapfer

Board Attorney: Mr. Zabarsky

Board Engineer: Mr. Savacool

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Coppolino, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2025. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion passed.

Resolution for Memorialization

10-25- Block 251 Lot 63- 1103 Hollywood Boulevard- Block 251, Lot 63. The application had been previously approved for variances related to lot frontage and width, front yard setback, and side yard setbacks for mechanicals and an accessory structure.

Motion: Made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Smith, to memorialize the resolution for application 10-25. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

Roll Call Vote

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

Application 12-25-1102 Gowdy Avenue- Block 30- Lot 1(7:10-7:37)

Mr. Coleman introduced the application for a side yard setback variance for a new mechanical unit. The permit was denied because the proposed location for a multi-split air conditioning system is approximately three feet from the property line, whereas a five-foot setback is required.

Mr. Zabarsky noted that the submitted survey map did not have a precise measurement for the proposed unit's location and that the applicant handwrote the locations of two existing units.

A-1 Application

A-2- Survey

A-3 Mr. Savacool's review letter

A-4 Photos from applicant

The applicant, testified that the intent is to place the new condenser on the north side of the house, adjacent to two existing condensers. The applicant further stated the existing units are non-conforming and closer to the property line than the proposed new unit. The plan includes relocating a gate to enclose all three units. When questioned by a Board member about

placing the unit on the south side, the applicant explained that the home's front door and a patio are located on that side, making it unsuitable.

No Public questions or comments

Discussion among the Board centered on the function of the new unit, which is to provide air conditioning for a new addition to the home that lacks central air ductwork. Mr. Savacool acknowledged that while the submitted plan was not too scale, it appeared to represent the property's current state. Mr. Savacool confirmed the degree of variance could not be precisely determined but was less than five feet. A Board member observed that the proposed location is over 25 feet from the neighbor's windows and further from the neighbor's home than the existing units. The Board noted the straightforward nature of the request and the absence of any objections from the public.

Motion: Made by Mr. Smith, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the application with the condition that the unit be placed as close to the existing plumbing as possible to minimize the side yard setback, and that the gate be relocated as described. The motion passed by a vote of 6-1.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes	Mr. Coppolino- Yes	Mr. Giordano- No	Mrs. Masterson-
Yes	Ms. Smith- Yes	Mr. Smith- Yes	Mr. Coleman- Yes

Application 13-25- 1609 Beaver Dam Road- Block 359 Lot 1-(7:37-7:56)

A-1 Application

A-2 Mr. Savacool's review letter

A-3 Previous Resolution

A-4 Survey

A-5 Architectural Plans

A-6 Power Point

Mr. Jackson, attorney for the applicant, presented the application as a request to modify a previously approved plan for a use variance, rear yard setback, side yard setback, and improved coverage. The modification involves reducing the size and reorienting a second-story addition from a north-south to an east-west configuration. This change was necessitated by FEMA regulations, as the original plan's improvement value would have exceeded 50% of the property's value, triggering a requirement to lift the entire building. The new, smaller plan keeps the project under this threshold.

The project architect, Mr. Berzinskis, explained that the revised design decreases the addition's mass and orients more toward an adjacent commercial property and less toward residential properties. While the length of the setback encroachment changes, the setback distance itself does not require new relief. The revised plan also removes a previously proposed exterior lift.

Board members expressed that the original design was more aesthetically cohesive but understood that the changes were driven by regulatory constraints. The board acknowledged that the modification represents a less intense use of the property than what was previously approved.

Motion: Made by Mr. Giordano, seconded by Ms. Smith, to approve the application as a modification of the previous approval. The motion passed unanimously.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes Mr. Coppolino- Yes Mr. Giordano- Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes
Ms. Smith- Yes Mr. Smith- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

Application 23-24- 922 Arnold Avenue- Block 116 Lot 26(7:58-10:34)

Mr. Zabarsky introduced the application for a D1 use variance to permit the construction of a second principal dwelling on a single lot, along with bulk variances for a habitable accessory structure. Mr. Zabarsky clarified that the proposal is for a second principal structure, not an accessory one, and therefore requires the applicant to meet an enhanced standard of proof.

A-1 Application

A-2 Denial Letter

A-3 Aerial

A-4 Plan

A-5 Topographic Survey

A-6- Architectural Plans

A-7 Mr. Savacool's letter

A-8 PowerPoint

Mr. Jackson, attorney for the applicant, stated the proposal is to build a "carriage house" with a two-bedroom apartment over a three-car garage on the oversized 30,000-square-foot property. The applicant, wishes to preserve the historic main house on the lot and provide a residence for his mother. The applicant initially explored a subdivision but is now seeking this variance to maintain single ownership and control over the property.

The applicant was sworn in. He testified about the historic nature of the main house, which dates to the 19th century. He explained his desire to preserve it while creating a separate, accessible living space for his mother that includes an elevator. He noted that other properties in the vicinity have similar rear dwellings.

The project engineer, Mr. Intile, was sworn in. Mr. Intile described the site and the proposal, which also includes an addition to the main house and a new pool. He reviewed the required variances, including a front yard setback for a new porch on the main house and a pre-existing non-conforming setback for a barn that will be partially removed. He confirmed the project is significantly under the maximum building coverage limit. He also presented a revised concept plan showing the carriage house shifted to increase the side and rear yard setbacks from neighboring properties, a modification the applicant is willing to make.

The project planner, Mr. Taikina, was sworn in. He testified that the property is particularly suited for the proposed use due to its large size and location in a mixed-use area with adjacent commercial properties. He argued that the proposal is less intense than a fully commercial development permitted in the zone and advances the purposes of zoning by promoting historic preservation and providing a desirable visual environment. He stated the project would not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the zone plan, noting the Master Plan has language encouraging flexibility and the upgrading of dwellings.

Public Comment

Resident, 1009 Clayton Avenue -objector

Resident, 903 Rue Ave- objector

Resident, 907 Rue Avenue, objector

Resident, 1009 Clayton Avenue- objector

O-1 and O-2 were marked into evidence.

Resident, 231 Passaic Avenue- in favor of application

Resident, 904 Arnold- in favor of application

Resident, previous owner, in favor of application

Resident, 1227 Woodsend Road, in favor of application

During the public comment portion, several neighbors from adjacent properties voiced objections. Concerns included the 31-foot height of the proposed structure, the visual impact of a "huge wall of siding" on their backyards, loss of privacy, potential for diminished property values, and the precedent it might set. Several members of the public, including a Planning Board member and the property's previous owner, spoke in support of the application. They praised the applicant's commitment to historic preservation and noted the proposal was a preferable alternative to a more intense subdivision or commercial development.

In response to neighbor concerns, the Mr. Intel testified that the proposed location was chosen to preserve numerous mature trees on the property. After discussion with the board, the applicant agreed to move the proposed structure five feet further north to increase the buffer for the neighboring property and to install a dense landscape buffer around the perimeter.

Motion: Made by Mr. Giordano, seconded by Mrs. Masterson, to approve the application with the following conditions:

- The proposed carriage house shall be relocated five feet north, from the white outline shown on the applicant's exhibit.
- The applicant must submit amended plans for review and approval showing the new location of the structure and the associated drainage trench.
- The applicant must submit a landscaping plan for review and approval by the Board Engineer, detailing a dense planting buffer around the perimeter of the new structure.
- A portion of the existing shed will be removed, while the historic barn portion will remain, as depicted on the plans. The motion passed by a vote of 6-1.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes

Mr. Coppolino- No

Mr. Giordano- Yes

Mrs., Masterson- Yes

Ms. Smith- Yes

Mr. Smith- Yes

Mr. Coleman- Yes

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Giordano and seconded by Ms. Smith. The meeting concluded at 10:35PM

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Morgan

Board Secretary