

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

February 11, 2026

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. Guetzlaff Mr. Coppolino Mrs. Masterson
Mr. Ippolito Mr. Shrewsberry Mrs. Schlapfer Mr. McConnell

Members Absent: Mr. Smith Ms. Smith Mr. Corso

Board Attorney: Mr. Zabarsky

Board Engineer: Mr. Savacool

01-26- Block 126 Lot 6- 916 Ellison Avenue- Side Yard Setback, Lot Frontage & Lot Width

A motion was made by Mr. Guetzlaff, seconded by Mrs. Masterson, to **memorialize Resolution 01-26.**

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Coppolino -Yes Mrs. Masterson- Yes Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes
Mr. Ippolito- Yes Mr. Coleman- Yes

Memorialization of Reorganization Resolutions:

Board Attorney, Board Engineer, Chairman, Vice Chair, Board Secretary, Meeting dates and time, and Official Newspapers

A motion was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mrs. Schlapfer, to **memorialize the reorganization resolutions of appointment.**

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes Mrs. Schlapfer- Yes Mr. Coppolino- Yes
Mrs. Masterson- Yes Mr. Guetzlaff Mr. McConnell Mr. Coleman

03-26- Block 24 Lot 4- 406 River Ave- Building Coverage, Lot & Impervious Coverage, Front Yard setback dwelling & Porch, & side yard mechanicals & pavers (7:05-7:38)

The applicant sought variance approval for building coverage, lot and impervious coverage, front yard setback for the dwelling and porch, and side yard setback for mechanicals and pavers.

Ms. Servidio, attorney for the applicants, presented the case. Exhibits were marked, including the application for development (A1), a review letter from the board engineer dated October 6, 2026 (A2), and a PowerPoint presentation (A3).

Ms. Servidio explained that the application was for improvements that were already completed. The applicants had hired a contractor who advised them that permits were not required because they were replacing existing items. The homeowners were later notified by the zoning officer that permits were necessary, which led to the current application.

The property is located one house from the corner of River Avenue and Herbertsville Road, a high-traffic area. Ms. Servidio stated that safety concerns were a primary motivation for the improvements. The presentation included photographs showing the property before and after the work. The prior wooden stairs at the front and rear of the house were described as rotting and hazardous. These were replaced with a new front porch and a rear deck with a landing area. The rear yard, which previously had a mix of stone and brick, was updated with a level paver patio.

The driveway was also replaced and widened with pavers to address unevenness, puddling, and to provide safer off-street parking. Ms. Servidio highlighted the danger of parking on River Avenue, showing a photograph of the applicant having to stand in the street to access her vehicle. The goal was to park all family vehicles off the street.

Initially, the impervious coverage was calculated at 68.8%. Ms. Servidio stated the applicants were willing to cease using a gravel area for parking, which would reduce the impervious coverage by approximately 8%. Mr. Zabarsky noted that the borough ordinance generally prohibits parking in a required front yard setback area.

The applicant, was sworn in and provided testimony. She acknowledged that a mistake was made by not verifying permit requirements and apologized. She stated that they were notified of the violation by the zoning officer and acted as quickly as possible to resolve the issue. She further confirmed the old porches were deteriorating and she had fallen on them. A primary reason for the new driveway was to create a safe play area for her grandchildren in the back of the property by moving cars further toward the street. She stated that the work was performed by a licensed New Jersey home improvement contractor.

Board members noted that a licensed professional should have been aware of the permit requirements.

During the discussion, Mr. Savacool, the Board Engineer, provided a correction to the impervious coverage calculation. He noted that the submitted plan misstated the size of a shed as 66 square feet when it is actually 166 square feet. After accounting for the removal of the gravel parking area and the corrected shed size, the final impervious coverage requiring a variance was calculated to be 62.7%.

Ms. Servidio argued that the hardship for the existing setback nonconformities was based on the lawfully existing structure. For the new variances, including impervious coverage, a flexible C2 variance was sought on the basis that the improvements provided an aesthetic upgrade, improved safety, and enhanced drainage without creating a substantial detriment to the public good or the zoning plan, noting there was no negative impact on light, air, or open space and no new fire safety concerns.

The public comment portion was opened and closed with no members of the public speaking.

In a final summary, Ms. Servidio reiterated that the homeowners had relied on their contractor and acted in good faith to rectify the situation once notified. She emphasized the safety and aesthetic benefits of the project.

Board members discussed the application, noting that while the circumstances were unfortunate, the result was a functional and aesthetic improvement.

