

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

**April 8, 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. Shrewsberry Mr. Guetzlaff Mr. Coppolino  
Ms. Smith Mrs. Masterson Mr. McConnell

**Members Absent:** Mrs. Schlapfer Mr. Ippolito Mr. Smith Mr. Corso

**Board Attorney:** Mr. Zabarsky

**Board Engineer:** Mr. Savacool

**Minutes**

**Approval of Minutes – March 11, 2026**

A motion was requested to approve the minutes of the March 11, 2026, meeting by Mr. Coppolino, seconded by Mr. Coleman, to approve the minutes

**Roll Call Vote**

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

**Approval of Minutes – March 25, 2026**

A motion was requested to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2026, meeting was made by Mr. Coppolino, second by Mrs. Masterson, to approve the minutes.

**Roll Call Vote**

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

**Resolutions**

**08-26- 2103-2109 Veterans Memorial Drive- Use Variance- approved with conditions**

A motion was requested to memorialize Resolution for 2109 Veterans Memorial Drive, which approved a use variance with conditions. A motion was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Coppolino.

### **Roll Call Vote**

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

### **Unfinished Business/ New Business**

#### **05-26- Block 126 Lot 26- 1110 Rue Avenue- Side yard setback for porch, mechanicals and shed. Rear yard for shed (7:05-7:17)**

Emiline Fitzgerald, counsel for the applicants, presented an application to replace a porch on a house built in 1921. The applicants seek only to replace the porch, which is in poor condition, within its existing footprint. The proposal involves replacing a solid wall with an open railing but will not expand the structure. Exhibits entered into evidence included the application packet (A1), the Board Engineer's letter (A2), and photographs of the property and the porch's deterioration (A3-A8).

The applicant was sworn in. He testified that the porch has rotting wood and holes, posing a danger to his three small children. He confirmed the replacement will not expand the current footprint and that the roof will remain. The only aesthetic change will be the replacement of a column wall with a knee wall and railing. The space will remain open-air and non-habitable. New composite materials will be used that are in keeping with the home's current appearance.

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

A motion was made by Mrs. Masterson to approve the application, seconded by Ms. Smith.

### **Roll Call Vote**

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes   Mr. Coppolino- Yes   Ms. Smith- Yes   Mrs. Masterson- Yes  
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes   Mr. McConnell- Yes   Mr. Coleman- Yes

#### **06-26- Block 258 Lot 10- 1409 Buckner Street- Front yard setback dwelling and porch, side yard pergola (7:18- 7:37)**

The applicants were sworn in. They presented an application for a front yard setback variance to accommodate a vertical expansion of their home. Exhibits entered into evidence included the application packet (A1) and the Board Engineer's letter (A2). The applicant, testified that he and his growing family wish to convert the existing one-and-a-half-story structure into a full two-story house.

The relief is required because the house was built with a 20.47-foot front yard setback, which was compliant at the time of construction but is now a preexisting non-conformity under the current 25-foot requirement. The proposed vertical expansion will not increase the building's footprint. The applicant submitted photographs of neighboring homes (A3) to demonstrate that the proposed improvements are consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

The board discussed several items from the engineer's report. The applicant confirmed that a pool and surrounding pavers had been removed, and they were advised that replacing the hardscaping

would likely require a future variance due to impervious coverage limits. The applicant also confirmed the property has two on-site parking spaces to support the proposed four-bedroom home. An engineering firm, RC Associates, has approved the existing foundation for the additional load of the second story.

The public comment portion was opened and closed with no speakers.

A motion to approve the application with a condition that the attic will not contain habitable space was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mr. Guetzlaff.

**Roll Call Vote**

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes      Mr. Coppolino- Yes    Ms. Smith- Yes      Mrs. Masterson- Yes  
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes      Mr. McConnell- Yes      Mr. Coleman- Yes

**09-26- Block 25 Lot 14- 313 Maxson Avenue- Side yard Setback accessory structure(7:38-7:58)**

The applicants were sworn in. They presented an application to vertically expand an existing detached garage to create a more usable and aesthetically pleasing pool house. Exhibits entered into evidence included the application packet (A1), the Board Engineer's letter (A2), a packet of photographs and neighborhood maps (A3), and a rendering of the proposed structure (A4).

The applicant's architect, Danile Lynch, testified that the project will maintain the garage's existing footprint and foundation. The current low, flat roof will be removed and replaced with a new, properly pitched roof structure that matches the aesthetic of the main house. The interior will be a single multi-use space with a bathroom containing a toilet, sink, and shower. The structure will have heating and air conditioning but will not contain sleeping quarters or cooking facilities and will not be used as habitable space. The applicant noted the structure's height would be similar to or less than a neighboring garage.

The board confirmed that the structure would not be used for parking. It was clarified that while the structure is referred to as a garage, it will function as a pool house. The applicant confirmed the structure would contain a kitchen sink and a dishwasher but no stove.

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

A motion to approve the application with the condition that the structure will not contain sleeping quarters or cooking facilities and will not be used as habitable space was made by Mr. Guetzlaff, seconded by Mr. Shrewsberry.

**Roll Call Vote**

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes      Mr. Coppolino- Yes    Ms. Smith- Yes      Mrs. Masterson- Yes  
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes      Mr. McConnell- Yes      Mr. Coleman- Yes

**10-26- Block 214 Lot 21- 1001 Northstream Parkway- Setbacks for accessory structure: side yard, rear yard, and street side yard. Mini Splits on rear of accessory within the setback. Fence is located within the Borough Right of Way ( 7:59-8:47)**

The applicants, appeared before the board seeking relief for work done without permits and to propose a new second-story addition. The unpermitted work includes a four-foot bump-out on the main dwelling and two separate additions to the detached garage. The applicants acknowledged their mistake in proceeding without approvals.

The Zoning Officer, Colleen Malvasio testified that a notice of violation was issued in July 2025, followed by a penalty notice in October 2025. The relief sought covers the unpermitted work as well as a proposed second-floor addition and new AC units.

The Board Engineer, Raymond Savacool, clarified that the addition to the main house conforms to setbacks, but the additions to the already non-conforming garage aggravate the side and rear yard setback non-conformities.

The board expressed significant concern over the extent of unpermitted work, the lack of clear documentation and photographs of the existing conditions, and the complexity of the situation. The garage is climate-controlled and used for storage and housing reptiles. A fence was also replaced without a permit and remains in the borough right-of-way, an issue that was supposed to have been corrected in 2010.

Due to the confusion and lack of sufficient information to make an informed decision, the board members suggested the applicant adjourn the hearing. They advised the applicant to return with comprehensive documentation, including detailed photographs of all completed work, revised plans, and professional representation.

A motion to adjourn the application to the May 13, 2026, meeting without additional formal notice was made by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mrs. Masterson.

**Roll Call Vote**

Mr. Shrewsberry- Yes      Mr. Coppolino- Yes      Ms. Smith- Yes      Mrs. Masterson- Yes  
Mr. Guetzlaff- Yes      Mr. McConnell- Yes      Mr. Coleman- Yes

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mrs. Masterson, seconded by Mr. Shrewsberry.

All voting members present were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:48PM

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Morgan

Board Secretary