

# MASTER PLAN REEXAMINATION REPORT

**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH**  
OCEAN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

Revised for Public Hearing  
July 12, 2007

Prepared for:  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH**  
**PLANNING BOARD**

Prepared by:



ASSOCIATES

Eleven Tindall Road  
Middletown, New Jersey 07748

---

Stan Slachetka, P.P., AICP  
New Jersey Professional Planner  
License LI-03508

---

John C. Jennings, P.P., AICP  
New Jersey Professional Planner  
License LI-04282

*Original Signed and Sealed in Accordance with Law*

*Adopted by the Point Pleasant Beach Borough Planning Board on \_\_\_\_\_.*

**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS**

**William Ammirata- Chairman**

**Thomas Neumaier-Vice Chairman**

**Councilman Michael Corbally**

**Elaine Koscinski**

**Michael Brodeur**

**Thomas Spader**

**Mary Mossa**

**Sonya Lopez**

**Cornelia Calderone**

**Diane Johnson- Planning Board Secretary**

**James DeBenedett, Esq. - Planning Board Attorney**

**Raymond Savacool, P.E., C.M.E., Board Engineer**

**Christine Riehl, Borough Administrator**

**Maryann Ellsworth, Municipal Clerk**

Prepared by:



ASSOCIATES

Eleven Tindall Road

Middletown, New Jersey 07748

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Requirements of the Periodic Examination Report</b> .....	1
<b>General Municipal Goals</b> .....	2
<b>Review of Current Planning Documents</b> .....	4
<i>Major Problems and Objectives in 1999 and the Extent to which Problems and Objectives have been Reduced or have Increased</i> .....	4
<i>Major Problems and Objectives in 1992 and the Extent to which Problems and Objectives have been Reduced or have Increased</i> .....	6
<i>Major Problems and Objectives in the 2005 Master Plan Review Committee Report</i> .....	7
<b>Demographic Changes Impacting the Master Plan</b> .....	13
<i>Population</i> .....	13
<i>Employment and Income</i> .....	17
<i>Household Characteristics</i> .....	18
<i>Point Pleasant Beach’s Housing Stock</i> .....	20
<i>Housing Unit Characteristics</i> .....	20
<i>Development Patterns</i> .....	24
<i>Population Projections</i> .....	26
<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b> .....	27
<b>Land Use Plan Element Progress Report (1999-2007)</b> .....	29
<i>Housing</i> .....	29
<i>Parking</i> .....	29
<i>Character/Design</i> .....	29
<b>Changes in State or Federal Laws, Regulations, and Plans</b>	
<b>Impacting the Master Plan</b> .....	30
<i>Housing</i> .....	30
<i>Residential Site Improvement Standards</i> .....	30

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<i>Municipal Stormwater Management</i> .....	30
<i>Open Space and Recreation Plan</i> .....	31
<b>Point Pleasant Beach Zoning Board of Adjustment Annual Reports</b> .....	31
<b>Review of Zoning in Adjoining Municipalities</b> .....	33
<b>State Development and Redevelopment Plan</b> .....	33
<b>Ocean County</b> .....	34
<b>Recycling</b> .....	34
<b>Recommended Changes in the Borough’s Master Plan, Development Regulations and Zone Plan</b> .....	35
<b>Redevelopment Areas</b> .....	36
 <b><u>TABLES</u></b>	
<b>1: Population 1940-2000</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>2: Population Density per Square Mile 1990-2000</b> .....	14
<b>3: Population Distribution 1990 &amp; 2000</b> .....	15
<b>4: Persons by Race and Sex 1990 &amp; 2000</b> .....	16
<b>5: Employment and Income 2000</b> .....	17
<b>6: Household Size 2000</b> .....	18
<b>7: Household Size 1990 &amp; 2000</b> .....	19
<b>8: Median Household Income 1989 &amp; 1999</b> .....	19
<b>9: Housing Data 2000</b> .....	21
<b>10: Household Size 1990 &amp; 2000</b> .....	22
<b>11: Housing Values 2000</b> .....	23
<b>12: Indicators of Housing Conditions 2000</b> .....	24
<b>13: Building Permits for New, Privately Owned Residential Units 1980-2006</b> .....	25
<b>14: Housing Units Certificates of Occupancy Issued 1996-2006</b> .....	26
<b>15: Population Projections 2005-2025</b> .....	26
 <i>ATTACHMENT A: EXISTING LAND USES</i>	
<i>ATTACHMENT B: EXISTING ZONING</i>	
<i>ATTACHMENT C: PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES AND LAND USE MAP</i>	

## **INTRODUCTION**

The New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) requires that each municipality in New Jersey undertake a periodic review and reexamination of its local Master Plan and municipal development regulations on a regular basis in order to determine the need for updates and revisions. This report constitutes the Master Plan Reexamination Report for the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach as required by the MLUL (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89).

The Borough of Point Pleasant Beach adopted its last comprehensive Master Plan in 1978. Subsequently, the Borough adopted a Housing Element in 1988 and updated Land Use Plan in 1992. In addition, the Planning Board has adopted two reexamination reports: in 1992 at the time the Land Use Plan was updated and in 1998. While not officially adopted by the Planning Board, this Reexamination Plan also considers the report and findings of the Borough's 2005 Master Plan Review Committee, which recommended a variety of changes to the Borough's Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Point Pleasant Beach is a densely populated shore community located in the northeastern part of Ocean County. It is served by major transportation routes including Route 35 and New Jersey Transit's Coast Line. The Borough also has convenient access to Route 34 and the Garden State Parkway. Significant local north-south routes are Bay Avenue and Ocean Avenue. Important east-west streets include Arnold Avenue and Broadway Avenue. The central business district in the Borough is located along Arnold Avenue as is the post office and train station.

Point Pleasant Beach Borough is considered a premier NJ shore destination and as such it is estimated that day trippers in the summertime add between 37,000 to 53,000 people per day to the area and increases local traffic significantly. In addition, seasonal homes rentals along with hotel/motel guests add approximately 2,500 additional persons to the Borough's population of 5,300 people during the summer months.

## **REQUIREMENTS OF THE PERIODIC REEXAMINATION REPORT**

The MLUL requires that the Reexamination Report describe the following:

- The major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last reexamination report.
- The extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date.
- The extent to which there have been significant changes in assumptions, policies and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection, disposition, and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county and municipal policies and objectives.

- The specific changes recommended for the Master Plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared.
- The recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans adopted pursuant to the “Local Redevelopment and Housing Law,” P.L.1992, c. 79 (C.40A:12A-1 et seq.) into the Land Use Plan Element of the municipal Master Plan, and recommended changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality.

The report that follows addresses each of these statutory requirements.

Under the Municipal Land Use law, the Master Plan identified the following general goals that formed the primary objectives of the Master Plan.

### **GENERAL MUNICIPAL GOALS**

*The Municipal Land Use Law, enacted by the State Legislature on January 14, 1976, empowers municipal governments with the right to control the physical development of the lands within their bounds. N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2 of the Municipal Land Use Law, as amended, lists fifteen (15) general purposes regarding the local planning process which are as follows:*

- To encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in this State, in a manner which will promote the public health, safety, morals and general welfare;*
- To secure safety from fire, flood, panic and other natural and manmade disasters;*
- To provide adequate light, air and open space;*
- To ensure that the development of individual municipalities does not conflict with the development and general welfare of neighboring municipalities, the county and the State as a whole;*
- To promote the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well being of persons, neighborhoods, communities and regions and preservation of the environment;*
- To encourage the appropriate and efficient expenditure of public funds by the coordination of public development with land use policies;*
- To provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, commercial and industrial uses and open space, both public and private, according to their respective environmental requirements in order to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens;*
- To encourage the location and design of transportation routes which will promote the free flow of traffic while discouraging location of such facilities and routes which result in congestion or blight;*
- To promote a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangements;*

- (j) *To promote the conservation of historic sites and districts, open space, energy resources and valuable natural resources in the State and to prevent urban sprawl and degradation of the environment through improper use of land;*
- (k) *To encourage planned unit developments which incorporate the best features of design and relate the type, design and layout of residential, commercial, industrial and recreational development of the particular site;*
- (l) *To encourage senior citizen community housing construction;*
- (m) *To encourage coordination of the various public and private procedures and activities shaping land development with a view of lessening the cost of such development and to the more efficient use of land;*
- (n) *To promote utilization of renewable energy sources; and*
- (o) *To promote the maximum practicable recovery and recycling of recyclable materials from municipal solid waste through the use of planning practices designed to incorporate the State Recycling Plan goals and to complement municipal recycling programs.*

## **REVIEW OF CURRENT PLANNING DOCUMENTS**

### **MASTER PLAN**

The Borough of Point Pleasant Beach Master Plan consists of the following documents.

1. April 1999 Master Plan Reexamination Report
2. February 1999 Master Plan Reexamination Report<sup>1</sup>
3. June 1992 Master Plan Reexamination Report
4. May 1992 Land Use Plan Update
5. March 1990 Land Use Plan Element
6. October 1988 Housing Plan Element
7. September 1988 Reexamination of the Master Plan
8. October 1982 Reexamination of the Master Plan
9. 1978 Master Plan

In addition to these Master Plan documents, the Borough's Master Plan Review Committee made several recommendations to the Borough's Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance in 2005. These recommendations were not formally adopted by the Planning Board. However, these recommendations were reviewed during the process of preparing this Reexamination Report.

### **MAJOR PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES AT THE TIME OF THE LAST REEXAMINATION REPORT AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN REDUCED OR HAVE INCREASED**

The 1999 Master Plan Reexamination Report identified six major objectives from the previous Master Plan Reexamination Report as summarized below:

- Strive to foster an aesthetically pleasing downtown commercial district for the ease and safety of pedestrians
- The Land Use Plan and Development Ordinance should be a simple, straightforward set of regulations
- Continue developing at prevailing land use intensities
- Recognize the inherent incompatibility of certain land uses and strive to segregate those that are potentially incompatible
- Foster a diversity of housing
- Regulate the unique and valuable resources in the community- the beach, ocean vista, river frontage and strengthen the city's resort economy and tax base

---

<sup>1</sup> While the document was dated 1998, it was formally adopted by the Planning Board on February 8, 1999.

In addition, the 1999 Reexamination Report noted three issues from 1992:

1. “The Development Ordinance attempted to encourage an “architectural continuity” of structures by permitting zero side yards in the General Commercial Zone by connecting buildings.
2. A problem with the single-family residential zones became apparent. The proposed zoning required various minimum lot areas ranging from 5,000 to 7,000 square feet. The abundance of nonconforming lots required considerable time by the Board of Adjustment to address simple additions and the result was that the ordinance was amended to allow 5,000 square foot lots.
3. The problem of the conversion of rental properties to condominiums and the potential negative impact on the borough resulting from the loss of rental housing stock.”

*Source: 1998 Master Plan Reexamination Report adopted by resolution of the Planning Board on 2/8/1999*

The 1999 Report reaffirmed the goals and objectives from the 1992 Reexamination Report; however, the three issues identified above were determined to no longer be significant development issues in Point Pleasant Beach Borough. The Planning Board concurred with this finding.

In evaluating the goals and objectives of the Borough, the Planning Board wishes to maintain a diversity of housing, but encourage a lower proportion of renter occupied housing to support a stable population base. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 37% of the housing stock in the Borough is rental housing. As part of the Master Plan Committee 2005 review, rooming houses were evaluated and determined not to pose a negative land use concern. The Planning Board concurs with this finding. The Planning Board also expressed a desire to encourage bed-and breakfast lodging as a means to enhance the community. Opportunities for bed-and breakfast uses should be investigated and encouraged in the Borough’s commercial and resort residential districts as described in further detail in this report.

**MAJOR PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES IN 1992 AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN REDUCED OR HAVE INCREASED**

The 1992 Land Use Plan contained the following goals and objectives that were reaffirmed in the 1999 Reexamination Report. This Reexamination Report again reaffirms the following 1992 Goals and Objectives as still valid with the exceptions noted in the previous section.

**1992 Land Use Plan  
Goals and Objectives**

The following goals and objectives serve as the foundation of the Land Use Plan

1. To recognize the importance of protecting and stabilizing established residential and commercial areas of the borough.
2. To separate those land uses which are inherently incompatible, and in those transition areas between zoning districts to encourage adequate traffic separation, buffering and screening.
3. To provide appropriate land use regulations to preserve the pedestrian scale of the central business district along Arnold Avenue.
4. To relate land use decisions to the established land use pattern of the borough, with new development taking place at essentially the same scale and intensity as nearby existing development patterns.
5. To adequately relate planning in the borough to adjoining municipalities, Ocean County, and the State of New Jersey to assure full recognition of regional planning issues.
6. To protect and preserve areas of environmental sensitivity, such as wetlands.
7. To restrict impervious surface coverage through the development regulations ordinance as a way of controlling stormwater runoff.
8. To regulate development in recognition of the importance of retaining the borough's valuable natural resources, including the beach, views of the ocean, and relationship to the Manasquan River.
9. To recognize the continuing role of Point Pleasant Beach as a family resort, while addressing its increasing attractiveness as a year-round community.

This Reexamination Plan reaffirms the 1992 and 1998 Goals and Objectives.

## **MAJOR PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES IDENTIFIED IN THE 2005 MASTER PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT**

While not formally adopted by the Planning Board as part of a Master Plan Reexamination Report, in 2005 the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach's Master Plan Committee prepared a report and recommendations for the changes to the Land Use Plan Element of the Master Plan and the Borough's Zoning Ordinance. As part of the development of this Reexamination Report, the 2005 Master Plan Committee recommendations were examined. The recommendations of the Master Plan Committee and the Planning Board's formal actions concerning these recommendations are described below.

### **Master Plan Review Committee Final Report Summary of Zoning Recommendations**

The following land use and zoning changes were recommended by the Master Plan Committee. Normal text identifies the 2005 recommendation, while *italicized* text indicates the formal actions recommended by the Planning Board as part of this Reexamination Report.

1. The westernmost portion of the Highway Commercial (HC) Zone along Arnold Avenue between Woodland Avenue and Lincoln Avenue is proposed to change to a General Commercial Zone (GC) Zone. A new use in this zone would allow 3-story mixed use buildings in limited areas with residential on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors. *(The Planning Board supports this recommendation with the exception that further study and evaluation with appropriate community input is needed to determine whether three stories is appropriate in all or any location within the GC Zone. In addition, the Planning Board recommends that the five residential lots that front on Lincoln Avenue south of Arnold Avenue and extend into Point Pleasant Borough be rezoned from the HC to SF-5 Zone, which is more consistent with their current use and actual lot size and configuration.*
2. The HC Zone along Route 35 should have a unique identity different from the downtown. No new residential uses would be permitted. The northernmost portion north of McLean Avenue would be rezoned to an HC-1 Zone. The HC-1 would continue to permit existing residential uses to be conforming. The southernmost portions of the HC District (south of the GC District) would be rezoned to an HC-2 District. The HC-2 District would exclude residential uses as a permitted use, with existing residential considered a pre-existing

- non-conforming use. *(The Planning Board recommends changing the HC Zone into an HC-1 and an HC-2 Zone to implement this recommended change. In the HC-1 zone residential uses should be considered a conforming use. In both the HC-1 and HC-2 consideration should be given to creating standards in the ordinance that would allow reasonable expansions to these uses to prevent a need for variance relief.)*
3. A boundary line change is recommended in the HC District, with the portion of district along Central Avenue bordering Jaeger Lumber proposed to be changed from HC to SF5. The HC Zone would run along the eastern edge of the railroad tracks. *(The Planning Board supports this recommendation.)*
  4. Eliminate the Limited Commercial (LC) Zone along the south side of Broadway from the ROS District east to Boston Avenue and include this area in the SF-5 zone. East of Boston Avenue, the existing land uses and commercial district would continue over to the Beach. The existing 7-11 convenience store would be located in a new MC 1 Zone. Allow existing hotels and motels currently in the LC Zone to remain as a conditional use. *(The Planning Board supports these recommended changes to create greater flexibility to enhance these areas. However, the Planning Board disagrees with the recommendation regarding the 7-11 property. The Board recognizes that this site may not be appropriate for residential uses due to the proximity of the active rail line and Route 35 and Broadway intersections. Therefore, the Board recommends that the 7-11 property remain in the LC District. In addition, the Planning Board recommends that the LC District east of Boston Avenue remain to reflect the existing land use characteristics in this area pending a more comprehensive evaluation and recommendations that may result from the Broadway Avenue Corridor Study that is currently being undertaken by the Borough.)*
  5. Split the existing Marine Commercial (MC) Zone into the MC-1 and MC-2 Zones.
    - a. The MC 1 Zone would be located on the north side of Channel Drive to the Manasquan Inlet. Uses should be limited to those promoting fishing, boating, and marine industries. No residential uses would be permitted. *(The Planning Board supports these recommendations with the inclusion of appropriate waterfront*

*commercial activities such as restaurants as being permitted conditional uses consistent with the purpose of the marine commercial zone.)*

- b. The MC-2 Zone would be located between Broadway and Channel Drive. This zone would allow mixed uses, but no single family residential. Hotels and motels would be permitted uses. Multi-family residential will be permitted at a density to be determined by a professional planner. *(The Planning Board supports these recommended changes. However, any future planning for this area should be undertaken in a comprehensive manner taking into consideration land use, traffic and pedestrian circulation, and parking issues. Currently, the Borough is undertaking a comprehensive planning study evaluating these issues. The impacts of any proposed changes should be carefully evaluated and closely monitored by the Borough to ensure that land use changes occur in a desirable manner.*

*The Borough recently created an MC-2 Overlay District at Baltimore Avenue between Broadway Avenue and Channel Drive. The Borough Council has introduced an ordinance to expand the existing MC-2 overlay zone which permits townhouse development as an option in selected portions of the MC-1 area for those properties with frontage along the Baltimore and Chicago Avenues between Broadway Avenue and Channel Drive. The Council referred the ordinance to the Planning Board pursuant to the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) for discussion and input for the Council's consideration. At its July 9, 2007 meeting, the Planning Board discussed the proposed ordinance, including conditions and standards regulating townhouse uses and agreed with the suggested revisions. Therefore, the Board recommends adoption of the proposed ordinance as presented to the Planning Board. The Planning Board finds that this approach would provide a transition between the residential areas to the south and the more intensive marine commercial uses to the north and a more pedestrian friendly linkage between these areas. The Board also recognizes that the new overlay zone is a first phase of a more comprehensive land use planning strategy for the revitalization of the Broadway Avenue corridor including Channel Drive.)*

- c. MC-1 and MC-2 also can be primary areas for open space and active and passive recreational use. The Committee recommended a foot bridge to Gull Island and expanded use of Gull Island. *(While recognizing that the primary purpose of the MC-1 and MC-2 Districts is to promote the development of other uses in accordance with a comprehensive plan, the Board supports the inclusion of open space and recreation uses as part of the plan for this area as appropriate and recognizes the need to form a partnership with the County to encourage the completion of any improvements and linkages to Gull Island.)*

6. Resort Residential (RR-1, RR-2 and RR-3 Zones)

- a. In the RR-2 Zone, make hotels and motels conforming again. Change the north side of Arnold Avenue from RR-2 to SF-5. *(The Planning Board supports this recommendation but further recommends that an overlay district be established for properties fronting on Arnold Avenue that would permit Bed and Breakfast uses as a conditional use).*
- b. In the RR-3 Zone, move the two northernmost lots east of Ocean Avenue to the RC Zone. Hotels and motels should be permitted in the RR-3 Zone. The Zone would be extended to the west to include the White Sands Motel (by Philadelphia Avenue). Allow new hotels and motels as conditional uses. *(The Planning Board supports this recommendation as this change would create a land use plan that is more consistent with existing conditions. While the Planning Board generally supports this recommendation, it also is suggested that further study of this area be undertaken to evaluate other changes that may be appropriate to recognize the existing land use pattern in this area.)*
- c. Create an RR-1 East and RR-1 West Zone.
  - The RR-1 West Zone would include properties west of Ocean Avenue currently in the RR-1 Zone. Use standards should be approximate to the SF-5 Zone. Encourage garages and adjust bulk requirements if needed to achieve this. Two stories may be permitted, but the maximum height should be limited to 32 feet.

*(The Planning Board supports this recommendation. However, the Board acknowledges that a number of homes have been built to 35 feet.)*

- The RR-1 East Zone would include the “bungalow area” east of Ocean Avenue. The area would have smaller lot size standards. Adjust building height and standards commensurate with existing lot size. *(The Planning Board supports the intent to preserve the existing character of the bungalow area on existing small lots and discourage lot consolidation that often results in the teardown of existing structures and its replacement with a structure that is greater in square footage and height. Recent development has resulted in impacts on the air and light available to existing structures. The existing 16 foot height limit often results in requests for height variances. Considering that a conforming lot can be as small as 1,500 square feet, the height of a structure should be kept to 20 feet or less.)*
7. The Resort Commercial (RC) Zone should be expanded to include two lots from the RR-3 Zone as discussed above. No changes to the zone standards are proposed. The Committee agreed that there is a need for more parking. Options include: deck parking at the eastern portion of Silver Lake, deck parking at the Inlet, designated off site and off street parking for boardwalk employees, and/or parking as permitted/conditional use on the West side of Ocean Avenue. The parking issue needs to be studied in more detail. *(The Planning Board supports the recommendation of investigating ways to provide additional parking in these areas of the Borough. However, the Board does not agree with parking decks as an option to provide parking. The Borough has applied for a Smart Futures Grant through the NJDCA- Office of Smart Growth to investigate this issue in more detail.)*
8. SF and LR Residential Zones – No changes except as noted above. (The Borough adopted Ordinance 2007-2 that added a tenth zoning district to the Point Pleasant Beach Borough Zoning Map. The new SF-2 zone covers the area from Oak Terrace to Walnut Avenue west of Woodland Road. The zone change established a 75 foot by 100 foot lot minimum as a conforming lot. *(The Planning Board recognizes that the SF-2 District*

- covers a limited area and residents supported the concept to help protect the integrity of the neighborhood.)*
9. Open Space/Community Facilities/Recreation—Encourage preservation and acquisition of open space, particularly in the MC and waterfront. The Borough recently commissioned a Recreation and Open Space Report that identifies existing deficiencies and future needs. *(The Planning Board recommends that the Council investigate all funding sources available to preserve existing open space and vacant lands and to investigate opportunities to provide additional recreation and open space in the Borough as may be needed in accordance with the Borough’s Open Space and Recreation Plan.)*
  
  10. The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Commission, which recommended participation of the HPC in preservation and restoration, reasonable alternatives to renovations that are out of character with existing historic structures, promotion of the re-use and restoration of buildings rather than demolition, encourage the participation to preserve the historic integrity of existing neighborhoods in Point Pleasant Beach. *(The Planning Board supports investigating options to retain the historic character of the Borough.)*
  
  11. The High Density (HD) Zone should be studied to come up with “ideal densities” for future multi-family development where permitted. The Council has initiated the process to further study this issue by a professional planner. *(The Planning Board states its intent to be involved in the identification of appropriate densities and the development of any new zoning approaches within these areas.)*

Related to the Planning Board’s review of the 2005 Report, the Board discussed the bungalow area on Loughran Point. The Board believes that this area deserves some consideration in relation to the future planning of the Borough. The residential requirements should provide flexibility to encourage reinvestment in the area, but also provide some protection against teardowns of existing dwellings and conversions to larger residences that are inconsistent with the character of the area and may have air and light impacts on smaller bungalows. In addition, the Planning Board recommends that the MC District on Loughran Point be evaluated and that appropriate recommendations be developed for zoning and land use regulations on the peninsula.

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES IMPACTING THE MASTER PLAN**

This Element presents general housing and demographic information for the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach. It is important to understand demographic conditions and population trends in order to effectively plan for the Borough’s present and future development. Although past trends do not necessarily predict future conditions, they do provide a sense of the Borough and call attention to emerging trends.

**POPULATION**

As of the 2000 U.S. Census there were 5,314 people residing in the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach. As shown in Table 1 this was an increase of 4.0 percent from 1990 to 2000. By comparison, Ocean County grew by 17.9 percent and the State of New Jersey grew by 8.9 percent.

**TABLE 1**  
**POPULATION 1940 – 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH, OCEAN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY**

Year	POINT PLEASANT BEACH			OCEAN COUNTY		NEW JERSEY	
	Population	Population Change	Percent Change	Population	Percent Change	Population	Percent Change
1940	2,059	215	11.7%	37,706	14.0%	4,160,165	2.9%
1950	2,900	841	40.8%	56,622	50.2%	4,835,329	16.2%
1960	3,873	973	33.6%	108,241	91.2%	6,066,782	25.5%
1970	4,882	1,009	26.1%	208,470	92.6%	7,168,164	18.2%
1980	5,415	533	10.9%	346,038	66.0%	7,364,823	2.7%
1990	5,112	-303	-5.6%	433,203	25.2%	7,730,188	5.0%
2000	5,314	202	4.0%	510,916	17.9%	8,414,350	8.9%

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1940 – 2000.*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

The migration of population from urban areas to developing suburbs and to the major interchange areas along the Garden State Parkway has led to tremendous growth in Ocean County between 1940 and 2000, increasing by the population by 1,255 percent. During this same time period Point Pleasant Beach also grew experienced steady growth, with the population increasing by 158.1 percent or 3,255 people. The Borough’s population rose from 2,059 to 5,415 between 1940

and 1980, decreased by 5.6 percent (303 people) between 1980 and 1990, and increased by 202 people between 1990 and 2000.

As shown in Table 2, Point Pleasant Beach has a much greater population density than that of Ocean County. A flatter growth rate for the Borough as compared to Ocean County is expected, considering Point Pleasant Beach has been, essentially, built-out for many years.

**TABLE 2**  
**POPULATION DENSITY PER SQUARE MILE 1990 – 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH, OCEAN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY**

Year	POINT PLEASANT BEACH			OCEAN COUNTY			NEW JERSEY		
	Population	Sq. Miles	Persons per Sq. Mile	Population	Sq. Miles	Persons per Sq. Mile	Population	Sq. Miles	Persons per Sq. Mile
1990	5,112	1.44	3,560.1	433,203	636.30	680.8	7,730,188	7,418.80	1,042.0
2000	5,314	1.44	3,696.0	510,916	636.29	803.0	8,414,350	7,417.34	1,134.4

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000.*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, as depicted in Table 3 below, the majority, or 59.9 percent, of Point Pleasant Beach is characterized as within the "working years" (20 to 64), 19.1 percent is 65 years or older, 16.6 percent is within the "school years" (5 to 19), and 4.4 percent is within the preschool years (0 to 4); between 1990 and 2000 the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach and Ocean County experienced slight fluctuations in each of these groups. Overall, the median age of the Borough's residents in 2000 was 42.6 years, an increase of three (3) years from 1990's median age of 39.6. Point Pleasant Beach's median age was higher than Ocean County's in both 1990 and 2000, which stood at 38.4 and 41.0, respectively.

It would appear that Point Pleasant Beach is attracting an increasing number of people beginning their working years and those retiring to live near the shore, as the Borough's 20-34 and 65 and older cohorts experienced discernable increases from 1990 to 2000. The decrease in the 35-59 age cohorts, which represents middle-aged and, frequently, better-established persons may offer an indication that this age group may be seeking other housing and/or living options not available in the Borough.

**TABLE 3**  
**POPULATION DISTRIBUTION, 1990 & 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH & OCEAN COUNTY**

Age Groups	1990 % of Population		2000 % of Population		Change 1990-2000	
	Point Pleasant Beach	Ocean County	Point Pleasant Beach	Ocean County	Point Pleasant Beach	Ocean County
Under 5	5.0%	6.7%	4.4%	6.3%	0.6%	0.4%
5-9	5.0%	6.3%	5.3%	6.7%	-0.3%	-0.4%
10-14	5.0%	6.1%	5.8%	6.6%	-0.8%	-0.5%
15-19	6.3%	5.9%	5.5%	5.6%	0.8%	0.3%
20-24	6.8%	5.6%	4.7%	4.6%	2.1%	1.0%
25-34	15.4%	14.5%	12.1%	11.2%	3.3%	3.3%
35-44	14.0%	13.6%	16.5%	14.9%	-2.5%	-1.3%
45-54	11.0%	9.0%	15.8%	12.4%	-4.8%	-3.4%
55-59	5.2%	3.9%	6.4%	5.0%	-1.2%	-1.1%
60-64	6.0%	5.1%	4.4%	4.5%	1.6%	0.6%
65 and older	20.2%	23.2%	19.1%	22.2%	1.1%	1.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	N/A
Median Age	39.6	38.4	42.6	41.0	3.0	2.6

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000.*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, as depicted in Table 4 below, the racial component of the Borough's population is as follows: 95.9 percent White; 1.0 percent Asian or Pacific Islander; 0.5 percent Black; 0.3 percent American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut; and 2.2 percent being some other race. Point Pleasant Beach's racial composition is very similar to that of Ocean County, the only material differences being the White and Black populations, which stood at 93.0 percent and 3.0 percent, respectively, in 2000 for the County.

The Hispanic population encompasses portions of the groups listed above it in Table 4. As of 2000 the Hispanic population was 4.4 percent of the Borough's population, very similar to that of Ocean County's 5 percent Hispanic population component. Both Point Pleasant Beach and Ocean County saw its respective Hispanic population increase from 1990, which stood at 1.3 percent and 3.2 percent of the total population, respectively.

Point Pleasant Beach's population in 2000 was 50.4 percent male and 49.6 percent female, which represents a significant change from 1990, when the population was 46.9 percent male and 53.1

percent female. As indicated in Table 4 below, the Borough's gender breakdown is inconsistent with that of Ocean County, which in 2000 was 47.1 percent male and 52.9 percent female. Overall, the population in New Jersey was 48.5 percent male and 51.5 percent female as of 2000.

**TABLE 4**  
**PERSONS BY RACE AND SEX, 1990 & 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH & OCEAN COUNTY**

	1990				2000			
	Point Pleasant Beach		Ocean County		Point Pleasant Beach		Ocean County	
Race	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	4,975	97.3%	412,709	95.3%	5,098	95.9%	475,391	93.0%
Black	65	1.3%	12,035	2.8%	28	0.5%	15,268	3.0%
American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut	11	0.2%	615	0.1%	18	0.3%	702	0.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	41	0.8%	3,874	0.9%	55	1.0%	6,653	1.3%
Other	20	0.4%	3,970	0.9%	115	2.2%	12,902	2.5%
Total	5,112	100.0%	433,203	100.0%	5,314	100.0%	510,916	100.0%
Male	2,398	46.9%	204,181	47.1%	2,678	50.4%	242,596	47.5%
Female	2,714	53.1%	229,022	52.9%	2,636	49.6%	268,320	52.5%
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population
Hispanic Origin, Any Race	65	1.3%	13,950	3.2%	234	4.4%	25,638	5.0%

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000.*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

Population trends within Point Pleasant Beach are influenced by a variety of factors including national, state and regional economic conditions, social changes, and government policy. Changing birth rates, changing employment trends and consumer preferences, and the availability of land and other factors can affect future development within the Borough.

As updated census data for population and housing becomes available, the Planning Board should monitor population growth and composition and review its planning program to determine how the needs and desires of present and future residents of the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach may be changing.

**EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME**

As indicated in Table 5 below, of the 2,617 Point Pleasant Beach residents aged 16 years and over that were part of the labor force in 2000, only 137 persons were unemployed, which accounts for an unemployment rate of 5.2 percent. The Borough's unemployment rate was identical to that of Ocean County, and slightly lower than the 5.8 percent Statewide unemployment rate.

The median household income of \$51,105 for Point Pleasant Beach in 1999 was slightly greater than that of Ocean County (\$46,443). The median household income for both the Borough and County was less than that Statewide, which was \$55,146 in 1999.

The per capita income for the Borough in 1999 was \$27,853, and ranks Point Pleasant Beach in the upper half of all municipalities (257<sup>th</sup> place out of 566 municipalities; New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development). The Borough's 1999 per capita income estimate was higher than that of the County (\$23,054) and State (\$27,006). Per capita income is the calculated average amount of income available per person.

**TABLE 5**  
**EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH, OCEAN COUNTY AND NEW JERSEY**

	POINT PLEASANT BEACH		OCEAN COUNTY		NEW JERSEY	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>						
Employed	2,480	94.8%	213,336	94.8%	3,950,029	94.2%
Unemployed	137	5.2%	11,615	5.2%	243,116	5.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>224,951</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,193,145</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>INCOME</b>						
Median Household	\$51,105	N/A	\$46,443	N/A	\$55,146	N/A
Per Capita	\$27,853	N/A	\$23,054	N/A	\$27,006	N/A
Per Capita Rank	257 <sup>TH</sup> (of 566 Municipalities)		14 <sup>th</sup> (of 21 Counties)		N/A	

*SOURCES: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000; New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

Income levels are affected by educational attainment, occupation and age. Education and occupation are related to earning potential and higher incomes for workers, while income

generally declines after retirement. The income levels of Point Pleasant Beach’s households are discussed at greater length in the following section.

**HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS**

Table 6 presents the households in 2000 by the number of persons in the Borough and the County. The Census defines a household as one or more persons, whether related or not, living together in a dwelling unit.

**TABLE 6**  
**HOUSEHOLD SIZE, 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH AND OCEAN COUNTY**

Household Size	Point Pleasant Beach		Ocean County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Person	841	36.3%	54,186	27.0%
2 person	732	31.6%	70,740	35.3%
3 person	325	14.0%	28,823	14.4%
4 person	261	11.3%	26,428	13.2%
5 person	101	4.4%	12,750	6.4%
6 person	34	1.5%	4,385	2.2%
7 of more persons	23	1.0%	3,090	1.5%
Total households	2,317	100%	200,402	100%
Average Household size	2.25	N/A	2.51	N/A

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 2000.*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

The average size of Point Pleasant Beach’s 2,317 households in 2000 was 2.25 persons, slightly smaller than that of Ocean County’s average household size of 2.51 persons during the same time period. An explanation for the smaller average household size is due to the fact that, as indicated by Table 3, the Borough has a greater percentage of 1 person households than does the Ocean County.

Table 7 illustrates the fact that the number of households in Point Pleasant Beach increased by twelve percent (249 households) between 1990 and 2000, while the average household size decreased by 5.9 percent. The greatest increase in this time period occurred within the one person household category (216 households), which represents a 34.6 % increase over 1990 totals. The increase in 1 person households within the Borough greatly explains why the average household

size decreased between 1990 and 2000, and also gives an indication as to why Point Pleasant Beach’s population only increased by 4 percent (as indicated in Table 1) while the number of households increased by 12 percent during this same time period.

**TABLE 7**  
**HOUSEHOLD SIZE, 1990 AND 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH**

Household Size	1990		2000		Change 1990-2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 person	625	30.2%	841	36.3%	216	34.6%
2 person	718	34.7%	732	31.6%	14	1.9%
3 person	296	14.3%	325	14.0%	29	9.8%
4 person	239	11.6%	261	11.3%	22	9.2%
5 person	138	6.7%	101	4.4%	-37	-26.8%
6 person	36	1.7%	34	1.5%	-2	-5.6%
7 or more persons	16	0.8%	23	1.0%	7	43.8%
Total	2,068	100.0%	2,317	100.0%	249	12.0%
Avg. Household Size	2.39	N/A	2.25	N/A	-0.14	5.9%

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000.*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

As indicated in Table 8, the median household income of \$51,105 for Point Pleasant Beach in 1999 was slightly greater than that of Ocean County (\$46,443), and less than the median income Statewide, which was \$55,146 in 1999.

**TABLE 8**  
**MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 1989 & 1999**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH, OCEAN COUNTY, AND NEW JERSEY**

	1989 Median Household Income (in 1999 dollars)	1999 Median Household Income	Percent Change 1989-1999
New Jersey	\$54,987	\$55,146	0.3%
Ocean County	\$44,485	\$46,443	4.4%
Point Pleasant Beach	\$46,754	\$51,105	9.3%

*SOURCES: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000; U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics (inflation calculator)*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

The Borough's median household income increased by 9.3 percent (adjusted for inflation) between 1989 and 1999, significantly greater than increases experienced in Ocean County (4.4 percent) and Statewide (0.3) during this same time period. It can be stated that Point Pleasant Beach became increasingly affluent as compared to Ocean County as a whole during the 1990's.

## **POINT PLEASANT BEACH'S HOUSING STOCK**

### **Housing Unit Characteristics**

Table 9 below indicates that, as of the 2000 U.S. Census, Point Pleasant Beach had a total of 3,558 housing units at the time of the 2000 U.S. Census of Population and Housing; of these, 2,317 units (65.1 percent) were listed as occupied, and 1,241 (34.9 percent) were vacant. Point Pleasant Beach historically has seasonal residents who, drawn to the shore during the warmer months, many of whom reside in housing that the U.S. Census identifies as a subcategory of vacant units classified as "for seasonal, recreational or occasional use". Fully 26.6 percent of all housing units in Point Pleasant Beach fit this category in 2000, while Ocean County rate was only 13.3 percent. This difference would account for the Borough's vacancy rate of 34.9 percent being significantly higher than that of Ocean County's 19.4 percent.

A total of 52.9 percent of the Borough's housing stock was constructed before 1960, as compared to only 21.3 percent for Ocean County. An associated disparity is that between the median years of construction for Borough and County housing stock as (1953 and 1975, respectively). The median year of construction for New Jersey's housing stock was 1962. As of the 2000 Census in the "Population Trends" section and illustrated in Table 1, Point Pleasant Beach experienced impressive growth (158.1 percent) from 1940 through 2000. Point Pleasant Beach has been built-out for many years with housing units supporting both permanent and seasonal residents. As the permanent population grew, housing for many of the new Borough residents was provided for by converting seasonal housing to year round structures. As such the need to provide new housing was lessened as compared to what was happening in Ocean County, where the population grew by 1,255 percent between 1940 and 2000. The sheer amount of new housing built in Ocean County to support its growing population helped contribute to lessening the median age of its housing stock.

Over three-quarters (75.1 percent) of the Borough's housing stock consists of single-family detached structures, with one-unit attached structures being the next most prominent housing

structure type with 9.1 percent of all housing units. With regard to the size of the unit, it is noted that approximately 53.0 percent of all units contain at least 6 rooms.

**TABLE 9**  
**HOUSING DATA 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH AND OCEAN COUNTY**

Characteristics	Point Pleasant Beach		Ocean County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total housing units	3,558	100.0%	248,711	100.0%
Occupied housing units	2,317	65.1%	200,402	80.6%
Vacant housing units	1241	34.9%	48,309	19.4%
Seasonal, recreational or occasional use	947	26.6 %	33,200	13.3%
Tenure of occupied units				
Owner occupied	1,457	62.9%	166,826	83.2%
Renter occupied	860	37.1%	33,576	16.8%
Year Structure Built				
Built 1999 to March 2000	10	0.3%	5,904	2.4%
Built 1995 to 1998	109	3.1%	16,961	6.8%
Built 1990 to 1994	67	1.9%	16,639	6.7%
Built 1980 to 1989	226	6.4%	51,068	20.5%
Built 1970 to 1979	253	7.1%	61,770	24.8%
Built 1960 to 1969	618	17.4%	43,345	17.4%
Built 1940 to 1959	1,264	35.5%	39,950	16.1%
Built 1939 or earlier	1,011	28.4%	13,074	5.3%
Units in structure				
1 unit detached	2,437	68.5%	186,722	75.1%
1 unit attached	110	3.1%	22,510	9.1%
2 units	299	8.4%	9,903	4.0%
3 or 4 units	196	5.5%	6,896	2.8%
5 to 9 units	151	4.2%	4,945	2.0%
10 to 19 units	244	6.9%	5,169	2.1%
20 or more Units	121	3.4%	6,693	2.7%
Mobile home	0	0.0%	5,746	2.3%
Boat, RV, Van, etc.	0	0.0%	127	0.1%
Number of rooms				
1 room	134	3.8%	1,433	0.6%
2 rooms	79	2.2%	3,676	1.5%
3 rooms	257	7.2%	13,395	5.4%
4 rooms	608	17.1%	40,528	16.3%
5 rooms	674	18.9%	57,922	23.3%
6 rooms	653	18.4%	54,269	21.8%
7 rooms	553	15.5%	34,559	13.9%
8 rooms	266	7.5%	24,632	9.9%
9 or more rooms	334	9.4%	18,297	7.4%
Median (Rooms)	5.5	N/A	5.6	N/A
<b>MEDIAN YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION: POINT PLEASANT BEACH, OCEAN COUNTY &amp; NJ</b>				
Point Pleasant Beach	1953			
Ocean County	1975			
New Jersey	1962			
<i>SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 2000. COMPILED BY: T&amp;M Associates</i>				

As indicated in Table 10 below, the Borough's housing stock increased by approximately 10.0 percent (323 housing units) from 1990 to 2000. Of note is that seasonal/recreational/occasional use units increased by 49.8 percent (315 units). Though seasonal units are classified as vacant by the Census they are not included in rental vacancy rate calculations, which is computed by dividing the number of vacant units for rent by the sum of renter-occupied units and number of vacant units for rent, then multiplying by 100. As such seasonal units do not directly affect the rental vacancy rate.

**TABLE 10**  
**HOUSEHOLD SIZE, 1990 AND 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH**

	1990		2000		Change 1990-2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>HOUSING OCCUPANCY</b>						
Total housing units	3,235	100.0%	3,558	100.0%	323	10.0%
Occupied housing units	2,068	63.9%	2,317	65.1%	249	12.0%
Vacant housing units	1,167	36.1%	1,241	34.9%	74	6.3%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	632	19.5%	947	26.6%	315	49.8%
Homeowner vacancy rate (percent)	N/A	4.9%	N/A	1.9%	N/A	-61.1%
Rental vacancy rate (percent)	N/A	27.9%	N/A	14.8%	N/A	-47.0%
<b>HOUSING TENURE</b>						
Occupied housing units	2,068	100.0%	2,317	100.0%	249	12.0%
Owner-occupied housing units	1,255	60.7%	1,457	62.9%	202	16.1%
Renter-occupied housing units	813	39.3%	860	37.1%	47	5.8%
<b>VACANCY STATUS</b>						
Vacant housing units	1,167	100.0%	1,241	100.0%	74	6.3%
For rent	314	26.9%	149	12.0%	-165	-52.5%
For sale only	64	5.5%	28	2.3%	-36	-56.3%
Rented or sold, not occupied	71	6.1%	23	1.9%	-48	-67.6%
For seasonal, recreational of occasional use	632	54.2%	947	76.3%	315	49.8%
For migrant workers	0	0.0%	10	0.8%	10	N/A
Other Vacant	86	7.4%	84	6.8%	-2	-2.3%

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000.*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

The Borough's rental vacancy rate in 2000 stood at 14.8 percent, a decrease from the 1990 vacancy rate of 27.9 percent. Homeowner vacancy rates also decreased markedly from 1990 to 2000, declining from 4.9 percent to 1.9 percent.

Table 11 indicates that the 2000 median value of the owner-occupied housing units in Point Pleasant Beach was \$223,600. This was significantly higher than both the County and State median values of \$131,300 and \$170,800, respectively. Point Pleasant Beach's median contract rent of \$777 per month was also higher than that Statewide (\$672) but slightly lower than that of Ocean County (\$819).

**TABLE 11**  
**HOUSING VALUES 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH, OCEAN COUNTY & NEW JERSEY**

Value Range: Owner Occupied Units	Point Pleasant Beach		Ocean County		New Jersey	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
\$0 - \$50,000	0	0.0%	4,743	3.1%	30,058	1.8%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	9	0.7%	37,435	24.6%	229,354	13.5%
\$100,000 - \$149,000	134	10.5%	54,265	35.7%	415,190	24.4%
\$150,000 - \$199,000	364	28.6%	30,397	20.0%	379,890	22.3%
\$200,000 - \$299,999	467	36.7%	17,342	11.4%	354,359	20.8%
\$300,000 - \$499,999	245	19.2%	6,009	4.0%	213,099	12.5%
\$500,000 and up	54	4.2%	1,920	1.3%	79,782	4.7%
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,273</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>152,111</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,701,732</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Median Value: Owner Occupied Units</b>	<b>\$223,600</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$131,300</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$170,800</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Gross Rent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$200	8	0.9%	920	2.8%	49,700	4.7%
\$200-\$499	55	6.4%	2,849	8.5%	123,265	11.7%
\$500-\$749	274	32.1%	8,278	24.8%	333,465	31.8%
\$750-\$999	267	31.3%	10,809	32.3%	314,000	29.9%
\$1000-\$1499	145	17.0%	6,706	20.1%	149,173	14.2%
\$1,500 and up	8	0.9%	1,388	4.2%	45,726	4.4%
No Cash Rent	97	11.4%	2,479	7.4%	33,798	3.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>854</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>33,429</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,049,127</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Median Gross Rent</b>	<b>\$777</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$819</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$751</b>	<b>N/A</b>

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 1990 & 2000.*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

As shown in Table 12, the housing stock in Point Pleasant Beach is in sound condition and had only a very limited number of substandard units at the time of the 2000 U.S. Census, which indicates that the Borough had just 17 units (0.5 percent) lacking complete plumbing facilities and only 33 units (0.9 percent) lacking complete kitchen facilities. In addition only 48 of the Borough's housing units (2.1 percent) exhibited overcrowded conditions (1.01 persons or more per room).

**TABLE 12**  
**INDICATORS OF HOUSING CONDITIONS, 2000**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT**  
**BEACH**

	Number	Percent
Total housing units:	3,558	100.0%
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	17	0.5%
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	33	0.9%
Occupied housing units:	2,317	100.0%
No telephone service	53	2.3%
Occupants per room:		
1.00 or less	2,269	97.9%
1.01-1.50	18	0.8%
1.51 or more	30	1.3%

*SOURCE: US Bureau of Census 2000.*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

## **DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS**

Attachment A illustrates existing land use development patterns within the Borough. The Borough is essentially a fully developed community. Land uses consist primarily of single family residences with commercial areas located along Arnold Avenue, Route 35, Broadway Avenue, and the Beach area. It is important to note that Attachment A is generally representative of existing land use conditions and is provided for informational purposes. It is not intended to be the land use planning policy map for the Borough. Attachment A was prepared based on a Statewide GIS data Modification 4 (MOD4) tax records. No detailed field investigation was conducted except for along the Broadway Avenue Corridor and several small areas pointed out during the Master Plan Reexamination Report review process. The New Jersey Division of Taxation is replacing the MOD4 with PAMS (Property Administration Management System) later this year. Once the PAMS data is available, the Borough may wish to consider updating the Existing Land Use Map at that time.

A review of building permits issued from 1996 through 2006 shows that the preponderant growth pattern in Point Pleasant Beach has been single-family residential, with activity remaining relatively low during this time. At the end of the construction process, construction officials issue certificates of occupancy when buildings are complete and ready for occupancy. Table 13 documents the building permit trends for the last 26 years. Since, the 2000 Census, there have been 103 permits issued- all for single-family residences. Table 14 identifies the certificates of occupancy issued between 1996 and 2006.

**TABLE 13**  
**BUILDING PERMITS FOR NEW, PRIVATELY OWNED RESIDENTIAL UNITS:**  
**1980 – 2006**

YEAR	TOTAL PERMITS	SINGLE FAMILY	TWO FAMILY	3 TO 4 FAMILY	5 OR MORE FAMILY
1980	9	9	0	0	0
1981	35	23	0	0	12
1982	18	6	0	0	12
1983	29	13	4	0	12
1984	15	13	2	0	0
1985	43	15	2	0	26
1986	30	12	0	0	18
1987	34	32	2	0	0
1988	4	4	0	0	0
1989	11	11	0	0	0
1990	3	3	0	0	0
1991	9	9	0	0	0
1992	6	6	0	0	0
1993	8	8	0	0	0
1994	11	11	0	0	0
1995	21	21	0	0	0
1996	13	13	0	0	0
1997	24	24	0	0	0
1998	15	15	0	0	0
1999	13	13	0	0	0
2000	4	4	0	0	0
2001	27	27	0	0	0
2002	11	11	0	0	0
2003	11	11	0	0	0
2004	14	14	0	0	0
2005	17	17	0	0	0
2006	19	19	0	0	0
Totals:	454	364	10	0	80

*SOURCES: NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, DIVISION OF LABOR PLANNING AND ANALYSIS: "New Privately Owned Residential Housing Units Authorized To Be Built"; YEARLY SUMMARIES 1980-2005; 2006 YEAR TO DATE SUMMARY*

*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

**TABLE 14**  
**HOUSING UNITS: 1996 – 2006**

YEAR	HOUSING UNITS
1996	17
1997	21
1998	24
1999	19
2000	7
2001	18
2002	7
2003	6
2004	6
2005	6
2006	10
Totals:	141

*SOURCE: US Bureau of New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Division of Codes and Standards, Certificates of Occupancy.*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

**POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

Although Point Pleasant Beach is, essentially, a built-out community, it is projected by the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) that the Borough’s population will increase by 19.9 percent in the period from 2005 through 2030, which is less than the 33.6 percent increase that is projected for Ocean County. This population increase would likely be the result of limited infill development, increased occupancy rates, and various redevelopment activities. Table 14 shows the NJTPA’s population projections for the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach and Ocean County.

**TABLE 15**  
**POPULATION PROJECTIONS, 2005 THROUGH 2025**  
**BOROUGH OF POINT PLEASANT BEACH AND OCEAN COUNTY**

	Point Pleasant Beach		Ocean County	
	Population	% Change	Population	% Change
2005	5,370	N/A	553,500	N/A
2010	5,440	1.3%	579,500	4.7%
2015	5,640	3.7%	610,400	5.3%
2020	5,980	6.0%	651,000	6.7%
2025	6,440	7.7%	697,200	7.1%
2030	6,440	0.0%	739,300	6.0%
Total Population Change	1,070	19.9%	185,800	33.6%

*SOURCE: North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority*  
*COMPILED BY: T&M ASSOCIATES*

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Population projections should only be utilized only as general guides. They may not be accurate in every case. As such, the actual growth should be periodically monitored in order to determine the rate of change within the Borough. Various indices can be monitored for this purpose. These include: birth and death records; building and demolitions permits; school enrollment figures; and, County, State and Federal population estimates. The latter estimates are being developed jointly on the basis of a variety of component data, such as adjusted birth rates, institutional residents, sample surveys, vehicle registration, building permits, and other data.

### **THE EXTENT TO WHICH SUCH PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN REDUCED OR HAVE INCREASED**

Based on the review of the 1999 Master Plan Reexamination Report and the Committee's Final Report from 2005, the Borough continues to perform admirably in evaluating its master plan and development regulations. Recent demographics and the fact that the Borough is substantially built out; limits anticipated future problems due to growth.

### **EXTENT TO WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN ASSUMPTIONS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES**

The policies of the 1999 Reexamination Report are still valid with the exceptions noted in the Major Problems and Objectives in 1999 and the Extent to Which Problems and Objectives have been reduced or have increased section of this Plan.

The Borough continues to implement strategies of the 1999 Plan. In order to further achieve the goals of Smart Growth and compact mixed use development, the Planning Board recommends that sections of the Master Plan emphasize the flexibility to permit mixed-used development, encourage shared parking options, and traffic calming to manage access and lessen the amount of speeding traffic.

In light of these directives, the Planning Board encourages the Borough to move forward with the Bicycle/pedestrian Local Transportation study with the NJDOT, continue the efforts to develop the gateway design from Route 35 to Ocean Avenue along Broadway and Channel Drive, and

investigate parking arrangements needed to curtail congestion especially during the summer season.

Furthermore, in recent years, problems associated with the large number of day-trippers have increased demand on municipal services. Traffic on local roadways and lack of parking are worsening and are beginning to affect resident's quality of life. While there is no clear short-term solution to this problem, the Borough should consistently monitor improvements needed to maintain and improve the quality of life for year-round residents.

## **1. LAND USE PLAN ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT (1999 - 2007)**

**Housing-** Based on the demographic data contained in this reassessment it is likely that between 2005 and 2030, the Borough population will increase by about 1,070 residents which translates into approximately 470 living units at the current household size. A more detailed analysis of household growth is currently being undertaken by the Borough's housing consultant.

Most of the new residential is single family, and problems may occur when the units are rented out during the summer months with several people sharing the facility or when summer visitors come to visit family relatives and friends on the weekend.

**Parking-** From October to the middle of May, residents and businesses have ample available parking. There is adequate on-street and off-street parking in each zoning district to provide for most activities to satisfy the residents, employees, and most customers. However, there is an extreme shortage of parking during the summer months (June through September) especially when schools are out and on the weekends from May through October. This parking shortfall is most critical along the oceanfront by the amusement area and the existing parking areas that access that area. There are also parking shortfalls along Arnold Avenue during the peak season. Generally, day trippers extend hours of traffic congestion and create a severe shortage of parking. The Borough has applied to the New Jersey Office of Smart Growth for a grant to study and develop solutions to this situation. The existing infrastructure of the Borough is unable to handle the current parking demand.

The proposed parking study will determine the extent of the critical need, and how best to address this need.

### **Character/Design**

Point Pleasant Beach is a relatively small beachfront community that contains a mixture of housing types, but it is predominately a single-family home community. The evaluation of the range of housing types and the sizes of facilities indicates a desire to permit multi-family housing and mixed use development in certain areas to encourage commercial and residential in the same building. In existing established single-family residential neighborhoods, this Plan encourages policies that retain community character.

The majority of the housing stock in the Borough was constructed prior to 1959. A typical housing unit in the Borough contains four, five or six rooms. Often these homes are improved or replaced with larger homes that have four or more bedrooms. Often, housing improvements are out of character with established neighborhoods. The Borough should consistently monitor its bulk requirements to encourage reasonable improvements to homes that do not alter the character of the community. Consideration should be given to incorporating additional design standards to encourage this practice. It is also envisioned that the Planning Board will encourage compatible design during the review of developments that require variance relief.

### **Changes in State or Federal Laws, Regulations, and Plans impacting the Master Plan**

#### **Housing**

Since the last reexamination the State adopted the 3<sup>rd</sup> Round Rules to regulate and monitor incoming housing in the State of New Jersey. Based on a recent court decision, several criteria and conditions in the new rules were overturned and the Council on Affordable Housing was given six months to develop a new set of rules. The Borough should monitor the status of the proposed rule changes.

#### **Residential Site Improvement Standards**

The NJDCA Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) sets forth the standards for residential development. Residential applications before the Borough must conform to the standards or apply for exemptions or waivers to the standards based on special conditions. The latest regulation can be found at N.J.A.C. 5:21- 1.1 et seq. effective on February 6, 2006. The Site Improvement Advisory Board provides a mechanism to hear calls for modifications or make changes to the RSIS. It should be noted that residential stormwater management is addressed in the RSIS in Chapter 7 at N.J.A.C. 5:21-7.1 et seq.

#### **Municipal Stormwater Management**

Under the Municipal Land Use Law Section 40:55D-93, every municipality shall prepare a storm water management plan and a storm water control ordinance or ordinances to implement the plan. The Borough adopted a Stormwater Management Plan in accordance with New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection requirements. As required by the Municipal Land Use

Law, the Stormwater Management Plan shall be reexamined at each reexamination of the Master Plan. Point Pleasant Beach Borough first adopted a stormwater ordinance on May 9, 2005 and revised it on October 17, 2006. The plan was filed with Ocean County and has been recognized as a complete plan. The County requested additional information, which was submitted by the Borough engineer to the Ocean County Planning Board on February 28, 2007. The County is currently reviewing this submission. Upon final review by the County a letter of acceptance will be issued to the Borough.

### **Open Space and Recreation Plan**

Point Pleasant Beach Borough has recently adopted an Open Space and Recreation Plan and approved a municipal Open Space tax. It is anticipated that these monies will be utilized to match NJDEP Green Acres funds to preserve and acquire municipal open space and recreational lands. The Recreation Plan identified a shortfall in open space and recreation areas in the Borough. Under the Balanced Land Use Standard, Point Pleasant Beach Borough has an Open Space need of 25.83 acres and provides 16.52 acres. Therefore, a shortfall of 9.31 acres exists. The adopted Open Space and Recreation Plan identifies parcels appropriate for acquisition. A key objective of the Open Space Plan is to preserve key viewsheds and character of the Borough.

Adjustments were made to identify municipal listing of protected open space and recreation properties to exclude active recreation fields on Board of Education properties. The Green Acres listing of preserved municipally owned recreation and open space properties is called a Recreation and Open Space Inventory or ROSI. To be included within a ROSI, a property must be municipally owned. Since Board of Education properties are not municipally owned, these properties were eliminated from the Borough's ROSI.

This Reexamination Report encourages the implementation of the recently adopted Open Space and Recreation Plan.

### **Point Pleasant Beach Zoning Board of Adjustment Annual Reports**

The annual reports of the Zoning Board of Adjustment from 2001 to 2005 were examined as part of this Master Plan Reexamination Report. The Planning Board evaluated the trends or recurring patterns of variance relief granted by the Zoning Board to determine whether or not they need to

be addressed by changes or clarifications to the Master Plan or revisions to the Zoning Ordinance. The majority of variances requested were for type “c” bulk variances, i.e., side yard setback, building coverage. This is an indication that there is no need to substantially change the zone plan of the Borough beyond those changes recommended previously in this report. A summary of the primary concerns and recommendations raised by the Zoning Board and the Planning Board’s responses follow:

1. Include FAR (Floor Area Ratios) in the development ordinance. These would be helpful in protecting the size and intensity of development within any zone. This would give the Planning Board and Zoning Board a more recognizable standard to evaluate the intensity of development for applications that come before the Board. *(This recommendation was made uniformly in all five annual reports and resolutions from March 21, 2002 to the April 20, 2006. The Planning Board recommends that the Borough fully evaluate this option by directing the Borough Planner to prepare a report and recommendations concerning appropriate FAR standards in either commercial or residential zones. However, the Board does not want to penalize any existing property owners by making a significant amount of existing properties non-conforming.)*
2. Amend the Borough’s development checklist to require that a Professional Engineer, Surveyor or Architect stipulate the exact building coverage or impervious building coverage as part of any application submission. *(This recommendation was in the 2002 Report. The Planning Board agrees with this recommendation.)*
3. Establish a technique for applicant’s to demonstrate that “garage” and “attic space” meets ordinance requirements to the Borough’s Code Enforcement Officer. *(This recommendation also was in the 2002 Report. The Planning Board recommends that the Borough seek professional advice and the input from the Borough’s Code Enforcement Officer in developing the appropriate criteria to include in the definitions as needed to facilitate the Code Enforcement Officer’s decisions on these matters.)*

### **Review of Zoning in Adjoining Municipalities**

The New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) requires that the Borough evaluate the relationship of its Master Plan to the plans of adjacent communities, the Ocean County Plan, the State Development and Redevelopment Plan, and the appropriate Solid Waste Management Plan.

The policy of the Borough is to work cooperatively with neighboring communities, the County, and the State to advance sound planning and develop compatible plans.

Point Pleasant Beach Borough adjoins three other Shore municipalities. Manasquan is located across the Manasquan River in Monmouth County to the north, and Point Pleasant Borough and Bay Head Borough adjoin the Borough to the south and west in Ocean County.

The Manasquan River provides a separation from the municipality of Manasquan to the Borough of Point Pleasant Beach. Along the Manasquan River, each community is zoned for marine commercial uses. Accordingly, there is no land use conflict. On the western boundary of Point Pleasant Beach Borough is Point Pleasant Borough. The two municipalities have similar characteristics and land uses as one transitions from one municipality to the other.

This includes small commercial uses along Arnold Avenue characteristic of a business district and residential uses adjacent to the business district. The character and design is similar in human scale and design in both communities.

At the southern end of the Borough is the boundary with Bay Head Borough that also has a similar land use characteristics as Point Pleasant Beach. The existing zone plan, character and design are similar in both adjacent communities.

### **State Development and Redevelopment Plan**

The New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) was most recently adopted on March 1, 2001. It contains goals, objectives, and policies to guide the development and redevelopment of New Jersey. Proposed changes to the SDRP was released for cross acceptance in 2004 with the continued primary objective to guide development to areas where infrastructure

is available or can be readily extended such as along existing transportation corridors, in developed or developing suburbs, and in urban areas. The SDRP encourages new growth in “centers” which are “compact” forms of development, rather than in “sprawl” development. The SDRP characterizes Point Pleasant Beach Borough as within the Suburban Planning Area (PA-2). According to the Ocean County Cross Acceptance Report (January 2005), the entire Borough is located in a designated Coastal Center regulated by the Coastal Area Facilities Review Act (CAFRA). The elimination of a coastal center designation greatly hampers the potential infill development that in the Borough. Utilizing the NJDEP land use/land criteria will diminish future impervious surface limits from 70 to 80 percent to 30 percent in the PA-2. Accordingly, the Borough needs to develop a plan endorsement or Coastal Center designation application in order to maintain consistency of the municipal ordinance for cases that would require a CAFRA permit. The Borough is primary built-out with limited unimproved sites that are available for development. It is anticipated that the majority of new development will result in the redevelopment of existing properties. To ensure compatibility in density and design, this Plan encourages planning and policies that retain existing impervious surface requirements associated with coastal centers.

### **Ocean County**

According to the Ocean County Department of Planning, the Borough may have up to 174 acres of vacant land in 2004; however there is no statement to the amount of developable land. It is important that the County recognizes in its planning documents the limited amount of developable vacant land in the community so that future growth potential in the Borough is not over projected by state and county agencies.

### **Recycling**

Point Pleasant Beach Borough has an active recycling program in compliance with the Ocean County’s Plan and State requirements. According to the Ocean County Department of Solid Waste Management, the Borough recycled 55.86% of total materials for 2005. Sanitation services are provided twice a week throughout the year, and during the Summer – the oceanfront, center, and hotels receive service seven days a week. The recycling drop-off center is located at 301 Cooks Lane. The Borough has a bulk and white good pick-up four times a year, and hosts a hazardous waste disposal day for Ocean County in October at the Municipal Parking Lot at Arnold and Ocean. The State has suggested that municipalities may want to recycle

commercially-generated cooking grease because it is extremely hard on sewer and septic systems. The County is considering changing to a single stream paper recycling program that could simplify the various collections of paper goods. The Borough in conjunction with the Environmental Commission has adequate means to maintain and foster quality of life enhancements for the community.

### **Recommended Changes in the Borough's Master Plan, Development Regulations and Zone Plan**

The Borough's current zone plan is shown on Attachment B. The recommended changes to the Borough's Master Plan, development ordinances and zone plan are presented in the context of the Borough's other comprehensive planning efforts, including the update of the its Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, the analysis of its downtown and central business district, the Smart Future Planning Study of the Broadway and Ocean Avenue corridors, the Open Space and Recreation Plan, and a view towards achieving a sustainable future. They are as follows:

1. Revise the zoning ordinance and zoning map to incorporate the land use changes as described in the prior sections of this report and depicted on Attachment C, Proposed Zoning Changes and Land Use Map. Collectively, these constitute the amendments to the Land Use Plan Element of the Borough's Master Plan.
2. Evaluate the appropriateness of establishing FAR (floor area ratio) standards in the Borough.
3. Develop a form based code that uses graphics to clearly illustrate ordinance requirements to ease the interpretation of complex regulations. This will facilitate and regulate design practices in the Borough.
4. Evaluate stormwater management planning and mitigation measures to stays current with the latest technologies and best management practices.
5. Revise the zoning ordinance as appropriate to incorporate land use and design concepts along the Broadway Avenue and Channel Drive Corridor in accordance with the Broadway Avenue Plan currently being prepared by the Borough.

6. Prepare the applications for plan endorsement or Coastal Center designation that effectively maintain the permitted impervious lot coverage standards as contained in the Local Development Ordinance.
  
7. Closely work with State and County agencies, and adjacent municipalities to foster cooperative and collaborative planned growth that sustains and improves the quality of life in the Borough.

### **Redevelopment Areas**

The Borough does not contain any areas determined in accordance with the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law (LRHL) to be considered as an area in need of redevelopment. At this time, the Planning Board does not recommend any areas of the Borough to be investigated for this purpose.