

**MINUTES**  
**RED BANK PLANNING BOARD**  
**January 14, 2025**

The Red Bank Planning Board held a public meeting on January 14, 2025, at 7 PM in the Municipal Building, first floor, Council Chambers, 90 Monmouth Street, Red Bank, New Jersey.

Chair Daniel Mancuso called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM. A roll call showed the following members were in attendance:

Mayor Portman	Absent	Megan Massey	Present
		Louis DiMento	Absent
Dan Mancuso	Absent	Kristina Bonatakis	Present
Shawna Ebanks	Present	Barbara Boas	Present
Frederick Stone	Present	Wilson Beebe	Absent
Itzel Hernandez	Present	Brian Parnagain	Present

Also present were Marc Leckstein Esq., Board Attorney and Jacqueline Dirmann, P.E., Board Engineer.

Acting Chair Fredrick Stone read the Open Public Meeting Statement Act. In addition, an adequate and electronic notice of time, place, and matter was posted in two newspapers, the Borough Clerk's Office, the Borough's website, outside the council chambers, and on the front door of Borough Hall.

**Oaths to Office:**

Marc Leckstein read the Oath of Office and swore in the following members to the Planning Board:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
Shawna Ebanks	2026
Barbara Boas	2029
Brian Parnagian	2027

**Reorganization of the Board:**

Members of the Board announced nominations for the following positions:

**1) Chairperson:**

Motion: Nomination for Dan Mancuso as Chairperson  
Moved By: Itzel Hernandez  
Seconded By: Barbara Boas  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.

Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**2) Vice Chair:**

Motion: Nomination for Barbara Boas for Vice-Chair  
Moved By: Shawna Ebanks  
Seconded By: Itzel Hernandez  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**3) Board Secretary:**

Motion: Nomination for Shawna Ebanks as Board Secretary  
Moved By: Kristina Bonatakis  
Seconded By: Fred Stone  
Ayes: Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**4) Board Attorney:**

Motion: Nomination for Marc Leckstein, Esq. as Board Attorney  
Moved By: Kristina Bonatakis  
Seconded By: Shawna Ebanks  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**5) Board Engineer:**

Motion: Nomination for T &M Associates as Board Engineer  
Moved By: Shawna Ebanks  
Seconded By: Barbara Boas  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**6) Official Newspapers:**

Motion: Nomination for Asbury Park Press and Two River Times as the Board's newspapers.  
Moved By: Fred Stone

Seconded By: Barbara Boas  
Ayes: All in favor  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**7) Conflict Board Professional**

Motion: Nomination for Kevin Kennedy as Conflict Board Attorney.  
Moved By: Shawna Ebanks  
Seconded By: Barbaras Boas  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**8) Conflict Board Professional**

Motion: Nomination CME as Conflict Board Engineer.  
Moved By: Shawna Ebanks  
Seconded By: Barbara Boas  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**9) 2026 Board Meeting Calendar**

Motion: Approve the 2026 meeting dates as presented.  
Moved By: Shawna Ebanks  
Seconded By: Fred Stone  
Ayes: All in favor  
Nays: None  
Abstain: None

**Regular Meeting Minutes: December 10, 2025**

Motion: Approved as presented  
Moved by: Kristina Bonatakis  
Seconded by: Barbara Boas  
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Brian Parnagain  
Nays: None  
Abstained: Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone, Megan Massey

**Resolution of Approval: P15852: 1 Riverview Plaza; Block 9, Lot 33.01**

Motion: Approved as presented  
Moved by: Kristina Bonatakis

Seconded by: Brian Parnagain

Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Brian Parnagain

Nays: None

Abstained: None

**Master Plan Consistency Review:**

Find that Block 39, Lot 30 meets the criteria for an Area in Need of Rehabilitation and Proposed Council Resolution: Designation of Block 39, Lot 30 as an Area in Need of Rehabilitation

Motion: Approved as presented

Moved by: Shawna Ebanks

Seconded by: Kristina Bonatakis

Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.

Nays: None

Abstained: None

**Ordinance Referrals – Master Plan Consistency Review:**

Ordinance Amending and Supplementing Chapter 490, Planning and Development Regulation Relating to Section 55 Historic Districts/Sites Regulation and Procedures, Adding “Attachment 7” Historic Preservation Design Guidelines

A motion was made by Barbara Boas and Shawna Ebanks seconded to refer the ordinance to Mayor and Council.

Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.

Nays: None

Abstained: None

**Z15934:183 Drs James Parker Boulevard; Block 90, Lot 12.01**

Edward McKenna, Esq., represented the applicant, 183 Drs James Parker Blvd, LLC.

The following witnesses were sworn in for the presentation:

Edward O’Neil, Jr., P.P, R.A - O’Neill Architecture + Planning LLC

A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E – Two River Engineering

Exhibits A-1 to A-9 were marked and presented:

A-1 Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for 183 Drs James Parker Blvd, LLC prepared by A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, dated July 1, 2025, last revised October 20, 2025, consisting of fifteen (15) sheets

A-2 Minor Subdivision Plat for 183 Drs James Parker Blvd, LLC prepared by A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, and David J. Von Steenburg, P.L.S., of Morgan Engineering & Surveying, dated March 1, 2025, consisting of one (1) sheet.

A-3 Architectural Plans prepared by Edward W. O’Neil, Jr. R.A. of O’Neill Architecture + Planning LLC, dated August 11, 2025, last revised September 26, 2025, consisting of four (4) sheets.

A-4 Stormwater Management Report prepared by A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, dated October 1, 2024

A-5 Photos of the Site

A-6 Aerial of Subject Property Outline

A-7 Color Coded Use Diagram

A-8 Sanborn Tax Map 1923

A-9 Color Enhanced Landscape Plan

B-1 T&M Engineering Review Letter dated January 2, 2026

Mr. McKenna explained that the applicant is proposing to subdivide the property and develop two detached two-family dwellings, along with parking, drainage, landscaping, lighting, and additional improvements. The property is a unique piece of land located right next to the Coffee Corral and between the Coffee Corral and the Red Bend Housing Authority on James Parker Boulevard. It is a deep property that is 75 feet wide. There is an existing structure that is located in the rear of the property.

The proposed development creates a flag lot which serves as the driveway for the two two-family dwellings. It is the best way to access the entire piece of property, allow each of the two family homes to be developed, provide as much green area as possible, and provide adequate parking.

The applicant checked with the Red Bank Housing Authority to see if they could utilize their property during construction.

Edward O'Neil provided professional testimony on planning and architecture. He explained that the site comprises two existing lots with frontage on Drs James Parker Boulevard. It is 0.052 acres, which is 22,500 square feet. The lots are in the RD zone that allows two-family houses, and there was a potential to construct a six-unit development.

Marc Leckstein asked whether an association would be created to manage the property. Mr. McKenna replied that there will be a cross-agreement for the management of the property. Two parties will enter into an agreement and pay into a fund to maintain the property, including landscaping, snow plowing, etc.

Mr. Leckstein followed up by asking whether the applicant considered a condominium for the four units, and Mr. McKenna replied that the applicant will consider the option; however, they hope for rental units instead of ownership. The applicant will remain the owner of both lots. He said that it was discussed, and if the Board prefers the option of a homeowner association, they have no opposition to creating one for the development.

Megan Massey asked if there was any discussion about developing a fourplex instead of two separate buildings. Mr. O'Neil responded that the applicant felt as though the detached units were more prevalent in the neighborhood. Ms. Massey had concerns about the amount of asphalt being installed on the site. The neighborhood is prone to flooding, and the asphalt may exacerbate it.

Mr. O'Neil presented a Sanborn Map depicting two structures on the proposed lots in the 1920s, indicating a history of two detached structures with a shared common garage. The proposed development is not different from what existed previously. The only difference is that the back building turns 90 degrees because it better uses the area.

The creation of the flag lot or access easement allows access to the back building. The driveway will be 250 feet long.

The subdivision allows the two buildings to be rearranged front-to-back on separate lots, with substantial landscaping between the parking areas. Parking areas are used instead of garages to limit lot coverage to ordinance requirements, enabling the provision of eight parking spaces. Landscaping reduces the heat island effect and supports sustainability.

Because of the back building's orientation, a bulk variance was required for the combined side-yard setback. The reason for this orientation is that it allows for greater spacing between structures on adjacent lots, so the development doesn't negatively impact the neighborhoods. Therefore, the side yard variance is justified because it allows the proposed development to be at a similar distance from the surrounding houses.

Each unit will be 1,650 square feet with three bedrooms. There will be a partially finished attic, which will not be used as a bedroom, and no bathroom will be located there. The attic is 170 square feet. So the total house square feet is 1,800 square feet. There will also be a belvedere installed to provide additional lighting in the units.

The basement will not be finished, but it does have a bathroom. The bathroom will have an ejector pump.

The rear decks will be 10 feet by 11 feet. There will be two staircases to maintain the landscaping units. The trash receptacles and condenser units will also be located there. The condensers will be screened by a decorative fence.

Jacqueline Dirmann asked whether the condensers' location creates a variance, and Mr. O'Neil replied that it does not.

Ms. Massey asked about garbage pickup and how it would be handled. Mr. O'Neil replied that the tenants will be responsible for bringing them to the curb.

Mr. Leckstein asked where the trash cans would be kept, and Mr. O'Neil pointed out that they would be by the deck.

The building materials will include a dimensional asphalt roof and metal highlight roofs on some of the box windows. The siding will be fiber cement in a horizontal lap. The roof will be gabled. The building's color is still to be determined.

Shawna Ebanks asked if the siding style is common to what can be found on Shrewsbury Avenue, and Mr. O'Neil responded that it is.

Mr. O'Neil continued that the house is 25 ft 6 inches high, which meets the ordinance.

Mr. O'Neil explained that, since the use is permitted in the zone, the applicant needs only prove the negative and positive criteria. The positive criteria are that the project meets the zoning goals

for appropriate use, population density, and appropriateness relative to context and use. The proposed use is residential rather than some permitted nonresidential uses, and it improves the visual environment. The development's orientation allows it to blend into the neighborhood.

There is a side-yard setback variance; however, the applicant wanted a setback similar to the other houses. There are areas of town where you can petition to have the setback of the average surrounding properties reduced.

The project promotes smart growth, allowing for a high-quality residential lifestyle, as the property is close to multiple transportation options.

As for the negative criteria, the development is less dense than permitted by the ordinance. The neighboring properties are not significantly affected by the site's development. There are similar setbacks for other existing two-family houses.

The Coffee Corral property was approved for a shopping center with a parking lot adjacent to the subject property, and the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the potential shopping center.

Mr. Leckstein asked to clarify whether the applicant could build an as-of-right site plan with six units with no variances. Mr. O'Neil responded that when they originally planned the townhouse site, they believed that would be the case.

Megan Massey had concerns about the parking lot in the middle. She questioned the required number of parking spaces and whether the applicant needed eight spaces. She mentioned that the RSIS was changed to no longer require a minimum number of parking spaces, but a maximum of two spaces, based on the use. This would mean the applicant would not need eight spaces.

Mr. Leckstein asked the Board Engineer for clarification on whether the applicant is required to have eight parking spaces under the new RSIS standards.

Ms. Dirmann clarified that RSIS was amended in 2023 to allow applicants to meet the maximum parking requirement instead of the minimum. The applicant would need to justify to the land use board that they do not need to meet the minimum parking spaces. The applicant must meet three criteria. *RSIS 5:21-4.14 Parking specifies the maximum number of parking spaces planning boards and other local reviewers shall require, maximum. The number of parking spaces is determined by the number, size, and type of the dwelling. Reviewers may allow fewer parking spaces when warranted. Factors that may affect parking include the following:*

1. *household characteristics.*
2. *access to mass transit.*
3. *geographic location.*
4. *off-site parking resources.*

*Approvals with fewer parking spaces shall be exempt from the de minimis exception process. The notice's requirements shall not apply to approvals with fewer parking spaces.*

Ms. Massey commented that Red Bank is designated as a town center, and that the required two parking spaces per unit is a suburban-type parking standard. The applicant would have an argument, and the applicant can testify to the need to reduce the number of parking spaces.

Mr. O'Neil confirmed that the applicant would agree to reducing the number of parking spaces.

Brian Parnagain asked if the applicant was maxed out on unit square footage or lot coverage? Could the unit size be increased with a reduction in the parking area? Mr. O'Neil was unsure, but they did not believe so.

Mr. Parnagain stated that the existing site plan has extensive paving. He questioned whether there was landscape buffering around the site. Mr. O'Neil replied that there are landscape buffers around the site, street trees in the front, and that the existing tree will remain.

Mr. Parnagain had concerns about the orientation of the front building and how it would look from the public right-of-way, noting that the deck, trash enclosures, and condensers would be visible from the side yard against the Coffee Coral property. Mr. O'Neil responded that, since the adjacent property will not be developed for residential use and there may be a shopping center with a parking lot, the location of the deck, trash enclosures, and condensers would not negatively impact the property.

Mr. Leckstein asked the Board to specify to the applicant how many parking spaces they would approve for the site. The Board agreed that 4-6 off-street parking spaces would be acceptable. One space per unit.

Ms. Massey asked if there was any potential for the Housing Authority to share parking spaces with the unit. Mr. McKenna was unsure if that was a possibility. They do not have the flexibility because they are subject to federal regulations governing how the site can operate.

Ms. Ebanks added that the Board should consider the limited on-street parking during Coffee Coral's peak hours. Also, the Housing Authority asked for the elimination of one parking space to improve exiting from their property, and the Thrive development is deficient in parking and would also rely on on-street parking.

There was no public in the audience to comment on the application.

A.J. Garito provided engineering testimony about the site layout. He testified that the entire property drains northerly towards Drs. James Parker Boulevard. The property is only half an acre in area, but an extensive drainage system has been provided. There is no public sewer out on Drs. James Parker Boulevard, so they plan to install a series of 12-inch ADS pipes throughout the property to collect all water on the site and feed it into two underground detention areas. There will be two storm arch chambers and a stone trench to provide infiltration. Outflows from the infiltration will come down towards Drs. James Parker Boulevard. The applicant is also proposing a bubble basin on Drs. James Boulevard. So, for most storms, no water will leave the site; it will be infiltrated back into the ground. If there is a 100-year storm, a small amount of water may flow out of the proposed bubble basin and then flow down Drs. James Parler Boulevard toward Leighton Avenue is the direction the stormwater flows. The nearest stormwater sewer is a few blocks down Leighton Avenue, which is 100 feet from the property, which is why the applicant is not proposing a direct connection to an existing storm sewer system.

There were several soil borings throughout the property for the foundation and the drainage system. They did not hit any seasonal high-water table or groundwater levels, which is good because the infiltration basins are designed in accordance with the DEP stormwater management regulations. The bottom of the basins must be at least 2 feet above the seasonal high-water table, which limits the use of underground systems. They also found that the soil was very permeable, which is good for the property.

The proposed lighting will light the parking lot in accordance with Borough's standards.

All utilities will be coming from Drs. James Parker Boulevard.

There are gas and water that go back 280 feet to the existing house. There will likely be all-new utilities, as well as a sanitary main running along the side property line, to which both buildings will be connected.

A new concrete curb and apron are proposed for the driveway, and a new sidewalk along the front of the site. Any damage to the sidewalk or curb during construction will be fixed or replaced if required.

The applicant agrees to televise the line and to fix any issues that may arise during televising. This is to ensure the flow proceeds without problems through the sanitary system.

The applicant agrees to comply with the engineering review memo and make any revisions.

Ms. Dirmann asked that the applicant provide the soil test results prior to their next hearing so that she can verify whether the applicant's analysis is consistent with the proposed stormwater system.

Mr. Parnagain requested a front elevation of the building. The side profile of the building facing the street, and whether you can see the front entry. Mr. O'Neil identified the elevation on the submitted plans.

Ms. Ebanks asked if the windows are the same size on the side elevation facing the street. Mr. O'Neil said the windows were the same size.

Mr. Parnagain asked that the entry be given more attention, as it faces the street. There should be a modification to the entry to address the street more meaningfully.

Ms. Dirmann noted that the other side of the building should mirror the street-facing elevation.

Mr. Leckstein asked that the applicant return with renderings of the front elevation.

A motion was made by Shawna Ebanks and Itzel Hernandez, seconded to carry the applicant to another meeting date, February 11, 2026.

Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Itzel Hernandez, Fred Stone and Brian Parnagain.

Nays: None

Abstained: None

Shawna Ebanks motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Itzel Hernandez seconded.

Ayes: All in favor  
Nays: None  
Abstained: None

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shawna Ebanks  
Acting Board Secretary