

MINUTES
RED BANK PLANNING BOARD
February 11, 2026

The Red Bank Planning Board held a public meeting on February 11, 2026, at 7 PM in the Municipal Building, first floor, Council Chambers, 90 Monmouth Street, Red Bank, New Jersey.

Chair Dan Mancuso called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM. A roll call showed the following members were in attendance:

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

Marc Leckstein, Esq., Board Attorney; Jacqueline Dirmann, P.E., Board Engineer; Daniel Hauben, P.P., AICP, Professional Planner, and Shawna Ebanks, Acting Board Secretary, were also present.

Chair Mancuso 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.

Regular Meeting Minutes: January 28, 2026

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Shawna Ebanks
Seconded by: Wilson Beebe
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Louis DiMento, Megan Massey, Wilson Beebe, Frederick Stone, and Brian Parnagain.
Nays: None
Abstained: None

Resolution of Approval – P16237:170 Broad Street; Block 104, Lots 14 & 15

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Shawna Ebanks
Seconded by: Wilson Beebe
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Louis DiMento, Megan Massey, Wilson Beebe, Frederick Stone, and Brian Parnagain.
Nays: None
Abstained: Dan Mancuso

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

Applicant Exhibits A-10 to A-13 were marked and presented:

A-10: 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 January 19, 2026, consisting of sixteen (16) sheets.

A-11: Architectural Plans prepared by Edward W. O'Neil, Jr. R.A. of O'Neill Architecture + Planning LLC, dated August 11, 2025, last revised January 14, 2026, consisting of four (4) sheets.

A-12: Stormwater Management Report prepared by A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, dated July 1, 2025 last revised January 19, 2026.

A-13: Installation, Operations, & maintenance Manual prepared by by A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E., C.M.E., D.F.E., of Two River Engineering, dated January 19, 2026.

A-14 Colorized Version of the Site Plan, page 7.

Board Exhibits B-2 to B-3 were marked and presented:

B-2: T&M Engineering Second Review Letter dated February 6, 2026

B-3: Shade Tree Commission Comments

Mr. McKenna explained that, based on the board comments from the last hearing, substantial changes were made to the plans.

Edward O'Neil detailed that the fenestration patterns on the front building were changed, including making the windows on the ground floor match. The metal roof over the bay windows will also cover the porch.

The plans were revised to show the street trees.

The Belvedere on the roof allows for more passive solar lighting into the units.

The attic and basement will accommodate the option to finish the space later. There is a legal egress window and stairs to allow for occupancy of the space. The attic is a third of the second floor and is a half-story.

There is a make-ready bathroom space in the basement, but it will not be installed. The plumbing stubs will be present.

Dan Hauben asked the applicant to clarify the discrepancies between the zoning table for the engineering and architecture plans. Mr. O'Neil stated that the architecture plans have the correct information, and the engineering plans will be revised to match.

Mr. Hauben then asked what the intention was for installing the bathroom plumbing if they do not intend to finish the space. Mr. O'Neil stated that it was easier to install the plumbing stubs now, while construction is underway, than to install them after construction.

Mr. Hauben followed up by asking whether the space is not used for a bathroom, what other use it could be, and Mr. O'Neil responded that it could be used as storage space. Mr. Hauben stated that he usually discourages full bathrooms in basements so they cannot be used as separate units.

It was stated that the trees removed from the lot for construction have to be replaced with trees of the same caliber and size.

Brian Parnagain commented that he appreciates the revision to the side elevation facing the street to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Dan Mancuso asked how many bedrooms are upstairs, and Mr. O'Neil replied, "Three."

There was discussion about the basement bathroom and the potential to turn the space into an illegal unit. If the applicant does not intend to use the space for a bathroom, they should remove it from the plans. There should not be an option to use/install the fixtures later. The applicant then suggested installing a half bathroom instead of a full bathroom.

Marc Leckstein advised that the deed restriction will state that the attic cannot be occupied without the Planning Board's approval. The basement will be unfinished, with a half bathroom and an egress window, but no exterior stairs from the basement to the outside.

A.J. Garito presented the revisions to the site plan. The major change to the site plan is that the two parking lots, which had 4 parking stalls each, were eliminated. They were not efficient for lot coverage because there was one driveway with stalls on one side. The Board had suggested removing two parking spaces and providing only three spaces per unit, as the plans now show. Removing the extra parking stalls enabled three stalls off the main driveway, reducing lot coverage. The plans now provide more sidewalks.

For the first building, the rear deck will be split and elevated a few feet to provide space for garbage can storage, and a sidewalk will be provided to allow a path to bring the cans to the street. For the rear building, the garbage cans will be placed in the back between the two decks, and a sidewalk will lead to the driveway to bring the cans out to the street.

For the rear building, the a/c condensers will be on both sides. For the front building, they will be placed between the two decks and screened.

The two underground detention facilities were eliminated and consolidated into one detention facility located in the green space in the middle of the lot.

Shawna Ebanks commented that the Shade Tree Committee recommended that two street trees be required; however, since the applicant is proposing two crab apple trees near the sidewalk, they were sufficient for not planting the street trees. The sugar maple in the right-of-way should be protected during construction.

Louis DiMento questioned the number of trees that will be removed for construction. Mr. Garito replied that six trees will be removed and replaced with trees of the same caliper. The applicant must plant four trees to replace the 36-inch tree being removed. The revised landscaping plans show the correct number and placement of trees.

Wilson Beebe questioned whether the applicant is proposing any generators. Mr. O'Neil replied no.

Shawna Ebanks asked whether the units will be owned or rented. Mr. McKenna replied that the current owners would own them, but they would be sold later.

Mr. Leckstein asked for clarification on whether the applicant is asking for a subdivision. Mr. McKenna replied that they are requesting a subdivision with an easement for the driveway between the two properties.

Mr. Ebanks stated that if the new property owners would like to install generators, they should be placed next to the area for the a/c condensers, and that should be a condition of the approval.

Mr. Beebe commented that applicants should move away from using generators, as they are a nuisance, and encourage residents to use power walls instead.

Mr. Parnagain asked what the updated impervious coverage was relative to the previous coverage, and Mr. Garito replied: Lot 12.03 was 63% and is now 56%; Lot 12.04 was 67% and is now 57.9%.

Chair Mancuso asked whether a variance was required, and Mr. McKenna replied that it was.

Shawna Ebanks requested testimony on the subdivision's layout and boundaries. Mr. McKenna explained that there are two lots in place; however, the plan is to reconfigure them. The applicant proposes to create a flag lot by moving the property line to split the drive and place the rear building on its own lot. Shared access will be through the driveway. This is because the property is 300 feet deep and 75 feet wide.

Mr. Hauben commented that creating a flag lot is not ideal; however, in this instance, where two two-family properties will be created, the site is an appropriate location, especially if there is a suitable cross-access easement. The narrowness of the lot makes it difficult to do a typical design.

Jacqueline Dirmann asked for testimony on how the access easement and stormwater systems will be maintained. Who would be responsible for the maintenance? Mr. McKenna answered that the deed will require the new buyer to be responsible for maintenance.

Mr. Leckstein followed up by asking which lot would have the majority of the responsibility. Mr. McKenna stated that there will be an agreement, submitted by the Board Attorney and Engineer for review, that binds all parties to the maintenance of all four units. There will not be an HOA, but a cross-maintenance agreement in which both owners pay into a fund. The agreement should include the utilities, repairs, driveway access, trash, etc.

Mr. Beebe asked what the remedy would be if one of the property owners fell through on the agreement. Mr. Leckstein replied that the other homeowner would likely sue the defaulting homeowner.

Mr. Mancuso asked about snow removal responsibilities. Mr. Beebe suggested that one of the two owners would be the primary for property maintenance.

Mr. McKenna suggested that one of the property owners would have primary responsibility for property maintenance and would arrange with the other property owner to fund both lots. Mr. Leckstein suggested that the northern lot be designated as the designatee, since it is the dominant lot and would collect from the lower lot.

Chair Mancuso asked whether the driveway has raised blocks or is at grade, easy to plow, and the applicant replied that it is one surface.

Ms. Dirmann added that the agreement between the two owners must include instructions for maintaining the water and sewer mains. The rear lot sewer and water lines are connected in the existing plans. The Borough's DPU may require property owners to separate utility lines rather than use a common main. Ms. Dirmann recommends that, as a condition of approval, the two property utility mains must be separated.

In the agreement, it must state that the lower lot must remove the garbage cans in a timely manner and not leave them in front of the property for a prolonged period.

Should the owners of each dwelling decide to split the ownership rather than have two properties, the property must return to the Board for subdivision of the two two-family dwellings into single-family dwellings.

Mr. McKenna assured the Board that the deed restriction will state that the two-family dwellings must be sold together and can have a maximum of 2 owners.

There was one in the audience for public comments.

A motion was made by Megan Massey and Shawna Ebanks seconded to approve the application as present.

Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Louis DiMento, Barbara Boas, Megan Massey, Wilson Beebe, Frederick Stone, and Brian Parnagain.

Nays: None

Abstained: Dan Mancuso, Louis DiMento

Dan Mancuso motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Shawna Ebanks seconded.

Ayes: All in favor

Nays: None

Abstained: None

The meeting adjourned at 8:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Shawna Ebanks
Acting Board Secretary