

MINUTES
RED BANK ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
June 18, 2026

The Red Bank Zoning Board held a public meeting on Thursday, June 18, 2026, at 6:30 PM in the Municipal Building, first floor, Council Chambers, 90 Monmouth Street, Red Bank, New Jersey.

Chair Raymond Mass called the meeting to order at 6:35 PM. A roll call showed the following members were in attendance:

Anne Torre	Present	Paul Cagno	Absent
Raymond Mass	Present	Chris Havens	Present
Greg Fitzgerald	Absent	Dorothy Cerulo	Present
Johnathan Gilday	Present	Eugene Horowitz	Present
Anna Cruz	Present	Rebecca Flynn	-
Vincent Light	Present		

Also present were Kevin Kennedy, Esq., Board Attorney; Jacqueline Dirrman, P.E, Board Engineer; Daniel Hauben, P.P., AICP, Board Planner; and Sharleen Rodrigo, Board Secretary.

Chair Mass 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, and outside the council chambers.

Regular Meeting Minutes: May 21, 2026

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Vincent Light
Seconded by: Chris Havens
Ayes: All in favor
Nays: None
Abstained: None

Resolution of Approval – Z15133A: 273 Shrewsbury Avenue; Block 77, Lots 1, 2, 2.01, 3, 25.02

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Raymond Mass
Seconded by: Vincent Light
Ayes: Anne Torre, Raymond Mass, Johnathan Gilday, Anna Cruz, Vincent Light, Eugene Horowitz, Chris Havens, Dorothy Cerulo
Nays: None
Abstained: None

Annual Reports 2022–2024

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Raymond Mass
Seconded by: Vincent Light
Ayes: All in favor
Nays: None
Abstained: None

Z16087: 199 & 205 Broad Street; Block 105, Lots 15 & 16

Rick Brodsky, Esq., represented the applicants, 199 Broad Street, LLC and 205 Broad Street, LLC.

The following board members were sworn in:

Jacqueline Dirmann, P.E. - Board Engineer
Daniel Hauben, P.P., AICP - Board Planner

The following witnesses were sworn in for the presentation:

John L. Smallwood, Owner/Principal
Andrew R. Comi, P.E. - Kennedy Consulting Engineers
Anastasia Harrison, AIA - AHD and Co. Architecture and Interiors
John McCormack, P.E. - Dynamic Traffic

Exhibits A-1 through A-21 were marked and presented:

- A-1 Intent to Proceed
- A-2 Preliminary and Final Site Plan prepared by Kennedy Consulting Engineers, dated February 14, 2025, last revised July 28, 2025, consisting of 8 sheets
- A-3 Architectural Plans prepared by AHD and Company Architecture and Interiors, dated February 25, 2025, consisting of 18 sheets
- A-4 Project Narrative
- A-5 Traffic and Parking Study prepared by Dynamic Traffic, dated December 18, 2025
- A-6 Stormwater Management Report prepared by Kennedy Consulting Engineers, dated July 28, 2025
- A-7 Transmittal Letter prepared by Rick Brodsky, Esq., dated December 22, 2025
- A-8 Summary of Variances
- A-9 Red Bank Green Development Checklist
- A-10 T&M Associates First Engineering Review Memorandum dated March 25, 2026
- A-11 Intent to Proceed
- A-12 Disclosure of Ownership - 199 Broad Street, LLC
- A-13 Disclosure of Ownership - 205 Broad Street, LLC
- A-14 Environmental Commission Report dated March 2, 2026
- A-15 Shade Tree Commission Report dated February 9, 2026
- A-16 Historic Preservation Commission Report dated June 17, 2026

- A-17 Rendering - Front Elevation of Proposed Buildings, prepared by AHD and Company Architecture and Interiors, dated June 16, 2026
- A-18 Rendering - Front Elevation, Alternate Perspective, prepared by AHD and Company Architecture and Interiors, dated June 16, 2026
- A-19 Rendering - Proposed Six-Unit Apartment Building, prepared by AHD and Company Architecture and Interiors, dated June 16, 2026
- A-20 Aerial Exhibit prepared by Kennedy Consulting Engineers, dated June 18, 2026
- A-21 Site Plan Rendering (colorized) prepared by Kennedy Consulting Engineers, dated May 21, 2026

Mr. Brodsky provided an overview of the application stating that the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval with variances to permit additions to the existing office buildings at 199 and 205 Broad Street, connection of the two buildings via a second-story bridge addition, and construction of a six-unit apartment building at the rear with first-level garages and associated site improvements. Variances requested include a residential density variance, a minimum habitable floor area variance for two units below the 600 square foot minimum, and a parking deficiency variance. Certain existing nonconformities related to signage and side setbacks would either be eliminated or remain unchanged.

John Smallwood testified that he purchased and restored 199 Broad Street in 2012 for use as a financial planning office and then purchased 205 Broad Street with the vision of creating a combined office and residential development that would increase foot traffic to that part of Broad Street and provide smaller, more affordable apartments for community members. Smallwood Wealth Management currently has approximately 13 employees on a hybrid schedule with hours of Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM to approximately 6:00 PM, and approximately 50% of client meetings are virtual. The firm would occupy 199 Broad Street and the bridge connection, while 205 Broad Street would offer suite-style offices for professional tenants. Mr. Smallwood confirmed a member of his team would manage the rental units.

Jonathan Gilday asked Mr. Smallwood to clarify the parking situation and who benefits from it. Mr. Smallwood explained that clients and employees have easy access to on-site parking as well as ample on-street parking, and that in 13 years of operation at 199 Broad Street, there has never been a parking issue except during special events, at which point the neighboring church has allowed use of its parking lot on two occasions.

Mr. Gilday asked how many virtual versus in-person client meetings Mr. Smallwood has per week. Mr. Smallwood confirmed approximately a 50/50 split, or about 15 appointments per week, half virtual and half in person.

Chair Mass asked whether the addition of 205 Broad Street would require hiring more staff. Mr. Smallwood explained that the bridge connection would serve as a larger conference and open workspace area, while 205 would be offered as smaller suite offices to businesses. He noted the firm has recently reduced staff in favor of virtual operations but sees potential to expand administrative staff into 205.

Anne Torre asked for confirmation that the proposed apartments would be rental. Mr. Brodsky confirmed they would.

Vincent Light asked why the applicant would want to place six units on the site, which triggers a D5 variance, rather than a smaller number. Mr. Smallwood explained the design intent was to recreate a carriage house aesthetic at the rear of the property, and that six units fit the space in a way that looked proportional and natural. He acknowledged that four units would require fewer variances but would result in larger apartments at higher rents, whereas six smaller units could be offered at a lower price point, making them accessible to younger community members or longtime residents.

Mr. Gilday asked for clarification on the difference between the bridge as a passageway versus usable office space. Mr. Smallwood confirmed the bridge would contain approximately 1,000 square feet of usable space, intended to function as a larger conference room and open work area.

William Hardigan, 122 Hudson Avenue, asked whether the variances were required to maximize profits. Mr. Smallwood explained that the design was driven primarily by aesthetics and how the building would look on the property, and that the rental income needed to make financial sense regardless of the number of units. Mr. Hardigan followed up with whether Mr. Smallwood had considered reaching out to directly abutting neighbors prior to the application. Mr. Smallwood acknowledged that they did not. Mr. Hardigan then asked whether the application would set a precedent for similar projects in surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Smallwood expressed the hope that quality investment in the property would inspire others to beautify their own properties.

Kevin Moss, 115 Hudson Avenue, complimented Mr. Smallwood on the restoration of 199 Broad Street and questioned whether six apartments would meaningfully address the lack of foot traffic in that part of town. Mr. Smallwood replied that the units would not solve the problem but expressed that every contribution helps, noting more residents and employees in the area would support local businesses. Mr. Moss also noted the application proposes fewer parking spaces than required and that the residential units would further increase the deficiency. Mr. Smallwood stated that it was a technical variance but noted the parking lot is typically less than half full and on-street parking on Broad Street is ample.

Thomas Jones, 133 Hudson Avenue, complimented Mr. Smallwood on the restoration work and the architectural renderings and noted that if the residential component were removed, most of the variance relief would be unnecessary. Mr. Smallwood replied that residential use is permitted in the zone and that a mix of residential and office use was a better model for the area. He added that the alternative of demolishing 205 and converting it into a parking lot would be detrimental to the character of the street.

Katherine Hardigan, 122 Hudson Avenue, asked whether the two lots are the same size. Mr. Smallwood confirmed the lots are the same width at approximately 60 feet each, with 199 Broad Street being slightly deeper.

Andrew Comi provided professional engineering testimony. The project site consists of two lots in Block 105, Lot 16 at 199 Broad Street to the north and Lot 15 at 205 Broad Street to the south, with a combined area of 34,143 square feet and 120 feet of combined frontage on Broad Street. The site is in the Professional Office zone and borders a commercial parking lot to the north, a church and office building to the south, and single-family residential properties to the rear.

Regarding the proposed conditions, Mr. Comi testified that the two buildings will be connected via a second-story bridge addition with a clearance of 12 feet 8 inches below the structure to the driveway below. An addition is proposed at the rear of 205 Broad Street, bringing the total floor area from 6,315 square feet to 9,940 square feet. The two lots will be merged into one, eliminating two existing nonconformities as each lot currently has only 60 feet of frontage where 75 feet is required, and the merged lot will conform at 120 feet.

The proposed six-unit apartment building at the rear will be 35 feet high. The ground level will contain six single-car garages, each assigned to one unit. The apartment building requires two variances: a residential density variance, as 6 units per acre is permitted and 7.65 units per acre is proposed, and a minimum habitable floor area variance, as two units are proposed at 500 square feet where 600 square feet is the minimum. Design waivers are also required for apartment building side yard setbacks of 15.6 feet to the south and 10.3 feet to the north where 20 feet is required, and for the absence of a required 25-foot setback from internal driveways.

Regarding parking, a total of 34 spaces are proposed, consisting of 28 surface spaces and 6 individual garage spaces, with 3 ADA accessible spaces. Nine EV spaces are proposed, six EV-ready and three with chargers installed at the certificate of occupancy. The ordinance requires 62 spaces, reduced to 56 with the EV credit, resulting in a deficiency of 22 spaces. A design waiver is requested for parking space length of 16 feet where 18 feet is required, consistent with the existing parking lot. The two existing two-way driveways will be converted to one-way circulation, with the 199 Broad Street driveway as the entrance and 205 Broad Street as the exit, in a clockwise flow. Design waivers are requested for the driveway widths of 9.6 feet at the entrance and 10.7 feet at the exit where 18 feet is required, and for the zero setback of the 205 Broad Street driveway from the southerly property line where 3 feet is required. No entry signs will be added to the revised plans.

Trash and recycling for the residential units will be handled by private hauler, with an enclosed area of approximately 10 by 6 feet with a 6-foot solid fence proposed in the southerly portion of the property near the apartment building.

Stormwater management improvements will expand the existing underground detention system to handle the 100-year storm without runoff to adjacent properties, with soil testing to be provided.

Lighting will consist of four downward-pointing LED light poles with house-side shields at perimeter locations, remaining on from dusk to dawn with efforts to reduce overnight light levels.

Landscaping includes 13 trees, 86 shrubs, and perennial plantings, a double row of evergreen trees at the rear property line, a 6-foot solid fence at the rear, and additional plantings along the southerly side yard.

Two existing ground signs are proposed to remain, both updated to reflect a single address of 199 Broad Street, with a variance required as only one sign is permitted per consolidated lot.

Eugene Horowitz asked about the two principal structures on the merged lot and whether a waiver would be required. Board Attorney Kennedy noted this would need further discussion and would be addressed.

Mr. Gilday asked about the AC units and their location relative to the proposed landscaping on the southerly side. Mr. Comi confirmed six AC units, one per unit, will be on the southerly side and the double row of evergreens may need to be adjusted to accommodate the units and maintenance access.

Mr. Light asked about the landscaping gaps shown in purple on the site plan rendering. Mr. Comi clarified those represent existing trees to remain, with perennial plantings proposed at their base.

Chair Mass asked if the applicant had consulted with Fire Officials. Mr. Comi confirmed that they met with the Fire Department and concluded that the tallest fire apparatus is 12 feet high and can fit within the 12-foot 8-inch bridge clearance, and the minimum driveway width required is 9 feet, which the site meets. Turning templates are to be prepared and submitted with revised plans. Newer apparatus could be taller and committed to continuing discussions with the fire official.

Chris Havens asked how many apartments could be placed on the site as of right if the existing buildings were demolished. Mr. Comi answered that four units would comply with the density requirement, and noted that a study showed that demolishing both buildings and constructing a single combined building could yield approximately 53 parking spaces, close to the required 56.

Jacqueline Dirmann asked where the trash enclosure would be located and confirmed it is not currently shown on the plan. Mr. Comi indicated it would be located in the southerly portion of the property near the apartment building and acknowledged it will need to be added to the revised plans.

Mr. Moss asked whether the lot width nonconformities would be resolved by the lot consolidation. Mr. Comi confirmed that merging the two 60-foot lots creates 120 feet of frontage, which exceeds the 75-foot requirement and eliminates both nonconformities. Mr. Moss followed

up with a question about the existing evergreen trees at the rear of the property and whether they would be removed. Mr. Comi confirmed three trees within the proposed building footprint and parking area would be removed. A double row of new evergreen trees proposed at 7 to 8 feet in height will be planted at the rear property line. Mr. Moss noted the existing trees appear to be approximately 25 to 30 feet tall and expressed concern about the loss of screening during the interim period. Mr. Comi stated that the existing trees were planted around 2012 at a similar height and have matured since, and that the proposed trees can grow similarly over time.

Mr. Hardigan asked about the location of the parking lot lights. Mr. Comi replied that the lights are located within the parking lot as shown in red on the colored rendering, with small overhead lights above the two emergency exit doors at the rear of the apartment building. He added that there is a possibility for motion sensors for the emergency exit lights and agreed to work with the Board Engineer on that detail.

Mr. Gilday asked whether a clearance sign and physical protection such as bollards would be installed at the bridge. Mr. Comi replied that signage indicating the clearance height would be installed, similar to the Courts at Red Bank on Maple Avenue, and that bollards or similar protection would likely be provided subject to coordination with the fire official. Mr. Gilday then asked about snow removal plans. Mr. Comi answered that snow would be pushed to striped end areas of the parking lot or into landscaped areas, with some spaces potentially impacted during heavy snow events.

Mr. Light asked about the driveway widths and whether turning templates had been completed. Mr. Comi confirmed the entrance driveway is 9.6 feet at its narrowest and the exit is 10.7 feet, and that turning templates are being prepared for the revised submission.

Ms. Dirmann asked whether the applicant had consulted with JCP&L regarding electrical service requirements and transformer needs. Mr. Comi answered that he had not yet had that discussion and agreed to look into it.

Anastasia Harrison provided professional architectural testimony. The design objective was to preserve both existing Victorian buildings while creating a unified development maintaining the residential character of the neighborhood. The bridge connection was inspired by the porte-cochere concept found in older Victorian homes, featuring a largely glass design to maintain transparency. Both buildings will have Hardy shake siding, a shake asphalt roof, and painted trim consistent with the existing treatment of 199 Broad Street. The rear carriage house incorporates brick on the lower half referencing the adjacent church, with shake siding above and architectural details including curved brick above the garage doors, flared roofs, and bracketed eaves to give the building a residential character. The floor plan for 199 Broad Street remains unchanged. The addition to the rear of 205 Broad Street provides new office space, elevator, stairs, and ADA and fire accessibility improvements. Mailboxes will be residential in character, placed on each section of the apartment building rather than as a centralized bank.

Mr. Havens asked whether the rendering incorrectly showed two-way driveway circulation. Ms. Harrison confirmed this was a renderer's error and that circulation is one-way as testified by the engineer.

Mr. Gilday asked for clarification on the ADA accessibility of the 500-square-foot unit. Ms. Harrison answered that the elevator serves the ADA-accessible 596-square-foot unit, not the 500-square-foot studio, which has a standard bathroom.

Mr. Kennedy asked whether the bridge constitutes as one building or two. Mr. Brodsky clarified that once connected, the two buildings are treated as a single building under the building code with a single address of 199 Broad Street, with the two existing signs remaining for wayfinding purposes only.

Jacqueline Dirmann asked about the height of the residential building. Ms. Harrison confirmed the tallest point of the apartment building is 43 feet, while the front buildings are 38 feet and approximately 37 to 38 feet respectively. She noted the taller peak results from a 12-on-12 roof pitch intentionally chosen to match the Victorian character of the neighborhood and that the average mean height meets the ordinance. Ms. Dirmann noted she would need to verify whether the 43-foot peak triggers a height variance and requested the height calculation be shown on revised plans.

Ms. Harrison explained that there were alternative designs that were considered, such as additions to the rear of the existing buildings however it was not explored because Mr. Smallwood was committed to preserving both buildings.

Mr. Moss asked for clarification on the building footprints. Ms. Harrison confirmed the footprint of 199 Broad Street remains unchanged, the bridge is new, and 205 Broad Street extends to the rear with a new addition. Mr. Moss then asked about affordable housing requirements. Mr. Brodsky explained that developments of five to ten units are required to make a payment to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund in lieu of providing a dedicated affordable unit. Vincent Light added that because the project exceeds four units, it will be subject to the Red Bank rent control ordinance.

Mr. Hardigan asked whether the design complies with the current zoning requirements. Ms. Harrison confirmed that the design did not comply. Mr. Hardigan then asked how many windows face the rear properties on Hudson Avenue and whether they would impact the privacy of neighboring properties. Ms. Harrison answered that there are six windows on the rear elevation beginning at approximately 14 to 17 feet above grade and noted the upper portion of the building has no rear windows by design, intentionally minimizing any impact on neighboring properties. She compared the window heights to those of a typical two-family residential home.

John McCormack provided professional traffic and parking testimony. The proposed development improves site access by converting two existing full-movement driveways into a one-way entrance at 199 Broad Street and a one-way exit at 205 Broad Street, simplifying

circulation and reducing conflicting movements. Broad Street is under Monmouth County jurisdiction and the County will review and approve the driveway changes.

The proposed development would generate approximately 18 trips in the morning peak hour and 24 trips in the afternoon peak hour for the entire property. The net increase over existing conditions is approximately 7 trips in the morning and 9 in the afternoon. With Broad Street carrying approximately 800 to 900 vehicles per hour, the additional traffic is imperceptible and falls below the county's 50-trip-per-hour threshold for requiring a traffic study. Driveway levels of service are B and C under both existing and proposed conditions.

The site uses a shared parking model for the mix of office and residential uses. Residents will be assigned the six garage spaces, and they can use the on-street parking during business hours if needed. Residents would be eligible for Borough resident parking permits allowing all-day and overnight parking on Broad Street, where approximately 96 on-street spaces exist within two blocks of the site. A parking occupancy study conducted on October 29, 2025 found a maximum of 24 vehicles parked on those segments during a 13-hour weekday count, leaving 72 spaces available at peak. Based on observed employee counts at the site, actual parking demand is approximately 1.1 spaces per employee, consistent with the ITE standard of 1.3 spaces per employee. The 28 surface spaces on site are adequate for the anticipated office demand and that on-street availability addresses any remaining concerns.

Mr. Gilday asked about bicycle storage. Mr. McCormack indicated one or two bike racks would be sufficient and the location will be shown on the revised plan.

Mr. Havens stated that parking behind office buildings converted from homes on Maple and Broad Streets tends to be underutilized and asked whether it was observation during the study. Mr. McCormack confirmed this is consistent with his observations and the nature of the use.

Dorothy Cerulo asked about EV parking. Mr. McCormack confirmed nine EV spaces are proposed, three with chargers installed at the CO and six EV-ready, with garages wired for future EV charging.

Ms. Dirmann asked about the parking lot circulation arrows on the rendering, which appeared to show two-way traffic. Mr. McCormack clarified the entire parking lot will be one-way and the arrows were a drafting error, to be corrected on revised plans with pavement markings and signage. Ms. Dirmann followed up with question about loading and unloading arrangements. Mr. McCormack stated that delivery vehicles can pull in, loop through, and exit in one direction, a significant improvement over the current dead-end configuration. Move-in activity for residents would occur on weekends when the parking lot is largely empty.

Mr. Hardigan asked whether the parking study accounted for holidays, summer peak hours, or weekends. Mr. McCormack explained that industry standard for an office and apartment study is a typical weekday, and that daily traffic variation on Broad Street far exceeds the incremental traffic from this development. Mr. Hardigan expressed concern about congestion at the Broad

Street and Harding Road intersection, noting Hudson Avenue has become a cut-through, and asked about the impact of construction traffic and pedestrian safety. Mr. McCormack acknowledged the intersection carries significant traffic but noted the project generates fewer than 10 additional trips per hour, below the county threshold. He offered to meet with the Borough's traffic safety officer to discuss any concerns. Mr. Hardigan asked about the methodology used to determine that fewer parking spaces are sufficient. Mr. McCormack explained that he observed actual parking demand at the site and cross-referenced it with ITE standards, concluding that the square footage-based ordinance requirement is antiquated for this type of office use and that the on-site and on-street supply is adequate.

Mr. Light asked whether the ITE provides a rule of thumb for the number of employees supported by a 10,000 square foot office building. Mr. McCormack confirmed this data likely exists and agreed to provide it prior to the next hearing

A motion was made by Raymond Mass and seconded by Vincent Light to carry the application to August 20, 2026 without the need for further public notice.

Ayes: All in favor

Nays: None

Abstained: None

Anne Torre motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:40PM, and Vincent Light seconded.

Ayes: All in favor

Nays: None

Abstained: None

Respectfully submitted,
Sharleen Rodrigo
Zoning Board Secretary