

MINUTES
RED BANK PLANNING BOARD
July 8, 2026

The Red Bank Planning Board held a public meeting on July 8, 2026, at 7:00 PM in the Municipal Building, first floor, Council Chambers, 90 Monmouth Street, Red Bank, New Jersey.

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

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

Also present were Marc Leckstein, Esq., Board Attorney; George Minaidis, P.E., Board Engineer; and Susan Favate, AICP, P.P., Board Planner.

The Chair 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: June 10, 2026

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Kristina Bonatakis
Seconded by: Barbara Boas
Ayes: Shawna Ebanks, Kristina Bonatakis, Dan Mancuso, Louis DiMento, Barbara Boas, Itzel Hernandez
Nays: None
Abstained: Mayor Portman, Brian Parnagain

Resolution of Approval: P16248: 15 East Leonard Street; Block 72, Lot 30.01

Motion: Approved as presented
Moved by: Shawna Ebanks
Seconded by: Kristina Bonatakis
Ayes: All in favor
Nays: None
Abstained: None

P15522: Bridge Avenue & Oakland Street; Block 41, Lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.01, 6.02, & 7; Block 63, Lots 5, 5.01, 6, 7, & 7.01

Christopher Murphy, Esq., represented the applicant, Denzar at Transit LLC.

The following witnesses were sworn in for the presentations:

Stuart Johnson, AIA - Minno & Wasko Architects and Planners
Tom Bauer, FASLA – Melillo Bauer Carman Landscape Architecture

Exhibits A-1 through A-28 were marked and presented:

- A-1 Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan & Major Subdivision Plan, prepared by James A. Kennedy, P.E., of Kennedy Consulting Engineers, LLC, dated April 6, 2026, consisting of fifteen (15) sheets.
- A-2 Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision Plat, prepared by John T. Luts, P.L.S., of Yorkanis & White, Inc., dated January 9, 2026, consisting of one (1) sheet.
- A-3 Architectural Plans, prepared by Stuart A. Johnson, R.A., of Minno & Wasko Architects and Planners, dated April 7, 2026, consisting of twelve (12) sheets
- A-4 Landscape Plans, prepared by Thomas B. Bauer, L.A., of MBC Landscape Architecture, dated April 17, 2026, consisting of eight (8) sheets.
- A-5 Boundary & Partial Topographical Survey, prepared by John T. Luts, P.L.S., of Yorkanis & White, Inc., dated July 7, 2021, revised November 11, 2025, consisting of four (4) sheets.
- A-6 Traffic Impact Study, prepared by Nick Verderese, P.E., and Justin P. Taylor, P.E., P.T.O.E., of Dynamic Traffic, dated April 10, 2026.
- A-7 Stormwater Management Report, prepared by James A. Kennedy, P.E., of Kennedy Consulting Engineers, LLC, dated April 15, 2026.
- A-8 Engineer's Report for Proposed Water & Sewer Service, prepared by James A. Kennedy, P.E., of Kennedy Consulting Engineers, LLC, dated May 12, 2026.
- A-9 Affordable Housing Plan, prepared by Beacon Planning and Consulting Services, LLC, dated June 4, 2026.
- A-10 Aerial Site Plan and Colorized Building Floor Plans Package, 8 pages
- A-11 Rendering Package, 7 pages
- A-12 Slurry Gray Brick Physical Sample
- A-13 Red Brick Physical Sample
- A-14 Charcoal Brick Physical Sample
- A-15 Fiber Cement Panel Sample
- A-16 Soffit Material Sample, Summer Wheat
- A-17 Streetscape Master Plan
- A-18 Existing Conditions and Potential Relocations
- A-19 Train Station Plaza 3D Perspective
- A-20 Train Station West View
- A-21 Woonerf Rendering
- A-22 Woonerf Farmers Market
- A-23 Oakland Street Crossing
- A-24 Oakland Street Crossing Night View
- A-25 Amenity Deck Overview

- A-26 Amenity Deck Plan Details
- A-27 Second Floor Rooftop Amenity Deck View
- A-28 Fifth Floor Rooftop View

Board exhibits B-1 through B-4 were marked and presented:

- B-1 T&M Engineering Review Letter, dated June 26, 2026
- B-2 BFJ Planning Review Letter, dated June 26, 2026
- B-3 Environmental Commission Review
- B-4 Shade Tree Commission Review

Mr. Murphy stated that the applicant is seeking preliminary and final major site plan and major subdivision approval for the north parcel of the Red Bank Train Station redevelopment area, known as the Rail at Red Bank North. The Borough Council adopted the Red Bank Train Station Redevelopment Plan on June 11, 2025. This is the first application to be presented under that plan. One minor deviation is sought relating to internally lit LED halo backlit signage, which the plan anticipates as a potential deviation. The project is a five-story mixed-use transit-oriented development comprising 175 residential units, approximately 15,750 square feet of retail space, and a structured parking garage with 331 spaces. The project is part of NJ Transit's land plan.

Stuart Johnson provided professional architectural testimony. The subject property comprises of approximately 3.9 acres, triangular in shape, with frontage on Monmouth Street to the north, West Street to the east, Chestnut Street to the south, and the NJ Transit commuter rail line to the west. The site is currently entirely impervious surface parking. The historic train station and gatekeeper's booth exist on-site structures.

Mr. Johnson described the building design, noting it comprises two separate structures connected by a bridge element at the second floor over Oakland Street with approximately 12.5 feet of vertical clearance. The primary residential lobby is at the base of the north building off the Woonerf and West Street. A secondary residential lobby is at the corner of West Street and Chestnut Street. The structured parking garage is wrapped on three and a half sides by ground-floor retail and upper-floor residential. Vehicular ingress and egress is off West Street. The ground floor and basement provide 93 public parking spaces. Upper levels are dedicated residential parking with key fob access. Total parking is 451 spaces: 331 in the new structured garage, 61 surface spaces in the Woonerf, and 59 across the tracks. The building contains 175 units containing 140 market rate units and 35 affordable. Affordable units are distributed inclusively throughout every floor with the same finishes, appliances, and amenity access as market rate units. The unit mix is 24 studio units at all market rate, 84 one-bedroom units with 7 affordable, 60 two-bedroom units with 21 affordable, and 7 three-bedroom units all affordable. No studio units will be affordable. Ground floor commercial space is approximately 15,570 square feet including 10,000 square feet of restaurant use and 5,750 square feet of retail.

Susan Favate asked how a commuter would access the train station from the proposed parking garage. Mr. Johnson answered that vehicular access is off West Street with 24-foot drive aisles and 9-by-18-foot stalls. A public elevator connects the basement level to a public ground-floor corridor with a direct sight line to the train platform, maintained by the developer. Monthly permitted parking assignments will be available.

Ms. Favate asked about the rooftop parking level and the parking guarantee for residents. Mr. Johnson confirmed 238 spaces are dedicated to residents, exceeding the required minimum.

Ms. Favate asked about the size and layout a studio apartment near the parking garage on the third floor. Mr. Johnson replied that it was a 577 square foot studio with a sleeping alcove and two double windows.

Mr. Johnson testified that the exterior materials of the north and south buildings. Both buildings will have a masonry brick veneer designed to appear as separate structures. The south building will feature a custom slurry gray brick blend, and the north building will have custom red brick blend with a charcoal brick accent. Three colors (iron gray, night gray, gray slate) of vertical fiber cement hardie panel will be selectively used on both buildings. A summer wheat wood-tone soffit material will be used on the underside of the second floor where it cantilevers over the first floor along West Street and Monmouth Street.

An artist mural is proposed on the exposed portion of the parking garage facade, and the final design would be subject to Visual Arts Committee review as a condition of approval.

The proposed retail and building identification signage, consisting of raised channel cut dimensional letters, side lit with an ambient glow. The deviation being sought from the redevelopment plan relates to this type of illumination.

Shawna Ebanks asked whether tenants would be required to conform to the same signage standards and was advised that any tenant seeking relief would need to apply to the Board.

Chair Mancuso asked whether the stoops on West Street could be reoriented to face the street rather than run parallel to the building. Ms. Favate noted that page 20 of the redevelopment plan calls for stoops appropriate to West Street and expressed support for the deviation. Ms. Ebanks added that the current configuration read more like a back door than a street-facing entry, particularly given the single-family homes across the street, and suggested the applicant seek front yard setback relief. Ms. Favate continued that the darkness of the proposed materials takes away the human scale of the stoops. Mr. Johnson agreed to look into it.

Brian Parnagain asked whether the West Street facade took into consideration the scale of buildings across the street, noting the proposed cornice is discontinuous and questioning whether it achieves a true cornice effect. He suggested a two-story facade articulation to better relate to that context. Mr. Johnson responded that the redevelopment plan contemplated five stories here, that the sub-cornice line was intended to relate to the adjacent Armory building, and that the massing steps down approaching Oakland Street relate to the existing context.

Mr. Parnagain add that the design felt like a superficial level of differentiation applied to satisfy the redevelopment plan's articulation requirement rather than achieving real coherence, citing specific inconsistencies: a discontinuous cornice unrelated to the beige brick, four-story corbelling with a window band at one corner, a brick spandrel at another, and red brick appearing as a thin veneer over dark fiber cement panel elsewhere. The proposed design was a step back from redevelopment plan renderings, recalling a full-brick, simply detailed treatment on the Monmouth Street building nearest the station, and stated the Board's and community's vision was for the architecture to be influenced by the nearby buildings such as the Galleria, the Armory, and the Anderson Building.

Marc Leckstein asked why the applicant's architecture differed from what the Board adopted as part of the redevelopment plan. Mr. Johnson responded that the design conforms with the plan's bulk, mass, scale, and setback standards. Ms. Ebanks stated the windows appeared smaller than expected and the design read as institutional. Chair Mancuso compared it to 170 Monmouth Street and the former Red Bank Register building. He stated the Board had preferred the architecture previously presented and expected to see what was reflected in the redevelopment plan's exhibits. Mr. Murphy acknowledged the feedback and stated the applicant would return with revisions.

Mr. Parnagain asked about the quantity of fiber cement panel proposed and whether the material would require repainting within ten years and the applicant should use durable low-maintenance materials. Mr. Johnson responded that the panels have a 30-year lifespan, can be repainted in the field, and that similar materials were used in the design imagery associated with the redevelopment plan appendix.

Ms. Ebanks asked that residents not pay for a parking space so that they would not pay for parking and parking on the street. Mr. Leckstein noted this would need to be a condition of approval. The applicant agreed that one parking space would be included in the base rent, with any additional space available at an extra charge.

Ms. Favate asked about the material proposed at the corner tower feature. Mr. Johnson stated that it was a night gray board and batten vertical fiber cement panel and extending the brick to five stories at that corner was something the applicant would investigate.

Mr. Johnson testified that the building incorporates a number of green design features including stormwater management and reduction of the heat island effect, Energy Star appliances, LED lighting with auto-off motion sensors in common areas, programmable thermostats, low-flow water fixtures, 15% of required parking spaces equipped with EV charging, internal bicycle parking for residents and transit users, and low VOC building materials. Ms. Favate noted the sustainability features described were standard and asked whether the team had looked at electrification of portions of the building, noting the redevelopment plan speaks to solar ready aspects and the potential for panels on the roof or canopies on the garage roof. Mr. Johnson responded that nothing prevents installing a solar photovoltaic canopy on top of the parking garage at a later date, that the flat roof has a number of penetrations and mechanical equipment that does not lend itself to much area for photovoltaics, but the roof would be solar ready and the building would have the capability of adding solar to offset house loads. Ms. Ebanks asked that the lighting should be downlit as part of the environmentally friendly measures. Mr. Johnson confirmed the building lighting would be shielded and down lit.

Kristina Bonatakis asked whether there was secured residential bicycle parking, and Mr. Johnson confirmed there are 88 spaces internal to the building.

Ms. Bonatakis asked about the roof elements and whether a green roof was proposed. Mr. Johnson clarified that no green roof is associated with the application; the green space on the rooftop consists of raised planters and plantings within the passive rooftop space, designed as an amenity rather than for stormwater management.

Mayor Portman asked whether there was drop-off parking for deliveries such as Amazon; Mr. Johnson confirmed there are two off-street loading bays within the south building adjacent to the residential lobby, a striped loading area immediately adjacent, and a striped area on Monmouth Street for retail service and

short-term deliveries. All loading is coordinated through building management, with trash collected by a private hauler twice weekly from mechanically ventilated internal trash rooms.

Ms. Favate asked about the loading areas and transformers along the West Street corridor next to the Juanito's building. Mr. Johnson noted the loading areas are consistent with the exhibits attached to the redevelopment plan, the building is separated from the Juanito's building in compliance with the building code and redevelopment plan setbacks, and three pad-mounted transformers are required by the utility provider and cannot be placed inside the building, with locations selected to mitigate views and impact.

Mr. Parnagain asked about the approximate length of the building along the west façade. Mr. Johnson confirmed that the combined frontage of both buildings is slightly over 600 feet. Mr. Parnagain noted that the building length was a primary concern during the redevelopment plan process, leading to the requirement for meaningful architectural articulation and the Oakland Street Promenade concept. Ms. Ebanks commented on the promenade design, window size, and façade articulation and expressed that the current design does not provide the same level of transparency shown in earlier renderings and suggested exploring larger window openings and additional articulation. Mr. Johnson acknowledged the comments and agreed to evaluate potential refinements while balancing the redevelopment plan intent with structural, mechanical, and residential unit requirements.

Ms. Ebanks asked whether apartment windows would be operable. Mr. Johnson confirmed that operable windows will be provided in all apartments.

Ms. Bonatakis asked whether the design conforms to the 25% red-brick standard. Mr. Johnson confirmed that the required percentage of red masonry brick veneer is provided along the public rights-of-way. Ms. Bonatakis stated a preference for using more red brick in a less asymmetrical manner across larger façade areas, noting that it better reflects the Borough's historic character. Ms. Ebanks asked whether the 25% requirement applies per building or to the site overall, to which Ms. Favate responded that the standard is largely satisfied on one building. Ms. Ebanks expressed a preference for incorporating more red brick on the southern portion of the building.

George Minaidis requested that any revised plans submitted reflect all building materials and color changes discussed during the meeting.

William Poku, 90 Bank Street, asked why none of the 24 studio units are affordable while all the three-bedroom units are. Mr. Johnson responded that UHAC caps one-bedroom/efficiency units at 20% but also sets a minimum bedroom count, so the applicant used one-bedroom rather than studios to meet that minimum, noting affordable households also generally prefer a larger unit over a studio.

Mr. Poku asked whether parking spaces would accommodate larger vehicles, such as trailers or service vehicles for residents with occupations such as landscaping. Mr. Johnson confirmed that there is no accommodation for trailers or commercial vehicles and noted that all parking spaces are 9 feet wide by 18 feet deep, consistent with RSIS, with 24-foot drive aisles. The parking dimensions comply with Borough standards.

Mr. Poku asked whether there would be a homeowner's association. Mr. Johnson replied that the project is anticipated to be a rental community with an on-site leasing and management office, but no homeowner's association.

Paulo Rodriguez Haymon, 18 Hubbard Park, asked whether the lighting color temperature could be reduced to 2,700K for dark sky and wildlife compliance. Mr. Johnson agreed to explore 2,700K.

Alan Hill, 64 McLaren Street, asked whether the proposed cladding materials met fire safety standards; Mr. Johnson confirmed all materials comply with the New Jersey State Building Code and NFPA fire protection requirements, and that the building would be fully sprinklered to NFPA 13 standards.

Linda Cohen, 28 Riverside Avenue, expressed concern about the scale of the project and the impact of large developments on the Borough's infrastructure. The Chair acknowledged the concern and noted the Board had already reduced the building from six to five stories in response to public feedback during the redevelopment planning process, and that the Board did not have authority to further reduce the size of a substantially conforming application.

Mr. Poku asked about EV charging quantities and access. Mr. Johnson confirmed 15% of parking spaces would have Level 2 EV charging with one third installed at opening and full infrastructure in place for the remainder, accessible for both public and residential parking areas.

Suzanne Viscomi, 25 Cedar Street, asked whether residents could have pets and whether a dog run would be provided. Mr. Johnson confirmed the building would be pet friendly with no dedicated dog run, though ample open space exists on site. The Chair suggested considering a rooftop dog walk area. The applicant agreed to review the option.

Tom Bauer provided professional landscaping testimony. The proposed train station plaza using Exhibits A-17 through A-20. The plaza design was developed in coordination with NJ Transit and SHPO, which requested a more traditional approach to complement the historic train station. The design uses brick pavers, bluestone pavement, seat walls, lawn areas for flexible programming, shade trees, two integrated bus stops, parking adjacent to the woonerf, and two main entrances. The gatekeepers booth will remain. A vehicular drop-off area is provided at the west entry.

The Count Basie bust, the Mayor O'Hern memorial plaque, and the NJ Transit circular map of New Jersey artwork would be relocated to more prominent positions flanking the main entry walkway rather than remaining in lawn areas where they are not easily visible. Mr. Murphy noted this would require a deviation from the redevelopment plan, which calls for these elements to be preserved in place, and Ms. Favate confirmed the deviation would be acceptable.

Ms. Bonatakis asked about SHPO's requirements for the plaza, preferring the earlier, more naturalistic concept, and questioned whether the seat walls could impede pedestrian movement, especially for commuters rushing for a train or bus. Mr. Bauer responded that the plan offers more pedestrian access than existing conditions, with ample circulation space (about 24 feet wide) balanced against impervious coverage limits, and that SHPO preferred the traditional layout shown and wanted the train station building to remain the plaza's prominent feature.

The proposed will have a 24-foot cartway that features decorative paving, street trees, angled parking on the plaza side, and parallel parking on the retail side, with bollards and lighting defining the pedestrian zone. The Woonerf could be closed for community events such as farmers markets.

Louis DiMento asked about speed limits in the Woonerf. Mr. Baur stated typical posted speeds would be five to ten miles per hour and deferred to the traffic engineer for confirmation.

Ms. Ebanks asked about the bike racks within the Woonerf area. Mr. Baur replied the enclosed Oonee bicycle storage accommodates 32 bicycles in two units at the train station. He added that additional bicycle racks would be installed in the retail area.

Mr. Leckstein asked who would control the space for events. Mr. Murphy stated this would be determined through the redeveloper's agreement.

Mr. Bauer continued that east of the plaza could include public art, including rotating installations. Ms. Favate noted that a taller, pyramid-shaped piece as shown in the exhibit would block sightlines and recommended flat artwork in this area.

The Oakland Street crossing would have string lights, seating, retail activity, and landscaping. Outdoor cafe seating is proposed under the bridge element. Mr. Bauer stated that the area will have honey locust trees in an allée flanking the promenade seating area. Ms. Bonatakis asked about the honey locust trees and the Environmental Commission's recommendation to use Silva Cells. Mr. Bauer stated structural soil would be sufficient and offered to meet with the Environmental Commission to discuss plant selections before the next hearing.

The second floor and rooftop amenity decks will include a pool, barbecue area, communal dining, lounge seating, intensive plantings with concrete pedestal pavers, a TV under a canopy, and chaise lounge seating. The fifth-floor rooftop deck includes a green roof canopy over a juice bar, communal dining, lounge seating, private barbecue areas, and lawn with intensive plantings offering views of the train station plaza.

Ms. Bonatakis asked how the green space on the rooftop would buffer the parking level. Mr. Bauer confirmed screen walls separate the amenity space from the mechanical and parking areas on both sides. Ms. Favate asked about the height of the elevator penthouse above the roof deck. Mr. Johnson replied 15 feet.

Mr. Bauer added that all site lighting would be dark sky compliant, downward-facing, and agreed to a 2,700K color temperature in response to the Environmental Commission's comments.

Ms. Viscomi asked whether public restrooms would be provided in the plaza. Mr. Bauer replied that none are proposed as part of the site plan. Mr. Murphy noted restaurants would have restrooms and that events would address sanitation through the permitting process.

Ms. Viscomi asked about snow removal on the Woonerf. Mr. Bauer confirmed snow could be relocated to the lawn areas.

Ms. Viscomi asked whether the woonerf is a one-way or two-way street; Mr. Baur confirmed it is two-way, with two travel lanes plus 90-degree parking on the plaza side and parallel parking on the retail side. She also asked whether parking would be 24-hour or time-limited; Mr. Baur stated he was unsure whether the Borough would choose to meter it, but that the woonerf itself would be open 24 hours.

Jackie Carneahan, 28 Riverside Avenue, asked about whether there will be the ability for someone to drive up to the ramp for the train station and Mr. Bauer stated no it would not be possible.

Wendy Jagger, 211 Monmouth Street, asked where rideshare and taxis will park, and Mr. Baur responded that the drop-off area handles three staged cars, and that two or three taxis typically wait there when trains are coming. Ms. Jagger stated that solar panels should be placed on the roof; Mr. Johnson, who clarified solar is not being proposed, but could potentially take the form of a solar panel on the canopy parking deck.

Frank Bevacqua asked about pedestrian access between the parking garage and the train platform. Mr. Baur and Mr. Johnson identified a pedestrian corridor from the garage along the Oakland Street extension to the train station, accessible via stairs or elevator.

Denelle Johnson, 28 Elm Place, asked about Pachysandra and Liriope listed in the landscape plan, noting Pachysandra is classified as invasive and Liriope is non-native. Mr. Baur acknowledged both species and argued they perform well in contained urban environments. She also asked about permeable, open-based pavers to help with stormwater, citing recent storms; Mr. Baur said that's possible and could be reviewed with the civil engineer.

Ms. Favate addressed the rendering, which shows decorative pavers at the Monmouth Street bus stop area and stated that would require Borough approval. Mr. Baur noted a discrepancy between the applicant's plans, which show standard asphalt and the rendering, which shows decorative pavers. Mr. Minaidis clarified that if the area remains standard asphalt, no Borough approval would be needed; using pavers would require approval.

Ms. Favate asked the applicant to consider strengthening the sightline toward the train station from the Monmouth Street entrance, noting it currently leads people more toward the woonerf, possibly through pavement or broadening that area.

Ms. Bonatakis reiterated concern that the low seat walls impede natural pedestrian movement through the plaza and suggested relocating them to the outside of the lawn areas or reconceiving them as round walls surrounding shade trees. Ms. Favate also added that the walls are not accessible for wheelchair users.

The application was carried to September 9, 2026 with no further notice required.

A motion was made by Chair Mancuso and seconded by Shawna Ebanks to adjourn the meeting at 10:18pm.

Ayes:	All in favor
Nays:	None
Abstained:	None

Respectfully submitted,

Sharleen Rodrigo
Planning Board Secretary