

MINUTES
RED BANK ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
July 16, 2026

The Red Bank Zoning Board held a public meeting on Thursday, July 16, 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 6:30 PM. A roll call showed the following members were in attendance:

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

Also present were Kevin Kennedy, Esq., Board Attorney; Jacqueline Dirrman, P.E, Board Engineer; Shawna Ebanks, AICP, P.P., Director of Community Development; 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: June 18, 2026

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

Z16518: 195 Bridge Avenue; Block 75.03, Lot 45

Dante Alfieri, Esq. represented the applicant, Robyn Renaud.

The following board staff members were sworn in:
Shawna Ebanks, AICP, P.P., Director of Community Development
Jacqueline Dirmann, Board Engineer

The following witnesses were sworn in for the presentation:
Robyn Renaud - Applicant/Owner

Joseph M. Donato, R.A. - Joseph Donato
Cristen Sheppard, AICP, P.P – Cofone Planning Consulting Firm

Exhibits B-1 and A-8 through A-10 were marked and presented:

- B-1 Transcript certificate signed by Greg Fitzgerald
- A-8 Proposed Site Plan prepared by the applicant, Robyn Renaud, dated June 29, 2026, one sheet, not signed or sealed
- A-9 Revised T&M Associates Review Memorandum dated July 16, 2026
- A-10 Turning Radius Exhibit prepared by the applicant, dated July 16, 2026

Joseph Donato testified that the revised plans address the board's parking and circulation concerns from the May 21 hearing. The proposed building, along with all setbacks and coverage, remains unchanged. The rear parking area was reconfigured to include a 484-square-foot, two-car garage with a 23-foot rear setback and a 6-foot-6-inch side setback. There will be a gravel area that provides two additional parking spaces, for a total of four off-street parking stalls, meeting RSIS standards. There is potential for a fifth off-street space for guest parking on site but is not counted as a designated stall. The turning radius exhibit confirms that there is sufficient space for vehicles to maneuver within the site. Lot coverage was reduced to 36.12% because of the reconfigured gravel area.

Cristen Sheppard testified that the revised plans satisfy the board's concerns and that the application can be approved without substantial detriment to the public good or adverse impact on the zone regulations or master plan. She cited the 2023 Master Plan, which encourages reinvestment in older homes and recommends the Borough consider adding residential uses of up to four units as conditional uses in the RB zone. She noted the Borough's recently adopted Ordinance 2026-18, which permits accessory dwelling units to support increased density in the zone.

Paul Cagno questioned whether a D1 variance is appropriate, given the recent adoption of the ADU ordinance, which provides a path to a second unit on this property without a variance. The applicant could convert the garage to an ADU in full compliance with the ordinance, and granting a D1 variance so soon after the council addressed this issue is inconsistent with the Borough's planning intent and amounts to spot zoning. Ms. Shepard responded that the ADU ordinance does not eliminate the master plan's existing goals, and that each application must be considered on its own merits. She clarified that spot zoning is defined as introducing an incompatible use into an area, which does not apply here as the proposed two-family use is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Chris Havens asked whether the ADU ordinance was prescriptive or simply an option available to applicants. Eugene Horowitz followed up, asking Kevin Kennedy whether the ADU ordinance has any bearing on this application given that it predated the ordinance's adoption. Mr. Kennedy clarified that under the time of the application rule, the ADU ordinance adopted after this

application was filed does not govern this application, and that if the application were withdrawn and resubmitted, it would likely be processed under the ADU ordinance.

Robyn Renaud confirmed there is no living space proposed in the basement. Since the property was constructed in the 1920s, the existing four bedrooms cannot accommodate modern-sized beds, making the property better suited to a two-family configuration.

Mr. Kennedy reiterated the application's conditions, and the applicant agreed to all of them.

Anne Torre motioned to approve the application, and Vincent Light seconded.

Ayes: Anne Torre, Raymond Mass, Greg Fitzgerald, Johnathan Gilday, Vincent Light,
Eugene Horowitz
Nays: Paul Cagno
Abstained: None

Z15870: 240 Shrewsbury Avenue; Block 78, Lots 12-14

Edward McKenna, Esq., represented the applicant, Incredible Oz, LLC.

The following witness was sworn in for the presentation:

Edward William O'Neill Jr., R.A, P. P, O'Neill Architecture + Planning LLC

Exhibits A-1 through A-19 were marked and presented:

- A-1 Application Package
- A-2 Disclosure of Ownership
- A-3 Environmental Commission Report dated April 18, 2025
- A-4 Shade Tree Commission Memorandum dated July 16, 2026
- A-5 Plan entitled "Preliminary Major Site Plan – Incredible Oz, LLC", prepared by A.J. Garito, Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, dated August 1, 2024, last revised April 15, 2025, consisting of thirteen (13) sheets.
- A-6 Boundary and Topographic Survey, prepared by David J. Von Steenburg, P.L.S., of Morgan Engineering & Surveying, dated September 12, 2023.
- A-7 Architectural Plan prepared by Edward W. O'Neill, Jr., R.A., of O'Neill Architecture + Planning, dated August 29, 2024, consisting of seven (7) sheets.
- A-8 Affordable Housing Plan prepared by Edward W. O'Neill, Jr., R.A., of O'Neill Architecture + Planning, dated August 29, 2024, consisting of three (3) sheets.
- A-9 Stormwater Management Report, prepared by A.J. Garito Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, dated August 1, 2024.
- A-10 Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by A.J. Garito Jr., P.E., of Two River Engineering, dated October 1, 2024.
- A-11 Letter of Denial prepared by Shawna Ebanks, dated September 11, 2024
- A-12 Intent to Proceed dated October 24, 2024
- A-13 Project Narrative
- A-14 Two River Engineering Response to T&M Review Letter dated July 25, 2025
- A-15 T&M Associates Review Memorandum dated September 26, 2025

A-16 Land Use Analysis prepared by Edward O'Neill, dated March 4, 2025
A-17 - A-19 Photographs of Neighboring Land Uses, taken March 4, 2025

Mr. McKenna explained that the applicant is seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval, with variances, to construct a residential development comprising 14 two-bedroom units on three lots at 240 Shrewsbury Avenue. The property is in an Opportunity Zone. There was an attempt to acquire the adjacent property, but it was unsuccessful.

Edward O'Neil provided professional architectural and planning testimony. Mr. O'Neil testified that the proposed 14 units are arranged in five linked structures that would constitute one building under the building code. The grouped structures surround a central courtyard of approximately 50 by 27 feet. The design was inspired by passive solar and environmental principles, in which each unit has at least three exterior walls that provide cross-ventilation and natural light, reducing air conditioning and electricity costs. The proposed flat roofs with parapets are designed to accommodate solar collectors, which would power the common areas. The architecture uses brick to create a sense of permanence and fiber cement siding to break up the mass, modeled after River Street Commons. All units are 872 square feet, below the 1,000-square-foot ordinance minimum, and would include two bedrooms, a living room, a kitchen, a dining area, and bathrooms. All units, including the three affordable housing units, are identical in size, with the only variation being the floor plan layout. The development provides 28 surface parking spaces meeting the RSIS standard. One of the two curb cuts on Shrewsbury Avenue would be removed to create two on-street parking spaces.

Vincent Light asked whether EV spaces are proposed. Mr. O'Neil confirmed that four EV spaces are proposed, and one will be ADA-accessible. It is not indicated on the submitted plans; however, it will be revised to show the location. The EV credits were not applied to reduce the parking requirement.

Paul Cagno asked why 872-square-foot units were chosen rather than the required 1,000 square feet. Mr. O'Neil testified that the decision was driven by budget and efficiency considerations, and that the difference in square footage across all units would not justify adding a unit. He noted that many newer two-bedroom apartments in Red Bank are under 1,000 square feet and that the ordinance standard reflects apartment sizes from the 1950s.

Johnathan Gilday asked about the parapets and elevator tower shown in the rendering and what height is being used for variance purposes. Mr. O'Neil clarified that the building is 35 feet to the roof surface, which conforms to the zone, and that stair towers and the elevator tower exceed that height as permitted appurtenances. Jacqueline Dirmann confirmed that the permitted height is 35 feet and that appurtenances above the roof are not counted in the height measurement.

Mr. Cagno noted that the T&M review letter indicates 2.5 stories are permitted, but three stories are proposed. Mr. O'Neil acknowledged that there was a discrepancy in the ordinance and there was an older provision that allowed two and a half stories; however, there was an amendment

that permits commercial use on the first floor and two stories of apartments above, effectively a three-story building, and cited prior board precedent approving three-story buildings in the same zone. Mr. Cagno noted that prior three-story approvals involved commercial use on the ground floor, which is not proposed. Mr. O'Neil disagreed, stating that precedent has been set for three-story residential buildings without commercial use in the same zone.

Shawna Ebanks asked about the treatment of the Shrewsbury Avenue facade and the elevator and stair towers, noting they appeared flat and blank on the elevation. Ms. Ebanks recommended considering more articulated materials, such as different-colored brick and architectural detailing like a cornice, to give the towers more identity.

Dorothy Cerulo asked whether the elevator is directly accessible from the parking area. Mr. O'Neil confirmed that it is located at the rear of the courtyard by design, consistent with sustainable design principles that encourage pedestrian movement.

Mr. Gilday identified an additional variance not previously noted: Section 490-96D of the ordinance requires a minimum courtyard width of two feet for every one foot of building height for courtyards bounded on three or more sides. With a building height of 35 feet, the required courtyard width is 70 feet, whereas approximately 46 to 58 feet is proposed. Mr. O'Neil acknowledged the courtyard was designed based on passive solar sun angles rather than the ordinance provision. Chris Havens asked whether the required width could be achieved by reducing parking and spreading the building out. Jacqueline Dirmann suggested lowering the building height as an alternative. Mr. Havens added that reducing parking could also make the courtyard a more usable amenity space for residents.

Ms. Ebanks asked whether window dividers could be added for a more residential appearance. Mr. O'Neill confirmed this is possible.

Mr. O'Neil provided planning testimony in support of the D variance. He testified that a D variance is required due to the proposed increase in residential density and the elimination of ground-floor commercial use, but that the proposed FAR is less than half of the permitted amount. The property consists of three separately assessed lots that could each be developed as of right with commercial use on the first floor and four residential units above for a total of 12 units without a variance. The proposal for 14 units without the commercial component requires a D variance but produces a better streetscape and neighborhood connection. The development replaces a non-residential use with residential use permitted in the zone, meets all parking requirements, adds two on-street spaces by removing a curb cut, is within half a mile of the train station, and includes three affordable housing units. There are examples of inclusion of multifamily development in the neighborhood, and commercial developments on Shrewsbury Avenue reduce south of River Street.

Mr. Gilday and Mr. Cagno raised concerns about the absence of ground-floor commercial use, noting that the NB zone is specifically designed for first-floor commercial use with apartments above, and that the 2023 master plan calls for maintaining the mixed-use nature of this zone. Mr.

O'Neil and Mr. McKenna responded that commercial uses south of River Street on Shrewsbury Avenue are sparse and unsustainable, citing a prior application before this Board in which a commercial space in the same area remained unrented for about eight years before the Board granted relief to convert it into a residential unit.

Mr. Light had concerns about the proposed setbacks, lot coverage, and courtyard width. Mr. O'Neil and Mr. McKenna responded that, since the development conforms to the parking requirements, it impacts the surface area standards, triggering nonconformities with the lot coverage and buffer variances.

After further discussion, the applicant requested that the application be dismissed without prejudice.

Raymond Mass made a motion to dismiss the application without prejudice, seconded by Anne Torre.

Ayes: Anne Torre, Raymond Mass, Greg Fitzgerald, Johnathan Gilday, Vincent Light,
Paul Cagno, Eugene Horowitz

Nays: None

Abstained: None

Chair Mass motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Vincent Light seconded.

Ayes: All in favor

Nays: None

Abstained: None

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:26 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharleen Rodrigo
Zoning Board Secretary