

MINUTES
RED BANK ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
August 20, 2026

The Red Bank Zoning Board held a public meeting on Thursday, August 20, 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	Present	Rebecca Flynn	-
Vincent Light	Present		

Also present were Kevin Kennedy, Esq., Board Attorney; Shawna Ebanks, PP, AICP; Director of Community Development; and Sharleen Rodrigo, Board Secretary.

Chair Mass read the Open Public Meeting Statement Act. In addition, an adequate 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: July 16, 2026

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

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

Motion: Carried to October 1, 2026 at 6:30 PM without the need for further public notice
Moved by: Raymond Mass
Seconded by: Vincent Light
Ayes: All in favor
Nays: None
Abstained: None

Resolution of Approval - Z16518: 195 Bridge Avenue; Block 75.03, Lot 45

Motion: Approved
Moved by: Raymond Mass
Seconded by: Anne Torre
Ayes: Anne Torre, Raymond Mass, Greg Fitzgerald, Johnathan Gilday, Anna Cruz, Vincent Light, Eugene Horowitz

Nays: None
Abstained: None

Resolution of Dismissal – Z15870: 240 Shrewsbury Avenue; Block 78, Lots 12-14

Motion: Application dismissed without prejudice
Moved by: Vincent Light
Seconded by: Anne Torre
Ayes: Anne Torre, Raymond Mass, Greg Fitzgerald, Johnathan Gilday, Anna Cruz, Vincent Light,
Paul Cagno
Nays: None
Abstained: None

Z15711: 44 Haddon Park; Block 13.02, Lot 42

Brian McPeak, owner and applicant, was present to provide testimony regarding the proposed garage.

Shawna Ebanks, PP, AICP was sworn in.

Exhibits A-1 through A-6 were marked and presented:

- A-1 Application Package
- A-2 Intent to Proceed dated May 21, 2026
- A-3 Survey of Property prepared by Marc J. Cifone, P.L.S dated November 8, 2023
- A-4 Scope of Work Narrative dated May 18, 2026
- A-5 Rendering Existing and Proposed Garage consisting of nine (9) pages
- A-6 Planning Review Memorandum dated August 12, 2026

Mr. McPeak explained that he proposed replacing an existing, dilapidated 240-square-foot storage shed with a new prefabricated accessory structure of the same size. Variance relief is required because of the existing setback requirements for an accessory structure. The proposed shed will be in the same location and have the same overall footprint on the property as the original shed. The condition of the existing structure is unsafe, with rotting wood. The proposed modernized accessory structure would not increase the lot coverage or exhaust the existing non-conformity.

Kevin Kennedy questioned the existing and proposed use of the shed. Mr. McPeak replied that the shed will be used for personal residential storage and a home workshop. No commercial operations will run out of the building, nor will it be used to house commercial power tools or heavy equipment.

Mr. Kennedy asked whether the new structure would contain living space, guest quarters, or plumbing utilities. Mr. McPeak responded that the structure will contain no living quarters, bedrooms, bathrooms, or plumbing. The electrical connections will be installed for interior overhead lighting and standard convenience outlets to power basic hand tools and shop equipment.

Shawna Ebanks asked about the setbacks of the proposed structure relative to the side and rear yard property lines and whether the building could be shifted to meet conforming setback requirements. Mr. McPeak explained that shifting the structure into a conforming location would encroach into the usable rear yard space. The exact footprint of the original 12' x 20' shed preserves existing open lawn space while utilizing the pre-existing gravel pad foundation.

Mr. Kennedy asked about the exterior siding, color scheme, and roof materials for the new shed. Mr. McPeak responded that the shed will have neutral vinyl siding, residential-grade asphalt roof shingles, and trim detailing designed to match the main single-family residence, significantly improving the aesthetic appearance along the rear lot line compared to the existing decayed shed.

Ms. Ebanks asked whether replacing the shed would alter surface runoff patterns or impact drainage onto neighboring residential properties. Mr. McPeak explained that since the new shed will be the same size there will be zero net increase in impervious coverage on the lot. He added that roof runoff will drain naturally into surrounding turf and landscape beds, maintaining existing drainage paths without adverse impacts to adjacent parcels.

Ms. Ebanks asked for details regarding any exterior light fixtures planned for the structure. Mr. McPeak answered that exterior lighting will be a single downward-shielded fixture above the main access door to eliminate light spillover onto adjoining properties. Mr. Kennedy reiterated the conditions of the application, and the applicant agreed to all conditions.

Anna Cruz motioned to approve the application, seconded by Dorothy Cerulo.

Ayes: Anne Torre, Raymond Mass, Greg Fitzgerald, Johnathan Gilday, Anna Cruz, Vincent Light, Paul Cagno, Eugene Horowitz, Chris Havens, Dorothy Cerulo

Nays: None

Abstained: None

Z16601: 44 Irving Place; Block 102, Lot 31

Rick Brodsky, Esq., represented the applicant, Maria T. Micale Revocable Trust.

Shawna Ebanks, PP, AICP was sworn in.

The following witnesses were sworn in for the presentation:

Vincent Hager, Principal, Maria T. Micale Revocable Trust – Applicant/Owner

Maria Micale, Principal, Maria T. Micale Revocable Trust – Applicant/Owner

Paul Rugarber, AIA - PDR Architecture

Cristen Sheppard, AICP, P.P - Cofone Consulting Group LLC

Matthew Hockenbury, P.E. - MCH Engineering, Inc

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

A-1 Application Package

A-2 Intent to Proceed dated June 9, 2026

A-3 Topographic Survey of Property prepared by Marc K. Cifone, P.L.S dated January 22, 2026

A-4 Scope of Work Narrative

A-5 Denial Letter dated May 19, 2026

A-6 Plot Plan for Variance, 44 Irving Place, Block 102-Lot 31, Borough of Red Bank, Monmouth County, New Jersey, prepared by Michael C. Hockenbury, P.E., consisting of one (1) sheet, dated April 23, 2026

A-7 Plans Titled: Micale Hager Residence, 44 Irving Place, Red Bank, NJ 07701, Block: 102, Lot 31, prepared by Paul David Rugarber, AIA, consisting of six (6) sheets, dated April 24, 2026

A-8 Planning Review Memorandum dated August 12, 2026

A-9 Neighborhood Context Exhibit prepared by Cristen Sheppard, dated August 20, 202

A-10 Photograph of proposed cedar shake design

Mr. Brodsky explained that the applicant is seeking a variance to construct a 2.5-story rear addition and to expand the existing detached garage to add a third bay. The 9,991.2-square-foot lot meets the lot area requirements, and the 50-foot lot width is an existing non-conformity. The proposed garage expansion increases the accessory structure size from 464 to 682 square feet, exceeding the 500-square-foot requirement. Because the structure is over 500 square feet, it is considered a second principal structure, necessitating a D1 Use Variance. The garage will remain an accessory use to the principal structure, as it will have no living quarters, plumbing, or climate control, and will be intended only for vehicle parking and minor storage. Additionally, the overall lot coverage is being reduced from a non-conforming state to a conforming condition.

Vincent Hager testified that they purchased the property in September 2025 as their primary residence. They intend to maintain the architectural character of the 1901 home while accommodating their family. Vincent Light asked for clarification of the intended use of the third-floor attic offices. Mr. Hager responded that the office space is for personal use. No commercial business or public visitors will operate out of the home.

Paul Rugarber provided architectural testimony. The existing principal structure will go from a 2,240-square-foot home to a total of 4,329 square feet of living space. The house will contain four bedrooms, five full bathrooms, and one half bathroom. The exterior will feature beige Hardy Plank siding, cedar-shake accents, a round blue cedar-shingle turret rebuilt from the basement up to align with the second floor, a brick base, and a gray Grand Manor asphalt-shingle roof. The basement will feature reinforced framing and a relocated interior switchback stairwell serving all levels, while the exterior Bilco door will be removed. The first floor will expand the living space within the covered porch footprint, rework the kitchen and bar, and add a rear family room that opens to a screened porch. The detached garage will be reinforced and expanded by 218 square feet (to a total of 682 square feet) to store three vehicles, maintaining its existing midpoint height and replacing the upper walk-up stair with a pull-down attic access ladder.

Laura Garrett, 23 Irving Place, expressed support for restoring the turret's original round shape and inquired about the treatment of the front entrance. Mr. Rugarber confirmed that the full-width front porch will remain intact and restored.

Christen Sheppard provided planning testimony. She explained that the Use Variance was for the garage expansion. She explained that the 200-foot-deep lot provides sufficient site area to maintain and expand the garage approximately 178 feet back from the Irving Place frontage. Because the rear of the property abuts an open lot, any visual impacts will be de minimis. There is no substantial detriment to the public good or impairment of the zoning regulations. The garage remains an accessory structure with no windows facing the rear property line to protect privacy. Approximately 70% of surrounding lots within a 0.2-mile radius feature similar rear-detached accessory structures, thereby maintaining the prevailing neighborhood character.

Paul Cagno asked whether the other accessory structures in the neighborhood were also three-car garages. Ms. Sheppard responded that she observed various uses of the accessory structures in the area. Some garages appeared to accommodate extra parking without an additional garage space. Two lots in the area had substantially larger accessory structures similar to the proposed structure; however, it was unconfirmed that there were three cars inside.

Jonathan Gilday commented that the positive criteria presented pertained to maintaining existing housing stock and asked specifically how adding a third bay to the garage advances the zoning criteria, given that the home could be renovated without expanding the garage. Ms. Sheppard answered that Purpose G is advanced because the 200-foot lot depth allows the garage to support residential use by providing an additional parking space to match the additional bedroom unit, thereby offering sufficient space and an appropriate location for accessory parking.

Mr. Gilday asked how many cars could fit in the driveway leading up to the garage. Ms. Sheppard replied that she did not have the specific driveway capacity, but additional parking could exist in the driveway; however, the third garage bay enables a vehicle to be parked inside and out of sight.

Mr. Gilday asked whether the neighboring lots had similar accessory structures and were also 50-foot-wide. Ms. Sheppard answered that the specific lots referenced were slightly wider at approximately 75 feet, but the massing and visual impact of the proposed garage remains consistent with the prevailing character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Ebanks asked about the removal of three trees on the property and whether they will be replaced. Maria Micale responded that, after consulting with a landscaper, the trees must be removed because they obstruct the driveway and the porch structure. The plan is to remove and sell the trees, but they will be replaced with new trees in the rear to maintain shading and landscaping.

Ms. Ebanks asked whether side or rear fences will be removed or replaced. Ms. Micale answered that landscaping will be added in the rear to enhance the view for the neighbors. The fence to the east appears to belong to the neighbor; the white fence to the west belongs to the adjacent neighbor; and the rear fence will remain. Ms. Ebanks advised that if any new fencing is installed on the applicant's property, a separate development permit application must be submitted to the planning and zoning office.

Dorothy Cerulo asked whether the applicant intended to maintain the cedar-shake design on the house. Ms. Micale said they plan to install board-and-batten elements, broad blue accents, and decorative cedar shakes to closely replicate traditional Victorian aesthetics.

Ms. Ebanks asked about stormwater runoff impacts to adjoining properties. Matthew Hockenberry testified that the existing grading pattern, slopes from the street to the middle of the house and back down toward the rear, will not change. To manage the 899-square-foot roof expansion, roof runoff from 1,100 square feet of roof area will be directed into a double recharge trench behind the patio. The system was upsized by 40%, ensuring a net drainage benefit when combined with the replacement of the asphalt driveway with pavers.

Ms. Ebanks asked whether the lighting would remain the same or will it change, and how neighboring properties will be shielded given the close setbacks. Mr. Hockenberry responded that new exterior fixtures will be placed above or between the front garage doors. All lighting will be directed downward to illuminate only the driveway, with no spillovers onto adjacent lots. Ms. Ebanks asked if electric was the only utility connection planned for the garage. Mr. Hockenberry confirmed it was.

Ms. Ebanks asked for the existing and proposed height of the garage. Mr. Hockenberry stated that the height is 15 feet 10.5 inches and confirmed that the proposed garage expansion will maintain the same height.

Mr. Cagno noted four air conditioning condensers and a generator positioned on the left side of the home and asked about potential noise impacts on the adjacent neighbor. Mr. Hockenberry explained that because the driveway occupies the right side, the left side is the only available area for placement. The machinery will maintain a 3-foot setback from the property line, fully complying with the Borough's ordinance.

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

Raymond Mass made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Anna Cruz.

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

Anna Cruz motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Raymond Mass seconded.

Ayes:	All in favor
Nays:	None
Abstained:	None

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Sharleen Rodrigo
Zoning Board Secretary