

MINUTES
RED BANK PLANNING BOARD
August 16, 2021

The Red Bank Planning Board held a Planning Board meeting on Monday August 16, 2021 at 7:00 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 7:00 pm. A roll call showed the following members were in attendance: Mayor Menna, Dan Mancuso, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Juanita Lewis, Dave Cassidy, Fred Stone and Erik Perry. Also present were Marc Leckstein, Esq., PE, Shawna Ebanks, Director of Community Development, Ed Herrman, PE and Maria Graziano, Board Secretary.

Dan Mancuso read the Open Public Meeting Statement Act. An Adequate and electronic notice with the time, place and matter was posted in the two newspapers, with the Borough Clerk's office, the Borough website and posted outside the Red Bank Meeting room and on the front door of Borough Hall.

Dan Mancuso opened the meeting to the public for non-agenda items of which there were none.

Area in Need of Redevelopment Report

Marc Leckstein explained this report is an examination of the properties designated by the Mayor and Council for the Planning Board to determine if the proper criteria have been met for the Council to further proceed with the next phase of the Redevelopment process.

Chris Dochney, PP, from CME Associates.

The Redevelopment process is a multi-step process. The first step was for the Council to pass the Resolution referring this to the Planning Board. He named the specific properties subject to the investigation. Included is the former VNA site, the two gas stations surrounding the intersection on Route 35 and several other properties in the area. There are 10 properties included.

The findings of the report are presented to the Planning Board. This is the second step, which is being done at this meeting. The Planning Board will then make their recommendation, or not, to the Council.

There was a site plan approval given to the VNA site not long ago. This approval involved an area in need of rehabilitation. Now this property is included in this study to determine if it is also in an area in need of redevelopment. There are different sets of criteria. There is a greater burden of proof required for redevelopment.

Redevelopment Law originated from the law regarding blighted area. There are 2 currents used in the Redevelopment Law, one involves utilizing eminent domain and one does not. This one would not utilize it.

One of the revisions to the law states if a building has not been able to rent in a period of at least 2 years, this meets one of the criteria of Redevelopment.

The criteria for Redevelopment are: [A] the building is unsafe or dilapidated, [B] the building is vacant with regard to commercial properties [C] the Borough or government agency owns the property, or if the property has such features, such as location, that will not enable a private developer to want to

develop the land [D] buildings that show lack of ventilation, light or sanitary facilities that are unsafe to the public [E] properties with lack of proper title [F] areas of at least 5 acres damaged by earthquake, fire [G] properties located in an Urban Enterprise Zone [H] areas pursuant to smart growth (the vast majority is located in this area) this is not a criteria to utilize alone.

The following properties are included:

Block 1, Lot 1, 80 Rector Place; vacant since 2010, it is a known contaminated site, the building on the site is dilapidated. This meets criteria A, B, C, H.

Block 3, Lot 1.01, 151 Bodman Place; building appears to be in pretty good condition, occupied, there is overgrown vegetation, there are no real issues: does not meet any criteria regarding the building, it only meets criteria H. Not recommended.

Block 3, Lot 1.02, small property on Route 35; it is pump station owned by the Borough, contaminated site; This meets criteria C, H.

Block 3, Lot 9.01, VNA site located Riverside Avenue and Route 35; the exterior of the building itself doesn't look bad; however, there are substantial roof issues involving leaks onto the third floor, still leaking in 40-50 areas; there was debris blown into neighboring properties from mechanicals on the rooftop; also, since the car crashed into the building, it had been deemed an unsafe structure, which has not been remedied. This meets criteria A, B, H.

Block 3, Lot 2.01 and 4.01, they are the parking lot for the VNA building, they are not in bad shape. They meet criteria B, H.

Block 3, Lot 6, Bodman Place, has been boarded up for several years, the property is not in great shape, there is mold and water damage and there has been no maintenance in several years. This meets criteria A, B, H.

Block 3, Lot 7.01, small parking lot serving the Colony House across the street, generally ok, but it is not curbed properly. This meets criteria 3, H.

Mr. Dochney explained criteria 3 discusses the inclusion of a property in relation to the whole project, meaning, that a particular lot is necessary for the Redevelopment area as a whole and should not be excluded.

Block 4.01, Lots 1 & 2, these two properties are merged as one and it was previously a gas station, it is a contaminated site, the building is not in good condition, the ceiling was completely caved in for a portion of the building, it has been vacant since 2010. The layout is also unsafe, with regards to the ingress/egress. This meets criteria A, B, D, H.

Dave Cassidy clarified information regarding the approved site plan received by the VNA.

There was also discussion regarding an approval that was obtained to construct the Hampton Inn Hotel on the property located at 80 Rector Place. It was noted that the Board unanimously denied the request for extension from the applicant; however, the approval is still valid. If this Redevelopment is referred

back to the Council and they proceed to implement the Redevelopment Zone, that would change the zoning and then the approval would not be valid.

Kristina Bonatakis clarified the Redevelopment and Rehabilitation Plans.

Fred Stone expressed his concerns regarding the tax interest and the effect of the schools.

Sergio Benetiz, 130 Bodman Place, clarified that Mr. Docherty represents the town.

Ben Forrest, Locust Place, clarified one of the properties not being separated from the inclusion of the study.

Thomas Salmon, 130 Bodman Place, clarified if the toxic waste and cold tar could migrate. Mr. Dochney is not a remediation expert, but stated the levels exceed the state guidelines.

Maryellen Mess, 95 Hudson Avenue, clarified this area is primarily an area in need of Rehabilitation. She also wanted to know the benefit of the town for this designation. Mr. Leckstein explained the Council would have to address this.

A role call showed the same members in attendance, after a short break.

Kristina Bonatakis will recuse herself from voting for this, as she resides within 200 feet of the properties.

Suzanne Viscomi, 25 Cedar Street, thanked the Board. People let developments run down and she feels residents should go to the Council meeting to voice their concerns about tax issues and property owners not paying taxes, which then become to responsibility of other property owners.

Rose Sestito, East Bergen, wanted to know if there are any guidelines that the Board has follow once an approval is granted. Mr. Mancuso explained there are a variety of agencies that may have to grant their approval. She clarified why, in general, an extension is granted. Mr. Leckstein explained there are reasons that the applicant may receive an extension.

Zane Naqvi, on behalf of the Colony House. They request that the Board does not include their property as an area of Redevelopment. The property was not going to be included, they just want it on the record.

Dan Reardon, Irving Place, he discussed Redevelopment and blighted areas. He disagreed with Mr. Dochney regarding some of the criteria applied to the different properties.

A motion was made by Dave Cassidy, seconded Barbara Boas to carry the hearing to the September 22nd meeting. No further notice required. All were in favor.

Application:

Shrewsbury Manor, Riverside Avenue and Allen Place, Block 5, Lots: 5, 6.01, 8 & 9.02 P13492

Peter Carton, Esq. represented the applicant.

Nicola Bowers Metzheiser, VP Shrewsbury Manor Inc., was sworn. She explained the applicant would like to develop the property with 10 garden apartments. The property currently has a parking lot and garages, which service the existing Shrewsbury Manor. They also own a property, which currently has a

2-family house and another property which had a law office. Since there is a waiting list for the current apartment complex, they felt this would be a good opportunity to expand.

Mr. Menna clarified that since they own the existing Shrewsbury Manor and the proposed development, this would provide ample parking to both facilities.

Robert Waldron, Architect, sworn and accepted as an expert witness.

He explained the 2-story building proposed, which would consist of six (1) bedroom units and four (2) bedroom units. There will also be a partial basement, where the mechanicals and meters will be placed.

The following Exhibits were entered: A-1; Existing Elevations: A-2; Site Plans: A-3; Architectural Plans.

The first-floor unit sizes range from 855-1,224 square feet. The second- floor units range in size from 999-1,300 square feet. This project is a traditional building with no shared utilities or any common space. The roofs will be sloped; therefore, no space for a green roof.

The buildings will be brick in the front. The height to the peak will be just over 39 feet. The brick will be red, the roof will be slate gray and trim will be white.

William Wentzein, PE, was sworn and accepted as an expert witness. He reviewed the Exhibit A-1, an aerial view of the existing elevation. Exhibit A-2 showed A-1 with the proposed site plan super-imposed on it. He described the site. In total, the site currently has 6 access points, the proposed plan will have 2 access points, on Allen Place and Morford Place. There will be 50 parking spaces will be provided.

The property requires 20 spaces for the residents. There will be an electronic charging space. It was also noted of a 2-car parking easement, which was obtained when they purchased the property of the law office. That easement is properly recorded. The remaining spaces are available to the existing Shrewsbury Manor.

This project provides a fresh look with a better traffic flow. Impervious coverage is reduced.

The existing storm drainage was discussed, with regards to the large municipal storm water chamber that was observed. They will provide a new storm pipe, which will address the existing flooding trouble, in the area.

The landscaping will include an ornamental fence, intense plantings at Morford Place and foundation plantings around the residence; there will be 9 free standing lights at 20 -feet high, a wall mounted light is for the proposed walkway. They will also provide walkway lights.

They discussed the concerns from the T&M letter that the applicant wanted to address further, this included the charging stations, the parking easement and the parking spaces used by the tenants from the existing Shrewsbury Manor and the walkway for them to utilize.

Karl Pehnke, Traffic Engineer, was sworn and accepted as an expert witness.

There will be no real net change in the traffic with this application, there will be no change in flow and it is not impactful to the adjacent roads. The reduction of the existing curb cuts will be beneficial for pedestrians and traffic flow.

Design waivers are required. The improvements proposed are appropriate and improve the area. The trash enclosure will be in the rear, picked up 2 times weekly, with recycling picked up one-time weekly. Mayor Menna thanked them for removing any ingress/egress onto Route 35.

Kate Keller, PP, was sworn and accepted as an expert witness.

The benefits include reducing the 6 access points to 2 and upgrading the landscaping. The benefits outweigh the detriments.

Front-yard setbacks are required. The proposals will be a better use of the land, promotes general welfare, desirable. No detriment to the zoning plan. In accordance with existing plan.

Jennifer Steward, 26 Morford Place, was sworn. She commended the applicant for their addressing the flooding issue and how they keep-up their properties.

The public portion was closed.

A motion was made by Mayor Menna, seconded by Dan Mancuso to approve the Resolution. Ayes: Mayor Menna, Dan Mancuso, Kristina Bonatakis, Barbara Boas, Juanita Lewis, Dave Cassidy and Fred Stone. Nays: none.

Dan Mancuso made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Dave Cassidy. The meeting was adjourned at 10:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dina Anastasio