

Minutes of the Asbury Park Planning Board Regular Meeting
May 2, 2022
7:00pm

Announcement by the Chairperson that the virtual meeting is being held in accordance with the with the “Open Public Meetings Act,” Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, amended 2020, which explicitly permits a public body to conduct meetings electronically during a state of emergency. Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided to the Coaster and Asbury Park Press. All notices are on file with the Board Secretary.

Members in Attendance: Mayor John Moor, Councilwoman Yvonne Clayton, James Bonanno, Eric Galipo, Jennifer Souder, Jim Henry & Barbara Krzak

Members Absent: Alexis Taylor, Rick Lambert, Daniel Sciannameo (alt) & Juanita Barnes (alt)

Members Recused: None

Staff: Christopher Beekman (Presiding Board Attorney); Donna Miller (Board Planner); Doug Clelland (Board Engineer); Irina Gasparyan (Board Secretary)

Meeting begins at 7:03 pm

A. Salute to the Flag

B. Roll Call

C. Minutes:

1. Minutes of regular meeting of April 18, 2022

Motion by: Clayton **Seconded by:** Krzak **All eligible members vote in favor**

Recused: Souder, Henry & Galipo

D. Discussions:

1. **Block 4001, Venture Urban Renewal LLC, Block 4001 Lots 2-15**

Extension of time to file subdivision deeds & CAFRA compliance

Henry: think 1 yr is too long, 3/6 months

Smith: don't think 3 months would be enough time

Galipo: think 6 months is reasonable

Motion by: Krzak **Seconded by:** Henry **All eligible members vote in favor**

Recused: Souder, Henry & Galipo

E. Applications:

1. **PB-2021-06**

649 Mattison, LLC,

649 Mattison Avenue, Block 2505, Lot 9, CBD Redevelopment Area

Andrew Karas, Attorney for applicant

Daniel Condatore, Licensed Architect for applicant, sworn in

Board Professionals sworn in

Exhibit A-7: Revised Architectural plans dated 4/20/22

Condatore: reviewed updates and changes made since last meeting. Changes to mutttons, added screening on roof on E side,

Galipo: This is assembly creating, not custom designed pieces

Condatore: if look at top of arches, there is finished brick, behind is structural brick, when put new windows in, all brick was cleaned up. In order to push window back and recess, would need to break up all brick. Badly damaged wood,

Exhibit A-8: Photos of site

Karas: when looking at the windows not a simple replacement process?

Condatore: yes correct, can't simply change out the windows

Krzak: I personally am disappointed cant recess those windows

Karas: would require all new windows, change of interior tenant's work

Open to public Q's

Werner Baumgartner: why were original windows removed in first place

Karas: removed for a tenant to do business on Mattison ave

Close Public Q's

Carter Sackman, applicant, sworn in

Sackman: important for business to engage the street, glazing is important for a commercial business. I think this is a great mix & harmony of 2 things. Understand its subjective, but think you will be pleased.

Moor: by changing windows how much sq ft of light did it really change?

Sackman: there was a lot that was kept, columns, elements

Karas: those structures, including steinbach building, had windows that were replaced. There are stipulations in the plan to have certain percentage of glazing

Galipo: the procedure should be different,

Karas: you plan has in there a façade committee

Galipo: this board needs to make a plan for the future so that this does not happen. Your experience

Krzak: lets take this as a large lesson for the future

Henry: glad brought up uez guidelines- cant agree w architect opinion that met the UEZ guidelines- spent a lot of time developing these.

Karas: UEZ guidelines are somewhat subjective- state comparable not exact replacement

Open to Public Q's

No Questions from public

Close Public Qs

Karas: concludes presentation

Krzak: Best that I can tell as for conditions- mullions on windows, door changes,

Souder: think there could have been other changes to bring more light to room. Also talking about engagement, Its lovely inside but I think we are all mourning the loss of features

Clayton: its unfortunate that

Krzak: also that approval comes from the right place

Galipo: you bring value to the projects you work on. Plea that maybe next time would agree to get a consultation before work

Karas: process important, especially when have tenants waiting to get in

Moor: just as long as professionals agree that everything has been addressed

Miller: what are

Krzak: want to make sure that within the resolution that we as a board did not make a decision about historic guidelines

Motion to approve application with conditions discussed: Bonanno

Seconded by: Moor

Opposed by: Henry

Other 6 members vote in favor
APPLICATION APPROVED

F. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by: Clayton **Seconded by:** Henry
Meeting Adjourned: 8:05pm

All in favor