

Minutes of the Asbury Park Planning Board  
SPECIAL MEETING  
June 8, 2020  
Virtual Zoom Meeting  
6:00pm

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. In addition, a notice regarding this virtual meeting and instructions were published in the Asbury Park Press and the City of Asbury Park website. A copy of that notice is on file with the Board Secretary. The notices and the conduct of this meeting are in accordance with the guidelines for virtual meetings issued by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs. Official action may be taken on the matters listed below.

Members in Attendance: Mayor John Moor, Councilwoman Yvonne Clayton, Jim Henry, Michael Manzella, Alexis Taylor, Jennifer Souder, Rick Lambert & Chairperson Barbara Krzak

Members Absent: Trudy Syphax

Members Recused: Barbara Krzak

Staff: Jack Serpico (Board Attorney); Donna Miller (Board Planner), Jason Fichter (Board Engineer), Doug Clelland (Board Engineer) & Irina Gasparyan (Board Secretary)

Meeting begins at 6:01 pm

---

**A. Salute to the Flag**

**B. Roll Call**

- C. Minutes:** Approval of minutes of May 18, 2020 regular meeting  
Motion to approve minutes: Manzella      Second: Clayton  
All in favor    None opposed    Krzak recused

**D. Applications:**

**1. AP Triangle, LLC**

Bounded by Cookman Ave., Asbury Avenue, and Heck Street; Subdivision & Site Plan

Barbara Krzak recused herself from the application  
Board Profs sworn in

Jennifer Porter, Attorney for applicant

Porter: Opening statement, recap of application continuance.

Frank Minervini, Arch for applicant, sworn in

Minervini: Discussed surrounding area & showed relative aerial view of application

EXHIBIT A-8: Aerial view

EXHIBIT A-4: Rendering

Galipo: can you locate aerial views location? Will you provide Cookman ave frontage?

Minervini: don't think we have, but side facades are virtually same. Not much of façade will be seen.

Galipo: would u describe the sides of Cookman ave as “sides”?

Minervini: yes, 2 shorter sides are facing Cookman

Porter: very much in keeping with other developments ie Vive

Lambert: subdivision creates a lot & confines ability to create other layouts, when have open lots to use to liven streetscape & create much more space

Minervini: we think we've chosen design that is best. Go back to rendering, side facades are well designed

Lambert: vive really reflects coastal arch, seems like you could have been more colorful w/ choices by WRP

Minervini: although plan doesn't allow this gray town, this gray is more modern & in tune w modern coastal arch

Porter: this part color palette  
Henry: at trc requests some notes, seem to ignore those requests. One of things is bldg. not fronting streets, windows, colors, materials used  
Moor: agree that plan was well throughout but it was 12 years ago, have to have some changes with time.  
Galipo: any other bldgs. On Cookman with sides facing?  
Minervini: don't think there are any other that have the condition we do. I suspect no.  
Galipo: there are 2 bldgs. w sides, Cookman/main st  
Minervini: presented floorplans-  
Galipo: can provide views from Cookman. Important to see relation to buildings  
Minervini: happy to do it  
Manzella: a little confusing entrance ways on floorplans  
Minervini: corner apts have entries at the corner of building. On heck st have option to enter on heck street, have 2 entries  
Manzella: each unit has entryway on street or ped access?  
Minervini: not all do. Pointed out apts that don't on floorplans ... 25% have frontage w entry on street  
Lambert: go back to muse developments- are those front doors that face the muse?  
Minervini: they are a door, have 2 accesses. For private use of residents  
Porter: that will be further discussed by landscape arch & planner  
Barbara Krzak: which of these presentations going to be seen from Cookman  
Minervini: show renderings, most like what Cookman ave would look like  
Krzak: can you show the doors? Would they walk in to door from driveway?  
Minervini: show/explain rendering. New drawings show sidewalks  
Galipo: when deliver elevations will have correct cartway?  
Krzak: pathway on east is private pathway not public?  
Minervini: engineer will describe  
Serpico: in TRC resolution, reference recommendations made by Michele Alonso, #4 recommend. Was heck st be realigned  
Porter: correct, but for reasons that Eng. Will discuss, the plan was changed. Will discuss reasons.  
Serpico: will have to look into that. Don't know that we have authority to alter trc approval. Redev. agency & PB. This seems to be specific approval. Don't see ability to interpret that one.  
Lambert: says shall not will consider  
Manzella: goes back to council?  
Serpico: no. so something may have to be addressed.  
Porter: where is spec condition in resolution?  
Serpico: read portion of resolution  
Porter: no mandate that we have to follow.  
Open to public Qs  
Barbara Lesinski: concerned about units-  
Minervini:  
Porter  
Doug McQueen: facades will shape the street? Seems inconsistent w WRP to soften streets.  
Minervini: not fair characterization. Was talking about purely overall mass. By setting back top floor, good solution giving bldg. length.  
McQueen: are layouts of bldg.'s constrained by proposed lot sizes?  
Minervini: no think the lot sizes are based on layouts  
McQueen: why wasn't Cookman elevation provided  
Minervini: no part reason not provided, we will be happy to  
Galipo: seems can accept shorter dimension. Relationship of bldgs. & subdiv. concerned that Cookman ave.  
McQueen: could bldgs. Be layed out w longest facing Cookman ave ? if oriented a bldg. toward Cookman, the side of that bldg. could touch  
Minervini: if there was not public space proposed, yes. Project is not fronting on Cookman. Open space is the buffer.  
Galipo: could have front doors on Cookman

Minervini: agree w many comments, but since the triangle space was chosen as open space

Porter: go back to Serpico pointed out that trc approved and public space was designed and approved in that location.

Lambert: board has to approve the subdivision and the layout. Understand that trc approved this layout, but there are factors could be affected by that. Created situation that create waivers and design exceptions.

Porter: also want to point out that design is driven by many other factors. Think important to hear from Eng., landscape arch & planner instead of one

Adrian Smith, heck st: did arch explore option where bldgs. acknowledge corner ie. Flatiron bldg.? how do they relate to Cookman ave?

Minervini: bldg. not fronting on Cookman. Once we determine that corner not used for front of bldg., we determined this layout as best.

Smith: so why can't bldg. front on public space?

Minervini: to do that would have to turn orientation of bldg. would lose a number of structures.

Smith: why western/north yards so narrow & Cookman so much bigger?

Minervini: multifamily bldgs. don't have much front yards. Ground floor is residential, wanted some interaction w streets. Thought better solution to set less back from street. Have multiple accesses to streets.

Ernest Mignoli: is it fact that frontage on Cookman already

Minervini: public space is fronting Cookman not bldg. majority is facing heck & Asbury

Public Qs closed

Sean Delaney, engineer sworn in

Porter: can u begin by speaking to current conditions of property?

EXHIBIT A3: Subdivision plan

Delaney: showed in relation to streets & location

EXHIBIT A2: Site plan

Delaney: sheet 4 of 14 showing relationship of development to open space area. Sheet 5- phase 1 will consist of bldg. #2, phase 2- bldg. #3 facing future lot, phase 3 bldg. #1 along Asbury ave. noted that residential use is permitted use. Described and showed access & driveways. Showed & described sidewalk areas. Sheet 1 of 2 of vehicle circulation plan- described and showed vehicle paths

Galipo: what is dimension of internal drive- length of back of access down to the end of drive

Delaney: less than 250'.

Delaney: pg. 2- emergency vehicles could access property. Deliveries- no proposed loading zone. Deliveries to site will utilize driveways or street parking. Garbage/recycling, Direct access from Cookman ave incl public.

Street furniture- Cookman ave doesn't have design yet, propose trash, bike rack. Not proposing right now to do future developments along Cookman ave until all other developments completed.

Taylor: Many fences proposed, there are some points where say end wooden fence & start metal fence- go over?

Delaney: showed fence types- wood fence lattice design, metal- fence w slats. Metal defines courtyard areas Assoc w units

Taylor: may consider that wooden fence don't think its in vernacular of anything in area

Delaney: sheet 9 of 14- site lighting- described diff light fixtures

Sheet 7 of 14- Flood zone area- cafra permit approved for site

Galipo: area of open space in flood zone chosen so bldgs. Aren't susceped?

Delaney: described drainage system and area of drainage. All discharge into Wesley lake, 3 diff connection points. Discharge areas/points. We have submitted these plans as part of cafra permit application, have not recd any comments yet. Analysis is similar to beach club application & their comments and then we address them.

Wesley lake commission has provided letter.

EXHIBIT A-6: Temporary construction & sales trailer

Delaney: Temporary construction & sales trailer plan- shows where located, as phase 3 location begins construction, will be relocated.

Henry: That area is prone to flooding

Delaney: flow coming is still less than system says in pipe, so there is room for additional capacity

Henry: Wesley lake still has flooding problem, lake ave still has also. Isn't this going to make it worse?

Delaney: from my review the system is designed to handle. Perhaps pipes not maintained/cleaned out would affect capacity.

Henry: what is approximate increase?

Delaney: don't have that number handy. Remember it had 10 cfs additional capacity. Not adding that much, maybe 5cfs. On heck st, possibly less.

Delaney: wanted to keep private. Other extra driveway that doesn't restrict access. Security issue to keep people from walking through

Manzella: if someone need to access ac, wouldn't be able to access 8 units along the muse.

Galipo: both of issues brought on are result of orientation of that bldg.

Taylor: think should also provide view looking west of 6' fence. Don't feel that provided compelling argument for enclosing that area. Creating situation where those units on 2 alleyways. Doesn't even need to be meandering, should even be straight.

Galipo: agree.

Souder: have same comments. Back area of meandering pathway- could be negative for residents & public if it is has closed gates on both sides which makes it seem not accessible to the public. Happy to see open space, but may be ways to make some changes that would change relationship to bring them together to make it positive space for everyone.

Henry: last slides indicated sales office on Asbury ave.- if remember correct, vive had sales office & seems you're looking.

Porter: we can provide further info on that Q, but its my understanding that office will only serve this site, not any others.

Clayton: think the ac condensers has to hidden from view

Fichter: think there should be a little more light in walkways

Open to public Qs

McQueen: have you seen this area during flooding? Not how but what causes it to flood?

Delaney: not familiar

McQueen: have you seen the actual project site to see how that area floods or drains?

Delaney: did not, witnessed during rain events. Consulted infrastructure reports

McQueen: so didn't contact dpw or engineer to consult?

Porter: if I can interject, a number of these questions relate to conditions of Wesley lake but not our part site & outside the scope

Serpico: think it's fair to Q the witness

McQueen: under dep regulations for stormwater runoff criteria, for purposes of this project, lake ave & Wesley lake would be below point of discharge, so if it backs up & can't flow down, wouldn't that increase the flooding?

Delaney: based on my analysis, I don't believe its going to be exacerbated. Could be other sites.

McQueen: say this site would be only site drain? No inlets on heck? Not 4 stormwater drains on heck/ lake ave?

Delaney: didn't see any other inlets. They may not connect to this system.

McQueen: that is the Q- whether or not those storm drains tie into this system? When lake level rises, it's those steradians that flood.

Delaney: per my review of avail files, didn't show connections to any other pipes. Not disagree. Pipe runoff on heck, didn't see any other inlets.

Delaney: the runoff on this site would be a fraction of lake

McQueen: one of strategies listed on dep is minimize/break up impervious surfaces, pointed out in your report that cafra allows 90 & you state 78

Delaney: believe based on analysis done correctly address

Porter: must object. To go over all these points,

McQueen: can I ask what nature is of that Q to DEP- do you have any reference to it?

Delaney: a copy of plans & reports have to be sent to dep as part of WRA application & we made that request in March & waiting on that reply.

Serpico: Delaney when do you think you will receive responses from DEP? Am I correct in thinking that's something that would have to submit to board?

Delaney: yes

McQueen: provide for public rights of way in WRA? I think when E end of Sewall vacated, that Wesley grove proposed that recommendation was ignored, will we try to stick with intent of WRP?

Delaney: Planner would be able to speak better to the WRP

Barbara Krzak: mentioned Cookman Ave streetscape not being done now, why?

Delaney: idea was to do all streetscape at one time. Majority along Cookman is future site.

Krzak: what about Asbury ave?

Delaney: Asbury ave already done previously

Krzak: headlights going into residential building,

Delaney: landscape arch will testify about that

Krzak: mention lighting on 4<sup>th</sup> floor- Cookman units will have lights that will impact, just want to make sure that no spillage?

Delaney: they are downward facing lights, shoot straight down building. Portion of bldg. where lights

Barbara Lesinski: did you know there was a box covert initially when WRP was designed?

Delaney: not aware

Lesinski: so no knowledge that all runoff went into ocean. This can change so you can require a new plan?

Delaney: that's why dep will look at these and comment

Ernest Mignoli: are you aware that

Delaney: based on information avail, the slope of roadways

Mignoli: so are aware that corner where public space, all meet at corner of Cookman & heck, aware that's the gathering point? Haven't been there during storm events?

Delaney: aware that's where they convene. Have not seen any flooding during rain events I witnessed.

Mignoli: have u ever been here during heavy rain event, 3+ inches? Stated that dep application and feeds off WRP that's 16 years old? Has anything changed in area? When was application submitted?

Delaney: end of feb, march. Can receive all comments and approvals and have to comply

Mignoli: so can't build until have dep in hand? Do u believe updated condition on all sides of triangle

Delaney:

Mignoli: did u include all other developments?

Delaney: my analysis is related to this project only and how it relates.

Porter: application has been submitted by AP Triangle

Mignoli: so small triangle area is proposed park? All landscape will be flat park?

Delaney: design of that area has not been determined yet.

Motion to carry both applications to July 13, 2020 without further notice: Manzella Second: Clayton  
All in favor None opposed  
APPLICATION CARRIED to JULY 13, 2020

#### E. **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn: Manzella Second: Clayton All in favor  
Meeting Adjourned: 10:53 pm