

Minutes of the Asbury Park Planning Board  
Regular Public Hearing of  
**July 8, 2019**  
Council Chamber  
7:00pm

Announcement by the Chairman that the meeting is being held in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975. Adequate notice of the meeting has been provided to the Coaster and the Asbury Park Press. All notices are on file with the Board Secretary. Official action may be taken on the matters listed below.

Pledge of Allegiance  
Roll Call

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

Members Absent: Rick Lambert

Staff: Jack Serpico, Esq., Doug Clelland, (InSite), Michael Sullivan (CCH), Michele MacPherson (State Shorthand), Irina Gasparyan (Secretary)

Meeting begins at 7:00 pm

---

**A. Minutes:** Approval of Minutes of regular meeting of June 10, 2019

Motion: J. Souder      Second: M. Manzella

Discussion: Minor grammatical corrections by J. Henry

In favor: All

**B. Applications:**

**1. 1401 Ocean Ave, LLC**

**1401 Ocean Avenue, block 4204 lot 1, Waterfront Redevelopment Zone**

Minor Site Plan approval for rooftop event space to include bar, restrooms and seating.

Serpico: rec'd letter; Read letter to put into exhibit.

Exhibit B-1: Letter from Asbury Partners

Serpico: Planning board without going through the master redeveloper. Stated previous case to support. Can't say let's preserve notices, don't know how long it will take.

McGill: Keep application, hopefully resolve itself, notice again.

**2. 1105 Main Street LLC**

**1183 Main Street, block 2804 lot 2, Main Street Redevelopment Zone**

Amending Site Plan approval for Phase I of previously approved four phase approved site plan.

Mark Steinberg Esq. for applicant

1<sup>st</sup> Witness: William Stuckey, developer, sworn in

All professionals sworn in

Steinberg: Describe circumstance

Stuckey: owner Fasano has been talking to a lot of people in town, & people have voiced that no parking & office spaces.

Exhibit A-1: Parking Analysis

Stuckey: counting 2 blocks of building, counted 136 parking spaces

Steinberg: have planner & architect, tenants here to explain

Moor: submitted

Krzak: Need to change date of parking study submitted to reflect when the original document was done. May 13, 2016 traffic study done.

Manzella: When planner gives testimony,  
Henry: How many offices?  
Stuckey: 2, and they're here tonight  
2<sup>nd</sup> Witness: Jenna Zilincar: business called M Studio, want opportunity to move to main street. Design marketing.  
Total employees: 6  
Do you have parking now? No  
How many clients do you see? 1-2/week. Have a lot of communications with google hangouts  
Hours of operation: m-f 9-5  
Manzella: of 6 employees, how many have cars?  
Zillincar: maybe 2  
No further Qs

3<sup>rd</sup> witness: China Battista- nurse practitioner, work for plastic surgeon looking to expand non-surgical office  
Steinberg: Describe operations  
Battista: M-F, some Saturdays, 1-2 evenings until 8pm during week  
Henry: said 2-3 appts/hour, are there more than 2 waiting?  
Battista: no  
Manzella: do u ant that you & front desk person will drive to work?  
Steinberg: not trying to hide anything, have 2 low-key operations here.  
Stuckey: looking at initial term of 5 yrs. w/ 2-3 options of 5 years  
Krzak: whatever board decides, committing to 5 years  
Clayton: any idea of what type of retail?  
Stuckey: not yet  
4<sup>th</sup> Witness: Walter Hopkin, Licensed Planner for applicant, sworn in  
Hopkin: site has 9 parking spaces. Stuckey misspoke. We're 4.5 spaces shy, off street  
There are 9 off-street spaces available today. Also another 12 around block, another 13 across the street  
Q's in the report: trash will remain private, signs in parking- modify signs to say customers only. Utilities- office has lower demand than residential  
Steinberg: redevelopment plan allows for reduced parking?  
Hopkin: yes  
Krzak: what was proposed vs. what is now?  
Steinberg: 4x 2 bedroom apts, sq. ft retail on 1<sup>st</sup>  
Hopkin: parking lot, streetscapes  
Manzella: go thru requirements for parking again, not sure its clear; retail 10 req. 4500 sf, 11.5 spaces required., Planners letter says 18  
Krzak: require 10 for retail, + 8 for offices. Have 9 off street. Need 4 additional  
Manzella: depending on what retail is, have opportunity to share spaces between day/night with residential  
Moor: drive past everyday, looks like 4 apts on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. Why balconies on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor?  
Stuckey: can testify that outside of bldg., is same as what was approved  
Serpico: Construction completion date Sept 2019  
Steinberg: construction not going to be completed by that time  
Henry: is it your intent to designate 9 spaces for specific tenants?  
Hopkin: for customers only  
Krzak: any discussions with other biz in area to allow employees to park?  
Steinberg: Insite report 7/3/19- advises that adequate off street parking, given testimony as to type of offices,  
Steinberg: have planners letter 7/3/19- our planner test that we comply w zoning req., any negative aspects?  
Hopkin: yes, all in conformance. No negative. Parking req is only. As prof planner, all variances can be granted. Benefits outweigh negatives.  
Krzak: do you still feel that way after what u heard about 2 hour parking limit?  
Manzella: our objective to assess variance, not operations, but will add that should designate on site parking in rear for employees, not customers.  
Steinberg: deficit of 9 spaces,  
Clayton: signage for businesses?  
Steinberg: according to sign ordinance will comply  
Sullivan: may be worthwhile to maintain jurisdiction for signage  
Steinberg: no problem leaving that to board  
Stuckey: weren't going to have signs on rear  
Zillincar: only have placard, not a destination, don't need signs.  
Open to Public Q's:  
Paul McEvilly, Interfaith Neighbors: in seeking original approval, did applicant or board rely on know that there will be parking turnover twice per day?

Serpico: no way to find out for sure, unless we review that record.  
Henry: I don't remember that discussion

Open to Public Comments:

Paul McEvilly, representing interfaith, property adjacent to property of application. Sworn in: When came to current location, not a lot of businesses. Parking problem, started when railroad ave changed parking style. During course of business day, people park in our parking lot. While building completion will be good, our employees already parking on other side of railroad tracks.

Move to close public comment: Henry                      Second: Clayton  
All in favor

Board Comments:

Manzella: tough call to assess what parking will be

Moor: agree tough decision, but aware that parking problem. Saying no impact is wrong. Mr. McEvilly is correct.

Henry: don't know what tenant on ground fl, it's possible that if get right tenant, may alleviate parking. Fact that office use vs residential use, potential for reduce parking problem. Thing new prop use is better than previous

Krzak: looking @ 5yr leases, hope that biz increases, but so will numbers in future.

Clayton: for me its unknown, not business on 2<sup>nd</sup> fl, it's the businesses on 1<sup>st</sup> floor. It feels like a new application.

Serpico: would you like to reconsider

Steinberg: don't know answer, since we don't have tenant on ground floor. Respectively submit that this is not going to make or break parking in the city.

Conditions:

Comply w/ Insite recommendations

Signs: Come back to board for approval. DRC for signs

Trash-Henry

Parking: Customers only employees outside

Trudy: open parking spaces

Undesignated spaces

Time frame- not in application

Motion to approve the amendment: Manzella    Second: Henry

In Favor: Jim Henry, Michael Manzella, Jennifer Souder, Yvonne Clayton, Trudy Syphax, Alexis Taylor, Barbara Krzak

In Opposition: John Moor

Application **Approved**

**C. Resolutions:** none

**D. Discussions:** none

**E. Executive Session:** none

Motion to adjourn: Krzak                      Second: Manzella                      All in favor

Meeting Adjourned: 8:49pm