

**Zoning Board Minutes
Regular Meeting- Virtual
February 23, 2021**

Announcement by the Chairperson that “the meeting is being held by electronic means in accordance 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 the 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.”

Board Members in Attendance: Christopher Avallone, Russell Lewis, Tim Szlyk, Brittany Ashman, Daniel Harris, Christopher Gonzales, Jill Potter, Catherine Minervini & Bonnie Nach

Board Members Absent:

Board Members Recused:

Board Staff: Jack Serpico (Board Attorney); Donna Miller (Board Planner), Jason Fichter (Board Engineer)

A. Call to Order

B. Open Public Meetings Statement

C. Roll Call

D. Applications:

1. 1302 Mattison, LLC (Carried from December 8, 2020 without further notice)

1302 Mattison Avenue, Block 1101 lot 23, R1A Zone

Application seeking a use variance for use of the existing structure as a two-family dwelling in a single family zoning district.

Exhibit B-1: letter from attorney Mark Brietman requesting the application be withdrawn without prejudice.

Motion to withdraw application: Avallone

Seconded by: Lewis

All in favor, none opposed

Application WIHDRAWN without prejudice

2. 300 Sixth Avenue, LLC (Carried from November 10, 2020 without further notice)

300 Sixth Avenue, block 3606 Lot 5, R2 Zone

Bulk and FAR variances to construct a two-unit structure

Andrew Karas, attorney for applicant

Savarese: went over revisions to plan, rendering

Karas: any other revisions to plans?

Savarese: also adjusted height of the stair tower to get it down

Lewis: were u to make door on 6th changes?

Savarese: yes we made them, operable

Board professionals sworn in- Donna Miller & Doug Clelland

Miller: yield to Bd engineer for driveway configuration

Clelland: most of our concerns addressed @ last mtg. can run sidewalk through driveway?

Savarese: yes we can do that

Open to public Qs

Werner Baumgartner: Is it your belief that this fits the character of neighborhood

Savarese: it's a fitting appearance to fit in w adjacent buildings.

Karas: said fits within the character, not appearance

Baumgartner: what design exceptions

Miller: misspoke, there was previous design

Maria Peretti: how many variances requesting? How high is current design? Is there way to get rid of that tower w 300 on it?

Savarese: 38' currently. No, that tower is there to get to stair tower, owner wants that feature

Mignoli: what are heights? Rails heights?

Savarese: 33' to top of rail & 30' to top of parapet. Yes, railings are 3' . Roof level lower than parapet.

Mignoli: do u think out of character to have rooftop deck?

Savarese: no

Mignoli: is door operational?

David Roberts, professional planner for applicant sworn in

Karas: I think we are on community design standards where we left off, can you continue?

Roberts: it was determined that comm design stds still apply, from last meeting, we know lot has been vacant there, new design standards applied with objective to keep new construction consistent with homes around them, must have 2 stories, discourage ranch homes, most common predominant style 2.5 stories w front porch. 30-69.6- additional comment regarding new development, election district, group sections of city by development. In this case it is in election district 6.

Ashman: are u saying design stds are same?

Roberts? They haven't changed, same as 1995

Ashman: do u believe that building

Open to public Q's

Baumgartner: can read into record ? what is undeveloped lot?

Roberts: in this case undeveloped & vacant same?

Serpico: he just said vacant lot is same as undeveloped lot and that his opinion, if yours is different, then so be it.

Roberts: just guessing but when look at undeveloped lots talk about election districts. Anything that deals w new construction applies here.

Peter Siegel, Applicant, sworn in

Karas: why did you decide to go ahead w 2 family instead of 1?

Siegel: while technically could build single fam house, would still need variances, no one would build single family. Seems to me since its allowed on zone, why not allow other. Look great, real contributor to town, we need housing, if want to build something want it to look great

Peretti: would u be opposed to lowering height? Reason I ask is that original design had total height of 36' didn't have tower

Siegel: I wasn't opposed that's why we already lowered, your comment last time had impact & so we redesigned. I do recall height did fluctuate, for example being in flood zone had to raise it, it fluctuated.

Miller: the original design was sunken into ground but because its in a flood zone, cant do that anymore,

Perretti: what kind of lighting?

Siegel: can I answer that? Im very conscious of lighting, I believe we made a lighting plan that's very

Close Public Comments

Karas: think great building, fits in, planning testimony supports, not going to build single family, way lot is going to have to build within same even if single family, believe it adds to Asbury.

Serpico: however you opt to vote on this case, I want you to state your reason for voting either way

Szlyk: really torn, think its beautiful building, applicant bent over backwards to make concessions, height not really concerned & reduced. My hangup is styling, having trouble w design stds & how they're applied. At this point undecided, tentative yes.

Ashman: feel a lot of been met, looking at height, do see that outdoor space is public benefit. I know stormwater will be coordinated. Main for me is it doesn't fit in with the rest of block, could serve as gateway to waterfront area.

Lewis: still think this is heavy lift. Applicant has done so much to make it work, I don't think im satisfied, I don't agree that single family would work on this property, think 4 parking spots are driving this design. I don't have problem w design of building. Im still struggling with it, still a big ask. I'm stuck w parking & rooftop. But will say extremely impressed w applicant.

Potter: applicant has heard us, come back each time w changes, I disagree that cant put single fam here, its lovely building, not sure rooftop needed, parking problem, have to feel for homes across the street, so not in favor of project

Karas: in terms of roof deck, we would not be opposed to eliminate & cap height to 30'

Harris: wouldn't want this building on my street, think should stick to character of neighborhood, so right now

Glassman: I appreciate process & changes, have been struggling not to say no. rooftop was issue for me, but still feel it's a massive feel

Minervini: I agree that single fam would work, gives sense of apartment bldg., im fan of not replicating architecture of past, I think there is a way to do that, doesn't need to look Victorian, think there are. Think it looks out of scale.

Nach: think can build 2 family, biggest issue for me is height & rooftop

Motion to deny application: Harris

Seconded by: Potter

All regular members vote to deny, none opposed

Application DENIED

E. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by: Avallone

Seconded by: Lewis

All in favor, none opposed

Meeting adjourned 9:21pm