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Introduction: Plan for Red Bank, NJ

The recommendations and conclusions described here and in the chapters that follow are the result of three major steps:

- Extensive public discussions took place, in open forums, group meetings, and one-on-one conversations. They were held in various locations in several community neighborhoods, and all included clear expressions of opinions and ideas, conflicts between ideas and ideals, and an extraordinary civil resolution of them all into specific recommendations. This document therefore represents the efforts of the entire community.

- An analysis was developed that included a consideration of the past (i.e., the physical, social, and economic histories), the present (i.e., the physical, social, and economic existing conditions), and therefore of the possible alternative futures.

- The community reached the conclusion that it wanted to grow economically, while at the same time preserving its wonderful physical character and enriching the very quality of life that makes Red Bank so unique.

Prior to the preparation of the chapters of this Plan, the community held a lengthy and intense process to determine a vision for its future. This Vision Plan of 1994 was broad in its statement of principles and detailed in its suggestions for specific actions; it therefore is an integral part of this Master Plan. It was in this “visioning process” that the three fundamental and profound conclusions were reached:

- Economic growth must take place, for several reasons: the business community must grow to increase its share of the tax burden and therefore to reduce the taxes required of the residents; shopping must continue to serve the needs of the residents as well as the region; jobs must be created for residents of all economic classes. As a parallel to economic growth, it is recognized that the population should begin to grow again, after many years of decline caused by the decline in family size. Part of economic growth is the attraction of new residents that give vitality and stability to the town, and who are from a variety of household types, from families to single people to retired people.

- The wonderful, comfortable, walkable, historic character of Red Bank must be preserved and improved as the new development and growth takes place. This means that the best of the old buildings should remain and that new buildings add to the architectural richness of the town’s heritage; it means that the sidewalks should remain walkable, and that the streets are easy to cross in spite of the possibility of added traffic; it means that the landscape of the tree-lined streets, of the parks, and of the river should be both expanded and cared for. The community must remain a pedestrian-friendly place within the business community as well as in the residential neighborhoods, along the river, in the parks and open spaces, and in the access to public transportation.

- The quality of life throughout the community must be maintained: the town must retain its personal intimacy where neighbors and shop-keepers know each other, the neighborhoods must remain safe for everyone - especially children, the location on the beautiful river must be seen and understood throughout the town, the cultural and entertainment life that makes Red Bank much more than a small hometown should continue to thrive and grow, and the public educational system must now begin to better serve the whole community.
The Master Plan consists of six distinct plan chapters. The photograph and diagram shown here illustrate the location and organization of the town, and summarize the basic objectives of the plan in a composite look at the Master Plan recommendations. The diagram, in particular, highlights the areas where the major actions of the master plan are to be focused.

The six plan chapters are organized by these topic areas: land use, housing, circulation, community facilities, public infrastructure, and conservation. Each can be summarized in this way:

- The Land Use Plan gives direction concerning future development of all types, establishes the principles of preservation, and gives guidance for the determination of architectural and landscape character in new developments. It sets the basis for new Planning and Development Regulations, and for Design Guidelines covering certain community areas, and permits the variety of community life that results from a true mix of uses. Residential uses, for instance, will be permitted in almost every district, shopping will be focused in a way that promotes public activity and vitality, the existing neighborhoods will be protected, and new development can include residential, commercial, and hospitality projects that take
advantage of the river’s edge while remaining integrated into the fabric of the surrounding community.

- The **Housing Plan** identifies housing needs of all kinds, and recommends possibilities for their location. Some new developments will fall within existing neighborhoods, thus protecting and improving them, while others will be within the mixed-use areas of downtown, “over-the-store”, and along the river. The idea of people living and walking throughout the town in this way is fundamental to the conclusions of the Vision Plan.

- The **Circulation Plan** is emphatic in its focus on the importance of the quality and usefulness of Red Bank’s pedestrian and public transportation systems. While the plan recognizes the necessity of smoothly flowing traffic to the business and life of the community, it is clear that the means of human-powered transportation and public transportation are fundamental parts of the very quality of life that Red Bank cherishes. Therefore all recommendations for improvements to intersections and roadways are coupled with the overriding need to make crossing or walking along the streets pleasant and safe. The plan also therefore makes specific recommendations for the establishment of bicycle routes, and has a special...
focus on the 1995 Monmouth County study concerning improvements to the train station area. Finally, it also points out the importance of appropriately located developments to assure the ease of walking, biking, or using public transportation systems. If the various major land use areas, developments, and transit connections are located within walking distances of each other, walking will be Red Bank’s dominant movement system. When this occurs, and when the streets are made safer to cross and pleasant to walk along, the goal of creating a truly walkable community, that is linked by active and comfortable tree-lined sidewalks that border smoothly flowing streets, will be realized.

- The **Community Facilities Plan** documents the borough facilities dedicated to emergency and safety services, solid waste disposal/recycling, education, and recreation. It describes opportunities for greater utilization of borough facilities that range from improved lighting for playing fields to consolidation of some municipal facilities. It also demonstrates that the nature and capacity of these facilities will support the underlying goals of the larger Master Plan.

- The **Public Infrastructure Plan** assesses the status of water supply, stormwater management, and wastewater treatment in the borough. Of special interest are the ongoing improvements of the water supply system. Red Bank has, over the years, diligently expanded and maintained infrastructure capacities. This will enable the borough to meet the challenges outlined in the Land Use Plan, maintaining its role as a center of commerce, and growing as a community of compact, vital neighborhoods.

- The **Conservation Plan** describes the fea-
LAND USE PLAN

Introduction

The Land Use Plan element of the 1995 Red Bank Master Plan is designed to guide development and redevelopment in the borough, in order to realize the goals and intentions established in the 1994 Red Bank Vision Plan.

The recommendations of the Land Use Plan are also based in large part on the other Elements of the Master Plan: Housing Needs, Circulation and Movement Systems, Community Facilities needs, Public Infrastructure Requirements, and Environmental Constraints.

The Land Use Plan of a Master Plan is the most vital element of the required components of the Master Plan because it is the primary guide for all development, and because the New Jersey State Municipal Land Use Law requires that the zoning ordinance either be substantially consistent with the Land Use Plan or be designed to effectuate such a plan (40:55D-62a). For this reason, the Land Use Plan Map is precise in its location of the various land use categories recommended. Note also that the Land Use Law also requires that a municipality re-examine its Master Plan every five years; this Plan is Red Bank’s update of its previous Master Plan.

Goals for This Plan

In order to move forward with development in Red Bank, in order to respond to new conditions in the economic climate, the 1995 Land Use Plan builds on the foundations of the previous plans. Those plans include the previous Master Plan, past Reexamination Reports, the 1992 State Development and Redevelopment Plan, and the 1994 Vision Plan.

The borough adopted its previous Master Plan in 1985, and Reexamination Reports in 1988 and 1994. The 1988 Reexamination Report identified changes in the economic and regulatory environments that continue to influence Red Bank and the region. It also delineated ongoing infrastructure improvements to maintain and expand services throughout the Borough. The 1994 reexamination Report reviewed the objectives and assumptions that informed land use policy at the time of the 1985 Master Plan and the 1988 Reexamination Report, in the light of subsequent changes in land use, and various changes in Municipal, County, and State land use policies. The Borough also approved the Vision Plan in 1994, which established the fundamental objectives of this Master Plan. Many of the goals of these previous plans that continue to be relevant; those goals, and the goals of the 1995 Red Bank Master Plan that build on them, are:

1985 Red Bank Master Plan

- Maintain substantially all the existing residential districts.

- Emphasize the importance of maintaining, stabilizing and expanding the residential base of the western portion of the borough.

- Locate a new residential zone on the western border of the borough.

- Encourage preservation of the Broad Street Historic Area with design controls.

New Jersey 1992 State Development Plan (also known as "Communities of Place")

- Promote retention of existing businesses and development of new businesses.
• Encourage a range of housing in proximity to employment centers, to achieve a balance between housing and job opportunities and to ease commuter travel.

• Develop in higher density mixed-use centers ("communities of place") that accommodate the varied housing types, employment, retail and support services, the use of alternative modes of transportation, the use of shared parking and other site improvements, and so on. Note that this proposal holds for existing centers and communities, as well as for new developments.

• Support the residential adaptive reuse of obsolete facilities by revising regulations that might prevent and discourage adaptive reuse.

• Maintain and improve access to coastal and waterfront areas of recreational, aesthetic, cultural or ecological value provided that such access does not degrade the function and value of the natural resources.

1994 Red Bank Vision Plan

• The extraordinary visual character of the buildings and open spaces of Red Bank must be preserved, even when new and larger development takes place.

• The commercial vitality of the downtown area must be maintained and improved, so that it pays a greater share of municipal taxes and enables the Borough to accomplish the detailed proposals necessary to realize the Vision.

• In building on these objectives, the Vision Plan calls for a single, mixed-use downtown that includes a great variety of development areas, and that must be controlled by both development regulations and design guidelines. Included in the guidelines should be recommendations for the character and type of development in downtown, along the riverfront, and in a new mixed-use neighborhood that is east of downtown. This Plan also indicates that, on the whole, the existing residential neighborhood patterns should remain as they are now, except that the western river edge (the "sunset side" of town) should permit more public access.

The 1995 Red Bank Master Plan

The overall Master Plan that has resulted from building on these precedents, and from listening to the voices of the community, is quite simple and yet will have profound impacts on the life of Red Bank for a long time to come. It consists of four fundamental proposals that encompass the entire borough:

• As part of the larger goal of expanding the commercial tax base, the Downtown should grow and thrive. Development should be encouraged, historic structures and areas should be protected, and a true mix of uses that includes a variety of residences should occur. Therefore a large single downtown area is to be created that is focused on Broad St. and that is directed by both the zoning regulations and a set of design and planning guidelines. It should also be recognized that Red Bank is an important urban center for the region, and that a substantial amount of property within the borough, especially in the commercial areas, is occupied by tax exempt entities such as schools, churches and other service providers. These institutions serve not just the town, but the region as well. The borough will seek to establish an appropriate balance of commercial, residential, and (non-taxable) institutional land uses.
• The riverfront is a special resource that is uniquely attractive to private development, but it must also be accessible and useful to the community. Therefore, special zoning districts will be created that identify the land uses that are appropriate to the river edge locations, adjacent to the western river edge and to downtown. The regulations and accompanying guidelines will give direction to the need for a more open development pattern that maintains views and access to the river from the nearby streets - while at the same time permitting developments that are similar in density to those in either in downtown or the adjacent western neighborhoods.

• Residential developments should be encouraged in a variety of ways, to further the objective of an increased population. These developments begin with the basic recommendation to permit some type of residential development to occur in virtually every area of town, including downtown and the industrial areas, where many changes can be expected to take place in the future. It also includes the recommendation to create a new mixed-use residential area west of downtown, in the vicinity of the Galleria and the train station. This new zoning district should permit a higher density of residential development than in most sections of town, but should also be similar to the surrounding neighborhoods.

• The fabric of the rest of the town - the neighborhoods - must be protected to improve and thrive. This objective must therefore include these actions: the preservation of the existing zoning categories for the various neighborhoods; the preservation of the buildings and uses in the Professional Office area, including the addition of permitted residential uses in that area; the encouragement of a mixed-use area along Shrewsbury Ave. that can include residential developments, but must especially include small "mom and pop" type stores that serve the surrounding neighborhoods; and the possibility of a residential pattern along the western river's edge which includes improved public access to the river itself.

• Finally, the character of the buildings and streets must be preserved and protected by a careful crafting of the zoning regulations, to assure that the size, location, and appearance of each building contributes to the feeling that gives Red Bank its special quality of life.

Detailed Plan Description

The specific land uses of this Land Use Plan are described below, and are illustrated on the accompanying map. In recommending the various Land Use zoning Categories for the Planning and Development Regulations, regarding the locations and characteristics of uses, it is also essential to note that many of the design characteristics (set backs, lot areas, etc.) of the Regulations must be adapted to fulfill the principles of this Plan, also.

As stated in the Goals for this Master Plan, the zoning Categories and use locations for the downtown area will give more flexibility to developers and to the Borough, while at the same time will support the clear goals of the 1994 Vision Plan. The various residential use areas have required few changes from their existing Regulations. It is for these areas in particular that the design criteria of the Regulations must be studied. Because the Vision Plan calls for all development to be compatible with the existing character of Red Bank, Design Guidelines for key areas of town are also recommended to cover such issues as colors, facade and roof character, entrances, store fronts, signs, landscaping, building lighting, and so on. These
Guidelines will give clear direction to developers, provide flexibility to the borough, limit the need for variances that zoning can often require, and be the best tool the community has to preserve its character while also encouraging development. The zoning Categories recommended for inclusion in a new set of Regulations, and the accompanying Guidelines, are therefore as follows:

1. Commercial/Mixed Use Land Use Areas:

   **Category CCD (Central Commercial District):** The CCD area extends from the east side of Broad St. to the west side of Maple Ave., from Monmouth St. to Front St. It is the historic center of town, with the largest collection of retail space, and with the Historic District area at its heart. In order to realize the many goals listed above, this zoning Category will be a true mixed-use area. It will also accommodate a density of development that makes the commercial area thrive and adds to the tax revenues of the municipality.

   In order to accomplish these specific objectives, a wide variety of uses will be permitted throughout the entire District (for instance, retail of various types, offices, hotels, restaurants, entertainment, and a limited amount of residential). All types of retail uses will be permitted, except a few that are inconsistent with this location at the heart of town (e.g., gun sales, large supermarkets, drive-in fast food sales, tattoo parlors, etc.). The residential types that will generally be permitted are the multi-family conversions of existing buildings (except at those ground floors where retail is required), and the specific use of...
"over-the-store" spaces for new types of living. Because the character of this heart of the community is an important part of the whole nature of Red Bank, the Regulations will include specific and measurable criteria concerning the nature of both new and renovated buildings. Those criteria include:

- The desired location of storefronts on various streets, in order to maintain retail continuity.

- The locations of building facades at certain street lines, again, in order to maintain retail continuity.

- Recommended maximum building heights, which must be compatible with the character and heights of the existing buildings in the district. In general, this maximum height will probably be about five stories.

- The acceptable locations of parking lots and parking garages (for instance, not at the sidewalks of certain streets, behind the buildings, etc.)

- The number of parking spaces required for any development, and the methods for providing them - including shared locations off-site, participation in a district-wide parking program, and so on.

In addition to these specific regulations, Design Guidelines will be prepared which cover the whole district, and which the Planning Board will use as a set of policies to assist in their reviews of specific projects. These Guidelines will also complement the Historic District Regulations, which are more specific and which therefore will have precedence over the Guidelines in the designated historic area. Because of the ease of using them, and because they can address the subjective design issues that the Regulations cannot, the Guidelines are a fundamental part of meeting the two objectives of encouraging development and of preserving the town's great architectural character.

The Design Guidelines will define the criteria for the following building and landscape design characteristics, for private developments as well as public improvements:

- Building facade design criteria (i.e., facade materials; colors; window types; store front designs; roof and cornice design character; front and back entrance locations; etc.). Note that these criteria will apply to all buildings, including offices, hotels, stores, and parking garages.

- Parking lot landscape design criteria (i.e., number, spacing, size, and species of trees;
landscape buffers along sidewalks; walkways from parking to shopping streets; etc.)

- Open space landscape design criteria, for such places as gardens, sitting areas, and plazas that might accompany new buildings (i.e., the number, size, and species of trees; the use of ground covers and shrubbery; location and number of public benches; fences; and so on)

Finally, as part of the borough's concern for its design character, the Historic District criteria will now apply also to portions of Monmouth Street, and to an additional block of Broad St.

*Category WD (Waterfront Development District):* Because of the unique characteristics of developing along the river's edge, where all sides of a building must appear as the "front" and where the public desires view and access to the river, very special zoning conditions must apply. These conditions must give guidance to both the land uses and the physical pattern of development.

A mix of uses will be permitted, but a special emphasis will be on multifamily residential and hotel/bed-and-breakfast uses. Offices will be permitted, as in the CCD district, but retail uses will be limited to restaurants and certain types of entertainment. In general, no personal services or other retail uses will be permitted, since they are the primary activities of downtown and the neighborhood mixed-use areas.

The proposals to build a public walk ("Riverwalk") along the river's edge, the general lack of public access to the river now, and the pure emotional and symbolic impact of the beautiful views of the river expanse all call for a special way of developing here. Therefore the zoning regulations, and a set of Design Guidelines that are tailored specifically to this area, will do the following:

- Set height limits that are compatible with the adjacent areas of downtown and the mixed-use neighborhoods.
- Establish front and side yard setbacks that maintain the views.
- Give guidance to establishing the locations of pedestrian access to Riverwalk.
- Set criteria for the location and design of truck docks, parking garages, and auto entrances.
- Establish standards for the design of the private landscapes and buildings that adjoin Riverwalk. Note that is was pointed out many times in the Vision process that the river is also a gateway into Red Bank; therefore the views from the river, as well as to it, are important to the whole community.

Parking is a very important specific part of the criteria for this district, since it is necessary that all sides of a building appear as attractive fronts. Parking garages (which are specifically permitted), as a result, should not face either the nearby streets or the river, so special regulations and the Design Guidelines will identify limitations on their locations and criteria for their appearance.

*Category MS (Medical Services):* The intention for this area is to permit flexibility for development at the hospital, without being in conflict with the surrounding zoning districts, or with the public open spaces along the nearby river. Therefore, as a balance between encouraging this use to continue providing jobs and services to the community,
with the need to protect the vitality and character of adjacent downtown, the zone for development and growth is limited to the area.

**Category NB (Neighborhood Business):** This district is intended to serve the neighborhoods around it, in contrast to the CCD district which serves the whole town and the region. Therefore there will be limitations on the nature of retail uses and on the residential developments that will be permitted, to assure that they support this basic intention.

While all the retail types permitted in the CCD district will also be permitted here, there will be limitations on the size of individual retail space. As stated in the Summary of the 1995 Plan, the purpose is to encourage small neighborhood-related shops, of the kind often referred to as "mom-and-pop stores".

Residential uses will be permitted as part of the borough-wide intention to encourage an increase in the population and to have a mix of uses throughout. This use must not interrupt the desired continuity of retail at the center of the district, however. Therefore "over the shop" residential will be permitted throughout, but the permitted higher density types of attached single family, garden apartments, and townhouses should be located outside this retail core, or else they should contain ground floor retail space within them.

Parking must not interrupt the continuity of the shopping experience, and so the necessary parking lots must not be located along the sidewalk at the heart of this retail area. Note that shared, off-site, parking will be permitted in this district in order to meet these design objectives, but that it may not be provided in multi-story parking garages.

**Category HB (Highway Business):** This category permits a wide variety of roadside uses, ranging from offices to retail, and includes automobile sales and repair, and service stations. Its purpose is to accommodate the needs of highway-oriented businesses, including the larger stores known as "big-box retail", along Newman Springs Road.

**Category BR (Business/Residential Mixed Use):** This category will permit the widest range of uses of any single category in the Planning and Development Regulations, including single and multi-family residential, offices, retail, personal service, etc. The name indicates its application in this Plan, which is as a support for the various commercial and business uses that can exist within certain neighborhoods.

The permitted retail and personal service uses will be virtually identical to those in the CCD and BR-1 (which is described below) districts, with the specific exception of the sale of antiques, which are to remain focused only in the areas near the Galleria and Broad St. The uses that are specifically prohibited in those other districts are prohibited here, in order to assure their compatibility with the primary residential uses of this district.

Because this is a neighborhood district, the patterns of new buildings and the nature of renovations must be compatible with the scale and character of those neighborhoods. Therefore the Regulations will include criteria concerning set-backs, building footprints, building heights, etc. that are consistent with existing patterns. The two important differences between the BR district and the BR-1 district will probably be those of height and front yard setbacks. Buildings in this district should be compatible with residential neighborhood character, and therefore should probably be no taller than three
Residential/Mixed Use Districts

stories, which is lower than in BR-1. In addition, retail in the BR district should be designed to be compatible with the houses, and so stores located at the sidewalk will be neither encouraged nor required.

Finally, although the specific parking requirements are the same for other districts, shared off-site parking will not be permitted, in order to keep the size and scale of parking areas compatible with the character of the residential neighborhoods. It is important to note that, unlike the downtown and river districts (CCD and WD), no parking garages will be permitted.

Category BR-1 (Business/Residential Mixed Use, adjacent to Downtown): This district sits in the special place between downtown (CCD), the river (WD), and the mixed-use neighborhoods (BR). Because it is intended to be a new residential neighborhood in the borough, however, it is considered more as an extension of the adjoining BR residential and mixed-use areas. As a result, the specific differences between this district and BR are small, but they are fundamental in permitting the types of developments needed to meet the two objectives of increasing the population and of preserving and creating Red Bank's special character.

All of the uses are the same as the BR district, with the exception of two: no new single-family dwellings will be permitted, since the purpose here is to encourage a somewhat higher density of development than in the other neighborhoods; and, antique sales are specifically permitted here, as part of the goal to make Red Bank a regional antiques center.

The differences between this district and the BR district regarding design and site planning are more significant than those use distinctions, however; the special conditions that will make this area fulfill the Plan's objectives are:

- In order to encourage the level of residential development that is desired, to take advantage of river views across the adjacent WD district, and to be compatible with the scale and density of the adjacent CCD and WD districts, buildings could be as tall as five stories (in contrast to the possible three stories in BR).

- When street level retail is developed, in general it must be located directly at the sidewalk. This detail is essential to encourage the vitality that now exists, for example, at the Galleria and the train station and antiques areas.

- Parking will be permitted to be provided in shared, off-site areas, in order to maintain the character and continuity of the pedestrian
experience, especially in those areas that include retail. Site planning criteria will be necessary to guide the specific design and location of parking lots (note that no parking garages will be permitted), in order to assure that the desired character is accomplished.

**Category PO (Professional Office):** This category is intended to preserve the large older homes within the Broad Street and Maple Avenue area by permitting their re-use as offices. Re-use of these period homes is a fundamental part of the borough's overall efforts to preserve the character of the whole town, and to specifically preserve these structures which are from an important era in Red Bank's history. In addition, as part of the larger effort to encourage residential growth, and as a further means of protecting this great architectural heritage, residential uses will also be permitted. In keeping with the nature of the old houses, they may be either single-family dwellings or apartments within buildings that are used primarily as professional offices.

2. Industrial Land Use Areas:

**Category I (Industrial):** Category I permits the heavier industrial uses (e.g. food storage, dry cleaning plant, warehousing, large manufacturing, etc.) that are not permitted in LI; it also does not permit office uses. It is located approximately at the geographic center of the borough, and is surrounded by zoning districts that permit residential uses. In keeping with the goal of the 1994 Vision Plan to encourage growth of the residential population, residential uses will be permitted here, to give the flexibility to property owners and the borough to oversee possible changes at the very heart of the community. (Note that in the Vision process, this area was occasionally referred to as the "hole in the doughnut" of the town's uses.) The residential uses permitted here will be the same types and densities as in the BR district, which adjoins it.

**Category LI (Light Industrial):** The two areas of the LI district, which are located behind the houses west of Bridge Ave. and along Central Ave., permit light industrial uses such as research laboratories, printing, light fabrication, and warehouses. The district also permits offices of all kinds. Like Category I, these district areas are essentially surrounded by residential and other non-industrial uses, so it, too will permit residential developments to take place in the future. Also like Category I, the residential uses will be the same as in the adjacent BR areas.
2. Residential Land Use Areas:
Residential uses are the dominant land uses in Red Bank. The various neighborhoods are varied and stable, and the different zoning categories reflect that variety. As pointed out above, some of the design and planning criteria, which deal with building sizes, lot sizes, set backs, and so on, must be evaluated to assure their consistency with the goal of encouraging both new and re-use development, while maintaining the overall character of the town.

Category RA (Residential): This category is limited to single-family detached residences, with a minimum lot size of 7,500 s.f.

Category RB (Residential): The locations and uses of the various existing R-B districts include single family dwellings on lots with a minimum area of 3,500 s.f., and so is appropriate to existing neighborhood patterns.

Category RB-1 (Residential): This district, which is the area between the R-D1 district along the river and Leighton and Tilton Aves., permits single family attached dwellings as well as smaller-lot single family detached houses. These criteria are compatible with the nature of the existing neighborhood, which is also walkable to the Shrewsbury Ave. shops and the elementary school.

Category RB-2 (Residential): The R-B2 districts permit two-family detached residences as well as single-family attached and detached houses on smaller lot sizes. Note the distinction between "single family attached" dwellings, which are two houses side-by-side with a common party wall (permitted in R-B1),
and "two-family detached" dwellings, which are two residences (or, apartments) on two floors in the same building (permitted in R-B2). These slightly higher density areas are located immediately adjacent to the shopping on Broad St. and Shrewsbury Ave.

**Category RD (Residential):** The R-D districts permit garden apartments and townhouses, as well as the other various types of single family dwellings permitted in R-B2.

**Category RD1 (Residential):** This district, which is located along the western bank of the Navesink River, from Locust Ave. all the way around the bend in the river to Chapin Ave., is intended to open up the "sunset side" of town to the river by providing a variety of publicly-accessible open spaces that serve the community. All of the densities and uses of R-D are permitted with the additional requirement that, if garden apartments or townhouses are developed, a certain portion of the property must include a dedicated open space easement. Such green spaces can include active playgrounds for younger or older children, quiet parks for sitting, or river-edge walkways or docks.
HOUSING PLAN

Introduction

The Housing Element, in accordance with municipal Land Use Law and N.J.A.C. 5:91-93 (New Jersey Council of Affordable Housing) is designed to increase access to affordable housing, and to meet present and prospective housing needs, with particular attention to low and moderate income housing.

The Housing Element contains the following elements:

- Inventory of the Red Bank housing stock — age, condition, value, purchase or rental value and occupancy characteristics.
- Analysis of Borough demographic characteristics, including household size, income level and age.
- Analysis of the existing and probable future employment characteristics.
- Determination of the present and prospective fair share for low and moderate income housing.
- Projection of future housing stock, (including the probable future construction of low and moderate income housing).
- Discussion of lands and structures most appropriate for low and moderate income housing.
- Map to show appropriate areas of future residential redevelopment and development.

Summary

The Borough of Red Bank is located in the Northeastern Monmouth County on the Navesink River. To the north and west it is bounded by the river and to the east by the Borough of Fair Haven, to the South it is adjoined by the Boroughs of Little Silver, Shrewsbury and Tinton Falls. Red Bank’s 1.7 square miles is the home 10,636 residents. This translates to an average density of 6,256 people per square mile. The Borough is bisected by the New Jersey Transit Shore Line (formerly the New York and Long Branch Rail Road), and a commuter rail station is located at the corner of Monmouth Street and Bridge Avenue.

Red Bank’s population declined 11.5% between 1980 (when the census figure was 12,031) and 1990 (when it was 10,636). The population decline is primarily a reflection of the national trend towards smaller household size rather than out-migration of resident households.

Red Bank’s strength as an employment center has remained stable, though the general shift towards service industries has affected the nature of the jobs that are available. Red Bank serves as a regional shopping and service area for Monmouth County and the region, focused on a relatively large and dynamic business district.

The present housing stock is predominantly single-family detached houses. Approximately 40% of all housing units in Red Bank were constructed before 1940. Recently the Borough has been successful in attracting new residential development and redevelopment; proposals for approximately 170 housing units have been approved and will begin construction this year. Of these new housing units 62 units will be housing for senior
citizens created by the adaptive re-use of River Street School.

The Borough has a long history of addressing community housing needs and is currently pursuing an aggressive program to create new market rate, low, and moderate income housing. There are six areas of town which are projected to have additional development, which are discussed in more detail below:

- Downtown, along the River
- West Side, along the River
- Near the Train Station
- "Over the Store"
- "Over the Office"
- Rehabilitation and Infill

A number of projects have recently received preliminary approvals:

- Adaptive re-use of the River Street School: 62 d.u.; housing for low-income elderly.
- West Locust St.: 40 d.u.; substantial rehab for low-income families.
- Western Riverside Avenue, near the Molly Pitcher Hotel: 70 d.u.; mid-rise apartments; market rate.

According to COAH guidelines, the Borough of Red Bank is located in the East Central region which consists of Monmouth, Ocean, and Mercer counties. The Borough has a total calculated need of 482 units; of these, 56 are to be the housing rehabilitation component, and 426 are to be new construction. COAH has recognized that Red Bank has limited opportunities to provide additional low and moderate income housing by adjusting the new construction component of the municipal Calculated Need. The Borough will fulfill its indigenous need obligation of 56 units by promoting development and redevelopment in two areas:

1. At the western end of Locust Avenue—38 Units Fair Share Plan Allocation
2. Adaptive re-use of the former River Street School—18 Units Fair Share Plan Allocation

Inventory of housing stock

The present housing stock is predominantly single-family detached houses (36%). Approximately 40% of all housing units in Red Bank were constructed before 1940.

The median value of Red Bank’s owner occupied housing in 1990 was $155,400 which is 86% of the County’s. Owner-occupied housing accounted for 47.5% of occupied units in Red Bank, 72.6% in the county and 64% in the state. The share of renters whose payments represent more than 35% of household income is in line with that of the County as a whole.

Existing housing stock

Red Bank has implemented several initiatives that encourage maintenance and support rehabilitation of the Borough’s older homes. These initiatives include, for example, Zoning revisions that allow expanded uses in some areas and have contributed to the restoration of residential-type structures along Shrewsbury Avenue and Maple Avenue, a Regional Contribution agreement will fund the rehabilitation of 38 units located in the Locust Landing project and 11 units in the River Street School Project; and a Property Maintenance Code Enforcement Program. Infill development stabilizes value in the existing residential neighborhoods. The
Scattered Site Housing Program, in partnership with a non-profit developer, will construct new houses on several Borough-owned properties.

**Housing Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Red Bank</th>
<th>Monmouth Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Value Owner</td>
<td>$155,400</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental</td>
<td>$581 per mo.</td>
<td>$567 per mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income households Rent = 35% of income</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of housing stock Units built before 1940</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units built after 1980</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

|                | 100.0% | 5,112 |

In addition to the houses, apartments and condominiums already approved for construction, other projects have preliminary approvals including a 60 unit apartment building, (for seniors) which will occupy the site of the old Red Bank Lumber building. 1

**Number of units in existing and proposed housing**

In 1990 there were 4,683 occupied housing units in the Borough, of these 2,224 were owner-occupied and 2,459 were rented. The age of the housing stock makes clear that Red Bank has seen little of the residential development expansion experienced by Monmouth County in the past decade. More recently however, the Borough has been successful in attracting quality developments; proposals for approximately 170 housing units have been approved and will begin construction this year. Of these new housing units 30% will be housing for senior citizens created by the adaptive re-use of the vacant River Street School, 30% will be market rate single family housing and 40% will be in a new-mid rise condominium building. A discussion of housing projections for the longer-term planning horizon follows below.

**Units in Structure—Existing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, detached</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>1,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, attached</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 49</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home or trailer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Households (1990)**

- **One Person:**
  - Male Householder: 664
  - Female Householder: 1222
  - One Person (total): 1886

- **Two or more persons:**
  - Married Couple Family: 1719
  - Other Family: 149
  - Male Householder: 571
  - Two or more persons (total): 2439

- **Non-Related Household:**
  - Male Householder: 212
  - Female Householder: 121
  - Non-Related Household (total): 333

**TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS:**

4658

**Units affordable to low and moderate income households**

The standard measure of affordable housing, for all income categories, is that mortgage or rent will represent no more than 30% of household income. Applying this measure, (working from 1990 census data), indicates that only about 1 1/2 % of the Borough’s owner-occupied housing units, would be
affordable to a low-income household with an income at 50% of the Red Bank median income of $36,879. Using the same measure, about 6% would be affordable to moderate income households with an income of 80% of the median. By this standard measure, the highest rent affordable to a low-income household is about $460 a month. In 1990, 26% of the 2,391 units for rent in the Borough were less than $450 a month, and 69% of all units for rent in Red Bank were less than $700 a month, within the upper range of affordability for moderate income households.

Substandard housing capable of being rehabilitated

Substandard housing refers to a housing unit with health and safety code violations that require the repair or replacement of a major system. A major system includes a roof, plumbing (including wells), heating, electricity, sanitary plumbing (including septic systems) and/or load bearing load bearing structural systems.

Indicators of deficient housing that point to code violations are: 1) Persons per room (can indicate overcrowding), 2) Inadequate plumbing facilities, 3) Inadequate kitchen facilities, 4) Inadequate heating facilities, 5) Inadequate sewer services, and 6) Inadequate water supply. The absence of a telephone is also considered a statistical indicator.

The methodology employed by the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) establishes the probable number of "deteriorated units" in the Red Bank at 98. This figure is adjusted to distribute the regional responsibility for rehabilitation of substandard housing to all of the communities of the region. Once this is taken into consideration, the responsibility of the Borough is set at 56 units, as reflected in the Council On Affordable Housing Municipal Number Summary-1993 1999 Low and Moderate Income Housing Need Estimates By County, October 11, 1993.

Red Bank Housing Authority

The Housing Authority currently manages the residences of 110 qualifying lower income households at two locations, Montgomery Terrace on Tilton Avenue and Evergreen Terrace on Leighton Avenue. Montgomery Terrace (40 units, mostly families with children) is fully occupied and for a number of years has had a 2 year waiting list. Evergreen Terrace (50 units, mostly seniors) is also fully occupied and has a standing waiting list of over three years.

The Housing Authority also administers Section 8 housing for qualified seniors, disabled and families. Currently 236 households reside in apartments and houses managed by landlords that receive a portion of each rent payment from the Section 8 program. Market rate rentals are in short supply for apartment seekers. Because of this demand, and a fairly low mandated cap on fair market rent set by HUD (for example $698, including utilities, for a 1 bedroom), few landlords in Red Bank are inclined to rent to Section 8 participants. As a result, permission was sought and granted to include units outside the 1 3/4 square mile area of the Borough. Today approximately 70% of the Section 8 units administered by the Housing Authority are located elsewhere around the county.

HUD funding at current levels will enable the Housing Authority to place a maximum of 261 households. The portion of the total rent
that is the responsibility of the tenant is set at 30% of the household income. The actual payment is adjusted for utilities and other special expenses such as daycare and the number of minor children.

Demographic characteristics

Red Bank's population declined 11.5% between 1980 (when the census figure was 12,031) and 1990 (when it was 10,636). The population decline is primarily a reflection of the national trend towards smaller household size rather than out-migration of resident households. The average household size declined from 2.58 people per household in 1970 to 2.19 in 1990.

A maturing population

Red Bank's population is aging. In general, older people find that urban places are more hospitable to their needs for shopping, visiting, health care, and public transportation. Almost one-third (32.5%) of Red Bank households include at least one person over the age of 65. The corresponding figure for the State is 26.4% and is 24.5% for the County. Twenty percent (20%) of the Borough population is 65 or older, compared to 13.6% for the state and 12.7% for the county.3

Older Red Bank Residents (1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households w/ one or more persons 65 yrs or older</th>
<th>1512</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Person</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Persons</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Households With At Least One Person 65 Or Over</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household income

In the last decade, Red Bank has slipped in per capita income from 28th in the County to 34th and in median household income from 41st to 43rd. The extent of poverty and unemployment in the Borough is greater than in the County and, as is true for many urban places, there is also greater diversity in incomes and occupational distribution in Red Bank than in the County.

Per Capita Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Red Bank</th>
<th>Monmouth Co. Share</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$7295</td>
<td>$7054</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>$14786</td>
<td>$15132</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$14079</td>
<td>$20565</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is considerable disparity in household income, with the median household income for blacks amounting to less than half of that of white households. Hispanic median household income is 66% of that for all households and for blacks the comparable ratio is 56%. The rate of poverty among households is substantially higher for blacks than for whites and Red Bank's overall rate is much higher than Monmouth County's.

Existing and probable future employment characteristics

Because it is a regional center, Red Bank leads the County in service businesses and is second in retail sales (behind Middletown, largest in population). Statewide, Red Bank ranks 51st in retail sales. There is limited industrial development: manufacturing accounted for 556 jobs or 10% of the 5,363 persons employed in Red Bank, this is down from 15.6% in 1980. On the other hand, 3084 persons, or 58%, were employed in the retail, service, and professional categories (up from 44% in 1980). Red Bank ranks 16th in service receipts, up from 34th in 1982. With
less than 2% of Monmouth County’s population Red Bank accounts for 6% of total sales and 18% of service firm receipts. However, two different trends are at work. Red Bank’s position as a retail center continues to decline slowly, while the service sector has grown at a brisk rate.

A growing service sector

In five years, the Borough added 118 service businesses and 2,858 jobs. Leading the gains in the service sector is the category composed of engineering, accounting, research, management and architecture. In the most recent five-year Census report, Red Bank added 38 firms and 1,388 jobs in this grouping. Legal, business services, and health (non-hospital) were the other major gainers.

Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, Real Estate</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin.</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Mining</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflecting the decentralization trend of business-esses statewide, between 1982 and 1987 Red Bank’s share of service establishments declined slightly compared with Monmouth County. On the other hand, the Red Bank firms were large and growing in terms of receipts and employment. The resident employment concentration in services industries reflects both a general trend in the State and County and Red Bank’s own strength in these businesses during the growth period of the past decade.

Unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Red Bank</th>
<th>Monmouth Co.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1990, the unemployment rate among residents of Red Bank was 8.9%; compared with 7.6% for Monmouth County.

Present and prospective fair share for low and moderate income housing

Red Bank is small, compact, relatively urban community. The land within its boundaries can be said to be “fully developed” there are no parcels of land which are two or more acres in size and which are available pursuant to the adjustment calculations as set forth in N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2.

According to COAH guidelines, the Borough of Red Bank is located in the East Central region which consists of Monmouth, Ocean, and Mercer counties. The borough has a total pre-credited need of 482 units, of these, 56 are to be the housing rehabilitation component, and 426 are to be new construction.

Rehabilitation of the existing housing stock
and adaptive re-use of older buildings to residential uses will play an important role in the creation of housing opportunities in Red Bank. In the past two years several Borough-owned properties have been rehabilitated and sold through a Scattered Site Housing Program in partnership with a non-profit developer.

In addition, about 3 housing units a year are rehabilitated with financial assistance from the Monmouth County Housing Improvement Program.

**Fair Share Plan**

The Borough has identified two sites which will go towards meeting the 56 unit Indigenous need obligation from COAH.

**River Street School**

River street School is an adaptive reuse of a former grade school to senior citizen housing. The project is located on three parcels known as 60 River Street, 209 Shrewsbury Avenue, and 213-215 Shrewsbury Avenue. It is accessible from State Highway 35 and County Roads 520 and 13.

The site is currently served by a Monmouth County Bus Stop and it is a short walk (approx. 1800 ft.) from the Red Bank Train Station. The accessibility to these public transportation facilities were important factors in the selection of this site for an affordable senior citizen development. Moreover, from a service standpoint, the site is also located near Riverview medical and is within walking distance to the central business district.

**Project Description:** The building has been abandoned for over 10 years, with neighboring properties consisting of residential and neighborhood-scale mixed use. Adaptive re-use of the building will entail an extensive interior demolition and complete rehabilitation of all systems and surfaces.

**Unit Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency apartments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One bedroom units</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sponsor:** The project sponsor, Penrose Properties is a Joint Venture with Pindar Affordable Housing Development Corporation. Penrose and Pindar will be responsible for the administration and qualification of residents with regard to affordable housing requirements, including income verification.

**Funding:** River Street School is intending to utilize the following resources of financing, the only unsecured source is the Low Income Tax Credit which will be applied for in April 1995.

Monmouth County Home $650,000
Areas of Residential Redevelopment

1. Downtown, along the River
2. West Side, along the River
3. Near the Train Station
4. Over the Store
5. Over the Office
6. Rehab / Infill

Current Projects

FHLBB $300,000
LITC $3,870,000
RCA (Non-fair share units) $198,000

Affordability: The project will be affordable to residents earning 50% of median and 60% of median income for 35 years.

COAH Credit: For compliance with the Council on Affordable Housing Red Bank Borough seeks credit for 25% of the units in River Street School towards its 56 unit indigenous need. Therefore:
- 14 one bedroom units will be targeted at 50% of median income; monthly rent of $422.00.
- given the 1.33 credit for age-restricted units, the total credit for the River Street School Component would be 18 units.

Locust Landing Affordable Townhomes

As part of the continuing redevelopment of the Riverfront area, the municipality has agreed to support the development of 70 affordable townhomes on municipal land located at Block 71; Lot 101. The developer of Locust Landing will develop a 100% affordable ownership project whereby at least 50% of the units will be affordable to low
Income residents and 50% to moderate income residents. The Borough will take credit for 34 of these townhomes toward the 56 unit obligation addressed by this fair share plan. The developer is required to deed restrict all units in conformance with COAH regulations as well as develop an affirmative marketing plan.

Pricing: One Bedroom Units will be affordable to 1.5 persons. Two Bedroom Units will be affordable to 3 persons. Three Bedroom Units will be affordable to 4.5 persons. The average income for the 38 units will be established so that the development will be affordable to households earning 57.5 percent of median income.

The initial price of the low and moderate income owner-occupied single family housing unit will be established so that after a down payment of five percent, the monthly principal, interest, insurance, property taxes and condominium fees, cost will not exceed 28 percent of the eligible gross monthly income of buyer.

Affordability Controls and Standards

Since the Borough is meeting its fair share obligation through two projects which are 100% targeted for low and moderate income residents the following standards will be applied in keeping with COAH requirements.

Maximum Rents Standards
- Efficiency units will be affordable to one-person households.
- One bedroom units will be affordable to 1.5 persons.
- Two bedroom units will be priced for three-person households.
- Median income by household size will be established by regional weighted average of the uncapped Section 8 income limits published by HUD as per NJAC 5:93-7.4(b).
- Low income units designated within the Borough’s Fair Share Plan will be reserved for households with a gross income of less than or equal to 50% of median income.
- Gross rents, including allowance for utilities shall be established so as not to exceed 30% of the gross monthly income of the appropriate household size as per NJAC 5:93-7.4(a).
- Utility allowance shall be consistent with the utility allowance approved by HUD for use in New Jersey.

Administrative Agency: River Street School administrative responsibility for the verification and certification of low income residents will be done by Pindar Affordable Housing Management Service. The Borough of Red Bank under the office of the Borough Administrator will be responsible for the verification and certification of qualified purchasers for the Locust Landing Affordable Townhomes.

The Borough reserves the right to contract with a state agency, non-profit or consultant for technical assistance.

Affordability Controls: Units developed pursuant to this Fair Share Plan at the River Street School will be subject to 30 year controls on affordability. Units developed for the Locust Street Townhomes will be subject to affordability controls for 20 to 30 years.

Affirmative Marketing: The Borough of Red Bank intends to implement a regional marketing strategy designed to attract persons of all majority and minority groups regardless of age, sex or number of children, to housing units being marketed by the designated sponsors identified within this Fair Share Plan.
The Plan Prohibits discrimination in the renting of units on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, handicap, age, familial status/size, or national origin.

The affirmative marketing program requires: All newspaper articles, announcements, and requests for applications for low and moderate income units will appear in the following regional newspaper and publications: The Asbury Park Press and the Two River Times.

Projection of future housing stock

Because there is no remaining open and vacant land existing in the Borough, all future developments - both residential and non-residential - will take place either by renovation of existing structures or by land assemblage and redevelopment. Accordingly, this analysis of probable development is an estimate only, based on a general understanding of neighborhoods and streets rather than on several specific site analyses or project proposals. The few projects known of at this time are included in the overall analysis, however, so that all possibilities are included.

Lands and structures most appropriate for residential redevelopment

There are six areas of town which are projected to have additional development take place. Note that their locations, and the densities that could occur, reinforce these basic goals of the Master Plan: to increase the overall population of the town; to preserve the wonderful character of the entire community, to stimulate economic development, and to have all aspects of the Plan serve the entire population regardless of their age, their economic status, or the location of their neighborhoods:

1. Downtown, along the River:
   Mid-rise apartment buildings; market rate:
   Approx. 350 d.u.

2. West Side, along the River:
   Garden apartment, town houses; a combination of market rate and low/moderate income units:
   Approx. 60 d.u.

3. Near the Train Station:
   Mid-rise apartment buildings; a combination of market rate and low/moderate income units, especially including elderly housing because of the accessibility to public transportation and the shops of downtown:
   Approx. 320 d.u.

4. "Over the Store":
   Renovations of empty spaces above existing shops on the various retailing streets of town; market rate:
   Approx. 50 d.u.

5. "Over the Office":
   Renovations of the upper floors of the older houses that now contain professional offices in the P.O. zoning district along Broad and Maple Streets:
   Approx. 20 d.u.

6. Rehabilitation and Infill:
   Renovations and new construction on small sites in existing residential neighborhoods where there is some existing deterioration; a combination of market rate and affordable housing:
   Approx. 100 d.u.

TOTAL:
Approx. 900 d.u.

Residential redevelopment strategy

Within the six general areas; that are described above, and are indicated on this map, as many as 900 new and renovated dwelling units will be created in the Borough in the coming six (6) years. Note that the
Rehab/Infill component (6) is not shown as a specific area on the map above, as the ongoing process occurs to some degree throughout all successful and established urban places. It is anticipated that a significant portion of units that are sold will be affordable to moderate and low income families and that a percentage of the rental units will be affordable to elderly and moderate income households.

NOTES

1 Approved design occupancies are: The condominiums on Riverside Ave. near the Molly Pitcher - 70 units; River St. School adaptive reuse - 62 units; Single family houses on Prospect - 52 units; Wesleyan Arms (Red Bank Lumber) - preliminary review at 61 units—source: Borough of Red Bank
2 Not including institutionalized persons—source: 1990 census of Population and Housing
3 Source: 1990 census of Population and Housing
1995 Master Plan: Red Bank, New Jersey
CIRCULATION PLAN

Introduction

The Circulation Plan reflects the vision of Red Bank as a center for its surrounding suburban region, as a downtown surrounded by a variety of residential neighborhoods, as a town undergoing continuing revitalization, as a place that is continuously walkable, and whose sidewalks are truly pedestrian-friendly. For this vision of Red Bank to be realized, the circulation system should be well balanced, efficient in moving both people and vehicles, so that vehicular movement does not overwhelm the walking qualities which make Red Bank a desirable town center.

Most circulation elements in municipal master plans focus on the capability of the street system to move projected vehicle traffic demand. Traffic is necessary, especially in a town center. Traffic drives Red Bank’s economy and assures vitality. Red Bank throughout its history has been continuously shaped by the forces of transportation. In the past, commerce was based on sailing ships which docked on the Navesink River to serve surrounding farmers. Today, in contrast, commuter trains and buses operating from Red Bank provide access to the jobs which make this region one of the wealthiest in the nation. In addition, the town’s circulation system is also important in defining the image most people have of the borough. Whether walking, driving or riding a bus or train, the views of the borough and the experience of being in the borough are shaped by the passage through it while moving from one daily activity to the next.

Although traffic is essential for making Red Bank a vital center, traffic can also be harmful to what makes it a great town. Red Bank is not just another suburban strip shopping center. It is a town where people can walk to and from businesses, schools, home, and play. It’s streets and highways must therefore be appropriately designed and managed to maintain the pedestrian character of the borough and to protect the borough’s neighborhoods and shopping districts.

Inventory of Existing Circulation Systems

1. Pedestrian System

The pedestrian system is largely defined by the roadway network and therefore consists primarily of the sidewalks along streets. Principal pedestrian streets generally consist of the minor arterial and collector streets, which include the east-west streets like Riverside Avenue, Front St., Monmouth St., Oakland St., Chestnut St., and Bergen Place, and the primary north-south streets of Broad St. and Shrewsbury, Maple, and Bridge Avenues.

Typical pedestrian distances are shorter than vehicle trip distances, and travel distance poses a greater limit on pedestrian travel, compared to vehicle travel. As a result, the pedestrian network in Red Bank includes numerous short-cuts and passageways including parking lots, alleys and pedestrian paths. Walkways to off-street parking lots provide a critical portion of the pedestrian network, both to provide access to the parking lot but also to allow for cut-throughs between blocks.

Each of the primary walking streets has its own characteristics, especially concerning their usefulness, comfort, and access to important destinations. For example, the shopping areas of Broad and Monmouth Streets and Shrewsbury Ave. are comfortable,
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pleasant, and interesting in most locations. The same is true for most of the residential streets, which are usually tree-lined and quiet, such as southern Broad St., Chestnut St., Oakland St., and Bridge Ave. Other sidewalks are sometimes not as pleasant or useful, however: Front St., for example, has very narrow sidewalks and an unusually wide roadway in some areas; Riverside Ave., which leads to Broad St. from the hotels, has a narrow and unattractive sidewalk; and, the Monmouth/Bridge intersection, which is near both the Galleria and the Train Station, is one of the most difficult pedestrian intersections in town.

Because of the mix of land uses within Red Bank, and because of the continuity of the pedestrian network and the quality of the pedestrian environment, a substantial portion of local trips in the borough is made by walking. Elimination of vehicle trips by walking helps to enhance the quality of life in the borough, provides a healthier citizenry and reduces the total amount of traffic on local streets. Improvement of the sidewalks and their landscaping will make walking more appealing and even further the goal of making Red Bank a truly pedestrian-friendly community.

2. Public Transportation System

Red Bank is served by an extensive public transportation system consisting of local and commuter buses, commuter railroad service and taxis. NJ TRANSIT commuter rail service provides frequent access to Newark and New York City, as well as south to Bayhead. This service is augmented by commuter bus service
to lower Manhattan. The presence of this commuter transportation hub at the Red Bank Train Station helps to maintain Red Bank’s regional function as a center, and therefore offers major opportunities for developments of all kinds - retail, residential, hospitality, and business.

Local NJ TRANSIT bus service provides access to Long Branch, Asbury Park, Freehold, Highlands, and Sea Bright. This local service operates within Red Bank along East Front Street, Monmouth Street, Broad Street, Shrewsbury Avenue and Bridge Street. All of the regional and local routes pass by the train station at Monmouth and West Streets. Most local routes (M23, M24 and M25) connect the train station with the Broad Street area between Monmouth Street and East Front Street. Two local routes (M21 and M22) tie the train station with Broad Street south of Monmouth Street.

The presence of both a local transit hub as well as a regional commuter hub provides Red Bank residents and businesses with expanded public transportation opportunities. Although local bus service has generally suffered from reduced daily ridership as the level of auto ownership has increased in New Jersey, the availability of local bus service still provides businesses and residents with an important travel option augmenting the passenger car travel system. The local bus network can also help businesses in Red Bank comply with employee trip reduction regulations currently being implemented by the New Jersey Department of Transportation in accordance with the Federal Clean Air Act.

3. Roadway System

The roadways can be analyzed from four perspectives: the classifications of the various street types, the jurisdictions that control and maintain each street, the existing patterns of use, and the existing major traffic problems and constraints:

Roadway Classifications are useful in identifying roadways in accordance with the functions they serve within the general system of streets and highways. A transportation system must serve to both carry trips between destinations — a mobility function — and provide a locus for each trip’s start and ending — an access function. All streets and highways play either a mobility or an access function, and most play both functions. The functional classification system has evolved to describe the relative importance each street or highway plays in terms of providing for mobility or providing for access.

Principal arterial highways are exclusively for vehicles like cars, trucks, and buses. Trips on these highways tend to be of longer distance, and form a relatively small percentage of the roadway mileage in a region — usually less than 10% — but accommodate a large percentage of the total vehicle miles of travel — frequently over 50%. As a result, they represent major public resources. In the Red Bank region, principal arterial highways include the Garden State Parkway and Route 18.

Minor arterial streets and highways serve to connect a region with its principal arterial highways. However, minor arterial highways and streets also serve many of the trip needs within a town or region. Most trips are not long in nature — the majority of vehicle trips in Monmouth County are five miles in length or shorter. For many of these shorter trips, there is no need to use the most heavily travelled roadways. Minor arterial streets and highways also connect major towns together.
and create the roadway system through which most people learn about their towns. They also often serve as "Main Streets" in traditional town centers, or as the strip commercial centers in areas of suburban sprawl. However, because speed is of less importance on minor arterials, minor arterial highways can and frequently should be managed to operate at lower speeds. Minor arterial highways generally form an additional 10% of the roadway mileage in a region and carry approximately 20% of the vehicle miles. The continued vitality of shops on commercial streets such as Broad and Front Streets demonstrates that pedestrian circulation and vehicle circulation do not have to be in conflict on minor arterial streets. Indeed the types of access management practices which help to facilitate traffic flow on an arterial street (for instance, the prohibition on many driveways and improved clarity of street dimensions) can also help to create a more positive pedestrian environment by eliminating breaks in building frontage and limiting the number of vehicle crossings. Minor arterial streets and highways are sometimes under state jurisdiction but more frequently under county jurisdiction. In Red Bank they include the principal shopping streets and also serve to carry some of the vehicle trips that pass through the town.

Collector streets and roads serve to link neighborhoods to a town's minor arterial roadway system, and also provide access to commercial businesses. Collectors also provide for the circulation of trips within the downtown area of a town. Because traffic volumes and speeds are lower on collector roadways, these roads usually are desirable
locations for smaller businesses and do not create a conflict for residential properties. Collector roadways are usually under municipal jurisdiction, but some collector roadways may be under county jurisdiction. In Red Bank, north-south collector roads include Leighton Avenue, (parts of) Bridge Avenue, Branch Avenue, Spring Street, and Prospect Street. East-west collector streets consist of Monmouth Street, Chestnut Street, Reckless Place/Harding Road, Bergen Place, Mechanic Street/Wallace Street, and Pickney Road. Within downtown Red Bank, White, Wall, Oakland and portions of Mechanic and Wallace Streets serve to augment the circulation network and provide access to parking facilities and businesses.

Local streets and roads carry low traffic volumes and encourage low travel speeds. Most trips on local streets have either a trip origin or destination along the roadway, although local streets also provide a minor through-traffic function by maintaining the continuity of the street system. Most local streets are under municipal jurisdiction.

Roadway Jurisdictions, which include the responsibility for constructing and maintaining roadways, reflect in large measure the functional classification of the roadways. Most streets in Red Bank serve local trips and are under local jurisdiction. Several arterial and collector streets, however, are under the jurisdiction of the state or county, reflecting their increased regional importance.

The only highway administered by the New Jersey Department of Transportation in Red Bank is Route 35, extending north-south from
Cooper's Bridge along Riverside Avenue and Maple Avenue to Broad Street at Newman Springs Road. This route includes a one-way loop consisting of Pearl Street southbound, Water Street eastbound and Maple Avenue northbound.

Monmouth County routes in Red Bank consist of Routes 10 and 12 along West Front Street and East Front Street, Route 11 along Broad Street and Pickney Road, Route 13 along Shrewsbury Avenue, Route 34 along Harding Road, and Route 520 along Newman Springs Road, Broad Street and Pinckney Road.

Traffic Patterns in Red Bank are composed of many separate elements, including work trips, school trips, rail commuter trips (both inbound and outbound), shopping trips, etc. Traffic composed of all these activities may seem disorganized at times, but most activities are repetitive and predictable within specific time periods. The Average Annual Daily Traffic (or, AADT) along most roadways in New Jersey usually remains fairly consistent year after year. Daily traffic volumes vary from day to day within a year depending upon the season and the day of the week, with a major difference between weekdays and weekends. Traffic on most roadways in Red Bank is about 30 percent greater during the weekdays, in comparison to an average Saturday or Sunday.

A one hour period is used for the design and capacity analysis of roadways. In urban areas, the hour period selected for analysis is usually the PM peak hour. Along Red Bank roadways, the PM peak hour occurs between 3 PM and 6 PM. The peak hour volume is about 8 percent of the average weekday traffic, and about 9 percent of the AADT. The directional split of traffic during the peak hour is generally 55 percent in the predominant direction (for instance, outbound during the PM peak hour) and about 45 percent in the opposing direction (or, for instance, inbound during the PM peak hour).

New Jersey Route 35 (Maple Avenue, Riverside Avenue, and Cooper's Bridge) is the principal north-south roadway into and through Red Bank. Travel volumes on Route 35 have changed little over the past decade. In 1983, Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes ranged from 13,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day (v.p.d.), with a high of 33,000 v.p.d. at Cooper's Bridge. By 1989 this had grown to an AADT of 34,930 at Cooper's Bridge. 21,180 on Riverside Avenue, 11,660 north of Monmouth Street, and 15,050 north of Bergen Place. The relatively stable traffic volumes over the past decade on Route 35 reflect the limits on capacity which exist at Cooper’s Bridge and at the intersection of Route 35 with Broad Street and Newman Springs Road. However, it also reflects the relatively stable demographic status of the Red Bank area over the past decade. The Garden State Parkway has experienced similar stability in total vehicle travel, especially since 1988.

East Front Street and West Front Street (County Routes 10 and 12, respectively) serve east-west travel along northern Red Bank. The 1983 AADT along Front Street were 10,400 at Hubbard's Bridge and 16,000 near Prospect Avenue. 1989 volumes on Front Street were 9,250 west of Pearl Street and 14,670 east of Maple Avenue. Again, the traffic volumes on Front Street would appear to have remained stable over this period, consistent again with the general stability of growth patterns in the region.

Traffic volumes on other arterial streets and on collector streets have demonstrated similar
stability over the past decade. Shifts in traffic volumes, where they have occurred, were generally directly associated with land developments such as The Galleria. While locally significant, these trips are quickly absorbed into the travel stream and do not represent a regionally significant increase in traffic volumes.

Traffic Constraints on a community system of streets and highways, most frequently occur at intersections. As a result, the capacity of street is largely defined by the capacity available at key intersections. Exceptions to this generality would consist of unique features which limit capacity, such as a narrow bridge or a railroad crossing. Even in these situations, however, the impact to capacity is created by the need to accommodate conflicting vehicle movements, resulting in interruptions in traffic flow.

The 1985 Master Plan for Red Bank identified a number of intersections which were deemed critical from a traffic circulation perspective. There were five:

1) Maple Avenue, Broad Street and Newman Springs Road
2) Shrewsbury Avenue and Newman Springs Road
3) Broad Street and East Front Street
4) Riverside Avenue, Rector Place, and Bridge Avenue (the Cooper's Bridge area)
5) Maple Avenue, Riverside Avenue, Pearl Street and Front Street (the one-way loop of Rte. 35)

Not surprisingly, this list consists of most of the locations in Red Bank where east-west arterial streets cross north-south arterial streets. At these locations, relatively high flows of traffic must cross each other, resulting in increased levels of traffic delay. In addition, relatively high volumes of turning traffic flows between the crossing arterial streets, further complicating traffic operations. All of these critical intersections remain essential to the borough's traffic circulation system, and will continue to be critical in the future.

4. Parking

The parking requirements for the various land uses are uniform throughout town, but the means of providing those required spaces varies from use to use, and from location to location.

In the typical neighborhood residential areas, parking is simply in the driveway or the garage of the individual properties. In the higher density residential developments, and in the commercial/institutional areas, the parking is either on private lots, public lots, or multi-story garages. Some developments, such as The Galleria, the hotels, and the Hospital provide their own parking. Others, most notably the shops and businesses of the Broad St. area have shared public lots. These public lots are metered, while the on-street parking in that area is free.

The only parking garages in town now are located on Front St. and Riverside Ave.; one serves the hospital, and the others are located within the large apartment buildings facing the river. Future larger developments (especially along the river) will probably require the construction of additional parking structures.

Overnight parking is currently prohibited on all streets in town, in order to facilitate snow plowing and street cleaning.
Transportation Issues: A Summary

A new vision has evolved regarding what Red Bank could become, a vision which includes three circulation-related objectives: the expansion of both residential and commercial developments in ways that support walking, biking, and using public transportation; the greater unification of the eastern and western sections of the borough; and the assurance that Red Bank is primarily a pedestrian-friendly place, where the desirable way to get around town is to walk, or ride a bicycle.

As a result, the degree of vehicular delay at various intersections and on certain streets should not be the only criteria now used to determine whether the borough’s transportation system is operating effectively. Increased revitalization efforts, the public’s concern about the viability of pedestrian circulation within both Red Bank and New Jersey generally, the importance which the State Development and Redevelopment Plan has placed on regional and town centers, and the adoption of the Red Bank Vision Plan, have all served to demonstrate the importance of additional issues which should be considered when evaluating the effectiveness of the borough’s circulation system. Among these additional issues are the following:

1. Land Use

Does the whole transportation system (i.e., walkers, bicycles, cars, buses, trains, trucks) support the proposed land use plan for the borough, not just in terms of capacity but also in terms of linking and providing meaning to the separate areas of the town so that a true center can evolve?

2. Pedestrians Along the Streets

Are streets being managed to protect and enhance the flow of pedestrians, especially along the major pedestrian streets?

3. Barriers to Pedestrian Use

What barriers exist to the flow of pedestrians in Red Bank, and what can be done to expedite pedestrian movements, especially to schools, businesses, churches, parks, the riverfront and the train station?

4. Vehicles in the Neighborhoods

Are vehicle movements being sufficiently well managed that through traffic is accommodated without creating a severe impact on adjoining neighborhoods?

5. A Clear Vehicular Pathway

Does the roadway system provide its users with a clear, friendly and unambiguous pathway so that drivers in Red Bank will understand where they should be going?

6. Gateways

Do the major entry points into Red Bank serve as gateways to the borough, allowing visitors and residents alike to recognize that they have arrived in Red Bank?

These additional issues, in turn, suggest that there are a number of important circulation problems which should be addressed in future years. Some of the problems can be directly resolved in conjunction with private development efforts. Other problems will require public efforts to better define the problem, articulate potential solutions, evaluate benefits
and costs of potential solutions and then implement a desired improvement.

The following section highlights approaches which could be taken to address transportation problems in Red Bank and suggests certain specific actions which could be initiated to improve the quality of the total circulation system in the borough.

**Circulation Proposals**

1. **Pedestrian Movement**

The issues and objectives raised here are very clear: the pedestrian experience throughout the entire town must be pleasant, comfortable, and safe. Therefore a number of initiatives should be undertaken, which can be classified into three groups: new development planning, improvement to the public landscape, and changes to the roadway system.

**Carefully Planned Development Actions** are an essential part of making a community pedestrian system work. If new developments are located within the acceptable walking distances of other destinations, pedestrian use will be encouraged, traffic will be reduced, and parking demand will be less. For example: offices and other employment should be located within 1000' of restaurant and shopping areas (especially near the Broad St. area); higher density residential developments should be within about 1500' to 2000' of the train station, which is the maximum normal commuter walk; and hotels should be within about 2000' of restaurant and entertainment activities. In addition to these larger development objectives, the Monmouth County study for the train station area strongly recommended a "village of shops" that surrounds the station itself - an improvement that would be only a very short walk for the commuters. It must be clear that all these dimensions are based on long-standing studies of human behavior; location, as is well known in real estate, is everything.

**Improvements to the Public Landscape**, such as tree-lined sidewalks, with pedestrian scaled street lights, are an essential part of the whole effort to make the streets walkable. They are especially important on the major walking streets: Broad St., the central shopping area; Front St., which is the pedestrian gateway to the river in downtown; Riverside Ave., the location of the large hotels and a center of the tourism business; Monmouth St., which not only has a large shopping area, but also is the primary walk across town to the new borough hall and the train station; Shrewsbury Ave., the neighborhood business district, and the east-west neighborhood streets of Chestnut, Oakland, and Bergen.

Walking connections to the river must be created, especially at Broad St., at Riverside Gardens, from Riverside Ave. to the Riverwalk, and at the ends of the streets on the west side of town.

NJTransit has proposed to build a 900' long raised platform at the train station, and therefore close Oakland St., one of the few walkable east-west streets in the community. Therefore the clear recommendation of the Monmouth County train station study, to build a wide and open underpass that will connect the two sides of Oakland St., must be studied carefully. Without this pedestrian connection, the community will be even further divided into two distinct areas, and it will be, in particular, more difficult for children to take their east-west walks to school.
The use of bicycles should be encouraged; therefore certain key streets should be striped for bikeways along their sides. The east-west streets are especially important in serving this purpose.

Changes to the Street System are also necessary in an overall pedestrian system plan for Red Bank. Most of the changes focus on the ease of crossing certain streets, which now are limitations on the useful and pleasurable walks that the community now either takes, or wishes it could take. For example: as the river's edge becomes more accessible, it must become easier to cross both Front St. (which could have a narrower roadway and wider sidewalks) and Riverside Ave. (where new residential uses will occur, and where the hotels are); many people walk across Maple Ave., including commuters and school children, so various traffic calming steps should be taken to make that crossing safer and easier; the pedestrian crossing at the Bridge Ave./Monmouth St. intersection serves shoppers going to the Galleria and the antiques area, as well as commuters, and should be made more clear as the station rebuilding takes place.

In addition to these street changes, enforcement of existing pedestrian right-of-way laws can make a significant difference. By law in New Jersey a pedestrian crossing a street has the right-of-way at street intersections, whether or not a cross-walk is marked. Red Bank should vigorously enforce this law so that pedestrians can feel more confidant walking across streets, and so that drivers in Red Bank will think more carefully about the rights of pedestrians. Police can assist in this effort by serving as an example and stopping for any pedestrian seeking to cross a street, even those too hesitant to enter the street.

Finally, specific programs to assist pedestrians can be implemented in association with the New Jersey Division of Highway Safety. These could include classes for children and senior citizens, training for police, and signage and better cross-walk delineation at critical locations.

2. Transit

Red Bank has much to gain through enhanced use of its substantial public transportation resources. The following transit enhancement proposals are therefore recommended:

Train Service is provided on a regular basis from Red Bank to Newark, New York, and Hoboken, as well as to several southern coastal locations. Therefore Red Bank, in addition to having commuting service heading north, is also a stop for people from the New York/north New Jersey region who are heading south to the shore communities. In providing this service, NJ Transit is currently developing plans to provide high level platforms at stations along the Jersey Coast Line. The platforms will enhance rail access and permit compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The platforms will also reduce the length of time trains must dwell at each station, enhancing rail service and reducing the interference created at crossings.

As part of its proposal for Red Bank, NJ Transit plans to construct a 900' long platform, which will close Oakland Street. As the Monmouth County study indicated, this must be looked upon by the town as an opportunity rather than a problem. The new platform, a fully renovated historic station building, and the re-landscaping and reorganization of the adjacent bus area and
parking lot, can create a new active center in town. The high level platforms themselves can be designed, with landscaping and with shelters that are compatible with the character and pedestrian movement in town, to be new gateways to Red Bank - rather than the usual utilitarian structures seen at many commuter stations. And, as stated above, an underpass at the ends of Oakland St. will recreate the walking connection across town; it will also greatly simplify the commuters' walks to their parked cars on the other side of the tracks.

When this area is designed well, it will make rail use more attractive to the citizens of Red Bank, will create value in the properties and businesses in the area, and will make the walk across town more interesting and safe.

The local Bus Service focuses on the train station as a hub, and Red Bank's businesses and employers can take better advantage of being at this hub if certain NJ Transit routing and management systems are reconsidered. Bus schedules, for instance, could be adjusted so that they serve to provide greater intra-borough service. Bus access to the rail station could be enhanced. Service could be extended to coordinate with peak rail travel times, and bus schedules could be adjusted to coordinate with train schedules, especially for buses to Fair Haven/Rumson area and buses serving Red Bank neighborhoods. Comfortable and pleasant waiting shelters could be located at key points throughout town.

Because Red Bank is a local transit hub, most of the bus lines terminate within the downtown. As a result, buses "lay-over" for a period of time — usually less than 15 minutes — so that drivers can be provided with a brief break from driving and so that a late bus can start on time for the next run. Ideally, bus "lay-overs" should occur at a location out of the traffic stream and at a location where the drivers can take advantage of services such as restaurants, rest rooms and telephones.

Currently, at least one bus route involves a "lay-over" on Front Street at the intersection with Broad Street. This location results in sight distance problems, and blocks the eastbound right turn lane from eastbound Front Street onto Broad Street, and is disruptive of the whole pedestrian experience in that area. The long dwell time of the bus at that intersection creates a bad image for NJ TRANSIT. NJ TRANSIT should be encouraged to eliminate bus lay-overs at this and other congested locations (for the comfort of both pedestrians and vehicles) and instead locate them at appropriate "terminal" locations such as the train station or hospital.

3. Traffic

The traffic management initiatives recommended here will better control traffic on Red Bank's streets to help assure that cars will help to serve the borough rather than hurt it. These initiatives are, very importantly, also associated with the efforts which can help to improve the flow of pedestrians throughout town.

Route 35: Route 35 is the principal pathway which both residents and visitors use to enter the borough and pass through it. As a result, it is of critical importance because it affects how Red Bank is perceived by both residents and visitors. In addition, since it passes the length of the borough from north to south, it impacts on numerous neighborhoods and has the potential of becoming a major barrier dividing the borough.
Because of the importance of Route 35, it is especially important that the roadway provide drivers with a clear, friendly and unambiguous pathway so that drivers in Red Bank can feel assured that they know where they are going. Unfortunately, largely because of the turns the highway makes in the borough, that is not the case. As a result, it would be desirable as part of the borough’s continuing evaluation of development and transportation options, to identify methods by which this pathway can be improved to become more legible to the motorist. The three primary intersections which need further study (Cooper’s Bridge, Riverside/Maple, Broad/Newman Springs) are described in detail below. At the same time, it is important that any improvements to the Route 35 corridor also serve to enhance the borough’s development opportunities, and to improve pedestrian movement in the borough; this is especially true of Riverside Ave. and Maple Ave., which are also described below.

Since Route 35 is a state highway, one means of further defining the types of improvements which should be implemented would be to conduct a “State Highway Access Management Plan”, in cooperation with the Department of Transportation. Access Management Plans provide a specific mechanism by which the New Jersey Department of Transportation, Monmouth County and the Borough of Red Bank can cooperate in identifying needed improvements and in managing the roadway, including the use of adjoining properties.

The Cooper’s Bridge/Riverside Avenue/ Bridge Avenue/Rector Place Intersection is a combination of highway-oriented retail activities, a confusing street layout, and building vacancies that have created an impression of a no-man’s land at this gateway into Red Bank. While the intersection of the street appears to operate efficiently in terms of leading traffic onto Cooper’s Bridge and in receiving traffic from the bridge, it also serves to effectively block the movement of east-west traffic and pedestrians between Riverside Avenue and Rector Place.

An important objective of the new vision for Red Bank is to link the east and west sections of the town and to take better advantage of the development opportunities associated with waterfront development along the Navesink River. This would argue that this critical intersection should also serve to link the eastern and western waterfronts of Red Bank together. Accomplishing this objective while also serving the importance traffic functions created by Cooper’s Bridge obviously is a difficult task which will require substantial study.

Because of the number of vacant properties at this gateway location, because transportation improvements could help to guide land development decisions here and along Rector Place, and because land developments should be implemented in a fashion which would support both traffic conditions and pedestrian movement at the intersection, it is important that a detailed plan for the area be carefully defined.

Riverside Avenue: provides access to some of the borough’s most important riverfront developments, especially to its hotels and tourist business. It is important therefore that this Avenue be able to effectively provide easy automobile access to the major developments in the corridor, and also provide pedestrian connections between the different buildings and to the commercial center of Red Bank along Broad Street.
Minor improvements to street alignment combined with improvements in terms of sidewalks and street trees would serve to enhance the character of the street to accomplish these objectives. A detailed urban design analysis of the street would be desirable in order to identify potential methods of accomplishing these goals. Many of the improvements, for instance, could result from design guidelines created to guide private development along the Avenue.

*The Riverside Avenue/Front St./Pearl St./Maple Ave. Intersection* is the center of the borough’s vehicle street system, and marks the crossing of its most important east-west arterial with its most important north-south arterial. It is also extremely close to the traditional center of the borough.

From a pedestrian and land use perspective, the intersection and its current operation presents a challenge because of the volume of traffic, the extensive number of turning movements and the poor pedestrian quality of adjoining land uses. The transition from Riverside Avenue to Front Street, a transition defined by the Navesink River, currently is not reflected in the street network. If tourist and residential development along Riverside Avenue is to be linked to businesses located at Broad and Front Streets, it is important from an urban design perspective that this corner be better turned.

Property north and south of Front Street is currently being acquired as part of redevelopment efforts, or is recently developed. Therefore, a window of opportunity is available to define an appropriate urban design for this critical street crossing which would provide an improved pedestrian environment, enhanced land development opportunities and a better defined pathway for drivers. A high priority should be placed on developing detailed public improvement plans for this area which would both enhance riverfront development opportunities and create a better traffic pattern.

*Maple Ave.* is often so congested with traffic (especially at rush hour) that the flow of vehicles is slowed considerably, and that it is very difficult for pedestrians to cross. It is, in many ways, as much a barrier to east-west community connections as the train tracks. Therefore, a series of traffic-calming steps should be taken that assure an appropriate smooth flow of traffic, but even more importantly makes it easy for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross.

*The Broad St./Maple Ave./Newman Springs Rd. Intersection* is the gateway to Red Bank from the south, and confronts drivers with a number of decisions in a very short distance: the juncture of Maple Avenue and Broad Street, the intersection of Route 35 with Newman Springs Road, and the at-grade crossing of the NJ TRANSIT rail line. The result is an intersection with competing traffic control requirements which limit the ability to provide effective signage to guide drivers. The complexity of traffic patterns in this area is greatly increased whenever trains cross, which they must frequently do during the morning and evening peak periods. Because of the number of conflict points, an extensive traffic cycle length is required, and substantial delay is experienced by drivers before the back-ups created by a train crossing can be cleared.

The complexity of conditions and the poor signage at this important gateway location are anything but friendly and clear. For visitors arriving on Newman Springs Road or Route 35, little information or indication of
the way to Red Bank is provided. The issue therefore for arriving traffic is the issue of providing a clearer and more welcoming gateway.

Therefore, because the traffic flow is not easily changed, a study should be undertaken that proposes an overall system of signage locations, designs, and guidelines for both public and private signs, and landscape improvements on both public and private properties, all of which will help considerably to give order and clarity to the confusion.

Shrewsbury Avenue is one of Red Bank’s major north-south arterial streets. It is an important street both in terms of carrying through traffic, and in terms of serving this neighborhood pedestrian-oriented shopping district. These two functions can be compatible with each other provided that traffic flow on Shrewsbury Avenue is effectively managed. Traffic calming measures would help motorists understand that they are passing through a neighborhood which should be respected, which is a walkable place, and which includes school children along and across it.

Therefore, it is important to maintain the existing street trees and plant additional trees where gaps in the canopy exist. More on-street parking should be provided, crosswalks at intersections should be clearly marked, and pedestrian right-of-way laws should be vigorously enforced. The details of the street and sidewalks - the street lights and the many public and private signs - should also be studied: there is little relationship of the existing business signs to the pedestrian, and the small yellow street lights are of a color and dimness that creates a sense of darkness and does not make the night time walk pleasant.

Leighton Avenue is a relatively wide, residential collector street which runs parallel to Shrewsbury Avenue, and which serves the elementary school as well as the neighborhood. Residents along the street have complained about the volume and speed of traffic on the street, which results when drivers use it to avoid Shrewsbury Avenue and the traffic signal at Newman Springs Road. Our observations indicate that traffic calming measures on this street are needed to protect the quality of the residential neighborhood, but that the measures do not have to be extensive. The number of vehicles using the roadway is not high and while some may drive at high speeds, most vehicles appear to drive at speeds appropriate for a residential street.

One effective measure that has already been taken is the prohibition of through truck traffic; others that could be considered are a prohibition of left turns from Newman Springs Rd., even slower speed limits, and the prohibition of all through traffic. Obviously any measure must be studied carefully, and coordinated with NJDOT.

The East-west pedestrian streets of Front, Monmouth, and Chestnut Streets and Bergen Place need to be enhanced with cross walks, bike lanes, and street trees, and comfortable and attractive paving, as east-west pedestrian streets. In addition, if Oakland St. remains a through walk (see the discussion of the train underpass, above), it should be improved in the same way. Land development should be therefore be encouraged to enhance the pedestrian quality of their sidewalks, and all off-street parking should be located in rear or side lots.
The Bridge/Monmouth intersection is difficult for both pedestrians and vehicles to cross. The wide expanse of street, the inclusion of the train tracks and the their crossing gates, and no stop sign on Bridge Ave. all make the area a real deterrent to east-west town connections. Not only is local vehicle traffic delayed considerably, it is also very difficult for commuters and other pedestrians to walk from the train station area to the Galleria and antiques shopping area.

Currently there are no street or pedestrian crossings of the NJ Transit rail line between Chestnut Street and Bergen Place. This three-eights of a mile gap in an urban environment creates a substantial barrier, helping to divide the east and west sides of the borough. In addition, NJ Transit currently plans to also close the existing at-grade crossing at Oakland Street as part of providing high level platforms at the railroad station. Thus, provision of the new pedestrian underpass at this location, which was recommended in the Monmouth County train station study and which was describe above, becomes even more important.

4. Parking:

The storage of cars can have as much effect on the quality of life in town as their flow and movement. Therefore parking strategies are an essential part of a master plan, and must relate not only to the street system but to the pedestrian movement system, to public transportation, and to the various land uses throughout the community. Because the parking requirements must remain the same for the different land uses, certain policies toward the methods of meeting those requirements are necessary to be compatible with the differences in the various areas of town.

Examples of these strategies can include, for example, a change to current policy that would generally permit overnight parking. The presence of parked cars on the streets is far more pedestrian-friendly in that they act as barriers between the walker and the moving car, and that they narrow the perceived roadway and slow traffic down somewhat. The only prohibition on overnight parking might occur during winter months, during snow emergencies, and certain street cleaning days.

An effective parking strategy that could take place in the future is in the major shopping areas, where consideration could be given for the management of the parking lots by a merchant-supported validation system, and thus provide free parking for shoppers. At the same time, the addition of on-street parking meters could be used to assure the continual availability of short-term spaces for other shoppers.

Currently the parking arrangements for shoppers vary considerably from location to location, so a study should be undertaken to evaluate the various issues discussed here, and to raise and understand others. The objective should be to have a parking system that is supportive of the walking environment, and which is efficient and economical for both the businesses and the government of the community.

Conclusion

The recommendations of this plan indicate an expansion of downtown, the development of a new neighborhood west of Maple Ave. near downtown, a unique pattern of development along the river, and the special identification of the Shrewsbury Ave. business area. These plans will result in the need to make more
comfortable connections between the new developments that will occur, between the various areas of town, and between public transportation and the entire community. It indicates further that there are several overriding circulation goals: to reinforce the fundamental pedestrian quality of the town, to connect the two sides of town, to make the connections to the river easy and comfortable for everyone, to make public transportation more convenient, and to overlay all of these goals with the need to make a smooth flow of traffic on the principal through streets of the community.
COMMUNITY FACILITIES PLAN

Introduction

As stated in previous Master Plans, the Community Facilities Plan Element is concerned with all governmental functions and related facilities necessary to meet the safety, health, educational, cultural and general welfare needs of present and future Borough residents.

Summary

This Plan has concluded that most of the Borough community facilities are in a current state of change. For example: the Borough's administrative facilities, including municipal offices, police, and senior citizens center, will be renovated or relocated within the life of this Master Plan; the schools may need some consideration for renovation or expansion of existing facilities in order to address state mandated programs or local program desires; the Emergency Services and Public Works departments appear to be adequate for life of this Master Plan (six years from adoption of this document).

Existing Community Facilities

Educational Facilities

The Primary School, located on River Street and Locust Place, was constructed in 1971 on a 19.7 acre parcel deeded to the Board of Education by the Borough for $1.00. The building serves grades kindergarten through 4, even though it was designed for K to 3, originally. A Gymnasium was added in 1972. Since the previous Plan, the building has had the roof replaced, a new Geothermal heating and cooling system installed, and a classroom has been converted for use of instruction for English as a Second Language. The space allocations in the school are as follows:

- 4 Kindergartens
- 1 Art room
- 1 Library
- 1 Teacher work rm.
- 1 Compensatory education room
- 1 Music room
- 1 Nurse's office
- 1 Principal's office
- 1 Vice-principal's office
- 24 Classrooms
- 1 Music/science room
- 1 Gymnasium
- 1 Title I room
- 1 Faculty lounge

1 Auditeria (cafeteria and assembly)
5 Special services offices, conference and work spaces

The functional capacity of the school as of the last revision of the educational facilities Master Plan (1978) under the Board of Education was 690.

The Middle School is located on 6.9 acres off of Harding Road. It was built in 1917 as a high school, with three separate additions over its life, and converted to use as a middle school in 1978. The latest addition was in 1959, including the gymnasium. The school, with 39 classrooms, serves grades 5 through 8 plus special education. There are 35 1/2 teachers, 2 administrators, and 8 maintenance staff. Sixty off street parking spaces are provided for staff and visitors.

The outdoor recreational facilities consist of areas for softball, basketball and volleyball plus paved play areas. Since the last plan, the Industrial Arts classrooms have been converted to classrooms and a new window replacement program has begun. The functional capacity as of 1978 was 809 students.

According to the District's 1990 Long Range
Facility Plan, both schools were short of space for carrying out their educational programs. The Red Bank Primary School was short of a music classroom, regular classrooms, and early childhood classrooms. The Red Bank Middle School was short of suitable space for guidance. The outside recreation facilities are inadequate due to a lack of playground equipment and developed play areas. The site for the Middle School is inadequate in size based on standards by the State Department of Education for a middle school. The recommended area was 26 acres. In addition, the middle school space layout is contrary to the "team" teaching concepts required for several programs. This may necessitate future rearrangement or replacement of existing spaces.

The site constraint issues of the middle school should be examined for specific proposals to address the program necessities. These proposals should be evaluated in a coordinated manner with both the Board of Education and the Borough for other community facility needs. After grade 8, Borough public school students attend Red Bank Regional High School located in Little Silver.

Local School Enrollment

Unlike the statistics of the previous Master Plan, the school District's figures indicate an increase in student population from the time of that plan and going forward into the future. While this increase has not posed a significant constraint on the District's programs to date, this may need to be addressed in future school planning.

The School District's population and enrollment figures can be best summarized by the following quotation from their Demographic Studies and Enrollment Projections Report dated March 1994 (not yet adopted as of this date). "The median age of the population increased by .72 years over the period, and the age 65 & over declined by 300 persons. Such changes tend to be associated with increased turnover of housing to younger families with children. Nonetheless, the number of persons under 20 years of age declined substantially - - 704 persons, 25.58 percent. The decline was concentrated in the school age (5-19) population however; the Under-5 population actually increased by 19 persons, an increase of 3.24 percent.

The table (below) indicates that at that time, assuming no substantial in- or out-migration, the 1990 Under-5 group will become the 1995 age 5-9 group, increasing it by 155 persons, and the 1990 age 5-9 group will become the 1995 age 10-14 group, decreasing it by 34 persons. The net effect of these changes would be to increase the age 5-14 population by 121 persons, 12.9 percent. By the same reasoning, the table points to a slight decline at the high school level in 1995 when the 1990 age 15-19 population of 506 persons is replaced by the smaller 1990 age 10-14 population of 485 persons."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Births</th>
<th>Entrance year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provisional—Data Source: N.J. Department of Health; 1993 Estimated Birthday must be on or before October 1 for entrance in the indicated year.
### Enrollments by School And Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td>847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment in the district's schools as of October 15, 1995, totaled 847 pupils. The table, "Enrollments by School and Grade" above presents the district-wide enrollments by grade and for special education.

### Grades K-8 and Special Education Enrollments 1991 To 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp Ed</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1993 & Projected 1994-2002 K-8 and Special Education Enrollments (4-YEAR Trend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. ed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1995 and Projected Average 1995-2002 K-8 Enrollments By School By Grade and Sp. Education (4-Yr. Trend)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1996-</th>
<th>1998-</th>
<th>2000-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreK</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. ed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. ed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field Hockey Field

The school is a comprehensive high school with special programs in the Performing Arts and Vocational-Technical Education which attract additional tuition students from outside the regional high school district.

### Regional School Enrollments

Enrollment is projected to be stable over the next five-year period. Since 1975 a number of changes in the building have resulted in a change in the functional capacity as calculated by the N.J. Department of Education Building Capacity Worksheet. Maximum capacity is calculated to be 1,583.

### Red Bank Regional High School Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Red Bank Regional High School

### Red Bank Regional High School Enrollments (projected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yr:</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gd</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Red Bank Regional High School

### Red Bank Regional High School

The Red Bank Regional High School District was formed in November 1969 by the voters of Red Bank, Little Silver and Shrewsbury. In December of 1971 voters of the district approved plans for a new high school on a 53.4 acre site in Little Silver. The first students attended the new facility during the 1975-1976 school year.

The building is in exceptional condition as the result of an annual maintenance and improvement program. The site has exterior physical education and interscholastic sports facilities including:

- Field House
- Football Stadium
- Tennis Courts
- Soccer Fields
- Running Track
- Baseball Fields
Administrative, Police and Court Facilities

From 1992 to the present, a complete facilities evaluation has been in progress for the Borough. This evaluation and resulting reports have been fairly exhaustive in breadth and scope pertaining to all Administrative, Police, Court, Senior Citizen, and Public Works purposes. This Plan will not try to recreate the work done elsewhere, but will provide a synopsis of that report and its conclusions.

Administrative Offices

The Borough municipal offices are planning to relocate from their present location at 32 Monmouth Street (gross square footage of 10,800 square feet) which was constructed in the early 1920’s as a center for telephone exchange equipment. The existing building contains approximately 7,000 usable (net) square feet and contain the following offices and/or departments:

Basement
Basic Storage and Building’s Services
Parking Utility
Planning & Zoning Board of Adjustment
First Floor
Administration:
Borough Clerk
Administrator
Finance
Second Floor
Construction
Fire Marshall
Code Enforcement
Health & Public Records Department
Public Toilets
Storage
Third Floor
Welfare Department
Tax Assessor & Collection
Parks & Recreation
Council/Public Meeting Room

The report has indicated an expansion of the space needs of these departments of the Borough by a factor of one and one-half times their current usable area.

Police Headquarters

Red Bank Police Headquarters is currently located at 51 Monmouth Street and is shared with the Municipal Court facility, and the Borough Print Shop. The original structure was built over 75 years ago and was the first Township Hall for Old Shrewsbury Township. The building is currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the State of New Jersey Historic Register. The current uses for the Police functions in this building are as follows:

Lobby with public Seating
Communications & Dispatch Center
Roll Call/Training Room
Report Writing Room
Conference Room
Parking Authority
DUI Processing Room
Traffic Safety
Juvenile Bureau/Crime Prevention Bureau
Evidence Room
Records Division
Booking Room
Squad Room Administration

Shift Commander
Chief’s Office
Cell Block Area (5 Cells Total)
Secretary to Chief’s Office
Prisoner Processing
Deputy Chief’s Office
Locker & Physical Fitness
Storage
Rest rooms
Parking for vehicles

The Police Department itself, consists of: one Chief; one Deputy Chief; one Captain; three Lieutenants; eight Sergeants; three Detectives; twenty-two Patrolmen; five dispatchers; and two parking utility officers. In addition, the Department has one Special Officer; two Secretaries and one Clerk. With a police force of forty-five and a population of 10,500 (1990); the police protection force per 1,000 population is 4.5.

In terms of equipment, the Department has twenty-four cars. There is currently a routine replacement program.

The existing building and the site are very inadequate for police purposes. Parking is limited and unacceptable. The structure is in poor condition with major repairs required for future use including the roof, electric, and heating/cooling systems. As stated below, if the Police facilities are to be relocated, they must be adjacent to the Municipal Courts.

Municipal Court Facility

The Municipal Court presently occupies approximately 2,300 square feet of the Police Headquarters building; facilities include:

Courtroom
Judges Chambers
Court Clerk
Violations Clerk
Lawyers Room
Officers Waiting Rm.
The same deteriorated physical conditions of the building apply to the Court facilities as well. They are inadequate and in need of significant renovations, or of relocation. Due to the nature of the interactivity and operations of both Departments, it is recommended that the Court facility be relocated with the Police Department.

**Public Utilities**

The Department of Public Utilities is located on the one acre municipal water works parcel at 75 Chestnut Street. The site contains a complex of buildings (totaling approximately 15,000 SF) and storage areas including:

- Two garages for storage
  - One mechanic's garage
  - One filter room
  - Administrative office space
  - Small equipment storage yard

The duties of the department include:

- Trash collection, road and sidewalk maintenance
- All vehicular maintenance for the Borough, cleaning and maintenance of public buildings, municipal parking lot maintenance, water and sewer utility maintenance, shade tree installation, plus park and recreation maintenance

The department at the present time has 36 employees including six administrative employees and 30 public utilities workers made up of the following:

- Water supply personnel
- Sewage personnel (lift station)
- Mechanics (for vehicle and building maintenance)
- Janitors
- Street sweeper
- Sanitation personnel

- Treatment plant operators
- Utility meter readers
- Park and recreation maintenance personnel

The equipment inventory for the department as of September 1992 included the following:

- 6 Dump trucks
- 5 Pickups
- 24 Special vehicles (including 1 backhoe, 1 sewer jet, 1 excavator, 5 front end loaders, 1 snow tractor, 1 high wire lift back, 1 street sweeper, 1 grader, 1 disc chipper, 4 sanitation trucks, 2 recycling trucks, 1 bucket truck, 1 Vac All, 2 freightliners, 1 flat bed)
- 2 Sedans
- 3 Vans

The Director of Public Works is currently reorganizing existing space and anticipates no additional space needs at this time.

In general, the facilities of the department are adequate but an additional floor has been suggested at this location, by the public utilities Director, to better accommodate the administrative aspects of the department.

**Senior Citizens Center**

The Borough has obtained property, is constructing a new Senior Center. The Red Bank Senior Citizen Center is presently located in a leased facility off Chestnut Street, adjacent to the Borough's Public Utilities operations. The Borough pays a monthly rental for use of the building, which contains 3,272 square feet.

The facility includes a large meeting/dining/activities room; a medium sized and two smaller rooms used for arts, crafts and educational purposes; an exercise equipment room; a senior employment/health clinic office; a
reception area/library; two administrative offices; a kitchen; and two storage areas. The Center employs three full-time and 6 part-time staff members.

The multi-purpose Senior Citizen Center has a twofold purpose: (1) to make growing old easier for area elderly by responding to their basic physiological and security needs, and (2) to enrich and make enjoyable their remaining years by offering opportunities for satisfying social and intellectual needs.

To accomplish its goals, the center provides a location where seniors can socialize; recreate; expand their skills, knowledge, interests, and understanding; become informed of and utilize preventive, supportive, emergency and other personal services; find opportunities for useful paid and volunteer work, and improve their morale.

In addition to its various recreational, educational, crafts, and counseling activities, the Center hosts an active hot lunch program, health clinics, and meeting of local senior clubs. The Center is also a base for outreach programs servicing vulnerable homebound elderly.

Library

The Red Bank Public Library is located at 84 West Front Street. The original structure was built in 1856 with an addition constructed in 1967. The Library property is a long narrow rectangular lot sloping severely in the rear down to the Navesink River.

The facility has a Library Director and a staff of 8 full-time people. The total number of books is about 50,000 with a lending circulation of 75,000 presently available. The Library offers its customers access to the County Library collection through a State-organized Inter-library Loan System. At present, the Library facility is adequate and no additional recommendations are required. There have been some improvements since the previous plan which include the repair/replacement of the roof, additional off-street parking, and outdoor reading areas adjacent to the waterside of the building.

Recycling Center

The Borough landfill is closed and responsibility for solid waste disposal is handled at the County level. The Borough has completed a new recycling center at the site of the old landfill. The operation of the new facility is described in the Conservation Plan element.

Emergency Services

Fire Protection

The Borough currently operates six private and Borough-owned fire stations. In general, the protection for the Borough is adequate. The Borough has a fire insurance rating of "Class 4" on a class system scale from 1 to 10 with Class 1 being the best rating and Class 10 the worst rating. Since the time of the last evaluation by the Insurance Services Office (ISO) in 1980, improvements have been made resulting in increased fire flow capacity and better Fire Department communications. The Fire Department has also implemented an annual hose testing program and has established a permanent training division. The Department responds to about 850 calls per year, or 2.33 calls per day.

A brief description of each station and its equipment is listed below:
1. Westside Fire Company (Leighton Avenue)

This station, the newest private company, was built in the early 1900's as a two-story brick structure. A 1 story cement block addition was constructed in 1969. The station, currently with a white stucco exterior, houses one engine. The station is generally in fair condition and is provided with a complete fire detection system.

Equipment:
One 1989 pumper rated at 1,500 gallons per minute which is in excellent condition. The company has approximately 1,000 feet of 5" hose; 1,500 feet of 3" hose; 700 feet of 2-1/2"; 1,100 feet of 1-3/4" and 300 feet of booster hose.

2. Union Fire Company (Shrewsbury Avenue)

This privately owned station is a two-story brick structure in good condition, however storage space is limited. Built in the early 1900's the station contains two bays. This station also is provided with a complete fire detection system.

Equipment:
One 1982 pumper engine in excellent condition and one 1988 utility truck belonging to the Fire Police (in excellent condition). The pumper has 1,700 feet of 3" hose; 1,000 feet of 2-1/2" hose; 1,350 feet of 1-3/4" hose; 200 feet of 1-1/2" hose, and 400 feet of booster hose.

3. Independent Fire Company (Mechanic Street)

The Borough-owned, antiquated, two-story brick building is in need of extensive general repair and does not have storage space for small equipment.

Equipment:
One 1972 pumper engine rated at 1,250 gallons per minute, which is in the process of being replaced with a 1994 Seagrave 1,500 gallon per minute pumper. The 1972 pumper carries 1,600 feet of 3" hose; 100 feet of 2-1/2"; and 1,900 feet of 1-3/4" hose.

4. Hook & Ladder Fire Company (Mechanic Street)

The two-story brick structure was built in 1882 with a one-story cement block addition constructed in 1964. The private facility is in good overall condition. The building is provided with a complete fire sprinkler system, as well as complete fire detection system.

Equipment:
The building houses two ladder trucks. The first is a 1962 refurbished 100 foot steel aerial ladder in good condition. This apparatus requires two drivers to operate and is provided with a full complement of ground ladders. The second is a 1987, 100 foot Seagrave, rear-mount, aerial ladder in good condition, which also is provided with a full complement of ground ladders.

5. Relief Fire Company (Drummond Place)

This Borough-owned station is attached to Police Headquarters and is an old building unsuitable for this particular use.

Equipment:
One 1992 pumper engine in excellent condition, rated at 1,500 gallons per minute. The pumper carries approximately 1,600 feet of 3" hose; 1,200 feet of 2-1/2"; and 1,850 feet of 1-3/4" hose.
6. Liberty Fire Company (White Street)

This two-story Borough structure houses utility rooms including equipment storage and compressor apparatus for filling breathing tanks. The building is in poor condition and requires renovation.

Equipment:
One 1985 1,500 gallon per minute pumper in excellent condition. The company has 1,075 of 5" hose; 1,550 feet of 3" hose; 350 feet of 2 1/2"; 2,050 feet of 1-3/4" hose; and 200 feet of 1-1/2" hose.

7. First Aid Squad (Spring Street)

The First Aid Squad is a privately owned facility and was built in 1959. The one-story colonial, brick structure is in good to excellent condition.

Equipment:
One 1994 rescue truck; one 1982 Chevrolet truck chassis ambulance; one 1979 Ford Scuba Team Vehicle; and one 1986 Ford ambulance all in good condition.

Parks and Recreational Spaces

The Parks and Recreation department is overseen by a full time director reporting to an eight-person committee appointed by the Borough Council. Their programs encompass all recreational aspects of life in Red Bank for all citizens. While the concentration has been on youth programs, there are some available for adults and for families together.

To better enhance the existing programs, a new program developer has been retained. The programs also involve the Police Athletic League for baseball, basketball, and scholarships. There is an annual "Fishing Derby" for ages up to 14, with an intended expansion to all age groups intended for next year. Some activities are also scheduled which do not use facilities in town. These activities include family outings to the beaches of Monmouth County and to sporting events.

The parks and recreational facilities currently cover various sites throughout the Borough. The current inventory of park spaces include:

- Count Basie Park: Active recreation - baseball fields, football field, track, basketball courts, batting cage beneath the stands of the football field, tot lot and fishing pond.

- Marine Park: Clay tennis court center, Passive recreation, tot lot, boat slips, and shuffle board courts.

- East Side Park: Active and passive recreation - basketball court, baseball field/soccer field, tot lot

- Public Library: Passive recreation/reading/sitting area at open space to west of the library.

In addition, the Parks & Recreation Department works in cooperation with both the Board of Education and the Community YMCA in order to carry out several programs using their facilities. Obviously, these facilities’ schedules are determined by the Board of Education and the YMCA. These programs include:

- Youth basketball (Middle School)

- Sports Shorts Program (Middle School): program which includes arts and crafts, cultural awareness, and recreational opportunities for toddlers.
• Summertime Special Programs (YMCA): this program includes swimming, arts, crafts, and other recreational opportunities encompassing physical & cultural.

In the years since the previous plan, the following improvements have been made:

• Riverside Gardens Park: recently acquired and planned as passive recreation. Rough grading and seeding of the site has been accomplished with picnic tables and seating located.

• New night lighting has been begun at Count Basie Park, with no scheduled date of completion.

• The tennis courts at Marine Park have been resurfaced and have had new security fencing installed.

• Additional elements of the Borough's "riverwalk" have been committed along the north river areas.

• Plans have begun for a fishing pier at one or two locations on the west river areas. A public boat ramp is also in preliminary planning stages.

Community Facilities Plan

Community Facility Improvements

Local & Regional Schools

Since the local school population and the regional school enrollments have changed direction from the 1970's and 1980's, the existing system should be adequate for the short-term need. Additional recreational facilities are needed for both schools. Additional program requirements in future years may require modification and reorganization of the Middle School to better accommodate the teaching methods necessary to those programs.

Broader community use of recreational facilities during off-peak school hours should be encouraged. A policy provision for general community use of educational recreational facilities, should be developed.

Municipal Offices, Police Headquarters, Municipal Court & Senior Citizen Center

As a result of the analysis of these existing buildings and other options available for buildings or sites within the Borough it was concluded that the acquisition of 90 Monmouth Street would best accommodate most of these currently constrained Departments. Additionally, the Borough has undertaken to offer municipal services more readily to the Shrewsbury Avenue area through the construction of a new Municipal Annex at the corner of Shrewsbury Avenue and West Bergen Place. This will provide for various Municipal Services on a rotating schedule basis during the daytime hours of operation. In addition, this facility will provide for a local Police Department presence during evening hours.

The new Senior Citizens Center is currently under construction. It is anticipated to be between 6,000 and 7,000 square feet of program space with on-site parking and water front access for the seniors.

Borough Landfill/Recycling Center

The Borough will continue to use the County landfill facilities and utilize the former Borough landfill for multiple uses, such as a compost or transfer facility, the recycling facility, and future Borough park or recreational facilities. However, it is recommended
that the long range feasibility of the redevelopment of this site should be considered.

Borough Hall & Police Headquarters

Both of these locations are scheduled to be sold as part of the process of relocating Borough Administrative Offices to 90 Monmouth St.

Fire Protection Facilities

Provision of adequate fire protection facilities should be considered in the near future. The existing unreinforced masonry buildings do not meet current nationally recognized standards for fire station design. Existing buildings were designed to house late nineteenth-century equipment which results in the current necessity to choose apparatus with a basis upon building limitations rather than on optimal equipment performance.

The long-range goal should probably be consolidation of fire facilities into two stations, both municipally owned and maintained. Adjacent or consolidated private use facilities for volunteer force administrative and social functions will be required. It is unlikely that future apparatus requirements for the Borough will exceed two ladder, four engine and two or three special use or reserve vehicle. These can be easily accommodated in two facilities. Location of facilities should be selected in consideration of proximity of hazards and ease of access by volunteers. Future facilities should include adequate provisions for administrative activities and joint-training exercises. In addition, these facilities should be designed to meet optimum building requirements especially regarding concerns of seismic and other natural disasters. Locations of these facilities and the type of construction should take into account full coverage of the municipality in the event of one location being disabled.

Parks and Recreational Spaces

While the current facilities are adequate for ongoing programs there has been a desire for increasing programs to accommodate an increase in population across all age categories and activities. The following enhancements to existing parks and recreation facilities should be considered:

- Completion of the night lighting at Count Basie Park
- Improved accommodations for street hockey, which is one of many and growing new activities.
- Additional opportunities for indoor activities, such as volleyball and basketball.
- More and better waterside activity locations. Current programs could be expanded, and new ones such as boating & sailing and water safety could be added. Fishing and boating piers could be built at the ends of certain west side streets, also.
- Completion of Riverwalk between Broad Street, Oyster Point, and - finally - Monmouth Street.
PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN

Significant changes to the water system have occurred since the 1985 Master Plan was adopted. The source of supply, a concern in the previous plan, is no longer a concern. In addition, improvements to the distribution system, many as recommended in the 1985 Master Plan, have improved water service and pressure in the Borough.

The sewer system continues to provide quality service. The Borough continues its commitment to maintain it as necessary.

Water Utility

Source Of Supply

In 1985, the system water source was from two Borough owned wells with water from each well being treated by the associated treatment plant, one at Tower Hill and one at Chestnut Street. The most significant change to the system since 1985 involves a different manner of supply and has resulted in an increase in available water supply. This will enable growth in the Borough over the next 15 years to be supplied with sufficient water.

Since the 1985 Master Plan, NJDEP declared Red Bank, and many other shoreline communities, to be in a "Critical Zone" wherein the aquifers in the zone are subject to saltwater intrusion as a result of high groundwater withdrawal. To protect the aquifer, NJDEP required each community in the Critical Zone to limit well pumpage to one-half of its 1985 pumpage and required all the communities to make other arrangements for the remaining water demand. In answer to the NJDEP requirement, Red Bank entered into an agreement with the New Jersey Water Supply Authority (NJWSA) to provide the additional source of supply needed to meet the required limits on well pumpage. Red Bank continues to use its wells to withdraw groundwater to the permitted amount. NJWSA owns and operates the Manasquan Reservoir system comprised of a 740 acre, four billion gallon reservoir facility in Howell Township, along with a raw water intake structure and raw water transmission pipeline. Red Bank purchases approximately half of its demand from the New Jersey Water Supply Authority during the winter months.

Since the New Jersey Water Supply Authority supplies only raw water, Red Bank also entered into agreement with New Jersey American Water Co. (NJAWC) to treat and transmit to the Red Bank Distribution System the water purchased by Red Bank from the NJWSA. As a result of these two agreements (one for raw water with NJWSA, and one for treatment and transmission with NJAWC) the source and the amount of supply has been resolved.

There are currently two interconnections between NJAWC and the Red Bank water system by which the purchased water is delivered to the system; the first is on Newman Springs Road at Leighton Avenue, and the second is on Harrison Avenue at Marion Street. Each location has a meter and supplies water and acts as a pressure point to the Red Bank system.

Storage

The existing system storage consists of one 1.5 million gallon ground storage tank. It provides peaking requirements and satisfies the NJDEP requirement to provide 24 hour average day supply during power outage. However, in a worst case condition in which a fire occurs during a power outage, there
may not be sufficient water available from the Borough storage system. In this case, supply is to be augmented through the main interconnection with NJAWC.

The Red Bank agreement for water supply with NJAWC provides for this in the event of fire or other catastrophe which threatens the Borough supply.

Treatment

The existing treatment plants continue to operate satisfactorily. The continuation of a maintenance program in which all equipment is maintained and reconditioned throughout its useful life provides acceptable equipment operation. When equipment reaches the end of its useful life, timely replacement is recommended. Equipment replacement should be designed for long life, efficient use of power, and effective use of technology when appropriate.

Distribution System

Substantial improvement, many as recommended in the 1985 Master Plan, have been made to the distribution system since 1985. Table 1 lists the 1985 Master Plan Recommended Water System Improvements and Status as of January 1995. These improvements enable the system to meet domestic and commercial demands. Maintenance of the distribution system continues annually and helps maintain water quality and system serviceability.

Typically, fire flow places the highest demand on the distribution system. A network computer analysis was performed to determine the ability of the system to produce a fire flow of 1,000 gpm with a residual pressure of 20 psi during a peak day condition. There are three areas of the distribution system that do not meet this condition. These areas include:

- northeast section along East Front Street near the Fair Haven border;
- southeast area near the intersection of Branch Avenue and Spring Street;
- southwest area on Bridge Avenue between Drummond Avenue and West Bergen Place.

The recommended improvements necessary for the system to produce acceptable fire flow should be planned for implementation over the next several years. These are:

1. Parallel existing 4" on East Front Street from Caro Court to Haddon Park and on Harrison Avenue from East Front Street to Beekman Pl.;

2. Parallel existing 6" on Branch Avenue from Tower Hill Avenue to Spring Street with 8";

3. Parallel existing 6" on Bridge Avenue from West Bergen Place to Drummond with 8".

With the exception of the Branch Avenue extension, these improvements should be included in the Borough Capital Improvements Program over the next several years. The Branch Avenue extension should be studied in more detail to determine if the NJAWC system interconnection recommended as improvement B2 of Table 1 will produce adequate fire flows.

In addition, there are 4" diameter mains throughout the system. The locations of these 4" mains are identified in Table 2. To bring the system up to NJDEP standards, the mains should be replaced or paralleled. The work can be incorporated into a multi-year capital program. Other significant developments that
### Table 1: 1985 Master Plan Improvements, Status as of January, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated cost (1995 $)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Priority A</td>
<td>Interconnection with Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. and construction of 12&quot; main on Leighton Ave. from Newman Springs Road to West Bergan Place.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Priority A</td>
<td>Completion of 12&quot; main on Leighton Ave. and Locust Ave. from West Bergan Place across the railroad to connect with existing system.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Priority A</td>
<td>Interconnect existing 10&quot; Chestnut to Tower Hill Transmission main with existing system.</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Priority A</td>
<td>Replacement of 4&quot; with 8&quot; on East Front Street between Washington and Spring Street.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Priority B</td>
<td>Replacement of undersized mains in northwest portion of the Borough: Bridge, Monmouth, West Front, Rector, Morford and Bodman.</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>PARTIALLY COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Priority B</td>
<td>Interconnection with Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. on Spring Street near Branch and installation of 6&quot; mains.</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Priority B</td>
<td>Interconnection Improvement (automatic pressure control valve) @ Marion/Harrison.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Priority B</td>
<td>Replacement of 4&quot; with 8&quot; main on East Front Street between Caro Court and Harrison Street and between Front Street and Marion.</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Priority C</td>
<td>Installation of 0.5 million (min) elevated storage tank and 12&quot; connection piping to Leighton Ave.</td>
<td>$730,000</td>
<td>NO LONGER NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Priority C</td>
<td>Interconnection with Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. at Route 35/Rumson Pl.</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>NO LONGER NECESSARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Priority C</td>
<td>Miscellaneous improvements: Pearl St., Drummond Pl., Waverly Pl., Memorial Park.</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>SOME COMPLETED; REMAINDER RECOMMENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
may occur in the future, and which are in addition to the Vision of this Master Plan, may require other system improvements and should be reviewed at the time those developments are considered at the Planning/Zoning Board level.

Sewer Utility

The capacity, condition, and arrangement of the sewer system of the Borough is generally adequate. There were no major areas of the system which were found to be grossly under capacity for present or anticipated flows. Recommendations with regard to the sewer system can be considered maintenance, repair, and/or replacement activities. Since the 1985 plan, major pump station rehabilitation has been accomplished at the following locations:

1. West Newman Springs Road Lift Station
2. High Street Lift Station
3. Bergen/Tilton Pump Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Intersections</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Street</td>
<td>Washington to Hubbard Park</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic Street</td>
<td>William to Harrison</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden Place</td>
<td>Broad to Spring</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>$158,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthley</td>
<td>Mechanic to McLaren</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Mechanic to McLaren</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throckmorton</td>
<td>Front to McLaren</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>Front to McLaren</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rector Place/ Shrewsbury Ave.</td>
<td>Oakland to Bridge Ave.</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>$281,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Place</td>
<td>Bergan to Irving</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergan</td>
<td>South Pearl to Park</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street</td>
<td>Shrewsbury to Bridge</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morford</td>
<td>West Front to Bodman</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Newman Springs to Westside</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>Newman Springs to Westside</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Front St.</td>
<td>Shrewsbury to Bridge</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Morford to Riverside</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stormwater Management Plan

The Borough, in its planning and development requirements, provides that development address stormwater management and comply with the guidelines and regulations of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. The purpose of NJDEP Stormwater Management Regulations are to:

- Offset potential flooding and pinpoint pollution problems;
- encourage water recharge;
- protect the integrity of stream channels;
- reduce soil erosion from new development;
- and
- protect the adequacy of bridges and culverts.

Natural drainage swales and recharge areas, such as wetlands, wet weather ponds, and similar features are encouraged to be preserved when proven adequate for stormwater management purposes. Red Bank encourages compliance of new development with NJDEP guidelines.

At current development, Red Bank has only a few stormwater problems identified at this time. Generally, pipe sizes, inlets, culverts, and channels are adequate to handle existing generated stormwater flow, with the following exceptions:

- Bridge Avenue at Monmouth Street;
- West Bergen Place between the railroad crossing and Maple Street; and
- Pearl Street at White Street

Plans are underway to provide new construction to resolve the minor flooding at these locations.
CONSERVATION PLAN

Introduction
The Conservation Plan element, in accordance with Municipal Land Use Law, addresses the preservation of natural environments and resources including endangered or threatened species of wildlife, water supply, forested areas, soils, marshes, rivers and other waters, wetlands, harbors and open spaces. In addition to these issues, the Conservation Plan element of the 1995 Red Bank Master Plan also addresses two other planning areas, often treated separately or not considered in municipal master plans: 1) the conservation of energy and of manufactured resources through recycling of recyclable materials, and 2) The preservation of historic sites and historic districts.

The Conservation Plan element must systematically analyze the relationship of all of the other elements of the Master Plan to the present and future preservation, conservation and utilization of borough resources. Therefore, the Conservation Plan element for the Red Bank Master Plan is focused on seven specific areas:

Wetlands
- Definition
- Locations
- Assessment
- Relationship to other elements of the Master Plan

Water supply hydrology: the wells and the aquifers
- Sources
- Assessment
- Relationship to relevant elements of the Master Plan

Recycling plan
- Statewide goals for recycling and waste management
- Red Bank's recycling program

Historic preservation plan
- Identification of historic sites
- Resource organizations for historic preservation
- Relationship to relevant elements of the Master Plan

Coordination with adjacent municipalities, state and regional agencies and community organizations
- State and Federal agencies
- Regional organizations
- Area municipalities
- Red Bank agencies and community organizations

Subsurface conditions
- Geology and Soils
- Contaminated sites
- Relationship to other elements of the Master Plan

Surface water: the rivers and Mohawk Pond
- Assessment
- Relationship to relevant elements of the Master Plan
Subsurface Conditions

Geology and Soils

The Environmental Resource Inventory\(^1\) provides a technically detailed description of the subsurface conditions and soils beneath the upland areas. The documentation revels several ways that this knowledge should inform planning in the borough.

First, certain soils will become saturated and tend to “flow” more readily than others and the borough should anticipate that developers will encounter special conditions when considering certain sites (e.g.: along Newman Springs Road, as indicated by the presence of Holmdel Sandy Loam near the south end of Broad Street and near the south end of Leighton Avenue).

Second, the sandy soils present a high erosion hazard in the steep slope areas along the river.

Third, the delineation of the tidal and floodplain soils (Hemaquents and the sulfoquents/sulfihemists) indicate the presence of wetlands where development entails more costly structure and more exacting regulation, and will therefore influence future plans for development along the riverfront.

These qualities do not necessarily have a direct influence on zoning designations; however, one will find a general correlation. Traditionally, new construction is sited on high, dry, fairly level ground. Also, in some cases there are specific prohibitions and modifying regulations that apply to specific types of environments.

Contaminated Sites

Man-made and naturally occurring toxic materials may be a concern at certain locations in the borough. For example, the Monmouth County Waste Sites Map notes the location of the inactive incinerator and landfill at the end of Sunset Avenue, and several monitoring wells are presently monitoring the site to ensure that there is no potential for contamination of the surrounding area.

Surface water: the rivers and Mohawk Pond

Assessment

The Navesink River, the Swimming River and Mohawk Pond each have distinctive environments and are each impacted by human activities in different ways. Recently, for example, the ban on commercial shellfishing on the Navesink River (imposed in the early 60’s) was lifted. A primary cause of ban was eliminated in the 1970’s when the small wastewater treatment plants that emptied directly into the Navesink were closed; and continued controls and monitoring have dramatically lowered the presence of non-point source pollutants, such as fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and animal wastes.

Delicate marshland ecology like that of the Swimming River has come increasingly under state environmental protection. The borough was successful in having the river from Oyster Point to the Swimming River Dam declared an Environmentally Sensitive Area.

Mohawk Pond is primarily fed by municipal stormwater outfalls, therefore it is especially important to control stormwater pollution
through Best Management Practices, as noted in the Environmental Resource Inventory. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection: Division of Coastal Resources designates special areas which necessitate special management policies. For Red Bank these areas could include: submerged vegetation, navigation channels, Marina moorings, filled waters edges, shellfish beds, prime fishing areas, fish migratory pathways, natural waters edges, floodplains, wetlands, wetlands buffer, intermittent stream corridor, historic and archeological resources, and public open space.

Relationship to other elements of the Master Plan

New construction that is anticipated at several locations along the riverfront will impact some of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) designated "special areas" and come within the purview of several regulatory departments and agencies. The subject of special reviews administered by NJDEP include excavation or construction on coastal wetlands - (Wetlands Permit); construction on any tidal or navigable waterway - (Waterfront Development Permit) and construction of major residential, industrial, transportation (including structured parking), utility or energy related facilities - (Coastal Area Facility Review Act “CAFRA” Permit).

In most cases the NJDEP welcomes the opportunity for preliminary review early in the design process. Additional Federal review of proposed or substantially renovated bulkheads, breakwaters, docks, or piers in navigable waters is administered by the Army Corps of Engineers.

The necessity to protect the ecologically delicate nature of the riverfront environments need not compete with the natural human urge to be close to the water. Nationwide, the increased interest in marine and riverfront oriented public recreation has elevated public awareness of conservation issues. Plans to build a civic open space to connect Red Bank’s downtown to sweeping views of the Navesink and construct a pedestrian walkway “Riverwalk” along the river’s edge are central to the future of the community and its identity in the region.

Increased accessibility to the western riverfront as new residential development occurs is an essential element of the revitalization envisioned for the West Side neighborhoods. This should happen by the provision of public access at the ends of the east-west streets.

Wetlands

Definition

By definition, a “wetland” is: an area that is inundated or saturated by surface water or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances does support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions, commonly known as hydro-trophic vegetation.

Locations

The actual perimeter of the wetland boundary at a specific site is to be delineated in accordance with the USEPA three parameter approach (hydrology, soils and vegetation). In Red Bank the extent of wetland environments is indicated generally by the presence
of soils found in the floodplain and tidal areas (Humaquents and Sulfaquents) as documented in Figure 4 of The Environmental Resource Inventory (Phase One)\(^5\).

**Assessment**

In general, the areas occupied by these soils are used for wildlife habitat and recreation associated with riverfront activities such as marinas, docks and fishing piers. Thoughtful regulation and voluntary emphasis on conservation has reduced the negative impact that these facilities will have on Red Bank’s wetlands. For additional information on the nature and mapping of wetland areas see the Environmental Resource Inventory recently completed by the Red Bank Environmental Commission.

**Water supply hydrology: the wells and the aquifers**

**Sources**

Historically, groundwater has been generally abundant in most of Monmouth County. However, increased development in the 1980’s resulted in a larger quantity of water being withdrawn causing partial depletion and some salt-water intrusion of the underlying aquifers. As a result, Monmouth County has been classified Critical Area #1 in New Jersey by the NJDEP.

**Assessment**

Conservation measures included a requirement that all communities in the Critical Area reduce well pumpage by 50%. Red Bank now obtains its municipal water supply from the Manasquan Reservoir for six months a year. Red Bank presently maintains a 1.5 million gallon ground storage tank for fire flow and daily supply. The borough also has interconnections with New Jersey American Water Company for backup supply if necessary. The water supply and water treatment plants are presently in satisfactory operating condition. Relationship to other elements of the Master Plan.

The previous Master Plan noted that the yield capacity of the natural aquifers established a natural upper limit of the borough’s population. Since that time, alternative water sources have become available, as noted above. The 1995 Master Plan develops an upper population limit based on land use and design criteria in the Housing Plan Element.

**Recycling plan**

Statewide goals for recycling and waste management

The State Recycling Plan goal is to recycle 60% of the solid waste stream by January 1, 1996. The plan includes provisions for the collection, disposition, and recycling of recyclable materials designated on the municipal recycling ordinance, and Municipal Land Use Law requires that a specific plan be developed for the recycling of recyclable materials from any development proposal for the construction of 50 or more units of single family residential housing or 25 or more units of multi-family residential housing and any commercial development proposal for 1,000 square feet or more of land [N.J.S.A. 40:55d-28(12)]. The residential projects planned for Red Bank to have approved design occupancies at these levels will be provided with the same recycling services as other residential neighborhoods. It is recommended however, that the borough’s site plan ordinance and the
development regulations be amended to comply with these Municipal Land Use Law requirements pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55d-28(12).

Red Bank’s recycling program

The borough has begun curbside collection of plastics, metal, and glass and manages a collection site for mixed paper. The Red Bank recycling center is currently located at the Public Works building at 75 Chestnut Street. This site handles all Class A recyclables. In addition, an expanded borough-operated recycling facility will be constructed at the site of the obsolete Red Bank Landfill. The center will receive all Class A materials (which includes glass, cardboard, paper, metal cans, and plastics). Recycling of plant debris (fall leaves) will continue to occur at the landfill site where residents may take autumn leaves from their properties and pick up mulch for their gardens and planted areas.

Recyclables from businesses, restaurants, industrial and institutional establishments are required to be separated and are collected on the same schedule as residential pick-up.

Because Red Bank is a diverse, compact community, where varied land uses co-exist in close proximity. This provides many opportunities for re-utilization as well as making curbside pick-up of recyclable materials efficient and economical.

Historic Preservation Plan

Identification of historic sites

Red Bank has been a center of shipping and commerce for centuries. As documented in the Environmental Resource Inventory, the borough has significant architectural and historic resources that include historic sites and districts that date from the late seventeenth century to approximately 1930. The Environmental Resource Inventory provides a compilation of notable buildings, districts, and structures which are significant and representative of Red Bank’s history, culture and architecture.

The Downtown Design Overlay District, (the historic district) includes about eighty (80) buildings with frontage on Broad Street between Front and Linden streets or on Front Street between English Plaza and Globe Court. It is recommended that the Historic District Regulations, adopted in 1985, be refined and up-dated to provide clear criteria for evaluation of future development and restoration proposals.

Resource organizations for historic preservation

Local organizations that are involved with preservation and adaptive reuse of culturally significant sites in Red Bank are:

- Red Bank Environmental Commission
- Office of New Jersey Heritage, Monmouth county Park System
- River Center Visual Improvement Committee (VIC)

Relationship to other elements of the Master Plan

A fundamental theme of all previous planning efforts in Red Bank has been the challenge of adapting the structure and form of a town built largely in the 19th century to the requirements of 21st century commerce and market expectations. From the 1930’s forward, borough master plans focus on reshaping the downtown area to separate
uses and simplify automobile access. The 1995 Land Use Plan and Housing Plan elements place greater emphasis on encouraging mixed use and downtown living that will lead to redevelopment and adaptive reuse of Red Bank’s older buildings.

Coordination with adjacent municipalities, state and regional agencies and community organizations

Resource Recovery

Adjacent municipalities: Non-recyclable solid waste will continue to be taken to the Monmouth County Landfill.

Monmouth County Planning Board: In addition to administering the county’s responsibilities for the statewide solid waste plan, the Monmouth County Planning Board offers technical assistance to municipal collection processing programs. It also operates an extensive education program that includes several publications, workshops in the schools and resource materials for educators.

State and Federal agencies: As an incentive for municipal governments to participate in a recycling program, the State offers tonnage grant awards. The amount of money refunded to a municipality is directly related to the success of their recycling program. In 1987, the New Jersey Mandatory Source Separation and Recycling Act set a goal for all municipalities for recycling of 25% of the municipal solid waste stream within two years of the programs implementation.

In 1992 the Governor’s Solid Waste Task Force revised this benchmark in order to halt the expensive practice of transferring solid waste out of the state. The recycling goal was separated into two parts: municipal (which refers to materials from curbside pick-up from households) and total (which includes materials that are not usually collected on the regular weekly pick-up days such as scrap metal, leaves, mixed paper, industrial debris, and large items). A target was established to recycle (by weight) 50% of the municipal solid waste stream and 60% of total solid waste by 1995.

In 1994 recycling for all of Monmouth County has nearly accomplished the state benchmark: 46.5% of municipal solid waste and 52.4% of the total solid waste stream is recycled.

The corresponding figures for Red Bank (17% for the municipal waste stream and 60% of total solid waste) is indicative of the more diverse social and economic structure of a town as compared to the suburban and rural areas of the county. The presence of a thriving commercial scrap metal recycling company in Red Bank is certainly partially responsible for the high percentage of the total solid waste tonnage that is recycled.

The relatively low percentage (by weight) of all materials collected at curbside that are recycled is probably due to four factors; first, mixed paper is not currently economical for the borough to pick up at curbside; second, because the Chestnut Street facility is soon to be replaced by a new facility with much-needed expanded capacity, the separation of solid waste is not yet rigorously enforced. Third, the commercial and business community generate a significant amount (by weight) of mixed paper (recyclable, but not collected) and food waste (could be composted, but also not collected at curbside). Lastly, and as mentioned previously, because Red Bank is a
diverse, compact community, varied land uses co-exist in close proximity. This provides many opportunities for re-utilization by neighbors and other resourceful people of items that would otherwise become part of the solid waste stream. Therefore, a greater percentage of the overall weight of collected municipal waste is non-recyclable.

Environmental Protection

State and Federal agencies: As the borough begins to implement the plans for riverfront redevelopment along the Navesink the continued participation of various State and Federal regulatory agencies will be essential to sustain conditions conducive for development, avoiding unnecessary delays and duplication of effort.

Long-standing bans on shellfishing along the Navesink are an indication of the combined diligent efforts of the individual citizens, the borough, various regional organizations, and the state. The continued monitoring of pollutant levels will encourage further improvement in the quality of local waterways making Red Bank's rivers more hospitable for both wildlife and recreation. Ongoing activities of state/borough collaboration include contamination mitigation of the old landfill and the Clean Shores Program. Through the Clean Shores Program the municipal clean-up of the Navesink River banks is assisted twice yearly by state prison inmates.

Regional and Community Organizations: The Navesink River Municipalities Commission consists of three representatives from each of the communities of Red Bank, Fair Haven, Rumson, Middleton, Colt's Neck, and Tinton Falls. The committee monitors quarterly water quality testing and regular dredging operations (near-term objectives for dredging are to keep navigable channels clear to Marina at Maple Street and Chris's Landing) Another environmental objective is to make the Navesink a "no discharge zone" where boats are required to empty on-board sewage at a dumping station that will be provided at each of the principle launch sites.

Historic Preservation

State and Federal agencies: In addition to the state program for designation of historic places the Office of New Jersey Heritage maintains extensive records and other information related to area sites of cultural significance. Some of this material has been included in the Environmental Resource Inventory, including the location of many Red Bank historical buildings.

The state legislature is in the process of implementing the provisions of Article 34 of the BOCA National Code into the New Jersey Uniform Building Code. Once in place, this will remove some of the regulatory impediments to redevelopment of older buildings and should have a positive influence on the economic pro forma for restoration and adaptive reuse projects downtown.

Community Organizations: The facade improvement program administered by River Center continues to be an effective way to encourage property owners to maintain and improve buildings in a way that contributes to the character of the downtown area. Though the guidelines for the Design District Overlay provide a useful reference, they need to be updated regularly in order to assist decision-making regarding color, materials, graphic quality and lighting in the historic commercial core of Red Bank.
NOTES


2 Rules on Coastal Zone Management (N.J.A.C. 7:7E-1.1 to 3.40)


RE-EXAMINATION REPORT OF THE MASTER PLAN
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS
OF THE BOROUGH OF RED BANK

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law (NJSA 40:55D-89), the Master Plan must be re-examined every six years. The 1995 Master Plan was re-examined in 2002 and 2008 in accordance with the statute.

Following the adoption of the re-examination on December 15, 2008, the Borough of Red Bank Mayor and Council received requests from residents for an additional public meeting to further discuss the 2008 re-examination report. As a result of the public request, an additional public meeting was held on February 18, 2009 to discuss the 2008 reexamination report. This document has been amended to reflect the Board’s conclusion as a result of the February 18, 2009 public meeting and Board discussion.

I. **Major land development problems identified in the 2002 Re-Examination Report.**

The 2002 Re-Examination Report found significant progress was made in achieving the goals outlined in the 1995 Master Plan. The 2002 Re-Examination Report indicated residential development increased throughout the Borough; that additional parking had been developed in the Downtown area and at the train station, and that occupancy in the Downtown Business District and the Shrewsbury Avenue Business District had dramatically increased since the 1995 Master Plan. The 2002 Report goes on to state that
the number and quality of retail, financial, restaurant and service occupancies continues to develop and thrive, and that Red Bank had developed into a destination where shopper activity thrives at all times and that Red Bank had established itself as a place to shop, dine, and enjoy.

The 2002 Re-Examination Report further indicated that business development in the vicinity of the train station/Shrewsbury Avenue area was steadily improving. Many applications for development and occupancy were at both the Planning and Zoning boards in 2002, and sites in the area which were in disrepair for years had been or were being planned for re-development. The report found that a sense of pride and place was developing in Red Bank store owners, tenants, and residents and stated that a "truly remarkable transformation" had occurred in Red Bank since the 1995 Plan.

The 2002 Report also found that some of the changes since the 1995 Plan resulted in increased pressure on several problems identified in the 1995 Master Plan, primarily parking and traffic circulation, and therefore, the 2002 Re-Examination Report identified additional stress on roadways and traffic congestion as a problem. It also stated that the cost of land, home, office, and rental prices continued to increase with some residents and business owners expressing affordability as an issue.

The 2002 Report found that additional stress on the community was caused by regional facilities such as the YMCA, Armory Ice Rink, and the many service and religious organizations that increase traffic and, in some cases,
not providing tax revenue. The 2002 Re-Examination Report found that the remaining developable parcels in the Borough provided unique design challenges and that increased development since the 1995 Master Plan resulted in some loss of street trees and open space which impacts green space.

II. Land development objectives that existed in 2002.

The 2002 Re-Examination Report found that the objectives of the 1995 Master Plan continued to be essentially the same objectives in 2002. There was general “satisfaction” that the development and transformation which occurred between 1995 and 2002 was consistent with the goal of the 1995 Plan and was desirable. The 2002 Re-Examination went on to find that there should be a heightened emphasis on providing adequate parking and improved traffic flow in the Borough.

Changes in land development objectives identified in the 2002 Report included a recommendation that the Planning and Zoning boards focus on requiring Board applications provide a look consistent with Red Bank character, and suggested providing an extended mixed-use development between Broad Street and the train station along Monmouth Street. Other objectives in the 2002 Report included reducing noise and providing improved waterfront access throughout the Borough, and to review standards for residential density in zones west of Maple Avenue to promote development more in keeping with a residential character.
III. The change in land development problems since the 2002 Re-Examination Report.

Generally, development which has occurred since the 2002 Re-Examination Report has been consistent with the 1995 Master Plan and the 2002 Re-Examination Report. Additional development has occurred in the Monmouth Street Corridor between Broad Street and Shrewsbury Avenue. The River Center Special Improvement District was extended along Monmouth Street to Shrewsbury Avenue. New mixed-use developments have been approved along that corridor that include commercial, retail, and residential components. Additionally, the number and quality of retail, financial, restaurant and other uses continue to develop and thrive. Red Bank continues its role as a regional destination for both shopper, restaurant, and entertainment activities.

Development in the train station area continues to improve since the 2002 Report. Applications have been approved in the train station vicinity have an increased residential density, as well as include retail/commercial components. Applications in the vicinity of the train station for adaptive reuse, as well as demolition and reconstruction have also been approved.

The 2002 Re-Examination Report identified insufficient parking as a continued problem. Since the 2002 Re-Examination Report, the boards have generally not approved applications that proposed new square footage that did not also include sufficient parking. This has caused the positive result that applications now include parking garages, underground parking
facilities, and surface parking sufficient to meet the parking demand created by the application. Ordinance changes adopted by the Planning Board and Mayor and Council since the 2002 Re-Examination have reduced the density of residential uses immediately adjacent to the river and reduced densities of residential areas on the west side of town by eliminating attached single-family and multi-family dwelling uses.

IV. The changes in land development objectives since the 2002 Re-Examination Report.

The changes in land development objectives since the 2002 Re-Examination include extension of the special improvement district along Monmouth Street to Shrewsbury Avenue and an increase of allowable densities along that corridor. These objectives also include an increase to residential densities in the vicinity of the train station beyond what is provided for in the current ordinance. This change should encourage residential development that would predominantly use public transportation as the primary means of travel. Additionally, the board recognizes that the current limitations for residential units above retail and commercial (now 4 units/building) as being too restrictive and recommend increased density for these units be considered in the CCD-1, CCD-2 and BR-1 and BR-2 Zones.

In the CCD-1 and CCD-2 Zones, concern was expressed by the Planning Board that the lack of a density requirement in the zone is resulting in applications with excessive densities. Density limits should be considered for the CCD-1 and CCD-2 Zones. It further recognized that "Commercial
Parking Garage” should be a permitted accessory and principal use in the BR-1 and BR-2 zones to allow rental of garage space to help address the parking shortfall in Red Bank.

The Planning Board, Mayor and Council continue to address the shortfall of low and moderate income housing within the Borough as defined by COAH. The Affordable Housing Overlay District was established in the area east of Bridge Avenue which allows an increased density of residential units. The Borough is also preparing a housing plan to address its third round housing allocation for the period 2004 to 2018.

As previously stated, the 2002 Re-Examination Report found that increased development has resulted in loss of street trees and open space. To address this issue, the Borough completed a Community Forestry Management Plan in 2006 in cooperation with the Red Bank Shade Tree Committee. It is the goal of the Borough of Red Bank to maintain and promote a healthy, safe and sustainable shade tree resource that will physically, economically and aesthetically benefit the community and its residents in the most cost effective manner possible.

In addition, the Planning Board and Mayor and Council recently adopted expanded limits to the Historic District in the BR-1 and RB-2 Zones in the vicinity of Washington and Front Street to preserve the historic character of that neighborhood. The historic inventory of significant sites in Red Bank maintained by the Borough Historic Preservation Commission was used to establish the limits of a new Historic Residential District.
Finally, the Board recognized the need for additional waterfront access. The foot of Maple Avenue and the property at the foot of Sunset Avenue were discussed as possible candidates for consideration. Additional waterfront properties are discussed in the Red Bank Waterfront Plan which was completed in 2006.

V. The significant changes in Master Plan assumption policy and objectives.

The policy of objectives of the 1995 Master Plan as modified by the 2002 Re-Examination Report are still considered appropriate for the foreseeable future.

VI. The significant changes in development regulations assumption policy and objectives.

Since adoption of the 1995 Master Plan and 2002 Re-Examination Report, the Planning and Development Regulations were revised to reflect the addition of new zones and deletion of several others. The zone ordinance was reviewed and revisions made to comply with recommendations of the 1995 Plan and 2002 Re-Examination Report.

Below is a summary of significant amendments to the Planning and Development Regulations adopted by the Mayor and Council between 2006 and 2008. The Re-examination committee reviewed the amendments listed
below and re-affirmed the adopted Ordinances are consistent with the goals of the Master Plan:

- The minimum lot area for lots abutting the Navesink River was increased from 5,000 SF to 30,000 SF in the WD and RD Zones, and from 6,500 SF to 40,000 SF in the RA Zone. (Ordinance No. 2007-15)
- Attached single-family dwellings are no longer a permitted use in the RD and RB-1 Zones. (Ordinance No. 2007-15 and 25)
- Exterior balconies, decks, and porches shall not be included in calculations of Floor Area Ratio. (Ordinance No. 2006-52)
- The Affordable Housing Overlay Zone was created. (Ordinance No. 2006-53)
- The bulk standards for the RB-1 Zone were revised. (Ordinance No. 2007-25)

VII. The changes recommended to the Master Plan or the need for a new plan.

The objectives of the 1995 Master Plan are considered valid today. The 2002 Re-Examination Report also confirmed those findings in 2002.

Although the Master Plan remains valid, some changes are required to the Development Regulations to create development that is more consistent (in certain areas of the town) with the Master Plan goals.

VIII. The changes recommended to the Development Regulations.
The following is a list of areas in the Planning Development Regulations that should be modified:

1. According to the Borough Attorney, there may be an issue concerning whether proper notice was given to property owners in affected zones with respect to Ordinance Nos. 2006-52, 2006-53, 2007-15, and 2007-25. The referenced Ordinances are summarized in Section VI of this document. Therefore the Committee recommends, out of an abundance of caution, that the above noted Ordinances be re-adopted.

2. The Re-examination Committee suggests the following modifications for the CCD-1 and CCD-2 zones:
   - For new structures, the permitted uses shall include dwelling apartments on floors above street level at a maximum density of 25 units per acre where adequate parking is provided.
   - For existing structures, the maximum density permitted shall be 25 units per acre. However, the permitted maximum density may be increased to allow up to four (4) units per site.
   - The Committee recommends the maximum floor area ratio be reduced from 2.25 to 1.70.
   - Finally, the Committee suggests the maximum height of new structures be reduced from fifty (50') feet to forty (40') feet.

3. A new zone (or overlay district) should be considered in the vicinity of the train station to encourage residential development with ready
access to public transportation as the primary means of travel. A partial zone map is attached which shows the boundaries of this overlay district. The Re-examination Committee suggests the following density and height for the overlay district:

- Maximum density permitted at 35 units per acre. However, the permitted maximum density may be increased to allow up to four (4) residential units per site when the rate of 35 units/acre results in less than 4 units.
- The maximum structure height is recommended to be fifty (50') feet.

4. The setback requirements in the CCD-1 and CCD-2, BR-1 and BR-2 Zones should be reviewed and revised. Generally, applications in these zones are not compliant with the bulk requirements. However, the number of variances for set back given in these zones indicates the standards should be adjusted.

5. The Active recreation requirement for multi-family dwellings is currently 250 square feet per unit. The Committee suggests reviewing this requirement. In addition, the ordinance requiring a payment in lieu of providing active recreation should be reconsidered.

6. The Planning Board evaluated the parking fee required in the ordinance (Zones HB, CCD-1, CCD-2, BR-1, BR-2, PO, WD, MS, I, and LI) and concludes the parking fee requirement to be absolutely mandatory and reaffirms its validity.
7. Side yard setback should be modified in all residential zones to allow air-conditioning units to be no closer than 3 feet from the property line, provided that unit is compliant with applicable noise ordinances and is screened from neighbor view.

8. The density requirements in the BR-1 and BR-2 zones shall be increased to encourage increased residential development in that area and to allow residential uses above retail consistent with the recent extension of the River Center District. The maximum density permitted shall be 16 units per acre. However, the permitted maximum density may be increased to allow up to 4 units per site.

9. The parking requirement for primary food and primary liquor should be changed from based on “maximum-rated occupancy” to an amount based on a “building-square-footage”.

10. The new Historic District on Washington Street should be added to the Zoning Map.

11. Change the requirement for office, professional office and medical office parking to 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

12. Establish a height limitation of 35 feet and 2.5 stories for single-family uses in the BR-1 and BR-2 Zones.
13. Limit the permitted uses along Rector Place in the WD Zone to detached single-family dwellings.

14. Clarify the definition of “primary food service” such that any use which serves prepared food is considered a “primary food service”.

15. Clarify the definition of “apartment house”, “garden apartment” and “townhouse dwelling” as structures used only for residential purposes.

16. The definition of “vertical parking garage” is unclear and should be modified and listed as a permitted use in the BR-1 and BR-2 Zones. In addition, “Commercial Parking Garage” should be listed as a permitted accessory and principal use in the BR-1 and BR-2 Zones.

17. The definition of Commercial Recreation Facility should be clarified to include both profit and non-profit establishments.

18. Remove “lodges, clubs, and fraternal organizations” from the list of permitted uses in the PO and NB Zones.

19. Based on the current zoning ordinance, a change of occupancy of a retail establishment to personal service (i.e. nail/hair salon, tanning salon, yoga/dance studio, Pilates studio, etc.), triggers a need for Planning Board approval for the change of use, even though the proposed occupancy may be permitted in the zone. This results from an ordinance requirement where a proposed occupancy moves from
one use to a use lower in the "list of uses" and is then considered a "change in use" requiring Board approval. In many instances, this process is for minor changes which create a cost to downtown business owners who are moving into and want to occupy existing sites. The Board recommends an ordinance change that would streamline the approval process for "minor changes" to occupancies in the CCD-1 and CCD-2 Zone and will reduce the load on the Planning Board for applications which are minor in nature.

20. The Board recommends a revision to the Ordinance which would allow the Administrative Officer to approve a change from one permitted use to another permitted use when no new gross floor area or variances are proposed and the increase in parking demand is less than 5 spaces. Applications that meet the criteria for administrative approval would still be required to pay all applicable fees, including COAH, utility fees, and parking fees, as appropriate. This recommendation does not apply to primary food and primary liquor-type uses since these uses have delivery and trash issues which should be reviewed by the Board.

21. The Board supports the Borough's interest in "green" Ordinances which will provide incentives to Developers to include green technologies in new building projects.