



**PLANNING BOARD
BOROUGH OF RUMSON
Meeting Minutes
November 10, 2025**

The regularly scheduled meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm with a salute to the flag, followed by a roll call.

Present: Mrs. Baret, Mrs. Carras, Councilman Casazza, Mr. Ciambrone, Mrs. Ford, Councilman Kingsbery, Mr. Goodes, Mr. McManus, Chairman Brodsky
Absent: Mr. Shissias, Mr. Torres

Also present, Michael B. Steib, Esq., Thomas Rogers, Municipal Clerk and Administrator, David Marks, Borough Engineer, and Marie DeSoucey, Board Secretary

The notice requirements of the **Open Public Meetings Act** were stated as being met.

Borough Engineer David Marks was sworn in.

Administrative

After review and discussion, Councilman Kingsbery made a motion to approve the **October 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes** as submitted; Seconded by Mrs. Ford.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Baret, Mrs. Carras, Councilman Casazza, Mr. Ciambrone, Mrs. Ford, Councilman Kingsbery, Mr. Goodes
Nays: None
Abstain: Chairman Brodsky, Mr. McManus

Resolutions

None

Old Business

The continued application of **River Point Inn** for property located at **132 East River Road** originally carried to tonight's meeting will not be heard. Mr. Steib advised the application has been carried numerous times and recommended the application be carried with notice required. Mrs. Baret made a motion to have the application carried to the December 1, 2025 Planning Board Meeting at 7:30 pm with notice required; Seconded by Councilman Cassazza.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: Mrs. Baret, Mrs. Carras, Councilman Casazza, Mr. Ciambrone, Mrs. Ford,
Councilman Kingsbery, Mr. Goode, Mr. McManus, Chairman Brodsky

Nays: None

New Business

Chairman Brodsky explained the procedure that will be followed for the hearing and gave a disclosure statement.

The application of **TagCap Atlantic 50 Rumson, LLC** for property located at **50 Rumson Road, Block 103, Lot 1** in the **R-2 Zone** was presented for the Board's consideration. Mr. Steib stated the notice has been reviewed and the Board has jurisdiction to hear the application, advised the Board needs to review the T&M Associates completeness report and waivers requested. Mrs. Baret requested testimony regarding completeness waivers B-15 and B-22 listed in the T&M report.

Rick Brodsky, Esquire from the Ansell, Grimm and Aaron law firm representing the applicant addressed the Board. Mr. Brodsky introduced Patrick Ward, a New Jersey licensed engineer. Mr. Ward was sworn in, and the Board accepted his credentials.

Mr. Ward testified that legal metes and bounds descriptions of the proposed lots is required for new streets and no new roads are proposed. However, if legal descriptions are needed, they will be provided as a condition of approval. No utility or access easements are anticipated to be needed for the future development of the lots.

The Board is in receipt of the following exhibits: A-1 Development Permit Application dated 8/21/2025; A-2 Boundary and Topographic Survey prepared by InSite Surveying revised 6/13/2025; A-3 Minor Subdivision Plan prepared by InSite Engineering 8/19/2025; A-4 Application dated 9/8/2025; A-5 Stormwater Management Report prepared InSite Engineering dated 8/22/2025; A-6 Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Manual prepared by InSite Engineering dated 8/22/2025; A-7 T&M Associates Report dated 9/26/2025; A-8 Zoning Officer's Memorandum dated 9/29/2025; A-9 Monmouth County Development Review Committee Action Report dated 9/22/2025

Mr. Brodsky described the project as a Minor Subdivision application seeking approvals to form two lots. The property is a corner lot on Rumson Road and Tennis Court Lane and is vacant. There is no new construction proposed, and no variances associated with the application. The two proposed lots are approximately 1.15 acres each. Improvements, building envelopes and proposed locations for typical backyard amenities associated with single-family residential use are depicted on the plans simply for informational purposes. The technical variance is requested this evening is for frontage on Tennis Court Lane.

Mr. Brodsky stated the applicant is in receipt of a letter from Kevin Kennedy, Esquire representing the Sea Bright Lawn Tennis & Cricket Club dated 11/7/2025. The applicant is agreeable to all the negotiated items listed therein.

Mr. Ward submitted an aerial of the subject and surrounding properties dated 11/10/2025 marked A-10. Mr. Ward described the existing conditions at the subject premises. The two proposed lots will conform to the bulk requirements of the R-2 Zoning District. Portions of the existing driveway locations on Tennis Court Lane and Rumson Road will remain to preserve the access. The decorative brick wall will be maintained. Future approvals will be required for the individual lot development.

Mr. Ward submitted A-11 Aerial Imaging dated 3/2025. The proposal is to subdivide the property into two single-family properties Lot 1.01 and Lot 1.02. Both will approximately 200' by 250' and 1.15 acres each. The County Planning Board desires a five-foot wide right-of-way dedication along Rumson Road, which will be provided. The internal Lot 1.02 fronts on the private road, Tennis Court Lane, which functions as a public street. Access to and from the site, for users or emergency services, is not an issue. The applicant intends on fully complying with the Borough's Tree Removal Ordinance for each individual development application. Both properties can be serviced by public infrastructure and utilities.

Mr. Ward read A-12 the 11/7/2025 Sea Bright Lawn Tennis & Cricket Club letter into the record, and reiterated the agreements reached.

Board Members inquired regarding the approval from the Monmouth County Planning Board on the Rumson Road driveway access. Mr. Ward stated the application has been submitted and is pending final approval. Mr. Brodsky stated the applicant's position is that Tennis Court Lane is a private lane, and this is unique circumstance. The access on Rumson Road is existing and is not new access being sought. Should the Rumson Road access be considered too close to Tennis Court Lane, it can be relocated to the west end of the property.

Board Members asked about the ownership and maintenance responsibilities of Tennis Court Lane. Mr. Marks stated the municipality does not own Tennis Court Lane but does provide snow removal, refuse and brush collection. Paving of the road was recently done by the Water Company after replacement of the water main. There is no "official" homeowners' association. Mr. Brodsky stated it was an agreement between the immediately adjacent property owners on either side of the road. The easement rights that are in place run with the land therefore would be binding on current and future owners of the properties.

Should the access driveway on Rumson Road be required to be moved westerly, Board Members recommended that the decorative brick wall would have to be replaced and/or repaired in-kind at those affected areas and that this should be a condition of approval. The applicant agreed and is obligated to maintain the wall.

Board Members asked for clarification on the utility connections from Tennis Court Lane. Mr. Ward advised there is a water main, sanitary sewer on the Lane and the final connection points will be up to the purveyors. A single-family home will not burden the threshold capacity. The

applicant is willing to coordinate any roadway disruption and will not impede the Tennis and Cricket Club operations.

Mr. Brodsky introduced Kevin Slavin, a New Jersey licensed tree expert. Mr. Slavin was sworn in, and the Board accepted his credentials. Mr. Slavin submitted a tree removal plan marked as A-13.

Mr. Slavin stated there are eleven trees proposed to be removed and gave the inventory of the existing trees on the subject properties. The trees that will remain will have temporary chain link fencing installed around them extending to the drip line to reduce soil compaction and for the safety of the trees.

Mr. Ward testified that a conceptual development design plan has been submitted to the County showing the anticipated disturbance. No tree assessment has been performed. The applicant has met with Mr. Slavin to hone-in-on where these homes may be placed and what trees can be worked around. Also, there are some smaller trees that can be moved. A revised plan incorporating the findings of the report will be submitted for the Board's review. There are no plans to remove any trees around the perimeter of the properties. Revised plans will be submitted.

Mr. Brodsky reiterated that the application is for a subdivision and illustrates future development can comply with the ordinance regulations. Should future developers choose to deviate from the requirements, they would have to appear before the appropriate land use board for approval.

Board Members asked for clarification on the amount of soil disturbance required for the stormwater management system. Mr. Ward stated proper drainage needed to be demonstrated for County approval. Final layouts for each lot may change and could be reduced. These engineering plans were sized for the maximum coverage and may not necessarily be the final design. The drainage from the properties will be reduced. Mr. Marks advised in the process of developing a single-family lot there are processes between zoning board and planning board approval and inspections are performed throughout the construction.

Mr. Brodsky introduced Christine Cofone, a New Jersey licensed planner. Ms. Cofone was sworn in, and the Board accepted her credentials. Ms. Cofone testified that this is a straightforward application. The only item before the Board is the creation of two lots that front on Rumson Road and Tennis Court Lane. The R-2 Zone has a minimum requirement of one acre or 43,560 square feet. Both the subject lots are over 50,000 square feet and oversized by the Borough's zoning standards. There is nothing nonconforming about the lots and comply with all the bulk requirements. There is no bulk relief being sought.

The only relief being requested is because Tennis Court Lane is a private lane and not a municipal road. The applicant is seeking to have a lot fronting on a private road and therefore a variance is required.

Ms. Cofone read from the 2025 Zoning and Land Use Administration Manual and explained the concerns the Board should have in this type of case. Ms. Cofone cited the Kligman vs. Loutman case in support of granting the variance. “Abutting lots to front on specific kinds of streets suitably improved or improvement guaranteed before permits may issue. The street frontage requirements could be dispensed with provided that adequate access for emergency vehicles is assured by some lesser means of access, which will also protect any future street layout shown on the official map or Master Plan of streets duly adopted by the planning board.” If there is adequate safe and efficient access, the board need not be concerned with the fact that the lot doesn’t front an approved public street since it would not conflict with any layout shown on the official map.

The applicant is proposing to repurpose an existing driveway on Tennis Court Lane. Access has historically achieved access from that lane. There are several other homes similarly getting access further down Tennis Court Lane.

Ms. Cofone believes the Board can grant the relief under the c-2 Section of the MLUL. Purpose E is advanced establishing an appropriate population density. These lots are consistent with the established zone pattern in this area. There is sufficient space and is an appropriate location which advances Criteria E and G. There will be no substantial detriment to the Zone Plan or the public good.

Chairman Brodsky opened the testimony for public questions and/or comments. Fredrika Vince residing at 6 Belknap Lane questioned construction vehicle access. Mr. Ward responded they anticipate all construction vehicle access will be from Rumson Road. John Burgess residing at 3 Belknap Lane asked whether the use of Rumson Road is binding. Mr. Ward reiterated that it makes sense to use Rumson Road for both lots. Theresa Sperber, residing at 65 Navesink Avenue, requested that no construction vehicles utilize Belknap Lane West formerly known as Rikers Alley. Ms. Sperber also asked if runoff from the property going down Belknap Lane was taken into consideration. Mr. Ward responded very little runoff flows in that direction for this application. Barbara Mahon residing at 87 Bingham Avenue questioned the Board deciding on an application when the tree removal is uncertain and keeps changing. Ms. Mahon also questioned parking availability on Tennis Court Lane when the Club is in full season. Mr. Ward advised there is a Deed of Easement for the club parking along the frontage on Tennis Court Lane and he believed there is signage. There is an anticipation of an abundance of off-street parking on the property. Ms. Mahon inquired about the builder of the project. Mr. Steib advised the applicant will not necessarily be the builder.

Ms. Sperber commented that this is one of the few historic neighborhoods left in Rumson. There are 17 historic homes within the two-block radius of Navesink and Tennis Court Lane. What controls are there for the design of the homes? Mr. Steib advised there is no ordinance that has design standards for architecture and the Board has no control.

Nancy Haaron residing at 34 Warren Street inquired whether there were any specimen trees on the properties. Mr. Slavin stated there are probably two specimen London Plane trees located in the center of the property and a Copper Beach by the street, which is in poor condition and

unsafe. Ms. Haaren stated the Resolution should be specific as to the replanting or replacement of the trees.

Elaine Eden residing at 4 Wilson Circle asked when the zoning changed to allow one acre lots on Rumson Road. Chairman Brodsky explained the 1988 Borough Map shows bulk properties in the R-2 zone were one acre. Ms. Eden expressed concern for the estates on Rumson Road and this may set a precedent by approving the subdivision, and five houses on the properties should be limited to three. Mr. Marks responded that the R-2 Zoning has been in effect since at least June 1990. Ms. Eden suggested the Rumson zoning be revisited and evaluated.

Laurie Ellis Bruckmann residing at 66 West River Road spoke to the environmental impact of tree removal and requested the species and caliper of trees proposed to be removed. Mr. Slavin supplied the inventory of trees to be removed. Henry Swayne, owner of 2 Tennis Court Lane, asked for clarification of the current utility lines, any water issues and assurance of adding five homes to the capacity. Mr. Marks stated any type of development there are provision in the ordinances that address those issues. There is a process in place for the actual development of any parcel where the stormwater management system, drainage and runoff conditions will be reviewed and approved. The applicant has received letters that the gas, electric and water are deemed sufficient for the new homes.

Kathryn Taylor residing at 55 Rumson Road questioned the construction vehicles pattern during the summer and summer traffic congestion times. Mr. Ward stated it won't be a heavy trip generation from the construction vehicles, and they will have to just deal with the traffic. Ms. Taylor also inquired how the subdivision can be considered, and the development of the lots be considered separately, and who will maintain the stormwater basins. Mr. Brodsky stated that there are two different applications, and they stand on their own. Mr. Marks advised it would be each individual homeowner will be responsible. The project engineers will have to provide the accuracy of the system they are proposing, and the Borough's professionals will review and approve they plans.

Frederika Vince asked what recourses are available should the post development impact her property. Mr. Marks advised that the subject lots will not drain in the direction of her property. Their drainage will go in the opposite direction. Any resident who is aggrieved by development, may take legal action or address the issue with the builders or the Borough to help remedy the situation. Ms. Vince also express concern regarding the uncertainty of the tree removal. Has the Borough Arborist been consulted on these plans? The trees are important to the Borough. Brett Hunger is the Borough's Tree Conservation Officer, and he has reviewed the plans with respect to the ordinance. He will review the revised report and the amended tree removal plan.

Alison Friedel residing at 51 Rumson Road also asked about any recourse if her property is impacted by any runoff. Chairman Brodsky reiterated the grading and drainage plan were not being reviewed or approved at this time. They will be reviewed when each of the properties are presented for development. Mr. Ward advised the property is higher and the ground water is at a depth that is manageable. Final design and layout of the homes will be presented and reviewed at some later time. Ms. Friedel inquired about the County involvement in the process.

Mr. Ward advised the County Engineering Staff has responded there is no impact to their stormwater facilities. No additional runoff will be directed towards Rumson Road

Councilman Casazza asked for clarification on the grading and drainage plan. Mr. Marks assisted by asking “how are you not putting more water down Rumson Road?” Mr. Ward explained there’s a portion of the property that does drain toward Rumson Road today. In the future with the final plan there will be a portion of the property that drains towards Rumson Road. The County will not allow the property to increase the runoff. Mr. Marks stated through the illustrated proposed stormwater management system the volume of runoff will be reduced. In the final design for each house the runoff will be reduced in accordance with the Borough’s stormwater rules.

Rod Shenman residing at 47 Rumson Road reiterated the water issue in the area, and express concern with the subdivision creating more runoff towards Rumson Road. Mr. Marks advised that, if the subdivision is approved and a new home is proposed, the plans are reviewed through the zoning process then the engineering is reviewed. There are milestone inspections throughout the construction process.

Stacy Smith residing at 51 Allen Street expressed concern with the storage of construction vehicles on the property and contingency plans for heavy traffic volume times. Mr. Ward advised the construction vehicles will be off street. Any traffic control necessary will be the burden of an applicant. Ms. Smith questioned the tree removal count. Mr. Ward responded the illustrative plans show where all structure could be built by a future owner.

John Burgess stated the water runoff ends up in the existing pond between the properties in the event of a storm event and there is a highwater table in the area. How do we deal with an already existing problem that could potentially be exacerbated? Mr. Ward stated the system will be designed to collect the runoff. The water will go to an underground system that is sized for the square footage that is being proposed. The system collects and stores the water to be recharged into the soil.

Rosalie Bostic Rodriguez residing at 6 Tennis Court Lane also express concern with the runoff and prior flooding to her property. Mr. Ward advised the former house did not have any drainage improvements. When new construction is proposed there will current standard drainage improvements.

Heather Robinson residing at 4 Tennis Court Lane expressed concerns with the stormwater runoff and tree removal. Has the removal of trees been taking into consideration? Mr. Ward stated yes it was and explained the analyses. Eddie Barns residing at 60 Allen Street was concerned with the proposal and the subdivision of five homes affecting the historic feel and quality of life in the neighborhood. Mr. Barns stated the concerns with homes being removed and replaced and there’s a sense of loss for the original atmosphere of the town. What does Rumson gain from placing five houses into an estate neighborhood? Mr. Steib advised that is not before Board. The Board is here to accept or deny the applications pursuant to the established ordinances. The Governing Board sets the rules. Mr. Steib explained the entire process for the public’s benefit.

Eileen Burgess residing at 3 Belknap Lane stated Tennis Court Lane, Belknap Lane are beautiful parts of Rumson and questioned the subdivision. Councilman Casazza explained that the applicant is following the rules for development. Ms. Carras also explained that the Borough's Master Plan is being reviewed and can be changed.

Wendy Cambria residing at 7 Holly Tree Lane asked for the sizes of the other lots in the area. Ms. Baret stated the entire area is in the R-2 Zone where the minimum lot size is one acre. Ms. Cambria believes the applicant is being treated unfairly. Julia Swayne residing at 2 Tennis Court Lane stated the lot is an important piece of property and is a beautiful piece of land. The application falls short for many reasons.

Mark Gilbertson residing at 18 Hartshorn Lane inquired regarding truck access onto the property through the narrow gateway. Mr. Ward stated he believe the access is wide enough. If it is a conflict will be opened and then restored.

Chairman Brodsky stated the applicant needs to submit additional and revised detailed plans for tree removal, fire official review and any further concerns from the Sea Bright Lawn Tennis and Cricket Club, T&M Associates further review of the drainage plan.

The application will be carried to the December 1, 2025 Planning Board Meeting at 7:30 pm without further notice required.

The application of TagCap Atlantic 54 Rumson, LLC for property at 54 Rumson Road, Block 103, Lot 1.2 in the R-2 Zone will be carried to the December 1, 2025 Planning Board Meeting at 7:30 pm without further notice required.

Executive Session

None

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:40 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled **Planning Board Meeting will be held on December 1, 2025** at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michele MacPherson,
State Shorthand Reporting Service, Inc.