

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
**January 18, 2006**

PRESENT: Chair Harrison, Ms. Cockey, Ms. English, Vice Chair Fleischer, Mr. Haizel, Mr. Susswein and Mr. Whipple; also, Mr. Sullivan, Esq., Mr. Mellon, Secretary, and Mr. Charreun, Assistant Secretary

ABSENT: Mr. Flood

Assistant Secretary Charreun called the roll and announced the regular meeting of the Montclair Board of Adjustment. Notice had been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Whipple, the **Minutes of the November 16, 2005** regular meeting were adopted, Ms. Cockey and Mr. Haizel abstaining.

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the **Minutes of the November 28, 2005** special meeting were adopted as modified, Ms. Cockey and Mr. Haizel abstaining.

**Election of Officers**

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Haizel, Mr. Harrison was re-elected as Chair, Mr. Harrison abstaining.

On motion by Mr. Susswein, seconded by Mr. Haizel, Mr. Fleischer was re-elected as Vice Chair.

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Ms. English, Mr. Mellon was re-elected as Secretary and Mr. Charreun was re-elected as Assistant Secretary.

**Appointment of Professional Staff**

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Haizel, Mr. Sullivan was re-appointed as Board Attorney at the indicated rate for the 2006 year.

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Susswein, Mr. Watkinson was re-appointed as Board Engineer at the indicated rate for the 2006 year.

Chair Harrison addressed the Board regarding the recent legislation requiring that Board members participate in mandatory educational programs pursuant to New Jersey Department of Community Affairs regulations. He stated that it was not guaranteed that the Board members taking the scheduled NJPO course this spring would meet the statutory training requirement.

On motion by Mr. Susswein, seconded by Ms. English, the following Resolution memorializing the approval of the application of **Robert & Nina Sloan, 8 Windsor Place** was adopted, Chair Harrison, Mr. Fleischer, and Ms. Cockey abstaining:

**WHEREAS, Robert & Nina Sloan**, owners of property at **8 Windsor Place**, did make application to the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair for a variance pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70c to allow for a side yard setback less than that required pursuant to **Montclair Code Section 347-46A(2)a** in connection with the proposed relocation of a central air conditioning unit from the rear of their home to the westerly side of their home located on property designated as Lot 9 in Block 708 on the Township Tax Map and located in the R-1 One-Family Zone; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicants submitted a property survey prepared by G.B. Associates, dated March 30, 1992, an enlarged section of the property survey depicting the proposed relocation of the central air conditioning unit, and a specification sheet for the unit; and

**WHEREAS**, this matter came on to be heard at a meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on December 14, 2005 at which time it was established that notice was properly published and the property owners within 200 feet of the property in question had been properly served notice; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board carefully reviewed the testimony presented and established the following findings:

1. The subject property is an interior lot located in the R-1 One-Family Zone and contains a 2-story single-family dwelling and a detached garage in the rear yard. The subject property is irregularly shaped and measures 10,579 square feet in area.
2. The applicants propose to relocate a central air conditioning unit from the rear of their home to the westerly side of their home. The property survey indicates that the westerly side yard setback of the dwelling on the property is 9.10 feet at the front corner and 9.22 feet at the rear corner.
3. The central air conditioning unit specification sheet indicates that the central air conditioning unit measures 34 inches square (width and depth) and 38 inches in height. The applicants indicated that the unit would be placed 2 feet away from the wall of the dwelling, due to an existing ground level window well on that side of the dwelling, and that a side yard setback of approximately 4.5 feet is proposed, where 6 feet is required.
4. The applicants are proposing evergreen plantings between the unit and the westerly property line, which would mitigate any potential adverse impact on the neighboring property to the west.
5. Although the applicants did not demonstrate any hardship in regard to space on their property, the applicants did demonstrate that the proposed location of the

central air conditioning unit is the most suitable location, in that it would allow the applicants the best use of their rear yard and would be less noticeable to the adjoining westerly neighbor than other locations along the westerly side yard of the property.

**WHEREAS**, the Board, based on the aforementioned findings, concluded that the applicants did prove that the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements, and proved that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment and proved that the variance could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance pursuant to the requirements of NJSA40:55D-70C(2); and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair that the variance application of Robert and Nina Sloan is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicants shall screen the proposed central air conditioning unit as depicted in their plan using evergreen plantings.

2. The westerly side yard setback of the proposed central air conditioning unit shall not be less than 4.5 feet.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the applicants, Township Manager, Township Council, Township Clerk, Township Engineer and Construction Code Official.

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the following Resolution memorializing the approval of the application of **Omnipoint Communications, Inc, 641 Bloomfield Avenue** was adopted as modified, Mr. Haizel abstaining:

WHEREAS, Omnipoint Communications, Inc., did make application to the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair pursuant to Montclair Code Section 347-141B to appeal a condition of approval from the Montclair Historic Preservation Commission that required it to remove its proposed screening from the antennae located in Sector B, and in the alternative did make application pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d to modify a previous approval of the Board to eliminate the requirement that screening be provided for antennae located in Sector B on the roof of property designated as Lot 14 in Block 2209 on the Township Tax Map and located in the C-1 Central Business Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted a site plan prepared by Salient Architects dated October 18, 2005 revised through October 25, 2005; and

WHEREAS, this matter came on to be heard at a meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on December 14, 2005 at which time it was established that notice was published and that property owners within 200 feet of the subject property had been properly served with notice; and

WHEREAS, the Board carefully reviewed the testimony presented and established the following finding:

1. By resolution adopted on July 20, 2005, the Board granted variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(3) to permit the applicant to construct six telecommunication panel antennae, three equipment cabinets, and one battery cabinet on the roof of the building located at the subject property. The applicant complied with all of the conditional use standards contained in the Montclair Township Zoning Ordinance except that the proposed panel antennae failed to comply with Section 347-17.1C(4)(c) in that they exceeded the height of the parapet wall. In order to minimize any visual detrimental impact created by the proposal, the Board imposed a condition of approval that required the applicant to screen the antennae located in Sector B. Specifically, condition number four of the approving resolution provided in part that "[t]he applicant shall screen those antennae with one continuous stealth screen extending from the edge of the penthouse and covering both of the antennae in the Sector" (referring to Sector B).

2. Following approval, the applicant was required to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Montclair Township Historic Preservation Commission prior to the commencement of construction. The Montclair Township Zoning Ordinance requires the Commission to review proposals that seek to alter any building located within a landmark district of the Township prior to the issuance of a building permit. A building permit will not issue unless a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued by the Commission. Therefore, because the subject property is located within a landmark district of the Township the approved plans fell within the Commission's jurisdiction.

3. On review of the plans submitted by the applicant, the Commission determined that the creation of false chimneys or other screens to mask the antennae was inappropriate for the site. The Commission reasoned that screening would give a false sense of history to the building, and stated its preference that the new antennae be visible. The Commission concluded its review by granting a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to certain conditions, including removal of the proposed screening from the antennae located in Sector B.

4. The Commission's determination is the basis for the subject application. The applicant now proposes to revise the approved plans, by removing the stealth screening from Sector B in accordance with the Commission's rendering. The applicant relied on the Commission's reasoning for the modification, and presented expert testimony to support its position.

5. At the conclusion of the testimony, the Board determined that the modification sought by this approval would not significantly alter its prior approval granting a deviation from the conditional use requirements of the Ordinance. It further concluded that the relief could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

6. In light of the Board's determination, the applicant withdrew its appeal from the Montclair Historic Preservation Commission that required it to remove the proposed screening from the antennae located in Sector B.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair that the application of Omnipoint Communications, Inc. to modify a previous condition of approval to eliminate screening of antennae located in Sector B is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall screen three proposed equipment cabinets in accordance with the revised plans through June 15, 2005.

2. The applicant shall move the antennae in Sector B closer to the existing penthouse.

3. The applicant shall pay any required development fees to the Montclair Housing Trust Fund in accordance with Montclair Code Section 2502-39, et seq.

4. The applicant shall be responsible for all inspection fees required under Montclair Code Section 202-27 as well as escrow fees incurred in connection with review of this matter.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the applicant, Township Manager, Township Council and Township Clerk.

On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Whipple, the following Resolution memorializing the approval of the application of **Sprint Spectrum, LP, 36 Hawthorne Place** was adopted as modified, Mr. Haizel abstaining:

WHEREAS, Sprint Spectrum, LP, did make application to the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair to permit telecommunication panel antennae, one GPS antenna, and equipment cabinets on the roof of property designated as Lot 2 in Block 2110 on the Township Tax Map and located in the R-4 Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicant requested variance relief from N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d(3) for failure to comply with all of the conditional use standards contained in Montclair Township Code Section 347-17.1C(5); and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted a site plan prepared by Malick & Scherer, P.C. dated September 6, 2005 revised through September 21, 2005; and

WHEREAS, this matter came on to be heard at a meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on December 14, 2005 at which time it was established that notice was published and that property owners within 200 feet of the subject property had been properly served with notice; and

WHEREAS, the Board carefully reviewed the testimony presented and established the following findings:

1. The subject property measures 142,441 square feet in size and contains a six story residential apartment building.
2. The applicant proposes to install thirteen panel antennae, one GPS antenna and four equipment cabinets on the roof of the building.
3. The application complies with all of the conditional use standards contained in the Montclair Township Zoning Ordinance except that the apartment building is 58 feet in height whereas a minimum of 60 feet is required pursuant to Montclair Code Section 347-17.1C(5)(a), and proposed antennae enclosures exceed the height of the structure to which they are attached contrary to Section 347-17.1C(5)(d).
4. The plans submitted to the Board proposed to enclose four equipment cabinets with 12 foot high stealth screening, which would measure 70 feet in height from ground level. Three sets of three panel antennae would be flush-mounted to the enclosure on the northern, western, and southern sides, for a total of nine panel antennas. A GPS antenna would attach to the top of the enclosure measuring 71 feet from ground level. Two panel antennae would be enclosed in one cylindrical stealth casing mounted at the northeastern corner of the building, and two panel antennae would be enclosed in one cylindrical stealth casing mounted at the southeastern corner of the building. The cylindrical enclosures would be mounted above the parapet wall at a height of 65 feet from ground level.
5. The applicant represented that the plans effectuated the spirit of the conditional use standards contained in the Montclair Township Zoning Ordinance, in particular Section 347-17.1C(5)(d). The Section provides that the height of antennae shall not exceed the top of the parapet wall, penthouse or chimney to which it is attached. The applicant therefore proposed 12 foot high screening to enclose the equipment cabinets to simulate a traditional rooftop accessory. The proposal achieved two purposes for the applicant. The enclosure would screen its proposed equipment cabinets as required by Ordinance, and the height of the enclosure would allow the applicant to mount its panel antennae at a greater elevation for coverage.
6. Members of the Board took issue with whether the proposal actually effectuated the spirit of the conditional use standards. It was the view of some Members that the enclosure was particularly large, visually intrusive, and contrary to the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.
7. In order to achieve the purposes of the conditional use standards without prohibiting the use of wireless communications at the site, the proposal was modified during the course of the hearing. It was represented by the applicant's radio frequency expert that the panel antennae could be mounted at a lower elevation and achieve the same coverage as proposed, provided the antennae are mounted closer to the edge of

the rooftop. The proposed plans would be modified to provide screening no higher, wider, or longer than necessary to enclose the proposed equipment cabinets. The equipment cabinets would be shifted along the rooftop closer to South Fullerton Avenue to the extent necessary to achieve the proposed coverage as initially presented. Three panel antennae would be flush-mounted on the enclosure toward Hawthorn Avenue at a height no greater than the screening, and the other six panel antennae initially proposed would be eliminated. Two additional cylindrical enclosures, containing no more than two panel antennae each, would be utilized to compensate for the elimination of panel antennae on the equipment cabinet enclosure. The cylindrical enclosures would be mounted above the building parapet at a maximum height of 65 feet from ground level.

8. Installation of the antennae will eliminate a coverage gap and improve wireless communication service to the applicant's subscribers as per the applicant's FCC license which constitutes appropriate municipal action in a manner which will promote the public health, safety and general welfare consistent with the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law.

9. Based upon the size and location of the existing apartment building, the proposed roof top location of the site is particularly suited for wireless communication antennae and continues to be an appropriate site for the conditional use notwithstanding the deviations from the conditions imposed by the ordinance.

10. The proposed antennae and related equipment shall comply with all applicable State and Federal regulations for radiation transmission levels.

11. The visual intrusion caused by the height of the amended proposal is minimal and will not adversely impact adjacent properties and is not inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. To ensure minimal visual intrusion, the applicant has proposed to paint the equipment cabinet and cylindrical enclosures to match the grey brick of the building to which they are attached.

12. The application does not involve any noise, vibrations, smoke, dust, odors, heat or glare and involves minimal noise and thus will not cause substantial detriment to the public good and is not inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the foregoing findings, concluded that the applicant proved the requisite special reasons for the granting of this application and proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed relief could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair, that the within application of Sprint Spectrum, LP, for variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d(3) is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed equipment cabinets shall be enclosed in screening no higher, wider or longer than necessary for enclosure.
2. The placement of the equipment cabinets shall be shifted along the rooftop no closer to South Fullerton Avenue than necessary to achieve the proposed coverage as presented to the Board.
3. Three panel antenna shall be flush-mounted to the equipment cabinet enclosure toward Hawthorne Avenue at a high no greater than the enclosure.
4. The two additional cylindrical enclosures proposed by the applicant's amended plan shall be mounted above the building parapet at a height not to exceed 65 feet from ground level, and shall no contain more than two panel antennae each.
5. The cabinet screening and cylindrical enclosures shall be painted to match the grey brick color of the building to which they are attached.
6. The applicant shall pay any required development fees to the Montclair Housing Trust Fund in accordance with Montclair Code Section 2502-39 et seq.
7. The applicant shall be responsible for all inspection fees required under Montclair Code Section 202-27 as well as escrow fees incurred in connection with review of this matter.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the applicant, Township Manager, Township Council and Township Clerk.

Assistant Secretary Charreun announced that at the request of the applicant, the application of **Guy Maxwell, 559 Upper Mountain Avenue**, would be carried to the February 15, 2006 regular meeting of the Board, that the applicant has granted the Board an extension of time, and that no further notice would be given.

Assistant Secretary Charreun announced that at the request of the applicant, the continuation of the application of **Coldwell Banker/NRT, 242 Bellevue Avenue**, would be carried to the February 15, 2006 regular meeting of the Board, that the applicant has granted the Board an extension of time, and that no further notice would be given.

Chair Harrison called the continuation of the variance application of **PAAG, LLC, 7 Fidelity Place**. Laurence Olive, Esq. appeared as attorney for the applicant. Mr. Olive stated that although the testimony is now closed on the application, his client has prepared a drawing to reflect a revised front façade which would address the Board's concerns regarding the bulk of the proposed addition in the front yard and asked that it be considered during the Board's discussion on the application.

Assistant Secretary Charreun stated that Mr. Haizel and Ms. Cockey are eligible to vote on the application. The Board discussed the application and requested to see

the revised front elevation prepared by the applicant. On motion by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Whipple, the site plan and variance application was approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The front wall of the addition shall be no closer to the front property line than the front wall of the existing house.
2. The front edge of the porch shall be no closer to the front property line than the front wall of the existing porch.
3. The addition shall not extend more than 4 feet beyond the rear line of the existing house and shall not impact the Japanese maple tree in the rear.

Chair Harrison called the continuation of the site plan and variance application of **Wallwood Gardens, Inc., 400 Orange Road**. Robert Taylor, Esq. appeared as attorney for the applicant and called Rocco Orlando, Architect, who was still under oath. Mr. Orlando stated that a revised plan has been prepared in which 12 units are proposed instead of 14.

Marked into evidence was:

A-9 Revised site plan, on a board, dated December 19, 2005

Mr. Orlando described the revised plan and stated that, along with the reduction in the number of dwelling units, the front yard and rear yard setbacks have been increased, although variances are still required. He also stated that 7 of the proposed dwelling units have been reduced to 2 bedrooms, which has lowered the parking requirement to 28 spaces, and that all of the required parking is provided.

The Board questioned Mr. Orlando.

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public.

Ethel Booker, 24 Ward Place, asked for a clarification on the number of bedrooms proposed within the units that face Orange road.

Renee Baskerville, 371 Orange Road, inquired about the number of variances requested by the applicant.

James Dargan, 391 Orange Road, asked for a clarification on the proposed front yard setback from Orange Road.

Sybil Smith-Darlington, 67 Pleasant Way, asked for a clarification on the number of bedrooms proposed and whether the applicant has examined the impacts on the sight triangles at the intersections of Ward Place and Pleasant Way with Orange Road.

Thomas White, 77 Pleasant Way, asked whether any traffic lights would be installed at the intersections of Ward Place and Pleasant Way with Orange Road

Richard Williams, 22 Ward Place, asked whether the existing traffic on Ward Place and Pleasant Way was considered and whether the height of the proposed buildings could be reduced.

Mr. Taylor called John McDonough, who was sworn and stated his qualifications as a Professional Planner. Mr. McDonough described the revised plan and the variances requested. He addressed the variance requested for the proposed use and stated that the proposed residential use in a residential zone represents a better alternative functionally and aesthetically than the existing commercial use on the property and that the proposed density is consistent with the neighborhood pattern. He further stated that the previous planning testimony provided on the positive criteria, the purposes of planning that are advanced by the application, and the particular suitability of the site are still applicable to the revised plan. He continued by stating that by applying the existing lot sizes in the neighborhood and considering the fact that the neighborhood contains many two-family houses, the subject property could be viewed as a potential subdivision consisting of 6 lots containing two-family homes, which would result in a worse alternative than the proposed plan.

Marked into evidence were:

A-10 Tabulation prepared by the applicant indicating the multiple unit dwellings in the area and lot sizes

A-11 Tax Map illustrating the information on A-10

Mr. McDonough described exhibits A-10 and A-11 and stated that of the 55 properties included in the tabulation, 4 are commercial and 51 are residential. He also stated that 13 of the 51 residential properties contain 2 or more dwelling units. He continued by addressing the height variance and stated that, although the proposed buildings do not comply with the 2½-story component of the height restriction, the proposed buildings comply with the 40 feet that is allowed. He also stated that the neighborhood presently contains multiple unit dwellings that exceed 2½-stories in height.

A-12 Photos of existing multiple unit buildings in the R-1 Zone in the vicinity of the subject property that exceed 2½-stories in height

Mr. McDonough addressed the front yard setback variances requested. He stated that the existing site contains large storage bins that are closer to the Pleasant Way front property line than the proposed front yard setback and that the proposed front yard setback on Ward Place is larger than the predominant front yard setback of the existing dwellings on Ward Place. He stated that the front yard setbacks provide visibility at the intersections that is in full compliance with the engineering standards and that the sight triangles provided would also be reviewed by the County Planning Board.

- A-13 View of Pleasant Way looking west
- A-14 View of Ward Place looking west
- A-15 View of Pleasant Way looking north
- A-16 View of Pleasant Way looking west
- A-17 Photograph of a typical property in the neighborhood depicting cars parked in the front yard

Mr. McDonough addressed the rear yard setback variance requested and stated that the proposed rear yard setback represents an improvement from the existing rear yard setback of structures located on the property. He also stated that the rear yard setback could be landscaped to soften the view of the proposed development. He continued by describing the variance requested for front yard parking and stated that the visual impact could be mitigated with landscaping and that most of the parking spaces are internalized on the site. He summarized his testimony by stating that the statutory requirements have been met and the application should be approved.

The Board questioned Mr. McDonough.

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public.

Ethel Booker, 24 Ward Place, inquired about the number of two-family homes in the neighborhood.

James Dargan, 391 Orange Road, also inquired about the number of two-family homes in the neighborhood.

Richard Williams, 22 Ward Place, also inquired about the number of two-family homes in the neighborhood and the proposed density.

Ray Oliver, 20 Willowmere Avenue, asked how the proposed density could be justified.

Janet Hubert-Kraft, 5 Ward Place, inquired about the proposed parking and whether any impact to street parking could be anticipated.

Chair Harrison called for a short recess.

Mr. Taylor called Ruth Wallestad, one of the two owners of the subject property, who was sworn. Ms. Wallestad stated that she has been part owner of the subject property since 1996. She described the existing site, the structures located on the property, and typical business hours and operations. She stated that she and her business partner are seeking to retire and sell the property and that there has been very

little interest in the property as a retail garden center. She also stated that the proposal to develop the property with a residential use would be beneficial to the community.

The Board questioned Ms. Wallestad. Ms. Wallestad stated that the concept for townhouses at the density proposed was determined to be appropriate after an examination of the neighborhood. She continued by describing the community meetings that were held and that she and her business partner have tried to get input from the neighborhood. She further stated that the option of developing single-family dwellings on the property was not considered.

Marked into evidence was:

A-18 A copy of the notice provided to residents of the neighborhood for the community meetings organized by the applicants

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public.

Sybil Smith-Darlington, 67 Pleasant Way, inquired about the date of the first community meeting that was held.

Ethel Booker, 24 Ward Place, asked who the developer of the property would be for the proposed project.

William Scott, 23 Cedar Avenue, asked if the approval of the proposed project would create a precedent for other multiple unit developments in the R-1 Zone.

Renee Baskerville, 371 Orange Road, asked whether a significant number of the people that attended the community meetings organized by the applicant were not from the immediate neighborhood.

James Dargan, 391 Orange Road, asked how the notices of the community meetings organized by the applicant were served.

Lillie White, 77 Pleasant Way, also asked how the notices of the community meetings organized by the applicant were served.

Jennifer Giacchino, 395 Orange Road, also asked how the notices of the community meetings organized by the applicant were served.

Paul Burr, 2 Pleasant Way, asked whether the applicants would reconsider their proposal since there is significant opposition from the neighborhood.

Yvonne Bouknight, 9 Brooklawn Road, asked Ms. Wallestad if she resides in the neighborhood.

Mr. Taylor called Geraldine Woods, the other owner of the subject property, who was sworn. Ms. Woods stated that she has resided in Montclair for 61 years and that

her plan is to live within one of the proposed units. She stated that the proposed development would be geared to retired persons who do not want to deal with the maintenance of a single or two-family home. She also stated that the proposed units would be more affordable than the typical townhomes that have been constructed in Montclair in recent years.

The Board questioned Ms. Woods.

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public.

Ethel Booker, 24 Ward Place, asked how the maintenance of the property would be handled if the project were approved.

Ray Oliver, 20 Willowmere Avenue, asked whether the opposition from the public would cause a reconsideration of the proposed plan.

Tracy Fairlynn, 185 Willowdale Avenue, asked how a unit containing 4 levels could be used by a retired person or a person looking to downsize.

Karen Gunthorpe, 378 Orange Road, asked if the cost of the demolition of the existing site has been determined.

Rose Faison, 364 Orange Road, asked if property taxes would increase in the neighborhood if the project was approved.

Janet Hubert-Kraft, 5 Ward Place, asked whether the impacts to the neighbors directly affected by the proposal have been considered.

Wallace Choice, 5 Pierpont Drive, asked Ms. Woods whether she has observed the various multiple unit developments presently underway in Montclair.

Lillie White, 77 Pleasant Way, asked why the neighborhood residents were not notified more efficiently about the community meetings before these public meetings before the Board.

James Dargan, 391 Orange Road, asked if the applicants would reconsider the development plan to conform more to the existing neighborhood.

Chair Harrison announced that the application would be continued at a special meeting of the Board to be held on February 1, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. and that no further notice would be given.