

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
November 19, 2003

PRESENT: Chair Harrison, Ms. Cockey, Ms. Costello, Mr. Gallardo, Mr. Haizel and Mr. Susswein; also, Mr. Sullivan, Esq., Mr. Sammet, Secretary, and Mr. Charreun, Assistant Secretary

ABSENT: Vice Chair Fleischer, Mr. Flood, and Ms. Rock-Bailey

Secretary Sammet 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. Gallardo, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the **Minutes of the October 1, 2003** special meeting were adopted.

On motion by Mr. Gallardo, seconded by Ms. Costello, the **Minutes of the October 15, 2003** regular meeting were adopted as modified, Ms. Cockey and Mr. Haizel abstaining.

Secretary Sammet announced that the site plan and variance application of **The Salvation Army, 159 Glenridge Avenue** has been postponed at the request of the applicant until the December 10, 2003 regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment, that the applicant has granted the Board an extension of time through December 10, 2003 for which to act on the application, and that no further notice would be given.

Secretary Sammet announced that the variance application of **Donna Grant and Tim Gaydos, 89 High Street** has been postponed at the request of the applicants until the December 10, 2003 regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment, that the applicants have granted the Board an extension of time through December 10, 2003 for which to act on the application, and that no further notice would be given.

Secretary Sammet announced that the variance application of **Judith M. Stanton, 785 Valley Road** would be carried to the December 10, 2003 regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment because the applicant did not complete the mailing of the public notice for the application. He also stated that no further notice for the application would be published, however, the applicant would be completing the mailing of the public notice for the December 10, 2003 regular meeting of the Board.

Secretary Sammet called the variance application of **Roger L. Johnson, 500 Grove Street**. Roger Johnson, owner, was sworn and described the proposed detached garage. He stated that the proposed garage would be constructed on the same footprint as a previously existing detached garage on his property that has collapsed.

Chair Harrison joined the meeting.

The Board questioned Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson stated that the proposed garage would be constructed on a new concrete slab with new footings because the existing slab is damaged. He also stated that the new garage would measure 18 feet in width by 18 feet 6 inches in depth and that the previous garage was of the same dimensions. He further stated that the property survey of his property erroneously depicts the previous garage having dimensions of 17 feet by 17 feet and that he has photographs of the collapsed garage and insurance documentation that demonstrate that the dimensions of the previously existing garage are the same as the proposed garage.

Marked into evidence were:

A-1 Adjuster's Summary, from Encompass Insurance, dated March 12, 2003

A-2(a-f) Six (6) photographs of the collapsed garage

Mr. Johnson stated that the location of the dwelling on the property does not allow for the proposed detached garage to be constructed with the required setbacks in the rear and side yards.

Chair Harrison called for questions and comments from the public. None were offered.

The Board discussed the application.

On motion by Ms. Costello, seconded by Ms. Cockey, the variance application was approved, Chair Harrison abstaining, subject to the following condition:

1. The proposed detached garage shall be constructed on the same footprint as the previously existing garage and not be any larger than the previously existing garage.

Mr. Johnson left the meeting with exhibits A-1 and A-2 (a-f).

Chair Harrison called the variance application of **Mark Haefeli, 129 Llewellyn Road**. Mark Haefeli, owner, was sworn and described the proposed detached garage. He stated that the required side yard and rear yard setbacks for the garage would place the garage near the center of his rear yard and that the driveway for such a garage would also eliminate more rear yard space. He also stated that he has 4 children and is seeking to preserve as much rear yard space as possible because the rear yard is

limited in space. He further stated that an existing utility pole and tree in his rear yard also limit the ability to meet the required rear yard and side yard setbacks for the garage. He continued by stating that a detached garage previously existed in the same location as the proposed garage and that former owners of the property demolished the garage because it was dilapidated.

The Board questioned Mr. Haefeli.

Mr. Haefeli stated that the height of the proposed garage would not have an adverse effect on the view from the second floor windows of an existing carriage house on the adjoining property because the carriage house is significantly taller than the proposed garage. He also stated that an earlier survey of his property depicts the previous garage on the property in the same location and with the same dimensions as the proposed garage. He continued by stating that the direction of roof angle was chosen by the architect to match that of the dwelling.

Chair Harrison called for questions and comments from the public. None were offered.

The Board discussed the application.

On motion by Mr. Gallardo, seconded by Ms. Costello, the variance application was approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed detached garage shall be constructed on the same footprint as the previously existing garage and not be any larger than the previously existing garage.
2. The applicant shall submit to the Planning Department a copy of the earlier survey depicting the previously existing detached garage on the property.

Chair Harrison called the site plan and variance application of **Vizzone Family Realty, LLC, 7 North Mountain Avenue**. Robert Gaccione, Esq., appeared as attorney for the applicant and summarized the testimony from the previous hearing on the application held on October 15, 2003. He stated that the applicant has examined the possibility of adding an elevator at the rear of the building and that it has been determined that it is not feasible. He continued by stating that the applicant has developed an alternative ingress and egress plan for the site to encourage use of the rear parking lot and discourage visitor parking on North Mountain Avenue.

Mr. Gaccione called Brian Shortino, Professional Engineer, who was sworn and stated his qualifications as a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of New Jersey. Mr. Shortino described the proposed alternative site plan with a reconfigured ingress and egress plan.

Marked into evidence was:

A-5 Alternative Site Plan on a board, dated November 19, 2003, prepared by Bertin Engineering using Sheet A-1 of the submitted plans as a base map

Mr. Shortino stated that in the alternative plan, the existing ingress driveway from North Mountain Avenue would be removed and that the existing egress driveway to Bloomfield Avenue would be utilized as a two-way driveway for both ingress and egress. He stated that a barrier-free parking space and drop-off area is proposed at the front of the building that would be accessible via a two-way single lane driveway extending from the rear parking area. He also stated that the proposed barrier-free parking space is a van-accessible space that measures 16 feet wide by 18 feet long and was located at the front of the building to be near the proposed barrier-free ramp. He further stated that the entire frontage of North Mountain Avenue would be fenced, with no gate, in order to encourage the use of the rear parking lot. He stated that the alternative plan allows for the creation of 3 additional on-site parking spaces and that more landscaping could be added to the site to screen the proposed parking and drop-off area at the front of the building. He also stated that the entrance and exit to the rear parking lot from Bloomfield Avenue would be both right turns only. He further stated that that Essex County would likely prohibit a left turn from Bloomfield Avenue into the lot. He continued by stating that the alternative site plan reduces the likelihood that visitors would park on North Mountain Avenue and encourages use of the rear lot.

The Board questioned Mr. Shortino.

Mr. Shortino stated that the single-lane proposed to serve the barrier-free parking area and drop-off would be adequate due to the low volume of traffic anticipated to that part of the site. He also stated that the proposed barrier-free parking and drop-off would be setback approximately 4 feet from the North Mountain Avenue front property line.

Mr. Gaccione stated that the applicant prefers the original site plan and that the alternative site plan is being presented as an option in terms of site ingress and egress.

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public.

Jacqueline Daniher, 8 Francis Place, asked if a typical orthopedic patient was likely to make frequent visits to the site.

Linda Daniher, 8 Francis Place, asked if the existing detached garage and tree adjacent to the garage would remain in the alternative site plan. She also asked if any fencing is proposed along the property line at the northeasterly corner of the site.

Mr. Gaccione called Eric Levine, Esq., who was sworn and stated that he was employed by the previously existing business office use at the subject property from 1995 through 2001. Mr. Levine stated that he was among 25 employees that worked in

the building and that the site received several dozen visitors on a daily basis when he was employed there. He also stated that approximately 20 vehicles utilized the rear parking lot and that the office hours were from 9:30 am to 7:00 pm daily. He further stated that visitors used the front door on North Mountain Avenue to enter the building and that he had never heard of any complaints regarding parking on North Mountain Avenue. He continued by stating that the previously existing business office left the site at the end of 2001 and that there has been no interest in the site except for the applicant.

The Board questioned Mr. Levine.

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public. None were offered.

Chair Harrison called for public comment.

Linda Daniher, 8 Francis Place, was sworn and stated that she has no objection to the proposed medical office use, but is concerned about the potential removal of the detached garage and the tree at the northeasterly corner of the site. She also stated that some fencing should be provided at the northeasterly corner of the site.

The Board questioned Ms. Daniher.

Ms. Daniher stated that Francis Place is a dead end street with parking on both sides, which could not handle additional vehicles that may incorrectly turn left into Francis Place from Bloomfield Avenue while trying to reach the site.

Georgene Lane, 11 North Mountain Avenue, was sworn and stated that in previous applications to the Board, difficulties selling a property were not considered a determining factor. She also stated that the alternative site plan detracts from the residential character of the property and that site does not provide comfortable access to the front door from the rear lot.

Mr. Gaccione requested that he be permitted to call Dr. Vizzone for brief rebuttal testimony. Mr. Gaccione called Dr. Gerald B. Vizzone, who was already sworn and stated that he has resided in Montclair for a significant time and that he would like to maintain the character and appearance of the building and site. He also stated that he prefers the originally submitted site plan and that he would be willing to install fencing and landscaping as required to provide additional screening and buffering of the parking area.

The Board questioned Dr. Vizzone.

Chair Harrison called for questions from the public for Mr. Vizzone. None were offered.

Mr. Gaccione summarized the application and gave his closing remarks.

The Board discussed the application.

On motion by Mr. Gallardo, seconded by Ms. Costello, the site plan and variance application was unanimously denied.

On motion by Mr. Gallardo, seconded by Ms. Costello, the following Resolution memorializing the approval of the variance application of **David and Mia Norrie 26 Cross Street** was adopted, Ms. Cockey and Mr. Haizel abstaining:

WHEREAS, David and Mia Norrie, owners of property at **26 Cross Street**, 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 westerly side yard setback less than that required pursuant to **Montclair Code Section 347-45C(1)** in connection with the construction of second and third floor additions and a rear porch extension on property designated as Lot 6 in Block 2104 on the Township Tax Map and located in the R-2 Two-Family Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicants submitted a property survey prepared by Brunswick West, Inc., dated October 2, 2002 and floor plans and elevations prepared by the applicants, dated July 21, 2003, that depicts the new construction; and

WHEREAS, this matter came on to be heard at a meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on October 15, 2003 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 has a street frontage width of approximately 50 feet and contains a 2-story single-family dwelling and an open porch at the rear of the dwelling.

2. The existing dwelling has a nonconforming westerly side yard setback of approximately 3.8 feet measured from the southwesterly corner of the dwelling.

3. The applicants' proposal is to construct second and third floor additions onto the dwelling. The third floor addition meets all height and setback requirements. The second floor addition meets the height and rear yard setback requirements but does not meet the 6-foot side yard setback requirement in the westerly side yard.

4. The proposed second floor addition to the dwelling is aligned with the existing walls of the dwelling and would not encroach closer to any property than the existing dwelling.

5. The applicants also propose to extend an existing rear porch towards the westerly side property line and enclose the porch. The proposed porch extension meets the height and rear yard setback requirements but does not meet the 6-foot side yard setback requirement in the westerly side yard.

6. The proposed rear porch extension projects approximately 8 inches into the required 6-foot setback in the westerly side yard. The 8-inch projection into the required side yard setback is a minimal encroachment and is necessitated by structural components of the dwelling.

7. Based upon the Board's particular knowledge of local conditions, the proposed addition and extended rear porch is not inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and will not adversely impact the public good.

WHEREAS, the Board, based upon the foregoing findings, concluded that the applicants proved peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship and did prove that the variances could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70C(1); and

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 variances 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 within variance application of David and Mia Norrie is hereby approved subject to the following condition:

1. The additions to the dwelling, including the second and third floor additions and the enclosed rear porch, shall not be constructed closer to the westerly side property line than the existing dwelling.

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. Gallardo, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the following Resolution memorializing the approval of the variance application of **Marc and Leslie Kunkin, 1 Kenneth Road** was adopted, Ms. Cockey and Mr. Haizel abstaining:

WHEREAS, Marc and Leslie Kunkin, owners of property at **1 Kenneth Road**, did make application to the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair for variances pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70c to allow for front yard setbacks less than that required pursuant to **Montclair Code Section 347-45B(2)** in connection with the construction of a second story addition and a vestibule onto the dwelling on property designated as Lot 4 in Block 3706 on the Township Tax Map and located in the R-1 One-Family Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicants submitted a property survey prepared by Bernard W. Criscenzo, L.S., dated May 19, 1993, and a site plan, floor plans, and elevations prepared by Lawrence P. Quirk, Architect, dated July 30, 2003, that depicts the new construction; and

WHEREAS, this matter came on to be heard at a meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on October 15, 2003 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 a corner lot at the intersection of Kenneth Road and Grove Street and contains a 1½-story, single-family dwelling.
2. The applicants' proposal is to construct a complete second story addition over the first floor of the existing 1½-story dwelling and to construct an entrance vestibule at the existing front entrance in the Kenneth Road front yard.
3. The existing dwelling on the property has a conforming front yard setback of 32 feet in the Kenneth Road frontage, as measured to the southwesterly front corner of the dwelling, where a minimum of approximately 27.9 feet is required, due to the average front yard setback of the nearest 2 dwellings on Kenneth Road.
4. The existing dwelling has a non-conforming front yard setback of 21.20 feet in the Grove Street frontage, as measured to the southwesterly front corner of the dwelling, where a minimum of approximately 30.58 feet is required, due to the average front yard setback of the nearest 2 dwellings on Grove Street.
5. The proposed second story addition is aligned with the existing footprint of the dwelling and would not encroach closer to any property line than the existing dwelling. The proposed second story addition meets the height, side yard, rear yard,

and Kenneth Road front yard setback requirements, but does not meet the minimum required front yard setback of 30.58 feet in the Grove Street front yard.

6. The proposed vestibule in the Kenneth Road front yard projects approximately 6 feet closer to Kenneth Road than the front wall of the dwelling. A front yard setback of 26.30 feet is proposed for the vestibule in lieu of the required front yard setback of 27.9 feet in the Kenneth Road front yard. The Board determined that a fully conforming vestibule could be constructed without the need for a setback variance and that the vestibule size could be reduced without affecting its utility.

WHEREAS, the Board, based upon the foregoing findings, concluded that, with respect to the variance requested for the Grove Street front yard setback of the second story addition, the applicants proved peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship and did prove 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 the zoning ordinance pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70C(1); and

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the aforementioned findings, concluded that, with respect to the variance requested for the Grove Street front yard setback of the second story addition, 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

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the foregoing findings concluded that, with respect to the variance requested for the Kenneth Road front yard setback of the vestibule, the applicants did not prove peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship and failed to prove that the variance could be granted without substantial detriment to public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance pursuant to *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70C(1)*; and

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the aforementioned findings, concluded that, with respect to the variance requested for the Kenneth Road front yard setback of the vestibule, the applicants did not prove that the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements, and failed to prove that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment and failed to prove 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 *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70C(2)*;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair, that the within application of Marc and Leslie Kunkin, for a variance pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70C(1) and (2) to allow front yard setback less than required in the Kenneth Road front yard for the proposed vestibule is hereby denied; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair, that the within application of Marc and Leslie Kunkin for a variance pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70C(1) and (2) to permit a front yard setback less than required in the Grove Street front yard for the proposed second story addition is hereby approved subject to the following condition:

1. The second story addition shall not encroach closer to any property line than the existing dwelling.

NOW, THEREFORE, 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. Gallardo, seconded by Ms. Costello, the following Resolution memorializing the approval of the variance application of **Arthur J. and Alexandra Leale, 181 Summit Avenue** was adopted, Ms. Cockey and Mr. Haizel abstaining:

WHEREAS, Arthur J. and Alexandra Leale, as owners, did make application to the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair to convert a three-family dwelling into a two-family dwelling and install a new front porch on property designated as Lot 8 in Block 2606 on the Township Tax Map and located in the R-1 One-Family Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicants requested variances as follows:

1. A variance pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70d to permit a two-family use and expansion of the structure which is not permitted pursuant to Montclair Code Sections 347-41A, 347-112;

2. A variance pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70c to allow an easterly side yard setback of approximately 11-1/2 inches where a minimum of 6 feet is required pursuant to Montclair Code Section 347-45C(1);

3. A variance pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70c to allow a front yard setback of approximately 33 feet where a minimum of 35 feet 2-1/4 inches is required pursuant to Montclair Code Section 347-45B(1);

WHEREAS, the applicants submitted a site plan, floor plans and elevations prepared by Lineworks Architecture and Design, LLC, dated July 28, 2003 and a

property survey prepared by Teunisen Surveying & Planning Co., Inc. dated April 17, 2003; and

WHEREAS, this matter came on to be heard at a regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on October 15, 2003 at which time it was established that notice was properly 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 is a preexisting nonconforming three-family dwelling. Approval of the conversion to a two-family dwelling will reduce density and bring the property closer to conformance with the zoning ordinance.

2. The property is currently in disrepair and approval of this application will result in an aesthetic benefit and provide sufficient space in an appropriate location for the proposed two-family dwelling consistent with the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law contained in *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2g,i*.

3. The proposed side yard setback will not exacerbate the preexisting nonconforming side yard and will have a minimal visual impact.

4. Based upon the Board's particular knowledge of local conditions, the proposed conversion to a two-family dwelling and side yard setback is not inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and will not adversely impact the public good and is not inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the master plan and zoning ordinance.

5. With respect to a request for a front yard setback variance, the Board determined the applicants failed to prove a hardship or that any public benefit would arise and that the proposed front yard setback would result in substantial visual detriment to the neighborhood and is inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the foregoing findings, concluded that the applicants 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

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the foregoing findings, concluded that with respect to the side yard variance, the applicants proved peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship 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 *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1)*; and

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the aforementioned findings, concluded that with respect to the side yard variance, the applicants proved that the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements, and that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment and would not cause 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 *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2)*;

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the foregoing findings, concluded that with respect to the front yard setback, the applicants did not prove peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship and failed to prove 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 *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1)*; and

WHEREAS, the Board, based on the aforementioned findings, concluded that with respect to the front yard setback, the applicants did not prove the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements, and failed to prove that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment and would not cause 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 *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2)*;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair, that the within application of Arthur J. and Alexandra Leale, to convert the existing three-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling and side yard variance is hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed addition along the easterly side shall follow the line of the existing house and shall not encroach into the side yard any further than the existing structure.
2. The attic shall be utilized for storage only.
3. The basement shall be utilized as part of the two dwelling units and shall not be utilized as a separate dwelling unit.
4. Downspouts in front shall be directed toward Summit Avenue and downspouts along the easterly side shall be directed away from the adjoining property to the east.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair, that the within application of Arthur J. and Alexandra Leale, for a front yard variance is hereby denied.

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

On motion by Mr. Haizel, seconded by Mr. Gallardo, an extension of time was granted on the approval of the variance application of **Mr. and Mrs. Michael Strahan, 99 Lloyd Road**, until August 31, 2004.

On motion by Ms. Costello, seconded by Mr. Gallardo, an extension of time was granted on the approval of the variance application of **Mark Vespole and Mary Linda Fisher, 92 Montclair Avenue**, until July 31, 2004.

On motion by Mr. Gallardo, seconded by Ms. Costello, the meeting was adjourned.