

**Downtown Suffern Orange Avenue Designation Study
Village of Suffern, New York**

Prepared by:

Saccardi & Schiff, Inc.
Planning and Development Consultants
445 Hamilton Avenue, Ste. 404
White Plains, NY 10601

October 12, 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

The following report presents an analysis of existing conditions within the Downtown Suffern Orange Avenue Study Area, as shown in the attached exhibits. This study area was included in a recent planning study (Village of Suffern Downtown District Plan) aimed at the enhancement and redevelopment of downtown Suffern. The analysis presented herein examines whether this area is appropriate for designation as an urban renewal area in accordance with the provisions of Article 15 of New York State General Municipal Law. This law grants municipalities the power to redevelop certain areas in their jurisdiction which are in danger of becoming blighted or deteriorated, or have a blighting influence on the surrounding area, and "to promote the sound growth and development of our municipalities". . ." by the clearance, replanning, reconstruction, redevelopment, rehabilitation, restoration or conservation" of areas that constitute a "negative influence on adjacent properties impairing their economic soundness and stability." Article 15, Section 501. Further, Section 502 of Article 15 defines this type of redevelopment, in part, as follows:

“A program established, conducted and planned by a municipality for the redevelopment, through clearance, reconstruction, rehabilitation, and concentrated enforcement, or a combination of these and other methods, of substandard and insanitary areas of such municipalities...”

The legislative findings which help define Article 15 provide, in part, the following:

“It is hereby found and declared that there exist in many municipalities within this state areas that are residential or predominantly residential, non-residential or predominantly non-residential, commercial or predominantly non-commercial, industrial or predominantly industrial, vacant or predominantly vacant and which are deteriorated or deteriorating, owing to obsolete and dilapidated buildings.... physical deterioration... illegal uses and conversions, inadequate maintenance, (or) buildings abandoned or not utilized in whole or substantial part... all of which hamper or impede proper and economic development of such areas and which impair or arrest the sound growth and development of the area, community or municipality.”

In May of 2007, Saccardi & Schiff, Inc. surveyed the Downtown Suffern Orange Avenue Study Area to determine if there was sufficient evidence to designate the area a site appropriate for urban renewal, in accordance with Section 504 of Article 15 (Site Designation), as defined in subdivision three of Section 502 thereof defining "Urban Renewal." The analysis examined existing land use and zoning, building conditions, land use relationships and other factors that may adversely influence the sound and stable economic development of the Study Area. The results of this survey and analysis are described in the following report.

II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

A. Definition of the Study Area

The Downtown Suffern Orange Avenue Study Area consists of portions of two blocks and one full block, adjacent to the Village's downtown core, and the NJ Transit Suffern Station. The downtown core area, focused on Lafayette Avenue, is separated from the railroad station by the properties within the Study Area. For purposes of discussion, these Village blocks will hereinafter be referred to as Blocks 1, 2 and 3, and are indicated on Exhibit 1, Study Area. Block 1 includes a series of parcels located between Orange Avenue and Chestnut Street, behind the Lafayette Avenue commercial corridor. Block 2 includes the western portion of the block between Chestnut Street and E. Park Place. Block 3 includes the entire block bounded by Orange Avenue, East Maple Avenue, Park Avenue, and East Park Place. In total, these study area blocks include 19 parcels, which are identified in Table 1 and Exhibit 1 found at the end of this report.

The study area also encompasses land in the surrounding roadways, including the underpass on Chestnut Street, leading towards the train station.

B. Land Use

The Study Area has a mixed-use character, consisting primarily of residential and commercial uses. Of the principal buildings within the Study Area, six are used for active commercial use, nine include residential use, and four include vacancies. There are also two parcels consisting solely of parking lots that appear to be associated with vacant uses. Residential and commercial uses are evident on each block, with the most active commercial uses on Block 3. Most of the Village downtown vacancies are in Block 1. Although there are a few buildings which appear to be of older vintage (e.g., Properties 2, 6 and 8), none of the Study Area buildings are listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places.

Block 1 contains seven parcels, with varying uses. The largest is occupied by the former Hotel Lafayette, which was most recently a brew pub. This large building is currently vacant on the ground floor, with the two floors above used as a boardinghouse. A small beauty salon is contiguous with the north side of the boardinghouse building. The only other fully active commercial use on the block is a restaurant supply business fronting onto Chestnut Street. This is abutted immediately to the south by a single-family residence. There are also two commercial vacancies at the corner of Orange Avenue and Chestnut Street.

Block 2 is primarily residential. It includes four principal residences, a small office use attached to one of the residences, and a commercial vacancy. (Although not yet in use, it appears that the building is currently being fitted out for a new motorsports tenant.) This building and its associated vacant parking lot occupy nearly the entire Orange Avenue frontage.

Block 3 is dominated by an Off-Track Betting facility, which occupies approximately two-thirds of the block. It is set back deeply from Orange Avenue and is surrounded by a substantial surface parking lot. The Orange Avenue frontage also includes a laundromat and a bagel store. Three residences are located behind the laundromat and bagel store, on Park Avenue.

C. Zoning

The majority of the Study Area is zoned MR-15, Multifamily Residence. This includes Blocks 2 and 3 of the Study Area. Block 1 of the Study Area is located in the CB, Central Business district.

The MR-15 district permits: one-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, low-rise multiple dwellings and places of worship as principal uses. Professional offices or studios are permissible by special permit. Minimum lot areas range from 4,000 to 60,000 square feet in MR-15, and maximum height is 35 feet. The required yard setbacks vary depending on use, and range from 20-25 feet for the front yard, 10-25 feet for the side yard, and 20-40 feet for the rear yard. Maximum permissible development coverage ranges from 30-35%, depending on use.

The CB district permits a variety of business uses including: banks, offices, retail stores, restaurants, fast food restaurants, indoor theatres, houses of worship, printing, plumbing and HVAC supply, funeral parlors, school of special instruction and public parking facilities. Special permit uses include public utility building and substations, private membership clubs, live entertainment, bus terminals, microwave transmission and receiving antennas and dishes, wholesaling of food products as an accessory of the manufacturing of such products on site, and artists' dwellings on second and third floors. In the CB district there is no minimum lot area. Maximum development coverage is 70%, the minimum rear yard is 20 feet, and the maximum height is 4 stories (45 feet).

As is sometimes the case in older communities, the existing land uses in the study area do not conform with the Zoning Code. It appears that the three commercial properties in Block 3 (Off Track Betting, laundromat, bagel shop) are all non-conforming uses in the MR-15. In Block 1, the partial use of the former Hotel Lafayette as a boarding house and the single-family residence also appear to be non-conforming uses in their CB district. In addition, the currently vacant commercial building on Block 2, when reopened, will be a non-conforming use. A number of the buildings may also be non-conforming in terms of dimensional regulations, such as maximum development coverage and minimum yard requirements. Exhibit 3 identifies those properties that appear to be nonconforming in terms of use or dimension.

D. Downtown Planning Context

In 2001, Saratoga Associates prepared a Village of Suffern Downtown District Plan for the Village Board. This document was developed with extensive community participation and reviewed the existing conditions in the Village's downtown, identified opportunities and constraints, and defined a revitalization strategy. The report centered on a "Conservation District Study Area", which encompasses key locations including the Central Business District and the major visual and transportation points of entry. Block 1 and a portion of Block 2 are located within this study area. The report also suggested that the remainder of Block 2 and Block 3 should be added to the Conservation District Boundary.

The plan makes a number of recommendations regarding streetscape improvements, design enhancements, and redevelopment opportunities. Among its recommendations is that development occurring downtown should be concentrated in retail, residential, and professional office activities. The plan also noted that there are numerous gaps in downtown created by vacant or underutilized sites, and that "these sites are occupying valuable real estate in a Village with finite land resources and the goal of increasing economic activity." The poor link between the train station and Downtown Suffern was identified as a constraint and the report recommended redevelopment for mixed residential and commercial usage along the Orange Avenue gateway. In addition, the report specifically noted that the Off Track Betting site could be used more advantageously as a residential development site that could provide a "facelift for Orange Avenue, offering commuters and visitors an attractive image of Downtown Suffern as they leave the train station." New entrances to the train station facing Chestnut Street and E. Park Place were also recommended in order to more fully realize the potential of the train station to link with, and support, the downtown.

The Downtown District Plan provides a clear expression of the community's vision for its downtown. As described above in the Existing Land Use section, the types of improvements and transformation of the study area recommended by the Downtown District Plan have not yet occurred. As a result, the study area currently does not meet the recently detailed planning objectives of the community for its downtown. In addition, the study area does not necessarily meet with the community land use objectives expressed through the Zoning Code.

III. Negative and Detrimental Study Area Factors

A. Underutilized Land Resources

The study area suffers from the presence of vacant buildings and lots, and other underutilized land resources (primarily surface parking lots), in prominent locations. The study area is located directly between the Suffern train station and Lafayette Avenue and along the principal thoroughfare (Orange Avenue/Route 202) leading to the western end of the Village's downtown. As a result, this area is a key "gateway

location.” The concentration of vacant buildings and unused surface parking lots at this critical juncture fails to capitalize on a prominent location and projects a poor first image of the downtown.

Block 1 contains the study area’s heaviest concentration of vacant buildings. As seen on Exhibit 4, Existing Issues, three of the buildings appear to contain commercial vacancies. (Although it appears vacant and has no active street presence, the building on the second parcel north of Chestnut Street is currently in use for equipment storage, as indicated by the Code Enforcement Officer. Regardless, this is a relatively low-level use which appears as a vacant building to the casual observer and represents significant underutilization.)

In addition, two of the parcels in this block, one of which is owned by the Village Parking Authority, are principally surface parking lots. Currently, these parking lots are essentially unused (see Photos 9 and 10). The larger lot is currently chained to prohibit vehicles from entering it or passing through to the other parking lot. In combination, the underutilized or vacant properties on this block total approximately 1.2 acres, or approximately 70 percent of the block’s land area.

Block 2 contains one vacant commercial building that is in the process of being fitted out for a new tenancy. However, the remainder of the parcel and its neighboring parcel consists of surface parking. This unscreened parking area occupies most of the Orange Avenue frontage of the block and represents a substantial underutilization of land, as well as imposing visual blight (see Photo 11).

Block 3 is dominated by the Off-Track Betting use and its associated surface parking lot. The parking lot on this parcel alone accounts for over one acre.

Overall, more than one third of the study area is made up of relatively large surface parking lots, a low-level use of finite downtown land resources. Several of these lots are also largely unused because their associated buildings are vacant, underutilized, or contain uses having limited hours of operation. In all cases, this either detracts from, or does not contribute to, a vital downtown. Combining those study area parcels with vacancies or limited use as surface parking, the land considered underutilized accounts for approximately three acres. For a downtown environment of roughly 6.5 acres (with approximately six acres in tax lots and the remainder in rights-of-way), this figure represents significant underutilization and hampers the economic vitality of the downtown. A coordinated, possibly structured, parking arrangement could minimize the overall amount of land dedicated to parking and allow for more productive utilization of downtown land resources.

B. Structural Elements

Relationship to Downtown

In addition to being substantially underutilized in itself, the study area is underutilized in relation to its potential as a catalyst for economic development of the adjacent

business district. As described above, the Orange Avenue portion of the study area is a relatively weak commercial corridor with an auto-oriented development pattern. There is limited residential development towards the interior of the blocks. The current uses and built configuration of the study area do not contribute vitality to the commercial core, offer little additional customer base support for the central business district, and do not provide an effective link between the Suffern train station and Lafayette Avenue. It is noted that the three study area blocks are located within a larger Census block group meeting the County's standard as a low to moderate income area, with 46% of households having an income below 80% of the area median. This area is therefore eligible for Community Development Block Grant activities. The study area also has certain structural characteristics that suggest a high degree of downtown commercial activation along the Orange Avenue gateway is unlikely, and a change in direction from its current configuration may be warranted.

The core of the Suffern downtown is focused on Lafayette Avenue. The three blocks between Washington Avenue and Orange Avenue serve as the Village's traditional "Main Street" commercial core. This portion of Lafayette Avenue has a generally continuous and cohesive street wall, with buildings set close to the street line and occupying most of the frontage. The commercial activity on the street is also two-sided, with storefronts and restaurants facing each other across the street. This configuration creates a defined urban space that is comfortable for visitors, promotes pedestrian activity and window shopping interest, and is appropriate for a traditional, walkable, central business district.

However, these conditions change dramatically as one turns the corner onto Orange Avenue. Orange Avenue only has activity on the east-side of the street, and the street wall becomes weaker and is eventually lost within the first half of Block 1. As described above, surface parking begins to dominate the streetscape. As a comparison, the downtown core of Lafayette Avenue between Orange Avenue and Washington Avenue is approximately 1,570 linear feet. Of that total frontage, approximately 265 feet, or 17%, is dedicated to surface parking. (Parking is generally provided behind the buildings and screened from the street.) In contrast, the portion of Orange Avenue within the study area is approximately 1,065 feet in length and has a total of approximately 675 feet, or 63% of the total frontage used for surface parking. In addition, the Orange Avenue roadway itself serves as a higher speed through street, rather than as a core downtown commercial street. The rail line and associated at-grade commuter parking also limit the potential for creation of an active, two-sided downtown commercial street. As a result, the likelihood and potential for Orange Avenue to serve as a strong commercial extension of the downtown core is reduced. Further, any infill commercial use would likely be low-scale and have a highway or "strip"-type design that would not significantly improve the character of this area.

However, while it is a limiting factor in terms of creating an active commercial street, the adjacency of the railroad creates the opportunity to capture transit-oriented residential use, and provide a more viable and active type of use than low-scale

commercial with unmarketable 2nd floor offices or apartments. Redevelopment with transit-oriented residential use in buildings with a strong street presence and a contextual downtown scale (above two stories) could provide a significant urban design statement signaling the entrance to downtown and a break in the thoroughfare nature of Orange Avenue, and offsetting the negative features of the roadway, train line and associated parking. This type of conversion would also provide a viable use that supports the downtown, and is sustained by its proximity to the train station and the downtown.

These characteristics suggest that the study area may lend itself more appropriately to a different style of development that can more effectively reinforce the downtown. The development pattern could be changed to more effectively support the downtown by providing increased residential intensity that would expand the local customer base in close proximity to the core, and creating a built environment that is more inviting and can more effectively draw visitors to the Lafayette Avenue core. The current configuration of the study area is not reflective of a downtown environment, does not provide effective support or linkages for the downtown core, and exhibits conditions that exert an adverse and detrimental influence on the neighboring business district. These factors impair the economic soundness and stability of the downtown business district.

Parcel Configuration and Ownership

The pattern of ownership and development history within the Study Area suggest further structural impediments to development and that underutilization is likely to persist. In total there are 14 non-related owners of the 19 properties in the study area. As described in the supporting legislation for Article 15, the vesting of title in numerous and scattered ownership can hamper the proper economic development of such areas by making assembly for redevelopment by individual owners or private enterprise difficult and uneconomic. There are also two easements within the Study Area, although their impact is anticipated to be relatively minor. One is a driveway easement running along the northern edge of Property 7, which would only slightly reduce its development potential. The other relates to a retaining wall along Chestnut Street on Property 8, which is not anticipated to have any material impact on the property's potential.

There are five separate owners of the seven parcels in Block 1, (including one commercial property that was purchased during the winter of 2007, but has remained closed since then, suggesting that it may have been purchased for speculative reasons), which may hinder redevelopment efforts on that block. There is some common ownership throughout the Study Area, primarily within Blocks 2 and 3, which would suggest some existing potential for redevelopment. However, the uses on the majority of the properties under common ownership in the Study Area are not in conformance with their zoning district use requirements. Further, there has been no significant activity to redevelop these properties with uses that are compliant with zoning and consistent with the Village's downtown planning objectives. It is also noted that a number of the larger parcels and parcels in common ownership have been

under their current ownership for many years. (For example, the Hotel Lafayette and associated parking area on Block 1 has been held for over 20 years, and the large parcels currently occupied by a motorsports dealer and the OTB on Blocks 2 and 3 have been held for approximately 28 years. This indicates that, in the current configuration, there may be a lack of interest, incentive, and/or ability in improving or redeveloping the separate parcels.

In addition, the bulk of the Study Area properties (with the exception of Properties 10 and 14) are generally between 1/10 and 1/3 of an acre. With these relatively small sizes and split ownerships, it may be difficult for individual owners to properly redevelop their separate parcels. This is particularly true with regard to the ability to develop uses more appropriate to a downtown setting in a way that meets the dimensional and parking requirements of the zoning regulations. The relatively small parcel sizes also limit the ability to take advantage of the existing grade change along Chestnut Street and East Park Place. Larger (or an assemblage of) parcels may allow for a site plan configuration that could utilize excavation in conjunction with the grade change to provide space for off-street parking underneath new structures and buildings, rather than in open lots, to support more appropriate downtown redevelopment.

C. Deterioration

Maintenance and property conditions vary throughout the study area. Block 1 appears to contain the largest concentration of deteriorated buildings. The Hotel Lafayette, the two commercial buildings on the corner of Orange Avenue and Chestnut Street, and the residence all exhibit a moderate degree of exterior deterioration. Deficiencies include worn siding, damaged eaves and door frames, and pitting of the walls (see Photos 5-8). The level of property maintenance on some of these properties further fosters a negative visual impression (see Photos 13-16).

On Block 2, the single-family residence fronting onto Chestnut Street exhibits some moderate exterior deterioration (e.g., worn siding), and the building at the corner of Orange Avenue and East Park Place also exhibits some cosmetic deficiencies. However, this property is currently being fitted-out for a new tenancy and these issues (e.g., peeling paint, cracks) may be remedied.

On Block 3, while not necessarily attractive, the commercial buildings appear to be in generally sound condition. The residences also appear to be in good condition.

In addition to the buildings and properties described above, the Chestnut Street underpass also exhibits substantial deterioration. As seen in Photos 25-28, the walls are pitted and cracked, and the bridge steel is heavily rusted. This underpass provides the primary connection between the Village's downtown and the train station. Its current conditions create a forbidding atmosphere, reducing the attractiveness of this link and, therefore, hampering the economic development of the downtown.

D. Code Enforcement Conditions

Public safety is an important element of a healthy community. In order to obtain additional information about study area conditions that may not be directly visible from a street survey, a representative from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc. toured the study area with the Village's Code Enforcement Officer. During the discussions, the Officer indicated that the study area has been a focus area for code enforcement activities, primarily related to property maintenance issues.¹ Additional information regarding specific code enforcement activities and/or problematic conditions are provided below.

On Block 1, the primary area of code enforcement concern is the Hotel Lafayette property, which has been a consistent source of activity for the Building Department. The first floor had housed a bar, which was a source of numerous violations for items related to drug dealing, fights, live entertainment (topless dancing) and site plan non-compliance. The bar use was eventually shut down and the first floor space has now been vacant for approximately two years. The upper floors of the space are used as a boardinghouse. The Code Enforcement Officer estimates that he makes visits to the property at least once per month, and numerous warnings have been issued. The Police Department has also indicated that this property has been a source of numerous calls for incidents such as drug dealing, assault, and burglary.²

On Block 2, the Building Department has issued a series of warnings in the recent past for issues related to illegal overcrowding and property maintenance conditions at the residence fronting onto Chestnut Street. Progress has been made on these conditions, although some exterior repair work remains outstanding.

On Block 3, the Off-Track Betting facility has presented persistent code enforcement problems in relation to property maintenance. The OTB has recently installed new plantings around the western and northern perimeter of the property, however stormwater runoff is eroding the planting bed and threatening plant survival. The Code Enforcement Officer indicated that an agreement has been reached to install stormwater management measures and resurface the parking lot.

E. Incompatible Land Uses

The study area contains eight one- and two-family homes. They are generally located in the interior of the blocks and do not front onto Orange Avenue. However, the houses are located in close proximity to businesses, creating conflicting land uses that are not always compatible. For example the residence on Block 1 is sandwiched between a large restaurant supply business, in a building which is flush with the street line, and a vacant service station. The potential heavy vehicle traffic, related noise and unsightly visual conditions can contribute to undesirable residential living conditions. On Block 3, the three residences share the block with three large and

¹ Discussion with John Loniewski, Code Enforcement Officer, May 22, 2007.

² Beg, Sulaiman. "Massive project planned at troubled Suffern corner." *Journal News* 27 Oct. 2005, A3.

active commercial uses. The commercial buildings are all set back against their rear lot lines, placing them in close proximity to the residences. These residences are subject to the related noise and traffic from these uses, as well as rear views of the rooftop mechanical equipment and unscreened parking (see Photos 18-20). In addition, one of these houses abuts the Off Track Betting and is directly confronted with the blue brick side wall of that facility (see Photo 17).

F. Visual Conditions

While most buildings in the area appear to be structurally sound, their visual conditions are often less satisfactory. Several structures have not been maintained properly which has led to deficiencies such as peeling paint, rust stains and dirty exteriors. These conditions typically develop over time and reflect chronic neglect. These factors also make many buildings uninviting and contribute to a generally unpleasant and “worn” appearance. In addition, there are several relatively large surface parking lots along Orange Avenue that are either insufficiently screened, or entirely unscreened. These conditions create an unappealing pedestrian environment. The deteriorated and substandard appearance negatively influences and impairs the economic soundness and stability of the area, supporting a determination that this is a blighting condition. The condition of the pedestrian environment is of particular concern in this location, as the study area directly links the Suffern train station to the Village’s downtown core on Lafayette Avenue. Further exacerbating the unappealing visual conditions and pedestrian environment is the poor condition of the sidewalks surrounding Block 3. As seen in Photos 29-32, the sidewalks are cracked, buckling or chipped in several locations. As described above, the Orange Avenue sidewalk in front of the Off-Track Betting also appears prone to drainage problems, which is covering portions of the sidewalk with dirt, gravel and other sediment.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As noted in state legislation and court cases, the designation of an area as suitable for urban renewal extends beyond simply “blighted” or deteriorated building conditions and encompasses many other factors that reflect improper land use and combine to “impair or arrest the sound growth and development of (an) area community or municipality.” Based on the information presented in the above report, sufficient evidence exists to define the Suffern Downtown Orange Avenue study area as suitable for urban renewal under state law and appropriate for redevelopment in accordance with Article 15 of New York State General Municipal Law. This finding is supported by a combination of factors, including:

- Development that is inconsistent with the objectives of local planning studies and the requirements of the underlying zoning districts;
- Significant underutilization of land resources;
- Vacancies of relatively large properties at key locations;
- The presence of deteriorating buildings and public infrastructure;

- Incompatible land uses;
- Underutilization of area as a catalyst for economic development of the adjacent business district
- Neighborhood structure development impediments such as a fragmented ownership pattern, relatively small parcel sizes, and relationship with surrounding development and transportation corridors, as well as indications that in the current configuration there may be a lack of interest, incentive and/or ability in improving the separate parcels;
- Unsightly visual conditions at a key gateway to the Village's downtown; and
- Management and property conditions requiring persistent code enforcement activity.

Table 1
Properties Within Downtown Suffern Orange Avenue Study Area

	Number	SBL	Address	Owner	Notes	Assessed Value
Block 1	1	54.35-2-10	120 Orange Ave.	Village of Suffern	Parking Lot	\$11,000
	2	54.35-2-9	122 Orange Ave.	David M.Y. Shen	Former Hotel Lafayette	\$300,000
	3	54.35-2-8	124 Orange Ave.	David M.Y. Shen	Parking Lot	\$24,000
	4	54.35-2-7	128 Orange Ave.	David Shen	Possibly storage	\$67,000
	5	54.35-2-6	130 Orange Ave.	OK Suffern Properties LLC	Former Auto Repair	\$110,000
	6	54.35-2-29	33 Chestnut St.	Richard E. Blauvelt	Residential	\$50,000
	7	54.35-2-28	27 Chestnut St.	27 Chestnut Street LLC	Restaurant supply	\$75,000
Block 2	8	54.35-2-30	42 Chestnut St.	Edward W.B. Suffern	Residential	\$43,000
	9	54.43-2-1	138 Orange Ave.	Harold J. Heidt	Motorsports	\$12,500
	10	54.43-2-2	138 Orange Ave.	Heidt Realty Company	Motorsports	\$130,000
	11	54.35-2-40	20 East Park Pl.	Graham Enterprises, Inc. Gordon and Audrey Graham	Residential/Office	\$51,000
	12	54.35-2-41	22 East Park Pl.	Graham	Residential	\$56,100
	13	54.35-2-42	24 East Park Pl.	Lucy M. Lotito	Residential	\$48,000
Block 13	14	54.43-2-3	140 Orange Ave.	Heidt Realty Company	OTB	\$335,000
	15	54.43-2-55	144 Orange Ave.	Clean Storm, Inc.	Laundromat	\$57,000
	16	54.43-2-54	150 Orange Ave.	Richard f. Schiekofer, James J. Schiekofer, Anna P. Brill	Bagel Train	\$45,000
	17	54.43-2-4	53 Park Avenue	Dernelie D. Dufrene	Residential	\$37,400
	18	54.43-2-5	55 Park Avenue	Kathy and Bruce Gonzalez	Residential	\$31,500
	19	54.43-2-6	57 Park Avenue	Thomas and Patricia Russell	Residential	\$52,500