

UL v. Old Bridge

(1984)

Letter discussing inclusion of Oakwood
at Madison.

1 pg

CA000041 L

NORMAN AND KINGSBURY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 JACKSON COMMONS
 SUITE A-2
 30 JACKSON ROAD
 MEDFORD, NEW JERSEY 08055

December 14, 1984

THOMAS NORMAN
 ROBERT E. KINGSBURY

(609)654-5220

(609)654-1778

Jerome Convery, Esq.
 151 Route 516
 P.O. Box 872
 Old Bridge, N.J. 08857

Re: Urban League v. Township of
 Old Bridge

Dear Jerry:

The Township Planner, Hank Bignell, has just notified me that Mr. Kaplan is in the process of submitting an application to the Planning Board pursuant to his approval as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Oakwood at Madison controversy. Preliminary approval was granted for approximately 1700 units. Of these, 550 must be low and moderate income housing. It is my understanding that these units should conform with the standards enunciated by the Supreme Court in Mt. Laurel II. However, a 20% set aside would result in approximately 340 units. Obviously this issue must be resolved prior to the final approval of the application by the Planning Board. The Planner tells me that Mr. Kaplan intends to start construction in the spring.

The thought has occurred to me that given the past history of this application and given further the present controversy in the above captioned matter, we may want to consider the possibility of including the Oakwood at Madison project in the discussion with the Court Master, since a significant amount of housing construction is involved and a Mt. Laurel solution is mandated per the Oakwood at Madison decision.

Please call me.

Sincerely yours,


 Thomas Norman, Esq.

TN:mk

CC: Hank Bignell, Township Planner
 Henry Hill, Esq.
 Stewart Hutt, Esq.
 Carla Lerman, Court Master
 Honorable Eugene Serpentelli J.S.C.

RECEIVED

DEC 17 1984

THE SUPERIOR COURT