

Monroe 1985

7/8

Notes on Monroe Cardiac Motion

pgs = 4

no p.i.

CA000365Z

7/25

Monroe
Concordia motion

Apr 220

JS: Risk position - let Concordia proceed at its peril

W - why compare ~~to~~ Whittaker to ~~the~~ Bellanca
Comp to other 3 existing set devs, which
don't have set aside

tremendous amounts of land

restraint is not - final approval granted

emphasizes complexity & financial responsibility
of 5% set aside

make
our point }

JS What a build out schedule

W function of unit

JS 400/yr

W Optimistic 500 occupied } in 3 yrs
1000-1200 sold

Mytelka

[time]

status quo argument for his letter

→ why didn't we challenge Concordia earlier
impact in either event

loss of 100 units - plenty of land available

JS - I can impose the town's package even
tho they don't adhere to it

M - if we bad faith, why defer exactly to town

build with sooner

not ready
to put up a
model

JS - give weight to ongoing projects in terms of
speedy construction

M - balancing equities
plenty of land
other builders
no ordinance has been submitted

JS - delays have been in compliance - Masters
can't produce reports fast enough

After CL rpt [soon]
if no good → move rapidly
if good → hearing

JS - ~~will~~ more policies than should be,
but had to be, in public interest

JS - if Concordia retained
→ if CL says no good
I could be convinced to give him a remedy
promptly

Apruzzo - if motion planned soon
Council approved in July, the Concordia dev

JS - why not in bad faith?
why did GB approve Concordia?

A - new legislation

JS - is GB still bound by park zone?

A - hope that lego will believe them

JS - when the "write the mayor" letter. Ev of bad faith

A - don't know what the status quo is / what legal rights does VL have?!

JS - obey order of the court ↗

JS - suppose I reduced fish by 100 units would TL accept?

A - some answer w/in 5 days

No irreparable harm
Other adequate remedies

If 100 units lost, why doesn't TL VL apply to courts for other sites

JS - why yr concern for Concordia - if you let them off, have to make it up 5:1 or, eg Loin site. Much more building. How justify that to Mousse citizen

A - some vaguely racist stuff

JS - w/in 5 days, relay ^{dec in re Concordia} ~~compliance plan~~
if so, package file

What I hear today, Mousse doesn't intend to comply. Two choices

- reduce by 100 + comply w/
- stay w/ what they've done, then file order to comply.

Next Friday - 8/2 - in writing ↓

Council's position
2nd meeting
vote

Interim Gov
approvals at its own period
may hear, grant approvals

It may be heard & complain about 10
reductions

Voluntary - w/o appeal

No punitive action against inter

If adhere to proposed plan, TRO maintain

No response = sticking to position