U.L. v. Cateret, South Flainfield 1 Ay 1985

South Plainfield Public Meeting: Transcript of Phræedings

no pi-

CA0006495

	CA000048	15
to an experience of all AL		n A
1	STATE OF NEW JERSEY - MIDDLESEX COUNTY	•
2	BOROUGH OF SOUTH PLAINFIELD SPECIAL MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL	
3	<b></b>	, :
	The many assessment of	
4	IN THE MATTER OF: : PUBLIC MEETING	
5	1. Adoption of Resolutions : Numbers 1 through 10.	
6		No. 2 672
	2. Ordinance 1009 - Final TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2 (2
7	Reading and Public Hearing. :	
8	3. Ordinance 1010 - Final :	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i
9	Reading and Public Hearing.	
10	Monday, July 29, 1985	
11	South Plainfield Municipal Building South Plainfield, New Jersey	
12	Commencing at 8:07 P.M.	
13	THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. ENGLISH, Presiding  Mayor, Borough of South Plainfield	
14	MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL PRESENT:	en e
15	FERDINAND A. THIEL, Council President BERNARD J. CONLON	
16	ADDIE LEVINE MICHAEL WOSKEY	
17	DONALD ACRIN DANIEL J. GALLAGHER	
18	APPEARANCES:	
19		
20	FRANK A. SANTORO, Esq., Borough Attorney. WILLIAM T. DeSABATO, Borough Clerk Administrator.	
		and the second s
) - 21		
22		
23	JANICE M. SMITH, C.S.R. 136 Teeple Place	
24	South Plainfield, New Jersey	
25		
		And the second s

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

(Mayor English called the meeting to order and asked for a roll call. The roll call was taken and all Councilpersons were present. The Pledge of Allegiance and Invocation then took place.)

THE MAYOR: Ladies and gentlemen of the audience, this is a special meeting. The original intent of the meeting was to only discuss Ordinance Number 1009 and 1010, but what we are doing is because there is added work and we are in summer session and, therefore, do not necessarily meet the third and fourth Mondays, we have taken the opportunity to add on some Resolutions that we feel vital and necessary to pass tonight. Those are Resolutions 1 through 10.

The public will be given an opportunity to speak on those items. The Ordinances you will be given, because it is a final reading, there will be a public hearing and you can speak on them at that specific time.

Is there anyone in the audience who would like to discuss the Resolutions 1 through 10?

(No response.)

THE MAYOR: Seeing no one, I will close that portion of the public hearing and I call for a motion on the Resolutions.

· .	4
1	MR. THIEL: So moved.
2	MR. CONLON: Second.
3	THE MAYOR: So moved by Council President
4	Thiel and seconded by Councilman Conlon.
5	Any discussion?
6	MS. LEVINE: I would like to ask one question.
7	THE MAYOR: Yes, Councilwoman Levine.
8	MS. LEVINE: On Resolution 2, I would just
9	like to ask where we are getting the \$40,000 that
10	we're going to put into that program. Where is
11	that coming out of in our budget?
12	MR. DE SABATO: It will be through the if
13	you notice Resolution number 7 not 7 but Resolu-
14	tion number 8 makes a provision for matching funds.
15	It's done through a vehicle known as an Emergency
16	Appropriation where you pay it where you use the
17	funds this year and raise it in full in the 1986
18	budget.
19	MS. LEVINE: So actually we're not taking
20	let's see. The \$40,000 then will actually come out
21	of next year's budget?
22	MR. DE SABATO: It will pay for it in next
23	year's budget. We will take it out of funds that are
24	available this year.
25	MS. LEVINE: And the funds are in what

Anyone who wishes to discuss it may do so at this time. Would you please do us a favor? Simply state your name and address so we can get it down on the records.

A VOICE: I am LenoreSlothower. My address is

10 Thorton Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey, however,

at the present time I am here representing the

Piscataway Planning Board as an Assistant Planner

for the Township of Piscataway.

I beg your indulgence while I read a letter directed to you, Mayor, and the Township Council of the Borough of South Plainfield from the Piscataway Planning Board.

"Dear Town Council of the Borough of South Plainfield: Piscataway Township Planning Board has directed me to attend your meeting and voice their concerns to you regarding the rezoning of two tracts of land in your Borough to PRD 1 status. The two tracts are adjacent to New Brunswick Avenue and New Durham Avenue respectively.

"The Township of Piscataway has had a monumental task before it in managing the traffic
travelling on New Brunswick Avenue, particularly
where it intersects with Stelton Road. The same
circulation problem has proven to be true where New

19

20

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Durham Road intersects with Stelton Road.

"Because of the additional traffic which would be generated by the two planned residential tracts. the Borough of South Plainfield's properties, the Planning Board of Piscataway Township would respectfully like to make the following suggestions to your Honorable Body: 1, that you might reconsider allowing 12 units per acre and you might reduce that number to 10 units per acre; 2, that you might consider acting with the Township of Piscataway in a collaborative effort to effect road improvements to New Brunswick Avenue and its intersections with Stelton Road, Lakeview Avenue, and West 7th Street proportionately with development of tracts adjoining the roadway.

"This request is especially meaningful since both South Plainfield and Piscataway Master Plans show New Brunswick Avenue as a four lane highway.

"And, 3, that both the Borough of South Plainfield and the Township of Piscataway act in a dual effort to review site plans for development of the planned residential tracts which adjoin the boundary lines of both, especially with regard to drainage studies, traffic impact reports and proposed road improvements.

23

24

	. 8
• : • •	
1	"Signed, Lenore Stothower,, Assistant Planner
2	to the Planner for the Piscataway Township Planning
3	Board."
4	THE MAYOR: Thank you.
5	Is there anyone else who would like to speak
6	, and discuss this Ordinance from the public?
7	(No response.)
8	THE MAYOR: Seeing no one, I will close the
9	public portion and I will call for the Resolution.
10	MR. DE SABATO: "Be it Resolved, the Mayor
11	and Council of the Borough of South Plainfield, New
12	Jersey, that Ordinance Number 1009 entitled An
13	Ordinance Amending Ordinance 1008 entitled Zoning
14	Ordinance of the Borough of South Plainfield, 1978,
15	be finally adopted and advertised according to law."
16	THE MAYOR: Ladies and gentlemen of the
17	Council, you have heard the Resolution.
18	MR. ACRIN: Excuse me, Mr. Mayor. Before we
19	vote on this I would like to get a status report
20	from the Borough Attorney in reference to the request
21	to transfer this matter to the Housing Council.

I thought it would be more THE MAYOR: appropriate if that would be under discussion, but if you want to place it now, that's perfectly fine with

MR. SANTORO: Surely. You all got copies of the letter received by me today from Eric Neisser to Judge Serpentelli in which he asks that the motion which has been filed with the Court, the motion I might add that was filed on short notice and which the Court has chosen not to deem necessary, which means essentially we didn't get down before the Judge for the Judge to decide that motion before tonight.

As a matter of fact, as of four o'clock this afternoon I still had no date from the Judge as to when this motion is indeed going to be heard.

The letter of Eric Neisser suggests that the Township of Cranbury, Monroe Township and one other who have also filed similar motions for the transfer be consolidated with our request and be heard sometime in September.

With reference to the Ordinances that are before the Governing Body tonight for adoption, as of four o'clock this afternoon in a telephone conversation with Barbara Williams, believe it or not, they passed muster; that is to say, that other than some minor typographical corrections, the Ordinances are in proper form for adoption.

I think it also becomes important at this

ZI

point if I were just to -- all of you have copies, the Court has copies. However, many of those in the audience do not have copies of the moving papers that were filed. I think it appropriate to point out that the motion that was filed was filed pursuant to the Fair Housing Act, the much sought for Legislation that the Courts have been trying for for a number of years. As a matter of fact, Mount Laurel I and Mount Laurel II has language that indicates that the courts were really reluctant to do what they had to do or what they thought they had to do because the Legislature failed to act.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Council, as you know, the Legislature has indeed acted. It is a combined Senate Bill 2046 and 2334 called the Lynch, Littman, Stockman Bill which was adopted by both houses of our Legislature, signed into law July 3rd, 1985.

The appropriate sections of this which I would like to read into the record because I think they are very pertinent and I will also give the individuals in the audience an opportunity to hear firsthand since this new law is not really yet available in most of your usual sources.

The first section on which our motion for the

6.

transfer is based is found in Section 16, and it says, and I quote: "Any party to litigation of exclusionary zoning cases may file a motion with the Court to seek a transfer of the case to the Council."

Now, the Council they are referring to is the Council on Affordable Housing that is in the process of being set up by the Fair Housing Act. The intent of the Legislature and the intent of this Legislation is to allow for mediation and arbitration between municipalities, the Fair Housing Council, the Office of Administrative Law, the Appellate Division, and the like.

What we have done and we could not have done it before the law became effective, is to ask Judge Serpentelli to allow us to go to this Housing Council and have the Housing Council decide whether or not the present and prospective fair share allocations as contained in the May 22, 1984 Judgment are proper under all the circumstances. The Judge, as I said, has not given us, although I fully expect that the request of the Urban League to have the matter set down in September for oral argument, will more than likely be honored by the Court.

The criteria for and by which the Housing

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Council decides if the present and prospective need in terms of least cost housing is met can be found on page 6 of the original Bill, and just a couple of the items which may generate some questions, and if I could, I will read those sections into the record. These are the criteria and guidelines the Housing Council will establish to review the housing element that must as a necessary procedure in the step towards substantive certification of the municipalities' housing plan be filed. The housing element which is developed, and there is another section which has about 15 different items that a municipality is to use in developing such a housing element, is then reviewed by the Housing Council and the following are very particularly pertinent to the Borough of South Plainfield.

The guidelines and criteria will look at, for example, "the established pattern of development in the community would be drastically altered." Another section of equal importance is, "adequate land for recreational, conversation (sic) -- " Conservation Depends on if you want to talk. "...conservation or agricultural and farmland preservation purposes would not be provided." and last and by certainly no means least, and I think it was just brought to our

attention with the first publis speaker, the
Assistant Township Planner of Piscataway, namely,

"adequate public facilities and infrastructure capacities are not available, or would result in costs prohibitive to the public if provided."

Now, going back to our request and keeping that in mind that the Court Order of May 22nd, 1984 has as its basis, as its legal basis Mount Laurel II and Mount Laurel II which resulted because the Legislature failed to act, now provides the mechanism for the Borough of South Plainfield as well as the other municipalities to have decided for it the least cost housing units which would be their present and prospective fair share. I think that if I were to read all of the memoranda, it would take a considerable length of time. I am sure most of it will be covered with questions both from the Members of the Governing Body and members of the audience.

But, needless to say, the one statement or comment of Judge Serpentelli in the heading on November 2nd, 1984 certainly predicted in the event that such Legislation as the Fair Housing Act were to be adopted what the most logical and natural step for South Plainfield would be tonight.

The Court stated in that transcript on pages

10 and 11 -- that transcript, by the way, which has been available to anyone in the Borough Clerk's

Office -- the Court stated that, "Rezoning under

Mount Laurel II doesn't prejudice the town's right to appeal, seeing that the Legislature acts as it should act so the Courts don't have to."

In a nutshell, the current motion before Judge Serpentelli is exactly that. Your Honor, the Legislature has indeed acted. The original basis of the Judgment of May 22nd, which is in essence the basis of Mount Laurel II, is no longer valid. It is now time for South Plainfield to get its fair share housing decided by the Council on Affordable Housing.

So, my recommendation based upon the fact that the motion is still pending and that the Court has not deemed it convenient or whatever to hear that motion before tonight is that you do not adopt tonight but that a motion to table the adoption is in order pending the return date and determination by Judge Serpentelli of whether we can or whether we cannot go to the Housing Council.

With that, any questions?

MS. LEVINE: Can I make a comment?

THE MAYOR: First of all, Mr. Attorney, I want

to know what the consequences would be if we do not pass this within the time: limitation given to us by Judge Serpentelli.

MR. SANTORO: Certainly.

THE MAYOR: What are all the possible consequences that would happen to this town?

MR. SANTORO: Well, for one thing, I would probably have to put two more phone lines in my office.

THE MAYOR: I think this is a little bit too serious to make fun of it. I would like to know what the possible consequences are.

MR. SANTORO: Yes. The possible consequences are eloquently set forth in the transcript that I referred to before. They include among other things the appointment of a Master, the Master who would then look at all of South Plainfield and essentially tell the Court where and how least cost housing should be put in. He could shut the town down or I should say in this in this instance continue to have the town shut down, i.e., no building permits, no site plan approvals, no subdivision approvals. He could under other language in Mount Laurel II which he also alluded to at the November 2nd hearing decide South Plainfield is not zoned. It is unregulated. You can follow the usual consequences.

PENGAU CU., BATURNE, R.J. - UIOU

Could

25

## 1 probably be? 2 Could be Carla Lerner.. MR. SANTORO: 3 be Alan Mallick. Who has been the person that's 4 THE MAYOR: 5 been most of the time involved with the case in 6 South Plainfield? MR. SANTORO: Carla Lerner. 8 THE MAYOR: What was her original determination as to how many low and moderate income housing 10 South Plainfield needed? MR. SANTORO: Some thirteen hundred or so 11 12 as I recall. 13 I think it was 1,840 to be exact. THE MAYOR: 14 So, the Master, the Master Planner who might be appointed who would probably be appointed has 15 already stated publicly because she has already 16 looked at South Plainfield at one point, she said that 17 we needed around 1,840 homes. What is the date that 18 19 was given by Judge Serpentelli to act upon the 20 Zoning Ordinance? 21 MR. SANTORO: July 30, 1985. 22 23 24

THE MAYOR: So if this Council does not, if this Council tables the motions that are before it, Judge Serpentelli may as soon as this Friday appoint a Master who could come in and

town.

MR. SANTORO: Subject --

town and in fact stated in the court case of May of 1984 that that was a definite viable alternative; that the town of South Plainfield could be declared unzoned, unrestricted, and, therefore, anybody could come in and build whatever they felt like in this

THE MAYOR: Who could possibly declare our

Also, were not some of the other consequences which he stated that if that be the case, he also has the right to take away any and all authority of the Planning Board and the Board of Adjustment? Anybody coming in for a site approval would no longer have to go to them; would go to the Master Planner and the courts, and if the court saw fit and proper, they could issue the building permits, not the Borough of South Plainfield?

MR. SANTORO: No, that's not correct.

THE MAYOR: That's not correct? That is not stated in the May of 1984 transcript?

MR. SANTORO: It may have been stated somewhere in that transcript, but Mount Laurell II doesn't provide for the complete elimination of the authority and jurisdiction of Planning Boards and Boards of Adjustment.

1 THE MAYOR: So what you are saying, what the 2 Judge said was invalid? 3 MR. SANTORO: 4 5 6 7 THE MAYOR: 8 interpretation. All right. 9 10 . 11 12 13 14 15 the date registered? 16 17 18 19 20 22 23 24 MR. SANTORO: 25

I am saying if the Judge intended to take away the jurisdiction of the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment, he was overstepping the authority given him under Mount Laurel II.

Isn't he -- well, that's our

Wasn't it not stated in Eric Neisser's letter that he felt it appropriate and the Judge at this time said that he wasn't going to discuss that, but that it could be held for future discussions, and that would be a \$5,000 fine per day for every day the Borough does not comply with this Ordinance after

MR. SANTORO: The Court could award any kind of judgments in any kind of cases and in this particular case if he were to award a \$5,000 a day fine, he would be overreaching because Mount Laurel II doesn't talk in terms of civil penalties.

THE MAYOR: Okay. If the amendments were passed tonight, would that in toto dissolve dis of any right to go to the Fair Share Housing Council?

It would make the issue moot because since we are a municipality currently

involved in pending litigation, such litigation being of an exclusionary zoning nature, once adoption takes place of a fair share housing ordinance, there is no longer any need for the Court to decide whether we should transfer to the Housing Council.

THE MAYOR: Okay. On page 10 of the

Legislation, line 32, "The agreement shall be entered into prior to the entry of a final judgment in litigation. In cases in which a final judgment was entered prior to the date this Act takes effect and in which an appeal is pending, a munidipality may request consideration of a regional contribution agreement provided that it is entered into within 120 days after this Act takes effect. In a case in which a final judgment has been entered, the court shall consider whether or not the agreement constitutes an expenditious means of providing part of the fair share."

That does not give us the right to go before the Fair Housing Council and ask that we be developed relative to the regional plans and the regional numbers?

MR. SANTORO: That section talks in terms of a contribution to a receiving municipality under a regional plan whereby a receipt of the least cost

housing units being completely built in the giving or sending municipality, a portion in this instance if 990 were the present prospective need for 1990, some figure would be attributed to those numbers and up to 50 percent of them could be contributed to a receiving municipality.

But that section has nothing to do with the section under which a motion is filed for requesting a transfer.

THE MAYOR: In your motion before the Judge, section 5, you have stated in the motion that, "The Borough of South Plainfield shall adopt in accordance with the provisions of the aforesaid Fair Share Housing Act a Resolution of Participation and prepare and file a housing element and fair share plan within the time prescribed."

MR. SANTORO: That's correct.

THE MAYOR: Is that not stating we, therefore are in need of low and moderate income housing?

MR. SANTORO: No.

THE MAYOR: What does that do?

MR. SANTORO: That says that we're a municipality in an exclusionary zoning suit and we are asking the Council on Affordable Housing to take a look at the criteria that they are going to

establish and determine whether or not any least cost housing can be built with the ten percent set asides from the viewpoint of South Plainfield is basically a single family residential community, it's infrastructure is completely overloaded to date, there is very little area. Those are the bases by which the Council on Affordable Housing would look and maybe decide -- I mean, anything is possible. Maybe even decide that South Plainfield should not provide any least cost housing units.

THE MAYOR: Okay. And item 6; you said that "The Borough of South Plainfield may propose to transfer up to 50 percent of its fair share."

Is that acknowledging that we have fair share housing need?

MR. SANTORO: That is in the event -- let us suppose that the Court decides, yes, you do have the right to transfer. We go to the Council on Affordable Housing. We forward to them the housing element. The Council on Affordable Housing comes back and says X is the number of units of present and prospective need.

At the same time as the Council on Affordable Housing is considering what the numbers should be, there will be municipalities contacting the Council

least cost housing units and be a receiving 2 municipality. Are there any municipalities interested? . 3 We have preserved our right to then say, 4 okay, if the Council has decided that 900 be the 5 6 total number of units, we would like to enter into 7 a regional participation and pay over to the receiving 8 municipality the cost of --9 THE MAYOR: We pay somebody else to build them in their community? 10 MR. SANTORO: That's correct. 11 12 THE MAYOR: The Borough of South Plainfield 13 would pay somebody else? 14 MR. SANTORO: Yes. But that is not the 15 primary intent of the motion. THE MAYOR: I am just saying that that was 16 17 stated in your motion. MR. SANTORO: It is in there. I am asking for 18 19 it, yes. THE MAYOR: Also in the two ordinances that 20 are in front of us this evening, is there anything 21 included in the ordinance other than the senior 22 23 citizen complex where we are stating that we would ask for a tax abatement and the land given to them? 24 Is there any other instance where we say that the 25

in terms of they would be willing to put in other

1	Borough would be responsible for giving of land, for
2	paying of sewers, for improving in any other way
3	other than the density factor?
4	MR. SANTORO: No. The judgment of May 22nd
5	from which Ordinance 1009 and 1010 were developed
6	talks in terms only of seed money with regard to the
7	Morris Avenue site. There is no requirement under
8	that Judgment nor under these Ordinances for the
9	Governing Body to look to method whereby we would
10	contribute land to anyone else to build least cost
11	housing.
12	THE MAYOR: Is there such mandatory statements,
13	set asides, abatements, et cetera, in the Legislative
14	Act?
15	MR. SANTORO: I am not sure if I understand
16	the question.
17	THE MAYOR: Well
18	MR. THIEL: The point of order is, Mayor
19	THE MAYOR: Excuse me.
20	MR. THIEL: Well, can I ask a question?
21	THE MAYOR: Surely.
22	MR. THIEL: What is it? Is our attorney on
23	trial here tonight? Are you asking questions what
24	is going on? You know, Mr. Mayor, you had this all

week and now you are going public and asking questions.

2 year? 3 MS. LEVINE: Excuse me. 4 THE MAYOR: No. 5 6 7 8 9 as the Borough Attorney? 10 11 MR. SANTORO: Surely. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 income housing. MR. SANTORO: Correct. 22 23 24 25 income housing.

I am not letting this get any further. If we can't at a public meeting as representatives of the people ask the Borough Attorney questions about something we are going to vote on, what is the sense of having a person such

You know what -- who created this whole mess last

Now, Frank, if you will continue.

THE MAYOR: On page 9 of the new Legislation, certain areas which they say a town if the Fair Share Housing Council decides that we do need low and moderate income housing, some of the alternates which they could demand of a municipality: plan for an infrastructure, expansion and rehabilitation, if necessary, to assure the achievement of the municipality's fair share of low and moderate

THE MAYOR: Donation or use of municipal owned land or land condemned by the municipality for providing for purposes of providing low and moderate

MR. SANTORO: That's correct.

THE MAYOR: Tax abatements for purposes of

providing low and moderate income housing.

MR. SANTORO: That's correct.

THE MAYOR: Down to 8, untilization of municipally generated funds towards the construction of low and moderate income housing.

MR. SANTORO: That's correct.

THE MAYOR: So that this Council might, this Council that is being the Fair Share Council might demand of the municipality of South Plainfield that they pay for some of this low and moderate income housing?

MR. SANTORO: No. Mayor, if you look at the beginning of section 11 which is on page 8, it talks about in the adopting of its housing element, the municipality may provide for its fair share of low and moderate income housing, and then it says, "In preparing the housing element, the municipality shall consider the following techniques."

THE MAYOR: Right.

MR. SANTORO: So items 1, 2, 3 and some of the others you have just gone over through 8 are the techniques that the municipality shall consider, not that the Housing Council will mandate it.

THE MAYOR: But that all those alternatives are there if they find need for us to have, if they determine us to have a need for low and moderate income housing and we come up and say, well, we can't decide how to do it.

MR. SANTORO: Yes, except --

THE MAYOR: Those provisions are there?

MR. SANTORO: Except that each of those items may be mutually exclusive. For example, in preparing the housing element, item number 1 could be the only one need be used by the Borough of South Plainfield. Rezoning for densities necessary to assure economic viability of any exclusionary development, either through mandatory set asides -- in essence, the housing element prepared by the Governing Body would set up some kind of set asides, but they don't have to be 10 percent low and ten percent moderate. They could be something else.

Again, this is not mandaged by the Housing Council, but these are the guidelines if you will, the criteria if you will that the municipality may use in developing that housing element.

THE MAYOR: Okay. Does anyone else of the Council have any questions of the Borough Attorney?

MR. ACRIN: I have a statement if I could.

THE MAYOR: Wait a minute. We haven't made the motion yet. That was just simply questions for the Borough Attorney.

If no one else has questions for the Borough
Attorney, what I would like to do is you have had
the Ordinance. You have heard the Resolution. What
is the intention of the Council?

MR. GALLAGHER: So moved.

THE MAYOR: So moved by Councilman Gallagher.

MS. LEVINE: Second.

THE MAYOR: Seconded by Councilwoman Levine.

Now, any discussion? Councilman Acrin.

MR. ACRIN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

I have a prepared statement here.

On May 22nd, 1984 a summary judgment was entered by the court of Judge Eugene Serpentelli which mandated that the Borough adopt amendments to its zoning ordinance that would provide for low and moderate income housing. Where did the judgment come from? The judgment was a direct result of last year's council majority that illegally authorized the Borough Attorney to sign a stipulation agreeing to build low income housing.

At last weeks Executive Meeting, Mayor English and Councilman Gallagher stated they did not want

to transfer this case to the Housing Council because that would mean that we are agreeing in the concept of low income housing.

Well, Mr. Mayor, and Councilman Gallagher, if you're that against low income housing, why did you authorize the signing of the stipulation? Why did you approach a local developer and sell the Pomponio Avenue tract of land to that developer when knowing that Pomponio Avenue was designated for low income housing? You didn't have to sell that land.

I hope tonight sometime that both of you will respond to those questions.

As we know, the total number of low and moderate units is 990 within the next five years. Because of the builders' remedy, 4,500 total units would have to be built which is a 67 percent increase in the number of residences which will mostly be located on the south side of town. The impact is devastating. New schools would have to be built. New roads would have to be built. Municipal services such as police, fire, rescue squad would almost probably double, and this would all be funded by a major tax increase to all the Borough residents.

Does all this have to be? Do the wishes of some group called the Urban League have to control

the destiny of us and our children? Can a court as one of the branches of our government deny the Borough access to another agency of government even when the two other branches of government have mandated such access? The answer to these questions is a resounding no.

Many of you here tonight have been directly affected by the Judge's order which has virtually shut down the town. Many of you until the order was amended couldn't even get building permits to put in pools, put on siding, put on roofs. Where did the Judge get this power? He got it from the Mount Laurel Decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court. The entire constitutional basis for giving judges the power to rezone, the power to shut down towns, and the power to attempt to give the Urban League everything and anything it wants because the Legislature has failed to act. Well, that is not the case anymore.

Our Legislature under the leadership of Governor Thomas Kean has acted. It has adopted the Fair Share Housing Act. That means to me that at least whatever Mount Laurel II was intended to originally do must now be questioned in light of the Fair Housing Act.

Our Attorney has advised us of the latter.

The Fair Housing Act signed into law on July 3rd of

1985 will have the Council on Affordable Housing

consisting of nine citizens appointed to look into

what towns like South Plainfield's needs should be

and how they are going to come up with the plan.

Finally, they are giving us the ability to do this on ourselves without a judge telling us we have to do it.

Through our attorney we have asked the Court as the new law says we can to transfer the matter of low income housing to the Housing Council. This unfortunately has not been decided upon yet. For whatever reasons, the Court has refused the attorney the right to argue. Hence, tonight is literally a show down, since if we adopt Ordinance 1009 and 1010, even under protest, we will never have access to the Fair Housing Act and our future and the future of our children will be the disaster that I mentioned before.

I see no other alternative but to follow the recommendations of our Borough Attorney and table the adoption of this Ordinance until the Court rules on the request for the transfer.

Thank you, Mayor.

THE MAYOR: Anyone else? 2 MR. CONLON: 3 THE MAYOR: 4 5 6 7 8 9

Mayor.

Councilman Conlon.

MR. CONLON: For as long as I have been on the Council, we have been fighting Mount Laurel, Mount Laurel II. We have been saying that the Judge doesn't have any right to come in here and tell us how we should run our town. We spent a lot of money on attorneys defending our right to run our town. This man has come in. He has shut our town down. He has acted as far as I'm concerned completely illegally and unreasonable.

We had said that we were looking for legislation that would protect home rule. We now have that legislation after a fashion. It may not be the best, but it is something that will take it out of the courtroom, take it away from a judge who can be dictated by the Urban League; whatever they want they get. We have an opportunity to go into the Housing Council and ask that they look over South Plainfield and come up with a decision. The Judge has not seen fit to hear us yet or give us an answer, so we are in limbo. We don't know whether we are going to go in and be denied that right. If we are denied the right, we have a right of appeal.

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

23

24

25

1 and the right of appeal, nothing will happen with 2 these ordinances. Nothing can happen as far as 3 building is concerned until the appeal is exausted. 4 However, if we pass this Ordinance tonight, 5 that's the end. We have low cost housing. We have 6 a potential 4,500 more units in South Plainfield. 7 taxing our school, taxing our police force, taxing 8 everything in town. 9 I think we have a right to take advantage of 10 the Legislature's wishes. I don't think that a 11 judge has a right to take it away from us because 12 then he is really getting out of line. 13 I feel tonight the only thing we can do is to 14 table this Ordinance. If we don't table it, I have 15 no choice but to vote against it. I voted against 16 Mount Laurel last year. Council President Thiel 17 and myself, and we voted against it again. It is 18 unjust. We are taking away our right to rule 19 ourselves. 20 Thank you, Mayor. 21 THE MAYOR: Thank you. Anyone else? 22 MR. THIEL: Yes. 23 MS. LEVINE: Yes. 24 THE MAYOR: Council President Thiel. 25 Thank you, Mr. Mayor. My fellow MR. THIEL:

citizens: it's my third year that I am on the

Council and tonight I am telling you honestly from

the bottom of my heart it is a very difficult and a

very hard evening for me to sit here and have to

make a decision which I have to live with.

Mount Laurel II, the decision or the judgment which was handed down to the Borough of South Plainfield is asking for the maximum of 4,500 units in the Borough of South Plainfield. At the moment, the Borough of South Plainfield has approximately 6,100 private homes. The population is around 20,000 plus. We have a police force of 53 men. We have a fire department, volunteer fire department of 55 men. We have a volunteer rescue squad.

We say we cannot afford to build more homes and more roads. There is no room for more roads. The Borough of South Plainfield cannot under no circumstances take up this kind of judgment or comply with this kind of judgment that Judge Serpentelli demands from us.

The Urban League is doing it. It is something unbelievable. Believe me, I came to the United States in '51 and I was used to hearing things that you have to do, you cannot do what you want to do, and now we are told again you have to do this.

My fellow citizens, I can't go along with
this. I have to vote against it in the best interest
of the Borough. If Judge Serpentelli decides he
wants to put in a Master in the Borough of South
Plainfield, maybe it is one way he will find out
there is no such land that he is talking about to
put those units there. The land is not there. The
roads are not there. The schools are not there.
The police department is not there. It is not there.

I thank you, Mr. Mayor.

THE MAYOR: Anyone else?

MS. LEVINE: Yes, Mr. Mayor.

THE MAYOR: Councilwoman Levine.

MS. LEVINE: Thank you. Nobody up here likes
Mount Laurel. We all hate it, but before I tell you
how I am going to vote tonight I want to just read
number two of the transcript that came back to us
from Judge Serpentelli, and let me -- 'Should the
Council not take any one of the appropriate actions
by the date specified in paragraph 1 above," which is
tomorrow, July 30th, "the Court on request of the
plaintiffs will appoint a Master to submit forthwith
a proposed compliance plan for South Plainfield for
the Court's immediate consideration."

And what that means, ladies and gentlemen, is

if we don't vote this in tonight, he is coming in.

He is going to send more than likely Carla Lerner

in and she has been here. It is not a case of maybe

she is going to come in here and she is going to see

that we don't have roads or we don't have anything

that Councilman Thiel was talking about. She has

been through this whole town. She knows exactly

what South Plainfield is all about. She was part

of the planning of coming up with the tracts of land

that were zoned and that we are talking about.

So, it is not that she doesn't know what

South Plainfield has and doesn't have in the area
of land. She will be back in here, and you can bet
that the Master Planner will be Carla Lerner or
anybody else he sends in here. They are going to
rezone this town, and not only that, they are going
to do and do some of the things you heard the
Borough Attorney talk about before, and it could be
anything.

I disagree with the Borough Attorney. I am not an expert in law, but he can come in and fine us \$5,000 a day if he wants to. He is not fooling around with us. This has been going on for a long time, and he has called us on the carpet and told us you are either going to comply. Mount Laurel is law.

It is not we are fighting Mount Laurel law. It's already the law. And he is now doing his job and he has told us we are going to do what he has told us to do. We don't do it, nobody is going to be able to build anything and we are going to have a whole town rezoned, and as the Borough Attorney said, you can see five story buildings in this town. You can see trailers some place. There is a lot of ramifications if we don't go along with this.

So, I am going to vote to go along with these Ordinances tonight.

And another comment that I want to make.

Councilman Acrin, I believe it was you and Councilman

Thiel, you both alluded to last year and who brought

this mess into South Plainfield. I am a little tired

of it, and I want it cleared up tonight also.

Number one, the Mayor has no vote. Okay.

Remember that, people. The Mayor has no vote, so when something like this comes up, illegally authorized the Borough Attorney, he doesn't have a vote, so he didn't have anything to do with that.

You are referring to a stipulation. Now, as far as the stipulation goes, Mr. DeSabato, you sat in on every meeting that we had with Mount Laurel.

You were there last year when the entire Council --

	_ [	
	1	there wasn't anybody on that Council that evening
	2	that voted against the Borough Attorney going in
	3	with that number. Am I correct or not?
	4	MR. DE SABATO: Yes, you are.
)	5	MS. LEVINE: Thank you.
	6	MR. THIEL: Point of order.
	7	MS. LEVINE: The election is over. That was
	8	last November and a lot of garbage went on about this
	9	stipulation and a lot of lies, but it is about time
	10	it is cleared up.
	. 11	Nobody had a secret meeting. Nobody. The
	12	Mayor and the Borough Attorney of last year did not
	13	go and illegally authorize or sign any stipulations.
	14	That was agreed to by every Member of the Council
	15	last year and Councilman Thiel, you were on the
	16	Council.
	17	MR. THIEL: I never voted for it.
	18	MS. LEVINE: You did. Excuse me.
	19	Mr. DeSabato, did he or did he not?
	20	MR. THIEL: Point of order.
	21	MS. LEVINE: No, not a point of order.
•	22	MR. THIEL: Yes. Please
	23	MS. LEVINE: I asked this gentleman a question.
	24	MR. THIEL: Mr. DeSabato is a Borough employee.
14.447	25	MS. LEVINE: He is the Borough Administrator.

1 Mr. DeSabato, would you answer my question, please? 2 MR. THIEL: You may ask for the minutes. 3 MS. LEVINE: No. I am asking the Borough 4 Administrator a question. Every time you get your 5 back against the wall, you start saying, oh, don't 6 answer this and don't answer that. 7 Mr. DeSabato, did he or did he not vote along 8 with that? 9 MR. DE SABATO: Addie, my recollection of the 10 meeting that we were discussing is that Mike, the Mayor, went around the table and asked if everybody 11 12 was in agreement to what Patrick had suggested, 13 Patrick Diegnan, the Borough Attorney. My recollection 14 is everybody went around the table and said yes. 15 MS. LEVINE: Thank you. 16 MR. GALLAGHER: Mayor? 17 Councilman Gallagher. THE MAYOR: 18 If I can just correct a few MR. GALLAGHER: 19 misstatements that were made. I do not approach 20 developers and suggest to sell land. As Chairman 21 of Economic Development, Councilman Acrin should 22 know that developers approach Land Management and 23 the cases are brought before the Mayor and Council 24 and the land is sold at public auction. 25 The stipulation once again referred to - and

I am in total agreement with Councilwoman Levine it was brought before the entire Council. We voted
for it unanimously. The former Borough Attorney,
Mr. Chernin, had filed an appeal, a number of appeals,
and won a case under Mount Laurel II that would
require South Plainfield to construct 2,400 low
income homes.

As a result of the stipulation, we reduced that to 990. The stipulation said simply we do not zone for low and moderate income. We do not have it We find this in violation. Fine. That's a fact. We will go out with your Master. We will take a look at the land that we think is available. That's been done. The figure is 240 now and 660 in a six year need. It's 990.

If the stipulation did nothing other than reduce that amount by 50 percent, I think it did a terrif job.

Judge Serpentelli has given us an Order. We will comply by tomorrow or he will in effect close South Plainfield as he has done twice.

My disagreement with the Borough Attorney,
we will not have a Planning Board. We will not have
a Board of Adjustment. They will do nothing unless
the Master agrees. The Master will come in and select

lots, any size.

You have heard comments such as I recommend
we table this and wait for the Judge's ruling. The
Judge has made a ruling. You will decide by tomorrow.
I have heard a comment, I suppose we could take a
one family lot and construct a high rise commercial
office building on 10,000 square feet. That is not
a supposition. That's a fact. Statements such as
50 percent of our need could be contributed to another
community. It's got to be within your housing
region. The other municipality has got to agree to
accept it, and South Plainfield has got to pay for
it.

Also, when you hear some of the techniques that the Fair Housing Council can impose, the statement is as such other techniques as may be published by the Council, Fair Housing Council, whatever they suggest to do.

The Judge most certainly will send in his Planner as he has done already. The Planner has finished her work. She has recommended 1,800 units in South Plainfield. We have effectively reduced that to 990 as I said.

There are no fees or fines per se in Mount

Laurel, but they certainly do exist inviolation of a

Court Order, and is spelled out very clearly: \$5,000 per day.

The Urban League has petitioned for the

The Urban League has petitioned for the Borough to pay all their legal fees, possibly a million dollars. I have no idea.

They can reinstitute builders' remedies, give them the land, don't tax it, bring in the sewers, streets, sidewalks, curbs and any off site improvements. This can be done to you.

As far as two branches of Government mandating access to the Fair Housing Council, it has been provided based on a perceived need, Yes, they did act. In my opinion, they haven't done enough.

We have no assurance that we will get our case transferred to the Fair Housing Council and we've got to act by tomorrow.

This gentleman from the Urban League, this letter from him says, "I have been informally advised that several other municipalities may be going this route." Absolutely nothing concrete.

show down. I think that's a pretty damn poor label to put on something so important as this. I have people calling my home who I can't reveal. They can't do construction work. Contractors have hundreds

of thousands tied up. They can't sell a house. This is a very small example of what can be done to this Borough.

Voting for these two Ordinances to comply under protest will lift all those restrictions immediately, and as stated by the Judge - it is in writing and everyone has it - no low or moderate income homes will be constructed until all avenues of appeal have been exausted. All. They in themselves could take years to do.

To go to the Fair Housing Council as told to us by our Borough Attorney on July 15th is an admission, yes, we do need and want low income housing. Please tell us where to put it and how many. I don't know how in God's name we could do that to the people of South Plainfield.

Thank you, Mayor.

THE MAYOR: Any other discussion?

MR. WOSKEY: Yes, Mayor.

THE MAYOR: Councilman Woskey.

MR. WOSKEY: Yes. There have been Members on this Council, everybody talking of doom and gloom, about a czar coming in here, rezoning the town, taking away the zoning, allowing anybody to build anything haphazardly. This is not going to happen. Towns

have had Masters come in and have actually had their numbers reduced. Cranford is one town in particular and they are also at this time looking to appeal the Mount Laurel II decision and go under the Legislation Act.

Right now Judge Serpentelli has stated the reason that he is acting is because the Legislature has failed to act. Well, now, a law has been passed in New Jersey which states that any town that has not reached the final judgment or agreement will be able to go to the Housing Council and look for what they think either is their fair share or no share, depending on what their actual conditions of the town are.

We have talked in the past that the Legislature hasn't done anything. We said write your Legislature. Well, now they have finally done something. I don't see where the Court has the power any longer now that there is a law in the State of New Jersey that will allow a municipality to zone the way:it should zone. If it does not need low income housing, this Council will look at it and it will come up with numbers that can be agreed upon if that is the case.

But for a court and for the Urban League to mandate that a town zoned the way they say it should

be zoned instead of the people of the town to zone it the way the residents want it, I think that's unconstitutional.

Also the fact that they can mandate you as tax payers in this town put your money, actually give your money to developers or put in roads. That is dictating a town as to how they can spend or utilize their money. That also is unconstitutional. They cannot tell us how we can use our money.

I think a lot -- not a lot, but there are several Members up here that are trying to paint a gloomy picture when, in fact, we do have an option now, and if we do not look and act on this option and we act on these Ordinances as they are tonight, that option is no longer available to us.

And for that I would have to agree with the Borough Attorney's advise and to table this until such time as Judge Serpentelli looks at this motion that was presented to him so that we can, in fact, utilize the Legislator's law which is now in effect in New Jersey.

MS. LEVINE: Mr. Mayor?

THE MAYOR: I want the opportunity --

MS. LEVINE: Just one comment?

THE MAYOR: I want the opportunity to speak.

Everyone has had their opportunity to speak.

I would like to address some of the items stated
tonight.

First and foremost, I hope this evening has put to bed and I would hope that lack of experience or knowledge will not continue certain actions and statements made by Members of the Council relative to the actions taken by the Council last year. Every Member of this Council knew what the stipulation was of the 1984 Council. Every Member was given a copy and there was only one paragraph left out, and that dealt with lots that were three acres or more, and in the agreement which was finalized we even come out better relative to the three acre lots because instead of them all being rezoned for Mount Laurel, it was decided that none of them would; that you would have to go before our Board of Adjustment and our Board of Adjustment would decide.

Mount Laurel II has been with us for over eleven years. It has been with every last municipality that has had a growing problem or been in the regions that are considered growth problems in the State of New Jersey.

We were originally demanded to put in 2,400 omes. Then Carla Lerner came through, Planner,

Master decided we should need around 1,800 homes.

1,800 homes, if applied with the gloom and doom not what is represented by tonight's Council, but what was represented last year for three or four months would have put into process the development and rezoning for 9,000 homes in South Plainfield.

The Borough sat down with on many occasions with the Urban League and had that number reduced to 1,800.

Now, I want something very important to be understood. We were not agreeing to a judgment. The judgment had already come down. South Plainfield was in violation of the constitutionality of not having fair and moderate income housing. What we were trying to do was lower the amount of homes that the judgment would include. That did not in any way take away our right to appeal. That's exactly why these provisions and ordinances are under protest this evening, so we still have the right to appeal.

I agree wholeheartedly with Councilman Woskey
I think the actions taken by the Court are unconstitutional, but by going and agreeing to go to the
Fair Share Housing Council, the only difference is
instead of a judge telling us we need 990 homes, we

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

will have a Fair Share Housing Council telling us
we need 990 homes. Our argument has been for the
last eleven years that no one tells us what to do.
We should be allowed to develop ourselves, and that
will only be developed in a court case where we
declare that the motions of Mount Laurel I and II are
unconstitutional.

The premise for this legislation is that the actions taken by the court were valid. By accepting that you go to the Fair Share Housing Council, you accept the validity that every town needs and must have fair share housing provisions in their zoning I think every last person up here ordinances. tonight has said that they consider those actions unconstitutional. Well, why are you going to agree That's exactly what this Council is doing. It's saying, okay, the Legislature has acted. they have acted on something that the premise that we consider invalid, and we are going to go along with it? Why fight for eleven years in court? Now we are going to accept the premise, okay, then we accept that we need fair share housing. We accept that we need low and moderate income housing, and instead of going before a judge, now we go before a Council. What's the difference? There is none.

Sure they are going to say this is nine members instead of a judge. We are not -- if that judge comes in and says -- the Council says yes, you do need 900, then what are you going to do? You are going to appeal it to a higher authority. Why don't we appeal it now?

(Yelling from the audience.)

THE MAYOR: Excuse me, ladies and gentlemen.

MS. LEVINE: That's okay. I didn't vote for it.

THE MAYOR: Okay. The actions that are going to be taken tonight by this Council may have drastic lasting effects on this town. I am not talking doom and gloom. I am talking about written statements. We have seen in the last three weeks what the Judge can do. He's closed down development. He closed down all permits for a while. He could very easily on Thursday go right back and close down all permits, all of them, no matter what they are. He could bring in Carla Lerner and to set us straight, she could bring back the 1,800 homes that she originally designed for us. She could also demand that any site approvals go to her, not to the Planning Board, for approval. This Judge has stated publicly he does not appreciate all of the items of Mount Laurel II.

25

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

but he is acting according to the laws of the State of New Jersey.

There is a Councilman tonight who made reference to the fact that he does not particularly care for the way that the Courts are treating us.

None of us do. That doesn't give us the right to break the law. This government was founded upon the premise that if there -- if someone has infringed upon your priviledges, you can go to a higher court and seek remedies, and that's exactly what we are trying to do.

If this Council tonight decides to table, and a Master Planner comes in, he or she can rezone every last parcel of land in this Borough. This is fact.

I am not talking about doom and gloom. We've had over a year and a half with negotiations with these people. The Judge told us three weeks ago, okay, he has had it. Do something. And he gave us a time limitation. If we decide we are not going to do it, our right to control our town is totally taken away from us. And it was stated where possibly could the courts continue to control us with this legislation passed. Well, on page 16 of this legislation it gives the courts the exclusive right to determine if a municipality has been in litigation for over 60 days.

the Court decides whether or not we can go to the Council. The Legislation gave the courts that authority.

Stop fooling and smoke screening the people of this town. Of course the Legislation gave the rights to the Court to decide that. Now, if the Court decides we can't go to it, we have every legal right, therefore, to try to appeal the Court's decision because there is an out in this, an injustice performed upon the municipality.

But the injustice performed upon the municipality I don't think is this Legislation. The injustice performed upon this municipality is Mount Laurel I and Mount Laurel II, and, and if we don't file an appeal on the Judgment that was mandated to us, then we're not doing what we have been fighting for for the last eleven months (sic).

I would simply urge each and every Member of this Council, if they have decided they want to table this to go before the new Council, that they ask themselves two questions: 1, how is the Fair Share Housing Council in any way different from a judge? They are both going to demand certain things of us. If they don't like what we come up with, they will

demand we have something else. The Judge has done

~ .

Under the rules of this Legislation, I sincerely believe that if we pass these Ordinances tonight we still have every right to go before the Fair Share Housing Council because it states specifically if a judgment is there, you have 60 days to go to the courts. All right. If the courts don't give -- to go to a judge. If the judge doesn't give you what you want, you can appeal it.

If we do not pass these zoning ordinances, who is going to suffer? The town is going to suffer.

We're going to lose our right to govern ourselves, and any person here on this Council that cannot state unequivocally tonight that the Judge does not have the authority to do that, please state it in front of all these people in the audience. I don't want people in the audience leaving this courtroom believing that, okay, we tabled it. We are going to go to the Fair Share Housing Council and nothing can be done to us, because that's not true.

Lastly, this has been inferred by a Member of this Council that on a number of occasions this Mayor sought out someone to buy land, to build low income housing. As a politician and as a political figure you accept people being able to say whatever

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

I want to say about you. That's part of the game.

I want to state publicly for the last time, no one
on this Council -- excuse me. Especially the Mayor,
has never sought out anyone to buy any piece of
property, to conform with Mount Laurel II, and all I
think that is is someone trying to sensationalize
yellow journalism headlines instead of talking about
the issues that are real, the issues that are written,
the issues that will affect every last person in
this town come tomorrow morning.

Let's start talking about, all right, Thursday. Here comes a Master Planner. What does our Building Is he allowed to issue permits? No. Inspector do? Are we allowed to build single family homes so that people can move into them? No. Might the Judge take away the permits that he has given us as far as alterations to homes? Yes. Might the Judge accept Eric Neisser's statements that he wants \$5,000 a day? And what is the \$5,000 a day for? Because Mr. Neisser is saying it is because of our zoning we are precluding low and moderate income families from living here. They, therefore, have to live somewhere else. They, therefore, should receive damages for them living somewhere else. He wants \$5,000 a day. I am not saying he getsit, but the Judge can give it to him

until we rezone.

----

it we rezone.

Can the Judge make us pay for the legal fees of the Urban League? Yes. I know and you know what the cost of this has been to the Borough of South Plainfield. It's in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Double it because that's what we would have to pay to the Urban League.

Tabling this tonight and saying we're going to the Fair Share Housing Council in no way stops the Judge from doing what he can do. If this was last year at this time I would advise this Council to take the bet. Let's try to postpone. Let's work this as long as we can. That game is over with. This Legislation doesn't help us. This Legislation only accepts the fact that what the Supreme Court declared that zoning ordinances that don't allow for fair share housing are unconstitutional is valid and works from that premise. Not one Member of the Council has stated that yet tonight.

The time has come to stop playing, to stop postponing, and to do what is in the best interest of this Borough. We are not building any homes. This is being -- the amendments under protest are going to be appealed by this Council to higher authorities. While that is being done, not one single home will be

25

1

built in this town for low and moderate. Those are not my words. Those are the words down by Judge Serpentelli in the transcript. We were the first community to get that committment out of him. That was all part of the stipulation that people feel was illegal or not accepted by all the Council Members.

Any other comments?

MR. WOSKEY: Mr. Mayor?

THE MAYOR: Yes, Councilman Woskey.

MR. WOSKEY: Yes. You have stated that our original need for low and moderate income was 2,400 units which was reduced back to 1,800, and it is stayed at 1,800 it would mean with the ten percent set asides a total of 9,000 additional units that would be required in South Plainfield. Well, for all I care he could make that 20,000 because we are going to have a hard enough time to put the 4,500 units on the vacant land that is in town right now. To increase these numbers, the reason why they decreased it was because, in fact, they knew that this amount of units could not be built in South Plainfield. South Plainfield is just not big enough to handle nor do they have the vacant land available for that number of units.

The only way that those units could be built

is with the ten percent set asides because no builder will build it unless he is going to make a profit, and in that case that's why the ten percent set asides came about. The worse we will ever do is what we have right now. If the Judge came in with the Master, most likely if anything he would go with these two Ordinances along with the zoning that is set up right there now.

This town will not accept because of the geography additional units in this town. I think these numbers are just being put put to scare the people of the town when, in fact, it is not possible.

THE MAYOR: Councilman Woskey, just for a point of information, this town can accept a lot more than the units that were called for. Don't kid yourself.

We went around, Bill went around with one of the Planners, right, Mr. Administrator?

MR. DE SABATO: Yes.

Thank you, Mayor.

THE MAYOR: And so did our Planner and large portions of certain areas like on the south side or on the north side near the lake, et cetera, we told them there were no sewers there; you can't build there. All right. We told them no, you can't build on New Brunswick Avenue. That is all a waterway.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Don't kid yourself. This town can with high density accept a lot more homes. He can go into an area such as Gary Park and say okay, I now zone this so that you can build 12 units on an acre of land. they can be built. There are homes there. be torn down. People can decide to tear them down and build 12, 15 units on an acre of land. not just for existing vacant land. We are talking about someone coming in and rezoning all of South Plainfield. They can turn around and rezone one of the vacant factories and say, okay, let's make that an apartment complex, and put four, 500 people in it They can do a lot more than what we were able to get them down to at 900, 200 immediate and 990 total. Believe me, Michael. If you were there and saw all the parcels that the Planner came up with, and we said, oh, this couldn't be done because there is no sewers there, this can't be done because it is wet. this can't be done because there is no roads there. All right. We snowed them down to 900. They can come back and rezone the entire town and at that point we don't have the option of snowing them anymore. We don't have the option of sitting down and talking There will be a Master and a mandate. with them.

MR. CONLON: Mayor, a question.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE MAYOR: Yes, Councilman Conlon. 1 2 MR. CONLON: You alluded to approving this 3 under protest and with an appeal nothing would Where is the appeal? 4 happen. 5 THE MAYOR:

I would direct that we immediately appeal not only this Judgment to the Federal Court System on the premise that we do not feel that the legislation that was passed is constitutional because it's based upon Mount Laurel II Judgment. based upon the concept that they have the right to tell a town it needs a fair share low and moderate income zoning amendments, and I say and we have all said that we don't need it.

So, we don't -- just because this legislation was passed doesn't mean that we can't challenge it also.

MR. CONLON: Wasn't it one of our reasons to go to the Federal Court the separation of powers; that we said that the Court couldn't tell us what to Now we do have the legislation.

THE MAYOR: But the legislation is based upon the premise that what the Supreme Court did was valid and constitutional and we are saying that that is invalid, and that would be another alternative for us to go to the Supreme Court. That just opens up

1		another avenue for us to right this.
2		MR. CONLON: Well, I have to disagree with
3	·	you. As far as avenues of appeal in the Federal
4	11111	Court, what happened at Holmdel? The Mayors' Task
. 5		Force? Nothing happened there, right?
6		THE MAYOR: They went to one court. They are
7		not stopped.
8		MR. CONLON: Well, they are pretty dead in the
9		water right now I think.
10		THE MAYOR: They are pretty dead in the water
11		because there has been no one willing to challenge it.
12		MR. CONLON: Nothing has been happening as
13		far as the appeals are concerned. Appealed it to
14		the Supreme Court. It said no.
15		THE MAYOR: Exactly.
16		MR. CONLON: The Federal Courts, we have
17		separation of powers. We don't have that separation
18		of powers anymore. The Legislature has acted.
19		THE MAYOR: And acted in our view in an illegal
20		and unconstitutional fashion.
21	and the second s	MR. CONLON: Your view.
22		THE MAYOR: Well, the premise, therefore,
23		Councilman Conlon, is you believe that every last
24		municipality should be dictated to by the Legislature
25		and said that you must have a fair share housing plan

another avenue for us to fight this.

in your zoning ordinance.

MR. CONLON: No, I don't.

THE MAYOR: That is exactly what this says.

That is exactly what, if I am not incorrect, is in a resolution in the motion.

MR. CONLON: The Legislature is saying that they will give us an opportunity to go to them and they will decide if there is a need in a municipality for fair share housing.

THE MAYOR: The motion says that the motion that was supplied by our attorney to the Court dated July 18, article 5, "The Borough of South Plainfield shall adopt in accordance with provisions of the aforesaid Fair Housing Act a Resolution of participation and prepare and file a housing element and fair share plan within the time prescribed."

This motion, therefore, states that we agree that the concept that the Legislature has the right and this Bill has the right to tell us we must have a fair share housing plan is constitutional, and we are accepting it.

MR. CONLON: We have argued that we wanted to be able to dictate our own terms, and this is just what the Housing Council is allowing us to do. If we go into the Housing Council and say we only need

100 units, they look at it, approve or disapprove it. That may be --

THE MAYOR: And what happened?

MR. CONLON: At least you have a choice, and this is what we have been arguing about right along.

THE MAYOR: And Councilman Conlon, what happens in the next month if the Judge brings in a Master and rezones this town and does not allow any building except for that which is in accordance with Mount Laurel II?

MR. CONLON: The Judge has said that the Legislature should act. Now they have acted, and now I believe that he will --

THE MAYOR: He has --

MR.CONLON: -- allow us to --

THE MAYOR: I am sorry. He has already stated in the paper. He is not going to look at this until the end of August. Why? He wants to see what we are going to do. Let's stop this. That letter by Neisser and that letter by the Judge is telling us, hey, I am not going to let you fool around with this anymore. If you don't act on this, you will suffer the consequences. He could very exily said last Tuesday, okay, come on in. I am going to listen to this and decide whether or not to let you go to

24

25

1		the Fair Share Housing Council. He didn't. He told
2		us I am going to wait until let's not make it a
3		short notice. We are going to make it a longer
4		notice. I want time to look at this. The time to
5		look at it is to see what this Council is going to
6	<i>t</i> .	*do.
7		MR. CONLON: Well, regardless, Mayor, if we
8		pass this Ordinance tonight, we have a Zoning
9		Ordinance. There is no appeal. There has been no
10		appeal prepared. We act tonight, it is acted.
11		That's it. It is all over with. No Housing Council
12		no nothing.
13		THE MAYOR: This is not open to the public.
14		I ask
15		A VOICE: Break tradition, please.
16		THE MAYOR: No, no. I asked if there was any
17		comment from the public and there was none.
18		A VOICE: We didn't know what you all were
19		thinking.
20		THE MAYOR: No, no.
21		A VOICE: We would like an opportunity to
22		speak.

Anyone else?

public.

THE MAYOR:

There is no comment from the

1	MR. CONLON: That is all, Mayor.
2	THE MAYOR: I have a Resolution on the floor.
3	Motion on the floor to adopt the Resolution. I
4	think if there is a need, there is another motion.
5	MR. THIEL: I have a motion to table Ordinance
6	1009 until we hear
7	MR. CONLON: And 1010.
8	MR. THIEL: any response from Serpentelli
9	on our request to transfer our action to the Council
10	of Affordable Housing.
11	THE MAYOR: I have a motion. Is there a
12	second?
13	MR. ACRIN: Second.
14	MR. CONLON: Second.
15	THE MAYOR: Seconded by Councilman Acrin.
16	Any discussion?
17	Before I call for the roll, I will state
18	here publicly, I am not in accordance with what this
19	Council is doing tonight. I will not accept
20	responsibility if a Master comes in and rezones this
21_	town. And I will state the same to the Judge.
22	All right. Bill, the roll.
23	MR. DE SABATO: On the motion to table. Mr.
24	Acrin?
25	MR. ACRIN: Yes.

which deals with affordable housing may do so now.

GAD CO., BAYONNE, N.J. UJUUZ - FOHM ZU

25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE MAYOR: Yes, sir. Please again state your name and your address.

Mayor?

A VOICE: Joseph Murray. I am an attorney from Westfield representing Mr. Don DiGiandominico who is a builder in town. I have also for the last six or seven years been involved as the attorner representing developers in Mount Laurel litigation, specifically Warren Township and other communities in this area.

I would like to ask the Attorney if Barbara Williams indicated to him whether the restraints that are now against this community would have been voluntarily lifted between tonight and the date of the return of your motion for transfer. Was there any such discussion with Barbara Williams?

MR. SANTORO: The discussion with Barbara Williams concerned what she hoped to be the adoption process this evening. In that discussion she said that tomorrow her and I could get on a conference call to Judge Serpentelli and get the restraints removed as to non-Mount Laurel land.

MR. MURRAY: Assuming that you are tabling

MR. SANTORO: Assuming that the Ordinance 1010 and 1009 were adopted this evening.

MR. MURRAY: I have discussed with Barbara Williams the prospect of what I have indicated in my correspondence to Council, that is a suit on behalf of my client which is another element of prospective damage against this Township, against the Borough under Section 1983 of the Civil Rights Act which also includes a claim for counsel fees.

Under Section 1983 of the Civil Rights Act any governing body, municipality, such as this, acting under the color of law whereby deprives somebody of their property rights, my client's right to build, you are subject to the expenses of the loss of that client's profits, his expenses in carrying the properties which he cannot now develop, for example, mortgage, interest, et cetera, loss of contracts that have time limits, and I am only speaking for my client. I don't know how many others in this community are faced with the same economic problem.

There is a false premise that was evidenced by Ed Conlon tonight in that he has indicated that once you pass this ordinance we can't appeal. That's baloney. You can take both routes. You can stay with Judge Serpentelli, you can go to the Fair Housing Council. One doesn't bar the other. You can

•

take appeals from Judge Serpentelli's orders and final judgment while you are before the Fair Housing Council.

Make a decision at some point where you have one of two to choose from. You are not doing that. You are just cutting your tie lines to Judge Serpentelli if it hasn't already been cut because I am sure he is going to enter some additional judgment from which you have no appeal until you have a final judgment, and you get no final judgment until you have an ordinance in place.

The Mayor is right. Don't fool around anymore.

I have been before Judge Serpentelli for the past four, five years. He is not a person who is vindictive.

He is not a person who doesn't understand the municipalities' fears and hopes, et cetera. But he is also a person as the Mayor pointed out who has a job to do.

Mount Laurel II is not the source of your problems. The New Jersey Constitution is. That is the source of Mount Laurel II.

Now, let's stop fooling around with the

Federal case because how many dollars have been poured
into the New York lawfirm and where have they gone
with the Federal case? Right from the beginning, the

defenders' attorneys knew that that would most likely be a waste of time.

What you have done tonight is really provided fodder for the prospective 1983 claim. I don't know what you are going to do on the next ordinance, and I don't know how much that has of the bearing upon what we are going to do tomorrow. But the Judge is going to do something later this month, and I have indicated in my correspondence what we have to do. We do it by choice. I think the Judge has to do it out of necessity because he has been directed under his oath of office to do so.

You have an oath of office and you are not following it.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

THE MAYOR: We will resume if people will please take their places.

We are again in the public portion of the hearing dealing with Ordinance 1010.

If anyone else would like to speak, please raise your hand. All right. I would ask you again to state your name. Mr. George.

A VOICE: Good evening, your Honor. Phillip George.

Your Honor, I would like to direct questions

I may have an older copy of the Bill, but whether

Section 8 of the Act of the Fair Housing Act or that
section as it may have been changed requires the
housing element be submitted with the Council, the
Fair Housing Council, as a prerequisite to being
considered by the Fair Housing Council.

THE MAYOR: Well, I will ask my Borough
Attorney to answer that, but I think they give us
within a four month period.

MR. SANTORO: Yes.

THE MAYOR: To supply them with the information that they need.

MR. GEORGE: I would like to know further them, your Honor, whether that housing element as a mandatory requirement requires proof that the municipality has revised the Land Use Ordinances in order to incorporate provision for low and moderate income housing, and whether if that change has not been deleted whether that, in fact, requires the Borough to adopt an ordinance if not identical to this one or substantially similar to even be considered by the Fair Housing Council.

THE MAYOR: Borough Attorney?

MR. SANTORO: Mr. George, the latter section

of Section 8 on page 7 of the Legislation I have in front of me indicates that the Fair Share Housing Ordinance, i.e. the housing element, should be introduced and given first and second reading in a hearing pursuant to RS40:40-2, and that's exactly what's happened tonight. We are giving first reading and second reading. It does not indicate adoption unless your copy does. Mine does not. This came right from Trenton.

MR. GEORGE: Well, Mr. Attorney, what I am considering is that is my question. Since the final Act is bearly getting circulation now, whether my copy is inaccurate in stating that the municipality shall establish that the Land Use Ordinances have; in fact, been revised to incorporate the provisions for low and moderate income housing contained in the housing element, and isn't that, therefore, a precondition to even approaching the Housing Commission?

MR. SANTORO: Before we get a chance to go to the Council on Affordable Housing, Judge Serpentelli must decide as the Mayor indicates, the Judge has the discretion, the Court has the discretion of exclusionary zoning suits such as this to decide whether or not we even have a right under the Legislation to go to the Council on Affordable Housing,

2

and I think a point should be made, and everybody who leaves here tonight is going home with a lot of other points, so go home with this point as well. The Judge cannot forestall a determination of our request. Eventually, and eventually means to me in accordance if the Urban League continues to get what they want, the oral argument will be heard on the f irst Friday of September or shortly after August If the Judge at that time determines based upon certification submitted as I am sure by the Urban League that manifest injustice would occur to any party to the litigation and accordingly denies the Borough of South Plainfield access to the Council on Affordable Housing, my advisement to the Governing Body will be to set down on the usual notice another public hearing for the adoption of Ordinances 1009 and 1010, because at that point the adoption will take place simultaneously with the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Appellate Division of Judge Serpentelli's refusal to allow us access to the Council on Affordable Housing.

We are not tonight -- we are not tonight forestalling ever adopting the two ordinances. We are merely awaiting the Judge deciding whether we have a chance to go to the Housing Council. If we

go to the Housing Council, there is no need to adopt that ordinance or ordinances until after the Housing Council has looked at it and gotten back to us and said these are your numbers.

MR. GEORGE: Well, that is not my question.

My question is whether we have to file a housing

element in order to qualify for treatment under the

Fair Housing Act regardless of what happens in

Superior Court in Toms River.

MR. SANTORO: First Superior Court in Toms

River must say yes, you can go to the Housing Council.

Then we file a housing element.

MR. GEORGE: That's correct. But doesn't the Act require the housing element to require the municipality to establish that it has revised its ordinances to accommodate low and moderate income housing?

MR. SANTORO: Other than to have introduced and first and second readings as that section provides. It does not say adoption. We have done that.

MR. GEORGE: My question, though, is should you get that far, to even be considered before they recommend --

MR. SANTORO: Considered by whom? By Judge Serpentelli?

MR. GEORGE: By the Council. Is it not necessary that we enact an ordinance substantially similar or identical to tonight's ordinances?

MR. SANTORO: Certainly an ordinance that would include some least cost housing, yes.

would include some least cost housing, yes.

Certainly. That is what the Legislation says.

MR. GEORGE: So the Fair Housing Council --

MR. SANTORO: But not similar in numbers.

MR. GEORGE: That was only my question is whether we would have to be forced to adopt an ordinance in order to be considered by the Housing Council.

MR. SANTORO: The answer to that is yes.

MR. GEORGE: Thank you.

THE MAYOR: Yes?

A VOICE: Joann Graf. I live at 1012 Maple Avenue.

That being the case, why are you stalling tonight? If voting tonight under protest allows us number one to appeal to a higher court and, number two, I would think put us in a more favorable light with Judge Serpentelli as not being obnoxious, superior people, why not pass, untable if you may, if you can, your first ordinance, pass it under protest, go to Judge Serpentelli and say, okay, we

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we have done what you have asked. Please lift the ban on our town, number one, and please look favorably on our request to go over to the Housing Council for their consideration.

If he looks favorably on your request whether you vote yes tonight or you table, you are going to go over there. But if I were the Judge, I would look at the track record of this town. You have ignored Judge Serpentelli for the past year and a You have been and I have been -- I was on half. the Council last year. We have butted heads with him every chance we have had. We have said no, this is unconstitutional. We don't want to do it.

He has through his transcripts on several occasions given us loopholes to save ourselves. Perhaps we are too blind to see the loopholes and the kindness that he has shown As this gentleman said, he is not a vindictive man. He has stated I know to the Mayor that he is not thrilled about Mount Laurel, but he has a job to do and he is going to do

So, I beg you, do not sign a death certificate for this town. The Building Department -- the Judge has proven it. He shut us down already. You think he is going to be nicer tomorrow? Do you think he

is going to say well, they table it. They are probably going to vote for it eventually? Let's lift the ban. Carla, stay where you are and let's wait and see what's going to happen. No. He is going to say I've had it with South Plainfield. Who do you think you are? Are you the only town in the State of New Jersey who doesn't have to comply with the Order?

You will get what you are asking for. You are

You will get what you are asking for. You are playing a gamethat you have no way of winning.

Mount Laurel is not going away. You are not ultimately going to be blessed with no low and moderate income housing.

Do what you should do for the people in this room and the people in this town. I don't think there are too many people in this room and in this town who are going to be thrilled with what you have done tonight. My comments didn't get a boo. Okay.

Tomorrow it is going to be in the press what you have done. Fortunately, four of you aren't up for re-election. You better thank God that you aren't up for re-election this year. You would all be gone.

A VOICE: Try impeachment.

MS. GRAF: I beg of you, if there is a way,

.

that you can call another -- advertise two days.

If you can, untable that Resolution and change your minds for the good of this town, Forget your politics. Forget whoever told you how to vote tonight, and vote the way you know in your heart you should. Protect this town because Carla Lerner will be here, no doubt about it.

Thank you.

THE MAYOR: Anyone else? Is there anyone else in the public portion? Walter?

A VOICE: Walter Kalman, 232 Merchants

I have one question. You said that there is no building going on at all or there is no building allowed at this time or any time?

THE MAYOR: No.

MR. KALMAN: None at all, even outside --

THE MAYOR: No, Walter. You may build additions, alterations up to \$25,000. There have also been certain individual cases where individual people have gone and gotten special permission from the Judge to build.

Basically, what he has stated, the Order is that we can't have any new construction of any kind.

MR. KALMAN: As of what date?

1 Three weeks ago. THE MAYOR: 2 MR. KALMAN: Okay. Two houses being built 3 down my street. That is why I was wondering. 4 They must have already had THE MAYOR: 5 received the permits before the Order took effect. 6 MR.KALMAN: So they have permission to go 7 ahead and build? 8 THE MAYOR: Yes. 9 The only question I have is the MR. KALMAN: 10 type of houses. I was just curious because I know 11 they have almost two the same type of houses. I 12 didn't understand that. But I think -- thought we 13 have different housing permits. 14 THE MAYOR: Walter, do me a favor. Come to 15 us at a regular agenda meeting and discuss that, but right now we are talking about this. 16 17 They will be finished by then. 18 THE MAYOR: Okay. Anyone else? 19 A VOICE: Larry Massaro, 3122 Woodland Avenue 20 South Plainfield. 21 There was a statement made tonight by 22 Councilman Acrin that I would like to refute. 23 said that the Mayor and/or Council approached a certain developer in town to purchase a piece of 24 25 land that is in question with regard to this Mount

Laurel Legislation.

I would like to state and I am sure the record will show that the Land Management Committee received a letter from me, I guess, two and a half years ago requesting purchase of this land, and I think this is long before the word Mount Laurel ever came on the lips of anyone in South Plainfield.

So, I would like to state that, and I would like Councilman Acrin to please get his facts straight before he makes any statements.

THE MAYOR: Anyone else?

A VOICE: Yes.

THE MAYOR: Yes, Ma'am?

A VOICE: Jackie Weaver, 327 Norwood Avenue. Am I to understand that this Council is going to subject the people of this Township to undue hardships because of their decision tonight, meaning restriction of permits to any additions whatsoever is going to be banned as of tomorrow?

THE MAYOR: We cannot say that that is going to happen at all. It may, by the actions taken tonight, the Judge has a prerogative to do what he has threatened to do in both May of 1984 and as late as I think that case was June 11 -- June 24th.

> MR. SANTORO: June 24th.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE MAYOR: The June 24th appearance. He may.

MS. WEAVER: He has done it in the past as past performance shows. He probably is going to do it again tomorrow. Where does that leave the people of the Township? In a hole. I mean, this is ridiculous. You are supposed to be representing us, but what you are doing is representing themselves, and what the hell are you guys going to? What about us? You are leaving us nowhere and with no recourse. What are these people going to do that have bought houses that can't be built? They have no place to live.

Are you people going to pay for that, too? As well as I am supposed to be doing some building to my own home. What am I supposed to do? This is ridiculous. We voted you people to represent us, not for what you want but what we want. Why don't you listen to us for a change?

> THE MAYOR: Yes, sir?

A VOICE: John Putrico. Mr. Acrin, Mr. Woskey, the four people that turned this down tonight, I just sold my house and purchasing a new house. you going to pay my bills on my apartment that I have to move in the 29th of August? Who is going to pay my bills? My wife is pregnant. Are you going to pay

my bills? Are you? Are you? Are you? Then let's get this straight tonight.

THE MAYOR: Anyone else in the audience?

A VOICE: Yes.

THE MAYOR: Yes, Ma'am?

A VOICE: Diane O'Connor. I live at 1301
Walnut Street. I lived in the town for more than
seven years. I am a little embarrassed to say this
is my very first meeting and I am very disappointed.

It wasn't -- it was a point of order, I realize that -- that we were not allowed to express our views once all the discussion happened. Everybody on the Council made up their minds before they even heard what we, the town's people, had to say.

I am in the same boat. I am not going to have a place to live. I don't appreciate it because we are either going to have to file a suit against the town or something. I don't know what we can do. Or we are going to have to look elsewhere for housing. I like living in South Plainfield. But what option is there?

A VOICE: I lived 34 years.

THE MAYOR: One at a time.

MS. O'CONNOR: Are you going to have emergency housing for those of us who have sold our

<b>A</b>	
1	Is there a second?
2	MR. CONLON: Second.
3	MR. WOSKEY: Second.
4	THE MAYOR: Any discussion? Seeing none,
) 5	roll call, please, Bill.
6	MR. DE SABATO: On the motion to table. Mr.
7	Acrin?
8	MR. ACRIN: Yes.
9	MR. DE SABATO: Mr. Conlon?
10	MR. CONLON: Yes.
11 11	MR. DE SABATO: Mr. Gallagher?
12	MR. GALLAGHER: No.
13	MR. DE SABATO: Mrs. Levine?
14	MS. LEVINE: No.
3 15	MR. DE SABATO: Mr. Thiel?
16	MR. THIEL: Yes.
17	MR. DE SABATO: Mr. Woskey?
18	MR. WOSKEY: Yes.
19	MR. DE SABATO: Motion carried, Mayor.
20	Before we go any further
21	THE MAYOR: Excuse me. We are still in
22	session.
23	MR. DE SABATO: Before we go any further,
24	let me read into the record a letter from the
25	Middlesex County Planning Board, addressed to me.
	$\mathbf{I}$

1	"The professional staff of the Middlesex
2	County Planning Board has reviewed the proposed
3	amendment number 1009 and Ordinance 1010 regarding
4	Affordable Housing and the establishment of an
5	Affordable Housing Agency and has no additional
6	comment.
7	"Thank you for your considerations. Sincerely
8	yours, Robert G. Emerson, Principal Planner."
9	THE MAYOR: All right. Seeing that that is
10	the end of business, I will call for a motion of
11	adjournment.
12	So moved and seconded. We are out. Unanimous.
13	(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at
14	9:53 P.M.)
15	* * * * * *
16	I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
17	and accurate transcript of the proceedings taken
18	in the afore-entitled matters, reported by me at
19	the place and date hereinbefore set forth.
20	Sad 2-1-0
21	JANICE M. SMITH, C.S.R.
22	N.J. License #X100569
23	