

U.L. v. Cateret, Piscataway 1/29/1985

- Letter between council confirming earlier phone conversation
re parcels of vacant land in P-way located in Site 60

~~CA 000 799 L~~

Pg. 1

P.i. 1070

CA 000 ~~799~~ L
818 817

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS
 Campus at Newark

RECEIVED

JAN 31 1985

JUDGE SERPENTELLI'S CHAMBERS

School of Law-Newark • Constitutional Litigation Clinic
 S.I. Newhouse Center For Law and Justice
 15 Washington Street • Newark • New Jersey 07102-3192 • 201/648-5687

January 29, 1985

Raymond S. Miller, Esq.
 2301 Maple Avenue
 South Plainfield, N.J. 07080

Re: Urban League of Greater New Brunswick, et al.
 v. Township of Piscataway
 No. C 4122-73

Dear Mr. Miller:

This will confirm our conversation today regarding two parcels of vacant land which are located in site 60 in Piscataway Township and are owned or under option by Pelmont Builders.

With respect to Lot 6, Block 823, my client, in consultation with our planning consultant, has reviewed this parcel and determined that it is not practicable to develop it for Mt. Laurel purposes. Accordingly, we have no objection to having the Court's Order of December 11, 1984 dissolved as to this parcel.

With respect to the proposed purchase from the Township of an 80 X 100 foot parcel adjacent to Lots 76-79, Block 774, I asked you to send Barbara Williams and me additional information about the size, configuration, ownership and current use of the adjoining parcels. I also suggested that, to avoid reducing the size of a potentially developable, municipally owned parcel through purchase of the 80 X 100 strip, you should consider applying to the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a variance as to your parcel.

I hope this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,


 Bruce S. Gelber

cc/Hon. Eugene D. Serpentelli, J.S.C.
 Phillip Paley, Esq.
 Michelle Donato, Esq.