

CA - Edison

11/15/76

2 letters re: info about Edison's zoning

+ objections

+ modified proposed judgment

pg b

C4001371 L

Edison

November 15, 1978

Roland A. Winter, Esq.,
Totmstip of Edison
940tafooykwrntm@
Idlson* Hew Jersey 08817

Res Urban league of Greater Hew Brunswick, et al«,
T. The Mayor asui Council of the Borough
of carttxetr et al.

Pocket No. C-4122-73 ^^

Dear Mr. Winter

This is in response to your letter of **November**
8, 1978.

Plaintiffs object both to the form *made* the
assignment of the order which 7011 intend to present to
Jn&g@ Wurman on November 19. We will raise our objections
before the Court at the hearing scheduled for that
date.

We do not agree that obtaining information about
the proposed purchase price and rental ranges of "units
already *ppzwmA* for or now under construction in
Edison km without your authority, would be misunderstood
or would result in material and important
information. Rather, *much* information is vital to
establish whether or not Edison, as you assert, is
warranted providing low *affordable* housing units
within the provisions of the Judgment of the Court.

We do not affirm that the previously **submitted**
affidavits are sufficient to establish your compliance.
As to whether or not Edison's "song" is indeed
insufficient, plaintiffs will rely upon the opinion
and judgment of the Court, which held without qualification
that Edison's ordinance *is* valid under the
principles enunciated in Mt. Laurel.

Very truly yours,
/s/ Roland A. Winter

cc: Honorable: i^vld: p. IPorain.. * ttori » y - ^ fer ^ Plaii3 . tiffs i



Township of Edison

Middlesex County, New Jersey 08811

RECEIVED
NOV 11 1976

NOV 11 1976

November 8, 1976

National Committee Against Discrimination
in Housing, Inc.
1425 H. Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Attention: Daniel A. Searing, Esq.

Re: Urban League of Greater New Brunswick,
et al vs. The Mayor and Council of the
Borough of Carteret, et al
Docket No. C 4122-73

Dear Mr. Searing:

The information that you requested in your letter of November 1, 1976 and by previous correspondence is not within the knowledge of the Municipal Family.

I have given deep thought to the possibility of having municipal officials and employees canvas builders and developers and it is my honest opinion that such activity would be outside the realm of our authority, greatly misunderstood by the persons considered to be interviewed and whatever information might be forthcoming would be so conjectural and hypothetical that it would be non-evidential and insufficient.

Edison has steadfastly and openly maintained that housing of every nature and degree is being actively pursued within the parameters of present zoning. The aforementioned parameters, as evidenced by our affidavits previously filed, are substantially more than adequate to meet Edison's fair share of Middlesex County's housing requirements.

National Committee Against Discrimination
in Housing, Inc.

Attention: Daniel A. Searing, Esq.

November 8, 1976


Page 2.

As you must surely know, Edison has consented to and participated in an extensive check of permissible housing units in accordance with all of the evidence that we adduced at the trial of the issue.

It is my thought that at this extremely late stage you should have sufficient information about the case in general, and Edison in particular, to make an honest and sincere judgment as to whether or not you have a genuine claim that Edison's zoning is indeed insufficient.

I shall do everything in my power to insure that there is a final determination of Edison's role in this litigation on November 19, 1976. Towards that end, I am enclosing herewith a copy of the Order that I will present to Judge Furman for signature on November 19, 1976.

If you have any objections, either to the form or the substance, please make them known to me well in advance of that date.

Very truly yours,


Roland A. Winter

RAW/fif
encl.

ROLAND A. VEXATIFT, ESQ.

Attorney for Defendant, Township of Edison
\$40 hmbou Avenue, B*H#@»» l«tf Jersey fill?

SUPERIOR COURT OF MI JIIWT
CHANCERY DIVISION: MIDDLESEX ©«Tlf
BGCBBf MQ« C 4122-1\$

PIMM LEAGUE OF GRIMTBR
IBM BMJHS Via, #t'al.t

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE mtm - \$m CSUNOX crtn
BOROU CARTERET, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Actiaa

MODIFIED JUDGMENT

This s&ttsr iaviag beii ope«od to t&e Court on' Motioft **af**
d^fena&rtt, Township ofEiiison^ Roland A- feint or, Esq. appear tag
for tllt •Township• #f Bdison, liaaiol A. Searing, Bsq, and 7r^
otiiexs appearing for t&« plaintiffs, mid the Court aavirig had
the oeaefit of the isoviug papots, la<flftg' dcfcri'iant's " ^? :r
sffl4irrits, s»cb answering papers as hava beii filed ^n befealf
->f t^e islaintiffs and aa *independent invmignatum* **confirming**
the accuracy of tke i^ifefrstation contsiinc*4 im E4isor, **Township's**
moving papers a»tt -trial e-xiiiuits, asa it appearing, to **the**
Court that un&er ^lso:a*s existing Zoning Ordinance, ti^Te is
a substantiaily greater Buaber of pres«at, plaaned and potential

housing units for low and moderate income families as **described**,
detailed and outlined in the 4th article of this Court **filed**
May 4 1970, and as implemented by subsequent **judgments and**
Orders of this Court;

IT IS, on this _____ day of *March* 1976 **ORDERED**

1. That all previous decisions, orders and **judgments**
affecting the Township of *Edison* and in particular **striking**
down the validity of the *Zoning Ordinance* of the **Township of**
Edison be and is hereby affirmed to validate, in its **present**
form, the *Zoning Ordinance* of the Township of *Edison* **together**
with its *articles and* *ordinances* **revised** of the
Zoning **Code**.

2. Be it further **ORDERED** that *the* is in **compliance** with
the **and**
the **for**
and **needs**
low income families.

.....
J. F. C.