UA-Edison

1/13/77

motion transcript

pey 4

CA 00 1378 S

4:	CHANCEW DIVISION
1 1	CHANCEW DIVISION MIDDLESEX COUNTY
	Docket No. C-4122-73
]	
2	
_	
3	
4	URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW BRUNSWICK, :
ľ	etal.,
5	
6	Plaintiffs,
O I	I ***
	VS. MOTION
7_{h}	• ————
-#1	THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH :
8 9	OF CARTERET, et al.,
9 [Defendants. :
10	
10	
11	
12	MIDDLESEX COUNTY COURTHOUSE
	NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY
13	'u
14 []	JANUARY 13, 1977
17	
15	BEFORE:
16	HONORABLE DAVID D. FURMAN, J.S.C.
17	
17	
18	APPEARANCES:
19	MARILYN MORHEUSER, ESQ.,
	MARILYN MORHEUSER, ESQ., Attorney for Plaintiffs
19 20 1	Attorney for Plaintiffs
20 <i>‡</i>	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ.,
	Attorney for Plaintiffs
20 1	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ.,
20 <i>‡</i>	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ.,
20 1	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ.,
20 # 21 22 23	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ., Attorney for Defendant Edison
20 I 21 22	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ., Attorney for Defendant Edison JEANNE A. KERRIGAN, CSR
20 # 21 22 23	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ., Attorney for Defendant Edison
20 # 21 22 23 24	Attorney for Plaintiffs ROLAND WINTER, ESQ., Attorney for Defendant Edison JEANNE A. KERRIGAN, CSR Official Shorthand Reporter

SUPER^fc COURT OF NEW JERSEY

25

THE COURT: Urban League versus Carteret.

MISS MORHEUSERi Ready for the plaintiff,

your Honor. Mr. Winter was here.

MR. WINTER: Your Honor, I have only a short statement to make.

I think that the plaintiff here is contentious with regard to the content and substance of your

holding rather than the way I paraphrased it.

As your Honor well knows, I acceded to a De tninimis concept based upon the facts in this case and what we're seeking.

Now, I really don't understand what there is about this, I believe, innocuous Order under the circumstances that the plaintiff is disputing.

THE COURT: All right, Miss Morheuser.

MISS MORHEUSER: Your Honor, essentially
Mr. Winter is correct. The plaintiffs are objecting
to the substance and not merely the wording of the
Order because of the reasons set forth in prior
memoranda which, if you wish, I will recapitulate
here.

Essentially, Edison is seeking a stay of the Judgment or, perhaps more accurately, a change in the Judgment, and through the Order that is proposed it is seeking to be found in compliance with the

Order, or not in violation of it, without having changed its ordinance which you found invalid over six months ago.

Two of the Orders specifically allow Edison to continue to enforce that theory without giving any proof that it is providing or will provide its fair share of low and moderate income housing; to wit, 2,625 units which was similarly ordered by the Court. And by that I mean, your Honor, that despite Orders in the early Fall last year from you, or Orders from you requesting information be provided as to price and rental changes of housing units in process, no such information has been forthcoming, and without rezoning of vacant lands suitable for housing to comply with the Order.

Through this Order plaintiffs believe that the Judgment of the Court as to Edison has been rendered meaningless to them.

at the earlier argument and discussion in chambers,
Miss Morheuser. The view of the Court was that —
or, rather, a serious or substantial contention was
made by Edison; that is, within its present zoning,
ordinance it did have the potential for this number
of units and was not prepared to say that that was

g

2 %

inaccurate or not a reasonable projection.

We have had the benefit of a review of the vacant land by the County Planning Board, and the matter seems to be somewhat hanging in balance as to whether there is or is not the potential under the present zoning ordinance. So, my intention was to give an additional period of six months in which Edison would not be found in violation of the Judgment. I tend to think that there will be a shakedown during the six months, and it will be apparent one way or the other at the conclusion of that period of time.

Now, I do mean that one, two and three would be in effect, and I think the Show Cause provision would be not on May 1st but, let's say, on June 1st.

Will the two of you standby, and I would like to confer with you at the time of the recessf also Mr. Burgess with respect to Woodbridge Township.

MR. BURGESS: I will be present, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

* * * * * * * * * *

I, JEANNE A. KERRIGAN, Official Court Reporter, do certify the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of my original stenographic notes taken in the above matter to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Jeanne Kerrigan