

CA - Middlesex County

3/19/76

letter re: 3/15/76 letter, witness addition,
+ Mr. Maghes' property

pg 2

CAC01585L

RICHARD F. PLECHNER (*Helmetta*)
ATTORNEY AT LAW
351 MAIN STREET
METUCHEN, N. J. 08840

RICHARD F. PLECHNER
ALAN A. DAVIDSON

(201) 549-4457

March 19, 1976

Daniel A. Searing, Esq.
NCDH
1425 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

C

Re: Urban League of Greater New Brunswick,
et al. v. The Mayor and Council of the
Borough of Carteret, et al.

Dear Mr. Searing:

I am in receipt of your letter of March 15, 1976. First I would advise you that if you wished to use Mr. Maglies as a witness you should have called him during the trial of the case.

The property that you listed was all discussed in some detail at the trial. The 47 acres he is referring to, I believe, is the 44 acres that is zoned industrial and that the Helme Company has testified they wish to use to build warehousing for possible future sale. As you recall, that is land that is shown as unsuitable for private homes on the soils map and surrounds Bakersville with its numerous problems.

As to Mr. Maglies' 7 acres, this is my 6th year as Borough Attorney and at no time that I recall has Mr. Maglies ever applied for subdivision on his tract. Back in 1971 he asked me if he could obtain a subdivision and I indicated to him that if he made application he probably could.

P

Y

Daniel A. Searing, Esq.
Page II

March 19, 1976
Re: Urban League

He never applied, nor might I add, has he paid taxes since 1972. The property is presently in the process of foreclosure for failure to pay taxes.

As to Mr. Maglies' property on Main Street, approximately 2 acres, it is in a flood plain and I believe is also included in the same proposed foreclosure for non-payment of taxes. Again, I recall of no development proposals on the 2 acres and for that matter would hardly call the 2 acre parcel a developable tract.

I believe also, Miss Vincent, on behalf of the Helme Company, testified as to the proposed Queens Lake development, which was never formally applied for but was discussed with both the town and county. The bulk of this development was to be constructed on the 179 acres now taken over by Jamesburg Park. The Middlesex County Planning Board strongly disapproved of the development as they thought it would seriously endanger the aquifer. Be that as it may, the question is now moot inasmuch as the acreage is now to be used for parkland.

Yours truly,

RICHARD F. PLECHNER

mat

cc: Hon. David D. Furman

