

CA-Piscataway

6/10/75

request for admission by P's of  
Piscataway and answers

P7

CA001804G

Piscataway

RECEIVED

JUN 10 1975

BAUMGART & BEN-ASHER  
134 Evergreen Place  
East Orange, New Jersey 07018  
201-677-1400

MARTIN E. SLOANE  
DANIEL A. SEARING  
ARTHUR WOLF  
National Committee Against  
Discrimination in Housing, Inc.  
1425 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-783-8150  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
CHANCERY DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY  
DOCKET NO. C - 4122-73

URBAN LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW  
BRUNSWICK, et al.

Plaintiffs

vs.

THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE  
BOROUGH OF CARTERET, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION

TO:

Roy M. Oake, Esq.  
463 South Washington Avenue  
Piscataway, New Jersey 08854

Plaintiffs hereby make Request for Admissions  
pursuant to R. 4:22, et seq:

1. Does defendant Piscataway admit that its municipal zoning ordinance specifically prohibits mobile homes?

**Yes.**

2. Does defendant admit that its municipal zoning ordinance limits multi-family dwellings to 15 bedrooms per acre?

**Yes.**

3. Does defendant admit that its municipal zoning ordinance requires central air conditioning in multi-family dwellings?

**Yes, or individual air conditioning units.**

4. Does defendant admit that less than five percent of its land area is zoned RM for multi-family dwellings?

**Yes.**

5. Does defendant admit that its RR-1 zone requires minimum lot areas of 43,000 sq. ft., minimum lot widths of 150 ft., and minimum first floor areas of 1,000 to 1,300 sq. ft. ?

**Yes.**

6. Does defendant admit that its R-20 zone requires minimum lot areas of 20,000 sq. ft., minimum lot widths of 100 ft., and minimum first floor areas of 900 to 1,200 sq. ft. ?

**Yes.**

7. Does defendant admit that its R-15 zone requires minimum lot areas of 15,000 sq. ft., minimum lot widths of 100 ft., and minimum first floor areas of 900 to 1,200 sq. ft. ?

**Yes.**

8. Does defendant admit that as of 1970 it had 3,571 vacant developable acres zoned for residential use, of which 2,361 were zoned for one acre minimum lot sizes?

**Yes. Not on his own knowledge, but based on the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, 1970, zoning survey.**

9. Does defendant admit that as of 1970, of 5,577 vacant developable acres, it had 1,545 zoned for industrial use?

**Yes. Same as answer to #8 above.**

10. Does defendant admit that the Middlesex County Master Plan projects that the total acreage needed by Piscataway to accommodate existing and projected industrial uses by the year 2000 is 567?

**Yes, but there are other non-residential uses.  
The residential is limited to 5,400 acres.**

11. Does defendant admit that it has no public housing authority?

**Yes. The First Baptist Church of New Market has been approved as the sponsor for Senior Citizens Housing Project and are authorized to take such steps as necessary to implement said senior citizens housing for the Township of Piscataway.**

12. Does defendant admit that the number of building permits

it issued between 1965 and 1973 was as follows:

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>
Single Family	967	813	1,906	651	107	229	347	167	65
Multi-Family	668	532	1,700	522	0	0	116	24	0

**Yes.**

13. Does defendant admit that its 1970 minority population was 3,387 blacks, 101 Spanish-speaking and 351 other minorities?

**Yes.**

14. Does defendant admit that its black population increased from 1,401 to 3,387 during 1960-1970?

**Yes.**

15. Does defendant admit that over 60 percent of this increase occurred in census tract 5, blocks 103-116 and 410-429?

**At this time, the defendant does not have any sufficient information to admit or deny it. When the information becomes**

**available, it will answer #15.**

16. Does defendant admit that 12.3 percent of the dwelling units in the census blocks listed in 15 above are overcrowded as compared to six percent for the entire township?

**See answer to #15, but as listed in the census block for 1970, the 12.3 percentage of the dwelling units had 1.01 person per room or more.**

17. Does defendant admit that in census tract 7, blocks 501-508 are 100 percent black?

**Yes.**

18. Does defendant admit that blocks 512-518 of census tract 7 are over 90 percent black?

**Yes.**

19. Does defendant admit that in the blocks listed in 17 and 18 above, 13 percent of the units are overcrowded as compared to six percent for the entire township?

**Yes, but 13 percent of the units in question had 1.01 persons or more per room in 1970.**

20. Does defendant admit that in census tract 6, blacks are concentrated in blocks 916-925?

**Yes.**

21. Does defendant admit that in census tract 6, in blocks 916-925, 13.4 percent of the dwelling units are overcrowded compared to six percent for the entire township?

**Yes.**

22. Does defendant admit that its population increased from 19,890 to 36,418 during 1960-1970?

**Yes.**

23. Does defendant admit that a substantial portion of its developable land is readily amenable to sewer and water utility installations?

**Yes.**

24. Does defendant admit that there are no peculiar circumstances which require maintenance of the zoning ordinance and land use provisions listed in one through ten above?

**No.**

(a) If this is denied, list such peculiar circumstances and provide a summary of the facts supporting such circumstances.

This defendant cannot answer this completely at this time, but is awaiting the report and recommendation of the Planner, who is engaged in making a study and report and recommendation for a new Master Plan which would lead to a new zoning ordinance, but at this time, but not limited to the following nor is it intended to be all inclusive, Piscataway is unlike Mt. Laurel. The road network, for example, the location of Route #287, the proposed Route #18 and #195 make it available for industrial and commercial uses. The location of part of Rutgers University and its affiliate institutions within its border, the County Vocational School, the County Park, and lands belonging to the United States are not subject to zoning. The low and moderate income housing already erected by Rutgers University and proposed to be erected by them, which includes dormitories, multiple family housing, all of which is not subject to the zoning laws of Piscataway.

*[Handwritten Signature]*

BAUMGART & BEN-ASHER  
134 Evergreen Place  
East Orange, New Jersey 07018

MARTIN E. SLOANE  
DANIEL A. SEARING  
ARTHUR WOLF  
National Committee Against  
Discrimination in Housing, Inc.  
1425 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**CERTIFICATION**

I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

DATED: June 6, 1975

M. Ray Oake  
Attorney for Township of Roseland