RULS-AD-1971-30

· TELNSCRIPT OF SIEMINSKI + GAVIN DEPOSITIONS

P65- 91

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW DIVISION - SOMERSET COUNTY DOCKET NO. L-36896-70 P.W.

THE ALLAN-DEANE CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation qualified to do business in the State of New Jersey,

• RULS - AD - 1971 - 30

Plaintiff,

DEPOSITIONS UPON ORAL EXAMINATION

OF

VS.

ANN SIEMINSKI PAUL F. GAVIN

THE TOWNSHIP OF BEDMINSTER, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey, and THE TOWNSHIP OF BEDMINSTER

PLANNING BOARD.

Defendants.

.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

TRANSCRIPT of the depositions of Ann Sieminski and Paul F. Gavin, witnesses, called for Oral Examination by the plaintiff in the above-entitled action, said depositions being taken pursuant to Rules governing Civil Practice in the Courts of New Jersey by and before IRVING SABOR, a Notary Public and Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of New Jersey, at the office of William W. Lanigan, Esq., 59 South Finley Avenue, Basking Ridge, New Jersey, on Tuesday, November 2, 1971, commencing at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon.

Appearances:

WILLIAM W. LANIGAN, ESQ., and DANIEL F. O'CONNELL, ESQ., Attorneys for Plaintiff.

EDWARD D. BOWLBY, ESQ., and MC CARTER & ENGLISH, ESQS.,
By NICHCLAS CONOVER ENGLISH, ESQ.,
Attorneys for Defendants.

Since the very beginning of the Planning Board. When was the beginning of the Planning Board? The first entry here is the organization meeting dated August 2. 1950. August 2, 1960. 2 ANN SIEMINSKI, having been duly sworn according to law by the Officer, testified as follows: 2 s As to the 10% sould is soon their writer sectioned I 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. OCONNELL: 4 do Que Mrs. Sieminski, I am sure that your attorney, Mr. 5 } English has explained what the idea of the depositions are 6 <u>]</u> this morning. We are trying to proceed with discovery so 73 that the breadth of the questions are quite wide and the admissibility is not the question here and what we are trying to do is to determine some of the past history of the Planning 10 Board and in that regard, first, I would like to ask you, you 111 are the secretary to the Planning Board? ME, O'CONNETA: Yes. 13 2 How long have you been the secretary to the Planning "" 14 Board? 38 A Since 1966, the beginning of 66. 15 To Q To Your capacity as secretary to the Planning Board, 16 is it your responsibility to keep the minutes and records of the Planning Board? A The Yes. 18 2 Q' 7 Do you keep the minutes and records? 19 1 WI The Yes. 20 Are those documents in front of you the minutes 21

Yes.

and records of the Planning Board?

22

2

3

4

1

8.

9

10

11

12 . 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE ALLAN-DEANE CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation qualified to do business in the State of New Jersey.

CERTIFICATE

Plaintiff,

of Officer

•

THE TOWNSHIP OF BEDMINSTER, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey, and THE TOWNSHIP OF BEDMINSTER PLANNING BOARD,

Defendants.

I, IRVING SABOR, a Notary Public and Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of New Jersey, do hereby Shorthand Recertify that prior to the commencement of the examination the witnesses, ANN SIEMINSKI and PAUL F. GAVIN, were sworn by me to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of either of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not

) # 19 In.	★ (株)★ (株)	B gr
. 5	# 18 Id.	Minuses of Special Marking of	47
	2-30 xa.		
· ,		Minutes of Beauton Merting of	40
*	P-20 1d.		
2	The second secon	Manufacture of Special Mentury or	40
_			1
3 🍴	IND	EX OF WITNESSES	56
1	Jan Ia,	DIRECT	60
4.	WITNESS	DIRECT	
11	Ann Sieminski	Phytograph	61
. 5 ∥	Aili Dieminori		
1.1	Paul F. Gavin	P56 C 30 1	62
6	74.75 14.		**************************************
7		Photography	68
	P- 5 Id.	Pactagram	
8			62
14	7427 Id.	Photoseronia	
9		EX ^{PROOF TEXHIBITS}	63
1	%-98 Id.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
10	Page Id.		LAGE
118	P-1 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting	it.
	P-30 Id.	dated May 28, 1956	
17	P-2 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting	וננ
113	Y-M dd.	dated January 26, 1959	
13	P-3 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting	13
11.19	P-4 Id.	of July 25, 1960 Minutes of September 26, 1960	13
. 14	F-4 IU•	Regular Meeting	7.7
20	P-5 Id.	Minutes of Special Meeting of	16
15		February 8, 1965	
16	P-6 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting of	23
·		April 25, 1966	
27 17	P-7 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting of	27
17/19		November 27, 1967	
18	P-8 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting of	29
ាំង	P-9 Id.	April 22, 1968 Minutes of Regular Meeting of	31
19	1-5 ±u•	October 28, 1968	21
34	P-10 Id.	Minutes of June 28, 1965	35
20		Regular Meeting	
21	P-11 Id.	Master Plan	35
21.			1
22	P-12 Id.	Minutes of May 28, 1962	37
	D 10 Ta	Regular Meeting	110
23	P-13 Id.	Minutes of Special Meeting of	40
-	P-14 Id.	January 29, 1963 & December 4, Minutes of Special Meeting of	*
24	* - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	March 19, 1963	41
	P-15 Id.	Minutes of Regular Meeting of	44
25	-	May 27, 1963	
	1	-	İ

こうことは、大きないというないのであるというないというないというないというないというないというないできませんが、

あいしとうないないとのないというないとのないないないないないないないないないないできないないできないというないというないないできないというないないないないないないないないないないないないないないないない

「我们最好的的」の 建设量的 一分一定整理性的 あいまごを行いれた もっき しないれいか

.

_

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. O'CONNELL: Back on the record.

Q I am reading from the zoning ordinance of the Township of Bedminster. On page 15 there is a legend indicating the history of the ordinance itself.

It states it was adopted December 30, 1946 and amended November 17, 1947.

There was no Planning Board at that time, so there would be no minutes to reflect what occurred at that time, but there is noted here there was a revision to the zoning ordinance on December 18, 1950 which could be reflected in the minutes of the Planning Board since it was in existence on August 2, 1950.

Now, Mrs. Sieminski, could you see if in fact there was any public hearing of the Planning Board on the December 18, 1950 revision to the zoning ordinance.

A I don't see anything in the minutes that would indicate a public hearing in 1950.

Q The next revision noted in the history is February 20, 1956. Do your records indicate a public hearing of the Planning Board prior to that amendment to the zoning ordinance?

It could be any time prior to the February 20th date. It might even be in 1955, the latter part of 1955.

A Here is a notation, not of a public hearing, of a sub committee that was ---

5.

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A No. That's all the records reflect Planning Board? is what I have read in essence.

Do the minutes reflect any provisions for any other zones such as a business zone? Not as appears here

Q Office and research zone? That may come later, but not in this particular segment.

For any multi-family dwellings?

Your question relates I think to MR . ENGLISH: the minutes of January 23?

MR. O'CONNELL: I am still on the January 23, 1956 minutes.

No, there is nothing.

Again going back to the history, there is a statement that there was a revision to the zoning ordinance on June 18, 1956.

Do your minutes of the Planning Board, and necessarily it would be prior to the June 18th adoption date, reflect any public hearing of the Planning Board in relation to this revision, this June 18, 1956 revision, of the ordinance?

> MR. ENGLISH: Is your question limited to a public hearing, Mr. O'Connell?

Is there any record of any other hearing, any other meeting of the Planning Board in relation to --

My first question is, are there any minutes at a public hearing in relation to this particular zoning amendment of

1956, June 18th, that you have been able to locate in your records, any of your records?

Do your minutes reflect any meeting of the Planning Board in relation to this particular zoning amendment of June 18th?

MR. ENGLISH: We will try to answer your first question.

MR. O'CONNELL: All right.

A Yes, there seems to be a reference here of a regular meeting of May the 28th, 1956. There is a resolution.

How much of this do you want me to cover? It's rather lengthy.

MR. O'CONNELL: Can we mark that into the record then? Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Q Those are the May 28, 1956 minutes for the public hearing. A Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: We will mark them.

(Minutes of regular meeting of Planning Board dated May 28, 1956 received and marked P-1 for identification.)

Q Do your minutes reflect during the time period -I think you have gone through the minutes pretty thoroughly
-- from the January 23rd letter to the Township Committee
and the May 28, 1956 meeting of the Planning Board?

Do your minutes reflect any other discussions, whether it

be a public meeting or an agenda meeting or a private meeting of the Planning Board which reflects any reference to either the prior amendment, the February 20th amendment, or the June 18, 1956 amendment? A From the regular meeting of February 23, 1956 there is a paragraph here, "Chairman Bourne advised that the draft of the revision of the zoning ordinance is ready for the consideration of the Planning Board. The secretary then distributed copies to the members present. The Chairman requested that all members acquaint themselves with the contents of the revision and that a meeting be held on Monday, April 30, 1956 at eight p.m. to further discuss the revision."

Q There is reference made to an April 30th meeting.

A Yes.

Q Are there any minutes for the April 30th meeting?

No, there are none.

Q Are there any references to that meeting or any of the discussions that occurred at that meeting?

A No.

Q Are there any reasons in the minutes given for the revision prior to the May 28th minutes? A No. That seems to be the only thing in the minutes.

Q Now, Mrs. Sieminski, subsequent to the May 28th meeting, do your minutes reflect any other discussion of either the June 18th revision to the zoning ordinance or any

9.

Sieminski-direct other revision to the zoning ordinance? 1 Again reading from the history, the next official notation 2 of an amendment to the ordinance was December 2nd, 1957, but 3 I would like you to go through your minutes prior to that date to see if there were any other discussions. 5 A. There is a reference would like you to read them. 6 here to a regular meeting of October 28, 1957. Do you want he to read it? 8 Mrs. Sieminski, the meeting of October 28, 1957 9 refers to which ordinance amendment? Does it refer to the 10 December 2, 1957 amendment? Is there any reference? 11 No, it doesn't seem to state what particular reference. 12 Do the minutes reflect what the amendment to the 13 zoning ordinance is? Α No, it does not. 14 Does it give any reasons for recommending the 15 amendment? A ... No, there is no reason stated here. 16 see no reason stated here. 17 Are there any other references subsequent to the 18 October 28th meeting to any amendment to the zoning ordinance? 19 Yes. Α 20 Please tell us what the meeting is. 21 This is a regular meeting of December 22, 1958. I will 22 read the two paragraphs. "Mr. Edward Ball of Route 206, 23

Bedminster, New Jersey appeared before the board in the matter

of a request for an extension of the business zone to income

24

25

i5

include the land presently owned by him on the easterly side of State Highway 206, south of the Lamington Road intersection.

"Mr. Ball stated that he has operated a business at this location for eighteen years and is presently the owner of a business classified as a non-conforming use.

The Chairman advised Mr. Ball this matter would have to be referred to the Township Committee. He suggested that Mr. Ball furnish a map showing the requested zoning change to the Township Committee in order that they might give consideration to his request.

"Mayor Ten Eyck noted that a number of Pluckemin residents were present at the meeting and advised those present that the matter of the extension of the Pluckemin business zone is under consideration.

Mr. Wiley advised that an amendatory ordinance will be introduced after the 1st of the year."

- Q Is there any other reference to any other zone change in that particular minute? A No.
- Q There is mentioned in that particular last paragraph that an ordinance amendment to the ordinance would be introduced.

Could youssee if your minutes of the Planning Board reflect any discussion, be it either a private or public meeting, relating to that particular amendment.

MR. O'CONNELL: Mark this first.

(Minutes of regular meeting of January 26, 1959 received and marked P-2 for identification.)

Q The history on page 15 again of the Zoning Ordinance reflects an amendment of March 16, 1959 of Article V, Section 2.

Was that particular meeting of January 26, did that reflect the Planning Board's discussion of that particular amendment or are there other discussions in your minutes?

I think we can make reference to this. Which meeting is that?

A The regular meeting of February 23, 1959.

Q Do the minutes of that particular meeting make reference to a zoning amendment? A Yes. It indicates that a resolution was passed. Would you like me to read the resolution as it was passed?

Q Would you, please. A "Be it resolved by the Planning Board of the Township of Bedminster in the County of Somerset, New Jersey that the proposed ordinance entitled 'an ordinance to amend and supplement an ordinance entitled 'an ordinance limiting all and restricting two specified districts and regulating therein buildings and structures according to their construction and the volume and nature and extent of their use, regulating and restricting the height, number of stories and size of buildings and other structures, regulating and restricting the size of lot, plots and of yards and other open spaces and the density of population, regulating and restricting the location, use and extent of use

penalties for violation thereof in the Township of Bedminster, in the County of Somerset." 7 Adopted December 30, 1946 as amended November 17, 1947, 8 December 18, 1950, February 20, 1956, June 18, 1956 and November 18, 1957, and the amended zoning map attached hereto 10 and made a part hereto be approved by this board and returned 11 to the Township Committee for further action. In those minutes, are there any comments by the 13 Planning Board as to the reasons? That is the No. 14 extent of the information on that. 15 This is the February --February 23, 1959 16 Your minutes which you have gone through do not 17 reflect any other revisions other than the ones we have 18 marked as P-1 and P-2 to the zoning ordinance, more specifically 19 any reference to the R-5 Zone. No. 20 Or the business zone. Nothing other than 21 what we have given you. 22 There are no references to any office or research No, nothing in specific discussion, no. 23 zone. Going on again with the history of the zoning 24 ordinance, which I might note for the record is completely 25

The next amendment that I have noted here is May 16, 196 It is our understanding that was an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance in 1966. 7 MR. ENGLISH: If I may interrupt, I see in the history of the zoning ordinance appended to the whereof a reference to amendment adopted October 17 1960. 11 Could you please check your minutes then to see if there is any discussion subsequent to February 1959. 13 is October 1960. 14 MR. O'CONNELL: Let's make reference to this 15 and I will have them copied. 16 (Minutes of regular meeting of July 25, 1960 17 received and marked P-3 for identification.) 18 (Minutes of regular meeting of September 26, 19 1960 received and marked P-4 for identification.) 20 Previous meetings which have been marked for 21 identification of July 25, 1960 and September 26, 1960 refer 22 to an amendment to the ordinance. 23 I would assume it is the October 17, 1960 amendment, 24 but there is no reference to it. No specific reference Α

25

:

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

. 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

that I can see other than what is on those pages.

Q Again the history reflects the amendment to the ordinance as May 16, 1966. I would appreciate it if you would go through the minutes from the September 26, 1960 date up until the May 16, 1966 date and see if there are any references to any other discussions subsequent to the adoption of the amendment or any reference to any future amendment.

MR. ENGLISH: Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

MR. O'CONNELL: Back on the record.

Q Mrs. Sieminski, in your capacity as the secretary to the Planning Board and the keeper of the minutes, so to speak, we are interested in finding any reference to any public hearings or private meetings of the Planning Board relating to the zoning changes.

Again I will refer to the history of the zoning ordinance since this is the only thing we have at our disposal as to when there were zoning changes.

If, to your knowledge, there were other zoning changes,

I would appreciate that you refer to those particular minutes,
but the next amendment that we have noted in the history
occurred in May of 1966.

Do your minutes reflect any public hearing or any private hearings of the Planning Board or public meetings of the

records here and I would assume that there was discussion prior to the adoption.

How far ahead of time you raised this point, I would assume it occurred sometime in the early part of 1966. Again I don't know. A Special meeting of May 6, 1964.

"Counsel Bowlby reported on the meeting of the subcommittee on zoning held on April 24, 1964. Counsel reviewed the committee's findings after discussion at that meeting.

"Mr. Agle explained the contents of the land use map.

Colonel Field suggested that the board be given an opportunity to study the proposal of the subcommittee on zoning and that the board have an opportunity to study the individual map to be furnished for use of each board member.

"Mr. Agle showed colored slides comprising aerial photographs of the entire land area of the township.

"Chairman Fales suggested that individual proposed zoning maps and copies of the zoning committee minutes be made available to each member of the board."

Q Would you make reference to that and read that lower portion. A This is a special meeting of May 25, 1964.

"Mr. Agle distributed land use maps to each of those persons present at the meeting.

13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |

. 19

E

b

"Mrs. Ashmun suggested that consideration be given to upgrading the zones adjacent to the new highways.

"Mr. Agle suggested five acre zoning along the major routes.

"Chairman Fales requested that the subcommittee on community facilities plan to hold a meeting prior to the next regular meeting of the Planning Board."

Q Mrs. Sieminski, are there any reasons given in those minutes by Mr. Agle as to why he suggested an upgrading to five acre zoning? A No, there is nothing set forth here.

Q Are there any discussions noted in the minutes by members of the Planning Board for the upgrading?

A Nothing other than what I have read, no.

MR. O'CONNELL: Will you mark that P-5.

(Minutes of special meeting of February 8, 1965 received and marked P-5 for identification.)

Q Would you just make reference to that. Would you read the comments of Mr. Agle. Start at the beginning there A Regular meeting of February 24, 1965. "The Chairman appointed Messrs. Aglè, Slater, Ten Eyck & Counsel Bowlby to a committee whose function it will be to prepare the recommendations of the Planning Board and Advisory Committee for presentation to the Planning Board, Township Committee and the public.

-

"Mr. Agle discussed proposed zoning changes in the Lamington, Pottersville, Pluckemin and Bedminster areas.

"Colonel Field requested that Mr. Agle prepare a small print of the changes proposed in commercial zones for distribution to the Planning Board and Advisory Committee.

Mr. Agle agreed to furnish such maps."

Q Would you just read the second paragraph thereof. The date of that meeting was what? A Special meeting of March 8, 1965. "Those present discussed the possible expansion of the business zone around the intersection at Bedminster Village. Mr. Agle recommended possible expansion of the business zone at the discretion of the Board, although he did not feel that it is presently necessary.

"Colonel Field expressed the opinion that the landowners along Somerville Road could object commercial use at the rear of their properties.

"Mr. Ten Eyck also objected to the expansion of the business zone on the southeast and southwest portion of the intersection.

"Mr. Agle thought possibly that zoning boundaries should be extended to property line boundaries.

"It was on motion by Chairman Fales, seconded by Mr.
Ballantine and carried that the business zone in Bedminster
Village retain its status quo and that the Master Plan note
that expansion may be necessary in the future."

4,

 Q Mrs. Sieminski, is there any reference to an office and research zone in that particular special meeting?

A No, I don't see any reference.

Q Would you please read that one paragraph.

A This is from the regular meeting of November 22, 1965.

Mayor Kean then submitted a report as acting chairman of the committee on zoning, a subcommittee of the Planning Board.

He requested that a resolution be adopted by the Planning Board recommending to the Township Committee that the Mayor and some other properly authorized person be directed to take immediate steps under the Green Acres and Housing and Home Finance Act to obtain federal and state funds for the purchase of open space as indicated on the Master Plan.

"He further advised that it is the recommendation of the subcommittee on zoning that application be made for assistance and continued planning.

"He suggested that the Planning Board should seek funds under these state programs sponsered by the Division of State and Regional Planning to the Department of Conservation and Economic Development at a cost of \$2,500 to the township and an equal cost to the state each year of the contract term.

"Chairman Fales noted that it would seem advisable to continue Mr. Agle's services.

"Mr. Agle advised that he would plan to attend every meeting of the Planning Board and an equal amount of special

.

ŧ.

Ť

22 -

"The Mayor read items contained in the agreements proposed.

"Counsel Bowlby recommended that a planner be on the staff of the Planning Board.

"It was regularly moved, seconded and carried that the Planning Board recommend to the Township Committee that an agreement be signed with the Division of State and Regional Planning for the item of continued planning with state aid."

Q Mrs. Sieminski, do you know if your minutes reflect any actual adoption of that or signing of that contract or obtaining of any Green Acre funds? A No. It was only a resolution passed to the effect that application be made to the Green Acres program for funds to purchase open space land, but there is nothing other than that.

Q Is there any specific mention of any particular property to which this money would be applied?

A No, there is not.

Q To your knowledge, were any funds ever obtained by the township for this purpose? A I can only say that there were, but I could not state definitely.

Q Could you just capsulize for the record what this was in reference to and then we will make a copy of it and the meeting date. A The regular meeting of January 24, 1966, it was a presentation of a petition to the Planning Board signed by forty-eight residents of Bedminster Township

asking the Planning Board to reconsider their recommendation for conversion of the triangle bound by U.S. 202 and 206 and Lamington Road.

Q In essence, what was the Planning Board's proposed use of that property? A Here is the thing, the petition.

Q Could you read the petition, the reason behind it.

A "We, the undersigned residents of the Township of

Bedminster, petition the Township Committee and the Planning

Board to reconsider the recommendation for conversion of the

triangle bounded by U.S. 202, U.S. 206 and Lamington Road

(County Road 523) for the following reasons:

"Number one. The site in question would constitute a hazard to public safety in that access and egress are via two state highways and one major county road. The future of these roads is not controllable by the Township of Bedminster.

"Number two. The land in question is now primarily devoted to residential use, having a good deal of the esthetic value which we feel desirable to maintain.

"Number three. We expect the area to be further degraded by the lack of enforcement of regulations governing business property. The lack of enforcement is evident in several business properties constructed after the adoption of the existing Zoning Ordinance.

10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

"Number four. The proposed business zone is in an area which is now saturated from the standpoint of population growth and will not effectively serve the anticipated growth and population to the west of the site.

"Number five. A shopping district in this area will completely negate the effect of the park land site being created to provide an attractive entrance to the Village of Bedminster from the south."

Mrs. Sieminski, the minutes which I would like to mark as P-6, do they reflect the discussion of the Planning Board in response to that petition? Well, there seemed to be some number of comments from various members in the audience at that time I guess relative to that petition.

Was there action taken by the Planning Board at that particular meeting? No, there does not seem to be any action taken, just listening to the comments from the public.

Is there any reference to an office and research zone in this area in their discussion?

> MR. ENGLISH: Could I suggest that since you propose to mark the minutes, there is the best answer.

If there is no reference in there, we will then mark it as P-6. Well, there does not seem to be any actual reference from what I can see. Most of the residents

11

14

15

- 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

Mrs. Sieminski, would you just reference this and then we will mark it. Α

asked the secretary to forward a copy."

Was there any answer to that?

Regular meeting of April 25,

1966.

Mrs. Sieminski, does that relate to an adoption of a zoning amendment? Α Well, the outcome of this was that on motion, seconded and carried, that the recommendations and as suggested by Counsel Bowlby be made to the Township

wanted to know whether or not those properties were going to remain in the business zone or going to remain in the residential zone.

There was no action taken. Α There was no formal action taken by the Board, no.

Q Please see if there are any other minutes which reflect action by the Board either on this particular question or again on the 1966 amendment to the ordinance.

A Regular meeting, February 28, 1966. "Mrs. Wossen questioned whether Mr. Agle had an opportunity to review the commentary submitted by the triangle group to the Planning Board."

no answer to the question. Mayor Kean pointed out that since

Mr. Agle's contract was just put into effect on this case,

that they had no prior knowledge of the commentary, except

perhaps what he might have read in the newspapers, Mr. Agle

A

There was

_

1 6

Committee. I believe that would have reference to the ordinance as we have outlined it there.

MR. O'CONNELL: We will mark that as P-6.

(Minutes of regular meeting of April 25, 1966 received and marked P-6 for identification.)

Q Again, the history of the zoning ordinance indicates the next amendment to the zoning ordinance occurred on December 19, 1966.

Will you please refer to the minutes and see if there are any references to either the prior amendment of May 16 or the subsequent amendment of December 19. Mrs. Sieminski, would you just refer to this. A Special meeting of December 15, 1966. "The purpose of the meeting was to consider an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. The amending ordinance was introduced by the Township Committee on December 5, 1966 and referred to the Planning Board by said committee pursuant to RS:55-35 and then the ordinance -- the language follows.

Q Are there any comments from the public on that particular adoption noted in the minutes?

A There was a comment only by one resident, a Mr. Buccini.
Mr. Buccini questioned why regulations were limited to the
Pluckemin area. He also questioned as to enforcement.

Q This particular amendment, did it deal primarily with the business zone? A A new article was added

concerning site plan approval in business zones.

Q. There is no reference to any amendment taking into account an office and research zone. A No.

Q. Is there any recommendation for multi-family dwellings in this particular amendment? A No.

A There are no reasons set forth in the minutes for the adoption of this amendment to the ordinance?

A There are no reasons set forth.

MR. ENGLISH: You don't want to mark that?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.

Some Again reading from the history of the ordinance itself,
the amendments to it, the next revision which is noted on
page 15 occurred on October 21st, 1968.

Do your minutes reflect any other prior amendment or change to the Zoning Ordinance or discussion by the Planning Board of any future change? A Regular meeting of May 22, 1967. "Chairman Slater reported that copies of the proposed changes in the Zoning Ordinance were distributed to members of the Board by Counsel Bowlby and an executive committee meeting would be held on June 7, 1967.to review same."

Q Mrs. Sieminski, are there any minutes to the executive committee meeting of June 7?

A I have none.

Do you take minutes at your executive committee meetings? A I have not been present at all. I have only been asked to attend two or three.

5	Q Mrs. Sieminski, what particular revision to the	
8	ordinance was discussed at this meeting? Are there any	
7	references in the minutes to what the revision is?	
8	A Some of the minutes would seem to me to have to do with	
9	the triangle.	
10	Q Is there a reference to research zone in the minute	3
11	of the November 27, 1967 meeting?	
12	MR. ENGLISH: I would like to suggest that	
13	it would be preferable in the case of long minutes	
14	like this to have them marked as an exhibit rather	
15	than put the burden on the witness to characterize	
16	accurately.	
17	MR. O'CONNELL: I intend to mark it as	
18	Exhibit P-7, but for the record, to set it off, I	. \
19	would like to have some indication as to the partic	ılaı
20	amendment that we are talking about, but if there	
21	are none, I will mark this as P-7.	ia.
22	A It would seem to me that this has to do with the change	
23	in the zoning around Lamington.	
24	Q In the triangle. A The research, Cottrell	
25	property. I don't know if it involves that particular piece	
	<u>;</u>	l

The second secon

の一般の

.

of property specifically, but a proposed change on both sides of Lamington Road from the comment that I see here.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think we can mark this as

(Minutes of regular meeting of November 27, 1967 received and marked P-7 for identification.)

Q Do your minutes reflect any subsequent change or comment as to the October 21st, 1968 revision of the Zoning Ordinance? These are just public comments.

A That's all.

MR. ENGLISH: Let the record please show that the witness has just submitted to the plaintiff's counsel certain minutes for his consideration with the result that he indicated the material therein was not pertinent to the subject of his inquiry.

MR. O'CONNELL: Again it should be noted it is some public comment at a January 22, 1968 regular meeting in which there was no comment or commentary by the Planning Board.

MR. ENGLISH: Let the record also show that on other occasions earlier in this deposition, similar occurrences have taken place of minutes being submitted which for some reason plaintiff's counsel did not deem pertinent to this inquiry.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think again the record

should reflect that those particular minutes did not involve any discussion or comments by the Planning Board relating to zoning changes or changes in the zoning ordinance.

"Chairman Slater reported that the revisions to the Zoning Ordinance had been completed by the Planning Board and that the Board was prepared to submit them to the Township Committee for their consideration. He then gave a general outline of those revisions.

"Mr. R. Earl Smith moved to submit these revisions to the Township Committee.

"Motion was seconded by Colonel Field and unanimously carried.

"Copy of these revisions together with revised zoning map are on file with the secretary."

Q There is no reference, Mrs. Sieminski, to what the revision is. A No. no reference.

Q There were no discussions as to the reason for the recommendation. A No, no discussions. I don't know whether or not that might be pertinent or of interest to you. Let me back up for a second.

Q I think that would be pertinent to the public discussion at that meeting. A Still March 25, 1968.

"There was substantial discussion on the subject of partial

changed from 1967 to 1968; 2. In Article V, Section 2, the date of the Revised Zoning Map and each of the 5 plates of which it consists be changed from 1967 to 1968." MR. O'CONNELL: Could we now mark it as P-8.

21

22

23

24

25

(Minutes of regular meeting of April 22, 1968) received and marked P-8 for identification.)

Would you please just refer to that and read the last two paragraphs and first two paragraphs on the second

_

"Chairman Slater stated that he received from Mr. John Vossen a recommendation as to a change he would like to see made in the description of the continuance of non-conforming uses in

Regular meeting of September 23, 1968.

the zoning ordinance.

"Mr. John Vossen then paraphrased his recommendation, indicating that it basically would allow a non-conforming use to be enlarged or altered so long as it would not be made more non-conforming than it was originally.

"He felt this would remove quite a burden from the people owning non-conforming structures and would also take care of the objections raised at the various public hearings and other meetings about partial and total destruction.

"Chairman Slater then thanked Mr. Vossen for submitting his recommendation and stated that the Board was very pleased to have it and would take it under advisement."

- Q Mrs. Sieminski, are there any comments by the Board to the zoning changes in those minutes?
- A No, not in that set of minutes.
 - Q Could you please refer to that particular meeting.
- A Regular meeting of October 28, 1968.
- Q Is there any reference to the proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance in that set of minutes?
- A I will read the first sentence. "The Board then began consideration of the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance which

. 4

^

had been passed on first reading by the Township Committee and forwarded to the Planning Board for review."

Then "Counsel Bowlby summarized the changes to which, in the main, deal with the creation of a new type zone.

(Research-Office) and the rules and regulations governing it; non-conforming uses (this taking into account the suggestions of the Committee for the Preservation of Bedminster); the reverting of the two properties behind the Bedminster Inn to business; the restoration of the business zone on the north-westerly corner of the Lamington Road intersection; and the establishment of the area of the two properties in the Research-Office zone, one being Research-Cottrell on the easterly side of the intersection and the other being the Rodenbach property on the westerly side."

Q There are no provisions in this amendment for any multi-family dwellings. A No.

MR. O'CONNELL: I would like to mark those minutes to that meeting of October 28, 1968 as P-9.

(Minutes of regular meeting of October 28, 1968 received and marked P-9 for identification.)

Q Mrs. Sieminski, again I am referring to the history of the Zoning Ordinance. There is noted on page 15 that a number of revisions took place in 1968, one on October 21st, 1968 and two on November 18, 1968.

The last set of minutes of the Planning Board which we

have indicated, that they occurred on October 28th.

2

discussion of the November 18th revision?

Ĭ

A I have nothing other than what you have.

5

Q October 28th is the only one. A The only thing I have on record.

Are there any minutes of the Planning Board which reflect

6

Q Again, the final amendment noted on page 15 of the Zoning Ordinance occurred on October 5, 1970.

8

10

Do the minutes of the Planning Board from October 28, 1968 until October 5, 1970 reflect any discussion by the Board of any revision to the Zoning Ordinance?

11

MR. O'CONNELL: Would you just read those two paragraphs into the record.

13

14

15

12

A Regular meeting, September 28, 1970. "The Board next considered an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance forwarded from the Township Committee which would cure the ambiguity

16

existing between the zoning ordinance and subdivision ordinance

17

as regards frontage on a street, i.e., the zoning ordinance

18 19

provides for fafty feet and thirty per cent of the lot width,

"On motion duly seconded and unanimously carried, the

20

while the subdivision ordinance provides for fifty feet.

21

Board voted to remove the thirty per cent of the lot width

22 23

requirement from the zoning ordinance and the secretary was

24

directed to so advise the Township Committee of its action

25

and recommendation."

Q Were there any other references to zoning changes in the minutes of that meeting? A No, none at all.

Q Were there any reasons given for the changes other than what was read? A No, nothing other than what was read.

Q Do any of your subsequent minutes reflect any discussion on any zoning change since, as I read this in the history, the last amendment occurred on October 5, 1970?

A There is nothing further in the minutes that I can see through 1970.

Q Mrs. Sieminski, to your knowledge and having reviewed the minutes to the Planning Board from its inception, there are no other official records of any comments or reasons or hearings held by the Planning Board regarding any zone change or revision other than the exhibits marked into the record today or those portions of those minutes read into the record by you today. A Nothing further to my knowledge.

Q Again to your knowledge, are there any other records kept by the Board other than the official records?

A No, just the matters of correspondence, little things that we keep in our regular files, nothing in the way of official records other than what appear in the minutes.

MR. O'CONNELL: I have no further questions on the zoning amendments. This would be a good time to break for lunch.

(At this point a recess was taken for lunch.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. O'CONNELL: (Continued)

Q Mrs. Sieminski, we have previously gone through the minutes of the Planning Board from 1950 to date. During that time I think you were making notations as to references to the Master Plan which was adopted by Bedminster.

Could you tell us on what date the Master Plan was adopted? Do you have additional copies of the Master Plan?

A No. As a matter of fact, this may be the only one in existence. All our members have copies. I do have one.

- Q On what date was the Master Plan adopted?
- A The Master Plan was adopted on July 28, 1965.
- Q As to the adoption date of July 28, 1965, who adopted the Master Plan on that date? A It was adopted by the Planning Board of Bedminster Township.
- Q Do your minutes for July 28, 1965 reflect discussion of the Master Plan?

MR. ENGLISH: For the record, the records say June 28th. There are no minutes between June and September.

Q What date do the minutes show as the date when the Master Plan was adopted? A On June 28, 1965, according to the records.

MR. O'CONNELL: I would like to mark the minutes

marked P-11 for identification.) Do your minutes reflect whether the Master Plan was ever recommended for adoption by the Township Committee? They might be in those other minutes. 9 There is no reference to any recommendation other 10 than might be noted on June 28. 11 The meeting prior to that one just has some public comment here. 12 To your knowledge, do you know whether the Township 13 Committee ever adopted the Master Plan? 14 That is a good question. I really don't know. 15 Prior to the adoption of the Master Plan on June 28, 16 1965 by the Planning Board, do your minutes reflect any 17 discussion by the Planning Board relating to the preparation 18 of a Master Plan and, more specifically, are there any 19 discussions in the minutes relating to the establishing of 20 an office and research zone, as to any multi-family zones 21 and as to any business zones? 22 I think we will have to go back to the first minutes 23 which are listed here. I think it is August 28, 1962. 24 I think that is May. 25

or the statements made therein are lengthy, I think that we can mark them and make copies of them.

MR. ENGLISH: May I ask a question for clarification. I understood a previous question you put to the witness limited your interest to references to business zone, office and research zone or multi-family housing zone. Is your question limited to that?

MR. O'CONNELL: Generally it's limited to any discussion. More specifically, we are primarily interested in those three aspects of it since we

MR. O'CONNELL: Generally it's limited to any discussion. More specifically, we are primarily interested in those three aspects of it since we are going to go to each and every meeting and I think it's a very general meeting, what comments, what reasons, what statements were made, what reference was made to the Master Plan starting with the May 28, 1962 meeting.

MR. ENGLISH: I will show Mr. O'Connell minutes of the meeting, regular meeting, of May 28, 1962 for the purpose of enabling him to determine whether anything therein contained is pertinent to his inquiry.

.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think this is the first establishing of the committee to study the Master Plan.

Read that portion of the minutes.

MR. ENGLISH: It's pretty long, nearly a page MR. O'CONNELL: All right. We will mark that as P-12 then.

(Minutes of regular meeting of May 28, 1962 received and marked P-12 for identification.)

Q The next reference to the Master Plan is at what meeting? A July 23, 1962.

Q Would you please read that into the record.

A July 23, 1962. "The Board generally discussed the proposed Master Plan study and it was determined that Mr. Brady would contact the firm of Charles Agle of Princeton, New Jersey and inform Mr. Agle that the Board intends to use his services."

Just read that or make reference to those paragraphs. The meeting is what date? A September 24, 1962. "Chairman Fales advised those present that in order to create a Master Plan it is necessary to have an advisor. He further stated that the Planning Board proposes to use federal aid through the 701 Program, which provides that 2/3 of the cost of the Master Plan shall be absorbed by the State of New Jersey and 1/3 shall be absorbed by the Township of Bedminster. Federal

"Mr. Agle advised that his contract for the creation of a Master Plan is with the State of New Jersey. The township's share of the cost is paid to the state and the state in turn pays the consultant. 9 "Chairman Fales informed those present that the creation 10 of a Master Plan takes from eighteen months to two years. "Mr. Agle stated that the township must make application 12 to the State of New Jersey for financial assistance in the 13 preparation of a Master Plan." 14 Is there any other reference to the Master Plan 15 itself? No, just financing. Α. 16 Q Other than the actual financing of the Master Plan 17 itself, there is no comment as you see it as to what would be 18 encompassed into the Master Plan. No, not in that 19 set of minutes. 20 Q The next set of minutes which refer to the Master 21 Plan are on what date? 22 MR. ENGLISH: Let me show you, Mr. O'Connell. 23 the minutes of October 23, 1962 in case you find 24 anything in there pertinent to your inquiry. 25

para to the State of New Jersey.

Q Would you read from the second paragraph on, Mrs. Sieminski. A Special meeting, October 23, 1962.

"Chairman Fales discussed the general characteristics of the township land area. He advised that the Board will plan to meet monthly with Mr. Agle.

"He further stated that Mr. Agle would like to have ideas as to planning from residents of various sections of Bedminster Township.

"Mr. Agle advised those present that he has not done any specific planning as yet since he does not have a contract with the state. He stated that he has driven over every road in the township and has looked at the exterior of a number of homes in the area.

"He further stated that he has obtained and studied a geodetic map furniship topographical information relative to the township.

"He further stated that he has also studied the available maps of FAI-287 and I-78 and their alignment through the township.

"He stated that he would like to meet with people from the various township areas after which he can discuss the possible choices for planning."

Q Are there any other references to the Master Plan in those particular minutes? A No specific references to the Master Plan.

witness handed Mr. O'Connell the minutes of the meeting of December 4, 1962. Would you identify the meeting for the record. 8 Special meeting of December 4, 1962. 9 MR. O'CONNELL: 10 I think I would like to mark that as P-13. 11 (Minutes of special meeting of December 4, 1962 12 received and marked P-13 for identification.) 13 MR. O'CONNELL: 14 Why don't we mark that also P-13, both meetings. 15 (Minutes of special meeting of January 29, 1963 16 received and marked P-13 for identification.) 17 I would prefer to read into the minutes as much as 18 we can as far as discussion with reference to the Master Plan. 19 The next reference after January 29, 1968 is on what date? 20 Well, we have a reference but I don't know whether or 21 not this can be considered specifically with regard to the 22 Master Plan. 23 It seems to have started out with a discussion on a sub-24 division that was proposed over in Pottersville and some of 25

record snow that the

Route FIA-287 interchange. A general discussion of the effects of the new highways and the interchange followed."

Q Mrs. Sieminski, is there any reference to specific statements regarding the 287, Route 287, interchange in those minutes? A No, there is no mention of anything other than what I have read.

Q Thank you. The next reference to the Master Plan occurred on what date? A Special meeting of May 1st,

Q Would you please read this for the record.

A Special meeting, May 1; 1963. "The secretary distributed copies of Mayor Kean's memorandum stating the reasons for the Mayor's opposition to Mr. Agle's recommendation in connection with a request to the New Jersey State Highway Department for a slip-on-slip-off ramp on Route I-78 east of Route 202-206, Pluckemin, New Jersey. Mayor's memorandum is also on file with the secretary.

"A general discussion of the recommended slip-on-slip-off ramp followed the reading of Mayor Kean's memorandum.

"All members present expressed their own individual views in connection with the proposal.

"It was regularly moved, seconded and unanimously carried that a slip-on-slip-off ramp to and from the east on I-78 be recommended to the Township Committee."

Mrs. Sieminski, do you have a copy of Mayor Kean's

memorandum which was made part of the public record?

A I am now looking at a file folder that is marked "Master Plan" and I see no memorandum from Mayor Kean in this particular file.

Mrs. Sieminski, do you know where else the memorandum might be located? A I have another file that I brought with me called "Township Committee to Planning Board Correspondence" and another "Township Committee from Planning Board" and I can look in both of these files.

I have no Mayor's memorandum as such in both of these files that I referred to.

Q Where else might the memorandum be located? Do you know who might have possession of the memorandum?

A It might be in the office of the township attorney or

it might be in the office of the township clerk.

Q Then, in other words, you don't keep all the records for the Planning Board yourself. A Well --

MR. ENGLISH: This is before the witness became secretary, you will recall.

MR. O'CONNELL: I understand that.

Q I understand it was before, but you seem to have records from before you became secretary. I was wondering who else might have records prior to your becoming secretary. A These are all the records that were left in the file cabinets when I took on the job.

some of the records he may have kept in the township records. Mr. Robertson might have them. 7 Α Yes. Would anyone else have access to these files? 8 I would say only Board counsel or the township clerk. 9 Was Mr. Bowlby the attorney at the time of the 10 adoption of the Master Plan, of this meeting in 1963? 11 Yes, I believe so. Q What is the next reference? 13 May 27, 1963. A There seems to be a lot here. There seems to be some comments 14 from residents and also a listing of the Mayor's Advisory 15 Committee there. 16 MR. O'CONNELL: We will mark that as P-15, 17 a regular meeting of May 27, 1963. 18 (Minutes of regular meeting of May 27, 1963 19 received and marked P-15 for identification.) 20 The next reference, Mrs. Sieminski, is on what date? 21 June 24, 1963. 22 Would you read that reference to us. 23 "Mr. Agle submitted a memorandum dated June 24th, 1963, 24 which memorandum was explained by Mr. Agle with the use of 25

聖司 网络大牛科

3

5

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

several maps. A general discussion of the contents of the memorandum and the Master Plan program followed."

Do you have a copy of Mr. Agle's memorandum? I have a file folder here in which I have all Mr. Agle's reports, at least those that were available in the file.

I am going to ask at a future time and I might as well ask it now, to have copies of all of the specific reports in relation to the Master Plan study. Are these all the reports of Mr. Agle? These all are Mr. Agle's Α reports. However, they don't go back that far. The reports I have only come from 1967 to current date.

In other words, all of the reports of Mr. Agle are subsequent to the adoption of the Master Plan.

A Yes.

You have no records of any reports prior to the adoption of the Master Plan. I don't seem to have Α any, no.

Would someone else have them? Q Α Well, Mr. Agle certainly should have copies of the reports he submitted and again, Board counsel and the township clerk may have them.

But the only ones on file with you as secretary of the Planning Board are subsequent to the Master Plan.

As far as I know.

The next reference to the Master Plan occurred on what date? A August 26, 1963.

MR. O'CONNELL: I would like to have that marked P-16.

(Minutes of regular meeting of August 26, 1963 received and marked P-16 for identification.)

- Q There is reference made in P-16 to a report of August 26, 1963, a report of Mr. Agle. A I am again in the same position as I was with the last one.
 - Q You don't have any copies of that.
- A No.
 - Q The next reference to the Master Plan.
- A May 24, 1964. You better change that to May 25, 1964.
 - Q There was no May 24th meeting. A No.
- Q Would you read that report. A Special meeting, May 25, 1964. "The consultant suggested that vulnerable points be acted upon in order to make progress with the various phases of the proposed Master Plan project.

"He stated that the alternative to an immediate action is to wait until the whole picture is clear and then act.

"He further stated that the statutes provide that the Board may take partial action at any time."

- Q Would you identify the consultant for the record.
- A Mr. Charles K. Agle.
- Q Is there any other reference to the Master Plan in those minutes? A No, there are not any more references to the Master Plan. "Mr. Agle distributed land use maps to

"Mr. Agle suggested five acre zoning along the major 6 routes." 7 Is there any reference as to what highways they are 8 It is not set forth. referring to? 9 Do you have copies of the maps referred to? 10 I don't believe so, at least I have never seen them in 11 my files. The next reference would be on what date? 13 It seems to be January 25, 1965. 14 Would you just identify that this is subsequent to 15 other applications and what occurred and then we will mark 16 that as P-17. A This took place at the regular meeting 17 of January 25, 1965. It appears to be a discussion on a 18 memorandum prepared by Mr. Agle and presented entitled "Master 19 Plan for Bedminster draft." That is dated January 25, 1965. 20 Do you have in your files again copies of that 21 memorandum? I don't believe so. Just let me check 22 that Master Plan folder once again. 23 MR. ENGLISH: Off the record. 24 (Discussion off the record.) 25

adjacent to new highway.

(Minutes of regular meeting of January 25, 1965 received and marked P-17 for identification.)

- Q What is the next reference? A February 8, 1965 is the next. This happens to have been marked when we were going through the zoning.
 - Q That was marked as P-5. A Yes.
- Q We have copies of that. A Yes. The speciall meeting of February the 8th, 1965 has already been identified as P-5.
 - Q What is the next reference? A April 12, 1965.
- Q Would you just identify it as to the hearing and we will mark that P-18. A Special meeting, April 12, 1965, informal hearing on the proposed Master Plan for the Township of Bedminster.

(Minutes of special meeting of April 12, 1965 received and marked P-18 for identification.)

- Q The next reference to the Master Plan. This is a regular meeting of April 26th. A There are some other comments by the general public apparently. Take a look at those together.
- Q Would you identify those as the regular meeting for the record. A The next regular monthly meeting of April 26, 1965.
- Q At which time what occurred? Were there public discussions of the Master Plan? A The purpose of this

Yes.

Α

23

24

25

"Chairman Slater then appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Gavin, Mr. R. Earl Smith and himself to meet with Mr. Agle

·7

and Counsel Bowlby for the purpose of updating the Master Plan and official map."

Q Is there any other reference? A We have noted another date here, October 26, 1970.

Q Would you read that. A Regular meeting,
October 26, 1970. "In other business, Kenneth C. MacKenzie,
Esq. of Harding and McKenzie, Esqs., Morristown, New Jersey,
representing Lanid Corporation, said corporation having
presented a proposal in June 1970 for the rezoning of property
owned by it in the township, asked the Board of any decision
had been reached.

"Chairman Gavin stated that the Planning Board was considering revising the Master Plan and therefore requested that this matter be held in abeyance.

"Mr. MacKenzie indicated Lanid was still interested.

"Chairman Gavin also stated that the Board would consider the Master Plan revision before ruling on either Lanid's proposal or that of Western Electric."

Q Mrs. Sieminski, there is reference to a possible revision of the Master Plan in the minutes of October 26, 1970.

Do you have any other records or minutes indicating any revision to or proposed revision to the Master Plan?

A Yes.

Q Would you please read that into the record then.

l

A February 22, 1971. "Chairman Gavin then asked the Board to consider the areas in which they felt the Master Plan should be updated.

"The properties involved in the requests of Lanid Corporation and Johns Manville for zoning changes and the entire research-office zone were mentioned.

"It was Mr. Agle's suggestion that if possible the township should not make changes until such time as a good state plan was in effect."

Are there any other references in your minutes to any revision to the Master Plan? A Not in that set of minutes. Regular meeting, June 28, 1971. "In other business, the Board considered favorably the revisions to the Master Plan submitted to it by the committee responsible for updating the Master Plan.

"The Board set Monday, July 26, 1971 as the date for public hearing and requested counsel to draw up the proper notices required."

Q Mrs. Sieminski, do you have a copy of the report which was mentioned as being submitted to the Flanning Board by the Master Plan committee? A I think this is the report. I think that must be the report to which we are referring, although I don't have it.

MR. ENGLISH: The witness is referring to a two-page report dated June 14, 1971.

I believe Mr. Gavin, the Chairman, from whom the report issued originally would be the one to identify it positively. 8 May I retain a copy of this for myself? 9 A Yes. I have several copies. The next meeting is July 26. 10 1961 and that is a regular meeting at which the public hearing 11 took place. 12 July 26, 1971. Yes. Q 13 MR. O'CONNELL: I think we will mark that as 14 P-21. 15 (Minutes of regular meeting of July 26, 1971 16 received and marked P-21 for identification.) 17 Do your minutes reflect any further action by the 18 Planning Board on the revision or any comments on the Master 19 Plan itself? Well, in the minutes of August the 23rd, 20 1971 there is a statement by the Chairman. 21 "Chairman Gavin announced to the audience that the Board 22 would not be taking any action relative to the revisions to 23 the Master Plan. He indicated the Board's desire to have more 24 time to consider the comments made at the public hearing." 25

25

No, not of the file as I have it, no.

21 .

Q The next to the last item referred to in the appendix are minutes of subcommittees. Do you have copies of the minutes of the subcommittees? A No, I do not.

Q Do you know who would have minutes of the subcommittees? A Well, it would be my suggestion to
discuss that with the Chairman. He might have knowledge of
any minutes that were taken at the subcommittee meetings.

Q You don't act as secretary to the subcommittee.

A No, I do not.

Q In your file marked Master Plan or any other file which you have as part of the records of the Planning Board, do you have any other reports relating to either the Master Plan, the one adopted in 1965, or any revision thereof or proposed revision thereof submitted by either Mr. Agle or any other consultant? A No. The only reports, as I indicated before, that I have from Mr. Agle start in 1967.

Q Would you please identify each of the reports by the date and reference, if there is a title to them.

A Do you want me to give you a list of them or not and determine whether or not they have a bearing on the Master Plan?

Q Would you just read them and then we will mark them.

A Nomember 27, 1967. The subject of this report is

"Design standards for subdivisions."

July 25, 1968, subject, library location interim discussion.

The next is May 26, 1969, discussion of library site.

April 24, 1970, comments on proposed county subdivision and site planning resolutions.

May 25, 1970 rest area sites on I-78.

July 27, 1970, zoning ordinance to match subdivision regulations.

December 14, 1970, rezoning of Schley property for Western Electric.

The next is January 20, 1971, the planned residential neighborhood.

The next is February 18, 1971, program for civic center.

- Q. What is the date on that again?
- A February 18, 1971. The last one is April 14, 1971, flood plain protective zoning. Those are all the reports I have from Mr. Agle.
- Q Do you have reports from any other consultant relating to planning or zoning? A No.
- Q Do you have any correspondence from individuals relating to either the Master Plan or any zoning revision?

 A I have a file folder entitled "General correspondence."

 Without going through it piece by piece, I do not know whether or not there might be some letters here from the public regarding any one of these particular subjects.
- Q Do you have a separate file relating to any correspondence regarding the construction of the interchange

of I-287 and I-78? A I do not believe there is a file, at least I don't have any here with me. I don't seem to recall anything in the file having to do with that.

Again, you are the official record keeper of the Planning Board and have been since 1966.

A Yes.

Q To your knowledge, no one else would have the records of the Planning Board. A Not the records of the Planning Board as I know them. If there were reports which might have been submitted, as I just said, to the Chairman, I may not have them in my file.

Q But you would have or should have all the reports which are of a public nature. A I should have.

Q Do you have any correspondence in your files which further refer to the Green Acres fund, the application which was made in 1965? A Not that I can specifically remember as such.

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you.

MR. ENGLISH: No questions.

PAUL F. GAVIN, having been duly sworn according to law by the Officer, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LANIGAN:

Mr. Gavin, you are here in response to a notice of

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

્ર14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Pluckemin center? A Yes, I am familiar with it.

Q Approximately how far is that from your own residence?

- A I would say three and a half, about three and a half to four miles.
- Q Mr. Gavin, as Chairman of the Planning Board, do you have a familiarity with the Master Plan which was adopted some time I guess in 1965? A Yes, I do.
- Q Would you like to review that a little bit or look it over at all? Have you looked it over lately?
- A I have not looked at it. Do you mean the text of it?
 - Q Yes. A I haven't looked it over in some months.
 - Q You are quite familiar with it.
- A I am familiar with it, yes.
- Q Perhaps we can get another copy of it that you can follow.

MR. ENGLISH: I have another one here.

- Q Going first to the appendix, Mr. Gavin, do you know the location of these various reports which are referred to in the appendix? A The present location of the reports?
 - Q Yes. A. No.
 - Q You don't have them. A I do not have them.
 - Q Is it probable that your planner has them?
- A I would think that is probable.
 - Q Who is your planner? A Charles K. Agle,

.9

10

11 12

13

--

13

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

A-g-1-e.

Q Mr. Gavin, are you familiar with the property in connection with this lawsuit, the property comprising some 467 acres, owned by the Allan-Deane Corporation?

A Yes, I know where it is.

Q Could you describe in your own terms where it is in the township? A I am not too good on north, south, east and west.

- Q In your own terms of reference, where is it?
- A It is on the northeast side of Pluckemin.
 - Q Are you familiar with that area?
- A Reasonably.

Q Mr. Gavin, I am going to show you some pictures and I am going to ask if you can identify them.

MR. LANIGAN: The first picture I would like to have marked as P-22.

(Photograph received and marked P-22 for identification.)

- Q I ask you if you can describe that now.
- A Yes. That would be the corner of Route 202, 206 and Burnt Mills Road.
 - Q Can you tell what direction it is looking?
- A Well, it would be taken from the front of the Span real estate office looking towards the old Woolman house.
 - Q What type of use is in that house now?

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13

· 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

I do not know, I do not know.

Can you tell from the photograph? No.

Looking to the right-hand side of the picture, do you recognize that building? That is what is Yes. generally known as the Pluckemin Store.

Is that a liquor store? One part of it is Α a liquor store, on the ground floor, and the other part of it is the grocery store.

Do you have any idea how far away that is from the Allan-Deane property, approximately? I guess the Allan-Deane property would come in on the other side of that road called Knox Avenue, the other end of the A & P shopping center.

- Yes. Four hundred feet. A
- Thank you. I show you this picture.

Α Yes.

> MR. LANIGAN: I ask that it be marked P-23. (Photograph received and marked P-23 for identification.)

Can you describe what that is and where it is? I believe that that is the rear of the shopping center in Pluckemin looking again from near the Span real estlate office property.

How far away from the Allan-Deane property?

From where the picture is taken?

Q Yes. A Well, you can see that fence up there.

That is at the embankment. I think there is only a road

separating it, two hundred feet.

MR. LANIGAN: Would you mark this photograph, please.

(Photograph received and marked P-24 for identification.)

Q I show you the next picture. Do you recognize that picture? Can you describe that? A Yes. That is just the opposite view from the one you just showed me, standing I guess somewhere in the vicinity of the street called Knox Avenue.

Q That is a picture of what? A It is a picture again of the rear of the A & P shopping center.

MR. LANIGAN: The next picture will be marked P-25.

(Photograph received and marked P-25 for identification.)

Q I show you this next picture marked P-25 and ask you if you can describe that picture? A Yes. That is again a photograph of the rear of the shopping center in Pluckemin.

(Photograph received and marked P-26 for identification.)

Q I show you the next picture marked P-26. Can you describe that? A Yes. That is a photograph of the

front of the Pluckemin shopping center taken from the parking lot.

Q Can you identify any of the land in the background towards the top of the shopping center?

A Well, I of course can see the hills but I am -- yes, the hills that run up along Washington Valley Road.

Q Is that the Allan-Deane land? A Some of it I believe is.

(Photograph received and marked P-27 for identification.)

Q I show you picture marked P-27 and ask if you can identify that and tell us what it is. A That is a picture taken from the parking lot of the Pluckemin shopping center looking toward Woolman's Corner.

- Q What is in the picture? Is there a bus in the picture?
- A No. There is an old garage in the picture.
 - Q Is that garage still in use, do you know?
- A I don't think it is in use. It is still there but it is not in use I don't think.

(Photograph received and marked P-28 for identification.)

- Q I show you picture marked P-28 and ask you if you can identify that for us. A Yes. That is a view of the Roy Barker bus operation.
 - Q About how far is that from the Allan-Deane property?

Oh, five hundred feet.

Q What is the color of those buses?

Yellow.

Q Light yellow or dark yellow or what?

Indescribe it as a school bus yellow, whatever that means. I don't know.

> (Photograph received and marked P-29 for identification.)

I show you the next picture marked P-29 and ask if you can describe it. That is a former Esso gas A station on the west side of Route 202-206.

Is it in use? Α No.

Where is that property located in relation to the I believe that is directly Allan-Dean property? A opposite.

Directly in front of it. A Yes. Q -(Photograph received and marked P-30 for identification.)

I show you the next picture marked P-30 and ask you Q. if you can identify that. Α That is the Sunoco station on the west side of Route 202-206.

Is it in use? Α Yes.

Where is that located with reference to the Allan-Deane property? That is opposite it. Α

Q Directly in front of it. A Yes.

10 11

6

7

8

9

12

13

. 14 ['] 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Photograph received and marked P-31 for identification.)

- Q I show you the next picture marked P-31 and ask you if you can identify what that shows. A That is the new State Highway Department maintenance garage also on the west side of Route 202-206.
- Q Where is that located with reference to the Allan-Deane property? A That is opposite it.
 - Q Directly in front of it. A Yes.
- Q Are you familiar at all with the use to which that facility is going to be put? A Well, fairly, yes, I remember.
 - Q What use is it going to be put to?
- A For the storage of and maintenance of State Highway

 Department vehicles that will be servicing Routes 287 and 78.
 - Q Is there a heliport contemplated for that facility?
- A Yes. There is a helipad that is there.
 - Q Is it presently being used, if you know?
- A I don't know.
- Q Did the Planning Board take any position with respect to the installation of this facility? A We were consulted about it.
 - Q Did you approve of it or object to it?
- A I don't believe that we had or it was our province to object to it or to approve it.

Q Irrespective of officially, did you approve or disapprove of it either publicly -- A We reviewed it

Q What were your comments? A I cannot remember that. That is several years ago.

Q Would those comments be a matter of record some place?

A I do not know.

Q To whom did you forward your comments?

A I did not say that we made any comments.

Q I am sorry. I understood they were written comments.

A No.

Q What were the comments? A I don't remember. We had a meeting with the gentlemen from the State Highway Department. I don't know what they called it at that time. I would say it was the State Highway Department and the state police who showed us the courtesy of reviewing the plans with us.

Q Did you or members of the Planning Board try to talk them out of it? A No, because I believe my recollection is that we were told that we had no jurisdiction over it, no authority to prevent it.

Q From your recollection, can you summarize your attitude or the Planning Board's attitude towards the facility at that time? A I can't summarize the Planning Board's feelings. My own were that and are that I am sorry that it had to be there.

describe it, P-32. A That is a picture of the Pluckemin Inn or Pluckemin Tavern. I do not know for sure what they call it. Pluckemin Tavern it says on there. Where is that located with reference to the Allan-Deane property? That is also on the west side of A 9 202-206. II am not absolutely certain if that is directly in 10 front of your property or not. I am not sure. 11 Pretty close. Close, yes. 12 Q. Mr. Gavin, did you participate at all in the 13 consultation or planning which took place with the location 14 of Route 78 and 287? No. 15 That was prior to your time. Yes. 16 Mr. Gavin, do you have any knowledge of traffic flows 17 through the Village of Pluckemin on Route 202? 18 No. A 19 Do you know whether any studies have ever been made? Q 20 No. I do not. 21 You and the Planning Board have not made any. 22 Not to my knowledge. 23 Q Have you ever made any traffic studies of any of 24 the roads in the area as a Planning Board or authorized any? 25

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

... 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Not to my knowledge.

Q Have you as a Planning Board ever made any investigations of the sewage in the area? A In the area of Pluckemin?

Q Yes. A No.

Q You have never considered that. A Well, we have considered the presence or absence of sewers in Pluckemin. We never had made any studies.

Q In what respects? A We have considered the absence of sewers in Pluckemin in the planning that we have tried to do for Pluckemin.

Q For what reason? A Well, to try to keep the planning in step with the facilities that are or are not there.

Q You mean you have health problems there.

A I am not aware of that. That would be the board of health.

I don't get involved with that at all.

 $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{So}(k)}$. You are not familiar with any health problems.

A No, sir.

Q Or any areas that require sewers in the area of Pluckemin. A To the best of my knowledge, there are no sewers in Pluckemin.

Q No, there are not. Are you familiar with any areas that require them as a result of a health problem?

A No.

Q You have not at any time consulted with anyone with

respect to the sewering or the sewer problems of the township.

- A I have not, no.
 - Q Or as the Planning Board I mean.
- A I am not knowledgeable about that. I do not know.
 - Q At least since you have been on it.
- A Not that I know of, no.
 - Q Could it have occurred without your knowledge?
- A Yes.
- Q By whom? A Well, I would not know if it was without my knowledge.
- Q Do you have a subcommittee or anything on the Planning Board in charge of sewers? A No. That is the board of health.
- Q Do you know whether the Planning Board has ever made any recommendation to the township with respect to the Green Acres Program? A You mean with respect to the land that Bedminster acquired under the program?
- Q Or simply stated, you are familiar, are you not, with the Green Acres Program? A I am aware of it. I would not say I am terribly knowledgeable.
 - Q The availability of funds to purchase lands.
- A Yes.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Has the Planning Board recommended the purchase of lands and have they participated in that to your knowledge?

A Not to my knowledge, not since I have been on the Planning

Q With respect to the so-called historical sites in the area, are you familiar with them? A I am aware of the existence of some historical sites, yes.

- Q In the Pluckemin area. A Yes.
- Q You are aware of them. A Yes.
- Q How are you aware of them? A Well, just general knowledge in town that there had been a significant encampment there during the revolution. I think that there are one or two State Highway Department markers which define where the route of Washington's Army was coming back from Princeton and the other so-called Dorman House and the Planning Board did hear a very interesting discussion by a gentleman from Staten Island who was doing his master's paper on the historical significance of the encampment at Pluckemin.
- Q Are these encampments evidenced by anything tangible that you can look at? A The student said there was.
- Q Does the Planning Board have any knowledge or have you ever seen them? A No.
- Q So that the historical significance of Pluckemin is that it was an encampment area. A It was an encampment area and it was the location where the first military school was established for the Continental Army.
 - Q Did that school exist? A Now?
 - Q Yes, sir. A No. This is during the

Master Plan, Section 5, that with respect to through traffic,

Gavin-direc

25

1	few are more fortunate than Bedminster in its location in the	
2	regional highway pattern. Interstate 78 on the south will	
3.	lead to Manhattan in thirty-seven miles or about forty minutes.	*1
4	A Right.	
	Q Do you know what the derivation of that is?	
5		
6		
7	possible.	
8	Q Do you have any special knowledge when Route 78 is	
9	going to be done? A No.	
10	Q In reference to the Master Plan, did you participate	
11	in any way in the enactment of the original Master Plan?	
12	A Yes. I was on an advisory committee to the Planning Board	
13	prior to the adoption of the Master Plan.	
14	Q Which committee? A I'm sorry?	
15	Q Which committee? A An advisory committee.	
16	Q Overall advisory. A Yes.	
17	Q So that you have some familiarity with what evolved	
18	as the Master Plan, having advised the Planning Board.	
19	A Yes.	
20	Q Looking at the Master Plan with reference to item	
21	No. 2, residential development, first of all, were there any	
22	minutes of the advisory committee meetings?	
23	A I do not remember.	
24	Q Do you have any recollection of conversations or	
4.3	II ·	

discussions which took place?

25

No.

.

.

Q At that time did you consider the residential development of the township? A Yes.

Q Did you consider the existing zoning at that time?

I am sure we must have.

Q Did you make any provision at that time or discuss the use of multi-family use for the township in residential development? A I cannot remember it.

Q Was there any discussion or any feeling on the part of the advisory committee that the acreage requirement should be reduced from five acres? A No.

Q Can you express a reason as to why, if there were no discussions, why there were no discussions with respect to the multi-family use first? A I would say probably a total absence of demand for multi-family dwellings.

Q How about with respect to the reduction of the acreage requirements? A No. There was a discussion of increasing the acreage requirement, but I cannot remember any of reducing it.

Q Thank you. With respect to the commercial development, can we say that the commercial development is confined reasonably to two sections of the township?

A I think so.

Q Pluckemin and the so-called Bedminster center.

A If you mean by commercial business, yes.

Q Did you at any time increase that development zone

7

11

12

10

13 4

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

erosion, damage.

25

as a result of your advisory committee? A I cannot remember.

Q With respect to the research and development facilities, do you recall any of the conversations which prompted this new concept, research and research development facilities?

A I honestly cannot tell you who said what or when and why.

- Q You did not have it in the township prior to that time. A Yes.
- Q Do you recall any of the reasoning as to why you should have it then? A I can't honestly remember it now, no.
- Q With respect to traffic control, you are not in any way familiar with any traffic surveys which were done.
- A Not by the Planning Board, no.
 - Q Or any traffic surveys that you relied upon.
- A I seem to think that Mr. Agle had done some work in the traffic study area but I would not be sure.
- Q With respect to the conservation which is item 6, the intention of the Planning Board to protect the streams and prevent erosion, what other concepts did the Planning Board have in putting a section of conservation in at that time? A Well, I think that part of it was to reflect the existing topography of the township, to preserve the streams, prevent
 - Q Most of it refers, does it not, to flood plain and

. 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

flood possibility? A Yes, it seems to.

Q In terms of historical significance or historical sites, is there any reference to that in the Master Plan?

A I do not know. I cannot remember it.

Q Presumably it was not considered then.

MR. ENGLISH: You mean by his advisory group.

MR. LANIGAN: Yes, by his advisory group.

MR. BOWLBY: All these questions pertain to the advisory group.

MR. LANIGAN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I can't fix it in time, but I know we discussed very seriously the colonial character of Pluckemin or attempt to preserve it as a village.

In fact, the so-called Pluckemin by-pass which is on the Master Plan was intended for that purpose, to attempt to preserve Pluckemin as a colonial village.

- Q The by-pass went where? A It never really went anywhere, but it was on the Master Plan to by-pass Pluckemin to the north.
 - Q On the Allan-Deane property.

MR. BOWLBY: If you know.

- A Yes, I believe it would have included part of that.
- Q So that the intention of the Master Plan would be to reroute the highway across the Allan-Deane property.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

A Yes.

Q To preserve the village character of Pluckemin.

A Yes.

Q Jumping now to 1970, if that is the proper year, what did the Planning Board commence its studies of the revision of the Master Plan? At this time you can speak as Chairman of the Planning Board. A Yes. I believe that they were originally started prior to July of 1970 under the previous Chairman.

Q When you took over as Chairman, did you continue?

A Not immediately.

Q When did you start? A Well, I would have to look back at my calendar. I think we started or restarted our meetings again, about January of 1971.

Q So there were no meetings, at least to your knowledge, from July until January. A That is correct.

Q From July 1970 until January of 1971.

A Yes.

Q At that time did you commence meetings again?

A Yes.

Q What meetings took place? Are they evidenced by minutes? A No, we did not have any minutes. We had I believe three meetings at my home and at least two and I think three field visits.

Q Field. A Field trips.

20 21

22

23

24

25

23

24

25

Q Where you went out into the area. A Yes, the area that was under consideration in the updating of the Master Plan.

Q With respect to those revisions, they culminated, did they not, in a memo to the Planning Board from you?

A Yes.

Q Are you familiar with that memo?

A Yes.

Q Mr. Gavin, with respect to a memo which is entitled "Memo to Bedminster Planning Board from Paul Gavin, Chairman, dated June 14, 1971, will you look that over and I am going to ask you a few questions with respect to it.

A Yes.

Q What revisions did you make, if any, to the Pluckemin area in this Master Plan revision? A None as yet.

Q What was proposed? A The elimination of the Pluckemin by-pass and the conversion to I think one acre zone of a small piece that was isolated on 78 and 287 and a change to five acres in the rear of the Pluckemin church.

Q Beginning with the by-pass, what was the Planning Board's reason for eliminating the by-pass?

A Well, the fact that Pluckemin has become a small shopping center -- correction, not shopping center, has more stores than were originally contemplated.

Q You have told us the reason for the by-pass was to

Gavin-direct

25

STATE OF THE PARTY
8

9

10 11

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LANIGAN: I accept that change.

I have forgotten about the one THE WITNESS:

section.

How about the acreage behind the Presbyterian church?

That was converted to five acres.

From what? From one.

What was the reasoning for that?

The ideal location of it, the undeveloped character of it and the compatibility of it with the rest of the area.

Q Most of that acreage abuts 287, does it not?

Most of it did. It's high above 287, right.

Q Did you make any changes with respect to the office research zone or the proposed changes, rather?

The research-office zone?

Q Yes, as it had been originally designated on the Master Plan. A. Are you referring to research-office or research development?

I am going to research-office first and then research Q development. All right. Research-office is in the Α zoning ordinance.

Q Where is it located? Α On the southwest corner of Route 202-206 and Lamington Road.

In a large triangle, so to speak.

No, opposite the triangle, the other side of 206.

Could you show us with reference to this map.

- A Which one is the R-O, research and office?
 - Q Yes. A This piece right here.
 - Q About how large a piece is that?
- A I don't know.
- Q Is it one hundred acres or five acres or approximately how many? A I would say it runs for 1,500 feet on Route 206.
- Q And to what depth? A It varies. The deepest depth back from 206 would probably be 1,000 feet.
- Q What about the other zones, the research, so-called research type that you have designated in your Master Plan, that is, the original Master Plan? A Yes.
- Q Where is that located, describe it for us, if you can. A Well, there are two pieces bordering Route: 78 and south of 78 and on the opposite sides of Route 202-206.
- Q Approximately how far is that from the Pluckemin center? A Oh, 2,000 feet.
- Q Where are the other zones, research zones?

 A The other one is what is referred to as the Brady-Pontin property which is bounded by 202-206, Schley Mountain Road and Route 287.
- Q Is there a third piece? A Yes. There was another piece that was on the west side of 202-206, between 202 and 206 and 287 and the fourth one was a piece that is bounded by the Borough of Far Hills, Route 287 and the

; **.**

3

í.

6

.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

. 22

24

25

Raritan River.

Q You stated you cannot recall what the reasons were for making that revision as an advisory board member.

Can you tell us what the reasons were for the changes which took place with respect to that property on your Master Plan revision, your proposed revision, or did you leave them the same?

A As far as all of them are concerned?

Q All of them, beginning at the one next to 78.

A All right. The one on the west side of 202-206 and south of 78 was left as research and development, R & D.

The piece opposite it, the other side of 202-206, was also left that way. However, its use is and has been and probably will be a YMCA camp.

Q Nonetheless, it was left the same way.

A Yes.

Q How about the piece immediately to the north of 287 called Brady-Pontin pieces? A I would want to check my records to check that. I am not absolutely sure. May I?

Q Sure. A That was to be left as research-type.

Q Where is that specifically? A All of the land southeast of the interchange should remain as shown on the Master Plan. I can't just remember exactly what we did with that piece there.

Q Isn't that the piece that you designated as a motel site?

A I cannot tell you. I would want to check my

3

5

.

8

10

. .

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

records to see what we did with that piece.

Q Will you consult your memorandum. What piece did you designate as motel site? A The one that I am more sure of is the Brady-Pontin piece.

- Q That is to the north of 287. A Yes.
- Q North of -- A North and west.
- Q Will it help if I refresh your recollection that the Planning Board felt that piece below 287 was owned by the Keans? A I know the piece you mean.
- Q You cannot recall what your revision is for that piece. A No, I do not remember that.
 - Q Has it been left in office-research?
- A I do not remember. I can't answer you. I would have to check.
 - Q Your memorandum doesn't disclose it.
- A I can't discuss it with you any further. I do not remember.
- I would have to look back and see my own notes.
- Q Was there any formal revision proposed or published with respect to the revision of the Master Plan?
- A Yes. It was advertised in the newspaper.
- Q The actual revisions? A I did not see the newspaper article. I never did see it. I cannot tell you positively.
- Q I am talking about at the Planning Board meeting.

 Did the Planning Board as an entity introduce the proposed

(4)

revisions, reintroduce proposed revisions, or was there an announcement in the paper? A Yes. I think this memorandum was read. I don't just remember the details of how it was made public other than I was told it was advertised as it had to be in the paper.

Q The notice of meeting was advertised.

A Yes.

Q But do you know of your own knowledge whether there was a proposed legal revision of the Master Plan which was published? A I did not see it.

Q With respect to the property immediately north of 287 which had formerly been on the Master Plan as research-type, what did the Planning Board propose to do with that piece? A They proposed to convert that to five-acre residence.

Q What was the reasoning for that?

A Well, there were several reasons. There was an outpouring of public sentiment in town against any commercialization or industrialization of Bedminster.

There was no sentiment in favor of it. That was one consideration.

The other one or one other was the ideal residential character of the land, its beauty and I would say they were the main considerations.

Q You speak of outpouring of sentiment. How was that

Yes. A Q So you took the sentiments against Western Electric as being your guide to eliminate office-research in another section of the town. No, there was no sentiment Α against Western Electric. The sentiment was against the 10 change that such an office building would bring to the town. 11 What sort of change? Traffic, people, the effect it would have on the adjoining property owners, the effect it would have on our zoning ordinance. Taking the first one, the adjoining property owners, ୍ୟ 15 what effect would it have? The Western Electric 16 proposal was nge to a viable and a going five acre 17 residential development. 18 Q I don't mean to sidetrack you, but I am not really 19 interested in pursuing why you turned down Western Electric, 20 insofar as you have utilized that public sentiment as some 21 expression to change the zoning ordinance elsewhere, really 22 we can save some time. 23 MR. BOWLBY: You mean change the Master Plan. 24 I'm sorry. MR. LANIGAN: 25

Did that involve Western Electric?

୍ର 9

. 11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You took the outpouring and sentiment from the hearing at the Western Electric hearing and translated that into a revision or proposed revision to make it five acre That was one of the considerations residential. A that we had, yes.

And the other was that it was of an ideal residential Right. character. Α

Did you consider the fact that it was next to the interchange and abutted 287?

What effect would that have on the residential We did not think that it was harmful at character? I am sure that this does abut it.

The zone abuts it. A I am sure that the land does. Isn't there a road between 287 and this property, a new road? I don't think it is shown on any maps.

Q Your zone abuts 287, does it not?

A Yes, the zone does, yes.

And the entire zone would be five acre residential under your proposal. Right.

In your proposal you included a proposal with respect to motels. Right.

And to quote your memorandum, "Restaurants, motels and taxable private clubs for outdoor sports." Right?

Yes.

What reasoning prompted that change? Q

6

10

11 1 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Well, the unique -- I am now speaking of the Brady-Pontin property but I just cannot remember. I do not want to tell you that is not so, but the other piece that you referred to as the Kean property, that was not the only owner.

We believed that this piece of land which is totally landlocked by three state highways was too small for research and development or any large scale commercial operation.

It is not too desirable as a residential neighborhood which is the use that is put to now.

Because of the existence -- one Why not? Α of the houses is very close to 287, very close.

Q Did the Planning Board feel that there was some need for restaurants and motels in the township?

Not today, no.

Well, why did you make the proposal?

Well, that was our look towards the future, that some day we felt that this might be a spot where such facilities as that could possibly go.

- When would that happen in your thinking? Q
- Oh, I guess we were thinking ten, fifteen years.
- What would happen to make that change? How would the character change to require that sort of facility?

I put it in a different light. I work at it from the other way, the point when one of those houses might become undesirable as a residence.

🖟 No.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Was the reasoning the same for the land immediately to the south of the intersection which was included in the same change without any residences on it?

A You mean the Ellsworth-Kean property?

Q Yes. A Was that included in the same change as motels, restaurants and so forth?

Q Yes. A You are asking me if we had the same considerations as we did in the Brady-Pontin situation?

A Yes. I think our primary thinking was that that again was not large enough for much else.

Q Did the fact that it was next to the heliport have anything to do with it? A I cannot remember that ever entering our discussions. I cannot remember that.

Q It is next to the heliport, is it not?

A No, no.

Q The zone abuts the heliport. A Well --

MR. BOWLBY: The highway facility you mentioned?

There is no residence there as you are aware of.

MR. LANIGAN: Yes.

THE WITNESS: I do not know.

Q Where is that property located that we are talking about with reference to the Allan-Deane property?

A The Ellsworth-Kean property?

Q Yes. A It is on the other side of 202-206.

I believe some of it, most of it, is slightly to the north of

Gavin-direct

Q So you have not been advised by them. I am not aware there is one. Q Has anyone advised you other than this young student with respect to any historical interests? Not in a formal nature, no, no. Other than the knowledge of Q Informal then. gossip and old stories that people tell us about what went on in Pluckemin and Bedminster and the town in general. Q Have you sat on any of the other township bodies or 13 boards, the board of health? No. Any of those. No. Q You are a candidate, are you not, for the township committee? A Yes, I am. 17 18 19 20 21 22 24 25

financially interested in the action. Public of the State of New Jersey. My Commission Expires August 1974. ै 14