



# TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH BRUNSWICK

Municipal Building • P.O. Box 190 • Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852-0190

Phone
732-329-4000
TDD
732-329-2017
Fax
732-329-0627

December 23, 2015

Via email and regular mail

Honorable Douglas K. Wolfson, J.S.C.  
Superior Court of New Jersey  
Middlesex County Courthouse  
56 Paterson Street  
P.O. Box 964  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903-0964

Re: South Brunswick Declaratory Action and Motion for  
Temporary Immunity from Mount Laurel Lawsuits  
Docket No. MID-L-3878-15  
Our File No. L1347

Dear Judge Wolfson:

Please accept this Letter Memorandum on behalf of the Township of South Brunswick (“Township”) in opposition to the Motion to Intervene filed by American Properties at South Brunswick, LLC, (“American Properties”), in the above referenced matter, currently returnable before Your Honor on January 8, 2016.

This Court has already established the parameters by which these motions are to be measured and when, and under what conditions, such motions are to be granted, in In the Matter of the Adoption of the Monroe Township Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and Implementing Ordinances, unpublished opinion dated July 9, 2015, Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Docket # MID-L-3365-15 (“In Re Monroe”)¹.

## **THE MOTION TO INTERVENE SHOULD BE DENIED**

The Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act, N.J.S.A. 2A:16-51, et seq., governs declaratory judgment actions in New Jersey. Although the act requires that “all persons having or claiming any interest which would be affected by the declaration shall be made parties to the proceeding” (See N.J.S.A. 2A:16-56), certain additional requirements must be met before an interested party is permitted to intervene. Among these threshold requirements, the primary object of a party’s interest in any pending matter must be to “afford relief from uncertainty and insecurity with respect to rights, status and other legal relations.” N.J.S.A. 2A:16-51; Bergen County v. Port of New York Authority, 32 N.J. 303 (1960). In addition, there must be a “justiciable controversy”

¹ Attached to the Certification of Matthew N. Fiorovanti, Esq., as Exhibit C.

# TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH BRUNSWICK

---

Municipal Building • P.O. Box 190 • Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852-0190

between adverse parties. Young v. Byrne, 144 N.J. Super. 10 (Law Div. 1976). Indeed, a Court's ability to issue a declaratory judgment should not be used to obtain an advisory opinion. Gotlib v. Gotlib, 399 N.J. Super. 295 (App. Div. 2008). On the contrary, where an interested party's claim does not raise a judicial controversy that is "ripe for judicial determination," that party should not be permitted to assert its claim via a declaratory judgment proceeding. See Independent Realty Co. v. Township of North Bergen, 376 N.J. Super. 295 (App. Div. 2005).

Motions to intervene are governed by Rule 4:33-1, which states:

Upon timely application anyone shall be permitted to intervene in an action if the applicant claims an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the action and is so situated that the disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the ability to protect that interest, unless the applicant's interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

As such, a party seeking to intervene must show that it:

- 1) has filed a timely application;
- 2) has an interest in the property or transaction;
- 3) is so situated that the disposition of the action may impair or impede the ability to protect that interest; and
- 4) there is no adequate representation of its interests by existing parties.

In the instant case, American Properties cannot meet the requirements for intervention in the Township's declaratory judgment action. As such, its motion should be denied.

## The Motion to Intervene is not Timely

The court has the discretion to determine the timeliness, under all the circumstances, of the intervention application, and may deny the application if it is deemed untimely. See State v. Lanza, 39 N.J. 595 (1963); ACLU v. Hudson County, 352 N.J. Super. 44, 64 (App. Div.), certif. den. 174 N.J. 190 (2002). The Township's Declaratory Judgment Action was filed on July 1, 2015. Various parties filed motions to intervene within weeks of that filing, all of which the court decided on July 30, 2015. Since that time there have been several Case Management Conferences; preparation of a draft preliminary Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan; review of the draft preliminary plan by the court, the Special Master and all parties; numerous meetings and discussion between the parties with the assistance of the Special Master; and submission of an amended draft preliminary Third Round Plan that includes some of the objector/intervenors' properties. The court is scheduled to review the amended draft preliminary plan at the next Case Management Conference, scheduled for January 13, 2016.

Some six months later, American Properties now seeks to intervene for the first time. Given the advanced stage of this matter, and the significant work that has already been devoted toward

# TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH BRUNSWICK

---

Municipal Building • P.O. Box 190 • Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852-0190

formulating a Third Round Plan that is acceptable to the court, American Properties should not be permitted to intervene at this late juncture.

## American Properties' Interest in the Transaction has not been Adequately Established

As this Court has already determined, in a declaratory judgment action filed by a municipality in response to the decision in In re Adoption of N.J.A.C. 5:96 & 5:97 by N.J. Council on Affordable Housing, 221 N.J. (2015) (“Mount Laurel IV”), interested parties may intervene, but their intervention is “limited to the question of whether the particular town has complied with its constitutional housing obligations.” In Re Monroe, *supra.*, at 9. In its proposed Answer and Counterclaim, American Properties offers no opposition to the assertions made by the Township in its complaint, and merely “leaves Petitioner to its proofs.” Without offering any substantive basis for doing so, American Properties then merely makes an unsupported allegation that the Township has failed to meet its “obligation to provide a realistic opportunity for development of its fair share of the region’s need for affordable housing.” (See draft Answer and Counterclaim, Exhibit D to certification of Matthew N. Fiorovanti, Esq.).

American Properties therefore offers no evidence that it has an adequate interest in the matter pending before the court. The ability of American Properties to advance the issues in the litigation is suspect at best. More likely, American Properties will add nothing more to the litigation than what is already being contributed by the other objector/intervenors in the case. Its participation will therefore merely be a duplication of what is already present through the other parties in the case.

Moreover, although it is alleged in the Letter Memorandum submitted by American Properties that it owns certain property in South Brunswick, nothing in the proposed Answer and Counterclaim indicates that it has any interest in property located in South Brunswick. The only property identified in the proposed Answer and Counterclaim is located in Iselin, NJ. Thus, there is even a question as to its standing to pursue leave to intervene.

## There is Already Adequate Protection of American Properties' Interests

A motion for intervention may be denied if the applicant’s interest is already being represented in the litigation. See Asbury Park v. Asbury Park Towers, 388 N.J. Super. 1 (App. Div. 2006); White v. White, 313 N.J. Super. 637 (Ch. Div. 1998). The only arguable interest asserted by American Properties for intervention is “to participate in the preliminary judicial determination of the Township’s compliance with its constitutional affordable housing obligations.” (See American Properties’ Letter Brief dated December 14, 2015, page 3). There are no less than five (5) objector/intervenors already participating in this case, plus Fair Share Housing Center. Each has been permitted to intervene so as to participate in the preliminary judicial determination of the Township’s compliance with its constitutional affordable housing obligations. As such, this issue will be fully analyzed, briefed and tested by the current intervenors to the fullest extent possible. There is no need for yet another party to intervene to do the same. At some point, the

# TOWNSHIP OF SOUTH BRUNSWICK

---

Municipal Building • P.O. Box 190 • Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852-0190

“assistance” to be offered by these intervenors merely becomes duplicative and will not further assist the court or the parties in completing the necessary determination of constitutional compliance.

In addition, there is no “uncertainty [or] insecurity with respect to [American Properties’ specific] rights, status and other legal relations.” This Court has already adequately protected its rights related to any proposed exclusionary zoning/builder’s remedy claims that American Properties might have, holding that: “If, after having received a full and fair opportunity to comply with its constitutional obligations, the Court concludes that [the Township] is ‘determined to be noncompliant,’” this Court has firmly established that American Properties “may then initiate and prosecute exclusionary zoning actions against the [Township].” In Re Monroe, supra., at 17. This resolves any “uncertainty” with respect to American Properties’ specific rights and indeed more than adequately protects those rights in the instant matter.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the motion to intervene filed on behalf of American Properties should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

*s/Donald J. Sears*

Donald J. Sears  
Director of Law

DJS/lw

Cc: Middlesex County Superior Court – Motions Clerk  
Robert A. Kasuba, Esq., attorney for AVB  
Henry Kent-Smith, Esq., attorney for Richardson  
Kenneth D. McPherson, Jr., attorney for SBC  
Kevin Moore, attorney for Stanton Girard  
Brett Tanzman, attorney for Windsor  
Matthew N. Fiorovanti, attorney for American Properties  
Kevin Walsh, Esq., and Adam Gordon, Esq., attorneys for FSHC  
Benjamin Bucca, Jr., Esq., attorney for SB Planning Board  
Christine Nazzaro-Cofone, PP, Special Master