Redford vote was about land use

1dI'm disappointed in The ad he Blade's reporting of the he May 5 referendum vote in Bedford Township. To immοw ply that the measure was ch resoundingly defeated was completely misrepresenta--Xtive of the truth. The mea-Her sure was defeated by a mere nd. to-289 votes, with a very small portion of registered voters 1110

participating. ere

O.

۱-

F

d

3-

)1)

n-

I was aghast at the headline implying that this vote nd somehow turned down the Jrdevelopment of a Wal-Mart bse store. This vote was never m about Wal-Mart. This vote ble was about appropriate land ed use and nothing more. The ts. scare tactics and fear month gering of some made this $b\varepsilon$ vote about the possibility of na Wal-Mart. Let us not forget 3V the fact that as the property ir is currently zoned, a Wal-Mart could be developed swithout a rezoning request.

> I'm disappointed in the outcome of the referendum. not because I desire a Wal-Mart in Bedford Township but because the fears of a petrified a township from possibly seeing a longvacant piece of land developed into something useful.

> > KEITH R. GODFREY Lambertville