

Pine Barrens Commission
Proposed CLUP Amendment Review
(As of November 19, 2014)

BINDER review (September 30, 2014)

CHAPTER 4

<u>Page</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comments</u>
2	4.3.1.	Supervisor questions need for a commission vote
2	4.3.1.(d)	Jeff requests option to use short form Environmental Assessment
3	4.3.5.1.	Confusing text
3-4	4.3.6.-8.	John P. rep that text was amended by May 16, 2012 resolution
4	4.3.9.	Should reference 9.2 as an exclusion
4	4.3.10	Jeff requests substitution of "auto" to "natural"
4	4.3.11	Tall Structures-75 feet? Omit?
4-5	4.4.1.-4.5	Need reference to 9.2 exclusion
4.5.1.3.	6	Will appl be voted on to deem complete? If so, this section inconsistent.
6	4.5.2.	Why is overstrike language being removed?
6	4.5.2.1.	Reference to " <u>business days</u> " inconsistent with 4.5.1.3.; 4.5.2.2.-6.
8	4.5.2.6.	When is appl deemed compete See 4.5.1.3.
22	4.5.4.2.	In Supervisor Comment draft text- is overstrike, binder-underscored
22	4.5.5.	Need to exclude 9.2 Calverton Redevelopment...
24	4.5.5.2.	Proposed amendments are pre-existing
24	4.5.6.	Confirm this section was previously adopted on May 16, 2012

CHAPTER 5

<u>Page</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comments</u>
5	5.3.3.1.5.	Supervisor opposes
7	5.3.3.4.1.	Supervisor opposes-leave as guideline not standard (4-17-13 meeting)
8-9	5.3.3.4.3.-11.	Supervisor opposition various provisions.

CHAPTER 6

<u>Page</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Comments</u>
33	6.5.4.	Last paragraph confusing incl. "applicable reverse side info"
34	6.5.5.	Omit last paragraph in total.
34	6.5.6.	Option for credit usage for increased sanitary flow; omit last par.
38	6.7.6.4.	Wasn't last sentence starting, "Specifically...", omitted in 5-16-12 reso?