

8. Clarify whether the regulations apply to different types of residential development e.g. single-family and/or two-family (Duplex) vs. Multi-family development
9. Verifying ULDC lot count language is consistent with the SFMO's one-family dwelling and two-family dwelling language e.g. do two-family dwellings count as 1 unit or 2 units, etc.
10. PD zoning site plans would still retain the site design flexibility on the ingress/egress issue and be ultimately subject to staff's recommendations and LCBOC approval.
11. Each of the proposed options would be subject to the variance process (ZBOA).
12. Other access related ULDC sections
  - a. Remoteness (How far apart the two points of ingress/egress must be located)
    - i. At the least the ULDC should be modified to include this requirement for those subdivisions that are over the SFMO standard (120). Including it within the ULDC would open it up to local variance consideration by the ZBOA.
  - b. Future Connections 6.01.02(F)(8)
    - i. Clarify and strengthen the requirement for future connections/stub-outs to other developed or yet to be developed land
    - ii. Noteworthy: Western North Valdosta (More connected . . . Ballantyne and Millstone Subdivisions (Clyattstone Rd)) vs. Eastern North Valdosta (Less connected . . . Nelson Hill, Azalea Commons, Grove Point, Camelot Area)
13. Will the Range option Condition #3 (Additional Road Width) encourage increased vehicle speeds in the development?
14. On-street parking has been an issue in some communities. Especially when the on-street parking limits vehicular access or emergency access. The 2018 IFC also carries regulations where on-street parking is causing obstructions (503.4)