



Demonstration of Need – Boy Scout RCC

Site Boundary: [See Legal Description](#)

Parcel ID #s: **293008-000000-031010**

Acreage: **6.5 +/- acres**

1. Could the proposed amendment promote substantial amounts of low-density, low intensity, or single use development in excess of demonstrated need?

No. The proposed development compliments the surrounding uses and will provide land for the next retail development on the northeast corner of this intersection (SR 60 & Boy Scout Rd).

2. Will passage of the proposed amendment allow a significant amount of urban development to occur in rural areas?

No. We worked with County Staff to analyze this intersection and Staff declared that sufficient population support exists within three miles to support the proposed additional 6.5 acres. This acreage is also within the allowable acreage limitation of Policy 2.110-B3 (Location Criteria) of the Comprehensive Plan which allows RCCs to be “up to the size of a Neighborhood Activity Center”, or 20 acres. The existing RCC acreage at this intersection is approximately 8.5 acres, leaving more than the 6.5 acres requested with this amendment.

3. Does the proposed amendment create or encourage urban development in radial, strip, isolated, or ribbon patterns emanating from existing urban development?

No. The proposed RCC is adjacent to an existing RCC to the west across Boy Scout Rd.

4. Does the proposed development fail to adequately protect adjacent agriculture areas?

No. The site is currently undeveloped land that is not utilized for agricultural purposes.

5. Could the proposed amendment fail to maximize existing public facilities and services?

No. The property owner is proposing a development that will stay within the development intensity limitations of the rural development area (RDA).

6. Could the proposed amendment fail to minimize the need for future public facilities and services?

No. The proposed development will stay within the development intensity limitations of the rural development area (RDA).



7. Will the proposed amendment allow development patterns that will disproportionately increase the cost of providing public facilities and services?

No. The proposed development will stay within the development intensity limitations of the rural development area (RDA).

8. Does the proposed amendment fail to provide clear separation between urban and rural uses?

No. The proposed development will add onto the existing commercial node, matching the existing level of development intensity of the surrounding area and utilizing the access already provided at this key intersection.

9. Will the proposed amendment discourage infill development or redevelopment of existing neighborhoods?

No. The proposed development will service the needs of the rural area that have demonstrated an increased demand for goods and services at this location. It will not discourage neighborhood development.

10. Does the proposed amendment fail to encourage an attractive and functional mixture of land uses?

No. The proposed development will add onto the existing commercial node, matching the existing level of development intensity of the surrounding area and allowing similar types of land uses that will be functionally appropriate and visually attractive because the site will develop utilizing the latest adopted Land Development Code policies.

11. Could the proposed amendment result in poor accessibility among linked or related land uses?

No. The proposed amendment will change the allowable land use of the subject site to the same land use that is currently designated adjacent to the west (RCC). The RCC usage of the subject site will complement and better support the surrounding region, and the site has direct frontage on SR 60 and Boy Scout Road.

12. As a result of approval of this amendment, how much open space will be lost?

No true, protected open space will be lost. The site is currently A/RR and could be developed with housing, agribusiness, and supporting non-residential uses.