

Demonstration of Need

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

No, this amendment would recognize an existing non-residential development that has existing along this corridor of non-residential uses for nearly 60 years. The commercial developments along this corridor continue to expand, demonstrating the need for, and viability of, commercial uses in this area.

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

No, this amendment would recognize an existing non-residential development that has existing along this corridor since the 1960s and continues to expand.

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

No, this site is the last remaining land between an existing RV park and an established LCC corridor that is nearly completely developed.

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

No, this site is not an agricultural area. It has been commercially developed for approximately 60 years.

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

No, this amendment would allow infill development in an area of moderate intensity where public facilities and services currently exist.

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

No, this amendment would allow infill development in an area of moderate intensity where public facilities and services currently exist and maximum utilization and efficiency are the goals.

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

No, this amendment would allow infill development in an area of moderate intensity where public facilities and services currently exist and maximum utilization and efficiency are the goals.

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

No, this amendment would recognize an existing non-residential development that has existing along this corridor since the 1960s and continues to expand.

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

No, this amendment would allow infill development in an area of moderate intensity where that compliments the existing surrounding residential development.

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

No, this site is the last remaining land between an existing RV park to the south and existing commercial development within an established LCC corridor to the north.

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

No, the proposed use has excellent access to the surrounding land uses.

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

No open space will be lost with the approval of this amendment. The site has been cleared of its native vegetation and surrounded by commercial development for decades.