

## 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 will address the existing demand for office, medical, and institutional uses needed in this area. The site is located in an area heavily dominated by residential growth with very few INST uses. Tremendous population growth over the past 30 years has precipitated the need for supporting office and institutional uses, as well as other non-residential uses to support this growth. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not promote low-density or low-intensity development.*

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

*No, this area is not a rural area. This site is located in the TSDA, adjacent to US 27, within 375 feet of an existing transit shelter and stop, and with sufficient urban development in the surrounding area.*

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 one of the two last remaining infill sites between a substantial amount of retail, office, and restaurant businesses along US 27.*

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

*No, this site is not an agricultural area. It is located within a highly developed urban area of central Polk County.*

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

*No, this amendment would allow future redevelopment 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 the County that is currently served by the highest level of public facilities and services. Public facilities and services currently exist at the site, allowing maximum utilization and efficiency consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.*

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 the development of an infill site where public facilities and services currently exist, enabling maximum utilization and service distribution efficiency.*

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

*No, this amendment is surrounded by urban development and is within the TSDA where growth and infrastructure has been planned and implemented for decades.*

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

*No, this amendment will actually enable infill development in an area of high intensity development where it will complement the existing surrounding development.*

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

*No, this site compliments the level of infrastructure available and intensity of the surrounding uses.*

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, including transit service.*

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 was formerly a citrus grove. Future development will occur consistent with the Land Development Code without impacting open space in the vicinity.*