

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 recognize an existing development site consisting of warehouses and outdoor storage, two uses that are allowable in the BPC-1 and BPC-2 land use districts. Tremendous population growth over the past 5 years has necessitated growth in business, warehousing, retail, service uses, and other non-residential uses to support this growth.

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

No, this amendment is located in the Urban Growth Area (UGA) and is surrounded by urban development.

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 located adjacent to existing BPC land use in the County and Light Industrial in the City of Auburndale along an existing arterial road connecting this site to the entire region.

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

No, this site is not an agricultural area. It is located in a 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 and future redevelopment in an area of the County that is practically the geographic center of the County. 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 infill and redevelopment in the center of the County 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 well within the existing UGA where growth has been planned.

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

No, this amendment will allow infill development in an area of moderate intensity 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 planned future 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 developed to the greatest extent possible without impacting open space to the south.