

Avenue Q Autobody District Change

Demonstration of Need

An Analysis of Economic Issues [*Minimum population support and market area radius (where applicable)*] is required when requesting a Land Use amendment from Residential to a Non-Residential Land Use designation.

The property at the intersection of Avenue Q and 42nd Street has been used for vehicle repair off and on since 1988 according to aerial photos. It was Zoned C-4 in the former Zoning Ordinance. It became BPC with the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1991. It became BPC-1 in 2000 which is when it became a legally non-conforming use. Auto repair ceased on the property between 2014 and 2018. The owner purchased the property for that purpose in 2022 and has been operating the current autobody business since. It was while seeking a permit to improve the fire suppression system that the applicant discovered that the district did not permit vehicle repair. This change to BPC-2 will restore the former rights the business had enjoyed for 35 years.

Urban Sprawl Analysis

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

No. Between the autobody repair and the commercial vehicle parking, there is not much room for anything else.

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

When you look at all the development surrounding the site you quickly see that it is not rural.

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

Isn't everything either radial, strip, isolated, or ribbon in pattern? This is a rectangle property. Will that help?

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

No, this area has not been agricultural since the Roosevelt administration.

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

Not likely. There is water service to the site.

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

Probably not.

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

No.

It will restore the development rights that the property once had when it was zoned C-4.

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

Nope. It's surrounded by urban uses.

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

No, but it will serve existing development.

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

No, it's functional. There is a convenience store on one corner and Cuban Sandwich place on the other corner. I recommend it.

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

No. But they could use more sidewalks.

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

None on site today.