

N. 640 INDUSTRIAL PARK

DEMONSTRATION OF NEED

Meeting Marked Demands & Outweighing Adverse Impacts

A number of sites were converted from PM to Industrial around 10 years ago in the vicinity. Because of either site conditions limiting short term development, or those sites already being developed/in process of sales, only one of those Industrial sites remains available. This indicates a strong demand for these types of development sites. In addition, the owner reports a number of requests for new industrial sites in this area.

This proposed change outweighs adverse impacts to public facilities and environmental resources primarily by avoiding those impacts in the first place. The site will utilize existing CR 640 and then SR 37, both of which have available capacity for access. Fire protection, water and sanitary sewer collection and treatment will be provided by the developer onsite or nearby. There are few pristine wetlands onsite, and the developer has a large number of wetland mitigation credits available from previous nearby wetland creation efforts. By avoiding or mitigating such impacts, the amendment will meet the market demands for business expansion without adverse effects on the County.

Excess Vacant Land Analysis

There is currently only one industrial site in the immediate area available for sale or short-term development. We reviewed all nearby Industrial sites with this developer and he indicates a strong market demand exists for this type use and there are very little offerings for potential buyers/users.

We feel the above demonstrates that the County has a healthy development history for this designation. Furthermore, industrial sites of this size are difficult to assemble, and so this will provide a needed area for this use.

Why Now and Why at This Location

The change is needed at this time because market demands indicate that additional space of this size is not currently available to serve the county's expanding manufacturing and warehousing customer base.

This location has excellent access to the state highway system and although there are a number of industrial sites in the vicinity, many are already developed and/or are associated with the phosphate mining industry. There are few environmental concerns.

For Text Amendments, please provide a narrative discussing why the text amendment is needed and what other alternatives besides the request have been or could be sought as a remedy?

N/A, this is a map amendment request.

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.

This is a change from PM to Industrial uses. The PM designation allows similar uses as the Industrial, however the PM requires the use to be associated with the phosphate mining industry.

This is a manufacturing designation that does not typically feature common retail commercial establishments visited by the general public. As such, the Comprehensive Plan features a relatively large Service-Area Radius of “20 miles or more” with a Minimum Population Support of “150,000 or more people”.

Urban Sprawl Analysis (Only for CPA Map Amendments)

Address the following statements with regard to the proposed land use amendment:

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 amendment would allow for a relatively high intensity development near the intersection of a collector and major arterial roadway, CR 640 and US Highway 37. The area was previously mined.

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

No, because the area already has had significant mining and industrial development.

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

The amendment will focus additional intensity into an existing development area.

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

There will be no adverse impacts to adjacent agriculture areas.

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

No public facilities negatively affected.

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

The change as proposed will minimize the need for future public facilities by providing private, onsite private water and sewer.

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

There are no anticipated changes to existing facilities, and therefore no additional cost of providing those services from this amendment.

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

The area has seen significant mining and phosphate processing activities. The conversion to general industry will allow this land to be converted to more productive use after mining as ended onsite.

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

N/A

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

The proposed industrial designation is very similar to the uses currently allowed under the PM designation. A different mixture of uses on this land would be difficult to establish.

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

No, good access to the county and state highway system will be provided.

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

As the land is currently vacant, there will be open space lost.