

Demonstration of Need

Provide a narrative discussing how the need for the proposed Future Land use meets market demands and outweighs adverse impacts upon existing public facilities, public services, and environmental resources. Also, address the amount of excess vacant land in the County that has the same Future Land Use as the proposed request. Most importantly, discuss why the change is needed now and why it is needed at the proposed location.

The Property is part of a 25+/- acre PIX district with the Property constituting the southern portion of the district. The northern portion of the PIX district consists of a church which occupies the majority of the adjacent parcel. The Property is the only undeveloped portion of the PIX district. The Polk County Comprehensive Plan (Appendix 2.131-C) describes the PIX as an activity center to provide areas for the establishment of office uses and retail related support uses. The Professional Institutional Land Use District is intended to serve surrounding neighborhoods with professional medical, financial, educational, legal, government, property management and other similar professional office uses. The Professional Institutional Land Use District is also intended to accommodate limited retail operations which complement the primary office uses of the district. The developed PIX properties in the US 27 SAP do not appear to be consistent with the description or vision of the PIX land use district as described in the Comprehensive Plan. Further, the Property, as a remnant piece of a partially developed PIX district, no longer independently meets the location standards of the PIX district, which required a PIX district to have frontage on two collector roadways or be located at an intersection of an arterial and collector road.

The PIX land use areas have largely remained undeveloped in the US 27 SAP. Much of the US 27 SAP has been developed with residential, commercial, and industrial uses, while office and institutional development has been limited. The proposed change of land use from PIX to RHX will allow efficient use of the Property and would remove unwieldy development constraints and limitations from the Property, which has precluded prior attempts to develop the Property. Rent associated with multi-family housing in Polk County increased 20-25% in Polk County in 2020 and another 15-20% in 2021, resulting in a 40-45% increase in rent for an apartment in Polk County over a two year period. The supply of available multi-family units has not been able to keep pace with the increase in demand for this housing type. Further, the concerted effort by the Federal Reserve to quash inflation by raising interest rates will further increase the demand for multi-family units as an alternative to home ownership in the short to intermediate term.

In summary, the land has sat undeveloped while the surrounding properties have been developed due to the current development constraints imposed on the PIX district and lack of demand for the primary PIX uses. A change in land use to RHX is appropriate to allow efficient use of the land (with existing adequate public infrastructure to support intensive development), to help alleviate the upward pressure on rental rates in the area, and to provide additional supply to help satiate the growing demand for multi-family units.

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. This request would support high-intensity residential development in an already developed area.

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

No. This is not a rural area.

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

No. Development has occurred north, south, east, and west of the Property.

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

No. The surrounding properties are developed.

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

No. Development of the Property would be a more efficient use of public facilities and services.

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

No. (See response 5).

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

No. (See response 5).

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

No. A clear separation would remain between urban and rural areas. This is an urban area.

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

No. This could accurately be described as infill development.

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

No.

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

No. The Property could function independent and is not anticipated to be linked or connected to related land uses.

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

The Property is 12 acres. Upon development some of the Property would remain open space. Substantial open space is nearby with the Green Swamp west of the Property.