## No. 07RZ065 - Rezoning from General Commercial District to ITEM 49 Central Business District

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION:**

APPLICANT/ AGENT Bob Fuchs

PROPERTY OWNER Bob Fuchs

REQUEST No. 07RZ065 - Rezoning from General Commercial

**District to Central Business District** 

**EXISTING** 

LEGAL DESCRIPTION The South 50 feet of Lots 28 thru 32 of the Original Town

of Rapid City, Section 36, T2N, R7E, BHM, Rapid City,

Pennington County, South Dakota

PARCEL ACREAGE Approximately 0.14 acres

LOCATION 321 7th Street

EXISTING ZONING General Commercial District

SURROUNDING ZONING

North: General Commercial District
South: General Commercial District
East: General Commercial District
West: General Commercial District

PUBLIC UTILITIES Public

DATE OF APPLICATION 8/28/2007

REVIEWED BY Jonathan Smith / Mary Bosworth

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Rezoning from General Commercial District to Central Business District be denied.

### **GENERAL COMMENTS:**

The applicant has filed a request to rezone 0.14 acres from General Commercial District to Central Business District. The property is located at the northwest intersection of Apolda Street and 7<sup>th</sup> Street. A three story structure with 5,000 square feet of floor space per floor is located on the property. Staff has noted that the building was formerly used as a bar, restaurant, and a furniture store. No business is currently operating within the structure.

On December 21, 1999, the Zoning Board of Adjustment granted a variance to reduce the parking from 104 spaces to one space for the bar/tavern currently located on the property contingent upon the business being open after 5:00 p.m.

### STAFF REPORT October 4, 2007

# No. 07RZ065 - Rezoning from General Commercial District to ITEM 49 Central Business District

A Conditional Use Permit to allow on-sale liquor (#99UR042) on the property was approved with stipulations by City Council on January 7, 1999.

In December 2001, the Zoning Board of Adjustment denied a variance request to allow the first floor on-sale liquor establishment to be open at 11:00 a.m. in order to serve lunch due to complaints regarding the lack of adequate parking in the area from other business owners in the immediate area.

A request to rezone the property (#02RZ033) from General Commercial to Central Business District was tabled by the City Council on July 15, 2002. Planning Commission concurred with City Council and tabled this rezone request on July 25, 2002.

A Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit (#03UR006) to allow the first floor on-sale liquor use to be open starting at 11:00 a.m. Sunday was approved with stipulations on May 22, 2003 by the Planning Commission.

An additional request to rezone the property (#03RZ050) from General Commercial to Central Business District was denied without prejudice by City Council on December 15, 2003.

#### STAFF REVIEW:

Staff has reviewed this proposed rezoning for conformance with the four criteria for review of zoning map amendments established in Section 17.54.040(D)(1). A summary of Staff findings are outlined below:

1. The proposed amendments shall be necessary because of substantially changed or changing conditions of the area and districts affected or in the City in general.

The property is currently zoned General Commercial District. All abutting property is also zoned General Commercial District. The character of commercial commerce has not changed within the vicinity of the property. The nearest Central Business Zoning District is located approximately 250 feet south of the property.

Rezoning of the property to Central Business District would occur it would result in "spot zoning" because there is no abutting Central Business District. Staff is unable to identify any change in condition that has occurred since the most recent denial of the request 3  $\frac{1}{2}$  years ago.

2. The proposed zoning is consistent with the intent and purposes of this ordinance.

As previously indicated, a Variance has been granted to reduce the parking for the existing use within the structure from 104 parking spaces to one space. The lack of adequate parking in the area would be aggravated by the proposed change in the zoning. The proposed change appears to be an attempt to avoid the requirement to provide off-street parking to adequately support the existing business and/or expansions to the business.

## STAFF REPORT October 4, 2007

# No. 07RZ065 - Rezoning from General Commercial District to ITEM 49 Central Business District

3. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect any other part of the City, nor shall any direct or indirect adverse effects result from such an amendment.

The Central Business District does not require that off-street parking be provided. As noted above, the applicant has obtained variance(s) from the Zoning Board of Adjustment to reduce the parking requirement for the bar and night club currently located on the property from 104 parking spaces to one space. Rezoning the property as proposed would exempt the applicant from providing parking for any existing and/or new use(s) that may be brought to the site. In particular, it will allow the applicant to use the third floor and the basement for a use other than storage and not provide off-street parking for the use. As previoulsy indicated by testimony of adjacent property owners, a lack of adequate parking within this area currently exists. As such, rezoning the property as proposed will adversely affect this area of the City.

4. The proposed amendments shall be consistent with and not conflict with the Development Plan of Rapid City including any of its elements, Major Street Plan, Land Use Plan, and Community Facilities Plan.

The existing Future Land Use Plan identifies the appropriate land use as commercial. The existing General Commercial Zoning District is consistent with the land use plan.

#### **LEGAL NOTIFICATION:**

As of this writing, the required sign has been posted on the property but the receipts from the certified mailing have not been returned. Staff will notify the Planning Commission at the October 4, 2007 Planning Commission meeting if this requirement has not been met. Staff has received no inquiries or objections regarding the proposed request at the time of this writing.