

February 8, 2016

Dear Planning Commission,

There are three conditions that I am requesting an repeal for—the first is the condition stating that “A total of 12 vehicles shall be allowed for display and two in the bays at one time, prior to City Council consideration of the Plans”, due to the fact that although twelve cars may seem like a reasonable amount in terms of operating a small used car business, in reality, the way a car dealership is run, it is not feasible. Because the business deals with large amounts of money, as well as a plethora of paperwork, it takes multiple business days for a sold car to actually leave the property. Once a car is sold, it is no longer in the market, however, the said customer also cannot drive it off the lot until paperwork from the bank and secretary of state is filed and approved. Due to the length of this process, there are discrepancies in terms of when the car will actually be gone. A majority of my used cars, if not all, are over ten thousand dollars. No potential customers have that amount of money to buy the car in full and take it off the lot, so, when they put down a small deposit of five hundred to one thousand dollars, I have to hold on to that car (and cannot show the car to new customers) until the client can sort out their assets and pay for the car in its entirety. So in essence, when there is a twelve vehicle limit, only a fraction of those cars are actually up for sale. When a renovated building is placed on the lot, then my taxes will also increase, and due to the lack of variation in vehicles, the resulting decrease in sales will, in turn, lead to the business being unable to pay the increased taxes, as well as the bills, salaries of employees, and other expenses. I have a hardship in terms of parking, and for this reason, I am requesting that the city approve the alternative site plan, which incorporates an extra six parking spots and has been discussed by Ed Anzek, Sarah Roediger, Chester Stempien (architect), and myself, and has been approved by the planning department.

The next condition I am asking to repeal states, “If two or more violations, as determined by the local district court or violations of the conditions occur in one year on the west or east lot, the Conditional Use Permit shall be considered revoked, and staff shall be directed to initiate legal revocation proceedings of the Conditional Use Permit”, and in turn, request that instead of revoking the Conditional Use Permit, issue a monetary penalty that increases with each violation, because this penalty will induce an incentive to comply with the conditions, without putting my future in jeopardy.

The last condition that I am asking to repeal states, “The gate on Hessel shall be shown as removed and replaced with a solid fence prior to City Council consideration of the plans”, because the gate was a part of a preexisting condition approved by city—a condition that I had to follow through on or I would not have gotten permission for the used car dealership. After spending thousands of dollars in order to meet the conditions issued, it is unfair for the city to ask me to discard the gate as another condition. I am requesting that the gate simply be there, but remain closed and locked (unopened and unused).

Respectfully yours,

  
Syed Riaz Ahmed  
Auto Rite, LLC.

RECEIVED

FEB -9 2016

PLANNING DEPT.