Core City District Workshop 3 Summary: April 29th

Memphis 3.0 Community Workshop Series

As part of the update to the Memphis 3.0 Comprehensive Plan, a three-part community workshop series was conducted to gather input and guide the vision for the future of the district. Each workshop built upon the outcomes of the previous session to ensure a comprehensive, community-informed planning process.

Workshop 1: Priorities and Anchors

In the first workshop, participants reviewed and refined the district's *Priorities and Anchors*—key values and significant places originally identified in the 2019 adopted plan. Community members were asked to validate what still matters most and to identify any new priorities or places that have emerged in recent years.
(*Purpose: Confirm district priorities and identify important community places.*)

Workshop 2: Future Land Use Vision

Building on the feedback from Workshop 1 and the existing 2019 land use framework, this session focused on shaping an updated *Future Land Use Vision*. Participants discussed where and how different types of development should occur, helping to inform updates to the future land use map and overall development strategy for the district.
(*Purpose: Update the future land use map.*)

Workshop 3: Zoning and Policy Recommendations

The final workshop translated the ideas and visions from the first two sessions into actionable strategies. Participants provided input on how zoning rules and policy guidelines might need to evolve in order to support the desired future for the district. This included recommendations for changes to development regulations, land use policy, and implementation tools.
(*Purpose: Propose updates to zoning and policy to align with the community vision.*)

This document provides a detailed summary of **Workshop 3**. If you would like to review the outcomes of **Workshop 1** or **Workshop 2**, summaries are available on our website at Memphis3point0.com.

Policy Recommendations: The following policy recommendations were identified by community members during Workshop 3 of the Core City District planning process. While not directly tied to zoning, these ideas reflect broader concerns and aspirations related to infrastructure, economic development, and community representation.

- **Mobility and Transportation**
  Community members emphasized the need for improved mobility and safer streets. Key priorities included bringing back trolleys, enhancing pedestrian-friendly corridors, safer crossings, and bicycle infrastructure. Stronger connections between neighborhoods were also highlighted to support both daily travel and overall community cohesion.

- **Public Space and Parks**
  Residents highlighted the value of public spaces and green amenities. Suggestions included expanding parks, ensuring accessibility, and creating promenades or gathering areas. Landscaping buffers with natural elements like trees and shrubs were preferred over hard barriers, and maintaining existing parks was seen as essential.

- **Historic Preservation and Neighborhood Character**
  Preserving historic character and neighborhood identity was a priority. Adaptive reuse of older buildings was encouraged, and rules should favor maintaining historic fabric over new construction. Development should respect the scale of existing neighborhoods and ensure long-term residents benefit from growth. Clear guidance on historic overlays and zoning is needed to reduce confusion.

- **Parking and Traffic Management**
  Residents raised concerns that new development could strain parking and spill into neighborhoods. Suggestions included requiring rear parking with natural buffers and exploring permit zones or off-street parking standards. Traffic congestion and safety along busy corridors were also noted as issues needing attention.

- **Code Enforcement and Cleanliness**
  Stronger code enforcement was a consistent theme. Concerns included sidewalk and curb maintenance, property upkeep, and general neighborhood cleanliness. A proactive approach was seen as critical for supporting pride in place and encouraging reinvestment.

- **Community Livability and Social Concerns**
  Residents stressed livability and community well-being. They opposed incompatible uses and blighted properties while supporting locally managed multi-family housing. Growth and diversity were welcome if balanced with neighborhood character and practical concerns. Clearer communication about planning rules was seen as essential to reduce confusion.

Highlighted Places: Areas that were highlighted by community members in the Core City District Workshop 3 meeting.

Downtown (Pg. 3-4)
- Riverside /Front Street
- FedEx Forum/ South Main
- St. Jude/ Pinch District
- Edge and Medical Districts

Area 4: Rozelle, Glenview, Cooper Young (Pg. 5-6)
- Cooper Young/ Early Maxwell
- Glenview
- Annesdale Park

Area 5: Central Gardens, Overton Square (Pg. 7-8)
- Central Gardens
- Union and Belvedere
- Overton Square

Area 6: Crosstown and Evergreen (Pg. 8-10)
- Jackson and Watkins
- Crosstown
- Overton Park Ave
- Washington Bottoms
- Poplar Corridor

Areas 1, 2, and 3 Downtown

Riverside/ Front Street

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Existing Zoning: Central Business District (CBD) the primary zoning district for Downtown and South Main (SM) an overlay district for South Main **Recommendation:** Central Business District (CBD) and Mainstreet-2 (MS-2) would encourage a Mainstreet feeling along Front Street while still connecting it to the larger downtown district.	Residents emphasized that the riverfront should serve as a public park and promenade, rather than being dominated by tall buildings. They expressed concern about blocking views of the river and suggested height restrictions to ensure property is used in a way that maximizes access to the views.

FedEx Forum/ South Main

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Existing Zoning: South Main (SM) and South Main- Historic (SM-(H)) The primarily zoning districts for South Main **Recommendation:** Mainstreet 2 Historic (MS-2 (H)) would preserve the historic Mainstreet and encourage new development to follow a similar pattern.	Residents suggested that vacant lots near FedEx Forum, particularly along Vance and Pontotoc, would be well-suited for small-scale residential buildings. They also supported infill multifamily development in the South Main area to strengthen the neighborhood fabric.

St. Jude and the Pinch District

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Existing Zoning: Central Business District (CBD) the primary zoning district for Downtown and Mixed Use (MU) a zoning district that broadly supports mixed use development **Recommendation:** Central Business District (CBD) and Main Street-2 (MS-2) would connect St. Jude and the Pinch District to the rest of Downtown while maintaining a Mainstreet scale.	Community members recommended shifting zoning around St. Jude from employment-focused designations to mixed-use districts, such as CMU-1, to allow more density and a better transition to surrounding areas. They also supported incorporating upper-story residential near the campus.

Medical District and Edge District

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Existing Zoning: Campus-1 (CMP-1) a zoning district appropriate for medical and institutional campuses and a Mix of Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) and Residential (R) Uses and Residential Urban (RU) uses **Recommendation:** Institutional campus (IC) and Mainstreet-2 (MS-2)would help integrate the medical campuses into the surrounding primary corridors	Residents agreed with the MS-2 designation along Poplar but raised questions about whether zoning should differ between the Downtown Core and the Edge, reflecting mixed opinions on how the areas should be treated.

Area 4: Rozelle, Glenview, Cooper Young

Cooper Young / Early Maxwell / Christian Brothers

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor and Anchor Neighborhoods **Existing Zoning**: Residential Urban-6 (R-6) exclusively single unit zoning, Residential Urban 1 (RU-1) low intensity residential zoning consisting of primarily single- and two-unit residential developments, Mixed Use (MU) a zoning designation that broadly supports mixed use development, Commercial Mixed Use-3 (CMU-3) the highest auto centric commercial development district **Recommendation:** Residential Urban-6 (R-6), Residential Urban 1 (RU-1) and Mainstreet-1 (MS-1) would preserve the historic and naturally occurring low intensity residential housing types by better connecting to the activities of the Mainstreet	Community members voiced strong support for maintaining the walkable character of Cooper-Young, but with clear limits on building scale. Residents generally supported MS zoning for Cooper, provided that development was capped at two stories, with density concentrated at key intersections such as Central & Cooper and Peabody & Cooper. Transition into nearby residential neighborhoods should also be carefully protected, with strict two-story limits to preserve neighborhood integrity and protect long-term residents. Specific zoning recommendations included keeping Avery and Toby Park as R-6, designating Spanish American Park as parkland, and zoning Nelson & Young as MS-1 with height restrictions. A consistent preference emerged for two-story maximums along Cooper and Young, though opinions diverged about whether MS-1 was too intense overall. Many emphasized the need for natural buffers between commercial and residential areas and expressed concern about parking requirements associated with future MS-1 zoning. Residents highlighted a clear north/south split at the railroad: those south of the tracks favored retaining low-intensity zoning with no major changes, while those north of the tracks were more open to slightly increased density. At the same time, there was tension between some residents, who felt RU-1 zoning was too permissive and some who agreed. These contrasting views underscored a broader conflict about where intensity should be increased or reduced within the district.

Glenview / Netherwood & Willet / Lamar & McLean

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor and Anchor Neighborhoods **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use-1 (CMU-1)the lowest intensity auto-centric, Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) a zoning district primarily used for apartments, Residential-6 (R-6) a primarily single unit residential district **Recommendation:** Mainstreet-1 (MS-1) Residential Urban-1 (RU-1), Residential-6 (R-6) would preserve the existing and naturally occurring low intensity residential housing types by better connecting to the activities of the Mainstreet and allow more opportunities for intergenerational housing.	Residents expressed strong opposition to multifamily housing, commercial uses such as stores or restaurants, motorcycle clubs, halfway houses, and blighted properties within their neighborhoods. They preferred downzoning several streets, including Willet, Netherwood, Kendale, Glenview, South Parkway, and the old rehab center, from RU-1 to R-6. While supporting MS-1 zoning, many residents suggested allowing building heights up to three stories instead of two.

Annesdale Park / Carr Ave Historic District

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Community **Existing Zoning**: Residential 6 Historic (R-6(H)), exclusively single unit zoning designation with a historic designation, with pockets of Residential Urban-1 (RU-1) low intensity residential zoning consisting of primarily single- and two-unit residential developments, **Recommendation:** Residential-6 Historic (R-6 (H)) would continue to maintain the historic development pattern that exists in the area while unifying disjointed zoning districts	**Annesdale Park / Carr Ave Historic District** Residents generally supported the current zoning and the RU-1 designation once distinctions between cottage homes and cottage courts were clarified. They emphasized that zoning should not be split within the historic district and suggested downzoning Courtland and Idlewild from RU-1 to R-6. Union Avenue was widely recognized as an anchor, but residents highlighted the need for safer, more pedestrian-friendly streets, including improvements to bike lanes and better traffic management. While welcoming growth and diversity, they stressed that congestion must be avoided and adequate space provided for cars. Some residents also suggested reducing commercial intensity near the interstate along Lamar, and there was interest in aligning the Annesdale Mansion's zoning with the surrounding R-6 neighborhood, despite its current use as an event center.

Area 5: Central Gardens, Overton Square

Central Gardens

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Community **Existing Zoning**: Residential-6 Historic (R-6 (H)) an exclusively single unit zoning district within a historic district and Residential-8 Historic (R-8 (H)) an exclusively single unit zoning district within a historic district with slightly larger lots **Recommendation:** Residential-6 Historic (R-6 (H)) would continue to maintain the historic development pattern that exists in the area while unifying disjointed zoning districts	Residents were generally satisfied with the proposed changes and showed Active support for the new R-6 zoning. There was strong enthusiasm for restoring the trolleys. Some residents expressed interest in slightly more density near I.C. Church and Grace-St. Luke's, though this was not a consensus view across the neighborhood.

Union & Belvedere / McLean

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor- Neighborhood Mainstreet **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use 1 (CMU-1) the lowest intensity auto centric commercial corridor, and Commercial Mixed Use 3 (CMU-3) The highest intensity auto centric commercial corridor. **Recommendation:** Mainstreet 1 (MS-1) and Mainstreet 2 (MS-2) would help unify the development pattern down Union and discourage high intensity automotive uses	Residents supported the MS-1 designation along Union and emphasized the importance of walkability, particularly for safe crossings. They were generally comfortable with more intense development north of Union, provided that walkability is maintained. Concerns were raised about future parking pressures, with a preference for managing parking to prevent spillover into residential streets and using rear parking with natural buffers like trees and shrubs rather than fences.

Overton Square

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor-Urban Mainstreet **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use-1 (CMU-1) the lowest auto centric commercial zoning district, Commercial Mixed Use-3 (CMU-3) the highest auto centric commercial zoning district, Office General (OG) a zoning district appropriate for large office towers, Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) zoning districts appropriate for large multi-unit housing **Recommendation:** Mainstreet-1 (MS-1) and Mainstreet-2 (MS-2) would clean up the many zoning districts and reenforce the pattern of walkability instead of autocentric development patterns	Some residents suggested downgrading the area to MS-1, citing concerns that commercial activity is too intense. Others countered that Overton Square is a vibrant community hub that could benefit from additional nearby housing and a wider variety of commercial uses beyond just restaurants.

Area 6: Crosstown and Evergreen

Jackson and Watkins/ Snowden

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Corridor **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use-1 (CMU-1) the lowest autocentric use, Commercial Mixed Use-3 (CMU-3) the highest auto-centric commercial use and Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) a district appropriate for large multi-unit residential buildings **Recommendation:** Commercial Mixed Use-2 (CMU-2) and Commercial Mixed Use-3 Historic (CMU-3 (H)) are maintained along Jackson to scale into the neighborhood. Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) was maintained over existing multi-family properties, but instances of RU-3 over non-apartments were downzoned to RU-1 to match the rest of the neighborhood.	Residents generally supported the proposed zoning, with most tables expressing no objections to commercial zoning along Jackson. A few questioned whether CMU-3 (H) was appropriate but recognized it aligned with existing uses and the highway location. There was broad support for limiting auto-centric uses to highway exits to keep neighborhood commercial areas walkable, and for downzoning RU-3 parcels near I-240 and Crosstown. Some noted that retaining RU-3 could provide flexibility for higher-risk properties.

Madison & Cleveland / Washington Bottoms

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor Neighborhood Urban **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use -3 (CMU-3) the highest intensity Commercial Mixed-Use districts, Commercial Mixed Use-1 (CMU-1) The lowest intensity auto centric use and Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) a district that is appropriate for multi-unit housing. **Recommendation:** Residential Urban-4 (RU-4) would allow large scale infill development while remaining primarily residential	Residents agreed that this area is appropriate for higher density development and supported broad upzoning to MS and RU-4 to foster a walkable, urban neighborhood. They also appreciated the step-down from RU-4 to RU-3 transitioning into Evergreen, helping maintain neighborhood character while accommodating growth.

Overton Park Avenue / Evergreen

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor Neighborhood Crossing **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use-1 (CMU-1) The lowest intensity auto centric use, Commercial Mixed Use-3 (CMU-3) has the highest intensity auto centric use, Office General (OG) a zoning district appropriate for large office towers. The neighborhood is predominantly R-6, but with instances of R-8, R-10, and RU-1. **Recommendation**: MS-1 would reinforce the block's form as a walkable node of activity at the scale of the surrounding neighborhood. The primarily Single-Unit pattern should be maintained with a unified R-6 zoning, with RU-3 being used to cover long existing apartment properties.	Residents generally supported MS-1 frontage standards for commercial properties and a unified R-6 (H) zoning for Evergreen. Some concerns arose about the transition from R-8/R-10 to R-6, though most understood the reasoning. Residents sought clarity on zoning versus historic overlay rules and emphasized retaining RU-1 between Lawrence and Poplar. Feedback on specific structures, such as the Dickinson & Autumn church, was mixed, with some supporting rezoning for reuse and others prioritizing protection from over-intensity. Overall, residents wanted to maintain neighborhood character while allowing compatible development.

Poplar Corridor (Cleveland to Tucker) / Evergreen

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Corridor **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use-3 (CMU-3) the highest auto centric commercial development district **Recommendation:** Commercial Mixed Use-2 (CMU-2) would allow for less intense auto centric uses without excluding the existing uses. Historic districts south of Poplar should be downzoned from RU-3 to RU-1 where possible to better reflect and preserve the existing pattern of historic homes.	Residents generally supported RU-3 along Poplar, though some expressed concern that older tall buildings felt too large. They backed downzoning Evergreen south of Poplar from RU-3 to RU-1 and generally agreed with CMU-2, with some advocating for CMU-1 to reduce drive-thrus and height. MS-2 at Poplar & Tucker was supported as a gateway into Overton Park

Crosstown & Cleveland Corridor / Speedway Terrace & Evergreen

Zoning and Policy Recommendations	What We Heard (Community Feedback)
Anchor Urban Mainstreet and Anchor neighborhoods **Existing Zoning**: Commercial Mixed Use-2 (CMU-2) medium intensity commercial uses, and Commercial Mixed Use -3 (CMU-3) the highest intensity Commercial Mixed-Use districts Employment (EMP) appropriate for warehouses and employment centers **Recommendation:** Mainstreet-1 (MS-1) and Mainstreet 2 (MS-2) and Urban Center (UC),	Residents expressed strong support for commercial zoning along Crosstown and the MS frontage standards, with positive feedback on the step-downs from MS-2 to MS-1 into Evergreen and the increase to MS-2 at Poplar/Cleveland. There was general support for a unified RU-3 in Speedway Terrace, though reactions to RU-1 east of Cleveland were mixed, with some wanting continuity with Evergreen and others supporting limited RU-1 near commercial edges, with a compromise to revisit if vacancies rise. Concerns were raised about potential street parking impacts from increased commercial activity. Residents also emphasized the need for better code enforcement of sidewalks and curbs, and supported RU-4 zoning near Crosstown and Overton Park.
Anchor neighborhoods **Existing Zoning**: Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) a district that is appropriate for multi-unit housing. Residential- 15 (R-15) Extremely Large lot suburban residential zoning district, Residential-10 (R-10) large lot suburban residential zoning district, Residential Urban-1 (RU-1) lower intensity residential district appropriate for single- and two-unit homes, Residential 6 Historic (R-6(H)) exclusively single unit zoning district with small and moderate lots	

Recommendation: Residential blocks west of Cleveland should uniformly be zoned RU-3 to allow the greater diversity of housing types requested by residents. Residential blocks east of Cleveland should be RU-1 to better scale between the development pressures along Cleveland and the existing pattern of Single-Unit homes in the neighborhood.	