North District Workshop 3 Summary: December 12, 2024

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 North District planning process. While not directly tied to zoning, these ideas reflect broader concerns and aspirations related to infrastructure, economic development, and community representation.

• Environmental Justice and Public Health

Community members emphasized the need for widespread soil testing, environmental cleanup, and green buffers to address pollution and industrial impacts near residential areas. They support reducing heavy industrial zoning and converting brownfields into open space with trees. There is also concern about health risks from unregulated businesses, illegal dumping, and housing near highways.

• Economic Development and Commercial Activity

Residents support commercial growth by encouraging local businesses, targeted upzoning, and more flexible zoning policies. They want supportive services to help create vibrant, active commercial areas. There is also a call to reform tax incentive programs like PILOTs to promote equity and reduce displacement.

Mobility and Transportation

Community members want a clear transit vision that supports walkable, vibrant neighborhoods. Increasing density near transit stops and calming traffic in key corridors are seen as ways to improve safety and accessibility.

Community Character and Aesthetics

Residents want to preserve neighborhood character by promoting adaptive reuse, walkability, and aesthetics. They support more parks and green buffers between industrial and residential areas. Zoning should reflect community identity, not just density goals.

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

- Chelsea Ave (Page 3)
- Uptown (Page 4)
- Douglass (Page 5)

- Jackson Ave (Page 4)
- Klondike (Page 5)

Chelsea Avenue

| Zoning and Policy Recommendations | What We Heard (Community Feedback) |
|---|--|
| | Community members expressed strong |
| | support for downzoning along the Chelsea |
| | Avenue corridor, emphasizing the need to |
| | reduce industrial uses and prevent future |
| | industrial encroachment. They recommended a |
| | formal downzoning study and advocated |
| | prohibiting industrial zoning altogether in order |
| | to better align land use with the surrounding |
| | residential and commercial context. |
| | There was also a desire to preserve and expand |
| | mixed-use zoning, particularly at key |
| | intersections and connecting corridors like |
| | Watkins, Danny Thomas, and Thomas Street. |
| | Residents highlighted the opportunity to create |
| | a more walkable and vibrant corridor by |
| | extending mixed-use zoning and implementing traffic calming measures between North |
| Corridor | Parkway and Chelsea. |
| Contact | Tarkway and Onetsea. |
| Existing Zoning: Primarily Heavy Industrial (IH) | To improve environmental conditions and |
| with pockets of commercial and employment | neighborhood aesthetics, the community |
| zones | supported adding green buffers, such as trees |
| | and shrubs, between industrial and residential |
| Recommendation: Primarily low to medium | areas, rather than using walls. They also called |
| intensity Commercial zoning CMU-1 and CMU-2 | for funding to evaluate and address soil |
| surrounded by Open Space (OS) designation. | contamination, along with a broader vision to |
| Would limit the amount of new industrial uses and | reimagine Chelsea Avenue using models like |
| encourage natural remediation of brownfields and | Jackson or Broad Avenue that feature adaptive |
| contaminated spaces. | reuse, attractive design, and a mix of uses. |
| Community | |
| Existing Zoning : Employment (EMP) a district that | Chelsea and Watkins- Residents |
| suitable for warehouses and employment centers | recommended rezoning to OS (Open Space) |
| | rather than EMP→ RU-3 in order to strengthen |
| Recommendation: Residential Urban-3 (RU-3) | green space connections and tie into the |
| which would allow for diverse housing types | existing Greenline network. |
| Community | |
| Existing Zoning : Mixed Use (MU), the old mixed | |
| use zoning designation | |
| Recommendation : Chelsea and Hollywood – | Chelsea and Hollywood- Residents supported |
| (MS-1) Main Street 1 would encourage mixed use | maintaining the transition from MU to MS-1 |
| development aligned with the pattern of old | zoning to better reflect the evolving character of |
| | the area. |
| Hollywood | |

Jackson Avenue

Zoning and Policy Recommendations What We Heard (Community Feedback) Along Jackson Avenue, community members supported targeted zoning changes to balance growth and neighborhood character. They recommended increasing density and activity Corridor around the Jackson bus stop to promote transit-oriented development and create a Existing Zoning: A mix of Mixed Use (MU) more vibrant, walkable corridor. At the same Commercial (CMU) and Residential Uses time, residents emphasized the importance of preserving residential character east of Jackson Recommendation: Mixed use areas should be and Watkins by downzoning or maintaining updated to the new category of Mainstreet 1 (MSexisting zoning and specifically proposed 1), Commercial uses should maintain lower reducing RU-1 to R-6 at Evergreen and Jackson. intensity, and residential neighborhoods should Additionally, there was support for zoning that primarily remain the same unless there is need for would allow the development of a new police infill particularly around the interstate. station along Jackson Avenue.

Uptown

| Zoning and Policy Recommendations | What We Heard (Community Feedback) |
|--|---|
| | In Uptown, including the Chelsea, Greenlaw, |
| | Bearwater, and North Main areas, residents |
| | expressed mixed views on residential density |
| | but aligned around the need for zoning |
| | consistency. Some supported RU-3 zoning in |
| | specific parts of Uptown Chelsea to allow for |
| | increased density, while others strongly |
| | preferred limiting upzoning, suggesting RU-2 at |
| | most and encouraging MU zoning only with |
| | justification. There was broad consensus that |
| | zoning should be mirrored across the |
| | neighborhood to avoid a patchwork approach. |
| | In Bearwater, residents emphasized a |
| Community | preference for RU-1 zoning focused on |
| | homeownership and long-term sustainability. |
| Existing Zoning: Medium Density Residential | Similar priorities were echoed in North Main |
| (MDR) A mix of residential and special districts | and Greenlaw, where community members |
| that support infill development | supported maintaining RU-1 and noted limited |
| | capacity for additional apartment |
| Recommendation: Residential Urban 1 and 2 | development. Additionally, concerns were |
| (RU-1 and RU-2) would promote the continued | raised about affordability, particularly in |
| growth and development of the unique housing | relation to rising rents in large condo |
| types that are found throughout uptown. | developments in Uptown Chelsea. |

Klondike

| Zoning and Policy Recommendations | What We Heard (Community Feedback) |
|---|--|
| | In Klondike, community members advocated |
| | for a greater range of middle housing options to |
| | support diverse residential needs while |
| | preserving the existing neighborhood character. |
| | They also supported maintaining MS-1 zoning |
| | west of the Jackson and Watkins intersection to |
| | ensure stability and continuity in land use. In |
| | the adjacent Watkins area, residents |
| | recommended keeping R-6 zoning and |
| | proposed rezoning the Watkins & Chelsea |
| | intersection to Open Space to connect with the |
| | Greenline and enhance recreational access. |
| | In Smokey City , there was support for zoning |
| | that would enable the development of a new |
| | police station along Jackson Avenue, indicating |
| Community | a priority on public safety infrastructure. |
| | In Vollintine & Avalon , community feedback |
| Existing Zoning: Residential Urban-1 a primarily | focused on ensuring zoning accurately reflects |
| single- unit neighborhood that also allows for | current land uses, such as restaurants, |
| duplexes. | churches, and schools, rather than applying |
| | commercial designations like CMU-1. |
| Recommendation : Residential Urban 1 and 2 | Additionally, residents requested the addition |
| (RU-1 and RU-2) would promote the continued | of parks and green spaces near Wild Bill's Juke |
| growth and development and allow for more infill | Joint to support community gathering and |
| housing in areas experiencing high vacancy rates | enhance the area's vibrancy. |

Douglass

| Zaning and Balicy Basemmandations | What We Heard (Community Feedback) |
|--|---|
| Zoning and Policy Recommendations | virial we heard (Community Feedback) |
| Community | |
| | In the Douglass neighborhood, residents called |
| Existing Zoning: Commercial Mixed Use-1 (CMU- | for stronger enforcement to address ongoing |
| 1) the lowest auto centric commercial district and | illegal dumping issues that are negatively |
| Heavy Industrial (IH) | impacting quality of life. At Warford and |
| | Chelsea , the community expressed a desire for |
| Recommendation: Commercial Mixed Use-1 | increased commercial activity, recommending |
| (CMU-1) would maintain the existing scale of the | upzoning to CMU-3 and supporting the growth |
| commercial business in the area and Heavy | of local businesses to help revitalize the area. |
| Industrial (around Southern Cotton) would reflect | In the Southern Cotton area, there was a |
| the areas current industrial activity. Future | strong push to downzone the area due to |
| transitions could be explored as industrial uses | concerns about odor and pollution from |
| change over time. | industrial uses affecting nearby homes. |