

U District Draft Zoning Proposal

Summary of Public Comment Process

What We Heard

August, 2016

1. Introduction and Background

The Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) released its draft zoning recommendations for the U District for public comment on May 27th, 2016. The release of the draft zoning recommendations follows 4+ years of community involvement in the U District neighborhood, including more than 80 meetings and the development of the U District Urban Design Framework (UDF).

The proposed rezone would increase the allowable height and density in the core of the neighborhood, adjacent to the Sound Transit light rail station that will open in 2021. The proposed rezone also applies new development standards that are responsive to the U District context, and includes requirements for affordable housing, open space, and other amenities valued by the community. A report summarizing the draft proposal as well as the Urban Design Framework can be found [here](#).

The City conducted an open house meeting to share the recommendations with the community on May 31st, attended neighborhood organization meetings, and conducted “office hours” sessions throughout the neighborhood.

Presentations and Opportunities for Comment on Draft Proposed Zoning

OPCD provided numerous opportunities for community members to meet with staff to learn more about the zoning recommendations and provide input on the proposal.

OPCD conducted the following outreach meetings/events:

- U District Street Fair – May 21-22
- Community-wide meeting at Neptune Theatre, May 31, 2016 (over 100 attendees)
- Office Hours at Suzzallo Library Café, June 2
- Office Hours at Café Allegro, June 8
- Office Hours at U Heights Community Center, June 14
- Office Hours at Café Allegro, June 16

OPCD attended the following community meetings to discuss the draft proposed zoning:

- U District Partnership (UDP)
- University District Community Council (UDCC)
- City/University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC)
- Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance (RNA)
- Ravenna neighborhood residents

OPCD used multiple methods to invite community members to provide comments on the proposed zoning recommendations including:

- Project Listserve (email)

- Dedicated email account UDistrict@seattle.gov
- Other OPCD communication channels (Twitter, Facebook)

The comments highlighted in this report reflect feedback obtained during the community meetings and via electronic and mail posted comments during the advertised public comment period. Over 100 people turned out for the community-wide event on May 31 at the Neptune Theatre, participating in thoughtful discussions with staff from OPCD, many other city departments, and community partners. Dozens more attended neighborhood meetings. We received over 130 written comments during the public comment period. You can review the comments submitted [here](#):

2. Public Comment Highlights and OPCD Response

Approximately 90 separate comments were received via the email address UDistrict@seattle.gov during the comment period (May 27 – July 15). An additional 33 comment cards were collected during the May 31 open house event. We received comments from individuals and organizations including:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> U District Partnership (UDP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Livable U District |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U District Community Council (UDCC) | <input type="checkbox"/> Housing Development Consortium Seattle-King County |
| <input type="checkbox"/> City/University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) | <input type="checkbox"/> Laurelhurst Community Club |
| <input type="checkbox"/> University of Washington (UW) | <input type="checkbox"/> Roosevelt Neighbors Alliance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SEIU Local 925 and the Coalition of UW Unions | <input type="checkbox"/> University Park Community Club (UPCC) |

Overall response:

Overall, most people who submitted written comments via UDistrict@seattle.gov either expressed outright support for the proposal, or support if specific issues were addressed more thoroughly. A little over one quarter expressed disapproval of or opposition to the proposed zoning. About 10% expressed general concerns (not related to zoning) that they felt should be addressed. This is how the responses can be generally summarized:

Approximately 36% of the comments received were supportive of the zoning proposal.

Approximately 28% of the comments indicated that they would be supportive if certain things were changed in the proposal and/or addressed. In general, people were asking for changes to the specific provisions of the proposed zoning or wanting certain conditions to be met prior to implementation of the proposed zoning.

Approximately 26% of the comments received were opposed to the zoning proposal

Approximately 10% of the comments were either unrelated to the proposal, or very specific to an issue without stating whether or not they supported the proposed zoning. For example, expressing concerns about public safety, traffic, parking, etc.

People who submitted comment cards at the May 31 open house meeting were less apt to express whether or not they were supportive of the proposal. These comments were collected at a series of information stations and tended to reference a particular theme (e.g. housing, parks, transportation). Of those who specified support or opposition, it was fairly evenly split – approximately 20% expressing support, 20% expressing opposition, and 20% expressing a particular change (most asking for increased development potential) that they would support. The remaining 40% were thematic in nature and have been included in the comment summary (see Section 3).

In addition to written comments, OPCD staff had many community conversations and received verbal comments that are harder to quantify but echo many of the same themes that were provided in written comments.

Most frequently raised comment themes and OPCD response.

While the comments received reflected a variety of opinions and particular interests, there were some themes that were repeated fairly frequently.

The most frequently raised comment themes were:

- Open space
- Tree canopy
- Urban design-related issues: development character and livability
- Transportation-related issues: traffic and congestion, transit and parking
- Affordable housing
- Overall impacts of development – impact fees
- Historic preservation

OPCD response to comments and concerns:

It is interesting to note that the recurring themes were mentioned both in cases where people were supportive of the proposal and also where people were opposed to, or conditionally supportive of the proposal.

For example, the need for public open space was by far the most mentioned theme for those who had concerns about the zoning proposal. However, people in favor of the proposal often cited open space requirements and incentives as some of the rezone’s advantages. Similarly, the potential loss of affordable housing was mentioned by those who were not supportive of the proposal, while the affordable housing provisions in the zoning recommendation were liked by many who were supportive. In this section we highlight each of the frequently-mentioned comment themes and how they are being addressed by the zoning recommendation or other non-zoning related actions/programs where relevant.

Open Space

Many people expressed concern about the existing amount of public open space in the U District neighborhood. Some stated that they felt additional public open space should be provided, in particular a centrally-located public plaza, before the zoning proposal be implemented. Conversations about the desire for more public open

space have been ongoing throughout the U District Planning Process. In 2015, the University District Parks Plan was updated and a publicly-owned central square is listed as one of six key elements of the identified open space planning concept.

The zoning proposal addresses three of the six key open space elements described in the *University District Parks Plan*:

North-south green spine: The recommended zoning includes provisions where new development can earn bonus floor area by contributing to improvements to help improve the Brooklyn Ave NE green street. This is the green street referred to in the parks plan as the *north-south green spine* and it will connect existing open spaces at the north (Cowen Park) and south (Portage Bay Park).

East-west pedestrian connections: The recommended zoning includes provisions where new development can earn bonus floor area by contributing to improvements to create the NE 43rd Street and NE 42nd St green streets. In addition, new development can earn bonus floor area by providing east-west mid-block pedestrian corridors, and mid-block pedestrian corridors are required for new development on certain large sites.

Pocket plazas (small, publicly-accessible spaces): The recommended zoning includes provisions where new development can earn bonus floor area by creating open space that is accessible to the public or paying a fee-in-lieu to create public open space. For large sites, 30,000 square feet or greater, a minimum of 15% of the site must be set aside for publicly accessible open space.

The other 3 key elements of the University District Parks Plan planning concept are: a *Publicly-owned central square*; *Activate existing and planned parks*; and better integration with the *UW Campus edge*. These key elements are not directly addressed by zoning, but we are working with partners to address them.

New investments by the City, Sound Transit, and UW will help address the desire for centrally-located open space, including improvements to one of the preferred sites near the intersection of Brooklyn Ave NE and NE 43rd St identified during the open space planning process. Seattle Parks and Recreation is committed to working with the U District Partnership to help activate existing and planned parks, and various elements of the UW's Campus Planning work will help improve the west edge of Central Campus.

Tree Canopy

Trees and tree canopy are a valued feature in the U District. Many people commented that they were concerned new development would result in loss of existing trees. People also expressed an interest in making sure that new development provides for tree planting and landscaping.

Our analysis suggests that development in the rezone areas will actually increase local tree canopy. Most of the U District's core has less than 5% canopy cover. Between the proposals landscape requirements and SDOT's street tree requirements, we anticipate new development will exceed 15% canopy cover, the City's goal for commercial and mixed use zones.

Urban Design and Development Character

There were a variety of concerns expressed in comments about the character of new development under the proposed zoning. This was also an area where there was also excitement for the potential of a transformative effect on the core of the neighborhood with transit-oriented development (TOD). General concerns relate to the increase in building height and the scale of development that would be allowed with the proposed zoning. People also were concerned about the character of new development and that it respect the existing neighborhood character. Related to this were comments about the need for building setbacks, modulation and tower spacing.

The proposed zoning includes development standards that manage building bulk and modulation. These development standards include limits to floor area size for highrise buildings and requirements that towers be spaced a minimum of 75' apart. There are street level and upper level setback requirements in specific locations and a maximum building width limit of 250' feet to prevent overly-wide buildings on the long north-south blocks (no such standard currently applies to development in the U District).

In addition to the bulk and scale provisions in the proposed zoning, OPCD will work with the community to update the neighborhood design guidelines immediately after the rezone. These guidelines provide more detailed guidance on building character and materials, site design and street-level amenities.

Transportation

Transportation-related concerns included traffic congestion, lack of parking, and access to convenient transit.

First, it's worth noting that the biggest driver on congestion in the U District is not locally-generated trips, but through traffic, which is not directly affected by development patterns in the U District. The U District zoning proposal responds to the regional investment to bring light rail service to the neighborhood by allowing mixed use, higher density transit-oriented development. By focusing more housing and job density in the core area within the walkshed of the transit station for transit-oriented development, more people will have the ability to live and work in a neighborhood where car ownership is not a necessity.

The proposed zoning does require larger developments to prepare a transportation management plan to mitigate traffic that would be generated by new development.

Separate from the zoning, numerous transportation improvements are planned and underway. For example: protected bike lanes on Roosevelt Way NE, NE Campus Parkway and NE 40th St are under development. Pedestrian improvements to Brooklyn, Ave NE, NE 42nd and NE 43rd St will be realized through implementation of adopted green streets plans. A bus rapid transit route along Roosevelt Ave NE is being considered that would provide additional connections between the U District, Downtown and Northgate.

Affordable Housing

Concerns about affordable housing were mostly related to the risk of losing existing affordable housing units as redevelopment occurs. Some people specifically requested a housing displacement analysis be conducted for the U District before any zoning changes are made.

Affordable housing has been one of the most-discussed topics in the U District planning process. OPCD has conducted multiple studies of housing and displacement issues, and will provide an updated displacement analysis this fall in the final Director's report. Whether or not any zoning changes are implemented in the U District, we anticipate somewhere between 40 and 275 existing units will be demolished in the next 20 years – generally in older, relatively affordable buildings. But current zoning in the U District has very few requirements for developers to build affordable housing or pay for affordable housing construction. Under existing zoning in the next 20 years only 8-20 units of affordable housing would be anticipated, and those would depend on developers choosing to use incentives. Under new requirements in the proposal, we project 540-700 units of affordable housing would be created in the next 20 years through payments and on-site construction. Unlike the demolished housing, these 540-700 units would be new construction meeting modern life safety codes, and they would be income-restricted for 75 years to ensure that low income individuals and families are living in them. See more detailed discussion this fall in the revised Director's Report and Council briefings.

Impacts from Development

Some people felt strongly that new development in the U District should be assessed impact fees for transportation/traffic, parks, and or schools.

The City has not adopted impact fee programs and none are proposed specifically for the U District. A conversation about establishing policy and programs for collecting impact fees for new development would need to take place on a city-wide basis. However, the City does require developers to pay for infrastructure upgrades needed to support new projects.

The proposed zoning does incorporate both requirements and incentives for providing open space and incentives for space for schools, but no requirement that a developer pay a fee for these facilities.

Historic Preservation

There are many older masonry buildings in the U District that represent the history and character of the neighborhood. People are concerned about the possible loss of historically significant buildings and character buildings that are located within the area proposed for increased height and density.

The zoning recommendation includes a provision for a transfer of development rights (TDR) program whereby developers can earn bonus floor area by preserving existing historic landmark buildings and moving the development potential to another site. Further, the proposal allows TDR to preserve unreinforced masonry buildings that are not landmarks. We've heard a particular interest in preservation strategies for the Ave, and are working on additional proposals toward that end.

3. Comment Summary

General concerns and conditions related to the proposed zoning:

The table below summarizes the concerns that people mentioned in their comments with an indication of how many times the issue was mentioned.

Theme	What We Heard (number of times mentioned)
Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a public open space/central public plaza (31) • Existing open space in the U District is inadequate (10) • A public square is not supported and not needed (2) • Create secondary open space areas within the single-family zoned areas (1) • Upzone will increase property values making it difficult to acquire property for public open space. (1)
Tree preservation/tree canopy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect existing trees and require tree planting with new development (9) • Concern about loss of tree canopy (3)
Urban design, development character and livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't like highrise development, proposed zoning allows for buildings that are too tall for the neighborhood (10) • Establish and/or update neighborhood design guidelines to make sure new development maintains desired character (9) • Tall buildings and increased density will reduce livability (4) • Residents of new highrises won't fully participate or be invested in the neighborhood (3) • General concern about loss of neighborhood character (2) • Taller buildings will cast shadows (2) • Tall buildings will block views (1) • Tall buildings will create wind tunnels (1) • Existing view corridors should be analyzed and preserved (1) • Concern that setback provisions and design guidelines are being removed (1) • Long-term residents may leave the community due to the changes zoning will bring (1) • UW campus master plan will result in additional growth and associated impacts to the neighborhood (1) • Concern about lack of maintenance of existing buildings (1) • Need more code enforcement presence for - public safety, noise ordinance violations, overgrown vegetation, obstructed sidewalks, trash dumping (1) • EIS should have analyzed cumulative effects of zoning proposal (1)
Transportation, traffic and parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about existing traffic congestion and lack of parking, and that new development will make conditions worse (11) • Conduct a transportation demand management plan, provide additional parking, require parking, etc. (7) • Ensure adequate transit and access to transit in the neighborhood (3) • Increased development in the U District will have spillover effects on traffic and parking in adjacent neighborhoods (1) • Create pedestrian and bicycle improvements and link to transit (1) • Allow for parking in new buildings (1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about freight and bus mobility on existing streets (1) • No more bike lanes (1)
Affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An affordable housing displacement risk analysis should be conducted (7) • General concern expressed about need for affordable housing (6) • Existing affordable housing must be preserved or replaced if demolished (8) • Affordable housing fee-in-lieu payments should create housing in neighborhood where fees are collected (2) • Need more incentives for family housing (2) • People who oppose the proposed zoning are a minority and reside in single family housing – they will greatly benefit from transit improvements. (2) • Concern that requirements for affordable housing drive up the cost of market housing making it less affordable for those caught in between subsidized and luxury housing. (1)
Impact Fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require developers to pay impact fees for transportation, parks, schools, etc. (11) • Assess development a fee for public art (1)
Historic Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve historic buildings, prepare a historic preservation plan, establish a conservation district, or similar (7) • General concern about loss of historic buildings (2)
Social services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the needs of homeless in the U District, including shelter and social services (9) • Provide for more social services (2) • There are already plenty of social services in the neighborhood (1) • There is a disproportionate number of human services in the neighborhood currently which has resulted in increased crime and uncivil behavior (1)
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that new development will stress existing infrastructure, water, sewer, electricity, etc. (7)
Equity/who benefits from zoning proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed zoning only benefits developers/big business (7) • UW will benefit from the zoning proposal (6) • Neighborhood residents were not represented in the proposal (3) • Concern that people who don't support zoning recommendations live in single family areas and will benefit from light rail and their not supporting the zoning means they don't want to share the benefits by allowing for more people to live and work in a neighborhood with good transit access (2) • Existing TOD policies fall short on racial equity (1) • Only want more affordable housing, not more housing in general (1)
Schools and childcare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for new schools in the neighborhood (3) • Provide for new childcare spaces (1)
Crime and public safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General concerns about rate of crime and public safety in the neighborhood (3)
Land use mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ave has too many restaurants - provide incentives for landlords to lease to non-restaurant businesses (1) • Provide for more residential than office space (1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased office development will not support 24-hour community (1) • Concern that existing businesses will be displaced (1) • Provide for family housing (1)
Economic issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • U District neighborhood growth rate is exceeding projections (1) • Increases in property taxes and lease rates will result in existing businesses leaving the neighborhood (1) • Increased density will result in increase in housing rental rates (1) • New development will create thousands of new low-wage service sector jobs and increase pressure on existing affordable housing and child care (1) • Proposed zoning could result in overbuilding and future vacancies (1) • Need to preserve older commercial business spaces (1)
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taller buildings are not as sustainable and healthy as buildings 6 stories or less – they require more energy, elevators and sophisticated ventilation systems (1)
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the Ave and Brooklyn Ave NE smoke free (1) • Developers should be required to recycle building materials when they demolish buildings (1) • Off leash dog park in the U District is not a good idea (1)

What do people like about the zoning recommendations?

People who provided favorable comments about the zoning recommendation cited the following as things they liked about the proposal.

Theme	What We Heard (number of times mentioned)
Affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning will increase opportunities for the creation of affordable housing (18)
Increased accessibility and Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning is responsive to the opening of the light rail station on Brooklyn Ave NE and will support transit-oriented development (16)
Urban design, development character, and livability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning will result in increased livability and vibrancy in the neighborhood (10) • Like the proposal for increased building height and increased density, some supported even greater height and density than proposed (10) • Like the variety of building types and heights that the zoning would allow (3) • The proposed zoning protects existing single family neighborhoods (3) • The proposed zoning helps prevent sprawl (1) • Allowing for increased height and development in the core area will allow for preservation of existing character buildings outside of core. (1) • Like how the proposed zoning transitions from higher to lower density (1) • More development will mean more eyes on the street and improved public safety (1) • Like the proposed requirements for mid-block connections (1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the proposed requirements for building modulation (1) • Like the proposed requirements for street level activation (1) • Like the proposed landscape requirements (1)
Economic opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning will provide for increased economic opportunity within the neighborhood (9)
Open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning will require and incentivize the creation of additional open space in the neighborhood. (8)
Community planning process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognized and appreciated the involvement of city staff with the neighborhood during the planning process that led to the zoning recommendations (5)
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed zoning supports sustainable development and is more environmentally responsible. (3)
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the proposed green streets plans (2) • The proposal enhances walkability. (2) • Like the Festival Street on Brooklyn Ave NE (1)
Social services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like how the proposed zoning encourages provision of social services space (2) • Glad the Y will stay in the U District and expand. (1)

Specific recommendations for modifications to the proposal:

Some of the comments we received included recommendations for modifications to the zoning proposal. These recommendations are listed in the table below. While most of the recommendations were individual observations and fairly specific, some were mentioned more than once. The table indicates the number of times we noted a particular recommendation.

Development Standard	What We Heard (number of times suggested)
Building height/density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow taller buildings on the Ave than the proposed zoning allows (8) • Reduce overall height limits throughout the neighborhood(2) • Don't increase building height limits on the Ave (2) • Increase the allowable height overall and increase the area designated for SM-U zoning (2) • Increase height limit for properties abutting Roosevelt Way NE between 50th and Ravenna Blvd. (1) • Increase allowable height in SM-U 240 areas to 340 feet (1) • Increase height limit to 500 feet (1) • Eliminate building height limits (1) • Keep building heights as low as possible on the Ave north of 50th (1) • Do not increase height limits to 85' on 12th Ave and 50th – keep existing zoning (1) • Parcels adjacent to narrower streets should be limited to 3 stories (1)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcels adjacent to wider streets (like 45th) should be limited to 6-8 stories (1) • Upzoning should be limited to 2-3 stories more than existing zoning allows in all cases (1) • Cap height limits at 160'. (1) • Should also upzone single family areas. (1)
Floor plate area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase allowable floor plate area in SM-U zone (4)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the allowable FAR overall (1) • Eliminate FAR limits (1)
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the setback requirements (1)
Tower spacing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce tower spacing corner-to-corner to 20' (1)
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require on-site parking (2) • Remove all parking requirements (1)
MHA requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make MHA requirements for U District higher (5) • Limit or no fee in lieu, prioritize/require all housing to be developed on site (3) • Waive MHA fees for property abutting the Ave since no upzone proposed (1)
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every MF housing unit should be required to have a terrace and be open on at least two sides (1) • Include a mandatory requirement for family-sized housing units (1) • Eliminate requirement for street level retail spaces to allow more space for affordable housing. (1)
Zoning boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure zone boundaries coincide with parcel boundaries (1) • Push MR zoning out west and north so that single family does not abut I-5 (1) • Increase the area where SM-U zoning is applied (1) • Upzone area east of 15th Ave between NE 47th St and NE 50th St to NC2-75. (1)
Incentive zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize bonus floor area incentives based on community priorities – make bonus for open space worth more than other incentives (1) • Update childcare incentive zoning requirements to adjust for inflation (1) • Provide a bonus incentive for human services spaces and allow for a fee-in-lieu payment for human services spaces. (1) • Provide an incentive (in single family zoned areas) for mother in law (MIL) and backyard cottages (1) • Only allow bonus floor area for green space and pedestrian connections (1) • Allow the Parks Department to receive property offered from development incentives and 'land bank' it (1) • In the proposed MR zone - allow increased FAR for on-site daycare/ preschool/elementary school and allow increased height for mechanical equipment, green house, and similar on roof (1)

Building modulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No façade on a MF building shall have a flat surface greater than the width of one unit (façade modulation) (1)
Other recommendations – non-zoning related	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a large free 2-hour parking garage near the Ave (1) Change the identified festival street, adjacent to the light rail station to a pedestrian-only boulevard (1) 42nd, 43rd and 47th Streets should have a retail/pedestrian focus (1) Make 12th, Brooklyn and the Ave one-way streets. (1) NE 52nd St should be a green street (1) Lid I-5 between 45th and 50th for open space (1) Close 43rd Ave between campus and the Ave – make it pedestrian only and connect to new public square (1) Consider the condemnation of select parcels to create public open space (1) The capacity allowable with proposed zoning should be limited to 150% of projected growth and development. (1) <p>Rezoning should be done in phases (rings), as development reaches 80% of capacity on one phase, allow increased zoning in next ring, then next. (1)</p>

4. Next Steps

Proposed modifications to zoning recommendation

OPCD is currently considering making amendments to the proposal based on community feedback. We anticipate releasing a revised version of the proposal in September.

Zoning legislation review schedule:

OPCD is finalizing revisions to the zoning recommendations and will transmit legislation to City Council for consideration per the following tentative schedule:

- Mayor’s Recommended proposal transmitted to Council and initial Council briefings expected: **September, 2016**
- Council public hearing on zoning legislation expected: **November, 2016**

Links to Background Information

The following information is available for review on our U District project webpage:

<http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/cityplanning/completenesslist/universitydistrict/whatwhy/default.htm>

- May 31 Community Meeting Power Point presentation

- May 31 Community Meeting Presentation Boards
- 4-page summary of recommended zoning
- Director's Report
- Draft Zoning Ordinance
- Draft Zoning Analysis
- Copy of public comments received