

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT <sup>002</sup> <sup>003</sup>	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT <sup>011</sup>
R1	H1	R1
R-2	H2	R1
R - 2A	H3	R1
R - 2B	H4	R1
R-3	H5	R1
R-3A	H6	R1
R-4	N1	R2
R-4A	N2A	R2
R-4B	N4A	R1
R5	N2B	R3
Fulton R-3	H5	R1
RG-1	N5B	<del>R1</del> <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
RG-2	<sup>005</sup> <sup>006</sup> UG3/ <sup>007</sup>	<del>R1</del> <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
RG-3 <sup>001</sup>	<sup>004</sup> UG3A <sup>008</sup>	RX1 <sup>009</sup> <sup>010</sup>
RG-4	UG5A	RX1
RG-5	UG15	RX2
RG-6	UG25	RX2
R-LC	UG3A	RX2

## #001

Posted by **AtlantaTwin** on **01/21/2025** at **5:12pm** [Comment ID: 919] - [Link](#)  
*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Does this include RG-3-C?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **01/22/2025** at **7:46am** [Comment ID: 921] - [Link](#)  
*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Yes, it does. The “-C” shown at the end of some zoning district names on the official zoning map simply means that there zoning conditions applied to that property. All zoning conditions dated 2000 and later will still apply.

## #002

Posted by **AtlantaTwin** on **01/26/2025** at **9:34am** [Comment ID: 976] - [Link](#)  
*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

I am looking for PD-H, which is what Amsterdam Walk is currently zoned for. What will that be converted to?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **01/27/2025** at **11:19am** [Comment ID: 979] - [Link](#)  
*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

PD districts will convert to a corresponding Form and Use Districts, depending on their specifics. We are in the process of reviewing several hundred cases for the best fit. All associated conditions, including site plans, will continue to apply as conditional zoning (-C on the zoning map).

Regarding Amsterdam Walk, the City's GIS website appears to have an error. As of 1/27/25 501 Amsterdam HAS NOT been rezoned to PD-MU. The legislation (23-O-1715) remains in Zoning Committee and is being held.

## #003

Posted by **AtlantaTwin** on **01/27/2025** at **4:27pm** [Comment ID: 984] - [Link](#)  
*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

I am looking for existing zone HC-20B, which is what 1215-1459 South Ponce de Leon NE are zoned for. What will this be converted to?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **01/29/2025** at **10:34am** [Comment ID: 995] - [Link](#)  
*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Historic and conservation districts (HC's) will keep their current zoning. They are not converting to Form and Use Districts.

## #004

Posted by **Jennifer Friese** on **12/06/2024** at **5:05pm** [Comment ID: 649] - [Link](#)

*Suggestion*

*Agree: 2, Disagree: 0*

I agree that it's more appropriate for the RG districts to convert to Neighborhood categories - RG3 is closest to N5A - (N5 is too dense for RG1)- the goal of RG3 was to allow for a variety of housing options and to preserve and reuse the existing buildings - it allows single family, single family conversions, duplexes, town homes, college court, small apartments - although that flexibility caused a lot of confusion and some headaches interpreting the rules, it's left us with wonderful neighborhood scale areas that have naturally occurring affordable housing. The Neighborhood categories will ensure that new buildings are in scale with the residential neighborhoods they are part of.

## #005

Posted by **phiae01** on **12/05/2024** at **3:15pm** [Comment ID: 604] - [Link](#)

*Suggestion*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

This is an inappropriate conversion. This should be an N5A or an N5B for the area in VAHI.

## #006

Posted by **phiae01** on **12/06/2024** at **9:45am** [Comment ID: 627] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

As the current RG2 zoning is very heterogeneous across the city. Can different RG2 blocks be rezoned into different new forms? For example the RG2 zone at the south end of VAHI seems like it would better map to N5A or possibly N5B.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/06/2024** at **1:30pm** [Comment ID: 633] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

Thank you for your idea. You and others have commented on the RG-2 and RG-3 "islands" within neighborhoods. We're going explore if we can find a way to convert these districts in a way that doesn't create unforeseen problems in other neighborhoods.

Reply by **phiae01** on **12/10/2024** at **10:57am** [Comment ID: 720] - [Link](#)

*Suggestion*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Perhaps a new UG2 ?? Something that has setbacks of say 3-5' on side and rear, front setbacks that match existing, a 35' height limit or 2.5 floors, no limit on number of units, and a similar ~.4 FAR based on GLA.

#007

Posted by **bluedestiny917** on **12/06/2024** at **4:10pm** [Comment ID: 648] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

Why are RG-2 and RG 3 the same since the FAR doubles the allowable area in going from RG-2 (0.348) to RG 3 (0.696)? Logically RG-2 needs it's own definition more in line with the existing FAR.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/09/2024** at **11:40am** [Comment ID: 709] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you for your comments. The FAR of RG-2 (0.348) is LESS than the allowed FAR in most House-Scale Districts. Because RG-2 is intended to create low-density garden apartments, we have grouped it with the "Form District" that results in a typical 2 to 3 story "house-scale" building.

This said, we are going to review if RX1 is the best conversion based on the input of you and others.

Thanks!

Reply by **bluedestiny917** on **12/09/2024** at **1:21pm** [Comment ID: 711] - [Link](#)

*Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

Thanks. Related question: In select areas of the RG-2 districts there are still many remaining 1 1/2 story bungalow and two story single family/duplex homes interspersed with garden apartments/condos.

Also UG3A setbacks appear to be less than existing in RG-2.

Are there any transitional buffer and height planes envisioned to buffer these legacy homes from potentially larger developments than exist now or may be created out of assembled and replatted lots?

Is there the possibility of creating Conservation Districts for these legacy single family/duplex homes?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/09/2024** at **2:28pm** [Comment ID: 712] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: -1*

The proposal continues the current regulation of having a "transitional yard" where an RG district abuts R1-R5 in place of side or rear setbacks (see Division 8.4 of Chapter 8 of the draft). This generally requires a 10 or 20 ft landscape setback or matching the setback of the adjacent House-Scale or Neighborhood-Scale District.

Within NS Districts, the number of stories has been reduced from current 3 to 2.5, which better matches existing built patterns. There is currently a Conservation District proposed for R-3 and

R-4 equivalents.

Reply by **phiae01** on **12/10/2024** at **10:30am** [Comment ID: 719] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

I want to clarify here, the issue with the proposed form is that the RG2 has 7ft setbacks within its zone, so an RG2 to RG2 requires 7ft setbacks on side and rear even when adjacent to another RG2. This is something worth preserving (could perhaps decrease to 5ft). But the UG3A has no such within UG3A setback requirements. Why not? From a property access and safety perspective setbacks should be preserved.

724] - [Link](#)

Reply by **bluedestiny917** on **12/10/2024** at **5:30pm** [Comment ID:

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you. To develop this a bit more:

Are there any thoughts for creating a Conservation District for the existing legacy single family/duplex homes within the existing RG-2 to UG3A Districts with additional buffering/setback requirements similar to what may be proposed for the R-3 and R-4 equivalents as mentioned above?

For these RG-2 to UG3A Districts, could there be a new Form diagram more like N5B forms to be applied to any UG3A sites abutting these legacy RG-2 single family/duplex homes so there is a Conservation strategy to harmonize new development with these existing RG-2 single family/duplex homes, since the UG3A diagrams don't offer a way to address this

This alternative form would also be a strategy to address the setback issue in the post below and scale issues mentioned in related posts.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/10/2024** at **6:28pm** [Comment ID: 725] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

If I understand your request correctly, there is currently no proposed Conservation District for more urban bungalow neighborhoods (remember, Conservation Districts only change height). Can you please be specific about where you are referring too? Is it St. Charles/Greenwood Ave in Virginia-Highland? Other than the two streets, almost all RG-2 in the City is large apartment complexes (I just ran a search using GIS). Thanks!

729] - [Link](#)  
Reply by **bluedestiny917** on **12/11/2024** at **12:33pm** [Comment ID:

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you,

Yes, it is specifically St. Charles/Greenwood Ave in Virginia-Highland. I believe there are others.

- [Link](#)  
Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/12/2024** at **11:20am** [Comment ID: 730]

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thanks for clarifying. Believe it or now, all other RG-2 (save 5 lots on Atlanta Ave, 10 on Troy Street, and some one-offs) are large complexes. We will look into options. Thanks!

## #008

Posted by **Jennifer Friese** on **01/26/2025** at **2:50pm** [Comment ID: 977] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Just a thought, perhaps RG3 could be split into Neighborhood Scale Form and UG3 Form based on where they currently fall in the LUI table?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **01/27/2025** at **7:40am** [Comment ID: 978] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you for your idea. Many other stakeholders have made us aware of concerns regarding the RG-3 conversion. We are looking into strategies for addressing RG-2 and RG-3 embedded in neighborhoods differently.

## #009

Posted by **Jennifer Friese** on **11/24/2024** at **5:12pm** [Comment ID: 576] - [Link](#)

*Suggestion*

*Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

I don't think it's appropriate to change RG-3 from a Residential Use to Residential plus small Commercial (aka mixed use). RG-1 and RG-2 are in residential R1, Rg3 should be in residential R2. In neighborhoods like Ansley Park we are very proud of our diverse housing stock and our naturally occurring affordable housing it would be a shame if this were supplanted by small bars, restaurants, nail salons etc.

## #010

Posted by **phiae01** on **12/01/2024** at **3:04pm** [Comment ID: 580] - [Link](#)

*Suggestion*

*Agree: 1, Disagree: 0*

I agree with this, right now RG-3 in many areas (mine included) is a mish-mash and mostly smaller houses or houses which were split into multiple units (and sometimes put back together) not commercial. Commercial should be greatly restricted here or that which is commercial be converted.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/02/2024** at **7:03am** [Comment ID: 585] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you for your comment.

## #011

Posted by **AtlantaTwin** on **01/21/2025** at **5:28pm** [Comment ID: 920] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

I can't find any documentation that explains what a "Proposed Use District" is in the red column. I can find the "Proposed Form District" but see no explanation about the Use District. Please advise.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **01/22/2025** at **7:51am** [Comment ID: 922] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Use Districts are a way of organizing the uses are allowed in a particular area. They are combined with the form districts to create the "zoning district" for a lot. They include this table and the text below:  
<https://atlzoning.konveio.com/revised-discussion-draft-use-districts-excludes-use-table-clean>


Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **01/22/2025** at **7:55am** [Comment ID: 923] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

This video may be useful: <https://youtu.be/h2w3IKklEAK?feature=shared>  
The slideshow and materials are around the project website under "Meet and Contribute." Scroll down to the applicable meeting.

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
O-I	CM	CV2
MR-1	N5B 	R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
MR-2	UG3A	R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
MR-3	UG3A	RX1
MR-4A	UG5A	RX1
MR-4B	UG5A	RX1
MR-5A	UG15	RX2
MR-5B	UG15	RX2
MR-6	UG25	RX2
MR-MU	N5B	R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
MRC - 1	UG5A	MX11
MRC - 2	UG15	MX11
MRC - 3	UG25	MX11
NC General	UG3B or UG5A (based on the number of stories allowed today)	NX1
NC-1	UG5A	NX1
NC-2	UG5A	NX2
NC-3	UG5A	NX1
NC-4	UG5A	NX1



## #012

Posted by **Itovar@atlantaga.gov** on **06/30/2025** at **1:08pm** [Comment ID: 1250] - [Link](#)  
*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

I didn't find N5A in the conversion table. I would assume there wasn't a conversion for this new district.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **06/30/2025** at **1:45pm** [Comment ID: 1252] - [Link](#)  
*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

The "A" and "B" only distinguish between FARS. They are both considered N5, as shown on the N5 page. Thanks!

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
NC-5	UG5A	NX1
NC-6	UG5A	NX3
NC-7	UG5A	NX4
NC-8	UG3B	NX5
NC-9 (added 11/18)	UG5A	NX3
NC-10	UG5A	NX5
NC-11	UG5A	<del>NX1</del> <sup>013</sup> <del>NX5</del> (corrected 12/11)
NC-12	UG5A	NX5
NC-13	UG3B	NX5
NC-14	UG3B	NX3
NC-15	UG3B	NX3
NC-16 (added 11/18)	UG5A	NX3
C1	UG5A	MX11
C2	UG15	MX11
C3	UG25	MX11
C4	UC1	MX14
C5	UC2	MX14
I-1	W1	I3

## #013

Posted by **bluedestiny917** on **12/10/2024** at **3:47pm** [Comment ID: 723] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Why are NC-10 and 12 mapped to NX5\* and NC 11 mapped NX1\* since the three districts along N Highland Ave presently are essentially the same language and requirements except for the parking subareas unique to each district?

Please see the comparison below:

PG 10 and PG 18: Why is NX1\* permitting Nightclubs/lounge when NX5\* prohibits them?

PG 10 and PG 18: Why is NX1\* permitting Convention hall or event facility up to 8000 SF when NX5\* requires Special Use Permit?

PG 14 and PG 22: Why is NX1\* permitting Vehicle service and repair, light up to 8000 SF when NX5\* prohibits them?

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/11/2024** at **10:53am** [Comment ID: 728] - [Link](#)

*Resolution*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you for bringing this error to our attention. I reviewed the source conversion methodology and all three NC districts in Virginia-Highland should have converted to NX5. Assigning NC-11 to NX1 was a scrivener's error and has been corrected, as noted. We're very sorry About that.


# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - **REVISED**

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
<b>I-2</b>	W2	I4
<b>I-MIX</b>	WX15	IX3
<b>LW</b>	UG5A	IX1
<b>SPI-1 SA1</b>	UC4	MX14
<b>SPI-1 SA2</b>	UC3	MX14
<b>SPI-1 SA3</b>	UC2	MX14
<b>SPI-1 SA4</b>	UC1	MX14
<b>SPI-1 SA5</b>	UC3	MX14
<b>SPI-1 SA6</b>	UC4	MX14
<b>SPI-1 SA7</b>	UC4	MX14
<b>SPI-2 SA1</b>	S-FM	n/a
<b>SPI-2 SA2</b>	S-FM	n/a
<b>SPI-2 SA3</b>	S-FM	n/a
<b>SPI-2 SA4</b>	S-FM	n/a
<b>SPI-2 SA5</b>	S-FM	n/a
<b>SPI-3 SA 1</b>	N4A	R2
<b>SPI-3 SA 2</b>	N4B	R5
<b>SPI-3 SA 3</b>	N5B	RX1

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - **REVISED**

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
<b>SPI-3 SA 4</b>	UG3B	MX9
<b>SPI-3 SA 5</b>	UG5B	MX9
<b>SPI-3 SA 6</b>	UG8B	MX11
<b>SPI-3 SA 7</b>	UG8B	MX11
<b>SPI-3 SA 8</b>	WX5	I2
<b>SPI-3 SA 9 (based on height)</b>	UG8A	MX11
<b>SPI-3 SA 9 (based on height)</b>	UG15	MX11
<b>SPI-4 SA1 (Single-unit)</b>	N3A	R2
<b>SPI-4 SA1 (Two-unit)</b>	N3B	R3
<b>SPI-4 SA2</b>	UG3A	RX2
<b>SPI-4 SA3</b>	UG5A	MX1
<b>SPI-4 SA4</b>	UG5A	MX4
<b>SPI-4 SA5</b>	UG8A	<b>R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)</b>
<b>SPI-4 SA6</b>	UG5A	<b>R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)</b>
<b>SPI-4 SA7</b>	UG3A	MX7
<b>SPI-4 SA8</b>	WX5	I1
<b>SPI-4 SA9</b>	N5B	<b>R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)</b>

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-4 SA10	UG8B	MX7
SPI-4 SA11	UG3A	R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
SPI-4 SA12	CM	MX6
SPI-4 SA13 (other than Northside Dr)	UG8B	MX7
SPI-4 SA13 (Northside Dr)	UG25	MX7
SPI-5 - SA1 	PK	CV1
SPI-5 - SA2	N3B	R3
SPI-5 - SA3	N3B	R3
SPI-6 - SA1	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-6 - SA2	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-6 - SA3	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-6 - SA4	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
SPI-7 - SA1	PK	CV1
SPI-7- SA2A	N2A	R2
SPI-7- SA2B	N2A	R2
SPI-7- SA2C	N2A	R2
SPI-7- SA3	N2B	R3

## #014

Posted by **billdorn** on **09/02/2025** at **12:10pm** [Comment ID: 1588] - [Link](#)

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Why isn't SPI-5(SA1, SA2, SA3) being carried forward as a Legacy District?

The current provisions of SPI-5(SA1, SA2, SA3) are neighborhood specific, extensive and comprehensive. The chapter should be carried forward as a Legacy District.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **09/16/2025** at **12:46pm** [Comment ID: 1678] - [Link](#)

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thank you for your input.

We have reviewed the SPI 5 conversion again, along with the Chapter 20L Inman Park Historic District Standards (to remain).

When you factor in the overlaying historic district remaining, and the proposed conversions, there are minimal changes. In fact, N3B was written specifically to convert SPI-5 SA2 and SA3.

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
<b>SPI-8</b>	015 n/a	n/a
<b>SPI-9 - SA1</b>	S-BV	n/a
<b>SPI-9 - SA2</b>	S-BV	n/a
<b>SPI-9 - SA3</b>	S-BV	n/a
<b>SPI-9 - SA4</b>	S-BV	n/a
<b>SPI-11-SA1</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA2</b>	UG3B	MX4
<b>SPI-11-SA3</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA4</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA5</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA6</b>	N3A	R1
<b>SPI-11-SA7</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA8</b>	UG3A	RX2
<b>SPI-11-SA9</b>	UG3B	MX3
<b>SPI-11-SA10</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA11</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-11-SA12</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-12 - SA1</b>	S-BS	n/a



## #015

Posted by **ChrisMcD1** on **02/05/2025** at **11:39pm** [Comment ID: 1029] - [Link](#)

*Question*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

What does it mean that SPI-8 has n/a in both of its Proposed Form District, and Proposed Use district? And yet it is not Deleted (unmapped) like the SPI-6 - SA1.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **02/06/2025** at **8:02am** [Comment ID: 1031] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

This SPI only regulates parking. Parking is not a Form or a Use District. Parking standards are found here on page 8-19 <https://atlzoning.konveio.com/discussion-draft-chapter-8-development-standards> and here <https://atlzoning.konveio.com/discussion-draft-parking-zone-map>

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
<b>SPI-12 - SA2</b>	S-BS	n/a
<b>SPI-12 - SA3</b>	S-BS	n/a
<b>SPI-12 - SA4</b>	S-BS	n/a
<b>SPI-14</b>	n/a	n/a
<b>SPI-15-SA1</b>	WX5	IX2
<b>SPI-15-SA2</b>	UG15	MX13
<b>SPI-15-SA3</b>	UG25	MX13
<b>SPI-15-SA4</b>	UG25	MX13
<b>SPI-15-SA5</b>	UG15	RX2
<b>SPI-15-SA6</b>	UG3A	RX2
<b>SPI-15-SA7</b>	UG5A	RX2
<b>SPI-15-SA8</b>	UG5A	RX1/RX2
<b>SPI-15-SA9</b>	UG25	MX13
<b>SPI-16-SA1</b>	S-M	n/a
<b>SPI-16-SA2</b>	S-M	n/a
<b>SPI-16-SA3</b>	S-M	n/a
<b>SPI-17-SA1</b>	N6A	R1/CV1
<b>SPI-17-SA2</b>	N6B	RX3

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
<b>SPI-17-SA3 (E of Piedmont)</b>	N6A	MX2
<b>SPI-17-SA3 (W of Piedmont)</b>	N6B	MX2
<b>SPI-17-SA4</b>	N6A	<del>R1</del> <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
<b>SPI-18-SA1</b>	UG8A	MX12
<b>SPI-18-SA2</b>	UG8A	MX12
<b>SPI-18-SA3</b>	UG8A	NX1
<b>SPI-18-SA4</b>	UG3A	<del>R1</del> <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
<b>SPI-18-SA5</b>	N4A	R2
<b>SPI-18-SA6</b>	N4B	R3
<b>SPI-18-SA7</b>	W1	I2
<b>SPI-18-SA8</b>	W2	I1
<b>SPI-18-SA9</b>	UG5A	IX1
<b>SPI-18-SA10</b>	UG5A	RX2
<b>SPI-19-SA1</b>	UG5A	MX6
<b>SPI-19-SA2</b>	UG5A	MX6
<b>SPI-19-SA3</b>	CM	MX5
<b>SPI-19-SA4</b>	UG8B	MX8

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
SPI-19-SA5	UG3A	R1 <u>R2</u> (corrected 1/22)
SPI-19-SA6	N4A	R2
SPI-19-SA7	UG3A	RX2/MX1
SPI-19-SA8	UG5B	MX8
SPI-19-SA9	UG3A	MX8
SPI-19-SA10	UG3A	MX8
SPI-19-SA11	UG5B	MX8
SPI-20-SA1	S-G	n/a
SPI-20-SA2	S-G	n/a
SPI-20-SA3	S-G	n/a
SPI-20-SA4	S-G	n/a
SPI-20-SA5	S-G	RX2
SPI-20-SA6	S-G	R1
SPI-21-SA1	UG15	MX12
SPI-21-SA2	UG8A	MX12
SPI-21-SA3	UG3B	NX1
SPI-21-SA4	UG3B	MX12
SPI-21-SA5	UG5B	RX2

# CONVERSION OF EXISTING ZONING DISTRICTS - REVISED

EXISTING DISTRICT	PROPOSED FORM DISTRICT	PROPOSED USE DISTRICT
<b>SPI-21-SA6</b>	Deleted (unmapped)	Deleted (unmapped)
<b>SPI-21-SA7</b>	N3A	R2
<b>SPI-21-SA8</b>	CM	NX1
<b>SPI-21-SA9</b>	UG8A	I2
<b>SPI-21-SA10</b>	UG25	I2
<b>SPI-22-SA1</b>	UG25	MX10
<b>SPI-22-SA2</b>	UG5A	MX10
<b>SPI-22-SA3</b>	UG8A	MX10
<b>SPI-22-SA4</b>	UG5B	MX10
<b>SPI-22-SA5</b>	PK	CV1
<b>SPI-24</b>	N1	n/a
<b>SPI-25</b>	H2	n/a

016

## #016

Posted by **Laurel David** on **03/10/2025** at **11:53am** [Comment ID: 1112] - [Link](#)

*Suggestion*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

SPI-26 was approved after 9/12/24 and should be added, but the provisions should not be changed. The can be confirmed with Director Holmes. I was the attorney representing The Galloway School in this endeavor

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **03/11/2025** at **9:18am** [Comment ID: 1113] - [Link](#)

*Answer*

*Agree: 0, Disagree: 0*

Thanks. Given the ongoing updates to the ZO, we will be incorporating all adopted text amendments once we wrap up the Module III Q&A. There are several.