"All Creatures Big and Small, Welcome":
Contrasting Accessibility in *Zootopia* and *Sing!*

Paul Wells argues that animated animals are "able to carry a diversity of representational positions" and "can prompt issues about gender, race and ethnicity, generation, and identity" (*Animated Bestiary* 3). Entering this conversation about how and why animation uses animal bodies to depict difference metaphorically, my project focuses on how animation depicts the vast differences in animal bodies and how that might align with diverse bodies in our own world. I argue that Disney's *Zootopia* (2016) and Illumination's *Sing!* (2016) use water, or the lack thereof, to offer distinct accessible city planning models for people in our own world with different physical abilities who are often excluded from physically interacting with our ableist society. *Zootopia* uses water to divide animals from different habitats into discrete boroughs (e.g, Sahara Square, Tundratown, and Rainforest District), problematically sorting animals along species and habitat lines in separate but equal living spaces and leading to the film's inter-species unrest, an unrest that ultimately does not destabilize or problematize the sorting of different bodies. *Sing!*, on the other hand, incorporates all animals, no matter their species, in one integrated metropolis, using water to accommodate aquatic animals in places they otherwise would not be able to access (e.g., using structures such as canals and water steps that allow animals to traverse city streets) and including aquatic animals in places of work and community. City planning following *Zootopia*'s model would involve separating people with different abilities into specially designed communities cut off from the rest of society, while following *Sing!*'s model would involve designing our world with more diverse bodies in mind. Analyzing the successes and failures of these two models in their respective films and drawing on research from disability studies, I explore *Zootopia*'s and *Sing!*'s metaphorical accessibility planning and the implications of using animal bodies in depicting accessibility.