

SHARED VISION

REPORT ON

Community Involvement



CENTERS AND CORRIDORS

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
ALBUQUERQUE/ BERNALILLO COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Elected officials:

Mayor Jim Baca

City Council

Brad Winter, District 4, City Council President

Adele Baca-Hundley, District 3, City Council Vice President

Alan B. Armijo, District 1

Vince Griego, District 2

Tim Kline, District 5

Hess Yntema, District 6

Mike McEntee, District 7

Greg Payne, District 8

Michael Brasher, District 9

County Commission

Steve Gallegos, District 2, Chairman, County Commission

Tom Rutherford, District 3, Vice Chairman, County Commission

Ken Sanchez, District 1

Tim Cummins, District 4

Les Houston, District 5

Cover by Argus Designworks

Illustration by Karin Pitman

Report on

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

CENTERS AND CORRIDORS

JANUARY THROUGH MAY 2001

In preparation for

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE
ALBUQUERQUE/ BERNALILLO COUNTY
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

PREPARED BY SHARED VISION BASED ON COMMUNITY MEETINGS

REVIEWED AND RECOMMENDED BY THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PROCESS

Resolutions 70 and 55 of the Albuquerque City Council call for public involvement on the general Centers and Corridors policy prior to considering amendments to the Albuquerque/ Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan. In Sept 2000 the City Planning Department and Shared Vision, Inc. set up an advisory committee of community representatives (the Comprehensive Plan Public Advisory Committee or CPPAC) to oversee the public involvement process. This committee of volunteers undertook an extensive and ambitious public outreach program over the past year to educate the public regarding the Centers and Corridors proposals and solicit their responses and comments. Approximately 1,000 people throughout the metropolitan area attended presentations about the Centers and Corridors plan and took advantage of the opportunity to provide feedback to representatives of Shared Vision.

The process began with presentations to “stakeholder” groups by a volunteer speakers bureau formed by members of the committee. Primary civic and special interest groups (including the Board of Realtors, the Hispano Chamber and Greater Albuquerque Chamber, AARP, National Association of Industrial and Office Parks or NAIOP, League of Women Voters, Homebuilders, Mortgage Bankers Assoc. and others) heard presentations and commented on the Centers and Corridors concept.

The Committee was particularly interested in reaching out to ordinary citizens who would not normally be involved in a planning effort. To accomplish this, Research and Polling conducted seven focus groups representing different parts of the city and county to find out what typical residents thought of the proposal, and to identify ways that the presentations to Albuquerque communities could be most effective.

The second phase of the public involvement occurred at the community level. From January 2001 to April 2001, Shared Vision mailed over 10,000 invitations directly to residents of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County inviting them to community gatherings held in their area. Over half of these were random mailings. In addition to the invitations, Shared Vision publicized these gatherings through news articles, newsletters and the internet, and held five special pre-meetings with neighborhood leaders.

Several hundred people turned out for a total of twelve community workshops – at least one in each “Community Planning” area. In these workshops, residents had the opportunity to learn about the Centers and Corridors concept directly, and to participate face-to-face with their peers in discussion groups that encouraged them to express their views about the proposals and how they might apply to their community. The Committee’s role was to act as a neutral facilitator with the purpose of listening to the communities, rather than selling or advocating the proposals. Meetings were all held in the evening, with times carefully coordinated with coalition and neighborhood association meetings, in some cases combined so they would not conflict. Shared Vision provided soft drinks and pizza.

The meetings began with a video by the Planning Department and a presentation describing the Centers and Corridors proposal. The smaller facilitated discussion groups of 15-18 participants then met for approximately 1 hour to explore attitudes and opinions about the concept and how it might apply to their community, using blown-up maps of their area provided by the Planning Department, and a discussion outline designed in collaboration with the Committee and Shared Vision. The following lists show the number of discussion groups held for each area, reflecting the number of people attending:

Discussion groups (15-18 members each):

- Central Albuquerque – 3
- East Gateway - 3
- East Mountain- 1
- Foothills - 5
- Mid-Heights - 2
- Near-Heights- 4
- North Albuquerque (City) - 2
- North Albuquerque (County) – 1
- Sandia Heights – 1
- North Valley- 3
- South Valley - 1
- Southwest Mesa - 2
- West Side – 3
- District 7 Coalition – 1
- District 5 Coalition – 1

Total: 33 groups

In this process, the people who live and work in these communities are the “experts.” Those who took the time to show up and participate often feel strongly about these issues. The process of dialogue allows them to exchange ideas and influence each others’ thinking.

This report is based on the facilitators’ and recorders’ meeting notes of the discussion groups. Some people also turned in written comments, available in notebooks in the Shared Vision office. This report summarizes what those residents who came to the meetings had to say about the communities in which they live and work —their frustrations and hopes and how they would like to see them develop. It will be sent to those hundreds of citizens who participated, presented to city and county elected officials, and used to shape the Centers and Corridors amendment to the Albuquerque/ Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan.

SUPPORT FOR CENTERS AND CORRIDORS

The communities of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County support the *concept* of creating activity centers and transportation corridors. An urban framework emphasizing transit and walking can help the metropolitan area grow in a better way. “It’s a good idea to plan ahead (a revolutionary idea for Albuquerque).” “It will get us all on the same page.” “Do centers and corridors – it’s important, what we should have done earlier.” “It’s important to look at the city holistically and connect the city together.” “A livable city must re-invest in older areas, take action for the future.” It is “a useful way to get more urban areas, a useful approach to integrating ideas.”

Transportation benefits. The number one reason for liking the concept was its potential for encouraging transit and walking and reducing traffic, which many see as a growing problem affecting their daily quality of life.

Typical responses in this vein:

- “We’ll be another Phoenix if we don’t encourage walking, bicycling, transit, etc.”
- “I’d love to be able to take a train downtown. Transportation is key. Ours is not adequate.”
- “It will facilitate frequent, regular, reliable public transportation.”
- “I like being able to walk to services.”
- “Albuquerque is very unfriendly to pedestrians. It needs to change.”
- “We either have to improve the roads or improve the transit.” “This can make mass transit faster.” “I like the potential for mass transit.”
- “Will encourage frequent, reliable public transportation connecting centers.”

People noted that the population is aging, and that the availability of transit and services closer to home could be a plus. “Look to the future—there will be more older people and we will have to change to accommodate their needs.” Different development patterns can foster a needed “attitudinal change regarding transportation.”

Sense of Community

The auto-oriented design of Albuquerque may be one reason people do not feel connected. Creating centers of activity with civic spaces bringing people together could help to change that.

- “Centers and Corridors can promote community unity.”
- “We like the idea of gathering places that can restore a lost sense of community.”
- “This concept is the only way of getting back that village feel, where you can bump in to people you know. Now we’re too spread out and have to drive to 10 stores.”
- “We’ve lost our sense of community. We bear responsibility for that. The lack of pedestrian orientation contributes to a lack of community interaction. This could improve a sense of community in neighborhoods and get people to interact.”
- “In favor of centers that build community.”
- “This can create more community by connecting centers that are better designed.”

Protection of Valued areas

The proposal would concentrate intense uses within small areas strategically located and defined. Targeting more intensive development to activity centers and along corridors could help to preserve and maintain the lower density character of residential and agricultural areas. The North Valley and West Side greatly preferred nodal over linear development in order to avoid creating more traffic on already burdened arterial streets. “It’s a great idea to preserve corridors and not have strip development. Avoid strip zoning on transportation corridors and focus on clusters or nodes. We want to preserve and protect corridors; want to improve and protect existing neighborhoods.”

Efficiency, Saving Money

We can avoid wasting tax dollars by reinvesting in areas with existing infrastructure in place. Clustering uses together more compactly and intensively utilizes infrastructure more efficiently. “The development of corridors and centers makes possible higher density which facilitates the best use and rehabilitation of infrastructure.”

Improving Livability in New Areas

Residents of newer areas on the periphery (West Side, North Albuquerque) are unhappy with the way commercial areas are being developed with auto-oriented design, large parking lots, and lack of pedestrian amenities. They want new development NOW to follow different principles in order to avoid having to go back and undertake more expensive redevelopment and retrofitting later. “The concept should be implemented in new areas now.” “New areas have the opportunity to do it right.” “It’s less expensive than to go back and try and fix mistakes that have been made in the past.” “We should start at the periphery where growth is going and problems are not as great.”

Revitalizing Older Areas

Older areas near downtown, and along Central Avenue (old Route 66), Nob Hill and East Central supported more diverse housing, live-work spaces, and multiple uses closer together and walkable, and thought these qualities would help to retain young people and stimulate public and private reinvestment. Creating an urban character with benefits to pedestrians is essential to preventing decline. “A livable city must re-invest in older areas, and take action for the future.”

HOW CENTERS AND CORRIDORS SHOULD BE DONE

HOW and WHERE the proposal will be carried out is key, and participants' support is conditioned upon this question. "In concept it's great. The details are the issue."

Densities

High densities (not defined in zoning terms)

Participants saw "high density corridors" as appropriate only along the Interstates, specifically mentioning I-25 (opportunities at Century Rio and Renaissance Center) and downtown as appropriate for a high density major activity center.

Low densities

When asked about densities that they would accept, the majority of communities wanted single stories in their immediate living environment and 2-story limits in transitional buffer areas. The reason most often given is the desire to preserve views--which they identify as a basic desirable part of Albuquerque's character. "The uniqueness of Albuquerque is being able to see the views, to see the Sandias from anyplace in the city (like seeing the ocean in Florida). The concern is that tall buildings block views of the mountains."

"We do not want to change the predominant culture of single family housing."

The proposals "may make assumptions that people in the west are not ready to accept."

The community "would need lots of education."

"Will people want to live in these kinds of apartments?"

"The community wants to keep vistas/ views of Albuquerque, low rise housing and lifestyle."

"What kind of population is needed to support this kind of development? We would like a maximum 2-story, mix of uses." "No more than 2 stories as a buffer"

Medium densities

There is room for further exploration of mid or medium density concepts between these two extremes, depending on how they are designed and where they are located. Central Albuquerque and communities along the Central Avenue corridor (Near Heights and East Gateway) thought it desirable to encourage medium densities (e.g. 2-4 stories) for certain destinations along transit corridors--Broadway, San Mateo and particularly Central Avenue--to revitalize and reinvest in their community.

However, this does not mean giving a *carte blanche* to developers. Not all areas within the defined corridors are appropriate for multiple uses; it depends on situations such as depth of lots, historic character, and adjacency to neighborhoods. Each node along the corridor is different. The City needs an over-all policy approach to this issue.

The need to "buffer" higher intensities from residential areas is key. Mid-density must be done with high quality design to be acceptable to these communities. "It depends on how it's done; mixed use is not always good unless it's done correctly." These communities insisted upon a high degree of community involvement in the design of infill projects.

“Give a lot of importance to the views of residential neighborhoods regarding development immediately adjacent to them.” “Stricter design requirements are needed.” Residents in older areas want new investment but they also want to ensure that infill and redevelopment will be done in a way that is sensitive to the characteristics of existing communities that residents value.

As alternatives to single family housing or apartments, most communities would like to see more choices of diverse alternatives of housing types—not just apartments or single family—such as owner occupied condos and townhouses *within a short distance to a corridor or center*, connected by attractive walkways. Generally there is a preference for achieving mixed use through medium density housing located in transition areas and better pedestrian connections to residential neighborhoods. The type of housing provided in or near centers should be appropriate to the needs of each community so as to ensure a good mix of housing types and income levels within that community. “Living above stores” is seen as desirable primarily for economic reasons.

Preserving Uniqueness

Although the presentations emphasized that the video of Central Avenue was to be viewed only as one example, participants in every community still wanted reassurance that their area would not be treated the same as other areas, and wanted both continued input and clear design parameters for *how* development would be done. Each community views itself as unique.

Overcoming barriers

Many of the Community Activity Centers are located at the intersections of major corridors. Many of these corridors (e.g. Paseo del Norte, Montgomery) are difficult to cross on foot and are major obstacles for pedestrians. These activity centers could be located only on one side of an arterial, or if a Center encompasses all four corners, design solutions should be explored that help to make these intersections more pedestrian-friendly. Other corridors, such as Central Avenue, that are not so wide, have good potential for design solutions knitting together communities on both sides.

Characteristics

Participants saw opportunities to create unique, different kinds of places that are more conducive to interaction and a sense of community than the typical auto-oriented strip center. Participants were inspired in thinking about how these activity centers could be done to transform centers from auto-dominated places to pedestrian-oriented places for the community to come together. (See appendix 2)

The most successful centers require density of population or employment, and something—design features, destination stores, gathering places, performances—to draw people. The economic environment is very different today compared to when Nob Hill was developed. These centers can’t compete with big box retail so it’s necessary to analyze some remaining niches. The new and old paradigms are summarized and contrasted on the next page.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTERS

Summary of Characteristics

Don't Want

More driving

Strip malls

Huge asphalt parking lots

Parking in front

Stores with back to the street

Asphalt

Auto-oriented design

Indoor malls

In-out, car-oriented design

High rise apartments

Fast food

Big Box retail

Private space

Generic character

Isolated stores

Barriers, walls between uses

Commercial uses only

Multi-plexes

Want

More walking from store to store

Clusters of stores

Parking structures (2-story) or split parking

Parking behind stores

Stores facing public spaces, no setbacks

Landscaping, including trees

Landscaped seating areas

Outdoor malls, dining, patios

Parking integrated with pedestrian ways

Maximum 2-story buildings, condos

Moderately priced, quality restaurants

Small local stores, essential services

Civic gathering places, plazas

Unique character for each Community

Multiple uses with synergism

Pedestrian Access from Residential Areas

Mix with community and civic resources

Small cultural and performing arts venues

PRIORITIES

People had the most interest in creating activity centers for their communities and understood that it was necessary to set priorities in order to see results. “To be results oriented, start with a small center that doesn’t take a huge investment. Make it inviting on a small pedestrian scale, versus on an automobile scale, and apply a mixed use concept.” The Foothills area was different in that the Juan Tabo-Montgomery activity center was pre-selected by a coalition of business and property owners led by the City Councilor, and the community meeting focused on specific design solutions. For the other communities, discussion among participants at the meetings produced the groups’ priorities. This is a preliminary list and is not meant to exclude other areas from later focus.

<i>Community</i>	<i>Priority activity centers and corridors</i>
Central Albuquerque	Downtown, Broadway corridor, South Fourth, Fourth and Cesar Chavez
East Gateway	Four Hills Village
East Mountain	East Central Avenue-Wyoming to Tramway
Foothills	Tijeras Village (as hub with Cedar Crest, Sedillo Hill, Carnuel)
Mid-Heights	Juan Tabo and Montgomery
Near-Heights	San Mateo and Montgomery
North Albuquerque (City)	Menaul from Coronado Center to Hoffmantown
North Albuquerque (County)	Central Avenue - centers at UNM, Highland and Louisiana
North Valley	La Cueva Village, Cherry Hills Village
South Valley	La Cueva Village, with smaller centers east along Paseo del Norte
Southwest Mesa	Fourth and Osuna, Guadalupe Plaza
West Side	Isleta with village centers at important historic places
	Atrisco and Central with connections to river
	Coors and Paseo del Norte

The Near Heights and East Gateway communities support Central Avenue as a Major Transit Corridor and are enthusiastic about the possibility of light rail, which they want to continue as far east as possible, even to Tramway. The Central Albuquerque community would like transit corridors extended along Broadway and South Fourth. They envisioned amenities such as landscaping, pedestrian friendly lighting (gas lamps, kiosks, etc) along the corridor. The South Valley would like to enhance the historic qualities of Isleta. The West Side and North Valley could not see much difference between intensive corridor land use development and typical strip commercial centers they want to reduce, and were more concerned about the potential impact of development on corridor traffic. North Albuquerque wanted mixed use centers at defined nodes only.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

Feasibility

Communities have concerns about implementation, citing many instances of what they view as a poor track record on the part of government to stick to and implement adopted plans that have community support. “It’s a good idea, if something happens.” “How will this be different with respect to implementation? Will people do what the vision is?”

There is skepticism whether the City and County could really carry out such a far-reaching proposal that would require alignment of zoning, capital programming, incentives, and continuity of political will. “It’s a good idea *if* something happens.” “It could be great to incorporate these ideas that we saw in the video. We would like it *if* it could be made to work.” “Will this involve a lot of money? This is ideal but we need to be practical. We do not want to pay for downtown parking garages.”

Residents of developing areas in the far northeast and west side note that the type of development proposed is not what is being done today. Westsiders and residents of North Albuquerque don’t like the way commercial areas are being developed with single story, large parking lots and lack of quality design sensitive to the pedestrian and to location. (Cottonwood Mall, I-40 and Coors), the La Cueva town center, Paseo improvements, Century Rio, Louisiana Blvd at Uptown, and Montgomery were cited as examples of missed opportunities to create places for people conducive to walking.) “In 50 years.(these places)...will look like Central Avenue and create the same problems.”

Changing these dominant patterns of development will not be easy. Residents question the financial feasibility for the development and lending communities and legal issues for property owners who may not agree, and wonder whether there would be sufficient market acceptance of mixed-use or higher density types of development needed for the pedestrian and transit proposals to work everywhere. “It will be hard to make it work in the suburbs, but it’s a good redevelopment tool.” “How many people in North Albuquerque would really live above a store?” “What will keep the local businesses in centers? Big boxes keep driving them out.”

Existing Plans

Relationships between the Rank 1 Comprehensive Plan and the adopted Rank 2 and 3 plans need to be clarified. There is concern about how the proposed amendments would affect existing area, sector and corridor plans that residents have a strong interest in implementing. “Don’t use the Centers and Corridors concept as a way to abandon existing plans.” “This should fit in with what we’re doing, not the other way around.”

These plans were specifically mentioned as needing to be followed and coordinated with the Comprehensive Plan:

- Broadway streetscape plan

- Downtown Plan

- Coors Corridor Plan

East Mountain Area Plan
La Cueva Sector Plan
North Valley Area Plan
Southwest Area Plan
West Side Strategic Plan

There needs to be an effort to pull together and unify the various plans into an overall strategy without sacrificing the existing plans that communities strongly support.

Competing needs

Participants questioned whether areas outside of the proposed centers and corridors would lose funding or support.

“What happens to the little shopping mall not on a corridor? Smaller commercial centers could be displaced by larger centers.”

“The vacant building problem may get worse if new businesses are built.”

“How flexible is this? If this sets Capital Improvements Program (CIP) priorities, how will areas not identified be impacted?”

Unintended Consequences

If activity centers develop without provisions for enhanced pedestrian access and transit connections, they could add to traffic problems because they would funnel more traffic to one place rather than disperse it.

“There will be more parking problems unless there is convenient public transportation.”

“Corridors are currently inadequate. More traffic will worsen the condition.”

“Would we use a first rate transit system if we had it?” Transit doesn’t work for many people because we’re not just going from Point A to Point B. Will it really work to provide mixed use at centers so extra auto trips to points B, C, D, etc. aren’t needed.”

Some pointed out a conflict between faster corridors and pedestrian orientation. “How can we move traffic faster AND make the streets more pedestrian-friendly?”

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Participants wanted to see the plan implemented: “This is aspiration. There needs to be a relationship between planning and what happens.” When asked what *actions would be needed* to create the types of centers that residents envisioned, participants thought that a combination of tools would be necessary involving government, the private sector, and communities. As one participant said, “It’s all connected.”

Policy Consistency and Continuity There is a widespread perception that the development process needs to change to be more consistent with plans. “There are too many zoning exceptions that deviate from adopted plans.” “Zoning is 100 years behind. It needs to keep up with long term plans” in permitting the types of mixed use compact development proposed in the centers and corridors framework. People called for *integrity* in the development process –for regulations on zoning, transportation , transit and traffic engineering to support the policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Suggested actions:

- ❑ Examine and modify regulatory requirements that impede good design.
- ❑ Create mixed-use zones that allow more innovative development concepts.
- ❑ Revise parking requirements; allow more flexibility in interpreting the ordinance and allowing variances if there is community support.
- ❑ Push for State legislation so the Comprehensive Plan has the force of law.

Timing Participants supported the concept as a good idea but wondered if it could be implemented within their lifetime. Many communities have become disillusioned with “nothing happening” after plans are adopted. “We need enforcement by the Mayor and Council.” Several groups cited turnover of elected officials as a problem in maintaining continuity over the long term. There needs to be a “way to ensure that the plan will survive and not constantly change so that nothing gets done.”

Suggested actions:

- ❑ Develop specific schedules and action plans when a plan is adopted and stick to the plan; set citywide priorities so that resources aren’t stretched too thin.
- ❑ Get the City to implement existing plans AS THEY ARE WRITTEN. “Don’t wait; development is happening.”
- ❑ Closely monitor designated centers to ensure that implementation=vision.
- ❑ Show results; begin to implement examples that demonstrate a pedestrian versus automobile scale.

Financial Incentives In addition to regulatory reform, almost all groups called for financial incentives to influence behavior and encourage landowners, developers and small businesses to take risks in creating the types of compact mixed use centers envisioned. “Will people do what the vision is? The people who own the land do what they want.” “Without funding it’s just pie in the sky.”

Suggested actions:

- ❑ Provide funding for infrastructure (CIP) to serve desired infill projects.
- ❑ Eliminate fees for outdoor dining in centers and corridors.
- ❑ Change the tax structure to tax vacant land at a higher rate or impose stand-by charges; require owners to pay back taxes when developing greenbelt property.
- ❑ Provide incentives for development of 2-3 story parking structures for centers.

Community Involvement Communities want a more active role in helping to make the plans happen in a way that enhances the uniqueness of each area. “If Albuquerque and Bernalillo County want to create this vision, listen to the people who live in those areas. Don’t treat them in a blanket fashion.”

Suggested actions:

- ❑ Bring developers, planners, neighborhoods and decision-makers together to communicate and plan together.
- ❑ Incorporate publicity; promote the process so that local people take an interest.
- ❑ Encourage collaboration and co-creative models, not just people selling their plan.
- ❑ Reach out and educate the community.

Design Higher densities are acceptable only with a great deal of community involvement and attention to design: “Higher density must be high quality.”

Participants thought that activity centers should not try to compete directly with “big box” retail but should offer a different experience that builds communities. Multiple use activity centers with small businesses can work only IF—they are attractive and inviting; they meet the unique needs of each community; they have a unique draw that fits the locale; uses are synergistic; and densities are adequate.

Suggested actions:

- ❑ Hold design charettes for specific centers and sites; bring in the property owners and encourage community interaction; create a vision for each center.
- ❑ Make the center inviting so that people want to be there; develop design guidelines to help each center define its character and draw people.
- ❑ Use larger scale more detailed maps to engage groups.
- ❑ Determine transitional areas for each center and corridor, especially along Central.

Public private partnerships Participants saw public private partnerships as the most effective vehicle for implementation. “Albuquerque is economically depressed. It takes a public-private partnership to have a vision and make this happen.”

Suggested actions:

- ❑ Bring in the existing landowners into the process; seek sponsors and local ownership.
- ❑ Infuse Shared Vision’s professionalism in working with the neighborhoods.
- ❑ Have a forum with lenders to develop a relationship and determine incentives.
- ❑ Survey neighborhoods to find out what types of businesses are needed and can survive in a particular center; develop synergism among uses.
- ❑ Communicate with developers so that they can respond to what people want.

APPLYING CENTERS AND CORRIDORS TO COMMUNITIES

SUMMARIES OF COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Central Albuquerque

The Central Albuquerque group selects Downtown as the priority activity center providing gathering places and services for the immediate neighborhoods as well as the entire metropolitan area. In the downtown, they envision *cultural* activities (e.g. concerts, visual and performing arts such as ballet and theater), viewing these types of events as more beneficial to surrounding neighborhoods than a large sports stadium.

Participants in the workshop for Central Albuquerque also wanted to see a variety of shops downtown for a variety of income levels--in particular grocery stores, drug stores, pizza, and affordable health club—with less emphasis on alcohol and entertainment, and more family activities such as community centers combined with schools. Like many other areas, they envisioned more outdoor dining, with the “feel of France.”

This is one place in the city that high rises were welcome--“take advantage of the great views.” The Warehouse District needs more focused revitalization. Connections such as bike and walking paths are needed to tie downtown to the neighborhoods. “Let’s just rebuild Old Albuquerque—we had it all.”

Within the neighborhoods, they would like to see community scale centers of activity, done with a “village feel” with small scale storefront development. A gateway feature at Broadway and Central would help to promote the area.

Broadway would be a focus for enhanced an enhanced transit corridor with trolley service connecting South Broadway Cultural Center, Avenida Cesar Chavez, Hispanic Cultural Center, zoo, Rio Grande. They envisioned restaurants, grocery stores, laundry, coffeehouses, and other gathering places for the community. Relaxing historic overlay zone standards on this key corridor would help to encourage these types of activities. Higher density housing would be appropriate here, but not in interior residential areas. Developers must create better buffers sensitive to residential areas.

Parking design standards need to be developed with transit corridor planning in mind, avoiding excess surface areas, changing minimum parking requirements, and possible development of structures and Park and Ride facilities.

The Broadway Streetscape Plan is a priority for implementation. The City should review and implement plans already adopted before going on to new things, and should not change planning concepts midstream in the process as recently happened with the downtown housing component. “If the plan changes, everyone loses faith in the process.”

Other activity centers:
South Fourth Street
Fourth and Cesar Chavez.

East Gateway

Residents of the East Gateway area value their location at a prominent entrance to the city from the east coming through Tijeras Canyon and see this as a unique role and identity for their community to build on. Albuquerque should take full advantage of the opportunity to demarcate an entrance that gives visitors an orientation and sense of place: “Welcome to the best part of New Mexico.” The Central and Tramway exit is the first place for westbound travelers to get off the freeway, and they should be encouraged to do so by providing a visitor center that welcomes people and introduces them to the city. The center could be located in the vicinity of Central and Tramway, on high ground with an observation deck for a dramatic overview of the entire landscape.

The eastern part of Central Avenue as Route 66 should be an extension of this welcome, giving a good first impression, but today it is deteriorated. Rather than a source of pride, one participant commented that “When I show Albuquerque to visitors, I cringe driving down Central, Lomas and Menaul.” “It’s ugly, not inviting and not unique.” Nothing welcomes people or stands out.

The East Gateway community would like to make east Central Avenue over to the Fairgrounds a priority corridor for improvement and redevelopment. Its rundown condition impacts the adjacent residential areas. They would like to dress up east Central and extend the Major Transit Corridor designation over to Tramway. Well-designed higher density residential development along with attractive businesses would be a welcome change from mobile home sales which are not the highest and best use. Because of its strategic location for tourism, these improvements to the visual image would make the area more economically productive, benefiting not only the East Gateway community, but all of Albuquerque.

The East Gateway community selects the Four Hills Village as a priority one-stop community activity center for residents to shop and “meet and greet one another.” This would be a great location to accommodate the big bicycling activity here for those cycling into the canyon by providing a place to walk, park and ride. Ideas for making the center attractive to businesses and investment through design amenities are summarized elsewhere in this report. The major part of the center might be on the south side, in order to avoid having to cross Central Avenue; other solutions for making the busy intersection of Tramway and Central more pedestrian friendly should be explored in a design process with the community involving architects and planners.

Things they like about the area:

Accessibility to the rest of town
Central Avenue, Tramway, mountains
Open space, views

Development should be site sensitive; poor example is a development that took down half of one of the four hills – a lost opportunity for mixed use

East Mountains

Residents of the East Mountain communities prefer the development of village centers but instead see strip mall style development taking place along major routes. They would like to avoid recreating the problems of old Route 66 in Albuquerque shown on the video.

Through traffic in the area is increasing as I-40 and 14 become major transportation corridors for other communities, creating congestion during rush hour. Residents are concerned that development will increase at a faster pace when water and sewer services are imported into existing subdivisions. Rapid development with apartment complexes is already threatening the historic character of Carnuel. The community needs and wants better policies to control growth. They believe that East Mountain Area Plan doesn't have teeth and is not followed. Stronger safeguards are needed at the Rank 3 level. "Our major land use problem is lack of policy that's enforced." They need more information on how to protect themselves from annexation by surrounding communities (the Campbell Ranch annexation request to Edgewood includes Cedar Crest).

Residents of the East Mountains are some of the strongest supporters of light rail major transit and revitalization along Route 66 in Albuquerque. Albuquerque is an activity center for the East Mountains, and "going to town" is part of the rural lifestyle. They would like Park and Ride facilities and have an interest in making Albuquerque a more attractive place to shop and visit, reducing demand for services in the East Mountains.

Limited commercial activity within the East Mountain area should be in small scale nodes or village centers. Residents would like these centers to be more walkable with pedestrian connections between stores and would like to have design guidelines and architectural controls for more cohesive relationships between buildings.

Tijeras would be the first priority for focus as a village center, serving as a hub with several small nodes – Cedar Crest, Sedillo Hill, Carnuel. South 14 has a unique character with many artists, potters, musicians and artisans. The village centers should build on the artistic nature of the community with galleries, shops, and performance spaces. Commercial activities should be drawn from the strengths of the community talent that is already there, using it to create a locally based economy. More definition of each center is needed to build on their uniqueness and historic qualities.

The interchange with I-40 is obsolete, creating traffic buildups for Tijeras. Design of a village center should look at ways to shift the traffic flows further east, get the main exchange out of the center of the village or at least to slow traffic down.

Other ideas:

Include wildlife zones, corridors in development plans.

Network of footpaths, bike paths, open space with bike trails on major roads.

Places for farmers markets, small outdoor amphitheater for local performers

Campus for educational institution in an open natural setting

Living museum "like Rancho de Los Golondrinas" –ironwork and crafts, working farm

Foothills

This meeting was different in that it consisted of a design workshop focused on creating an activity center at the intersection of Juan Tabo and Montgomery. It was attended by many property owners, tenants and residents within the immediate vicinity of the Center. The following list is a summary of ideas reported at the meeting. Specific plans are now being developed by the architectural and planning firm of Dekker Perich & Sabatini.

General on Centers and Corridors

- ❑ Each community should have a center, not try to draw from the entire metro area

Enhancing the Pedestrian environment

- ❑ Lights on streets and parking lots, more pedestrian friendly
- ❑ Street furniture fronting on parking lots, places for people to sit
- ❑ Widen sidewalks, prioritize pedestrian safety crossing the street and in parking lots.
- ❑ Signage and amenities.
- ❑ Create a larger pedestrian framework; people want to walk from where they live for health and exercise
- ❑ Bring stores out to the intersection
- ❑ It's ugly – asphalt and concrete.
- ❑ Xeriscape the four corners; landscape medians; bank is good example

Traffic/ Transit

- ❑ Need to re-design the intersection, provide islands of safety. This is a logical first step. Make it safe for pedestrians to cross.
- ❑ Idea to coordinate signals; do a “Barn dance” like in Washington, D.C. All lights red, then all lights green; or have cars stop all four ways at once to allow for pedestrians.
- ❑ Slow traffic, reduce speed limit to facilitate walking
- ❑ Diagonal crossings or mid-block crossings for pedestrians
- ❑ Calm traffic in the neighborhood residential streets
- ❑ Explore traffic circles
- ❑ Make this intersection a focal point for transit; transit stops
- ❑ Have express buses to Nob Hill or Downtown

Development that people would like to see:

- ❑ No “big boxes”
- ❑ Maybe a parking structure
- ❑ Integrate high school into planning
- ❑ Bring in other shops, e.g. deli, supermarket, restaurants with meeting rooms, theater
- ❑ Two stories is acceptable density

Identity - Create a Gateway

- ❑ Uniqueness: Mountains, Eldorado High School
- ❑ Hold an annual festival to give identity
- ❑ Arches and gateways, incorporate pedestrian overpass into gateway arch

Mid-Heights

Residents of the Mid-Heights are interested in retrofitting older auto-oriented strip centers and major arterials to make them more attractive for pedestrians, transit and community gathering space. “The lack of pedestrian orientation contributes to a lack of community interaction.” Three initial possibilities were discussed: Montgomery and San Mateo; Menaul Blvd from Coronado Center to Hoffmantown; Louisiana Blvd at Uptown

San Mateo and Montgomery

On the NW corner, Montgomery Plaza is a 1-story sprawling strip commercial center with a big parking lot, but it has elements of an activity center that could be made more attractive and useful. Within a broader radius, there is a diverse mix of uses near this intersection. Part of the challenge is to create better pedestrian connections between them, and to fill in the center parts with more intensive development.

Ideas for Montgomery Plaza:

- ❑ Filling in with 2 story buildings (e.g. a good restaurant, entertainment, small theater)
- ❑ Civic and community uses tied together such as a senior center, library
- ❑ Parking in 2 story structures (such as Old Town), on roofs or underground
- ❑ Use of the parking lot for community gatherings, and places to “sit and chat”
- ❑ Landscaping and green space
- ❑ Tie together Montgomery Park center, add senior center and library.
- ❑ On the NE corner, Del Norte High School has a huge grassed area that has potential for joint community use – some possibilities are a good little league baseball field, park, walking and running tracks and trees. “It’s a waste to have expensive isolated buildings on huge chunks of land.”
- ❑ On the SE corner, there is potential for filling in; a sketch at the workshops shows one side of perpendicular streets connecting to corridors with pedestrian orientation.
- ❑ *Pedestrian connections* between the residential neighborhoods and activity centers are the preferred means of fostering mixed-use.

Menaul

On the existing corridors, residents want more streetscape—less space used for parking lots, more landscaping, more flowers. Menaul has a sea of parking on both sides separating the street from businesses and is dominated by the automobile. As a designated Enhanced Transit Corridor, it needs to be made to look and feel more pedestrian friendly. Thoughtful transitions and linkages are important; no more than 2-story development is appropriate as a buffer with surrounding neighborhoods.

Louisiana

One idea is to depress this section of Louisiana to allow people to walk over it and create potential for an outdoor mall. Other suggestions: a free trolley around Uptown.

Other suggestions:

Designate Indian School a transit corridor connecting a new UNM North Campus and Indian Plaza at Carlisle to the Uptown Activity Center.

Near Heights

The Near Heights community supports the Centers and Corridors concept as a way to revitalize and reinvest in their community. “A livable city must re-invest in older areas, and take action for the future.” Without reinvestment, they saw the area subsidizing sprawl. They supported more diverse housing, live-work spaces, and multiple uses closer together and walkable, and thought these qualities would help to retain young people. Creating an urban character with benefits to pedestrians is essential to preventing decline. The City should support infill and revitalization of the existing city first. This is a positive and efficient alternative to sprawl. This group had a sophisticated understanding of the benefits: “The development of corridors makes possible higher density which facilitates the best use and rehabilitation of infrastructure.” In the Near Heights, you’re “speaking to the choir.”

However, they questioned the city’s definition of “higher densities” and were the most concerned of any area with HOW they would be implemented. They wanted to ensure design quality, protection of historically significant areas, and close attention to buffer or transitional areas adjacent to the higher densities. They did not want to give *carte blanche* to developers, but insisted upon strong community participation and involvement to ensure these protections. Without design standards, high profile buildings and densities could threaten qualities they value: views of the mountains, historic buildings and character in Nob Hill and along Central, and single family residential neighborhoods.

The limited lot depths along Central and San Mateo could limit mixed-use potential in sensitive areas. “Different areas are different – not all are appropriate for mixed use. The City needs an over-all policy approach.” There was concern that the video shows all areas along Central treated the same; different centers should have a different character.

“It depends on how it’s done; mixed use is not always good unless it’s done correctly. If residential development is to be integrated with commercial, it must be done in sensitive ways, achieved only with stricter design requirements and giving “importance to viewpoints of residential neighborhoods regarding development immediately adjacent to them.” How back from the corridor do you go? How much transition? These are critical questions and would vary depending on each community.

Priorities would be to reinforce existing, traditional community activity centers: University (Harvard Mall), Nob Hill, Highland. Redevelopment should “build on what we have, what is there.” Other ideas: make the sports complex a mixed use center; extend light rail further east at least to Wyoming; create an activity center at Central and Louisiana for an International Marketplace; Route 66 Cultural Center at Hiland

Qualities they like:

Historical nature of Central Avenue – neon, buildings
Central location, easy to get places
Restaurant corridor along all of Central (want)
Single family residential neighborhoods

North Albuquerque

Residents of North Albuquerque are happy with their residential areas but not happy with the design quality of commercial centers being built: single story, large parking lots and lack of quality design for pedestrians. Both the City and County groups in North Albuquerque would like to see better pedestrian-oriented design of new commercial centers as they are first developed, emphasizing the importance of implementing good design principles up-front, not after the fact. “New areas have the opportunity to do it right” but the type of commercial development being done is a disappointment.

What people like:

Cherry Hills library

The “look” – Mediterranean southwestern blend – terra cotta tile and stucco

Minimum signage in new commercial areas; cleaner look, no billboards

Most utilities underground

Open space, walking paths, small parks; site for North Domingo Baca Arroyo Park

Inexpensive housing

Low density residential character (County wants to maintain 1 DU/acre)

Quiet, stars at night, views

Less traffic

Feeling of smaller community in a larger area

Organized neighborhood associations

Feeling of safety

La Cueva Center

Both groups saw some potential for focusing on improvements to the La Cueva Village Center at Paseo and Wyoming. The City group strongly advocated for a *multi-generational center* to be developed there that could be used for community meetings and would be a catalyst strengthening a sense of community. Other uses: mid-priced restaurants (not just fast food); smaller scale movie theaters, shopping geared toward pedestrians. They do not want to see more development of isolated stores that turn their back on the street and “don’t do anything to create a community.”

Cherry Hills Village center has similar problems with lack of pedestrian orientation internally: “You can walk to it, but can’t walk through it.” It has large asphalt parking lots without places to sit. People mentioned the following uses that they would like to see added: banking, public restrooms, daycare, quality restaurants, shoe repair, bigger library meeting spaces and extended hours, small movie theaters.

Other:

Would like to see more activities - clustered at sites (Eubank, Holbrook) either on the north or south sides (not both) along Paseo. Frontage roads make them accessible to the neighborhood while keeping traffic out.

Academy and Wyoming could be re-worked with higher density, infill and mixed uses.

North Valley

The North Valley consists of at least two diverse areas (north and south of Montano). The meeting brought together both these areas to find qualities in common. They generally like living close to town in a rural setting. They see the proposal to concentrate more development within defined areas as way of preserving qualities they value, and a way to “save the livability of the North Valley.”

Qualities they value:

Big lots, low density, semi-rural nature, not as crowded, small farms
Access to river and acequias, ditch connections and preservation
Walking, bike paths, outdoor activities, open space, views, clean air
Historic architecture, neighborhood feel, single story
Coexistence with wildlife
Fewer traffic lights, less congestion

Participants in the workshops strongly favor concentrating development in centers rather than along corridors. Corridors are a sensitive issue. The community has seen increased traffic moving east-west *through* the valley serving Rio Rancho and the west side, and does not want wider arterial streets built to accommodate traffic pressures. “The North Valley has taken on its share of corridors. Now we need the centers.” Since 12th and Candelaria is already being done, there was general agreement among the three discussion groups that the area of concentration where they could have the most impact should be the vicinity of 4th and Osuna and 4th Street from Guadalupe plaza north, focusing on the Camino Real. Other centers for focus: Alameda and 4th.

Desired qualities of activity centers:

More restaurants, small shops, bookstores, art galleries, community center
Treed and well landscaped, not “like a mall.”
“A place you’d want to go.”
“Cohesiveness with North Valley architecture; hitching posts, pathways not sidewalks
When you’re there, you know you’re in the valley”
Unique lighting
Gathering places, multi-purpose plazas
Buildings around internal space, shops on perimeter “A place you can go and be protected and walk through.” “A sense you’re in the village center”
Festivals, concerts, entertainment, shops
Indoor/ outdoor dining
Housing above businesses along 4th St.
Ample safe parking behind stores, transit hub

People wanted pedestrian and bicycle linkages between centers and suggested making a trail along the Second Street ditch

Other suggestions: Make Osuna a transit corridor
 Include Los Ranchos community center

South Valley

South Valley residents favor the Centers and Corridors proposals only if they are done in a way that is respectful and sensitive to the scale of existing communities. “This should fit with what we’re doing, not the other way around.” There is skepticism about the effectiveness of the proposal because community members have seen “little development and impact” from the 1988 Southwest Area Plan.

Characteristics they value and want to retain:

Stability, long-term residents
Sense of community, family-oriented
Connection to nature
Locally owned business that serve the community
Rural qualities, open space, agricultural uses
Low density, large lots
Acequias, surface irrigation

This group saw potential for using the principles of the Centers and Corridors plan to enhance highly valued historic village centers and corridors. There is a desire to recognize, support and promote Isleta Blvd as *El Camino Real*. “Isleta should be addressed using visual techniques as were used with Central Avenue; but it should not be treated the same.” Isleta should be enhanced as more than a transportation corridor, becoming a comfortable place for pedestrians, with small businesses as well as housing. “It should meet the needs of the community. Scale and proportion are key.”

Improvements to Isleta would be a catalyst for other elements of the Southwest Area Plan to be implemented, including the historic Armijo village center at Isleta and Arenal. Village centers should be developed as important historic places that they are. Plazas are unique centers of villages. “Recognize, respect, and enhance villages as places to live and centers of the community.” They should include parks and traditional spaces for outside activities with trees, walkways, and small performance stages. “There are no places for people to gather. If we had them, we’d gather at them.”

The South Valley is in need of basic community services: medical, health and hospital services; grocery stores, more active recreation. The character south of Rio Bravo is agricultural; north of Rio Bravo the character is more urban. Financial incentives and disincentives are needed to preserve the greenbelt of remaining agricultural land.

Other opportunities:

Redevelopment and infill of Atrisco Plaza
East of 2nd, west of Broadway, between Woodward and Rio Bravo – entertainment district with local businesses, not big box
Coors and Rio Bravo – fill in the shopping center already there rather than using valuable agricultural land for development.
Transit should be placed on Unser rather than Coors to serve planned densities on the mesa, connecting across Arenal to Isleta Blvd. and south to Isleta Pueblo

Southwest Mesa

Southwest Mesa residents like the idea of promoting redevelopment within activity centers and along major transportation corridors and have already identified West Central and the center at Atrisco and Central as priority areas for action. They understood the efficiencies of using existing infrastructure and placed a high priority in filling in vacant land and re-using empty buildings. “Development should not move from the middle to the outskirts and leave the middle empty.”

They felt that their area had been unduly impacted by concentrations of affordable housing to the point that an emphasis on market rate, owner occupied housing was now needed to restore balance. For this reason, they resisted proposals for higher density multi-family housing along the Central Avenue corridor. “No more affordable housing on the west side of the river.”

Community members in the Southwest Mesa have clear ideas of what is and is not needed to make the most of the opportunities for redevelopment at Atrisco and Central and are excited about possibilities for connection to the river at this location. “Atrisco Plaza is the first thing you see crossing the river.” If that’s not taken care of, Central Avenue will die.”

Other activities:

Professional business services, especially medical

More choices in shopping

Recreational/ youth centers

Places to socialize, village feel

Stores clustered around an open space, cars behind buildings

Small entertainment and cultural venues, theaters

Performing arts spaces for local artists that would draw people

Owner occupied market rate housing- condos and townhouses

More “mom and pop” stores, fewer franchises, no chains or big box

Living above stores

Development of a riverwalk and recreational amenities associated with the river and bosque and connections between Atrisco Plaza and the river

Other opportunities: along the river between Central and I-40

Along West Central and at Coors and Central, they wanted to see more pedestrian lighting and other major pedestrian improvements.

Revisions to zoning are needed in order to encourage small local businesses to expand and allow living above stores. Redevelopment should be done as a whole package rather than piecemeal, and the community must continue to be involved to achieve the kind of centers they envision.

West Side

The West Side is experiencing many problems associated with rapid growth and the difficulty for city services to keep up. They feel impacted by too much poorly designed commercial development and a deficit of public services and civic amenities. The West Side has a critical need for roads, libraries, community centers, parks, recreational facilities and schools and this need is particularly urgent because of the high number of children and growing families that need these services now. Instead of more intensive commercial development as proposed in the Centers and Corridors Plan, residents want wanted services that only the public sector can supply. “There’s a lack of community resources to meet the needs of growing families.” “The things the City has to pay for are the things we need the most. The things developers pay for we have or will get—no more retail or commercial.” “Deal with the civic side of the community—for young people, for the future. There are so many children on the west side!”

The Centers and Corridors map presented to the group left out major streets and emerging centers and reinforced the perception of being short-changed. “Why should we support the city’s plan when they’ve ignored us?” The West Side pays taxes, but “they’re using the money over there.” (See map recommendations) Because of recent growth, the West Side is no longer one community and should be divided at least in two areas to serve more local needs. Montano was suggested as the dividing line, and in general the idea of dividing at the bridges made sense to people.

The group saw the value of the Centers and Corridors concept in concentrating commercial development at pedestrian-oriented clusters or nodes rather than strip centers. They identified Paseo del Norte and Coors as a priority site for developing a different type of walkable activity center and saw opportunities for a transit center, connections to bike paths and to archeological sites east of Coors. Examples of centers they liked: Montano Plaza and Mariposa Basin; centers they don’t like: Cottonwood Mall (no community orientation) and I-40 and Coors which stretches major strip commercial to the north on the east side of Coors. The preference is for small neighborhood centers serving local needs.

In recent years, traffic on Coors has doubled. Coors was supposed to be a limited access roadway, but instead is lined with commercial in-and-out traffic creating a dangerous situation for cars and pedestrians. The community wants to preserve open space and views along Coors and not add to the problems with more commercial growth on vacant land. In their view, it is critical to develop other North-South reliever arterials to disperse traffic, such as Unser, Paseo del Volcan, Universe, and Rainbow.

People on the West Side want to improve and protect views and open space along corridors, and focusing development within community activity centers may help achieve those goals. They view the Comprehensive Plan as a chain, with each part affecting other parts. Long-term plans need to be treated comprehensively; if one part goes, the whole plan collapses.

CENTERS & CORRIDORS:

A PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR CITY DESIGN



Appendix 1

CHANGES TO CENTERS AND CORRIDORS MAP

Central Albu

Old Town should be labeled a Community (mixed use) center, not special activity center
Extend across Rio Grande and to north and south of Central, expand to include Bio Park

Activity center at 4th and Cesar Chavez

NO major activity center at Medical District (Near Heights comment also)

Join UNM and TVI activity centers with pedestrianways, bikeways and expansion of activity center – show merging and flow between them

Broadway as enhanced transit

Extend major transit to South Fourth

East Gateway

Consider extending blue line for major transit corridor on Central over to Tramway

Mid Heights

The word “village” at San Mateo and Montgomery is a misnomer. Expand center to include SE corner*

Indian School as transit corridor (connecting UNM area, Indian Plaza at Carlisle and Indian School with Uptown)

Near Heights

Highland activity center – needs to be scaled down; spelled “Hiland”

UNM Sports Complex should be a Community Activity Center

Need Activity Center at Louisiana and Central – International Marketplace

“Stretch” Nob Hill west to UNM and east to Hiland.

Continue Central Ave. as major transit corridor further east beyond Louisiana to at least Wyoming, perhaps further

Serve Airport to Alvarado Transportation Center with major transit corridor

North Albuquerque County

La Cueva Village OK (to the south of Paseo also)*

North Valley

Community Activity Center – extend Guadalupe Plaza to 4th and Osuna
(2 groups wanted to make Osuna and 4th a priority; 3rd group wanted the corridor on 4th
St. from Montano to Osuna to be an activity center)

Osuna –enhanced transit corridor

4th and Alameda

South Valley

Review locations of Mesa del Sol centers

Map should reflect Historic Village centers

Los Padillos further south than shown on map

Armjo village center should be at intersection of Isleta and Arenal (SW of what is
shown)

Enhanced transit corridor on Isleta should continue south past Rio Bravo to Isleta Pueblo

Enhanced transit corridor on Coors dead-ends and doesn't connect to anything – not
enough people there for this to be enhanced transit. Transit should be placed on Unser
rather than Coors, following planned higher densities on the mesa, then connect across
Arenal to the activity center and transit corridor along Isleta.

Community Activity Center at Coors and Rio Bravo, building on existing infrastructure

Southwest Mesa

Show link to river at Atrisco Center

East Mountain

Expand Tijeras as a village center – showing it as a “hub” connecting several small
village nodes: Cedar Crest, Sedillo Hill, Carnuel.

West Side

Extend Paseo del Norte per approved alignment

Show Paseo de Volcan per approved alignment; no “study corridors”

Show Unser per approved alignment

Other roadways missing – Universe, Rainbow – add north/ south connections to Paseo

TV-I campus at Universe and Irving put on map

I-40 and Coors –shown as linear on map –shown on the west, should also be on the east to reflect reality– and should be depicted as a major center, not strip commercial

Paseo del Norte and Coors – Community Activity Center –Extend to east of Coors (Coors is a pedestrian barrier but other activities should go on the east of the intersection)*

Mariposa Basin – a developing center, should be on the map

Show city limits correctly on the western edge

Create two Community Identity areas on the West Side, divided by Montano

*Issue: For Community Activity Centers at major intersections that are barriers to pedestrian crossings, in some cases the whole intersection (e.g. Juan Tabo and Montgomery) is considered an Activity Center; in other cases (e.g. Paseo and Coors) only one quadrant is labeled, even though the community identified other types of activities that could take place to the East of Coors also. There should be a consistent policy on this, or “concept circles” could be used.

Neighborhood Centers

The Comprehensive Plan map does not show neighborhood scale centers. These were of interest to communities and are listed here as suggestions.

Central Albuquerque

- Broadway and Central

North Valley

- Rio Grande and Matthew
- Rio Grande and Griegos

North Alb County

- Paseo and Eubank – services clustered
- Holbrook and Paseo

Appendix 2

COMMON THEMES FOR COMMUNITY ACTIVITY CENTERS

Cohesiveness of character

- ❑ More than a shopping center
- ❑ Pleasing architecture, design elements to attract people
- ❑ A place you'd want to go
- ❑ A sense you're in the village center
- ❑ Curb appeal – created through design criteria
- ❑ Things that draw you in, attract people

Ample parking and transit connections

- ❑ Transit hub
- ❑ Village feel, cars behind buildings
- ❑ Parking structures or rooftop parking to save space; 2 story structures as in Old Town

Common civic spaces

- ❑ Multi-purpose plazas, gathering areas for village markets, festivals, outdoor concerts, entertainment, shops
- ❑ Socializing space, places to socialize, community open space
- ❑ Use Nob Hill as design example; stores clustered around an enclosed open space, European-style Plaza
- ❑ Civic space in the middle to break up the space and make it inviting
- ❑ Space to enjoy, not just park your car and go to the store
- ❑ Civic space, open space – something that draws you in, inviting, that keeps you there longer to run your errands. “Somewhere to hang out.”
- ❑ Community gathering places, plazas
- ❑ Community gardens and parks
- ❑ Buildings closer together
- ❑ Not a parking lot as the open space
- ❑ Buildings around internal space, shops on perimeter which protect pedestrian area in the center. A place you can go into and be protected and walk through

Pedestrian friendly

- ❑ Connections to facilitate walking more easily from store to store
- ❑ Indoor-outdoor dining
- ❑ Landscaping, trees, pedestrian lighting (gas lamps, kiosks)
- ❑ Trees for shade and pleasant seating (shade for cars in the summer could be a draw)
- ❑ Places to sit and chat
- ❑ Outdoor malls
- ❑ Shopping as a “relaxing experience.”

Beautification with xeriscaping, not water consumption

Services and activities to draw people

- ❑ Need *synergism* among tenants key to success of a center

- ❑ People around the area magnetized to the center; 1 stop centers to give people what they need and want; types of businesses that bring people together
- ❑ Essential services: Grocery, drugstore, cleaners, deli, post office, bank, bakery
- ❑ Youth centers to attract young people, but not to shop
- ❑ Community and civic resources (e.g. libraries) to meet the needs of children and growing families (West Side)
- ❑ More recreational/ youth activities
- ❑ Small scale cultural/ entertainment; smaller entertainment venues; theaters, cultural venues; performing arts for local artists that would draw people
- ❑ Professional business services, more of everything, especially medical (Southwest Mesa, South Valley)
- ❑ Small locally owned businesses; more “mom and pop” stores, fewer franchises
- ❑ Dispersed and de-centralized government services; satellite offices
- ❑ Multi-generational center
- ❑ Community meeting spaces
- ❑ Smaller scale movie theaters
- ❑ Community meeting spaces; uses that bring people together by foot
- ❑ Library, daycare
- ❑ Draws for people—good restaurants, coffee houses, boutiques

Not wanted:

- ❑ No chain stores or big box retail (North Valley) (Southwest Mesa) (East Gateway)(West Side)
- ❑ No more commercial (West Side)
- ❑ Strip malls (West Side, East Gateway, North Albuquerque, Mid-Heights)

Appendix 3
Centers and Corridors Discussion Outline

Community Meetings Discussion Questions

1. What do you think of the Centers and Corridors concept as a city/county-wide approach to development and redevelopment? What do you like or not like about this proposal as it would impact the metropolitan area as a whole?

2. Look at the map showing the ten communities in the city and county and identify your community.

What are some characteristics of your community that you like and would want to keep?
(list)

What do you think of the Centers and Corridors concept for your community? What do you like or not like about this proposal as it would impact your community?

3. We would like you to choose one community activity center or corridor to focus on for design and implementation in a possible next phase. Is there a particular area that you would like to select as your community's "activity center" or "corridor" that could be improved with more pedestrian orientation and new development? (If possible, arrive at some group consensus on one or two centers)

If "yes," what activities would you be likely to do there and would you like to see locate there? List features you'd like. Some examples are:

- Shopping (grocery store, drugstore, etc.) within walking distance for daily needs.
- Community open space (parks, plazas, trails, gardens).
- Different types of housing choices available (condos, single family homes, apartments, townhouses).
- Cultural/ entertainment such as theaters, music.
- Places to socialize (coffeehouses, community centers, plazas).
- Village feel with stores fronting directly on sidewalks.
- Other

4. What actions would need to happen to make this area into the kind of center you envision?

If you haven't already, please fill out a registration form. You will be sent a report and contacted if there is follow-up activity to help make this happen in your community.

Appendix 4

THE CENTERS AND CORRIDORS CONCEPT

We Should Develop Centers of Activity in Our City

A key **element** of our shared vision is the identification of places that are centers of activity in our daily lives. There are three different kinds of centers that we should focus on. The **first** is the **community activity center**. Each community has places with the potential to bring surrounding neighborhoods together, to shop, to work, go to school, be entertained or participate in recreational activities. The identification and enhancement of these urban and rural **community activity centers** is important to our shared vision for the future. Some of these places, like Nob Hill in the near heights community, already have all the characteristics of a successful, busy activity center. Many others have elements and an emerging recognition that must be built on to create an important place in that community.

The **second** type of activity center is the **specialty center** which serves the city and the region by providing a site for a unique special activity that draws large numbers of people from a wide area. Existing specialty centers include the balloon park, Old Town, the Bio-Park and Zoo, the Sunport, the State Fairgrounds and the UNM Sports Complex.

The **third** type of center we call the **major activity center**. These are places in our metropolitan area that serve our entire region as centers of commerce and employment. Our existing major activity centers, such as the Kirtland/Sandia area, Uptown, Downtown, UNM, North I-25 and Cottonwood Mall, need to be infilled and redeveloped over time. We need to make them more balanced in their activities, including housing opportunities and pedestrian and transit accessibility.

Our **future major activity centers**, be they on the westside, south valley or at Mesa del Sol, need too provide a mix of uses that will create the potential for large numbers of our citizens to satisfy their daily needs by living in or near these areas. The region's new major activity centers should be integrated into planned communities and exemplify sustainable development through a balanced mix of activities, pedestrianism, and transit accessibility.

Let's Connect the Centers with Transportation Corridors

Our shared vision also focuses on the transportation corridors we use to access the communities and activity centers of our city.

EXPRESS CORRIDORS. A network of roadways that would be dedicated to developing higher speeds with fewer interruptions to travel for the car and public transit vehicles. These corridors are typically limited access, higher speed with pedestrian and bicycle trails separate and protected. These corridors would provide efficient express busy service to the major activity centers where the largest shared of the region's jobs are

located. Our shared vision proposes that these corridors be the site of some future infill and redevelopment, that could create a larger number of people living close enough to have good access to public transportation at selected locations.

MAJOR TRANSIT CORRIDOR. Roadways designed to optimize public transit and move larger numbers of people in a a very timely and efficient manner. These roadways could have dedicated bus lanes, wide sidewalks, bike lanes and the possibility of light rail service. These corridors would focus on the movement of lots of people in a pedestrian friendly environment, would emphasized short trips and convenience and would be prime candidates for significant mixed use infill and redevelopment.

ENHANCED TRANSIT CORRIDOR. Roadways designed or redesigned to improve transit and pedestrian opportunities for residents, businesses, and other users nearby. These roadways could have similar features to the major transit corridor, but perhaps fewer and less costly. Their goal is to provide transit service competitive with the car, and develop adjacent land uses and intensities that promote the use of transit.

Thanks to the members of the Shared Vision Comprehensive Plan Public Advisory Committee (CPAC) who organized the community involvement process, reviewed this report and unanimously endorsed the Centers and Corridors concepts:

Nadyne Bicknell, Chair, Comprehensive Plan Public Advisory Committee

Jeanne Bassett, Public Interest Research Group (PIRG)

Brian Burnett, President, Bohannon-Huston, Inc.

Paul Cauwels, Cauwels & Associates, Inc.

Victor Chavez, Chavez Grieves Consulting Engineers

Louis Colombo, Albuquerque City Council office

Brad Day, New England Financial

Jim Folkman, Home Buildings Association of Central NM

Ned Farquhar, 1000 Friends of New Mexico

Barbara Garrity, 1000 Friends of New Mexico

Harold Gonzales, Albuquerque Hispano Chamber of Commerce

Donna Hill, League of Women Voters

Rupert Holland, Spruce Park Neighborhood Association

Rick Homans, Starlight Publishing

Herb Howell, City Planning Department Office of Neighborhoods

Randy Moorman, Public Interest Research Group (PIRG)

Orlando Olivas, South Valley Coalition

Fred Rael, East Mountain Area Neighborhood Association

Alan Reed, 1000 Friends of New Mexico

Penny Rembe, Los Poblanos Inn

Bruce Rizzieri, City of Albuquerque Transit Department

Stan Strickman, Trails Management Inc.

Joe Valles, West Side Coalition

Steve Wentworth, Bernalillo County Planning Commission

Robert Wertheim, President Charter Bank

Theodore Wolff, Sandia National Laboratories

Thanks to the City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County Planning Departments:

Bob McCabe, Director, City Planning Department

Joel Wooldridge, Division Manager, City Planning Department

Sandy Fish and others, Bernalillo County Planning and Zoning

Thanks to other City and County departments who attended meetings:

City Council Office; Department of Family and Community Services, Community

Planning; City Transit Department

*Community involvement and report
by Shared Vision*

Signe Rich, Executive Director

For more information or additional copies of this report
contact Shared Vision at 764-0222