NHNA Input on CABQ Community Planning Area Assessment

DRAFT, 2021-05-09

1. TRANSIT
2. **Solve excessive speeding and accidents on Lead and Coal** in Nob Hill
3. **Make Monte Vista Blvd a classic boulevard** with treed grassed median.
4. **Make sidewalks ADA respectful**, especially at corners and alleys
5. **More bike parking** - bike corrals and bike racks provide convenient parking options for shops and restaurants.
6. **Improve challenging intersections for bicycles**, like Copper/Campus and Carlisle, a wide intersection with many risks for conflict. It would help to narrow the intersection or consider a roundabout.
7. **Improve bike boulevard, lane, and route markings and signage** - especially those that connect to other parts of town and support the use of bikes as transportation.
8. **Continue bike lanes on Washington** south of Central to connect people to the Silver Avenue Bicycle Boulevard and to the bike lanes on Zuni which connect to our neighbors in the International District.
9. ART seems to divide our commercial district into north and south sides. **We need more opportunities to cross Central Ave.**
10. UNM has historically developed campus with little consideration of surrounding neighborhoods (and the city as well). What are the prospects for coordinating with them on traffic and the road and transit system? **Could UNM be specifically named as an accountable partner in the CPA** Assessment report?
11. Post pandemic, many businesses will allow employees to work from home at least part time. This will change traffic patterns and, in particular, the traditional morning commute. **CABQ should think about adjustments to transit service to accommodate such a change**.
12. CABQ should perform **strategic planning for parking** in Nob Hill.

1. ZONING
2. In the area within 1,320 ft. of the Main Street Corridor **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are now permissive.** This covers about 80% of the NHNA boundaries. On most streets this means that one neighbor can do it and the neighbor next door can’t. There is interest in modifying those boundaries to correspond to cross streets instead of the 1.320 ft. rule.
3. **The transition between residential and mixed use zoning should be examined on a block-by-block basis in Nob Hill.** In some areas the zoning allows adequate transitions, but in others the boundary is quite sharp.
4. The IDO annual update process, compared to the pre-IDO process, is much better for everyone due to its predictability and transparency. While there are good reasons for the City Council to make changes throughout the process **Council should reinforce transparency and public trust in the process by publicizing late stage amendments** on topics that were not under consideration at earlier stages.
5. **Frontages on Central Ave. in Nob Hill should appear as storefronts or public facing establishments**. There are residential properties on Central, and this use is not objectionable. However, the facades along the Central corridor in Nob Hill were historically commercial, creating its unique character and are an asset to the larger community even if new uses are residential. Large residential projects should maximize commercial uses on the street-level facade, such as leasing offices, recreation and meeting rooms, and space leased to third-party service and restaurant businesses. Smaller residential projects without public or common spaces can still maximize commercial appearance of street-level facade.
6. There are no proposed changes to the allowed building heights in CPO-8 that we are aware of. We would strongly oppose such changes and desire this position to be on record in the CPA Assessment Report.
7. The IDO requires façade articulation and glazing on buildings facing Central Ave. but leaves open the potential for highly visible and expansive walls with zero aesthetic value on the other sides of buildings. This creates ugly eyesores for the residents that live in the neighborhood and interact with the buildings daily. We support extending the façade articulation, variation, and fenestration called for in CPO-8 on the front façade to all facades of buildings in CPO-8.
8. Reference A2 Cannabis Retail, Cultivation and Manufacturing.  <https://abc-zone.com/document/ido-annual-update-2019-council-amendments-passed-lupz> Since submittal to EPC, the distance separation between Cannabis Cultivation and Cannabis infused Products Manufacturing to schools, residential zone districts and child day care facilities has been reduced from 1,000 ft. to 330 ft. The above zoning was changed from 1,000 feet to 330 feet in 2019. Now recreational cannabis has been legalized. This is a huge change. Much better zoning protection is needed given the problems Colorado and California have experienced with the passage of recreational cannabis. **The IDO should modify separation to 1,000 ft. between recreational cannabis facilities and: Residential uses, childcare facility, residential childcare facility, elementary school, middle school, high school, community center, recreational facility, skateboard park or any other facility or public place where youth congregate, place of worship, halfway house, correctional facility, other cannabis business.**
9. HISTORIC PRESERVATION
10. Two of Nob Hill’s six residential subdivisions are listed as a historic district in state and national registers. **Explore listing** of 1916 University Heights, 1925 Granada Heights, and/or 1945 Broadmoor Addition
11. Design and **Install sign toppers** on street signs to identify listed historic districts
12. Explore one or more **Historic Protection Overlay Zones** in the residential neighborhoods
13. PUBLIC SAFETY
14. What can the city do to help residents and neighborhoods **expand their Neighborhood Watch participation?**
15. PARKS  
    a. Explore the possibilities of **green space and shaded oases along Central Ave.**
16. The public is slowly finding out via conflict that while official policy towards dogs in public places, including parks, has not changed, the level of enforcement and prosecution has increased. The same is true for the public use of (shared) park space on APS property. At the very least, the parks and rec dept. should engage in a publicity campaign informing the public that these policies are being taken much more seriously than they were in the past. Better would be to **increase the number of off-leash dog parks, and local parks**, throughout the city.