CAMPBELL AVENUE

A STUDY OF THE CAMPBELL AVENUE CORRIDOR
College of Architecture, Planning, and Landscape Architecture
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona
Community Planning and Design Workshop
June 2003
STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Kristin Becker, 4th year, Bachelor of Architecture
Edward Bove, Masters of Planning
Jessie Maran, Masters of Landscape Architecture
Josh Mehlem, Masters of Landscape Architecture

PROJECT COORDINATION

Corky Poster, Professor, Director,
Community Planning and Design Workshop

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our design team would like to thank:

Campbell Avenue Business Partnership, Inc.
City of Tucson, Ward III Council Office
Kathleen Dunbar, Council-Member, Ward III
Carol Clark, Aid to Council-Member Dunbar
Katherine Walsh, Photography
Vince Catalano, Traffic Engineering Manager,
Department of Transportation
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHICS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZONING</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL USES</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN STRUCTURES</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE II</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSE OF PLACE</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE III</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTER PLAN</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATES</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPECTIVES</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIALS</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASING</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OVERVIEW**

Campbell Avenue is a unique north-south corridor in the center of the City of Tucson. It's rare blend of high and low-density commercial and office land-uses and neighboring residential, contribute to a vibrant local community.

As a classified gateway route, Campbell Avenue carries over forty thousand vehicles per day in the one-mile stretch from Grant Road to Fort Lowell Road. It serves as a major link between the University of Arizona and the city core and the unincorporated foothills-area of Pima County. This section of the corridor supports a distinct array of local and national businesses that support the neighboring residential neighborhoods and public institutions.

The Campbell Avenue corridor serves as a focal point for this vibrant area of town. It should be a recognizable gathering place for the community, representing the beauty and flow of the surrounding neighborhoods. The intention of this master plan is to make Campbell Avenue accessible by various forms of transportation with focus on strengthening pedestrian traffic and developing an orderly parking strategy.

The Back-to-Basics grant awarded to the Campbell Avenue Business Partnership by the City of Tucson will be used to begin the redevelopment of the Campbell Avenue Corridor.
PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Campbell Avenue corridor is currently dominated by vehicular traffic and lacks an attractive and functional streetscape. The constant speeding, noise, and parking requirements of the automobile have severely inhibited pedestrian and bicycle uses along the street. The lack of landscaping and the paving requirements for the automobile have rendered the corridor aesthetically unappealing and dangerous for foot traffic.

Campbell Avenue has the potential to be an area that facilitates access from the surrounding neighborhoods by all forms of transportation. Although the automobile currently dominates the corridor, limiting other modes of circulation, there is a desire to create a new image for the corridor and attract a new audience of consumers to benefit the existing businesses.

The goal of this master plan is to improve pedestrian and transit access while maintaining vehicular flow.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project has been broken into three phases. The first phase contains the site inventory and analysis required to begin the investigation. The second phase presents case studies of solutions to similar problems within Tucson. In addition, preliminary design ideas will be generated. The final phase is a design proposal.

The goal in this first phase is to collect relevant and useful data on the Campbell Avenue Corridor. This has been done in an attempt to determine the best way to turn this corridor into a vibrant focal point for residents of Central Tucson.
PHASE I

RESEARCH AND MAPPING
LOCATION MAP

The location of the site being studied is in Tucson, Arizona, within Sections 31 and 32, Township 13 S, Range 14 E. The one-mile corridor along Campbell Avenue between Grant Road and Fort Lowell Road, as well as the relation to the adjoining neighborhoods, are the focus of the project.
SITE DESCRIPTION

The section of Campbell Avenue contained in this study is approximately one mile from the University of Arizona and four miles from downtown. The scope of this study is the commercial and office corridor, approximately one mile long, stretching from Grant Road to Fort Lowell Road. The corridor contains approximately 207 different businesses. Food service, retail shops and medical offices are just a few of the types of businesses found along the corridor. Eight neighborhoods adjoin the business community on the East and West.
NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

There are eight neighborhood associations within one block of this section of Campbell Avenue: Samos, Hedrick Acres, Campbell/Grant, Shaheen Estates, Jefferson Park, Catalina Vista, Richland Heights West, and Richland Heights East.

The boundaries of the neighborhoods are as follows:

**Samos** – From Glenn on the north to Grant on the south, and Campbell on the east to Mountain on the west.
**Hedrick Acres** – From Fort Lowell on the north to Glenn on the south, and Campbell on the east to Tyndall on the west.
**Campbell/Grant** – From Glenn on the north to Grant on the south, and Tucson on the east to Campbell on the west.
**Shaheen Estates** – From Blacklidge on the north to Glenn on the south, and Tucson on the east to Olsen on the west.
**Jefferson Park** – From Grant on the north to Lester on the south, and Campbell on the east to Euclid on the west.
**Catalina Vista** – From Grant on the north to Lester on the south, and Tucson on the east to Campbell on the west.
**Richland Heights West** – From Prince on the north to Fort Lowell on the south, and Campbell on the east to Mountain on the west.
**Richland Heights East** – From Prince on the north to Fort Lowell on the south, and Tucson on the east to Campbell on the west.
The Campbell Ave Corridor includes portions of four census tracts (15, 16, 27.01, 27.02). For this study, the four tracts have been combined to give an average of the area with the knowledge that these immediate surrounding areas have the most influence on and are affected the most by the impacts of this corridor. Hereafter this compilation will be referred to as the ‘census area’.

The census area is compared with data from the Tucson Metropolitan Statistical Area as a whole, hereafter referred to as the TMSA or ‘Tucson Metro’.

* Data was compiled from the 1990 and 2000 census data as found at www.census.gov
While the census area's population did increase by 5.5%, the TMSA increased 19.5%, nearly four times as much between 1990 and 2000.
The population under 18 in decreased nearly an equivalent amount between the census area and that of the TMSA. A total of a 0.2% decrease occurred within the census area while the TMSA decreased by 0.3%
While the population of people over 65 decreased by 0.1% in the census area, it increased 0.7% in the TMSA over the 10 year period.
The median household income within the census area remained below the TMSA. In 1990, the median household income within the census area was 15.6% below that of the TMSA, while in 2000 the difference nearly doubled to 29% below the median household income of the TMSA.
In line with the lower median income within the census area, the population below poverty was higher than the TMSA in both 1990 and 2000. The difference of those below poverty increased by 8% between 1990 and 2000. In the TMSA the population below poverty remained relatively stable while in the census area it increased by 30%.
While the population below poverty remained higher and the median income lower than the TMSA, and increased at a greater rate, the median contract rent continued to be higher in the census areas and increased at a slightly greater rate of 31% within the census area compared to the 29% increase in the TMSA.
The Hispanic Ethnicity has been compiled into the race data to give a clearer understanding of the cultural breakdown within the census area and the TMSA. The percentage of Hispanics increased in both the TMSA and the census area between 1990 and 2000. A difference of a 1% higher increase in the TMSA occurred with a decrease of non-Hispanic whites in both areas, while the other races remained relatively stable.
Consistent with the higher percentage of Hispanics in the TMSA, there also remained a higher level of Spanish speakers. The predominant language spoken in both areas is English with Spanish being second to that. The percentage of people speaking Asian/Pacific Island or other languages remained low in both areas with a slightly higher percentage within the census area.
The percentage of renter-occupied units versus owner-occupied units within the census area remained stable while in the TMSA, the percentage of renter-occupied units decreased. The census area had a considerably higher percentage of renter-occupied units in both 1990 and 2000. The gap widened by 5% due to the decrease in the TMSA.
The census area had a much higher percentage of people with diplomas and degrees. The percentage of people with no diploma remained approximately half of that in the TMSA. Each level of educational attainment remained higher in the census area than in the TMSA.
DEMOGRAPHICS SUMMARY

The close proximity of the census area to the University of Arizona and the data found in the demographics study show that there is a high percentage of students and faculty living in this area. With the rents higher than average and wages lower, one could assume that outside assistance may be involved (i.e. educational loans/parent assistance). In addition, the percentage of housing units that are renter-occupied indicate a transient area consistent with the presence of students who remain only for the duration of their education. Also, the percentage of those with high levels of educational attainment indicate very few who would not be able to be enrolled in the University and the percentage that have already achieved a bachelors degree indicate there may be a high number of graduate students in particular.
ZONING DESCRIPTIONS

“C-1” COMMERCIAL ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for low-intensity commercial and other uses that are compatible with adjacent residential uses. Residential and other related uses are permitted.

“R-1” RESIDENCE ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for urban, low-density, single-family residential development, together with schools, parks, and other public services necessary for a satisfactory urban residential environment.

“R-2” RESIDENCE ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for medium density, single-family and multifamily residential development, together with schools, parks, and other public services necessary for an urban residential environment.

“R-3” RESIDENCE ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for high density, residential development and compatible uses.

“O-1” OFFICE ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for administrative and professional office uses that will complement the residential environment. Development within this zone typically consists of office conversions from existing residential uses fronting on major streets and new construction of small-scale office projects. Consolidation of lots is encouraged in order to reduce curb cuts on arterial streets and to assure compliance with the design and development criteria of this zone.

“O-2” OFFICE ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for office, medical, civic, and other land uses, which provide reasonable compatibility with adjoining residential uses. Typical development within this zone is two-story office or medical projects.

“O-3” OFFICE ZONE
Purpose: This zone provides for mid-rise office development and other land uses, which provide reasonable compatibility with adjoining residential uses.
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LAND OWNERSHIP DESCRIPTIONS

Parcel Numbers in parenthesis

1. Plitt Theaters, INC., Toronto, Canada (123-05-2170, 123-05-2180)
2. Catalina Vista Center, Tucson, AZ (123-05-2170)
3. Kivel, Daniel 1/6 & Kivel Alvin 1/6 & BJ Campbell 1/3 & Janal, LLP. 1/6 & Sea Colony Investments LLP, 1/6, Tucson, AZ (123-05-2150)
4. Rothstein, Gene & Iris TR. & California Pacific LLP, Los Angeles, CA (113-11-006B, 113-11-005B)
6. Argires Trust, Palos Hills, IL (112-06-2810, 112-06-2820, 112-06-2860)
7. Lordigyan Haig Trust, Phoenix, AZ (112-06-2830)
9. Mango Investments LLC, Tucson, AZ (112-06-2800)
10. Feikert, Joyce, Tucson, AZ (113-10-288A)
11. Valley National Bank of Phoenix, Dallas, TX (113-10-289B, 113-10-2940)
15. HP Enterprises LP, Santa Fe, NM (113-10-026B, 113-10-030B, 113-10-031B)
16. Sk Southwest, INC., Tucson, AZ (113-10-025A)
17. Toumi, Shekoufeh, Tucson, AZ (113-10-024A)
18. SK Southwest, INC., Tucson, AZ (113-10-023A)
19. Mason Trust, Tucson, AZ (113-10-022A, 113-10-021A)
20. Wilber Investments, LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-10-020A)
23. Fry Trust, Tucson, AZ (112-06-0070)
24. Thompson Trust, San Diego, CA (112-06-0060, 112-06-0050)
25. Reachout Inc., Tucson, AZ (112-06-0040)
26. Ries, Frank, Tucson, AZ (112-06-0030)
27. Marmis, Sonenblick, Chapparal Carrows Investment Co. Irvine, CA (112-06-0020)
28. Chapparal Carrows Investment Co. Irvine CA (112-06-0010)
29. Belzinger Trust, Tucson, AZ (113-10-0110)
30. Callinan, Susan, Tucson, AZ (113-10-0100)
31. Fisher Trust, Tucson, AZ (113-10-0090)
32. Zeta Partnership, Tucson, AZ (113-10-0080, 113-10-0070, 113-10-0060, 113-10-0050)
33. Campbell Smoochive LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-10-0040)
34. Davis Trust, Tucson, AZ (113-10-003A)
35. R & M Real Estate LLP, Tucson, AZ (112-06-0160)
36. Harrel, R., Tucson, AZ (112-06-0150)
37. Collins, Herbert, Tucson, AZ (112-06-014A, 112-06-014B)
LAND OWNERSHIP MAP
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LAND OWNERSHIP DESCRIPTIONS

Parcel Numbers in parenthesis

48. Camelback Corporation Joint Ventures LLC., Kailua Kona, HI (112-05-283E, 112-05-283F)
49. Lei & Yu JT/RS, Tucson, AZ (113-07-0060)
50. Diaz Trust, Tucson, AZ (113-07-005B)
51. Glenn/Adelaide LLP., Tucson, AZ (113-07-3710)
52. Campbell/Glenn LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-07-0040)
53. Hacienda Amado LLLP., Tucson, AZ (113-07-003A, 113-07-003B, 113-07-0020)
54. Arizona Bank, San Diego, CA (113-07-0010)
55. Fersha Corporation, Tucson, AZ (113-07-049C, 113-07-049D)
56. Adelaide/Blaklidge LLP., Tucson, AZ (113-07-3720)
57. Pizza Hut of Arizona, INC., Tucson, AZ (113-07-064A, 113-07-044A)
58. Kay Family LLP., Tucson, AZ (113-07-042A)
59. Pima County Industrial Development Authority, Tucson, AZ (112-05-0670)
60. Fie Enterprises, Denver, CO (112-05-0660, 112-05-0650)
61. Shenberger Trust, Tucson, AZ (112-05-0640, 112-05-060C)
62. Tosco Corporation, Phoenix, AZ (112-05-060B)
63. Casa Molina Del Norte, INC., Tucson, AZ (113-07-087C)
64. Foothills Business Venture, LLC., Durango, CO (113-07-087A, 113-07-088B, 113-07-086A)
65. Tousi, Shekoufeh, Tucson, AZ (113-07-085A, 113-07-085B)
66. Gibeault Office Co. Tucson, AZ (112-05-055B)
67. La Rue Trust, Tucson, AZ (112-05-0540, 112-05-0530)
68. M.H. Sherman Co, Deerfield, IL (112-07-052C)
69. Grunstein, Robert, Tucson, AZ (113-07-118B)
70. Vega Trust, Tucson, AZ (113-07-121A, 113-07-121B, 113-07-121C)
71. Norwest Bank, Phoenix, AZ (113-07-117B)
72. T.C. Real Estate LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-07-117A)
73. Campbell Fair LLC., Carmel, CA (113-07-145A)
74. Royal Carwash Acquisition LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-06-151A)
75. Royal Carwash LTD., Tucson, AZ (113-06-150C)
76. McDonalds Corporation, Chicago, IL (113-06-1490)
77. Campbell Square LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-06-147A)
78. Netvest, Fort Lowell/Campbell LLC., Tucson, AZ (113-07-141C)
79. Ram Dur Enterprises, INC., Tucson, AZ (113-07-142F)
80. El Campo Properties, LLLP., Tucson, AZ (113-07-1420, 113-07-141A)
LAND OWNERSHIP MAP

Glenn Street to Ft. Lowell Road
AUTO DOMAIN MAP
Phase II defined five key topics to be addressed along Campbell Avenue. These include parking, transportation, pedestrian space, landscaping, and the creation of a ‘sense of place’. Within each topic a series of issues were examined. Diagrams of possible design alternatives were explored and then case studies of those alternatives were analyzed. Looking back at the corridor, the ideas within the design alternatives and the case studies were applied to various locations along the corridor. Finally, each issue had one composite design alternative generated to include a sketch of what could possibly be completed along the corridor.
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A ‘Sense of Place’ will be achieved on Campbell Avenue by synthesizing the design elements into a master plan and applying it consistently throughout the corridor.
OVERVIEW

Phase III combines the information gathered in the first two phases into a master plan for the corridor as a whole. This plan is intended to be the starting point for a more detailed design in the future. The main design elements are the landscaping and a decorative wall to be implemented throughout the corridor. The pedestrian areas are highlighted by an accent material in order to make them distinctly different from the road. The intention is to bring more people to the corridor and welcome cross shopping. In the following pages the master plan is presented as well as some suggested materials and site furnishings, appropriate trees and shrubs for landscaping, as well as an estimated cost analysis and a suggested phasing method.

The following sixteen pages contain the masterplan in approximately one-eighth mile sections. Campbell Avenue runs down the center spine.
The following sixteen pages contain the masterplan in approximately one-eighth mile sections. Campbell Avenue runs down the center spine.

The thick black line represents the decorative wall that is to line to street, creating a cohesive corridor.

The light gray represents existing sidewalks, while the dark brown represents the newly paved sidewalks.

Landscaping is shown schematically. A complete landscape design would have to be completed. The goal in this plan is to use one palatte of trees and shrubs consistently throughout the corridor. Also, where possible, include as many shade trees as there is room for, especially along sidewalks, without disrupting businesses.
The complex containing Pastiche Modern Eatery on the west side has a good landscaping design that is desert friendly and would blend with the landscape suggested for the corridor as a whole. It also has a decorative wall along the center landscaped area bordering the street. These areas are intended to remain as they are.

Throughout the corridor, existing landscape that already follows the intentions of the new plan should be retained.
The open space on the east side of the corridor is currently under construction and will be the new location of Beyond Bread. The assumption is that as new construction, landscaping will be designed adequately. This area should be re-evaluated at the time this scheme is to go into effect.
The complex of small houses on the west side of the corridor, just north of the dry cleaners, are currently under construction. Landscaping and parking on this site should be re-evaluated at the time of implementation.
The right of way space in front of Campbell Plaza is currently a large strip of grass with a sidewalk along the street. The intention is to pull the sidewalk away from the street and re-landscape this area with drought-tolerant plants and trees for shade. The current retaining wall is intended to remain in place.
Both the east and west side of the corridor along this section contain buildings with sidewalks under overhangs. The new sidewalk has been routed to adjoin these walks and bring the pedestrian away from the street and into the shade. This has been repeated in other locations along the corridor.
Areas with parking stripes shown have been reordered to provide better vehicular circulation as well as space for landscaping and the pedestrian. In some places, current parking conditions do not meet Development Standards.
COPPER TO MITCHELL

MASTERPLAN
The lot just south of Mitchell Drive on the east side has been vacant for an extended period of time and is the only large area along the corridor in this condition. This space was seen as the most viable place to put a park and resting area along the corridor. This is to promote pedestrians to traverse the corridor and provide a place of refuge. A gazebo or other ramada structure could be included with seating areas. Two alternatives have been provided in the event that full conversion is considered too costly.
The vehicular circulation along this section has been reworked to include space for the pedestrian and landscaping as well as enable the removal of the excess curb cuts that currently exist, making the corridor much safer.
PARKING ALTERNATES

ALTERNATE #1
This plan provides more front-door parking with the trade-off of severely limiting the landscaping. The original plan and alternates include increasing parking on Silver Street as well as taking advantage of the alley. The alley has been improved to include landscaping, pedestrian walk, and repaving.
This plan reverses the angle of the parking and eliminates crossing of the through lane. It provides a few extra spaces in the front and may be easier to pull into. Exiting, however, may be more difficult due to the proximity of the lane to the road and the lack of turning radius.
ALTERNATIVE #1
This plan keeps the existing parking on this lot intended to be used as a central lot for the corridor. The building, in this plan, would be demolished to include an landscaped areas, similar to that of the one suggested in the masterplan.

SECTION
This section has been cut at the location of Bank One, across the street, to Eegees. This shows how a typical refuge island would look as well as the possibility of the bus stops being located next large landscaped areas, where the trees can provide shade, and the bench can be built into the concrete planter.
ALTERNATE #2
If the demolition of the building currently on this lot is determined unprac-ticle and the purchasing of this lot for public use is not sompleted, this plan suggests how to complete it, consistant with the masterplan.
PERSPECTIVE OVERLAYS

ENTRY

STREET CLOSURE

REFUGE ISLAND AND BUS STOP
DECORATIVE WALL

MATERIALS
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The decorative wall aligning the street along Campbell Avenue is depicted in the above and left images. Landscaping would be on either side of the wall. Below and to the left are images of possible configurations of the wall. These walls are made of recycled concrete such as that of sidewalks. The intention is for the sidewalks and asphalt being demolished along the corridor could be then reused to create the wall. Other possible materials would include cmu block, brick, or stone.
The various site furnishings shown belows as well as others, such as bicycle racks and shaded bus stops, will make the corridor more inhabitable.
Lighting is key to a safe pedestrian corridor after dark. It should be designed at human scale and should provide enough illumination to highlight the pedestrian to drivers and others walking along the corridor.

Brick or stone pavers have been selected as the optimum material for the pedestrian sidewalks. It will differentiate itself from the asphalt drives and alert the driver to the pedestrian space. In addition, it will help guide the pedestrian in the intended and safest path.
SMALL SHRUBS

Calliandra eriophylla
fairy duster
Small shrub (3' x 4')
Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Medium-Wide planting areas
Disadvantages:
- Detail plant: better appreciated by the pedestrian than the driver

Agave parryii
Parry's agave
Small shrub (2' x 2')
Uses:
- Desert accent in larger plantings
- Will survive/thrive in narrow tough spots
Disadvantages:
- Sharp spines, keep away from pedestrians

Hesperaloe parviflora
red yucca
Small shrub (2' x 3')
Uses:
- Proven in narrow areas near roads
- Bright, long-lasting color
Disadvantages:
- none known

Justicia spicigera
Mexican honeysuckle
Small - Medium Shrub (3' x 3')
Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Intersections/Entry
- Medium - Large planting areas
- Tolerates shade and sun light green
Disadvantages:
- Will not tolerate road-edge
- Chuparosa variety not tested for landscape use.
**MEDIUM - LARGE SHRUBS**

*Dasyliirion wheeleri*

desert spoon

Medium shrub (4' x 5')

Uses:
- Dramatic form
- Refuge Island
- Intersection/Entry
- Wide planters

Disadvantages:
- Give lots of space; extreme risk of poor maintenance

*Sphaeralcea ambigua*

globe mallow

Medium Shrub (3' x 3')

Uses:
- Refuge Islands
- Roadside plantings
- Tough 'weed' will grow nearly anywhere.
- Good color
- Low maintenance

Disadvantages:
- none known

*Encelia farinosa*

brittlebush

Medium - Large Shrub (3' x 4')

Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Intersection/Entry
- Large Planting Areas
- Brilliant color during bloom
- Fast growth

Can be pruned to maintain small, medium or large size

Disadvantages:
- Can look ragged if blooms aren't removed

*Opuntia sp.*

prickly pear cactus

Medium shrub (3' x 4')

Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Intersections/Entry
- Wide planting areas
- Looks great with ocotillo
- Desert accent

Disadvantages:
- Keep away from pedestrians
**Fouquieria splendens**
*ocotillo*
Medium - Large Shrub (15' x 10')
Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Intersections/Entry
- Large Planters
- Dramatic form
- Striking flowers
Disadvantages:
- Tolerate road edge?
- Irregular bloom/leaf

**Ruellia peninsularis**
*Baja ruellia*
Medium - Large Shrub (4' x 4')
Uses:
- Refuge Islands
- Intersection/Entry
- Medium - Large Planting areas
- Basic green shrub
Disadvantages:
- Tough enough?

**Calliandra californica**
*Baja fairy duster*
Medium-Large Shrub (5' x 5')
Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Medium-Large planting areas
- Bright color
Disadvantages:
- none known

**Leucophyllum sp.**
*Texas ranger*
Medium - Large Shrub (3' x 3' - 8' x 8')
Uses:
- Refuge Island
- Intersections/Entry
- Medium - Large planting areas
- Green, gray, or white foliage
- Bold color
Disadvantages:
- Often clipped into round balls
- Color is not long-lasting
Cassia phyllodenia
silverleaf cassia
Medium – Large Shrub (5’ x 5’)
Uses:
Refuge Island
Intersections/Entry
Medium – Large planting areas
Lacy foliage
Bold color
Disadvantages:
Often clipped into round balls

Buddleia marrubilfolia
butterfly bush
Medium – Large Shrub (5’ x 5’)
Uses:
Refuge Island
Medium – Large planting areas
Intersections/Entry
Silver-gray foliage contrasts well with greens
Disadvantages:
Can become leggy.
Often pruned into a ball.
Inconspicuous flower color.

Lantana camara
bush lantana
Medium Shrub (2’ x 3’)
Uses:
Intersections, Refuge Islands
Bright color
Disadvantages:
none known
**Acacia berlandieri**
*guajillo*

Small Tree (12' x 12')

Uses:
- Provide some shade along pedestrian walks without blocking business signage
- Can survive in a fairly narrow strip, but needs horizontal space for canopy

Disadvantages:
- May be damaged by vandalism, vehicles, etc.

**Acacia smallii**
*sweet acacia*

Medium Tree

Uses:
- Sturdy
- Provide color and some height at intersections/entries and possibly refuge islands

Disadvantages:
- May block sightlines in refuge islands

**Acacia stenophylla**
*shoestring acacia*

Large Tree (25' x 20')

Uses:
- Intersections/Entry
- Refuge Islands
- Lacy foliage
- Interesting texture created by seed pods

Disadvantages:
- none known
Bailey a mulitradiata
desert marigold
Groundcover (1' x 2')
Uses:
Refuge Islands
Roadside plantings
Intersections/Entry
Tough 'weed' will grow nearly anywhere.
Good color
Low maintenance

Verben a rigida
sandpaper verbena
Groundcover (1' x 3')
Uses:
Vibrant color
Tough
Disadvantages:
Won't tolerate being trampled

Dalea gregii
trailing indigo bush
Groundcover (1' x 6')
Uses:
Intersections/Entry
Refuge Island
Mounding: lifts ground plane
Disadvantages:
needs space

Macfadyena unguis-cati
cat claw vine
Vine
Uses:
Extremely narrow planting spaces
Outside wall?
Disadvantages:
Not known if it will survive polluted environment and wind at road's edge.

Myoporum parvifolium
prostrate myoporum
Groundcover (1' x 6')
Uses:
Narrow planting strips
To provide green ground plane
(turf replacement)
Disadvantages:
won't tolerate being trampled
ROUGH COST ESTIMATE

The following is a preliminary cost estimate for the work suggested by this master plan. Since elements may be added or changed, these costs may change dramatically when calculated for the final detailed plan. These numbers are only intended to be a starting point.

LANDSCAPING
Plants: $189,640.
Decorative Rock: $28,177.
Irrigation: $102,642.

HARDSCAPE
Decorative Wall (Recycled Concrete Slab): $408,400.
Alternative Option: CMU block wall (not calculated in total): $245,280.

SIDEWALK
Sidewalk Demolition: $183,594.
Sidewalk Installation: $188,000.

REFUGE ISLANDS
5 Refuge Islands @ $30,000ea. $150,000.

Subtotal: $1,250,453.

10% Contingency: $125,045.

Subtotal: $1,375,498.

22% General Conditions (Profit/Overhead): $302,609.

Grand Total: $1,678,107.
SUGGESTED PHASING OF PROJECT

The goal of this master plan is to create a coherent identity for the Campbell Avenue Corridor. Implementation of the master plan according to the phasing suggested below will create an outline of identity that is then filled out as the project progresses. In this manner, each completed phase will act as a "Coming Attractions" teaser, generating excitement for, and interest in, the next phase.

Preliminary: The banners created by the Campbell Avenue Business Association are the first step towards a distinct identity for the corridor. Once installed, the banners will act as announcements of the current activity and coming changes.

Phase I: Entry Nodes with Landscaping and Decorative Wall
While the banners will define the length of the corridor, the Entry Nodes at Grant and at Fort Lowell act as gateways, imparting a distinct sense of entry to the district.

Phase II: Refuge Islands
Campbell Avenue itself is the greatest barrier to cross-corridor shopping. Installation of refuge islands at strategic points along the corridor will facilitate cross-corridor flow of pedestrian traffic from parking areas and the adjacent neighborhoods. The landscaping on the islands will also establish a visual rhythm by continuing the landscape palette establish at the Entry Nodes.

Phase III: Re-order Parking and Sidewalks
Re-ordering parking areas and pulling sidewalks away from the road edge will ease vehicular traffic between the roadway and the businesses and will facilitate pedestrian flow along the length of the corridor. The creation of a visually and physically pleasant interface between the car and the business will improve the customers' shopping experience.

Phase IV: Corridor Landscaping and Decorative Wall
Finally, implementation of the corridor landscaping with decorative wall as described in the master plan will solidify the visual pattern suggested by the Entry Nodes and Refuge Islands, establishing a strong and coherent visual identity for the Campbell Avenue corridor.

CONCLUSION
The Campbell Avenue business corridor currently boasts many popular businesses and faithful customers, but due to its haphazard appearance and uncomfortable structure, has not achieved its full potential. The purpose of this master plan is to provide the community with a means to turn this area into a major shopping destination and a focal point of the city. Using the leadership and motivation that inspired the development of this master plan, the project will be able to move forward and make these suggestions reality.
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