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Preface

The Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan has been prepared pursuant to the Metropolitan Redevelopment Code of the State of New Mexico, Sections 3-60A-1 to 3-60A-48 N.M.S.A. 1978 (Supp. 1980) and Albuquerque Third City Council Resolution R-401-1979.

This Plan complements the policies established for the area by the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan and the University Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan.

This plan may be amended in accordance with the provisions of the New Mexico Metropolitan Redevelopment Code.

* * *
I. INTRODUCTION

A. SYCAMORE PLANNING PROCESS

On July 20, 1981, the City Council appointed a special Citizens' Task Force to consider the issue of designating the Sycamore area a Metropolitan Redevelopment Area. The Task Force was composed of twelve members who are property owners or residents, a chairman who has no financial interest in the area, and an ex-officio member from the Metropolitan Redevelopment Commission (see page ii for a list of the members). Out of three options provided by the City Council for pursuing their task, the Task Force chose the following option:

"to plan for the neighborhood and decide which areas within the neighborhood should be declared Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas depending on how they could benefit. The planning process would serve to define the community needs and purposes of designation and the redevelopment activities permitted prior to actual designation."

The Sycamore Citizens' Task Force met weekly to develop this plan from July of 1981 through April of 1982 and solicited neighborhood participation in these weekly meetings.

The first proposal to designate the Sycamore Area a Metropolitan Redevelopment Area had been prepared for Presbyterian Hospital by Herbert M. Denish & Associates in August of 1980. On May 14, 1981, the Metropolitan Redevelopment Commission recommended designation to the City Council. The City Council appointed the Task Force to assist them in making a final decision on designation.

At one of their first meetings, the Task Force adopted the following Governing Policy: "The integrity of neighborhoods and the people who comprise them is a hallmark of a free society. Throughout the deliberations of this Task Force, therefore, the rights and interests of each individual property owner and tenant of the area will be respected, and his or her opinions will be solicited." This policy reflected the Task Force's sensitivity to residents and property owners.

Because condemnation of property was the major fear of neighborhood property owners, the Task Force recommended that the City Council not exercise its power of condemnation pursuant to the New Mexico Metropolitan Redevelopment Code to acquire real property within
the proposed Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Area. The Task Force's intention was to protect the property owners and make area designation more acceptable to the neighborhood.

Much of the information necessary for preparing a plan had been gathered for the designation report prepared for a smaller area by Min Kantrowitz & Associates or is available in the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan (UNASDP) adopted for a larger area in 1978. The first step in gathering further information about the area was to survey all the property owners and residents within the "Study Area" proposed by the Task Force (see Map 3). The survey was delivered to every address within the study area and mailed to the property owners who did not live within the area. The results of this survey, discussed in Section II.A., determined the boundaries of the study area and identified area needs for commercial services, housing, social services, and public improvements. In addition, the Community Relations staff of Presbyterian Hospital undertook a survey of St. Joseph and Presbyterian Hospitals' employees and physicians to ascertain needs for housing and commercial services which the neighborhood might provide.

During the planning process, the Task Force was made aware of uncertainties regarding the future viability of both redevelopment bonds and the tax increment program, which are the other basic tools of the Metropolitan Redevelopment Code.

With this base information, the Task Force began the preparation of a plan including public improvements, land use and zoning, and the tools needed for redevelopment. Once these portions of the plan were decided upon, the Task Force held two neighborhood meetings on January 10 and 21, attended by approximately 140 people.

From this extensive public participation, surveys, other available information, and adopted City plans and policies, the Task Force, with the assistance of City Redevelopment Planning Staff, prepared this final document to be submitted to the City Council.
Map 3, STUDY AREA
B. SUMMARY OF PLAN CONCEPT

The Sycamore Redevelopment Area is one of the most diverse areas of the city in terms of land use, property ownership, and population. Within the eight-block area north of Central Avenue designated "Mixed Density Residential" in the Land Use Concept of the Plan (see Map 4) residential densities range from single-family houses to large apartment complexes. In the area south of Lead, land uses include a mortuary, a church, a health education center for Presbyterian Hospital, single-family homes, duplexes, offices, warehousing, and other industrial uses. Within the Area designated "Central Avenue Redevelopment" (see Map 4), commercial uses include offices, ambulance services, a motel, and a plasma donor center.

The Redevelopment Area is also diverse in property ownership and population. Resident homeowners and the Hospital each own approximately one-fourth of the real property. The rest of the property is owned by absentee owners. Most of the tenants are students attending a nearby educational institution (UNM or TVI) and plan to live in the area less than three years; most of the resident homeowners are long-time residents who plan to live in the area indefinitely (Source: Sycamore Citizens' Task Force Survey).

The Land Use Plan and zoning changes proposed in this Plan have not attempted to change this basic mixed-use character, because it is one of the development characteristics advocated in the City's official Comprehensive Plan. Rather, the intent of the Sycamore Plan is to encourage more compatible relationships between uses. The methods of achieving more compatible relationships differ for each area shown on the Land Use Concept.

Generally speaking, the Plan advocates "transition" areas to buffer residential from non-residential areas, and proposes tying different use areas together through a pedestrian network. Only areas that are now predominantly residential are proposed as single-use areas to ensure a desirable residential environment. Continuance of "mixed-density" development patterns within predominantly residential areas is proposed to encourage appropriate residences for the present population and additional residents.

For Central Avenue, the basic redevelopment intent is to upgrade commercial uses, some of which presently have a negative effect on both the neighborhood immediately to the north and the Hospital. The Central
Avenue Redevelopment Area is proposed to become more oriented to the neighborhood, both in terms of providing support and commercial services to the residential area immediately to the north and in terms of providing ancillary services to the Hospital and its employees.

Areas which have mixed use characteristics are encouraged to develop compatible relationships between related uses while buffering incompatible uses.

The Sycamore Redevelopment Area is also very "urban," in the sense of having many pedestrians, traffic congestion, noise and parking problems common to urban areas (source: Sycamore Citizens' Task Force Neighborhood Survey). The Plan takes into account this basic character and recommends emphasizing the positive aspects of Sycamore as an urbanized and urbanizing area. Public improvements to be undertaken in the area are intended to enhance its use for pedestrians and make it a more pleasant place to walk, both along Central Avenue as a shopping street and to Roosevelt Park, one of the city's finest landscape amenities.

Presbyterian Hospital is the largest single landowner in the area, and the hospital campus is a dominant feature of the neighborhood. At several neighborhood meetings, concerns were expressed about further expansion of the hospital campus. The plan designates the 12-block area bounded by I-25, Central, Sycamore and Lead as SU-1 for Hospital which requires that certain SU-1 hospital development plan guidelines be followed. The Plan recommends that primary hospital buildings be located in the SU-1 zone. It is anticipated that auxiliary services housed in smaller structures will continue to be located outside the SU-1 zone as they are now (e.g., ambulance service and accounting annex on north side of Central; education department on Silver, educational complex on Hazeldine, etc.). However, the Plan recommends that Hospital campus parking be allowed only within the 12-Block campus area.

The Sycamore Planning Area is unique because of its setting and natural topography. It is located directly to the east of I-25 and between two major urban centers. North of Central, hills remain which provide excellent views to the West Mesa and Sandia Mountains. The small area along Central Avenue between Spruce and Cedar, where houses are perched on top of hills with steps up the slope, presents a distinctive "face" to the street and contrasts to the rest of the Central Avenue commercial strip. Across the street, to the
South, however, Presbyterian Hospital has graded and levelled most of the land for surface parking. The Plan follows the Comprehensive Plan policy to "respect the natural topography" in its guidelines proposed for site planning north of Central Avenue.

The Sycamore Redevelopment Area is a relatively small planning area, comprising only a portion of the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan area. The plan proposes application of the special financial tools of redevelopment, as well as any innovative financial incentives the City of Albuquerque may formulate, such as the possible use of State of New Mexico surplus funds, other Federal grants or programs, as well as funds from the private sector, to attain the redevelopment objectives outlined in the plan.
C. SYCAMORE AREA HISTORY

The areas included in the Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan were the first Albuquerque neighborhoods built on the sandhills east of the Rio Grande Flood Plain. Two of the subdivisions in the Plan boundaries were platted early, the Terrace Addition (Silver Hill) in 1881 and Brownewell & Lail's Highland Addition (Sycamore) in 1886, but little building took place until about 1910, after the Huning Highland neighborhood was completely developed.

The first buildings in the Sycamore area were constructed along Central Avenue, and the neighborhoods grew slowly, first to the South and then North. Among the first buildings were the cottages that comprised Southwestern Presbyterian Sanatorium (now Presbyterian Hospital) which opened to house 30 patients in 1908. In 1911 an administration building and another patient cottage were added. In 1913 two additional wings and an operating room were added to the administration building. Service buildings, a dormitory for nurses and another cottage were all added prior to 1920.

In the early 1920s a two-story infirmary and an 18-room nurses home were built, and the Sanitary Laundry Co. was built and equipped by the Sanatorium. In the late 1920s the Maytag family of Iowa contributed funds to build a research building for tuberculosis; in the 1930s an addition including more patient rooms, surgical suites, and maternity services was constructed. During the early years, the Sanatorium acquired and sold properties all over Albuquerque, including not only lots near the hospital campus but also a farm in the Sandia Mountains, the Sanitary Laundry property and homes in the Old Town area of Albuquerque.

The World War II years saw minor additions to the hospital campus, but immediately following the war the Ruth Hanna McCormick wing was built to house maternity patients. The 1950s brought a major construction project to Presbyterian Hospital with the replacement of some of the smaller buildings with a 450-bed hospital which opened in 1961. For the next eight years, the growth of the Presbyterian Hospital Center system was outside the Sycamore neighborhood campus; Anna Kaseman Hospital was built and several other hospitals around the state of New Mexico were added to the PHC group. In 1979 Presbyterian undertook the largest hospital construction project in the history of the state of New Mexico, adding a $22 million wing to Presbyterian Hospital and raising its patient capacity to 520 beds.
Most of Sycamore's older homes were built during the 1920's and reflect the styles prevalent in Albuquerque then—predominantly bungalows, Mediterranean homes, and early examples of the Pueblo Revival style. In the Terrace Addition, stylish homes were built along Silver and Gold Avenues; most of these were builder-designed, while in the still more fashionable Country Club addition north of Grand Avenue, architect design was required. Several builders, notably J. T. Benton, Harvey Basher, and J. T. Harwood, were responsible for a large number of homes in the neighborhood.

Brownwell and Lail's Addition was filled in a few years later than Terrace, and developed with small homes by a variety of builders. Some of these have been replaced by more recent apartment building, especially along Grand, which acquired some southwestern styled apartment buildings in the 1930's and 1940's.

The Sycamore neighborhood has always been associated with health institutions and with the University of New Mexico. Murphy's Sanitorium, The Albuquerque Sanitorium, and Methodist Deaconess Hospital, as well as existing Presbyterian, St. Joseph and Memorial Hospitals were work locations for many neighborhood residents. Alley houses often rented to University students, as they still do today.

While the traditional platting of these neighborhoods, with a grid of north-south and east-west streets, took little advantage of the dramatic natural topography, the Silver Avenue median strip and Roosevelt Park (a 1934 WPA Project) remain major Albuquerque landscapes.
II. PLANNING FRAMEWORK

A. AREA PROBLEMS AND NEEDS

According to the New Mexico Metropolitan Redevelopment Code Section 3-60A-4, a Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan shall "seek to eliminate the problems created by a slum area or blighted area." This plan seeks to eliminate the following problems which have been identified through a Community Needs Assessment (CNA) consisting of three parts:

(1) a study of blighted conditions entitled The Proposed Sycamore Redevelopment Area: Facts Relating to Designation Criteria by Min Kantrowitz & Associates, June 1981;

(2) a mail-in survey of residents and property owners conducted by the Sycamore Citizens' Task Force with the assistance of City Planning staff; and,

(3) a survey of Presbyterian and St. Joseph Hospital employees and physicians conducted by Presbyterian Hospital Community Relations staff.

In addition, two neighborhood meetings and persons attending Task Force meetings (all of which were open to the public) have assisted the Sycamore Citizens' Task Force in identifying community problems and needs to be addressed through this plan.

1. Commercial Needs

The Kantrowitz study found that commercially zoned areas were under-developed, that three times as many businesses closed from 1976-80 as compared to 1970-75, and that more businesses closed than opened during the last five years.\(^1\) These factors point to a general pattern of commercial decline, and support the conclusion that the area exhibits "low levels of commercial ... activity or redevelopment" as a basis for requiring special assistance.

These low levels of activity exist despite the demand for neighborhood commercial services evidenced by planning surveys. Both the neighborhood survey and the survey of hospital employees and physicians identified a grocery store, restaurant, drugstore and bank as the

\(^1\)Kantrowitz, pp. 31-33.
commercial services most needed. Other commercial services desired by Hospital employees and physicians responding to the survey include a clothing store, beauty shop, laundromat, cleaners, gift shop, uniform shop, and child care center.

The area currently meets few of these needs; the only two restaurants closed in 1979 and 1980, according to Kantrowitz. The existing commercial activity along Central Avenue, with the exception of one 31-unit motel and other motels adjacent to the area, is largely unrelated, or in some cases detrimental, to Hospital and neighborhood functions. These low levels of commercial activity exist despite the area's location between two major urban centers and its large concentration of employees, suggesting excellent potential for attracting supportive and ancillary services.

2. Residential Needs

The area's proximity to both the hospitals and educational institutions, with large employee and student populations, suggests a significant demand for housing. The survey of the hospital employees and physicians undertaken as part of this planning process provides evidence which supports this conclusion. Forty percent of those responding indicated that they would or might be interested in moving to the area if housing suitable to their needs, income and taste were available near the Hospital. Most of those who stated that they would be interested in moving to the area wanted single-family homes or townhomes; only thirteen percent of those preferred higher density housing (duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, or apartments) as their first choice.

Of the twenty-five percent of respondents who presently rent housing, a much higher percent (71%) said that they would or might be interested in moving to the area if housing suitable to their needs, income and taste were available. Approximately one-fourth of this group said that they would prefer housing in the higher density category ranging from duplexes to apartments. Almost sixty percent of the group who presently rent stated that they would rent rather than buy housing in the area. One-half of those who currently rent pay $150-230 per month; approximately forty percent rent housing costing $230-350 per month; thus, ninety percent of those who rent pay less than $350 per month for housing. These statistics suggest a demand for moderately priced rental housing.
The neighborhood houses a relatively large number of people who work or attend school nearby. According to the neighborhood survey, a high percentage (53%) of renters living in the area are either employed by the University of New Mexico or attend educational institutions in the area; only one-fourth or twenty-nine percent of neighborhood residents and owners are employed elsewhere in the City.

Of the resident homeowners responding to the survey, a majority (56%) have lived in the area ten years or more, and a high percentage (79%) plan to live in the area indefinitely. This contrasts to the rental population, a majority (55%) of which plans to live in the area less than three years. The fact that only twenty-nine percent of the property in the area is owner-occupied suggests a general picture of neighborhood diversity and instability, with Presbyterian Hospital owning a substantial portion of the area and thirty-six percent tenant-occupied.

Notwithstanding the possible demand for housing because of the presence of large institutions nearby, the survey of neighborhood residents and property owners reveals a resistance to increasing densities. The majority of resident homeowners (64%), property owners (52%), and renters (68%) presently living in the area who responded to the survey believed that no additional housing was needed. Overall, the thirty-two percent of owners and residents who did want additional housing selected apartments, followed by townhouses and single-family residences, as the most needed housing types.

Within the group who favored additional housing, preferences varied by category of respondent. Homeowners wanted more single-family housing and townhouses; property owners felt there was a need for more townhouses, apartments, condominiums and elderly housing; renters wanted more apartments, townhouses and rental units in fourplexes or duplexes. It must be emphasized, however, that sixty-four percent of those responding to the neighborhood survey opposed any additional housing, perhaps feeling that increasing densities would lead to instability and redevelopment pressures threatening neighborhood character.

This opposition to additional housing may have a real basis in the type of new residential development that has been occurring in the recent
past. According to the Kantrowitz study, several new apartment complexes and four-plexes have been built in the past five years, but most are cheaply constructed, poorly landscaped, and do not blend well into the existing neighborhood (Kantrowitz, p. 31).

Needs for rehabilitation are somewhat inconclusive. According to the Kantrowitz study, approximately forty percent of the residential structures can be classified as "substandard," but only if the category of "slight" deterioration (minor repairs needed) is included in the definition. Kantrowitz finds that eleven percent qualify as moderately or extremely deteriorated. These percentages are the same with respect to single-family or multi-family categories. Kantrowitz concludes that housing conditions are not severely deteriorated enough to warrant a "blighted" designation on the basis of housing alone. On the other hand, members of the Sycamore Citizens Task Force have noted deteriorating housing conditions and voiced dissatisfaction with the quality of residential redevelopment.

3. Physical Improvement Needs

Physical improvements most desired by area residents and property owners included trash cleanup, weed removal, and noise control, with improved alley appearance, landscaping of private properties, street resurfacing, and improvement of specific buildings also high on the list of improvements desired. Off-street parking was clearly viewed as a problem, particularly by homeowners; almost ninety percent of respondents favored on-street parking restriction, while sixty-one percent wanted more off-street parking. Other traffic improvements most desired were bus stop shelters and pedestrian crossings. Kantrowitz also identified poor neighborhood access to Roosevelt Park which is located south of four major streets without pedestrian crossings.
4. Social Service Needs

The largest number of respondents (22%) favored a crime prevention program as the single most needed social service. However, a total of 60% mentioned either a community center or services which a community center could provide, including recreational facilities, health programs, elderly social programs, and day care services, as their highest priority.
B. CONFORMANCE TO THE ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The needs of area residents, property owners, and employees have helped to define a Planning Framework for improving the neighborhood for those who live and work there.

The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan provides a further source of planning concepts in the context of a city-wide perspective. Conformance to the Comprehensive Plan is required by the New Mexico Metropolitan Redevelopment Code Section 3-60A-4, which states that a Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan must "conform to the general plan for the municipality as a whole."

1. Area Designation. The Comprehensive Plan designates the Sycamore Area as a Redeveloping Urban Area, defined as an "infill area appropriate for redevelopment at mixed densities." The Comprehensive Plan commits the city to "continue and expand" its redevelopment and rehabilitation activities (Policy A.2.a).\(^1\)

The Sycamore Planning Area is a unique Redeveloping Urban Area because it combines the characteristics and needs of both Metropolitan Redevelopment and Community Development areas. As discussed in Section II.A., it contains both commercial areas in need of revitalization, and residential areas which could benefit from rehabilitation and new construction on vacant property.

---

\(^1\)The City presently has two programs for carrying out this mandate for continued redevelopment and rehabilitation: (1) The Federal Community Development Block Grant, which provides housing rehabilitation loans in low-income areas and low interest financing for the rehabilitation of commercial properties in the vicinity of Central Avenue from Rio Grande to University, including the Sycamore Area; and (2) the New Mexico Metropolitan Redevelopment Code, which offers the equivalent of industrial revenue bond financing for larger-scale commercial development or rehabilitation within a designated Metropolitan Development Area, and mandates that property tax increases resulting from new development be earmarked for a special "tax increment" fund to finance public improvements within the same area, if approved by a majority of affected governments.
Although the Sycamore Area has been designated a Community Development Area, it has received no funds for housing rehabilitation. Therefore, there is a need to develop other financing mechanisms for neighborhood assistance in upgrading housing.

The Sycamore Redevelopment Plan therefore carries out the intent of the Comprehensive Plan by proposing additional redevelopment and rehabilitation mechanisms made possible by designating the area as a Metropolitan Redevelopment Area.

2. Infill. A basic concept of the Comprehensive Plan is that vacant land within the City limits should be developed to alleviate pressure for continued outward expansion of the city limits and reduce the costs of extending city services. Therefore, the Comprehensive Plan proposes that densities closer to the center city will be higher than those at the fringe, and calls for a "mixed density" type of development pattern within older Redeveloping Areas, such as Sycamore.

While advocating infill, the Comprehensive Plan also requires the protection of existing neighborhoods. To ensure this protection, the Comprehensive Plan states: (1) that higher density housing will be permitted only where a mixed dwelling type of pattern is already established, and (2) that densities over 30 du/acre will be permitted only where access is directly available to a collector or arterial street (Policy A.2.g.). Since the Sycamore Area between Central and Grand is already a "mixed density" area, with development on many blocks ranging from single-family houses to R-3 density apartment complexes (see Existing Land Use Map in the UNASDP), the Sycamore Redevelopment Plan reinforces this mixed-density character.

In order to permit and adequately control the mixed density development called for in the Comprehensive Plan, the City has instituted a special zoning district (SU-2) which requires a Sector Development Plan to guide land use. The Sycamore Redevelopment Plan therefore includes proposed amendments to the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan which includes the Sycamore Area.

3. Mixed Use. Encouragement of mixed-use development patterns within Redeveloping and Developing Urban areas is another basic policy of the Comprehensive Plan. Mixed-use is defined as the provision of
neighborhood commercial services within walking distance of residences; provision of housing accommodations closer to employment centers; and allowing mixtures of uses (e.g., commercial, office, and residential) within a single new complex designed so as to create complementary relationships between those different uses (Policies A.2.h., A.5.a.). This concept is a significant departure from typical development patterns which tend to segregate use by rigid zoning categories. The Sycamore Plan implements this policy by creating special mixed-use zones, while at the same time providing safeguards necessary to ensure that mixed-use areas do not negatively impact residential neighborhoods.

4. Preservation and Reuse. The Comprehensive Plan encourages the preservation and reuse of "buildings and areas which explain our past and give Albuquerque identity, individuality and cultural richness." (Policy A.2.b.) Although the Task Force has not considered the subject, houses with noteworthy architectural style have been identified by the Historic Landmarks Survey of the City of Albuquerque as special historic structures in order to encourage their rehabilitation and re-use. These structures are identified on Map 10 in the Appendix.

5. Design. The Comprehensive Plan calls for "quality architectural design" in all new development. The Sycamore Plan implements this policy by requiring site plan review for new development within specified zones and proposing general review criteria and policies to be used in the site plan review process. This requirement applies to transitional areas and to any larger residential or mixed-use developments, as well as to the Hospital campus. As a guide to new development within residential areas, the Plan illustrates successful design features within existing multi-family developments (see Illustration 5). These examples are intended to encourage sensitive site planning so that new residential development enhances neighborhood character and quality.

6. Balanced Circulation. The Comprehensive Plan seeks to discourage exclusive reliance on the automobile by creating urban environments which encourage public transit, bicycling and walking (Policies A.5.a., B.1.a.). The Sycamore Plan complements this policy by proposing public improvements designed to create a more balanced transportation.
system. Transit is encouraged through the provision of bus shelters along Central Avenue; walking is encouraged by the provision of a north-south pedestrianway or landscaped street along Sycamore leading to Roosevelt Park. Bicycle lanes are proposed for Grand Avenue to facilitate safe bicycle travel to and from the Downtown and University urban centers.
III. SYCAMORE METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

This Plan is divided into separate categories addressing each area defined on the Land Use Concept (Map 4) individually. This approach is necessary because of the great variety of development patterns, problems and needs exhibited within the Planning Area. Only Circulation and Redevelopment Activities are addressed on an area-wide basis.

The basic objectives of this Plan are as follows:

1. To improve the existing "mixed-use" characteristics of the area by encouraging compatible relationships between related uses and buffering incompatible uses.

2. To improve pedestrian, transit and bicycle circulation by providing better internal connections within the neighborhood and improving connections to nearby urban centers.

3. To prevent neighborhood decline by stimulating private reinvestment, while providing sufficient controls and guidance to ensure mutually beneficial relationships between existing and new development.
Map 4: LAND USE CONCEPT

- Mixed Density Residential
- Central Avenue Redevelopment
- Roosevelt Parkside Redevelopment Area
- Mixed Commercial Development
- Proposed SU-1 Hospital Area
A. MIXED DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREA

Summary of Needs and Objectives

Continuing the variety and mix of residential densities which now exist.

Upgrading the character and quality of new multi-family complexes.

Provision of desirable housing close to major employment concentrations.

Implementation of Comprehensive Plan infill policies.

Obtaining financing for smaller projects.

Facilitating mixed-use by providing residential support for neighborhood commercial development.

POLICY ONE: REDEVELOPMENT WITH MID-RISE APARTMENTS AND TOWNHOUSES SHALL BE ENCOURAGED.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Implement re-zoning as recommended in Amendments to the University Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan (See UNASDP).

2. The City will actively seek to develop a specific mechanism for the use of redevelopment bonds for new residential development.

POLICY TWO: THE REHABILITATION OF SOUND RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES SHALL BE ENCOURAGED.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. The City should continue efforts to develop a residential rehabilitation program utilizing Metropolitan Redevelopment tools.

2. The City should actively seek to develop a mechanism to assist in obtaining new construction and rehabilitation loans for projects under $500,000 (e.g. use of an umbrella loan guaranteed by the City whereby title releases would be extended to each individual property owner as the loans were paid off).
3. The City should attempt to "package" smaller rehabilitation projects which could serve as security for a portion of a redevelopment bond or other financing tool issued for the area.

POLICY THREE: NEW DEVELOPMENT SHALL SERVE TO PRESERVE THE NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND TO IMPROVE ITS QUALITY.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Institute Site Plan review requirements for developments utilizing Redevelopment Bonds or other public assistance.

2. Institute Site Plan review requirements for larger developments (see Appendix Exhibit A).

3. New multi-family residential development should have desirable design features including provision and good siting of open space, effective landscaping, attractive street facades and entrances, off-street parking in close proximity to individual units, convenient access and circulation, and preservation of views along with compatibility with topography (See Illustration 5). These features will be evaluated in the site plan review process.

POLICY FOUR: NEW DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THIS AREA SHOULD RESPOND TO THE UNIQUE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE AREA'S TOPOGRAPHY AND VISTAS.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Through the Site Plan review process, development should be encouraged to preserve and utilize all appropriate vistas including vistas to the west mesa and Sandias, and to preserve existing topography.


IMPLEMENTATION

1. Stimulate redevelopment of vacant land on the north side of Grand by including it within the Redevelopment Area.
2. Include the north side of Grand within the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan and re-zone it to ensure development compatible with Spruce Park (see UNASDP).

3. Through the site development plan review process, the impacts of potentially negative elements, such as traffic, noise, and the blocking of solar access from potential new multi-family development along the north side of Grand Avenue on the adjacent single family residential neighborhood shall be reviewed and minimized through designated Transition Areas. (See Map 6) .
Illustration 5. MECHENBERG APT
CIRCA 1940

COMPACT PLAN

USE OF TOPOGRAPHY TO CREATE PRIVACY AND VARIETY

OPEN SPACE USED FOR GARDENS, PLAY AREAS

PARKING IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO INDIVIDUAL UNITS

VERTICAL SEPARATION FROM STREET WHERE POSSIBLE

ORNAMENTAL LANDSCAPING

RESIDENTIAL UNIT DESIGNED WITH GOOD VENTILATION, LIGHT, AUDIO VISUAL PRIVACY

QUALITY INTERIOR

SPLIT LEVEL PLAN WITH ENTRANCES

PORCH/SUN SCREEN

PLAN (NO SCALE)

ELEVATION (NO SCALE)
Illustration 5. EL PORVENIR APPTS 1938

PLAN (NO SCALE)

- Off street parking with secondary entrance/exit
- Courtyard terraces serve all units
  - Is multi-level
- Interior courtyard includes landscape
- Building is site close to streets thereby creating a more common entrance
- Decorative entrance gateway with stepped up plan optimizes slope
- Diversity of apartment types
- Possibility of common area
- Trash access alleyway
B. HOSPITAL CAMPUS DEVELOPMENT (within SU-1 Hospital Zone)

Summary of Needs and Objectives

Definition and containment of Hospital campus
Adequate provision for Hospital expansion needs
Intensification of development within the hospital campus
Provision of structured parking
Improve vehicular access

POLICY ONE: VISUAL AND FUNCTIONAL EDGES TO THE HOSPITAL CAMPUS SHALL BE ESTABLISHED.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Boundaries of SU-1 zoning for Hospital use should be expanded to include the proposed SU-1 Hospital Area outlined in the Land Use Concept but should not be expanded beyond those limits (see Map 4).

2. Through the SU-1 Hospital Site Plan review process, the City will encourage the Hospital to develop an attractive "edge" to the eastern Hospital campus along Sycamore which can buffer and serve as a transition to the Silver Hill neighborhood; this eastern boundary should include installation of street-scaping along Sycamore and limiting development heights to the SU-1 height guideline pursuant to Section 30.D. of the Comprehensive City Zoning Code along the eastern edge of the campus.

3. Outside the proposed SU-1 Hospital zone, surface parking for Hospital campus uses should be allowed only for those tracts presently used for Hospital campus parking as of the date of adoption of this Plan, or for ancillary Hospital uses located outside the SU-1 Hospital zone.

4. Through the Site Plan review process, require buffering of intensive development from adjacent residential areas through designated Transition Areas (See Map 6).
POLICY TWO: ACTIVITIES, USES AND DENSITIES SHALL BE ENCOURAGED WITHIN THE HOSPITAL CAMPUS SU-1 ZONE THAT BENEFIT THE NEIGHBORHOOD, BREAK DOWN HOSPITAL-NEIGHBORHOOD BARRIERS, AND REDUCE PressURES FOR HOSPITAL CAMPUS EXPANSION.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Through SU-1 Hospital Site Plan review process, the City should encourage the Hospital to intensify landscaping and provide recreational and park space benefitting the community.

2. Silver west of Sycamore should not be vacated unless assurances are made that the median landscaping will be maintained by the Hospital.

3. Through the Site Plan review process, development should be encouraged to preserve and utilize all appropriate vistas including vistas to the west mesa and Sandias.

4. Through the SU-1 Hospital Site Plan review process, the City should encourage the Hospital to develop mixed-use facilities within the campus; potential uses include medical office, support commercial, recreational facilities for employees and the public.

5. The Hospital should be encouraged to develop parking structures or parking facilities within other new structures rather than surface lots and as soon as practicable should construct a parking structure for Hospital campus parking.

POLICY THREE: DEVELOPMENT OF ANCILLARY INSTITUTIONAL USES RELATED TO THE HOSPITAL SHALL BE ENCOURAGED TO THE SOUTH OF THE HOSPITAL CAMPUS, TO THE NORTH OF THE CAMPUS ADJACENT TO I-25, AND ALONG CENTRAL AVENUE. RATHER THAN TO THE EAST SO AS TO REDUCE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT ON EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Implement mixed-use zoning south of the Hospital campus as recommended in the proposed amendments to the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan (UNASDP).

2. Ambulance services should eventually be moved to an area more compatible to the neighborhood (e.g. near the intersection of Lead and Coal and I-25).
C. CENTRAL AVENUE REDEVELOPMENT

Summary of Needs and Objectives

Provision of neighborhood commercial services, such as restaurants, grocery store, drugstore, bank, as identified in neighborhood and employee surveys.

Upgrading of commercial uses.

Efficient planning of access and off-street parking.

Development of new mixed-use complexes incorporating residential use.

Improvement of the pedestrian shopping environment.

Preservation of unique topography and buildings which contribute significantly to neighborhood character.

POLICY ONE: REDEVELOPMENT WITH COMMERCIAL/MIXED USES SERVING THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND EMPLOYEE POPULATIONS SHALL BE ENCOURAGED ALONG CENTRAL AVENUE.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Enhance development feasibility by including Central Avenue in the proposed Metropolitan Redevelopment Area.

2. Use of the subsidized Downtown Development Loan Pool Program administered by Albuquerque Center, Inc., or other similar programs, should be encouraged.

POLICY TWO: NEW DEVELOPMENT SHALL SERVE TO UPGRADE NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND QUALITY

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Implement requirements for Site Plan review as recommended in proposed amendments to the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan (UNASDP).

2. Mixed-use zoning should include a full block on the north side of Central Avenue to allow more flexibility in design for new commercial/mixed-use projects.

3. Through the Site Plan review process, require buffering of intensive development from adjacent residential areas through designated Transition Areas (see Map 6).
POLICY THREE: DEVELOPMENT ALONG CENTRAL AVENUE SHALL BE ORIENTED TO A PEDESTRIAN SCALE AT GROUND LEVEL

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Through the Site Plan review process, require ground floor design and landscaping treatments which enhance the pedestrian-scale visual experience along Central Avenue.

2. In general, parking should be located to the rear of development rather than in front of development and rather than at corner sites along Central Avenue.
D. MIXED COMMERCIAL AREAS

Summary of Needs and Objectives:

Revitalization of the area with office, commercial, and possibly residential development to serve the neighborhood and the institutions in the area (Presbyterian Hospital, UNM, TVI).

Sensitivity in design of new development to adjacent residential areas.

Higher intensity development adjacent to the major streets.

 Provision of potential expansion area for ancillary uses related to the Hospital.

POLICY ONE: BLOCKS ON THE PERIPHERY OF THE SYCAMORE AREA ADJACENT TO MAJOR STREETS SHOULD DEVELOP IN A MIXTURE OF MEDIUM DENSITY OFFICE, COMMERCIAL, AND RESIDENTIAL USES.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Re-zone these areas to allow commercial development and prevent further expansion of industrial uses. (see UNASDP)

POLICY TWO: THE ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL AREAS SHOULD BE BUFFERED FROM DEVELOPMENT IN THE MIXED USE AREAS.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Through the site plan review process, the impacts of potentially negative elements, such as traffic, noise, and the blocking of solar access from new development on the adjacent residential areas should be reviewed and minimized through designated Transition Areas (See Map 6).

2. Through the site plan review process, require non-residential development to include landscaping along the street where the other side of the street is zoned residually (i.e., Cedar SE, Mulberry NE, and Pine NE).
E. ROOSEVELT PARKSIDE REDEVELOPMENT AREA

Summary of needs and objectives

Revitalization which enhances Roosevelt Park.

Encouragement of residential redevelopment.

Revitalization with higher density apartments.

POLICY ONE: THE AREA IN THE VICINITY OF ROOSEVELT PARK SHOULD DEVELOP AS HIGHER DENSITY APARTMENTS WHICH ORIENT TO THE PARK.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Re-zone the area to permit higher density apartments (See UNASDP).

2. Require site development plan review for apartment development in the vicinity of Roosevelt Park.
F. TRANSITION AREAS

Summary of Needs and Objectives

Sensitivity in design of new development to adjacent residential areas.

Expansion of commercial/mixed-use area along the north side of Central Avenue.

Buffering of the lower density Spruce Park and Silver Hill Neighborhoods from the higher density Redevelopment Area.

POLICY ONE: TRANSITION AREAS SHOULD PROVIDE A BUFFER BETWEEN RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND BETWEEN LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AND MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Development in the Transition Areas (see Map 6) shall be reviewed through the site development plan review process to minimize the potentially negative elements, such as traffic, noise, and the blocking of solar access from new development on the adjacent residential areas.
G. CIRCULATION

Summary of Needs and Objectives

Lessen the negative impacts of the large traffic volume on the neighborhood.

Lessen the negative impacts of the heavy usage of on-street parking by students and hospital employees.

Improve and create amenities for the many pedestrians and transit users.

POLICY ONE: THE PEDESTRIAN NETWORK WITHIN THE SYCAMORE AREA SHALL BE PRESERVED AND EXPANDED (see Map 7).

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Grand Avenue should be re-designed to include streetscaping and a bicycle/jogging route.

2. Sycamore Street from Roosevelt Park to Grand Avenue should be re-designed and reconstructed to improve the streetscape for pedestrians. This re-design should include landscaping, pedestrian crossings (signals at major intersections), and steps on the steeper slopes (see Illustration 8 and Cost Estimate p. 40).

3. The City Parks and Recreation Department should continue to maintain the Silver Avenue landscaped median and should renovate the median to prevent run-off of irrigation water into the streets.

POLICY TWO: THE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF VEHICLE PARKING AND CIRCULATION ON THE NEIGHBORHOOD SHALL BE REDUCED.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. The City should install "no parking" signs at intersections as recommended by the Traffic Engineer to improve driver visibility at the intersections.
2. Lead and Coal Avenues should be re-surfaced and re-engineered by the City within the next five years in accordance with their heavy traffic volume.

3. The traffic patterns of the vehicles which travel from the Encino Medical Plaza to the Hospital should be studied and methods recommended to lessen the impacts of this traffic on the Sycamore and Spruce Park Neighborhoods. This study cannot begin until the construction on Central Avenue is complete and traffic patterns have returned to normal.

4. Permit parking should be installed in the area around the Hospital Campus where needed. A parking study shall not be required within a two block radius of the Hospital Campus if the required percentage of property owners request permit parking.

POLICY THREE: THE AREA SHALL BE IMPROVED FOR TRANSIT USERS.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Presbyterian Hospital Center should install bus shelters on the north and south sides of Central Avenue near Cedar.

2. The City Transit Division should consider Central Avenue between Interstate 25 and University Blvd. a high priority area in its analysis of bus shelter location.

POLICY FOUR: IMPROVE VEHICULAR ACCESS TO THE HOSPITAL CAMPUS.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. The main vehicular entrance/exit to the Hospital from the south on Cedar Street should be emphasized with signage and traffic signals.

POLICY FIVE: ALLEYS WITHIN THE SYCAMORE AREA SHOULD BE RETAINED AND UPGRADED FOR PARKING ACCESS OR ELIMINATED.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Alleys should be paved if heavily used to reduce dust and erosion, or vacated if requested by a property owner and found to be unusable for present or future parking access. Through traffic (going the length one or more blocks) on unpaved alleys should be discouraged or eliminated.
SYCAMORE STREET IMPROVEMENTS
COST ESTIMATE*
(between Grand and Coal Avenues)

Removal of Existing Facilities
(sidewalk, curb and gutter) $16,000

Landscaping
(trees, shrubs, irrigation) 20,000

New Facilities
(curb and gutter, drivepass,
sidewalk-exposed aggregate or pavers) 320,000

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST $356,000

Professional Fees (7%) $25,000

Administrative Costs
(surveys, inspections) 11,000

Contingency (10%) 36,000

TOTAL DESIGN COST $72,000

TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST $428,000

Prepared by the City of Albuquerque's Municipal Redevelopment Department, Redevelopment and Economic Development Division with March 1982 Cost Estimates. Cost Estimate does not include signalization at any intersections.
H. METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Summary of Needs and Objectives

Provide assistance to renovation and new construction.
Protect property owners from the fear of condemnation.
Generate public money for public improvements.

POLICY ONE: THE CITY SHALL NOT EXERCISE ITS POWER OF CONDEMNATION PURSUANT TO THE STATE METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT CODE TO ACQUIRE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE SYCAMORE METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT AREA IF SUCH CONDEMNATION WOULD RESULT IN IN Voluntary RELOCATION OF RESIDENTS OR BUSINESSES.

POLICY TWO: INCREASED TAX REVENUE FROM REDEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE SYCAMORE AREA SHOULD BE SPENT WITHIN THE SYCAMORE AREA.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. The City shall attempt to establish a Tax Increment Fund for the Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Area and the funds spent for public improvements and/or a program of housing and/or commercial redevelopment within the area.

POLICY THREE: METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT BONDS SHALL BE AVAILABLE WITHIN THE SYCAMORE AREA FOR PROJECTS WHICH CONFORM TO THIS PLAN.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Projects requesting an inducement resolution from the City for Metropolitan Redevelopment Bonds must conform to this general Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan and the University Neighborhoods Area Sector Development Plan to be amended as recommended.

2. The City should attempt to "package" smaller rehabilitation projects which could serve as security for a portion of a redevelopment bond or other financing tool issued for the area.
3. The City should continue efforts to develop a residential redevelopment program utilizing Metropolitan Redevelopment Bonds (see Appendix Exhibit B).

POLICY FOUR: ALL ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN THOSE PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED BY POLICIES IN THIS SECTION AS SPECIFIED IN THE NEW MEXICO METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT CODE AND WHICH ARE NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THIS PLAN MAY BE UNDERTAKEN IN THE SYCAMORE METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

POLICY FIVE: EFFORTS SHALL BE MADE TO REPLACE PUBLIC WITH PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. The City should assist the neighborhood in forming a private non-profit development corporation to provide private financial incentives for redevelopment (e.g., interest subsidies, loan pool).

POLICY SIX: PRESERVATION OF HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURES SHALL BE ENCOURAGED THROUGH USE OF AVAILABLE PUBLIC FINANCIAL INCENTIVES FOR RESTORATION AND RENOVATION.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Use of City Metropolitan Redevelopment Bonds shall not normally be permitted if a project would involve the demolition of any building which is on or has been designated as eligible for the State or National Registers.

2. Nominations of structures potentially eligible for the National or State Historic registers should be pursued by the City Historic Landmarks staff with owner consent. Projects involving the renovation of properties on or designated as eligible for the State or National Registers of Historic Places shall be exempt from requirements for maintaining pre-development taxes for a ten-year period after renovation.

3. The Historic Landmarks Survey staff should prepare a map identifying older buildings eligible for federal tax incentives for renovation.
EXHIBIT A

AMENDMENTS TO THE
UNIVERSITY NEIGHBORHOODS AREA SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN

MD - MIXED DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

The MD Mixed Density land use category corresponds to the R-T Residential Zone in the Zoning Code, including any subsequent amendments, and is subject to the same regulations as that zone with the following exception:

1. For premises of 20,000 square feet or more, or any premises that are a complete block new development which does not meet the requirements of the R-T zone but does meet the requirements of the R-3 Zone (not including the lot size requirement) in the Zoning Code may be allowed if:

   a. A site development plan and landscaping plan are approved by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit. A plan shall be approved only if found to conform to the University Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan and the Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan.

MC - MIXED COMMERCIAL

The MC Mixed Commercial land use category corresponds to the C-2 Community Commercial Zone in the Zoning Code, including any subsequent amendments, and is subject to the same regulations as that zone with the following exceptions:

1. All outdoor storage and activities listed as permissive uses in the C-2 Zone under Section 22. A. 10 are conditional uses.

2. Existing outdoor storage shall be treated as an approved conditional use.

3. Adult amusement establishments, adult book stores, adult photo studios, and adult theaters are not allowed.

4. Alcoholic drink under a restaurant license for sale of beer and wine, as provided by Section 60-4A-4 NMSA 1978 is permissive. The use of a full service liquor license shall be allowed only as a conditional use, and a conditional use shall be granted only if the sale of alcoholic drink will be in conjunction with a restaurant; any conditional use granted shall include conditions which assure that the sale of alcoholic drink is subsidiary to the sale of food.

5. Signs are regulated as in the C-1 zone.
6. For new construction on premises of 10,000 square feet or more and which is contiguous or across the street from an area zoned MD Mixed Density, a site development and landscaping plan must be approved by the City prior to issuance of a building permit. A plan shall be approved only if found to conform to the University Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan and the Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan.

CMU - CENTRAL MIXED USE

The Central Mixed Use land use category corresponds to the C-2 Community Commercial Zone in the Zoning Code, including any subsequent amendments, and is subject to the same regulations as that zone with the following exceptions:

1. Permissive residential uses in the R-3 zone which meet the open space requirements of the R-3 Zone in the Zoning Code are permissive uses in this land use category.

2. The following uses are not allowed, either permissively or conditionally: a) adult amusement establishments, adult book stores, adult photo studios, and adult theatres; b) drive-in restaurants and drive through windows; and, c) vehicle sales, rental, service, or repair.

3. All outdoor storage and activities listed as permissive uses in the C-2 Zone under Section 22.A.10 and not listed in paragraph 2 above are conditional uses.

4. Sale of alcoholic drink under a restaurant license for the sale of beer and wine as provided by Section 60-6A-4 NMSA 1978 is permissive. The use of a full service liquor license shall be allowed only as a conditional use, and a conditional use shall be granted only if the sale of alcoholic drink will be in conjunction with a restaurant; any conditional use granted shall include conditions which assure that the sale of alcoholic drink is subsidiary to the sale of food.

5. Signs are regulated as in the C-1 zone.

6. For new construction on premises of 10,000 square feet or more a site development plan and landscaping plan must be approved by the City prior to the issuance of a building permit. A plan will only be approved if found to conform to the University Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan and the Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan.
Nonconformance Regulations. The time that non-conformancy, as
dealt with in Section 40.D.1 h and i of the Zoning Code begins
with the effective date of this resolution as to lots 1 and 2,
block 33, Terrace Addition. Otherwise the provisions of Section
40.D apply.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW PROCESS

This site development and landscaping plan review process will
apply to all site development plan reviews required in the
Special Use, Mixed Density Residential, Mixed Commercial, and
Central Mixed Use land use categories. Procedures and fee for
this site review in these zones shall be as specified for an
SU-1 site development plan review in the Zoning Code with the
following exceptions:

1. In addition to the notification procedures for an SU-1
site development plan review, upon receipt of an
application for approval of a site development plan,
the Planning Director shall immediately send a copy of
the application form to the president and one
additional duly authorized representative of any
properly registered neighborhood association within the
Sycamore Area.

2. The submittal requirements for this review, in addition
to the SU-1 zone requirements, will be drawings,
elevations, or other materials which illustrate the
relationship of the proposed development to the
existing adjacent sites (including structures and
features).

3. The proposal will be reviewed for conformance with the
University Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan and
the Sycamore Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan.

4. A site development plan for a specific building shall
become void two years after approval unless a building
permit for the structure has been issued. The Planning
Director may give one six-month extension to each
two-year approval; this extension may be given without
public notice or hearing but the Planning Director
shall record it in his files; extension may be given
when the Planning Director finds that a building permit
for all or a major part of approved development will
probably be obtained within the six months and that
there is no public purpose in holding a hearing on the
site development plan prior to such extension.