



Justification Letter

To: City of Albuquerque
From: Maddy Kish
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Date: 3/25/2024
Subject: Flite Banking Drive-Up ATM

Project Narrative

Flite Banking is looking to propose a US Bank Drive-Up ATM located at 3500 Coors Blvd SW, Albuquerque, NM 87121. The site is zoned Mixed-Use low intensity (MX-L).

The proposed ATM will convert a portion of the existing parking lot into an ATM drive-up area. The improvements will maintain the existing grading on site and will therefore not affect the drainage patterns on site, and no additional impervious area is proposed. The existing landscaping in the area will not be impacted with the proposed improvements. This project includes the removal of 11 parking stalls to create the drive-up ATM area. The number of trips generated by the proposed improvements is very low and based on similar projects in the area will likely reduce the number of customers utilizing a parking stall and entering Walmart by providing a fast and efficient way to access an ATM.

This project is anticipated to have minimal impact on the surrounding properties. This project does not cause the development to go out of conformance and meets the code requirements of The City of Albuquerque. This goal will ensure the land is:

- Used efficiently to support broad-based economic development and the adequacy of housing and public services.
- Developed in an environmentally sustainable and aesthetically appealing manner.
- Supplied with public facilities sufficient to meet demand.
- Served by a safe, convenient, multimodal, and interconnected transportation system.

ATM Project – generated traffic estimates are determined through a process known as trip generation.

Trip rates and equations are applied to a proposed land use to estimate traffic generated by the development during a specific time interval. Flite ATM user specific data activity for the month of December in 2017 at an existing Flite ATM in Houston, Texas was used to determine the appropriate trip generation rates applicable for this proposed project. The following Table 1 summarizes the trip generation for the proposed Flite ATM.

Table 1 – Flite ATM Trip Generation

Use	Weekday Vehicles Trips						
	Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Flite ATM 1 Drive-In Lane	36	2	2	4	5	5	10

As summarized in Table 1, the currently proposed Flite ATM is anticipated to generate approximately 36 daily weekday trips with four (4) of these trips occurring during the morning peak hour, and 10 of these trips occurring during the afternoon peak hour.

Per previous data collected by Flite, a large portion of the ATM users above will be exiting customers, also known as pass-by trip generation. The addition of the non-existing customers, new trips generated in the nearby roadway network, is anticipated to have a negligible impact on the traffic in the current parking lot and surrounding roadway network.

A vehicle queuing analysis was completed at the site based on data provided by the client at the Flite ATM located in Houston, Texas as collected in December 2017. As shown in the site plan, vehicles enter the ATM drive-through from the south and exit to the north. Approximately, two (2) vehicles can queue at the ATM machine before spilling back into the drive aisle. In addition, one vehicle can queue after the ATM machine prior to exiting the single drive-through lane. Based on represented data, there were a total of 1,424 vehicles that used the Flite ATM in the month of December 2017. Of these transactions, there were 1,158 instances where only one vehicle was queued in the drive through lane (81 percent of the time of ATM occupation), 224 times where two vehicles were queued (16 percent of the time during ATM usage), and 42 times where three or more vehicles were queued (3 percent of the time during ATM usage). Therefore, over the month, 97 percent of the time while the ATM is being used, two or less vehicles are anticipated to be stacked at the ATM machine. Based on the 95th percentile confidence level, it is believed that the vehicle queues caused by the proposed Flite ATM will be successfully accommodated within the ATM drive through without blocking the internal parking lot drive aisle for most all times.

Code Analysis

The following section provides a summary of the applicable Site Design Review Criteria for this project. The project will meet the following criteria:

- City of Albuquerque IDO Section 14-16-5
- City of Albuquerque IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(2)
- City of Albuquerque IDO Section 4-3-F-5
- City of Albuquerque IDO Section 5-5-I

IDO Section 14-16-5(C)

Off-street parking spaces used to comply with the requirements of this Section 14-16-5 shall be calculated as follows:

1. *Parking requirements in Table 5-5-1 are calculated as ratios to be multiplied by the gross floor area or design capacity of the use.*

JUSTIFICATION: The calculated ratio per table 5-5-1 specifies that the required parking for a drive-through facility does not have a requirement. Therefore, no parking is proposed and minimum stacking requirement are met with 4 cars stacked.

2. *The required minimum off-street parking may be adjusted pursuant to Subsection 14-16-5-5(C)(5) (Parking Reductions).*

JUSTIFICATION: Understood.

3. *When a calculation of required parking spaces results in a fraction of a space, the number of required parking spaces shall be rounded down to the nearest whole number.*

JUSTIFICATION: All fractions rounded down.

4. *Calculations related to parking reductions that result in fractions of a parking space shall be rounded to maximize the reduction and minimize the required parking spaces.*

JUSTIFICATION: Parking reduction calculation fractions rounded.

5. *When a calculation of a parking space reduction provided as a percentage (e.g. 30 percent transit reduction) results in a fraction of a space, the number of parking spaces that can be reduced shall be rounded up to the nearest whole number.*

JUSTIFICATION: Corresponding calculations rounded up.

6. *When a calculation of a parking space reduction provided as a factor (e.g. 1.2 shared parking reduction factor) results in a fraction of a space, the total number of required parking spaces shall be rounded down to the nearest whole number."*

JUSTIFICATION: Corresponding calculations rounded down.

7. *No space used for a required loading or stacking space may be used to satisfy minimum off-street parking requirements.*

JUSTIFICATION: No loading spaces or stacking space used to satisfy minimum off-street parking requirements.

8. *No space used for shopping corrals or for other uses that make the space unavailable for vehicle parking may be used to satisfy minimum off-street parking requirements.*

JUSTIFICATION: No space used for shopping corrals or for other uses making the space unavailable are used to satisfy minimum off-street parking requirements.

9. *Unless specified otherwise in this IDO or modified by Sections 14-16-5-5(C)(3) (Amenity, Recreation, and Entertainment Uses) and 14-16-5-5(C)(5) (Parking Reductions), off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with Table 5-5-1. For unlisted uses, required parking is determined by Planning Director per Section 14-16-5-5(C)(4). If a conditional use is approved pursuant to Subsection 14-16-6-6(A) and the approval states a different parking requirement, then the parking requirement in the Conditional Use Approval shall apply. See also Subsection 14-16-5-5(C)(7) (Parking Maximums).*

JUSTIFICATION: Understood. The approved site plan required parking requires 1000 spaces, but since the new development of the current IDO, the required parking has changed to 474 spaces. Page 275 of the city of Albuquerque IDO specifies in part 14-16-5, 5-5(c), Table 5-5-1 the minimum off-street parking requirements at drive through facilities does not have a requirement. Therefore, all parking standards are met as no new parking is proposed.

IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(2)(a)

A minor amendment must meet all of the following criteria:

10. General retail in a permissive primary use specifies an IDO parking requirement of 2.3 spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. for establishments greater than 50,000 sq. ft. GFA.

JUSTIFICATION: Per this standard, 474 parking spaces are required at this development with a GFA of 205,802 sq. ft. There are 1,005 current existing parking spaces and the proposed parking is 997 spaces. The proposed site will exceed the required standards.

IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(2)(a)

A minor amendment must meet all of the following criteria:

11. The amendment is necessary because of site conditions or user requirements that were not known, and could not reasonably have been known, at the time the City approved the approval that is proposed to be amended, and that were not created by the actions of the owner of the property.

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment is necessary because the need for ATM banking was not known at the time of the construction of the original site.

12. The amendment does not increase or decrease the dimension of any standard beyond the thresholds allowed as minor amendments pursuant to Table 6-4-4 (cumulative of any earlier deviations or amendments).

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment does not increase or decrease beyond these thresholds allowed.

13. The amendment does not decrease the total amount of open space in the development and does not reduce the size of any open space abutting a lot containing a residential use.

JUSTIFICATION: The open space in the development is not affected. The proposed site changes are contained within the parking lot.

14. The amendment does not reduce any building setback adjacent to development containing residential uses by any amount.

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment and proposed development does not reduce any building setback.

15. *The amendment does not increase the maximum number of residential dwelling units in the development from that shown in the existing permit, approval, or plan. If the property is located in a DT-UC-MS-PT area, the amendment does not decrease the required number of residential dwelling units in the development from that shown in the existing permit, approval, or plan.*

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment does not contain any residential uses and not residential units are proposed.

16. *The amendment does not adjust a building design standard unless doing so improves the perception of building quality, variety, durability, and articulation when viewed from adjacent streets and abutting properties.*

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment does not affect any building design standard and only affects the parking lot adjacent to the building.

17. *The amendment does not reduce the amount of total landscaping installed on the subject property or the amount of screening or buffering required on portions of the site abutting any property containing residential dwelling units and does not waive or weaken any other landscaping or buffering requirement unless the ZEO determines that alternative building design elements included in the amendment improve the visual quality and screening and buffering effect of landscaping as viewed from adjacent streets and public areas.*

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment does not propose any reduction in landscaping.

18. *The amendment does not increase the traffic accessing the subject property from local streets and does not increase or decrease the number of through streets, sidewalks, trails, or trail connections passing through the property or connecting to or designed to connect to abutting properties.*

JUSTIFICATION: The amendment proposes negligible increases to the traffic accessing the subject property from local streets and does not affect the number of through streets on site. The proposed changes will serve existing users of the site.

19. *The amendment does not require major public infrastructure, significant changes to access to the subject property, or a traffic impact study, which would warrant additional review by the original decision-making body.*

JUSTIFICATION: This amendment does not require any public infrastructure.

20. *The amendment does not change a specific condition attached by a decision-making body listed in Table 6-1-1 to a prior development permit, approval, or plan for or including the subject property. For example, a specific condition attached to a prior approval requiring additional buffering to mitigate development impacts shall not be removed through a minor amendment process.*

JUSTIFICATION: This amendment does not change any specific conditions.

21. *The amendment does not affect a property in an Overlay zone as regulated pursuant to Part 14-16-3, in which case amendments may be granted per the original approval process for the Site Plan governing the site.*

JUSTIFICATION: This amendment does not affect a property in an Overlay zone.

22. *The amendment does not approve any land use that was not authorized by the permit or approval or that is not allowed by right on the subject property.*

JUSTIFICATION: This amendment does not approve any land use that was not authorized by the permit.

23. *The amendment does not expand a nonconformity as regulated per Section 14-16-6-8 (Nonconformities).*

JUSTIFICATION: This amendment does not expand a nonconformity.

IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(2)(b)

24. *If the Planning Director determines that an amendment warrants review by the decision-making body that issued the permit or approval being amended, the amendment shall be reviewed and approved pursuant to Subsection 14-16-6-4(Y)(3) (Major Amendments).*

JUSTIFICATION: Understood.

IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(2)(c)

25. Requests to amend approvals shall be reviewed according to 1 of the following procedures.

- a. Applications to amend an Administrative Decision (as listed in Table 6-1-1) may be approved by the same administrative body that made the decision being modified, provided that the administrative body determines that all of the criteria in Subsection 14-16-6-4(X)(2)(a) have been met.*
- b. Applications to amend a Decision Requiring a Public Hearing (as listed in Table 6-1-1) may be approved by the ZEO provided that the ZEO determines that all of the criteria in Subsection 14-16-6-4(X)(2)(a) have been met.*
- c. Applications to amend an approved Site Plan – DRB may be approved by the ZEO provided that the ZEO determines that all of the criteria in Subsection 14-16-6-4(X)(2)(a) have been met.*

JUSTIFICATION: Understood.

Thank you for your time and consideration and please feel free to contact me at 303-974-3624 or Maddy.Kish@Kimley-Horn.com with any questions.

Maddy Kish, Direct: 303-974-3624