

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| CLIENT: | Whataburger | | DATE: | 2/16/2022 | | Case No: |
| PROJECT: | Whataburger NM - San Pedro and Alameda | | REFERENCE: | 2nd DRB Application Comments (via Email) | | PR2018-001346 |
| No. | Plan Sheet No. | COMMENT | Responsible Company | RESPONSE | Response by: (PM/Designer) | |
| The following comments are from: Jay Rodenbeck/Jolene Wolfley/Robert Webb | | | RE: DRB - Major Case Comments | | | |
| 1 | Pg. 1 | This application is noted on the current DRB agenda as a Site Plan application, but is actually a Major Site Plan Amendment – DRB application as it’s amending the Site Plan – DRB for PR-2018-001346/SI-2018-00110 approved by the DRB on February 6, 2019. The application must meet the requirements of the governing Site Plan – DRB for PR-2018-001346/SI-2018-00110 as well as the IDO where the governing Site Plan is silent. Notice requirements are the same for the two actions and notice has been met. | SEG | Noted. See revised plan set. | KZ | |
| 2 | Pg. 1 | Signature blocks for DRB and Solid Waste signatures must be added to the Major Site Plan Amendment – DRB prior to approval. | SEG | Signature blocks for DRB and Solid Waste were added to sheet C2.00 | LP | |
| 3 | Pg. 1 | The Solid Waste signature must be obtained prior to approval. | SEG | Noted. | LP | |
| 4 | Pg. 1 | The project and application numbers need to be added to the Major Site Plan Amendment – DRB prior to final sign-off from Planning and distribution of the Major Site Plan Amendment – DRB to the DRB members for their e-signatures. | SEG | Project # added to the TTB: DRB PROJECT NUMBER: PR-2018-001346 SI-2022-00184 - SITE PLAN | KZ | |
| 5 | Pg. 1 | All the sheets in the Major Site Plan Amendment – DRB must be sealed and signed by a design professional licensed in the State of New Mexico. | SEG | Seal added to all plans | | |
| 6 | Pg. 1 | A restaurant is a permitted use in the NR-BP zone. No special use specific standards apply at this site location for the proposed use. | SEG | Noted. | KZ | |
| 7 | Pg. 1 | The Landscape Plan must confirm through depicted calculations that the General Landscaping Standards of 5-6(C) of the IDO are met, the Street Frontage Landscaping requirements of 5-6(D) of the IDO are met, the Edge Buffer Landscaping requirements of 5-6(E) of the IDO are met, and the Parking Lot Landscaping requirements of 5-6(F) of the IDO are met. | HPD | Calculation table revised to refer to ordinance section and street frontage / edge buffer calculations added. Site is an existing commercial development fronting 2 roadways and buffered by commercial drive aisles on the other 2 sides. Alameda Blvd side (N) is beyond 20 ft curb zone and existing vegetation will remain in place for buffer. San Pedro side (W) provides trees where not in conflict with existing utilities. Edge buffer met on East side of development and existing vegetaion buffers South side. Parking lot calcs exceed 10% requirement. | KZ | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|---|--|----|
| 8 | Pg. 2 | Per 5-6(C)(4) of the IDO all trees and shrubs depicted on the Landscape Plan must be selected from the Official Albuquerque Plant Palette. | HPD | All plants are proposed from the ABCWUA.org xeriscape plant list | KZ |
| 9 | Pg. 2 | The Climatic and Geographic Analysis is thorough and informative. Could there be any consideration to reorient the building to have the dining room windows facing the east instead of the west for a preferred solar orientation and better building performance? The orientation of the dining room to the east would provide a preferable occupant experience in terms of lighting and capturing views of the Sandia mountains. | SEG | Client prototype does not allow this. Moving orientation of the dining room to the east would drastically affect the overall layout. The current building orientation reduces the conflict between the Drive-thru lanes and the existing/proposed parking areas which is more preferable to reduce traffic conflict and a more efficient circulation layout. | KZ |
| 10 | Pg. 3 | Did not find in the submittal a comment letter explaining how the Façade Design requirements in IDO 5-11(E)(2) are being met. | SEG | See updated justification letter | KZ |
| 11 | Pg. 3 | Use Specific Standards for Drive-Thru do apply, per IDO section 4-3-F-4-a. | SEG | Landscape wall added along Alameda Blvd., this includes 2 evergreens and vegetative wall in front of the Menu Board areas as stipulated in 4-3(F)(4)(a) | KZ |
| 12 | Pg. 3 | Please indicate if signage is meeting previously approved Site Plan and/or current IDO standards. | SEG | Signage to be modified to meet current code requirements. See updated elevations | KZ |
| No. Plan Sheet No. COMMENT Responsible Company RESPONSE Response by: (PM/Designer) | | | | | |
| The following comments are from: Jeanne Wolfenbarger | | | RE: DRB - Transportation Development | | |
| 1 | Pg. 1 | A Traffic Study shall be completed and approved prior to site plan approval. Any items that are required as part of the Traffic Impact Study shall be placed onto an infrastructure list. As part of this Traffic Impact Study, also provide a queuing analysis for the Whataburger. | SEG | TIS provided. Please refer to Permit # SI-2022-00298. TIS has been reviewed by traffic and was resubmitted to Traffic Engineer Matt Grush on 03/18/2022 | KZ |
| 2 | Pg. 1 | List all sidewalk widths surrounding site on roadway frontages; the minimum sidewalk required on these roads is 6 feet. Label adjacent existing roadway widths and existing curb. | SEG | Widths of existing public sidewalks and roadways were added to the plan. | LP |
| 3 | Pg. 1 | Include a copy of the Fire-One Plan prior to approval of site plan. | SEG | Noted. | LP |
| 4 | Pg. 1 | The exit from the drive-thru is too close to the entrance off of San Pedro. Incorporate minimum throat lengths, and take into account all properties sharing the entrance. | SEG | Per email correspondence with Jeanne Wolfenbarger on 3/2/2022, we were to provide at least 2-vehicles worth of space between the exit and San Pedro curb. This has been updated in the site plan | KZ |
| 5 | Pg. 1 | The minimum pathway required to the right-of-way is 6 feet. Widen the existing 5-foot pathway to San Pedro to 6 feet wide. Revise design to avoid placing a ramp (shown graphically) on San Pedro Boulevard. | SEG | Pedestrian pathway was widened to 6'. Connection from the pathway to the public sidewalk at San Pedro Avenue is proposed without a ramp, sidewalk is flushed at ground level. | LP |
| 6 | Pg. 1 | Provide rounded curb, curb radii, and a pedestrian width at Keyed Note 29. | SEG | Rounded curbs with 2' radiuses were incorporated in the plan. Pathway width was added as well. | LP |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|---|-----|---|----|
| 7 | Pg. 1 | List parking space lengths and widths for all parking lot segments. Follow minimum DPM requirements. If compact spaces are being provided, there is a limit to how many can be provided, and they must be marked as "Compact" in the back of the parking space. | SEG | Parking spaces lengths and widths are shown as typical dimensions, except for the ADA spaces which are called out separately. No compact spaces are proposed. | LP |
| 8 | Pg. 1 | On the drive-thru aisle, a minimum radius of 15 feet shall be used for the interior radius. Also list all curb radii on-site (including islands), and use keyed notes to specify a 6" – 8" curb height. For the exit from the site to the existing drive aisle, if trucks are utilizing this exit, a 25-foot radius should be used. | SEG | required for typical dt width at 12' this site not typical and has 25' wide dt lane allowing for manuevaerability | |
| 9 | Pg. 1 | Include curb ramps as part of the site plan in lieu of placing them on the grading plan. | SEG | Ramp details have been added to the site plan. | LP |
| 10 | Pg. 1 | For the one-way aisle, place "One Way" signage and directional arrows. Place "Do Not Enter" signage at the egress. | SEG | A "One-way" signage was added at the drive-thru ingress, similarly a "Do not Enter" signage was added to the drive-thru egress. All per COA standard details. | LP |
| 11 | Pg. 1 | Show bicycle parking on the plan; call out overall dimensions for this bicycle parking area. | SEG | Bicycle parking shown with keynote no. 18, dimensions were added accordingly. | LP |
| 12 | Pg. 1 | On the civil detail sheet, include details for 6" to 8" curb, sidewalk with a maximum 2% cross-slope, crosswalks, and curb ramps. Include all signage details as well. | SEG | All curbs are 6". Sidewalk Signage details are provided for details not part of the City standard drawings. | |
| 13 | Pg. 2 | Use intersection sight distance triangles for the accessways off of San Pedro and Alameda Boulevard per the DPM guidelines. Add the following note as well: " Landscaping, fencing and signing will not interfere with clear sight requirements. Therefore, signs, walls, trees, and shrubbery between 3 and 8 feet tall (as measured from the gutter pan) will not be acceptable in the clear sight triangle. " (These shall be shown on the landscaping plan, too.) Sight distance triangles should not be shown to go through any structures such as fencing that cannot be seen through. | SEG | Sight triangles were added to driveways connecting to San Pedro Avenue and Alameda Boulevard, all 11' X 11' per DPM. Sight distance note was added to the plan. | LP |
| 14 | Pg. 2 | The ADA access aisle shall have the words "NO PARKING" in capital letters, each of which shall be at least one foot high and at least two inches wide, placed at the rear of the parking space so as to be close to where an adjacent vehicle's rear tire would be placed. (66-1-4.1.B NMSA 1978) | SEG | "No Parking" paint was added to the ADA access aisle, keynote no. 8A indicates the associated detail. | LP |
| 15 | Pg. 2 | The ADA accessible parking sign must have the required language per 66-7-352.4C NMSA 1978 "Violators Are Subject to a Fine and/or Towing." | SEG | Signage detail was updated to show this text. (Det. 2/C2.10) | LP |
| 16 | Pg. 2 | Include shared access agreement as part of this application. | SEG | Shared access agreement on file and submitted with this DRB package | KZ |

| No. | Plan Sheet No. | COMMENT | Responsible Company | RESPONSE | Response by: (PM/Designer) |
|---|----------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|
| The following comments are from: Kristppher Cadena | | | RE: DRB - Water Utility Authority: Utility Development Section | | |
| 1 | 1 | Availability Statement #211120 has been requested and is in review. An approved Fire One Plan is required. The statement will set the criteria for service. An executed statement must be obtained prior to approval. | SEG | Fire One Plan to be submitted to WUA Department prior to DRB submittal for review and Statement Letter issued | KZ |
| 2 | | An Availability Statement will be required with this project. | SEG | Fire One Plan to be submitted to WUA Department prior to DRB submittal for review and Statement Letter issued | KZ |
| 3 | | This project is within the adopted service area. | SEG | Noted | KZ |
| 4a | | Pro rata is owed for this property in the following amounts: Water = \$5,723.64 | SEG | Noted | KZ |
| 4b | | Payment of pro rata is a requirement prior to approval. | SEG | Noted | KZ |
| 5a | | The improvements required in the Availability Statement, if any, shall be incorporated into the infrastructure list. | SEG | Fire One Plan to be submitted to WUA Department prior to DRB submittal for review and Statement Letter issued | KZ |
| 6a | | Easement: Exclusive public water and sanitary sewer easements are required for all public lines that are to be constructed outside of any dedicated rights-of-way. A minimum width easement of 20' is required for a single utility and 25' for water and sewer both within the same easement. Easements for standard sized water meters need to be 5'x5' and include the length of the water service if located on private property. For larger meters that require a meter vault, a 35'x35' easement is required. Actual easement widths may vary depending on the depth of the lines to be installed. | SEG | Not applicable. This site is not installing any shared public lines that require easement dedications and there are no Water Meters within the property line. | KZ |
| | | | | | |
| No. | Plan Sheet No. | COMMENT | Responsible Company | RESPONSE | Response by: (PM/Designer) |
| The following comments are from: Jeff Palmer | | | RE: DRB - Code Enforcement | | |
| 1 | 1 | Property is Zoned NR-BP, but occupies area covered on previously approved Site Plan, PR-2018-001346 and SI-2018-00110. | SEG | Noted | KZ |
| 2 | 1 | ID IDO section 5-5-(l)(2) indicates the Drive-Through lanes adjacent to Public ROW are required to have a Vegetative Screen or Wall. Landscape plan shows ground cover plants rather than shrubs in that area of the LS plan on L.1.1, and no wall is evident. | SEG | Understory plants replaced with evergreen shrub between evergreen trees to screen visible direction of menu signs. Yellow Bird of Paradise utilized. | KZ |

| 3 | 1 | IDO section 5-11 (E) street-facing Façade requirements for North and West sides. Appears deficient on North street-facing façade. Please justify how these requirements are being met. | SEG | Added full awning over the pick-up window creating an arcade over the DT lane further creating sun shade for DT vehicles. Other supplemental canopy includes an orange canopy that wraps around the north west building corner and provides an exterior feature to break apart the horizontal facade. At the Pick-up window the brick was fully raised creating a break in the roofline canopy and indulation along the horizontal facades. See updated elevations | KZ |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| 4 | 1 | IDO section 5-7 Walls/Fences must be followed for any walls/fences to be built. These must obtain a separate wall/fence permit. | SEG | Noted | |
| 5 | 1 | All Signage must meet requirements of IDO 5-12, Signs, and be submitted under separate Sign permit. | SEG | Signage is proposed. Sign permit to be submitted separately | KZ |
| 6 | 1 | Sign Setbacks – show distance from property line to Freestanding Monument and Pole Signs. | | Distance from proposed monument sign to the west property line was added. | LP |
| 7 | 1 | Please clarify location of Freestanding Pole Sign – perhaps I missed it, but did not see on Site Plan. | SEG | No freestanding pole sign is proposed. | LP |
| 8 | 1 | Wall signs: Should show Wall Sign percentage of façade for square footage covered on each wall with proposed signage, as per IDO Table 5-12-2, Section 5-12(F)(2). | SEG | Dimensions and percentage for wall signs added to elevations | KZ |
| No. | Plan Sheet No. | COMMENT | Responsible Company | RESPONSE | Response by: (PM/Designer) |
| The following comments are from: | | | RE: DRB - Parks and Recreation Department | | |
| 1 | Pg. 1 | Per IDO 5-6(D), street trees required 20-ft from curb and approximately 25-ft on center. Albuquerque is currently USDA hardiness zone 7. Some species listed on the Landscape Plan have hardiness zones higher/warmer than what currently exists in Albuquerque and should be exchanged. IDO Section 5-6(D)(1)(b) requires tree species to be recommended on the Official Albuquerque Plant Palette (linked here: Official Albuquerque Plant Palette and Sizing List-2018-07-03.xlsx (cabq.gov)). And the Nature Conservancy has a Climate Ready list (linked here: NM_ClimateReadyTrees.pdf (nature.org)). The Parks and Recreation Department prefers species cross-referenced. (Please contact me at csomerfeldt@cabq.gov with any questions). | HPD | Trees revised to use Escarpment Oak and Chaste Tree (approved materials from tree list). | KZ |
| 2 | Pg. 1 | Please include planting detail for trees to include a note per IDO Section 5-6(C)(5)(e). | HPD | Planting detail added to preliminary sheet. Permit package will provide all install details for landscape and irrigation. | KZ |