

### **Code Enforcement Comments:**

Property developed in Journal Center must be approved by the Journal Center ARC for compliance with the Journal Center Standards.

**Journal Center ARC.** The architectural review committee established pursuant to the Journal Center Documents responsible for reviewing building plans, alterations, signage etc. for Journal Center

#### 3.1.5. City of Albuquerque Approval

After approval of the plans by both the Journal Center ARC and Journal Center 2 ARC, plans must be submitted to the City of Albuquerque for approval. All Journal Center development is subject to the City of Albuquerque ordinances and zoning code. The parcel owner is responsible to obtain such approval.

#### Section 2. Design Guidelines

These Design Guidelines apply to all land use areas: Large Office Campus, Small Office Campus and Office/Warehouse. However, there may be additional or different design guidelines for particular land uses within the three main land use areas. In such cases, there will be special guidelines or exceptions provided for such land uses. 2.1. Site Planning 2.1.1. General 2.1.2. Parking and Vehicular Circulation *f* Parking is per Journal Center Development Standards and City of Albuquerque parking requirements.

#### 3.2. Variance from Design Guidelines

A variance from the Journal Center 2 Land Development Design Guidelines is possible and may be granted with the approval of the Journal Center 2 ARC.

### **Carl's comments:**

*This property is within the Journal Center Master Plan boundaries and subject to all regulations within the Master Plan. The Master Plan requires that all property developed in Journal Center must be approved by the Journal Center ARC. Therefore, my recommendation is that this request be submitted to the Journal Center ARC initially for their approval or comments.*

*According to section 2.1.2 Parking and Vehicular Circulation are under Design Guidelines and per section 3.2 a Variance is possible and may be granted with approval of the Journal 2 ARC.*

#### 5-5(C)(5)(i)

Parking Study Allowance The Planning Director may approve a reduction of parking requirements if the applicant provides a parking needs study, prepared by a consultant with expertise in that area recognized by the City, and using parking generation assumptions

acceptable to the City, demonstrates that off-street parking at a rate lower than that otherwise required by this Section 14-16-5-5, will adequately accommodate all anticipated demand for off-street parking and will not result in either traffic congestion or parking congestion in surrounding neighborhoods, and the Planning Director determines that the parking study provides a more accurate measure of parking needs for the site than application of the standards in this Section 14-16-5-5 that would otherwise apply.

**Carl's comments:**

*If the decision is left to Planning, according to the section above, the Planning Director may approve a reduction of parking requirements if the study provides a more accurate measure than any standards in section 5-5 that would apply.*

*Code does not oppose this request, we recommend that all other standards in the IDO be exhausted prior to pursuing this request.*

*As per Table 6-4-2 Allowable Deviations, a 5% Deviation for minimum off-street vehicle parking spaces may be requested. A 5% reduction would be 11 spaces leaving 226 required spaces. The 23 parking space difference would then be reduced to a 12 parking space difference.*

*This section also applies: 5-5(C)(5)(d) 2. Electric Vehicle Charging Station Credit, When a new parking lot containing more than 200 off-street spaces is constructed, at least 2 percent of the vehicle parking spaces shall include electric vehicle charging stations with a rating of 240 volts or higher. This will also reduce the number of spaces from 12.*

*Another reduction the customer may seek is, Van and Car Pool Parking Credit*

*5-5(C)(5)(e).*

*If none of these reductions are possible, I would then state there is possible a case for approving the parking reduction requirement.*

*A concern from a Code enforcement position is setting precedence and making an approval based on a future Premium Transit designation under the comp plan. This is currently not in a Premium Transit Corridor according to the current IDO.*

*The proposal also mentions collective transit route times of 15 minutes – the IDO does not currently recognize collective peak time frequency.*