



**Stantec Architecture Inc.**  
722 12th Street NW Suite 100, Washington DC 20005-3957

October 14, 2022

Robert Webb / Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck  
Planning Department  
City of Albuquerque

**Reference:** New Mexico Proton Advanced Cancer Therapy (NMPACT)  
Response to Development Review Board Comments  
Project: PR-2022-007588  
Application: SI-2022-01658

All:

Thank you for the preliminary Planning comments which we received on September 23, 2022 and additional comments received on September 27, 2022. The following is our understanding of the reviewers with no objections, as well as our responses to the eighteen (18) comments received. For ease of review we are repeating Planning comments (in plain font) and providing Stantec responses (in *italicized font*).

**No Objections:**

- Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority.
- Development Review Board – Hydrology Section.
- Development Review Board – Transportation Development. Noted a full TLC required.
- Albuquerque Public Schools – Capital Master Plan.
- Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (MRMPO).
- Development Review Engineer AMAFCA.

**Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments**

1. The Journal Center Master Plan and the Site Plan for Building Permit per 1000560 / 06DRB-01023 both govern the site. Where they are silent, all development must meet standards and provisions of IDO (NR-BP), the DPM and any related Use Specific Standards.
  - a. Please provide a copy of the existing site plan if available.
    - i. *Stantec Response: The existing approved Site Plan was submitted with the application, and it is attached to this letter.*
  - b. On the Site Plans or site plan notes, please include detailed and relevant development information to help clarify new expansion and modifications. For example, setback & height measurements, buffer measurements, parking & landscaping calculations, new uses and/or changes in use.
    - i. *Stantec Response: We have prepared Sheet A1-10, DRB Site Plan with the required information. Please see the attached.*



Robert Webb / Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck  
Page 2 of 6

**Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments**

2. The site is located within the Journal Center Master Plan. A letter of approval was received from the Journal Center Architectural Review Committee approving the proposed development. Staff needs more information on the façade to determine compliance.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Please confirm that the compliance issue is the same one identified below in Planning comment 3.*
3. The applicant must provide proof how the building/façade design requirements are being met per 5-11(E) of the IDO as notes on the amended Site Plan and/or in a comment response letter.
  - a. *Stantec Response: The project complies with relevant sections of 14-16-5-11(E). Under 5-11 ( E )(2) Façade Design:*
    - i. *5-11 ( E )(2)(a)(1). The south and east facades provide a sense of human scale at the ground floor with unique base material, sunshades, offset in wall plane, and large bank of glazing. See attached project rendering.*
    - ii. *5-11 ( E )(2)(a)(2). The street-facing façade (south elevation) incorporates two features. Specifically:*
      1. *Item (b). Windows on upper floor. There are two windows on the second floor and their combined length exceeds 30% of the façade length. The windows combine for 44 feet and the façade is 140 feet.  $44/140 = 31\%$  of the façade. See attached project rendering and Building Elevations, Sheet A2-100.*
      2. *Item (d). Elements that provide shade or protection from weather. There are two sunshades, and their combined length exceeds 30% of the façade length. The element also occurs more frequently than every 40 feet. The sunshades combine for 100 feet and the façade is 140 feet.  $100/140 = 71\%$  of the façade. See attached project rendering and Building Elevations, Sheet A2-100.*
    - iii. *5-11 ( E )(2)(a)(3). The street-facing façade (south elevation)- longer than 100 feet - incorporates more than one required feature. Specifically:*
      1. *Item (c). Offset or projecting element. There is a niche that is 3'6" offset from main façade plane that is 30% of the façade length. Additionally, there are two sunshades that project more than 6" from the façade and cover 71% of the façade. See attached project rendering.*
      2. *Item (f). Art. There is an 11-foot high by 42-foot-wide section of the façade (at ground floor) that is designated for an Owner-furnished tile mural. See attached project rendering.*
    - iv. *5-11 ( E )(2)(a)(4). The building addition – visible from a public street – is similar in color, material, and accent features to the primary building. Specifically:*
      1. *The addition is finished in stucco colored to match main building. See attached project rendering.*
      2. *The window frames at the addition match the color of the windows at main building. See attached project rendering.*



**Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments**

3. The accent tiles at the addition match the color of the accent tiles at *main building*. See *attached project rendering*.
4. The project and application numbers must be added to the Site Plan.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Sheet C-101, Site Plan has been updated with the required information. See attached.*
5. Solid Waste approval and their signature must be obtained on the amended Site Plan prior to the approval of the amended Site Plan.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Sheet C-102, Solid Waste Plan has been approved. See attached.*
6. The Parking Tabulation section of the Site Plan notes that the parking requirements for the site are based on the previously approved site plan plus the addition at current parking rates. The overall indication is that there is potentially a parking shortage per IDO requirements. Staff has talked to the applicant about sections of the IDO where parking reductions could apply and awaits a resubmittal on parking for the site.
  - a. *Stantec Response: A Parking Report has been prepared. The purpose of the study is to provide the Planning Director for the City of Albuquerque with the information necessary to consider a reduction of parking requirements for this project. See attached report.*
7. The Parking Tabulation section of the Site Plan notes that 100 parking spaces will be provided off-site. If any off-site parking spaces will be utilized and will count toward the total of number of required parking spaces, a recorded Shared Parking Agreement will be required for those parking spaces and must be submitted prior to the approval of this Major Site Plan Amendment – DRB.
  - a. *Stantec Response: The Owner understands the requirement and will record a Shared Parking Agreement if required.*
8. The number of bicycle parking spaces which are required are depicted in the Parking Tabulation section, but the number of bicycle spaces/racks which are being provided is not depicted. That information needs to be added to the Site Plan.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Sheet C-101, Site Plan has been updated with the required information. See attached.*
9. Detail as to how the required number of motorcycle spaces (6 spaces) was calculated needs to be provided in the Parking Tabulation section.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Sheet C-101, Site Plan has been updated with the required information. See attached.*
10. The Landscape Plan must meet the 15% net lot area landscaping requirement per 5-6(C)(2) of the IDOS. Confirmation and calculations of this requirement must be provided on the Landscape Plan. (The plan sheet seems to state that the fire lane makes this requirement non-applicable, however staff is not able to confirm this per the IDO.)
  - a. *Stantec Response: Net lot area landscaping has been calculated for the entire site and the project exceeds the 15% minimum requirement. Sheet C-701, Landscape – Landscape Plan has been updated with the calculation. See attached.*



**Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments**

11. The Landscape Plan depicts the removal of two large Chinese Pistache trees from the parking area. Staff discourages the removal of mature trees from a development if there is a way to save them. Please explain and justify their removal.
  - a. *Stantec Response: The existing, mature Pistache trees are removed because they will be negatively impacted by construction of new fire lane improvements. In our experience they would not survive trenching and installation of new curbing because its within their critical root zone (5-10 feet of their trunks). Additionally, construction of the new parking lot will recompact the soil - creating oxygen deprivation. We propose new trees in new planter conditions as the surest approach to providing healthy plants.*

**Development Review Board Planning – Code Enforcement Comments**

1. Property is zoned NR-BP and is subject to the Journal Center Master Plan. There is also an approved Site Plan # 100560. Any changes must be submitted as an Amendment to the approved plan, and with compliance and approval of the Journal Center Master Plan and Architectural Review Committee. Where these are silent, development must meet current requirements of the IDO.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Noted.*
2. Parking calculations need to be clarified. It is unclear how the numbers shown were calculated, as the parking for the site as per current IDO requirements would be 5 spaces per 1000 sq ft, for a Medical Clinic. Please specify and break down parking requirements for specific uses of the building, utilizing IDO Table 5-1 as a guideline (Medical Clinic, Offices, or other applicable uses and their required parking). You may find additional Parking Reductions or Credits available, if you review IDO sections 5-5(C)(5) or 5-5(C)(6).
  - a. *Stantec Response: Noted. Background information provided in the attached NMCC Parking Study.*
3. Off-site Parking as proposed for 100 spaces would require a Shared Parking Agreement, as per IDO sections 5-5(C)(5)(b)(1), Shared Parking Reduction, and/or 5-5(C)(6)(e), Offsite Parking Credit. Please provide Site Plan showing location of proposed off-site parking, and distance from property. Shared Parking Agreement must be submitted to the Zoning Permit Counter for review and approved by the Planning Director.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Noted.*
4. A calculation for required parking spaces based on projected building occupancy must be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director, as per IDO 5-5(C)(5)(e), Parking Study Reduction.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Noted. Background information provided in the attached NMCC Parking Study.*
5. Landscaping must meet requirements of IDO 5-6, Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening. Provide revised calculations showing how it is meeting IDO requirements.
  - a. *Stantec Response: Required calculations for IDO 5-6 have been added to tables on C-701 (attached). The project is in compliance with following exceptions:*



Robert Webb / Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck  
Page 5 of 6

**Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments**

- i. 5-6(D)(2) – Additional Street Frontage – landscaping around building foundation. This is not met, and a variance is requested due to site constraints and potential impact to lost parking.
  - ii. 5-6(E) – Edge Buffer Landscaping. This is not met along the southern and eastern sides of the property. The existing trees are spaced at wider intervals and a variance is requested due to budget.
  - iii. 5-6(F) Parking Lot Landscaping. This is met for new improvements but is not met for existing. Existing lots have it about 200' (versus 100' requirement). A variance is requested due to budget.
6. Signs must meet requirements of Master Plan and, were silent, IDO 5-12, Signs.
    - a. Stantec Response: Noted.
  7. Code Enforcement has no further comments at this time.

**Development Review Board Planning – Parks and Recreation Department**

1. Please add note to tree planting detail pursuant to IDO 5-6(C)(5)(e): "Organic mulch is required as ground cover under trees within a 5-foot radius around the tree trunk, but not directly against the trunk. In these areas, weed barrier fabric is prohibited."
  - a. Stantec Response: Sheet C-701, Landscape – Landscape Plan has been updated to include the note; reference Detail 1. See attached.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to these comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

**STANTEC ARCHITECTURE INC.**

Allen Whitaker, AIA  
Principal  
Phone: 202.230.7479  
[Allen.whitaker@stantec.com](mailto:Allen.whitaker@stantec.com)



Robert Webb /Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck  
Page 6 of 6

**Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments**

Attachments: 2006 Approved Site Plan  
A1-101, DRB Site Plan  
A2-100, Building Elevations  
NMPACT Project Rendering  
C-101, Site Plan  
C-102, Solid Waste Plan  
Parking Study  
C-701, Landscape Plan