



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

October 21, 2022

Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck / Robert Webb
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 and October 18, 2022. The following is our understanding of the reviewers with no objections, as well as our responses to the 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 A1-101, DRB Site Plan and C-701, Landscape Plan with the required information. Please see the attached.*



Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck / Robert Webb

Page 2 of 5

Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning 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 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.

Update 10.18.22: The applicant has submitted a parking reduction study for approval. Planning staff sent the applicant's agent an email on 10/13/22 requesting the following information to be added to the study:

- a. Elaborate on how the additional 14K GFA of the proton center results in the need for only 12 more spaces. Maybe a graphic of the floor plan that shows occupancy. This is a critical component of your analysis and it needs some more explanation and math facts to back it up. (see paragraph below from the Study).
- b. The lease agreement term appears to be for 5 years and it does have a renewability clause. Please help explain how the NM Cancer Center will ensure additional parking when this lease time is set to expire.

It does not appear #a and #b above have been addressed. These are required for a final determination on the parking study. Could not locate Sheet A1-101 which was supposed to be in the resubmittal.

- i. *Stantec Response: NMCC has prepared a letter (with exhibits) explaining occupancy and lease duration. The letter is attached.*
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.*
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.*



Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning Comments

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. **Update 10.18.22** Please clearly note the location of bicycle and motorcycle parking spaced on the site plan.
 - a. *Stantec Response: Sheet C-101, Site Plan has been updated with the required information. See attached.*
11. 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.*
12. 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 – Code Enforcement Comments

1. Parking calculations still 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).
 - a. *Stantec Response: See Stantec response above to Comment number 6.*
2. Shared Parking Agreement must be submitted to the Zoning Permit Counter for review and then approved by the Planning Director. Signatures must be notarized prior to being recorded with the property – please contact us to discuss the process.
 - a. *Stantec Response: Noted.*
3. 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:*



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

Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning 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.

Development Review Board – 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.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Allen Whitaker".

Allen Whitaker, AIA
Principal
Phone: 202.230.7479
Allen.whitaker@stantec.com

Attachments: 2006 Approved Site Plan
A1-101, DRB Site Plan
A2-100, Building Elevations
NMPACT Project Rendering
C-101, Site Plan
NMCC letter dated Oct. 20, 2022
C-102, Solid Waste Plan
Parking Study
C-701, Landscape Plan