



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

September 28, 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 Planning – Case Comments
Project: PR-2022-007588
Application: SI-2022-01658

All:

Thank you for the preliminary Planning comments which we received on September 23, 2022. We understand that staff could have future comments and the Major Site Plan Amendment–DRB application is still under review. The following are our responses to the eleven (11) comments received. For ease of review we are repeating Planning comments (in plain font) and providing Stantec responses (in *italicized font*).

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 will revise and resubmit Sheet A1-100, Architectural Site Plan.*
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:*



Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments

- 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.*
 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 will be updated with the required information and resubmitted.*
 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



Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments

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: We have been made aware that the project site is within the Journal Center Employment Center where required parking may be reduced by 20%. Using this criterion, the available parking and the required parking are in closer alignment. See attached Parking Tabulation table.*
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 has a signed Parking Lease for sufficient spaces to cover the off-site parking requirement; see attached lease. The Owner 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 will be updated with the required information and resubmitted.*
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 will be updated with the required information and resubmitted.*
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: The project removes 2,900 SF of landscape planter and installs 2,930 SF of new landscape planter; a 30 SF increase. The site improvement area is 22,200 SF and the landscape planter area (@ 2,930 SF) is 13.2%. To achieve 15% would require elimination of more parking which is already a challenge for the project. We request exemption from this requirement because the project is only a small building addition with minor site adjustments.*
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.*



Robert Webb / Jolene Wolfley / Jay Rodenbeck

Page 4 of 4

Reference: Response to Development Review Board Planning – Case Comments

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

Attachments: A100, DRB Site Plan for Building Permit
NMPACT Rendering
A2-100, Building Elevations
C-102, Solid Waste Plan
Parking Tabulation Table
Parking Lease