

PLANNING COMMENTS & APPLICANT RESPONSES

HEARING DATE: 4/5/23

AGENDA ITEM: DFT Project Number: PR-2023-008423

Application Number: SI-2023-00606 Project Name: 4821 Pan American West – Lexus

Comments from: Planning Dept. Robert Webb/Jolene Wolfley DATE: 4/4/23

Request: Major Site Plan Amendment

COMMENT RESPONSES IN BLUE BY AYER DESIGN GROUP, BIRKIE AYER, JR., P.E. APRIL 13, 2023

1. This request is a major amendment of the site plan approval from 2000. Case history # 1000219. When a major amendment occurs, the site is subject to the requirements of IDO in place at the time the application is deemed complete.
 - a. One specific provision relates to updated site conditions for landscaping, screening and buffering:
 - b. 5-6(B)(1)(d) Renovation or redevelopment of an existing building containing multi-family, mixed-use, or non-residential development, including but not limited to reconstruction after fire, flood, or other damage, where the value of the renovation or redevelopment, indicated by building permits, is \$500,000 or more.
 - c. standards of NR-LM and the Use Specific Standards of Light Vehicle Sales.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

2. Specific site plan sheets are missing from the submittal: a utility plan, a landscape plan, and building elevations (color is preferred). The submittal checklist asks that the Site Plan and related drawings include a Site Plan Key of the sheets submitted.

RESPONSE: A complete set of proposed plans was submitted but not reviewed by Planning Staff including a utility plan, a landscape plan and building elevations. A key of sheets was included on the cover sheet, the first sheet of proposed plans.

3. A Signature Block for DFT staff members must be added to the Site Plan. The signature block can be obtained at the following link: [https://documents.cabq.gov/planning/development-facilitation-team/Site Plan Administrative DFT Signature Block.pdf](https://documents.cabq.gov/planning/development-facilitation-team/Site%20Plan%20Administrative%20DFT%20Signature%20Block.pdf)

RESPONSE: The correct signature block was included on both the Site Plan and the Cover sheet of the proposed plans.

4. Provide a justification letter to outline how you are meeting the IDO requirements, specifically IDO 6-5(G)(3). Include clarification that proposal is meeting the IDO standards

RESPONSE: A justification letter was included in the original submittal clarifying how the proposal meets the IDO Standards.

5. On the Site Plan sheets and elevations, clearly note areas of building additions and new landscaping with clarity about existing conditions.

RESPONSE: We have added a line on the site plan indicating the extent of the existing building such that staff can tell what constitutes the new addition. The landscape plan submitted clearly indicates existing vs. proposed plantings.

6. Sheet C02.0 should note NR-LM zoning on the subject site.

Note #3 in Site Design Data table on the Site Plan submitted indicates NR-LM zoning for the site. As requested by staff during our zoom meeting, we have added a redundant zoning label within the site boundary.

7. Is the parking area that was formerly a restaurant being added to this site plan? It appears so as the provided parking is listed as 162 spaces. If not, was it previously approved as a site plan for a parking lot and please provide that site plan?

RESPONSE: The parking area that was formerly a restaurant is not being added to this site plan, and the parking counts as submitted did not include the parking spaces on this separate parcel. Group 1 purchased these properties AFTER the redevelopment of the former restaurant parcel as a parking lot and was not involved in the permitting. However, we found a project number on an old plan provided by the former Owner, F17D102 & F17E102. This leads us to believe the parking lot was legally and properly developed through City of Albuquerque processes. We are not proposing any improvements to this parcel, although we will be adding sidewalk in front of this parcel in the NMDOT right-of-way.

8. Add the project and application numbers are added to plan sheets.

RESPONSE: Project and application numbers have been added to signature block on Cover Sheet and Site Plan.

9. All Plan sheets must be sealed and signed by the relevant design professional licensed in the State of New Mexico.

RESPONSE: All plan sheets that were originally submitted were sealed by relevant design professionals licensed in the State of New Mexico. Revised plans are also properly sealed.

10. Landscape Plans must be sealed and signed by a Landscape Architect licensed in the State of New Mexico.

RESPONSE: The submitted landscape plans were, in fact, sealed by a Landscape Architect licensed in the State of New Mexico as are the revised plans.

11. 5-6 Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening standards and requirements.
 - a. Plans will need to demonstrate compliance of landscaping requirements.
 - b. Provide calculations & detail. Please note that a minimum of 15 percent of the net lot area shall contain landscaping.
 - c. *Be aware of several sections related to new development -
 - d. 5-6-C General Landscaping, 5-6-D Required Street Trees, 5-6-F Parking Lot Landscaping, and 5-6-G Equipment/Support areas.

RESPONSE: We worked hard on our original submittal to meet these requirements and believe the plans submitted are in compliance. The landscape plan has not been revised except for a minor adjustment in the street tree spacing.

12. Check for and demonstrate compliance with section 7 of the DPM, Table 7.2.29, regarding Sidewalk width requirements and its landscape buffer.
 - a. This parcel is not in a Center nor a Special Corridor. The parcel is in an Area of Change and is surrounded by parcels also in an Area of Change.
 - b. Pan American West Fwy:
 - i. Major Collector requires 6ft Sidewalk and 5ft-6ft Landscape Buffer.
 - c. Long Range Trail Plan shows no Bikeway or Trail in this location.
 - d. *Verification per Transportation and Parks and Rec.

RESPONSE: We had shown the sidewalk with a 5 foot width, but since have revised the sidewalk to be 6 feet wide. The landscape buffer requirement is met. Transportation approved our plan, and we provided their approval in our initial submission. Parks and Rec. did not comment on bikeways or trail. Their only comment was to verify street tree spacing.

13. *Clarify existing easements noted in orange for AGIS map.

RESPONSE: The referenced easement was labeled on the existing conditions plan (survey) as a PNM Easement. We've added an additional label on the site plan to make it easier for staff to identify. This easement is not impacted by our proposed development.

14. A Signature Block for DFT staff members must be added to the Site Plan. The signature block can be obtained at the following link: [https://documents.cabq.gov/planning/development-facilitation-team/Site Plan Administrative DFT Signature Block.pdf](https://documents.cabq.gov/planning/development-facilitation-team/Site%20Plan%20Administrative%20DFT%20Signature%20Block.pdf)

RESPONSE: The requested signature block was already present on the Site Plan and remains there as well as the cover sheet as discussed during our Zoom meeting.

15. Please reference the following development standards from the IDO.
<https://www.caba.aov/planning/codes-policies-regulations/integrated-development-ordinance-l/integrated-development-ordinance> *Subject to change pending formal submittal or change in development type/use. Changes to site may require amendments to previous approvals.

RESPONSE: We are aware of no required amendments to previous approvals.

16. 4-2 Allowed Uses for NR-LM, table 4-2-1.
 - a. *Clarify Uses that will be Light Vehicle Sales compliance with Use Standards 4-3(D)(20) for Light Vehicle Sales.

RESPONSE: We comply.

- b. Please note that outdoor vehicle display is prohibited in the front 5- foot setback area. (See 20(d)).

RESPONSE: The parking stalls along the road frontage will be used for outdoor vehicle display and those stalls are outside of the front setback. There is an existing circular concrete display pad that we do not propose to remove. It is also outside of the front setback.

- c. Clarify uses that will be Light Vehicle Repair per 4-3(D)(19) and that those activities will be conducted within fully enclosed portions of buildings.

RESPONSE: The area of Light Vehicle Repair Use is listed on the site plan. The shop is the back part of the building, and the front part of the building contains the showroom and sales functions. All repair activities will be conducted within the fully enclosed portion of the building. We've added a note to the site plan to memorialize this.

- 17. 5-1 Dimension Standards for NR-LM. 5-1-G Exceptions and Encroachments. Required setbacks are shown below. Please show setbacks on plan sheet.
 - a. *Minimum 5 ft front setback.
 - b. * Side setback is 0 feet.
 - c. *Rear setback is 0 feet.

RESPONSE: These required setbacks were shown on the Site Plan submitted.

- 18. 5-3 Access & Connectivity requirements. Including, but not limited to -
 - a. 5-3(C) General Access and Circulation,
 - b. 5-3(D) Pedestrian Circulation
 - c. 5-3(E) Subdivision Access and Circulation.

RESPONSE: The Transportation submittal and approval was included in our first submission and it is our understanding that these requirements were included with that review.

- 19. 5-5 Parking & Loading requirements, Table 5-5-1
 - a. Plan sheets show 162 spaces are provided exceeding the required 52 spaces. If the parking area in the southeast corner of the site is not brought into the site plan, then the subject site needs to show it has 52 spaces or that a shared parking agreement is in place and recorded for the that southeast parking lot.

Light Vehicle Sales	15,635 GFA	2 spaces/ 1000 GFA	32
Light Vehicle Repair	19,400 GFA	1 space/1000 GFA	20
Required spaces			52 spaces

RESPONSE: The former restaurant parcel is not being brought into the site plan. The 180 parking spaces listed on the site plan do not include the 102 parking stalls on that separate parcel, Tract "B". We do not know if a shared parking agreement exists. Since our client owns both parcels, we don't think one exists, but we are researching this. If a shared parking agreement is not currently in place, we will produce and record one.

- 20. 5-7 Walls/Fences, table 5-7-1. * Development requires separate permitting.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

21. 5-8 for Outdoor Lighting requirements.

RESPONSE: Our electrical engineer prepared a photometric plan which complies with the ordinance and was included in our initial submittal.

22. 5-11 Building and facade design requirements.

- a. *Follow any site design standards from the original site plan. (The IDO does not have design standards for NR-LM at this location.)
- b. Demonstrate how plans are meeting these standards.

RESPONSE: The original site plan did not include building or façade design requirements and the IDO does not have design standards. However, the building will be attractive and does meet the requirements of Lexus, which is a luxury car brand with a high standard.

23. 5-12 for Signage requirements and restrictions.

- a. *Follow any site designed standards from the original site plan.

RESPONSE: Group 1 Automotive utilizes a national sign vendor who will make any signage permit applications separate from our site plan, but we acknowledge that existing design standards, if any, from the original site plan remain applicable.

24. Section 6-1, table 6-1-1 for public notice requirements.

RESPONSE: We've met the public notice requirements and included evidence of same in our original submission. We were informed that there were no neighborhood associations or property owner associations within the requisite distance of our project.

25. 7-1 Definitions for development, dwelling and Uses.

RESPONSE: It seems like this was just extra copy and paste text, but we acknowledge these definitions.