



**TOWN OF CARBONDALE  
511 COLORADO AVENUE  
CARBONDALE, CO 81623**

**Planning Department Pre-Application Meeting Summary**

**Meeting Date:** 1/19/24

**Project Description:** Construction of a new commercial restaurant building

**Applicant/Attendees:** Chester White, Property Owner; Yancy Nichol, Nick Kilbourn, Sopris Engineering; Forrest Lundgren, David Wirth, Ryan Lee, Forum Phi

**Property Location:** 522 Highway 133

**Zone District:** CRW

**Lot Size:** 26,442 sf

**Staff Present:** Jared Barnes, Kae McDonald

---

**DISCLAIMER**

The pre-application process is mandatory for most land use applications per Section 2.3.1 of the Unified Development Code (UDC). Information describing the proposed project shall be provided 10 business days in advance of the pre-application meeting. At the meeting, the applicant and staff should discuss the proposed development, applicable requirements and standards, and submittal documentation. The informal evaluation and recommendations provided by Staff shall not be considered binding. The Director may require an additional pre-application meeting if a complete application is not submitted within six months.

**Proposal**

The project proposes the construction of a new 2-story commercial restaurant building. The building footprint will measure approximately 3,500 SF and total building size will range between 4,500-5,000 SF. This pre-application meeting is subsequent to the original meeting on October 18, 2023. The Pre-Application packet provided to staff and reviewed during the Pre-App meeting includes a Vicinity Map and Site Plan.

**Discussion Topics and Feedback**

The pre-application meeting had the following discussion topics and comments:

Utilities: Yancy stated that he has been continuing due diligence and talking with Kevin Schorzman and Xcel Energy. There are several issues to be resolved:

1. Proposed connectivity from the Rio Grande Trail to Highway 133 via the southern edge of proposed parking may involve relocating the Excel power pole.

- a. Yancy noted that a permit will be required for ingress/egress along the Rio Grande Trail but based on experience is confident such a permit will be granted.
  - b. The applicant has committed to working with Carbondale Arts since the project is so close to the “Artway.”
2. Desire for a partnership with the Town to underground utilities along the Highway 133 corridor as the Town designs the Industry Way roundabout
  - a. Excel won’t accept a patchwork of above and below-ground configurations along any given length. A fee-in-lieu might also be an option considering the short length of the 522 Highway 133 project or there may possibly be a funding mechanism to assist with that process. Yancy still needs to follow up with the Public Works Director.
3. The transformer/pedestal and pole may need to be relocated to facilitate egress sight lines.
  - a. Staff is supportive of this as the public continues to raise concerns about the West Main transformer’s impact on sight lines.
4. Water/sewer/stormwater will require coordination with Town utilities.

Parking: Questions and comments from consultants for Town Staff:

1. The current site plan design proposes pushing the parking lot to the 0’ side yard setback.
2. Does RFTA allow surface bike parking within the Rio Grande Trail corridor?
  - a. Jared noted that there are examples of surface bike parking along the trail, but wasn’t sure if they were officially allowed. He recommended reaching out to RFTA to determine viability.
3. Will bike parking be considered as part of a parking reduction alternative compliance request?
  - a. Jared pointed out that the trade-off of bike parking in lieu of vehicle parking isn’t a favorable trade-off. He noted that there are more effective options such as highlighting the immediate area transportation amenities including the Rio Grande Trail and the RFTA Park-n-Ride (and providing employees with bus passes for alternative transportation) and emphasizing the site design difficulty for code compliance and potential loss of building square footage to satisfy the parking requirement.
  - b. The applicant asked about We-Cycle. Jared suggested contacting them directly to discuss options including a We-Cycle location (not sure that would be appropriate with the Park-N-Ride facility directly across the street) or providing capital funding similar to Basalt’s BCC project.
4. Will the Outdoor Seating ratio affect the parking requirements?
  - a. Jared stated that it would and the Applicant could discuss that in their alternative compliance request.
5. Elimination of landscape island?
  - a. The applicant commented that the northern portion of the site plan will have a fair amount of open space devoted to landscaping.

- b. Jared related that if the parking lot is screened well, the applicants might successfully argue for eliminating the parking island.

Access: Yancy noted that CDOT has reviewed their traffic study and may be willing to move access points. He also related that full movement for the property's intersection with Highway 133 is not considered a safety issue.

1. Timelines for the land use application process?

- a. Jared explained that although an Administrative Site Plan Review is a Staff action, it would be referred to the Planning & Zoning Commission in combination with the Alternative Compliance request for parking relief. If the Alternative Compliance request was only for a parking island, staff would be willing to consider that application.
- b. Jared noted that the fee-in-lieu request for undergrounding utilities would be referred to the Board of Trustees.