

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**New Castle, Colorado  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Wednesday, July 23, 2025, 7:00 PM**

**Call to Order**

Commission Chair Apostolik called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**Roll Call**

Present	Chair Apostolik
	Commissioner McDonald
	Commissioner Graham Riddile
	Commissioner Parks
	Commissioner Westerlind
	Commission Alternate Rittner
Absent	Commissioner Sass
	Commissioner Cotey

Also present at the meeting were Town Planner Paul Smith, Assistant Town Attorney Haley Carmer, Town Clerk Mindy Andis, Deputy Town Clerk Samantha Sorensen, and members of the public.

**Meeting Notice**

Deputy Clerk Sorensen verified that her office gave notice of the meeting in accordance with Resolution TC 2025-1.

**Conflicts of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest.

**Citizen Comments on Items NOT on the Agenda**

There were no citizen comments.

**Public Hearing (Continued from May 28, 2025)**

**Consider Resolution PZ 2025-2, A Resolution of the New Castle Planning and Zoning Commission Recommending Conditional Approval of a Final Subdivision Preliminary/Final PUD Development Plan Application for Riverside Park Lot 1**

Chair Apostolik reopened the public hearing at 7:02 PM for the continued consideration of Resolution PZ 2025-2.

Town Planner Paul Smith began by providing context for the continued hearing. He explained that the Coal Seam LLC team was represented by Abdi Pirzadeh, Lauren Prinz, Tom Stevens, and Caet May, and that this was a continuation from the May 28, 2025, meeting. Planner Smith reminded the commission that the project involves a 71-unit hotel, restaurant, 11 residential units, commercial space, and riverfront access on property located south of the Colorado River, adjacent to I-70 and the River Park condominiums.

1 Planner Smith stated that the purpose of the meeting was to get an update and  
2 discuss the progress of the application, acknowledging that the applicant has been  
3 actively working on addressing some of the conditions, questions, and concerns. He  
4 noted that more time would be required to complete the engineering components,  
5 suggesting continuation to a later date.  
6

7 Planner Smith directed the commission to his staff report (Exhibit A) and the updated  
8 site plan (Exhibit B). He reviewed the updates in the commission's packet, including his  
9 memo, the original resolution, and two site plans - the original and a new one  
10 submitted that day addressing parking concerns. He reminded everyone that this was  
11 a combined preliminary/final application requiring essentially a final plan for review.  
12

13 Planner Smith then summarized the main concerns from the May meeting, which were  
14 detailed in the conditions. These included questions about the shared parking  
15 agreement and whether there would be sufficient parking for a fully occupied hotel,  
16 restaurant use, and residences at night. There were also traffic ingress concerns  
17 regarding left turns into the property, as well as maintenance responsibilities for the  
18 emergency egress access serving River Park Condos. The rockfall berm design needed  
19 clarification, and there were questions about the completeness of civil engineering  
20 requirements.  
21

22 Planner Smith emphasized that as a final application, they were looking for a high level  
23 of completeness for engineering review, and that the engineering was not quite right  
24 at the May meeting. He acknowledged the applicant was working on this but noted it  
25 would likely be part of the continuation.  
26

27 Before turning the floor over to the applicant, Planner Smith outlined the commission's  
28 three options:

- 29 • Decide on the application as a preliminary only, with options to approve,  
30 approve with conditions, or deny
- 31 • Move forward as a final application and recommend approval with or without  
32 conditions, or recommend denial to council
- 33 • Continue the hearing once more without re-noticing  
34

35 Planner Smith indicated that the third option would best suit everyone involved at this  
36 point, clarifying that this would be the second and last continuation allowed before re-  
37 noticing would be required.  
38

39 Tom Stevens, project lead, provided a comprehensive update on their progress. He  
40 began by acknowledging that the biggest issue was parking. Mr. Stevens explained  
41 they had been wrestling with the parking ever since the last meeting, to the point  
42 where they reduced the program slightly. They reduced 1 residential unit and  
43 converted 2 retail spaces into commercial space to lower the required parking amount.  
44 He went on to say they had explored additional parking across the street, but it's  
45 located in the county, and they encountered some unforeseen issues.  
46

47 Mr. Stevens emphasized their commitment to addressing the parking concerns  
48 thoroughly, they determined the need for a rock-solid plan on parking. He announced

1 that with the slight reductions in program and increasing the size of the parking lot,  
2 they were able to get rid of the shared parking plan and the compact car spaces. As a  
3 result, they now slightly exceed the code requirement for this project on-site as it is.  
4

5 Regarding traffic concerns, Mr. Stevens reported that their traffic engineers had re-  
6 examined the project with the current program and again, they have come back and  
7 said that there is no need for a left turn lane in or exit turn lanes out. So, County Road  
8 335 is adequate the way it is.  
9

10 On the emergency access easement, Mr. Stevens explained they had removed parking  
11 and a trash enclosure from within the easement to keep it free and clear. He clarified  
12 that maintenance would likely fall to River Park Condos if they decided to improve it in  
13 the future, as it's there for their use only. Mr. Stevens also addressed the rockfall berm  
14 issue, explaining they had redesigned it to accommodate drainage along the entire  
15 north side of the asphalt paved path.  
16

17 The most significant challenge, Mr. Stevens acknowledged, was the incomplete civil  
18 engineering drawings. He candidly shared their difficulties: "I don't know if any of you  
19 are familiar with the workload of civil engineers in this area, but we're feeling the brunt  
20 of that right now. It's just brutally difficult to get information turned around in a  
21 hurry." He admitted that while he would have predicted completion in 30 days two  
22 months ago, they were now 60 days out and still not done. Mr. Stevens described it as  
23 "a global project" requiring Colorado-licensed engineering plans but needing global  
24 effort to complete.  
25

26 When asked about specifics, Mr. Stevens explained that they now exceed code by 13  
27 parking spaces. He described the changes to the parking layout on the west end of the  
28 property, noting they extended the parking lot to create double-loaded parking despite  
29 the additional cost of a retaining wall. He further articulated their rationale for  
30 presenting a parking plan that complies with code standards, especially after  
31 discovering that the other local hotel frequently operates at full capacity and often  
32 exceeds its parking allotment. When asked about the loss of snow storage, Mr.  
33 Stevens explained that snow will be trucked off site.  
34

35 Commissioner McDonald asked Planner Smith to expand on the civil engineering  
36 requirements and what was holding it up. Planner Smith explained the need for further  
37 clarification on a couple things such as road connections for County Road 335, and new  
38 drainage calculations. Ultimately the engineering needs to be clear so the commission  
39 does not approve plans that cannot be built. Mr. Stevens clarified that the delay is  
40 solely due to finding professional engineers available to commit time to the project.  
41

42 Planner Smith then displayed and discussed the proposed uses list (Exhibit A) for the  
43 PUD, explaining this was standard for PUD approvals. The applicants were asked to  
44 populate a list of uses they would potentially like to see on the property. The list was  
45 based on the C-1 downtown uses, and Planner Smith noted some uses like cannabis  
46 shops would need to be removed as they're not allowed in New Castle. He suggested  
47 the commission could provide direction on uses they wouldn't want to see, with further  
48 discussion at the continuation meeting.  
49

1 Several commissioners raised questions about specific uses. Commissioner Westerlind  
2 expressed concern about restaurants with drive-throughs, which Mr. Stevens stated  
3 was a use that would not work. Commissioner Rittner questioned entertainment  
4 venues and event uses, asking "how does that work as far as parking and flow of  
5 traffic?" Stevens clarified they were thinking of events like weddings or private parties  
6 where someone might rent the restaurant, with parking still being adequate for such  
7 uses.

8  
9 Planner Smith asked the applicants if they wanted to discuss affordable housing. Mr.  
10 Pirzadeh clarified they cannot afford to offer deed restricted or affordable housing, it  
11 would instead be workforce housing. Mr. Pirzadeh went on to explain that their  
12 employees would have the first right of refusal, then units would be made available to  
13 the Town staff. If employees did not fill the vacancies, they would then advertise on  
14 the open market.

15  
16 At 7:31 PM Chair Apostolik opened the meeting to public comment.

17  
18 Pam Whittington, a New Castle resident, asked for clarification on whether the housing  
19 would be rental units or for sale. The applicant confirmed it would be rental property.

20  
21 Cole Ule from 7999 County Road 312 addressed the commission about his property  
22 across from the development. He explained he had 5 acres of flat land available that  
23 could solve parking issues for multiple entities including the development, River Park  
24 Condos, and the park below. Ule stated that while the commission seemed accepting of  
25 this solution, it wasn't consistent with New Castle's comprehensive plan. He suggested  
26 that with town support, he could potentially get county approval for parking use  
27 through a special use permit rather than a full rezone. "I think with the amount of  
28 friction it's causing with the lack of parking over there, and I've got, like I said, a  
29 perfect situation to be able to remedy all of it in one shot," Ule explained.

30  
31 Planner Smith responded that parking, like the previously denied mini storage  
32 application, was not consistent with the comprehensive plan or county zoning. He  
33 noted it would require a rezone and demonstration of consistency. Planner Smith  
34 acknowledged the commission could make a case to council if they felt overflow  
35 parking was "absolutely necessary," but noted "it seems like we now have parking  
36 that's overflow."

37  
38 Chair Apostolik closed public comment at 7:38 PM.

39  
40 The commission then discussed timing for the continuation. Mr. Stevens explained  
41 their original goal of breaking ground in fall 2025 was no longer feasible, with a new  
42 target of spring 2026. After considering various factors including holidays and council  
43 scheduling, Mr. Stevens stated "our best guess is 4 months to be safe" for completing  
44 the engineering work.

45  
46 After deliberation, Stevens expressed preference for the December 10, 2025, meeting  
47 date, hoping to be through both council readings by mid to late January. Commissioner  
48 McDonald asked about the possibility of conditional approval at the November meeting

1 and advancing to council with engineering conditions. However, concerns were raised  
2 about engineering potentially changing the project design.  
3

4 **MOTION: Commissioner Riddile made a motion to continue to December 10,**  
5 **2025, Resolution PZ 2025-2, A Resolution of the New Castle Planning and**  
6 **Zoning Commission Recommending Conditional Approval of a Final**  
7 **Subdivision Preliminary/Final PUD Development Plan Application for**  
8 **Riverside Park Lot 1, along with a public hearing. Chair Apostolik seconded**  
9 **the motion, and it passed with a voice vote: Commissioner Westerlind: Yes,**  
10 **Chair Apostolik: Yes; Commissioner McDonald: Yes; Commission Alternate**  
11 **Rittner: Yes, Commissioner Parks: Yes; Commissioner G. Riddile: Yes.**  
12

### 13 **Comments/Reports**

#### 14 **Items for Next Planning and Zoning Agenda**

15 Planner Smith mentioned that while there was nothing specific for the next meeting,  
16 there were "some interesting conditional use permits coming up" that were very new.  
17  
18

#### 19 **Commission Comments and Reports**

20 Commissioner Parks reported that Down Valley Brewery's historic landmark  
21 designation was approved at the Historic Preservation Commission meeting on June  
22 23, 2025, and was on its way to council. He also noted that the cemetery dedication  
23 would go to council on August 19, 2025.  
24

#### 25 **Staff Reports**

26 No staff reports were presented.  
27

#### 28 **Review Minutes from Previous Meetings**

29 **MOTION: Chair Apostolik made a motion to approve May 28, 2025, meeting**  
30 **minutes. Commissioner G. Riddle seconded the motion, and it passed**  
31 **unanimously.**  
32

33 **MOTION: Chair Apostolik made a motion to adjourn the meeting.**

34 **Commissioner Westerlind seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.**  
35

36 The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.  
37

38 Respectfully Submitted,  
39  
40  
41

42 \_\_\_\_\_  
43 Chuck Apostolik, Commission Chair  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 \_\_\_\_\_  
49 Samantha Sorensen, Deputy Town Clerk

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

Exhibits

- Exhibit A – Staff Report for Coal Seam Preliminary/Final PUD, Lot Split, and Variance Application Resolution PZ 2025-02
- Exhibit B – Updated Site Plan

DRAFT