



D E E P W A T E R P O I N T C O M P A N Y

TIMOTHY J. LEONARD
PRESIDENT

VIA E-MAIL

25 January 2022

Ryan Howser

ryanhowser@elpasoco.com

El Paso County Planning and Community Development
2880 International Circle, Ste. 110
Colorado Springs, CO. 80910

**RE: SDP Submittal Letter of Intent – Slim Chickens Restaurant
Falcon Marketplace, Lot 9**

Dear Ryan,

Please find attached our re-submittal for the Site Development Plan approval:

Land Owner: Evergreen – Meridian & Woodmen, LLC
Attn: Karen Levitt Ortiz
2390 E. Camelback Rd, Ste. 410
Phoenix, AZ. 85106
602-808-8600
klevittortiz@evgre.com

Applicant: WRG Investors, LLC dba. Slim Chickens
Attn: Rick Stucy
5450 Montana Vista Way., Ste. 200
Castle Rock, CO. 80108
303-378-1592
rick@trailstardev.com

Development Mgr: Deepwater Point Co
Attn: Tim Leonard
1153 Bergen Parkway, Ste. I-150
Evergreen, CO. 80439
303-674-7856
tim@deepwaterpoint.net

Engineer: Point Consulting, LLC
Attn: Jim Shipton, Mitch Shearer
8460 W. Ken Caryl Ave, Ste. 101
Littleton, CO 80128
720-258-6836

jshipton@pnt-llc.com, mshearer@pnt-llc.com
Location: 7535 Falcon Market Place (Lot 9), Falcon, CO 80831

Tax Parcel#: 5301403005

Land Size: 1.55 ac land

Zoning: Commercial Regional

Project and Use: Slim Chickens restaurant; 3,762 sf plus a 418 sf patio

Utilities: Utility stubs for water, sanitary sewer and gas have been provided by the developer on the north side of the parcel. Storm water will connect to the master development’s water quality and detention facilities. Woodmen Hills Metro District for water and wastewater, CSU for gas, and Mountain View Electric Assoc for electricity.

Request: Site plan approval for Slim Chickens restaurant with drive-thru, parking, and landscape.

Existing Land Use: Vacant undeveloped land.

Proposed Land Use: Slim Chickens restaurant with drive-thru, parking, and landscape within the Falcon Marketplace shopping center.

Land Development Code: Applicant expects to adhere to all the site planning conditions as required by the County’s Land Development Code.

Alternative Parking Request: 37 parking spaces vs 39 parking spaces.

Justification:

The calculation for 39 parking spaces uses exterior dimensions, including that of the 418 sf covered patio, but excludes a separate non-occupiable cooler area of 278 sf. All this area totals 3,902 sf.

Exterior Bldg footprint	3,762 sf
Exterior Patio footprint	418 sf
Gross footprint	4,180 sf
Less Cooler (non-occupiable)	- 278 sf
Total Gross Occupiable Area	3,902 sf

Exterior calculations = 39 parking spaces

These same areas, if measured using interior dimensions, total 3,578 sf and would therefore require 36 spaces.

Interior Bldg footprint	3,483 sf
Interior Patio footprint	373 sf
Gross footprint	3,856 sf
Less Cooler (non-occupiable)	- 278 sf
Total Interior Occupiable Area	3,578 sf

Interior calculations = 36 parking spaces

This difference of 3 parking spaces calculated just due to interior vs exterior dimension and removing the non-occupiable cooler space is of significance because the site has a large amount of land dedicated to storm water detention and can only park 37 spaces. This means we are one space extra (36 required and 37 provided) with one calculation method and two spaces short with the other.

To help justify the difference of two spaces, we have “added” one more available parking space, by adding a “order waiting space” on the outer edge of the exit drive-thru lane, so the waiting customer does not have to use a space in front of the store, but now will wait close to the pick-up window.

In addition to helping to lower the need for 39 spaces to 37 spaces, our queue line holds an above-average amount of cars. For this size of a restaurant, we can queue 15-17 cars with an 85-90% confidence of capacity. This queue is designed for up to 25 cars which means customers, seeing additional stacking capacity, will be more likely to opt to drive-thru than they will to park. Therefore, there will be less demand for 39 spaces than 37 spaces.

With both these design attributes – longer queue and additional waiting space – we would consider that 37 available spaces will not have any effect on parking different than 39 spaces would. Therefore, this alternative calculation of interior dimensions, with the current site plan design, accomplishes the purpose of proper and reasonable parking equally well as the calculation using exterior dimensions.

I might add that the accommodation of these two parking spaces does not alter any pedestrian connectivity or convenience, nor are there any changes from the visual or aesthetic impact from any

surrounding roadways or adjacent retailers, nor any physical impact to any alternative modes of transportation or any natural areas, landscape features or storm water systems; and handicap parking ratios are maintained.

Thank you for considering, and hopefully approving, this alternative parking plan to allow 37 parking spaces instead of 39.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. Leonard", is placed over a light gray rectangular background.

Timothy J. Leonard
President