

SALIDA FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FLUM)

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY: ROUND 1

Introduction

The City of Salida is developing a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) – a tool to guide the type, intensity, and location of future development in Salida. It is intended to work in tandem with the principles and policies of the Salida Comprehensive Plan.

The City is developing a FLUM to:

- Establish a policy foundation for new zoning tools that are currently being considered as part of the ongoing Land Use Code update
- Address emerging thinking and community priorities:
 - Opportunities to support diverse housing options
 - Expansion of mixed-use development in targeted locations
 - More efficient use of existing land and available/planned infrastructure
 - Incremental growth in specific areas of the city
- Engage the community in an important discussion about where and how Salida could and should change in the future

The FLUM is supported by land use categories that describe the overall intent for each area and help “connect the dots” between Comprehensive Plan policies and the FLUM with regard to desired density, mix of uses/housing types, and distinguishing characteristics by area.

Land use categories fall into three groups:

- *Neighborhoods*
- *Mixed-Use Commercial and Employment Centers*
- *Other*

The draft FLUM reflects reasonable assumptions about future land use in City limits and municipal services area (MSA) based on current plans and commitments. Based on community input received, the draft FLUM will be refined and brought forward for further consideration as part of the Comprehensive Land Use Code Rewrite Process, which will be one of the primary mechanisms the City will use to implement community priorities embodied in the FLUM.

Who we Heard From

At least 75 Salida residents were engaged during the first round of outreach on the FLUM—75 attendees at the in-person Mappy Hour event on Wednesday, November 9th and another 20 online survey respondents. Participants at the Mappy Hour event were provided survey forms with the same questions (along with maps) and invited to provide feedback in-person. Approximately 25 of the the Mappy Hour event attendees provided written feedback.

Next Steps

Input received will be used to guide potential updates to Salida FLUM. Another round of community engagement will be held as part of the Land Use Code (LUC) rewrite process to allow community members the opportunity to review changes and provide additional feedback.

Comments from Mappy Hour Event

Wednesday, November 9th, 2022

LOW-INTENSITY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Existing lot sizes in these neighborhoods generally range from about 7,500 SF to 20,000 SF. Do you think slightly smaller lot sizes, slightly greater density, and attached single-family homes and duplexes (max 2 units) should be allowed in existing Low-Intensity Residential Neighborhoods to help expand housing options and sources of rental income for existing and future landowners?

- Yes, I think in some area we could have no limit.
- Full approval, low-intensity residential can be desirable, but the benefits of an increase in density are too great to ignore.
- I support higher density. We should be able to build ADU's and 35 ft and have a higher square foot of living space.
- Yes, although, I'd like to see the new houses not dwarf the originals.
- No
- Yes. Infrastructure is already present, and it is close to the Downtown Mixed-Use Area. Traffic calming should be used as needed.
- Any new construction should be higher density if possible. This makes sense.
- Yes, 100%.
- Yes, definitely
- Yes, smaller lot sizes should be encouraged or codified and incentivized with higher density to encourage.
- Please don't cram more into this small higher-end area. Sticking a 2 story ADU in a backyard impacts existing neighbors view and privacy, will affect their property value/surely the whole city does not have to be as dense as variable.
- Yes, more housing as close to downtown as possible. I think this would also allow land owners to subdivide and build additional units on existing land.
- Yes, but only if the rentals are focused on long term rentals. They should work to keep some of the charm but expand housing options
- Yes
- Yes, but more guidelines for new housing that requires a fit with current neighborhoods.
- Area of stability with slow changes
- There should be no single family (one building)
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes

- Yes, should be 2+adu
- Yes
- Yes if the expanded housing options include more affordable options for all.
- What is slightly greater density? Too much density will feel like front range or summit county. Duplex or triplex should be okay – people move here to get out of density or cities. If Salida gets too dense they will go to large country lots. No 2 units on a lot. Don't make Salida front range dense.

VARIABLE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

The Variable Residential Neighborhood designation supports an integrated mix of housing options in established areas, as well as in new neighborhoods. Do you think the expansion of this pattern makes sense in existing areas as infill and redevelopment occurs? What about for new neighborhoods on the fringe of town?

- Yes
- Mixed-use should be incorporated as often as possible, so at the very least one of these are available and close to regular residential areas, variable and integrated mix of housing gives character and flexibility. Great!
- Variable makes sense, infill. Parking constraints should be re-visited. I would support elimination of the # required parking areas. We need new neighborhoods at the fringe of town.
- It makes sense as long as the new forms match the existing forms. Building heights should be limited when views of iconic land forms would be affected. Each new neighborhood should be evaluated on its own. Traffic calming should be used as necessary. Floodplains should not be developed.
- I think that expansion of the pattern makes senses, however, the size of houses and the construction should be considered in light of the existing neighborhood. It is disheartening to have a beautiful home replaced by architectural nightmares.
- Yes
- Yes, regarding new neighborhoods on the outskirts. I prefer no minimum lot or house sizes (i.e. high density). And any mandatory open space should be at the outer edges.
- Variable residential neighborhoods should be expanded throughout Salida.
- Yes the integrated mix is nice – but there should be more parks!! Developers should incorporate more green and public spaces.
- I am in favor of this plan and higher-efficiency residential of fill-in and on the fringe. Lets get the most density as close to downtown as possible.
- Yes, although I think many of those could be upgraded to higher efficiency residential.
- VRN expansion makes sense as long as it allows density comparable as current R3. VRN or HTRN at fringes, hard to answer w/o specific examples or numbers. Add HERN from downtown to 7th and Spur?
- I think walkable neighborhoods with some basic shopping should accompany such neighborhoods.
- Sure
- These areas should be as close as possible to the center of city as possible.
- Yes

- Yes
- Yes to both
- Overall I think this is setup well. One main concern is that there are not very good massing standards. Currently you can build a 35' house next to a small house that ends up shading out and overwhelming the neighborhood character. I also ends up shading out and overwhelming the neighborhood character. I also think as more tall, newer buildings, are built, there may be community pushback against a very real need for increased density.
- City needs to think about having architectural standards (like Breckenridge has – no boxes) to mix in with current neighborhoods. Infill developments should compliment and fit in w current neighborhood. Again too much will not maintain “small town character”. You cant allow and remain a small town.

HIGHER-EFFICIENCY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Should opportunities for Higher Efficiency Residential Neighborhoods be encouraged where infill and redevelopment opportunities and infrastructure capacity are available? Given the high cost and low availability of land and housing, should new low-efficiency/low-density development be permitted in areas designated for higher-efficiency/higher-density development?

- Yes
- No. I would like to see an analysis of existing water and sewer infrastructure to confirm higher efficiency development would not challenge existing water and sewer capacity.
- Yes
- Yes, they should be encouraged where available. Unless higher density would be allowed outside the municipal boundary. Low density should not be permitted in these areas, we need more density close to town.
- No, we are pushing people out of their homes to replace them with large vacant vacation houses. Why would we contemplate this?
- Yes – Part 1. No – Part 2.
- Yes -1, No – 2
- Yes!! It should be encouraged, but low-efficiency should not be permitted in higher efficiency areas.
- High-efficiency is laudable and a worthy plan, but do all these new developments (as near Trailwinds in Poncha Springs – and along CR 140) have to look like boxes jammed in?? Ugly, no green around them. Too much concrete.
- No lets keep the density downtown, lets not sprawl! I currently live at F and 11th and my neighbors on both sides are second home owners and their homes sit empty 90% of the time. We do not want a vacant community, keep it dense!
- Yes, 100%! This should be a major focus and we should take care in expanding all these areas as much as we can. No to the second questions, that was misleading.
- 1 – Yes. 2 – The market will take care of this, don't worry about it. Standards for max lot size and min density are ok, but should still allow for variety.
- If this would increase affordable housing, yes.
- Yes
- These should be as close to the center of city as possible

- Yes – it should all stay mixed like it is now. Naturally evolving as needed, don't cordon off the poor folk.
- No, high density is crucial, low efficiency should only be tolerated if it helps bring costs down.
- Opportunities for high efficiency new neighborhoods should be allowed. New low efficiency/low density should only be allowed where individual lot owners can individually intensify by right – meaning things like HOA covenants shouldn't block intensification to subvert zoning.
- No not really
- No!
- Low availability of land = only so many seats in the theater. Just creating density is not what Salida is about. The developments by golf course are attractive – the ones on CR 160 are not (=density for density's sake = boxes)

MOBILE & MANUFACTURED HOME PARKS/NEIGHBORHOODS

Mobile & Manufactured Home Parks/Neighborhoods include the City's existing mobile home parks and other pockets of established affordable and workforce housing. Should steps be taken to ensure that existing affordable and workforce housing is retained or replaced with similar types of development (smaller, attached manufactured homes) as part of any future infill or redevelopment?

- Yes, although we do currently have mobile home parks on the river. That property is the most expensive and desirable in Salida. I don't know that it makes sense to retain manufactured home parks on expensive land.
- Let the market place determine the outcome.
- Yes
- Yes, but smaller stick-built should be allowed in addition to mobile homes. Lower min sq footage requirement in these areas. 600 sq ft?
- No
- Yes, it should be retained. Higher density modes should be encouraged wherever possible.
- Yes
- Absolutely
- Yes please retain existing manufactured housing at least or be allowed to replace with similar density and uses
- Yes – maintain mobile/ mfg home parks, but work to improve their appearance to better blend with variable res and adjacent housing. Encourage off street parking and guidelines/restrictions on number of vehicles per unit, reduce parking of recreational vehicles, rafts, boats, etc.
- Yes, this is key housing to the underrepresented senior community and labor force.
- Yes. We should work to keep these areas affordable.
- Yes – I would like to see more neighborhoods with restrictions on height and ADUs to preserve the small town feel of Salida.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes agree 100% - but where would this expansion be?
- Absolutely
- It can be, but shouldn't stop new housing from being built.

- Concern I have about limiting other uses is that owners of these properties may not be able to benefit from rising values if the only thing you can have is a manufactured home. Maybe allow SFR but not high density multifamily.
- Yes absolutely.
- This is a good way for true affordable housing (ownership/rental). Retain what we have because where else will those current occupants go? Protection.

NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED-USE

Should the existing mix of commercial and residential development along 1st Street and Oak Street be expanded through future infill and adaptive reuse? Are there other areas of Salida that could benefit from proximity to small, neighborhood-scale retail and office development? Do you see a measurable difference between future uses along Highway 50 and the future uses along Highway 291/1st Street/Oak Street?

- Yes
- Some limited expansion makes sense. Additional neighborhood and rental along route 50. Yes keep 29/oak st the way it is.
- Hwy 50 could have higher buildings and more auto oriented. 1st st should stay pedestrian and bike friendly.
- Hwy 50 and hwy 291 are different and should stay that way
- Yes, infill and adaptive reuse should be expanded. Other areas that could benefit would be the residential areas, areas that could benefit would be the residential areas near 50. I don't see a difference between the corridors, except for traffic speeds and safety, near Crest Academy.
- There is a big difference between 50 and 291/oak already. There is a school (crest academy) on 291 which should be considered for safety concerns. There should be a safe corridor both from Crest to town and between oak and the schools.
- Yes
- Yes hwy 50 should be more commercial/industrial but also needs to be accessible to walkers and rollers (wheelchairs, bikes, strollers, etc)
- Yes
- 1st and Oak – expand through infill yes. US 50 either truly tame 50 or don't intensify – building more auto centered uses will make traffic worse, but more development along 1st and Oak will allow much more of those now trips to be peds and bikes
- Yes expand mixed use and increase density
- Yes with the inclusion public preschools and children based services, continue to provide childcare support via business opportunities to support current and future growth, esp families and anticipated population growth of young people w/ families.
- Yes, 1st and Oak infill is a good idea and should be continued. Development like South Main in BV should be encouraged (mixed use). Yes, I see a difference between HWY 50 and 291/st st. HWY 50 should have more fast food/restaurants/bars/hotels/etc. 291/1st should not have these.
- Yes I like infill, adaptive reuse, and mixed-use. Difference with HWY 50 is its bigger and faster. 291/Oak should stay like it is – slow. Both need excellent provision for walking-both sides. De-emphasize cars and need for cars, make it safe and attractive.
- Yes I agree with these statements

- In the section that is 1st street north of the city there should be a mixed use and commercial development
- 1st and I are as abrupt transition from Gas Station and auto shop to residential. If the proposed softens that for the residents, then yes. 1st is the corridor but 2nd is often used, causing both to be super busy.
- Maybe I would need to learn more with regards to how more infill, etc, would impact the area. For example, water rights and enough electricity infrastructure is there or could be easily added and upgraded. Most in support of more infill but want to be sure to understand true costs and longterm impacts.
- Yes
- 1) Yes 2) Yes allow in VRN and HERN and let it happen naturally. 3) Absolutely HWY 50 is auto oriented while 291 has an opportunity to be mixed and ped friendly.
- Yes the areas along highway 50 and 1st make sense to have mixed use. Aother location could be HWY 50 , they are already using some of the space as that.
- Yes more commercial and residential development on 1 and Oak.
- Could use cleaners, restaurants, coffee shops, more groceries near west side and north on 291 beyond hospital.
- Yes, 1st/Oak street should be neighborhood commercial and highway 50 should be geared to auto oriented development.
- 1) Yes

COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL MIXED-USE

The Future 50 Corridor Plan envisions that portions of the Highway 50 (Rainbow Boulevard) corridor will redevelop into walkable areas over time. Do you support the concept of transforming auto-oriented uses at key nodes along the corridor to higher density mixed-use centers?

- It may work in small pockets, but the scale of in the 50 corridor will not be conducive to a walkable space
- Yes, I would support a variety of options in the 50 corridor.
- Yes but not clear on what that vision is. Please give more examples.
- Too wide of an area on SE side of town (Big O Tire), that should be neighborhood mixed use or Downtown Mixed Use to support development of Vandaveer
- I do support the concept. There are already bike lanes and sidewalks, and great views. Traffic calming and safety should be considered.
- Absolutely, we live in the area close to 50 and would love to see a focus on providing some better pedestrian access to a mixed-use area. It feels very industrial in the 3 blocks off 50, a higher density/mixed use area would be lovely.
- Yes
- Yes as long as the goal is increased walkability. More people have to walk, its not a choice.
- It wont be meaningful unless its at a scale that turns 50 to two lanes and “chicken” lane. Unless youll go the whole way, don’t divert the attention from 1st and oak.
- Yes high density pedestrian centers
- Only if walking/multi use options continue to be provided. Continue to develop access points for non-vehicle travel, especially for kids!

- Yes HWY 50 more walkable and bicycle friendly. This would have to be dense w/ tracks and open space/parks to keep the area livable. HWY 50 needs to remain 2 lanes each direction, but speed limits should be reduced.
- Yes we must support and encourage. Multi modes of transportation. We must expand our trails and make our connections. HWY 50 can be a highway, but it can also be more walker/biker friendly and more attractive visually.
- Yes... but... I support entire corridor from Walmart to 291 have a safe walking corridor.
- Yes
- Yes slow traffic as much as legally possible to make 50 walkable/bikeable
- Yes as long as HWY – Feds are to play nicely. Have we thought about all the CDOT implications tied to this development related access, snow removal, etc. Im very supportive but want to make sure we've thought everything through.
- Yes
- Yes, but the highway must be tamed before we can reasonably expect higher quality mixed use development. The other side of this problem is that, currently, too much land is signed commercial. Low-value commercial land creates low quality development, e.g. conex storage and gravel lot next to Ace
- Yes it feels very industrial today and could benefit from more mixed-use areas.
- Yes – walking and bike lanes would be great on protected 50. Yes – for people with disabilities.
- Yes – I like the idea of mixed-use nodes. Spread out some retail, relieve parking crunch downtown.
- Yes
- Yes

DOWNTOWN MIXED-USE

Do you support the intensification of the “edges” of downtown to accommodate more efficient housing? Would you support incentivizing more residential opportunities (e.g. increased density/up to 4 stories) within the downtown core, esp. if it included a greater percentage of deed-restricted affordable units?

- No fee for ADUs
- Yes
- Minimum unit size should be smaller
- Yes, or 5 stories. But, if you look at the surf hotel in BV, it works because of its beautiful design. I do not think the community would be happy with modern 5 story condos similar to Denver.
- Yes. I don't support greater height. I don't support additional deed-restricted units. I would like to see alternatives to the inclusionary housing questions, including city leasing land
- 3 stories max in downtown core
- Yes
- Yes, although a high percentage should be affordable. We don't need more high priced housing near the majority of services jobs.
- No, although historically there have been 4 story buildings there is currently a problem of residents losing their views of the mountains. I have had many conversations about the loss of views due to large buildings being put up adjacent to houses are historical.

- Yes! Density is important to keep costs of building down and to make services located closer to housing
- Yes for sure
- Yes, deed restrictions not necessary
- Yes
- What about parking for this development? How will this affect traffic, tourists, and city flow?
- No, multi story should only remain in the core of downtown or in/along hwy 50/hwy 291. Neighborhoods and homes should not have to worry about a 4 story building going in next to them.
- Yes
- Only if more than 50% is “affordable” meaning a single parent in the service industry could reasonably afford.
- Yes intensity should be centered near downtown
- Yes increase height and density
- Yes happy to support more infill so long as we’ve talked through infrastructure.
- 4 stories could compromise neighborhoods views o mountains and the same time I could support some limited increased density
- Yes
- Yes 100% this is the main reason I came today!
- Yes – the key is deed-restricted/rent control
- Where will there be parking for the higher-density residential areas? Don’t go very high, the charm of Salida is views of mountains in every direction
- Yes!
- Yes

INDUSTRIAL

Does Salida need additional space for industrial businesses (e.g., business or industrial parks) outside of the existing city limits and within the Municipal Services Area (MSA) or even the Municipal Planning Area (MPA)? Do you agree with the potential opportunities for future industrial activities shown on the FLUM?

- Small, quirky, weird (more affordable)
- Outside the FLUM. Not on the monarch spur trail.
- Need to look at this more closely to provide proper feedback. Set-a-sides for industrial areas makes sense for longterm sustainability. I do want to protect agricultural uses for longterm sustainability.
- Are there requests for industrial permits? It would be good to balance (a little) the tourism economy.
- Yes
- Industrial uses which do not pollute the air or create excessive noise should not be encouraged near residential areas.
- I cant answer this

- Yes
- I agree to the idea of future industrial/commercial projects outside city limits.
- There should be somewhere industry can go by right
- No
- Depends on what is being proposed and what is anticipated, this sounds like another topic. What is permitted and what industrial business will be permitted.
- No
- I don't know if it needs additional space for industrial uses, but if so – those neighborhood should also be multi-modal and be as attractive as possible, with green space. Transportation friendly.
- Yes, so long as air/light pollution is considered and restricted
- Light industry, live/work, creative spaces
- Yes I believe we want to continue to grow and attract light industrial businesses and services. Not sure
- Yes, if traffic issues addressed with limited impact on neighborhoods.
- Allow light industrial everywhere (“maker”. Other than that, it can go to unincorporated areas
- I don't think within city limits, there seems to be a lot of open space in county to develop more
- How about industrial by the airport and that road. No industrial along the bike path. The chemicals from the cabinet shop are already a bad match to children riding bikes.
- Yes
- Yes, industrial land should be set aside.
- It seems like industrial should be on HWY 50 or smelertown

GENERAL

Do you agree with the general direction proposed for the FLUM? Do you have other comments?

- More modern is okay, don't want it to be too “precious”
- Break up massing (but need to be careful)
- Parks need to be in higher density areas
- Possibly take away the maximum # of units on a lot. I believe micro units could help address the affordable housing issues
- Also, letting full-time residents short-term rent their primary residence. That could have the effect of diluting the current AirBnB pool.
- Consider industrial set aside for solar, wind, and small modular reactors.
- Yes, I like treating 50+29 differently. Keep 291 walkable.
- Agricultural lands or prime growing spaces should be treated as such and not considered placeholders for development. Where will our food come from?
- It does look like a common-sense approach given the increase in population. Floodplains and viewsheds need to be preserved and considered when changing land uses. Thank you for a well-preserved opportunity to gather input.
- I do agree for the most part. I am most concerned about the safety of Oak St. Anything we can do to make it more pedestrian friendly and to calm traffic would be appreciated.

- Thank you for your thoughtful proposal.
- One more comment: please teach developers and new home builders not to scrape the very valuable, naturally-adapted, highly functioning natural ground cover. So inefficient to scrape.
- Please limit STRs – I know you passed now must be chaffee county owners. Can you limit the number of years each STR can have their license? STR are a huge problem.
- Please try to keep heavy industrial trucks off of Oak st. Remember the high percentage of older adults who reside in Salida, many of whom no longer drive. Consider future transportation needs
- Yes, overall really good direction. I see a lot of “strong town” concepts. I think biggest hurdle is going to be education the community and helping us see the benefits of high density.
- Should have ring “high efficiency” residential neighborhoods for 1 or 2 block ring around the neighborhood mixed-use ring around downtown.
- Yes
- Continue to include opportunity to add to growth into the equation
- Yes I generally agree. There does need to be more pocket park area identified. More trail corridors/walk/bike needs to be identified.
- Yes but the agricultural, undeveloped reserve, is an absolute treasure! To have this beauty, peace, space, and habitat for birds, etc right in town is a treasure and very few towns are so lucky to have this. This land should remain as it is. Its got the trail through it already – its very important. Don’t ever develop it, please please please.
- The riverfront ecology and public access along the entirety of the riverbanks must be protected.
- I have not heard anything about preserving the character of Salida’s older downtown neighborhoods. A good example is the “Sackett’s Overlay” along east second and third streets. We have seen a number of “accessory dwellings” introduced on these beautiful historic neighborhoods.
- Proactively identify large needs like downtown hotel, higher ed campus, innovation zone, senior living, etc and identify future locations now before it is completely impossible.
- Yes I would like to see the downtown further protected as a true economic driver. Some housing, hotels, B&Bs, but a good use of small business, eateries, coffee shops, etc. Is there room for light downtown camping or glamping.
- Yes though my knowledge is limited. What about transportation? Fewer cars better, how would this be accommodated.
- Eliminate commercial zoning wherever commercial use is not consistently established, to create higher value for higher quality development. Anxious to see #s.
- Yes, generally, I feel there should be an even greater push for high efficiency housing in areas down HWY 50 by CR 105 by the river
- Please consider the underrepresented community members that can not be here tonight – the elderly, the working class, the disabled. In salida the voices of developers and real estate agents are often louder than people struggling to live.
- Walkable downtown is great, but salida has visitors and shoppers from a wide geographic area. We need parking spaces and not all parallel parking please! Glad to walk in town, but I need to drive to get there first. So do our tourists.
- Yes, have you considered a form based code?
- Keep open spaces open.

Online Survey Results

Online survey open from November 18 to December 19, 2022.

LOW-INTENSITY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Existing lot sizes in these neighborhoods generally range from about 7,500 SF to 20,000 SF. Do you think slightly smaller lot sizes, slightly greater density, and attached single-family homes and duplexes (max 2 units) should be allowed in existing Low-Intensity Residential Neighborhoods to help expand housing options and sources of rental income for existing and future landowners?

- Yes, absolutely.
- As the historic mesa neighborhood is largely reflective of the rest of Salida's older neighborhoods, it makes sense to allow slightly increased density and subdividing of existing lots there to allow for expanded housing options.
- Yes. The land around the open area of the golf course, and the two small parks, make this low density area ideal for creating more higher density housing. The "character" of a neighborhood can be maintained by not permitting multi storied high density housing/duplexes.
- Yes
- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- Yes
- Yes
- no
- No. I think we should keep some of the larger lot qualities and reassess in 10 years. Architecture and demand might be very different.
- No
- No
- Yes
- I do not think so. I think these should remain low density and not promote rentals. They serve a different purpose: long-term ownership and stability for the city. There are sufficient other areas for more rentals and duplexes.
- Yes. I also think the golf course should be turned into residential. It is foolish to have that much space, used by so few, so close to down town
- Yes. I'm all for higher density in town to avoid sprawl
- Seems the kind of thing we would want to happen faster rather than slower. this is where the space is. "Gradual" is how we got the mess we are in.
- yes
- Yes. I am coming around to the reality that this has to be part of the solution. I appreciated the lengthy article in the MountainMail last week.
- Yes but I do not think we should continue to expand out and new low-intensity neighborhoods. Let the existing ones become denser and don't add any more outside the city.
- No
- Yes

VARIABLE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

The Variable Residential Neighborhood designation supports an integrated mix of housing options in established areas, as well as in new neighborhoods. Do you think the expansion of this pattern makes sense in existing areas as infill and redevelopment occurs? What about for new neighborhoods on the fringe of town?

- Yes. I do think it should be curtailed a bit in more-sensitive areas (Hollywood, Methodist Mountain), but permitted/encouraged almost everywhere else.
- The character of Salida's historic residential neighborhoods is part of it's charm. Blending housing types and therefore neighborhood median incomes is proven to increase stability and foster a greater sense of community. Expanding and protecting this pattern should be a priority.
- It does not make sense to infill and redevelop in many existing/older neighborhoods. A myriad of problems arise when trying to support higher density housing as infill and redevelopment in established aka ""older"" areas: 1. parking will be an issue in the older neighborhoods. On street parking is already congesting roadways. 2. The existing water and sewage systems cannot support the additional demands of higher density housing. 3. The character and livability of older neighborhoods will be lost when multi story high density housing is built obscuring views, adding more noise pollution, more light pollution, and bringing in more vehicles -making it less safe for our kids to walk/bike to school. Adding higher density housing in the new neighborhoods, on the fringe of town, makes more sense. When new neighborhoods are built, planning can include adequate parking, and improved sewage, and water facilities to handle the higher density use. In new build areas, codes could support dark skies compliant lighting, adequate green spaces such as new public parks, and limits on the allowed number of stories per.
- Yes to both
- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- Both are good ideas and individual lot plans will still be reviewed by Planning commission and up for approval by city council.
- Yes
- no
- Yes, however we need more parks. I live in Two Rivers and they are increasing density without increasing parks and open space.
- Existing- no, New- yes
- Not in existing areas. Potentially on the Fringe.
- Yes
- Yes this is a good goal. But allow some fringe areas to have large lots too—that is part of the character of rural life. You want to be sure to attract those who CAN afford more space—to have a strong mix of income levels. Higher income buyers provide significant community support and investment.
- Yes. I think it is critical that the new neighborhoods contain neighborhood business to allow people to shop without getting in their cars
- Yes. We need lots of types of housing for the residence of Salida

- There really isn't much space in the core area. I actually think that the new neighborhoods should have far more flexibility to experiment than the core. Should be two different zones. Redevelopment/Infill is different animal than new developments.
- yes to both
- I agree it makes sense. I would like to see housing that fits with the town's character but doubt that will happen. New neighborhoods on the fringe of town sound good especially if bike and walking paths are provided.
- Yes, I think having mixed housing options makes sense.
- Yes as infill if it fits with the existing neighborhood.
- As long as the existing overlays in existing residential neighborhoods are protected. New neighborhoods, on the fringe, might allow for greater density.

HIGHER-EFFICIENCY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Should opportunities for Higher Efficiency Residential Neighborhoods be encouraged where infill and redevelopment opportunities and infrastructure capacity are available? Given the high cost and low availability of land and housing, should new low-efficiency/low-density development be permitted in areas designated for higher-efficiency/higher-density development?

- Allowing low-density development in the very limited areas in which high-density is suitable/doable is catering to exactly one type of [extremely wealthy] person and ignoring the needs, desires, and direction of the community.
- With appropriate guidance in the updated Land Use / Development Code to dictate building types and character, pedestrian facing buildings in this category should certainly be encouraged.
- Encouraging high density housing for Infill and redevelopment in older neighborhoods creates many problems that will be expensive to solve: 1. Safety for kids to walk, bike to school impacted by more vehicles, 2. inadequate parking leading to on street congestion, creating poor visibility and greater chance of vehicle pedestrian accidents, 3. light pollution, 4. noise pollution, 5. strain on old outdated sewer system. Low density development as an in kind replacement/improvement/rebuild of an older home should be permitted. It would be a mistake to have all of old Salida houses be replaced by duplexes or condos, or even completely crowded by such structures. It seems preferable to allow the building of single family homes in town than have low density sprawl overtaking the entire valley and up the hillsides.
- Yes to both
- No
- No
- No
- yes
- Yes.
- Yes
- Yes No
- Yes. More land could be designated Higher-Efficiency to account for some of that land not being used with high density. For example, if you are allowed to build three units on a lot, I do not think you should be required to build three units. It should be maximum density, not max and min density.

- Perhaps in some areas. But high density is a priority.
- Yes
- Yes. I am in favor of incentives for affordable housing options
- I don't know what "higher efficiency development" is? Is that the same as High density? This is a very confusing zone and there is no identified location? What is the point of this?
- yes to the first, no to the second
- I think it's time to focus on higher-efficiency and restrict lower-efficiency when possible.
- Yes, these opportunities should be encouraged. The infrastructure is there, and we don't need to spread out and add new infrastructure when we have good infrastructure already. Save the open country, keep it open. Besides, when you build out roads into the county, eventually people living on them want them to be paved and complain about maintenance.
- Yes along highways such as US 50, HWY 291 and other densely populated areas and/or areas with business locations.
- Care must be given to not 'over develop' density in existing neighborhoods. Where there is vacant available land, near infrastructure, higher density should be considered.

MOBILE & MANUFACTURED HOME PARKS/NEIGHBORHOODS

Mobile & Manufactured Home Parks/Neighborhoods include the City's existing mobile home parks and other pockets of established affordable and workforce housing. Should steps be taken to ensure that existing affordable and workforce housing is retained or replaced with similar types of development (smaller, attached manufactured homes) as part of any future infill or redevelopment?

- I don't think it necessarily needs to be the exact same type of housing, but it should still be affordable or attainable via some combination of methods, including smaller units (e.g. condos, apartments), manufactured homes (e.g. Fading West/The Farm), even tiny homes. I think replacing effective "trailer parks" with the same thing doesn't serve the community in the long run, as the lifespan on that type of unit is significantly shorter than other forms of housing such that we'll be having this same discussion 20 years from now.
- These neighborhood are vital to retain some semblance of affordable housing.
- Yes. Existing affordable, or higher density housing should be retained, or rebuilt in kind.
- Yes
- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- Keep affordable and livable.Mixed use
- Yes
- yes
- Yes. 100%
- Yes
- Yes
- I don't think so. If I owned a mobile home park on the river, I do not think I should be forced to keep that extremely valuable property a mobile home park. Historically, the least valuable property would be used as manufactured home parks. Much of that land has changed value.
- Yes. But design these areas to fit in. Not be the helter skelter eyesores we have in so many areas—like on HWY 50 in Poncha Springs, or on the SE section of Salida.

- Yes. However, we need to make sure that dwellings are properly maintained
- Yes. I work with many people who live in these neighborhoods and they would be forced out of Salida if they were not protected. Many of these families grew up in Salida.
- The horse has left the barn.
- Affordability through small size and HUD buildings should be allowed everywhere, not confined to a certain district.
- Yes
- Absolutely and let's add more cute and quiet mobile home neighborhoods.
- Yes
- There is a big difference between mobile and manufactured. I would like to see consideration for tiny homes in this zone. Not a fan of mobiles but replacing them with smaller manufactured or tiny homes might be useful to protect workforce availability, particularly if they are permanently deed restricted and rentals (as opposed to owned).

NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED-USE

Should the existing mix of commercial and residential development along 1st Street and Oak Street be expanded through future infill and adaptive reuse? Are there other areas of Salida that could benefit from proximity to small, neighborhood-scale retail and office development? Do you see a measurable difference between future uses along Highway 50 and the future uses along Highway 291/1st Street/Oak Street?

- Highway 50 is, reasonably so, the industrial-commercial corridor. That's where our Applebee's will go. The 291/1st/Oak corridor should be a mix of commercial/residential that begets the feel of downtown Salida rather than the feel of Powers Boulevard in Colorado Springs.
- Highway 50 lends itself more toward auto-oriented commercial development, while 291 / 1st St. / Oak Street should retain a pedestrian focused character. Mixed use development in both areas is key, but as 291 runs through the heart of Downtown retaining the walkability and pedestrian focus of the neighborhood is vital.
- "- The mix of commercial and residential development along 1st and Oak seems an appropriate area for infill - realizing that the 1st street area will present infrastructure challenges, not presented by infill on Oak closer to hwy 50.
- - Most all of Salida already has proximity to small, neighborhood scale retail, and office areas.
- - Yes, there is a measurable difference between future uses along Hwy 50, vs 291/1st/Oak. Hwy 50 has a speed limit of 45 mph and is the major artery carrying vehicle traffic past/through Salida. Oak/1st/291 serves a greater number of pedestrians and bike users, has a lower speed limit, and should not be an artery for through trucks and other pass through traffic. Traveling on G, or on the Monarch spur by foot or bike and crossing 1st is already exciting enough! Less vehicle traffic, not more, would be preferable for downtown."
- Yes to the first. Unsure on next 2
- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- Mixed use creates and sustains neighborhoods. Certainly 1st/Oak Street has more neighborhood feeling than mainly commercial Hwy 50. Both can exist.
- Yes. Small retail mixed use would improve areas along 50, oak and first

- no
- We need better hike paths and a better buffer between sidewalks and traffic.
- Yes to first question Not sure on other areas. No difference between 50/Oak
- YES Don't know Yes
- Yes to expansion, infill and adaptive reuse.
- Hwy 50 needs beautification!!! Not a pleasant front door for Salida. Ponch Springs needs to fix up their stretch too. We need more businesses spreading out the retail options. And need more parking in downtown. I hate parallel parking. Also need more traffic lights on 50—very hard to pull out, especially to turn left. Need more 4-way stops—very hard to see around parked trucks everywhere.
- I don't think there should be additional businesses only 291 between I and M streets
- Yes...291 and Hwy 50 have very different feels and the zoning should reflect that I am in agreement for the mixed use neighborhoods on 291
- Retail is dead. Look downtown. Why try to force people to build it? Focus on residential.
- 1. yes. 2. yes, allow these things in HRN/VRN and see where they occur. Won't happen until relatively high density gets built out to support it. 3. Absolutely different. Hwy 50 is auto-oriented until major highway redesign occurs. 291 has a chance to develop in a ped-friendly manner if highway redesign is done properly with on-street parking, wide sidewalks, street trees, alley access, parking lots behind buildings, etc.
- Highway 291/1st Street/Oak Street has a lower speed limit which is more conducive to focusing on permanent or semi-permanent resident needs where the Highway is a higher speed limit and could focus on locals and people travelling.
- Yes, neighborhood mixed-use is nice. It enables people to gather and socialize and get stuff done without having to drive too far. Add in some green spaces and natural scenic beauty and it's a win-win.
- Yes along 1st Street if it fits with existing neighborhoods. Yes along HWY 50 with high density and mixed with commercial.
- Highway 50 is very different than 291/Oak. Would like to see Oak continue to support a mix of residential and light commercial. It is close enough to the town center to negate neighborhood retail. That mix would better serve the community off of highway 50.

COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL MIXED-USE

The Future 50 Corridor Plan envisions that portions of the Highway 50 (Rainbow Boulevard) corridor will redevelop into walkable areas over time. Do you support the concept of transforming auto-oriented uses at key nodes along the corridor to higher density mixed-use centers?

- Please, for the love of John Wesley Powell, get this town out of the 20th century and get rid of auto-centric development.
- Certainly.
- Walkable areas are always preferable to vehicle centered areas. But, is it realistic to plan for hwy 50, the main thoroughfare past/through Salida, to become walkable? That would be an amazing accomplishment. Measures would need to be taken to discourage the diversion of through traffic from 50 to the Oak/1st/291 corridor. Unfortunately that unwanted diversion of vehicle traffic is a real concern, because as a first step, the speed limit on 50 would have to be lowered. I

do support transforming key nodes along hwy 50 to higher density mixed used centers. Traffic slowing, and calming occurs naturally when buildings are brought closer to the sidewalk edges.

- Yes
- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- That would be interesting to see and I support the effort. I would support
- Yes. 50 is currently unsafe to bike or cross. Much more can be done to improve pedestrian access, slow traffic and encourage businesses development
- no
- Yes 100%
- 100 percent yes!
- Yes
- I do not see HWY50 ever becoming a walkable area. Strip malls and heavy traffic on a wide road are not conducive to walking areas. 1st/Oak is completely different from HWY50.
- I filled out much of this at the community meeting. This survey is awfully long. Yes
- Yes. There needs to be better pedestrian access to the far side of 50. There need to be improvements to the intersections between 50 and the “letter” streets
- Yes. Please help with HWY 50!
- Seems like this is the area to let people go higher than 35 feet, and the only good spot for it.
- Yes, but the highway needs to be redesigned first in order to attract walkable redevelopment.
- I support higher density.
- Absolutely. Encourage non-motorized movement, make it possible, make it easier, make it safer, and CONNECT these trails. Don't favor automobiles. They're loud, dangerous, and stinky. They're great, but they have their place. Let's not fall into the same trap every other discovered mountain town does--gets ruined by car traffic, cars dominate, everyone adapts I guess but the sweet little quiet mountain town is no more.
- Yes, but it is also important to keep 2 lanes of traffic in each direction (4 lanes total).
- Yes

DOWNTOWN MIXED-USE

Do you support the intensification of the “edges” of downtown to accommodate more efficient housing? Would you support incentivizing more residential opportunities (e.g. increased density/up to 4 stories) within the downtown core, esp. if it included a greater percentage of deed-restricted affordable units?

- Yes. Highest density should be downtown, including a bit of height increase from the 2-stories we have. But the edges of downtown could go from 1 to 2, or 2 to 3 in some places easily.
- Yes.
- No. Building 4 story, high density housing on the edges of downtown creates more problems than it solves. Where will all these new downtown residents park their cars? When will the water and sewage systems be upgraded to handle this extra demand? How will 4 stories of residents feel about downtown music, events, parades? Downtown would be better served by expanding walkable areas, investing in public transportation (to alleviate downtown car congestion and parking issues). There is precedent for creating walking sidewalks, and biking

sidewalks (e.g. Copenhagen) as a means of keeping both pedestrians and bikers safe. We have an opportunity to expand on a safe, walkable downtown area. Let us not create an overcrowded residential area demanding more parking, sewage and other infrastructure when our businesses need that support.

- Yes
- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- I would support such development as I prefer density over sprawl.
- Yes
- NO
- No, we should not have 4 story buildings, this changes the quality of our town.
- Yes
- NO NO
- Yes, but not through deed restriction. I feel that deed restriction is not good for those in need. It takes away the one wealth building avenue for those who need it most.
- Prefer to keep at 3 stories. Not 4
- Yes
- Yes
- People hate living downtown. There is no parking. It is loud. You need to do a lot for downtown before people will want to spend what it takes to build there.
- yes and yes
- Yes.
- Sure! I'd love to live downtown or on the edge of downtown if I could.
- No
- Yes, on intensification on the 'edges' but no on the 4 stories unless it is within the boundaries of the historic downtown area and matches the look and feel.

INDUSTRIAL

Does Salida need additional space for industrial businesses (e.g., business or industrial parks) outside of the existing city limits and within the Municipal Services Area (MSA) or even the Municipal Planning Area (MPA)? Do you agree with the potential opportunities for future industrial activities shown on the FLUM?

- Absolutely not. Poncha, BV, and the County are willingly accepting industrial operations that can provide the necessary industrial needs for this area without using valuable land for often-extractive purposes.
- What about potential redevelopment of the CalCo plant as a business / light industrial building?
- Industrial parks can easily become an eye sore, space that encourages homeless encampment, and an area that requires increased policing. Is it possible for Salida to funnel any such future needs into the Smelertown area that is already industrial? It seems counterintuitive to commit waterfront property (an ideal location for high density, mixed use development) to industrial uses.
- No

- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- With outcome being jobs and services I support the industrial parks concept. Require walking paths and people friendly inclusions.
- Sure
- no
- I am not sure.
- Yes. They will bring or provide jobs
- YES YES
- I have not researched this enough to answer thoughtfully.
- Yes
- I don't think industrial use area should be expanded
- MOre residential, less industrial in town. Look to Smelertown.
- Smelertown and CR175 are fine places for industrial.
- Don't know enough to answer.
- I do not know about this, but it sure would be great if the development didn't ruin the landscape--there should be built-up berms and tree-plantings and other landscaping to keep our industrial areas from looking awful.
- I think too much industrial is noted in the south/central portion of the below noted map. Make it smaller.
- Keep industrial outside the city limits or on the highway 50 zone. Heavy industrial does not seem practical in our small rural community.

GENERAL

Do you agree with the general direction proposed for the FLUM? Do you have other comments?

- Make the F Street closure permanent for fuck's sake.
- As the rail right of way north of the river is already heavily impacted by historic industry, it seems logical to consider that area as mixed use / light industrial. Certainly limits should be consider as it's adjacent to the bulk of access to open space and trails, but the elimination of the rail line seems doubtful so zoning for potential future rail use seems useful.
- The proposals that are of concern : 1. Maintaining or expanding industrial use on waterfront areas does not seem like wise use of land, or good stewardship of water resources. Keeping industrial areas in Smelertown makes the most sense for land use 2. Keeping the land around the golf course designated as low density seems wasteful when there is so much open green space, making higher density more appealing. A variable density designation of that area makes more sense with all the new build already in the area, and existing space for more new build with supporting infrastructure. 3. ""Old Salida"", roughly from C to I and 4th toward 13th, has lovely, historic homes worthy of some preservation. Re-developing and infilling this area creates more problems than it solves. The infrastructure (parking, water, waste lines) just aren't up to supporting much higher density than is already supported. Higher density housing should be prioritized to new build areas where the infrastructure can support the higher demand. Increasing density of housing in new build areas makes the most sense.
- Maybe

- Yes, we also need to develop County Road 140 with a shoulder and sidewalk for the heavy traffic use.
- Yes
- Generally yes
- No. I don't agree w/the direction of Salida AT ALL
- We need more pocket parks and open spaces within high density neighborhoods.
- Unsure
- PROBABLY NO
- I appreciate our planners working so hard to find solutions for our future.
- See #5 above please!!!
- Yes. I would limit the commercial, aka mixed use along highway 50 south of oak street
- Yes
- Seems like we are spending a lot of time, money and effort to end up with slight variations on what we already have.
- yes
- I would like to see an emphasis on universal designed housing whenever possible.
- Yes, I agree with the general direction. Also, Salida is already pretty walkable--let's KEEP this great asset with a good variety of trails all over within the city limit and with excellent connectivity. ANYTHING we have already that is already an asset, please let's try to KEEP and not lose. Some of our assets are: trails, open spaces within the city, scenic views, quiet, walkable neighborhoods, convenient shopping, the river.... I've seen communities that have lost some of their best assets FOREVER and it is SAD. Thank you!
- I would need to have more meeting time to review maps with questions to staff to comment.
- Yes, as long as the residential overlays (voted on by the people) are protected: i.e.: Sackett Neighborhood. Would like to see that kind of overlay applied to other residential areas in the town center, to protect and preserve the character of the areas and the older more historic buildings. Not all historic buildings are located within the downtown historic area.