



January 14, 2010
Joint Planning Commission
Meeting

Purpose of Theme 4

- Set broad community housing goals
- Implement community goals through housing principles and policies
- Define strategies for achieving these goals
- Establish indicators to measure effectiveness and inform future action
- Do not try to do too much; Theme 4 is intended to set broad goals, principles and policies
- Land Development Regulations will determine tools and specific implementation strategies

Theme 4 Goals

- Specific chapter focusing on the community's housing policy
- Evolve and define '94 policy of "community first, resort second"
- Establish who the community wants to ensure has housing
- Establish what types of housing the community wants to promote
- Establish the tools the community will use to meet its goals

Meet Our Community's Housing Needs

● *Statement of Ideal*

- *Remain a community first and resort second by ensuring that at least 65% of the community's workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming.*

Housing Program Basis and Goal

	1994	April Draft	PC
Definition of Program	Affordable housing is a unit that a household making 120% or less of the area median income can afford, dedicating only 30% of its income to a mortgage or rent and utilities	Workforce Housing means all housing occupied by people working in the community regardless of whether the unit is deed restricted or not.	Discussion Questions 1 & 2
Goal	Provide (an unspecified amount) affordable housing	House 65% of the workforce locally	Discussion Question 2

Discussion Questions

1. In the planning commissioners' January 7, Theme 4 comments, Staff heard concern regarding implementation strategies and programs that have been in place or proposed over the past 15 years, but consensus that some sort of housing program is still necessary. If this is accurate, what should be the basis of the program?

- It is inaccurate, there should not be a housing program
- Maintaining a local workforce (April draft structure)
- Maintaining socioeconomic diversity
- Continuing to be a community first and a resort second
- Ensuring generational continuity of local families
- Not exporting our housing impacts to neighboring communities
- Other
- Some combination of the above choices

Discussion Questions

2. There are two components to defining a clear housing program, defining who the community wants to ensure has housing and setting a target for measuring whether the housing is being provided. The April draft focuses on housing 65% of the workforce – defined as anyone working in Teton County.
 - Based on the answer to the above question who does the community want to house? (ie workforce)
 - Based on the answer to the above question what is the target for housing (ie 65%)

Maintain a Local Workforce (April draft structure)

Definition – Workforce Housing means all housing occupied by people working in the community regardless of whether the unit is deed restricted or not.

- *Retirees not included*
- *Individual portfolio managers included*

Goal – 65% of the workforce housed locally

- *Represents maintenance of current situation*
- *Avoids phenomenon identified in other resorts*

Workforce Basis: Pros and Cons

Topics Possibly Addressed Indirectly

- Socioeconomic diversity
- Commuter impacts
- Resident investment in local economy
- Maintenance of historic character

Potential Issues Misrepresented by Workforce Basis

- 65% of workforce may not include a middle class
- Non-workers have more time for civic engagement
- Full-time vs. transient community not addressed
- Maintenance of generational knowledge not addressed

Workforce Basis: Pros and Cons

Possible Indicators to address Potential Issues

- Distribution of Population by Income
- Volunteerism, Number of non-profits, Local event attendance
- Average time lived in community per employee
- Percent of JHHS living/working locally after 10 years

Subsidized Housing Target

	1994	April Draft	PC
Overall Program Target	Provide quality “affordable housing” (a dwelling unit that a household making $\leq 120\%$ of AMI can afford, dedicating only 30% of its income to housing) for the community’s diverse population	House 65% of the “workforce” (people working in the community regardless of where they live or what type of unit they live in) locally	Discussion Questions 1 & 2
Subsidized Housing Target	Households making $\leq 120\%$ of AMI	Enough members of the workforce who cannot afford market housing to meet the community’s housing goal	Discussion Question 3

Discussion Questions

3. The April Draft distinguishes between who the community wants to ensure has housing (65% of all employees) and who subsidized housing programs will target (any employee that cannot afford housing). Should housing programs continue to accommodate anyone the community wants to house who cannot afford it? If not, who should housing programs accommodate?
- Maintain this general policy regarding subsidized housing
 - Subsidized housing should not be focused on affordability, it should focus on the basis of the housing program (ie employment restrictions for a workforce based program)
 - Focus on emergency service workers
 - Focus on educators
 - Focus on the middle class
 - Focus on seasonal employees
 - Focus on fulltime residents
 - Other
 - Some combination of the above

Housing Program Toolbox

	1994	April Draft (keep up)	PC
Toolbox	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inclusionary zoning (keep up)• Seasonal employee mitigation (keep up)• Incentives (catch up)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New development mitigation• Redevelopment mitigation• Preservation of existing stock• Density bonus incentives	Discussion Question 4

Discussion Questions

4. *The April draft focuses on a three-tiered implementation policy: 1) insure that new development does not exacerbate housing issues by requiring mitigation of new development; 2) to the extent possible, maintain the existing housing situation by restricting existing workforce housing stock, and 3) allow for density bonus incentives, as needed, to fully maintain the existing situation. What strategies should be included in the Plan moving forward?*
- *Mitigation requirements*
 - *Restriction of existing housing stock*
 - *Density bonuses (previous recommendations would indicate this option has been eliminated)*
 - *Creation of a permanent funding source*
 - *Pursuit of housing in and/or transportation to neighboring communities*
 - *Work within caps to transition to a residential land use pattern where housing costs less monetarily, but may have greater lifestyle costs*
 - *Other*
 - *Some combination of the above*

Mitigation Program

	1994	April Draft	PC
Program Philosophy	Equality – distribute housing subsidy requirements across all residential development	No program policy suggested	Discussion Question 5
Resulting Program	<p>Inclusionary Zoning – residential inclusionary zoning requirements house full-time members of the community that cannot afford housing</p> <p>Commercial Mitigation – house seasonal workers generated by commercial development that cannot afford housing</p>	Details to be worked out in LDRs based on philosophy	Details to be worked out in LDRs based on philosophy

Discussion Questions

5. If requiring mitigation of the impacts from new development is going to be a part of the community's housing strategy, what should be the basis of the program?
- Mitigation requirements should be based on 100% mitigation of housing impacts generated by residential and commercial development
 - Mitigation requirements should be based on mitigation of generated impacts, but should not discourage any type of development identified as desired in Theme 2 or Theme 3
 - Mitigation requirements should be distributed throughout the community by focusing on mitigating impacts through inclusionary zoning requirements on all residential development. (status quo)
 - None

Housing Types

Housing Type	1994	April Draft	PC
Single Family Detached, Townhomes, Condominiums	Throughout (except Downtown and Resorts)	per FLUP	Discussion Question 6, Themes 2&3
Duplex, Triplex, Fourplex, Stacked Flats, Townhomes, Mobile Homes	West Jackson Cottonwood Downtown (maybe) Northern South Park Wilson (maybe) Resorts Hoback	per FLUP	Discussion Question 6, Themes 2&3
Dormitories, Efficiency Apartments, One-Bedroom Apts, Accessory Units	East Jackson (ARUs only) West Jackson Cottonwood Downtown South Park (maybe) Wilson (ARUs only) Resorts Alta (ARUs only) Hoback (ARUs mostly)	per FLUP	Discussion Question 6, Themes 2&3
Campgrounds	alternative	not addressed	
Yurts and Tepees	alternative	no allowance	

Discussion Questions

6. The April Draft promotes a variety of housing types (detached single family, duplex, triplex, multifamily) in the community to house a diverse socioeconomic demographic. What housing types are appropriate?
- Detached single family
 - Duplex
 - Triplex
 - Multifamily (4 or more units in a building)
 - As determined by the policies of Themes 2 and 3 and the Future Land Use Plan
 - Consistent with surrounding housing types
 - Other
 - Some combination of the above

Discussion Questions

7. The April draft acknowledges that especially in mixed-use neighborhoods multi-family housing is an important, affordable option. Given the limitations the planning commissions have previously recommended, if this language is to be retained what are appropriate methods for achieving multifamily housing?
- There should not be encouragement of multifamily housing
 - Encouragement of multifamily housing will occur through the allowance of nonresidential to residential conversion
 - Residential and nonresidential areas of the Town should be down-zoned, and then smaller areas of the Town should be given the option to build multi-family housing within the previously recommended caps
 - Multifamily residential should be allowed for units transferred into Town from the County
 - Other
 - Some combination of the above

Discussion Questions

8. Should it be a goal of this plan to encourage maintenance of existing rental housing options and creation of permanent rental housing options? If yes, how should this be achieved?
- Limit the conversion of existing rental units to ownership units to the extent possible (condominiumization, etc.)
 - Provide incentives for the construction of permanent rental housing within the allowances of the FLUP
 - Other

Employee Generation

	Town	County	Total
Residential	1,043	5,881	6,924
Ops/Maintenance	398	2,527	2,926
Construction	645	3,353	3,998
Commercial	6,436	3,899	10,335
Public	972	1,271	2,243
Potential Employees from Buildout	8,451	11,051	19,501
Existing Employees			22,693
Total Employees at Buildout			42,194

Potential increase in employees = 86%

Potential increase in residential units = 93%

Potential increase in commercial floor area = 82%

Existing Employees

Bureau of Labor Statistics

2007 Average Annual Employees Living Locally	14,140
% of Existing Employees Living Locally	65%
Total Existing Employees	21,753

Bureau of Economic Analysis

2007 Local Jobs	27,231
Jobs/Employee	1.2
Total Existing Employees	22,693

Difference in Adjusted Total Existing Employees 4%

Housing Demand From Generated Employees

	Town	County	Total
Employees Generated by Potential	8,451	11,051	19,501
Employees per Household	1.8	1.8	1.8
Units Demanded	4,695	6,139	10,834
Percentage Provided Locally	65%	65%	65%
Units Demanded Locally	3,052	3,991	7,042
Potential Units under Current Regulations	2,534	8,382	10,916

- This does not include any existing employees or units

Can Housing Demand Be Met?

	Town	County	Total
Potential Units under Base Zoning	2,534	8,382	10,916
Units Demanded Locally	3,052	3,991	7,042
Guaranteed Workforce Units	-	1,922	
Nonres ARUs	-	700	
25% of New PRD units	-	913	
Employee requirements	-	309	
Remaining Potential	-	6,460	
Remaining Units Demanded Locally	-	2,069	
Can Housing Demand Be Met?	no	?	?

Effect of Nonres Conversion

	Town	County	Total
Employees Generated under Base Zoning	8,451	11,051	19,501
Units Demanded Locally	3,052	3,991	7,042
Potential Units under Base Zoning	2,534	8,382	10,916
Can Housing Demand Be Met?	no	?	?
Employees Generated w/25% Nonres Conversion	6,777	11,051	17,828
Units Demanded Locally	2,447	3,991	6,438
Potential Units w/25% Nonres Conversion	2,798	8,382	11,180
Can Housing Demand Be Met?	?	?	?

Purpose of Theme 4

- Set broad community housing goals
- Implement community goals through housing principles and policies
- Define strategies for achieving these goals
- Establish indicators to measure effectiveness and inform future action

Conclusion

- Do not try to do too much; Theme 4 is intended to set broad goals, principles and policies
- Land Development Regulations will determine tools and specific implementation strategies

Maintain Socioeconomic Diversity

Definition – Socioeconomic diversity means...

- *Distribution of population in income ranges (ie % of population making 0-40% AMI, 40-80% AMI, 80-120% AMI, etc.)*
- *Other*

Goal – ?

- Current situation
- Floors on each range (ie no range will drop below 10%)
- Even distribution
- Other

Community First, Resort Second

Definition – The difference between a community and a resort is ...

- *The percentage of the workforce living locally (April draft)*
- *The ratio of residential units to lodging units*
- *The ratio of full-time population to peak effective population*
- *Other*

Goal – ?

- *ie: 65% of the workforce living locally (April draft)*
- *ie: 2 dwelling units for every 1 lodging unit*
- *ie: Effective population less than 200% of year-round population*

Generational Continuity

Definition – Generational continuity means...

- *Multiple generations of one family living locally*
- *Other*

Goal – ?

- 25% of JHHS graduates living locally at ten year reunion
- Other

Buildout Totals

	Task Force			Appendix I		
	Town	County	Total	Town	County	Total
Existing DUs	3,898	4,697	8,595	3,890	5,930	9,820
Potential Base DUs	1,130	3,567	4,697	1,590	*3,300	*4,890
Possible Base Buildout	5,028	8,264	13,292	5,480	*9,230	*14,710
Potential PRD DUs	266	3,651	3,917		*2,890	*2,890
Possible Buildout w/PRDs	5,294	11,915	17,209	5,480	12,120	17,600
Potential ARU's	384	11,941	12,325	included	n/a	n/a
Potential Employee Units	754	309	1,063	n/a	n/a	n/a
Existing Short-term Rentals	n/a	1,250	n/a	n/a	included	n/a
Potential Short-term Rentals	n/a	155	n/a	n/a	included	n/a
Possible Short-term Rentals	n/a	1,405	n/a	n/a	included	n/a
Existing Nonres (sf)	4,576,840	3,473,829	8,050,669	4,251,000	3,666,000	7,917,000
Potential Nonres (sf)	3,436,798	3,179,295	6,616,093	4,856,000	4,597,000	9,453,000
Total Possible Nonres (sf)	8,013,638	6,653,124	14,666,762	9,107,000	8,263,000	17,370,000

* Appendix I was not broken down by base and PRD, numbers are approximate