



---

## Community Workshop: Preferred Plan and Policy Direction – MAY 2008

---

Thursday, May 15, 2008 – 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.  
Teton Science School, Jackson Campus

### Format/Agenda:

- Brief Orientation Presentation
- Small group exercises – to share opinions and knowledge about Preferred Plan and Themes and Policies direction.

### Participation:

72 people signed in for the meeting.

Staff: Jeff Daugherty and Alex Norton (County), Jeff Noffsinger and Tyler Sinclair (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), and Bill Collins (Collins Planning).

### Meeting Summary:

The planning team provided an overview of the “Preferred Plan...” and maps and the Themes and Policies. The following notes reflect verbatim written comments from the maps and materials AT THE MEETING. (See also meeting results from the May 14 Jackson Charrette/Open House Meeting for comments on town subareas.)

Additional comments for preferred plan will be available through on-line questions and polls in June 2008. The public will continue to have the opportunity to comment. In addition, town staff will be hosting meetings during summer 2008 to focus on town neighborhoods and county staff will be hosting meetings during summer 2008 in county areas to discuss the plan.

### **Countywide map comments (all sets of maps)**

---

*Teton Village:*

- “Teton Village should have more of their own housing and affordable homes. Where is that plan?”
- “The Village should be a node for affordable housing and neighborhood commercial. Could reduce traffic on 390.”

*Wilson:*

- “No additional density on Waldron property in Wilson.”

- “Wilson – Waldron 15 acres should not be included in the ‘Greater Wilson area.’ No additional density on Waldron property.”
- “Make it clear to public what the current allowable density is in Wilson—approx 150 more units. Do not increase this! If anything, decrease this.”
- “South on Fall Creek has been defined separately from Wilson Village for good reason, rural, wildlife, open space, etc. Remove Waldron Proper.”

*South Park:*

- “Current zoning in the surrounding areas is less than 1 unit/acre in South Park. The new plan is too dense – not maintaining wildlife corridors.”
- “Concerned that all dense future growth is targeted towards South Park. Why is transportation not being considered in terms of input for future growth scenarios?”
- “South Park – Lower South Park density--averages about 0.5 du/ac. Any development there should not be more dense.”

*General Comments:*

- “PUDs – Major developments should have significant open space requirements similar to past requirements.”
- “Never assent to town county government merger! Separation of powers.”

***County - Jackson Valley map comments (all sets)***

---

*Teton Village/390:*

- “Why isn’t there much useable land around Teton Village?” How many affordable units are there?”
- “Keep densities low on Village Road. No PUDs AHs.”
- “Why not plan to develop West Bank. Lots of commercial there. Won’t M-W road be improved. Seems M-W road comparable to S. 89 Highway.”
- “Keep Village road rural . Road is overburdened already.”

*Golf/Tennis:*

- “I have seen no place in the surveys of county members at large that density should be increased here!” (re: Golf and Tennis)
- “Please correct maps for current NRO prior to comments.” (re: Golf and Tennis)

*South Park:*

- “South Park density currently varies greatly. Don’t assume S. Park should have substantial density because one small section is dense. If we wanted town density, we’d have bought there.”
- “The survey questions which addressed growth patterns south of town were deliberately misleading, geared to achieve a result that now shows up on these illustrations. The community said that ‘some town-density development would be acceptable within ½ mile of High School Road.’ This meant along High School Road to most people. It clearly did not mean that ½ mile south town –density development is appropriate.”
- “We would need pathway the length of Flat Creek in South Park.”
- “Town density not the answer.” (re: near High School Road).
- The map had notes showing 3 acre lots on Scherr-Toss property, with lower densities of tiered density to the north.

- "I looked at the survey results too, and South Park doesn't want a node there. Our opinion should count more for our neighborhood."
- "Don't get your figures for density in southern South Park. My understanding is Melody Ranch is not 1 unit per acre, but half that."
- "Why is the idea of 'residential commercial in South Park' still being considered when the survey marked it as least preferred 'node'. Is anyone listening to what the survey results where? Preservation not upzone!"
- "Why is South Park targeted to get 3,400 housing units of the 5,200 remaining units in the valley. I thought we wanted to preserve JH not create urban sprawl?"
- "The question remains, will you cap growth as it the result of surveys? No upzones. South Park should not have increased density."
- "Why are we 'trading' development rights with Alta – don't we need to conserve as much open land here – where demand to develop is so much greater? Why is 90% of high density being targeted to South Park? What about all the other areas? Since resort growth drives jobs, why not charge the job generators with the task of providing 'affordable' housing? The current concept lets the taxpayer get the bill!"
- "Keep South Park Loop Road as rural as possible – the animals can travel safely from southern south park (where they are now) to the Snake River, and up into the hills across the highway. Keep the cottonwoods."
- "Would like to see conservation along the loop road – scenic, larger parcels further south to match the neighborhoods of S. Park Ranches, polo, shooting iron. Also, as Scherr Toss property is landlocked as far as road, it should stay lower density. Will there be more roads through South Park so the loop road is preserved? Overall, would like to see some density moved elsewhere, as South Park is bearing the burden."
- "Way too much density in all of South Park. Way too much traffic being generated here in South Park. Conserving Kelly and Buffalo Valley is a sham – as a ruse to transfer development here to South Park. People want a small town, not a city."
- "South Park migration corridor consideration. County should be viewed wholly since wildlife travel throughout."
- "In the survey, I felt you perhaps lead respondents to show 'interest' in South Park by phrasing questions ambiguously. Also, not specific about North or South South Park."

*NRO:*

- "Please correct the NRO as it currently exists prior to any new mapping and comments." (reference to location near Golf and Tennis)
- "Make NRO sacrosanct and invisible."
- "Delineate NRO for formal review independent environmental assessment."
- "NROs should be countywide as well as in town."

*General Comments and Other Comments about maps:*

- "Total numbers at buildout – a given number – the number of years that will take. Pick the numbers."
- "Set a buildout limit."
- "High School Road is a line voted on as the edge of town during annexation referendum. The county should respect it."
- "The Little Nell Hotel needs to make sure they have employee housing."

- “Public numbers with ‘some interest’ in increased density in areas could be 10% or 60%. Its rather misleading . Please publish these numbers.”
- “Push the issue of finishing the Indian Trails connector.”
- “Second bridge over the Snake? Also, a North Bridge?”
- “Where are rental units going?”
- “Town and county are intertwined. They must work together.”
- “Controlled growth of the new number of units – not all of them in the next three years. Pick the end number of total units to build out and phase them in.”
- “What new roads would support South Park growth. What type of jobs are envisioned after build out. What is buildout. Thanks.”
- “Where exactly did the survey respondents live? Was the survey targeted to a certain demographic? Thanks.”
- “Limit new home sizes to 4,500 sf. What about a carbon footprint tax on existing homes to fund workforce housing needs.”
- “Complete disclosure on all results. Incorporate ample public response periods and ability to tweak.”
- “The pressures to develop are always greater than the pressures to preserve. Constant movement towards the development interests.”
- “Limits on square footage - residential.”
- “Who will make final decision? Members of the collaborative.”
- “There is little support for the ‘nodes’ or ‘village’ concept, especially in the areas that are affected.”

### ***Town Stable Areas Map***

---

- “Town commercial projects need to immediately incorporate affordable housing at a higher rate. Town as Heart, Smart Growth – the best place to do it.”
- “This blob of civic (re: blue classified properties including Forest Service and area west of N. Cache) seems general and unsustainable. What should this gateway look like? How should it function?”
- “Just because this neighborhood is now vastly expensive doesn’t mean this is the best place for a residential S/D.” (west of Hospital).
- “(1) increase affordable housing percentages. (2) Think density in town (i.e., pedestrian-friendly community. (3) Town and county leaders must work together.”
- “What is the concept for this area of Broadway (the 7)? The Y is a key intersection with merging with the county.”
- “Traffic already maxed at critical \_\_\_ (illegible word?). Focus on transportation and mitigating. No more unilateral decisions (i.e. Town Square tree cutting).”
- “All of the surveys showed a preference for 3 stories (buildings) or less by about 80% to 20%, yet this was not mentioned either in the ‘themes’ or ‘preferred plan.’ It is one of the most critical aspects of town appearance, historical character, community character.”
- “Please continue the idea of ‘Town as Heart’ – increase building heights and put more folks closer to services.”
- “More housing in town, select a zone for more density – higher buildings. Not town square.”
- “Does the stability of this neighborhood (re: arrow pointing to neighborhood around Trails End road) consider the impacts of the future road connection?”

- “Referendum density in county or town vertically ... \_\_\_ (words illegible?)”
- “No more parking garages – condo units with no setbacks.”
- “Try for ‘a little of everything in town neighborhoods’. No one wants block after block of 4 story buildings. Allow for diverse types of housing in neighborhoods.”

### **Town Focus Areas Map**

---

- “Town commercial buildout must be reduced or we will never catch up with the affordable housing issue.”
- “Civic campus (i.e., High School) needs specific design and road connectivity.”
- “Seems to me that the Y area contains much potential for application of ‘Town as Heart’. Density increases/smart growth. This should be considered seriously for mixed-use expansion, especially affordable housing.”
- “There has to be control on condo converting from rental to high end condos or time shares. This variance is pushing housing needs into South park, etc.”
- “#12 (S. Cache Corridor) “Do not allow offices on the first floor – kills the pedestrian experience. Small scale commercial. Maintains visual interest and rest stops.”
- “Complete connectivity of existing and future pathways.”
- “Require pathways, sidewalks, and as least a few green trees – some of the new buildings have no green space.”
- “#7 (Mixed-Use Office). Does not make sense on Broadway east. Consider town vision.”
- “Town buildout numbers.”

### **Themes and Policies**

---

The following comments reflect verbatim suggestions on the “Themes and Policies outline” draft. The planning team will be refining the organization and policies and releasing a draft at the end of May 2008.

#### **Theme 1: Stewardship of Wildlife Habitat...**

##### *Introduction/General*

- “Wilson: Waldron 15 acres – No additional density. Wildlife habitat and corridors. Adjacent to Rossetter conservation land, which is adjacent to the Ordway piece. Waldron piece is Moose habitat and wetlands. Essential willows for moose. Bird habitat.”
- “Yes, this (wildlife) will be our lasting legacy, I agree it is a top priority.”
- “Scenic motorways are bad for wildlife because animals are lured toward road kill. Protect river bottom.”
- “I hope South Park residents gouge your eyeballs out.”
- “Wildlife valuable \_\_\_ (word?) of America found nowhere else. Protect and conserve foremost.”
- Wilson – no additional density and preservation of critical wildlife habitat and wetland areas. 15 acre Waldron piece in particular.”
- “People and animals are incompatible. Less density.”
- “Why does development in South Park contradict all of these? Is there nothing to protect there?”

- “Please stop density bonuses, PUDs, PADs, etc., It is a privilege to build and develop here – not a right. All developers should be put on notice by our officials – do it right. Protect our resources. It’s the law.”
- “South Park is as scenic as any part of this county. It needs preservation.”
- “Grow slow – grow smart. Less than 1% a year max.”
- “South Park below High School is a significant wildlife corridor, and as such should not be totally fragmented. Please evaluate the *Freedom to Roam* needs in context of zoning changes. (a coalition of business, including Yvon Chouinard’s Patagonia, brought together to support protection of North America’s largest wildlife corridors.”

*Principles and Policies:*

- Policy 1.1d: Restore environmentally degraded areas
  - “Close all south facing butte trails.”
- Policy 1.2b and c: Protect floodplains and riparian areas and wetlands
  - “Very important.”
- Principle 1.3—Preserve the region’s scenic resources and dark night skies.
  - “How does principle 1.3 apply to South Park?”
- Policy 1.4a: Minimize disturbance to forested hillsides
  - Add: “and sage covered”.
  - “Close the trail on southwest aspect of east GV Butte (state land) above the old Clark’s Redi Mix. Its about to look like High School Butte scar.”
  - “Pine Glades in town?”
- Principle 1.6—Avoid development in natural hazard areas
  - “Move Andy S. to a safe place.”
- Policy 1.7a and b: Designate Alta and Buffalo Valley and Kelly as voluntary Conservation Focus Area.
  - “Yes, yes”
- Principle 1.8—Maintain public access to public lands for recreation.
  - “What about Leeks Canyon access to BTNF?”
  - “How about a pathway on dike?”
- Principle 1.9—Promote sustainable uses of resources and minimize waste
  - “Quantify goals.”
  - “Yes!”
- Principle 1.10—Decrease energy consumption...
  - “Yes”
  - “Quantify percentage of reduction.”

## **Theme 2: Manage Growth**

*Introduction/General*

- “Define terms such as ‘livability’ or ‘sustainability’. If that is too hard, don’t use them. Be specific and quantify.
- “There is a wide range of density in South Park, don’t pick the most dense section of the 1 or 2 developments in South Park and use that as the density for future development in South Park.”
- “Every ‘hotel’ or resort you approve, brings in more people that can’t afford to live here. It increases the need for more housing.”
- “Changes proposed here will accelerate growth. Is that smart to ramp up the rate?”

- “The town’s (Jackson) plans affect all the surrounding area’s density. The town is building out of control and pushes their unfulfilled housing needs onto other areas. They need to be more responsible.”
- “The proposed densities in South Park will not maintain its ‘sense of place.’”
- “Growth versus conservation is zero sum. Don’t imply you can do both.” (referring to statement about balancing growth and conservation).
- “In order to protect wildlife – how about NRO for entire county including town.”
- “Preserve NRO worthy land.”

*Principles and Policies:*

- Principle 2.1—Predictable level of build out.
  - “In order for this to happen, there should be no more variances afforded. The Plan should have teeth in it. There should be a commitment to maintain.”
  - “What are buildout numbers and how are they set?”
  - “How would the tiered density of South Park determined justify it?”
  - “We must see your buildout numbers and the tax/infrastructure costs.”
- Policy 2.1c: Reevaluate the Future Land Use Plan
  - “Schedule”
  - “Yes”
  - “This was supposed to happen with the existing plan and didn’t due to lack of staffing and commitment by electeds. Need to make sure there is a commitment this time.”
- Policy 2.1d: Monitor rate of growth /redevelopment in Jackson
  - “Yes”
- Policy 2.2 a: Steer future development into designated areas.
  - “How will these ‘designated areas’ be determined? If an area in South Park doesn’t want this development, what happens? Doesn’t the area get more of a say for their neighborhood?”
- Policy 2.2d: Promote conservation in natural resource areas...
  - “Yes – no exceptions on development within NRO.”
- Principle 2.3—Level of service
  - “Residential growth historically is net sum loss to revenue.”
- Policy 2.3b: ...development pays its fair share..
  - “Require developers to assume all costs of infrastructure.”
  - “Mitigate at a rate over 100% of employee generation.”
  - “What assurance does the public have against future upzones by developers?”
- Policy 2.7c: Annexation...
  - “Use annexation very sparingly. Not in wildlife sensitive areas.”
  - “No—no annexation to increase town.”
- Policy 2.7d: Do not make land use decisions for revenue purposes
  - “Yes”
  - “Agree”
- General:
  - “Can these principles be upheld if we allow the population to double over time? These goals can only be achieved if we stabilize the population. We

can only meet affordable housing needs by curbing commercial growth. Jackson is loved for where it is—the wildlife and the small town atmosphere, all of which will be lost eventually if we don't question the need for growth."

- "NROs – A North/south NRO is necessary in South Park to protect an elk migration corridor.
- The South Park ditch needs to be maintained so that Bob Lucas can continue ranching.
- "Need to enforce LDRs – not allow developers to override. All this means nothing if the plan doesn't have teeth."
- "Understand that a community view on limiting growth exists and that much discussion should be allotted to it. Max buildout is only a number, not an objective, a vision, or a statement of ideal."

### Theme 3: Transportation

#### *Introduction/General:*

- "START to Alpine and Victor is the answer to workforce housing."
- "I live in a Teton County Housing Authority home – would love to have bus transportation into work. I would not ride my bike to work."
- "All points are very good."
- "Bikes good."
- "Please finish the bike path from the Science School to the village road, so people can bike from town to Wilson and Teton Village safely!"
- "Bike paths."
- "Pathways and public transportation to the parks."

### Theme 4: Jackson as Heart

#### *Introduction:*

- "Plan for a pedestrian-friendly community. Density in town versus county!"
- "Part of 'Town as Heart' is to minimize what is provided in outlying commercial nodes. (Define them). Have you seen the Hoback general store? It is marvelous. It's all they need in: (1) Buffalo valley, (2) Maybe Golf and Tennis, (3) Nowhere else!"

#### *Principles and Policies:*

- Principle 4.3—Preserve historic sites...
  - "Define historical".
  - "If you plan a 4-floor building next door, you have trashed the historical building."
  - "Rebuild, refurbish, restore – included in the development. Less demolition."
- Policy 4.5a: Preserve stable neighborhoods.
  - "Do not infill with apartments – preserve neighborhoods."
- General:
  - "What does the Town of Jackson think about becoming the affordable housing service community for the five-star county?"
  - "Town shuttle is great! Expanded service is a good idea – we must get people out of their cars."
  - "No 3 + 4 story buildings facing the gateways."

- “The community should discuss maximum square foot limits overall and stepped up in PUDs to create a mix.”
- “Workforce housing needs to be built in different areas of town and county. Don’t put it all in one area.”
- “Mixed-use village – Buffalo Valley area.”
- “Buffalo Valley working housing for year round employees.”
- “Buffalo Valley workforce housing is needed, particularly for Lodge Company.”
- “Workforce housing needed - affordable for families in Buffalo Valley at post office/school area and/or at Forest Service Blackrock Compound. Land type old campground by Hatchet.” (wording unclear?)
- “Commercial node needed in Buffalo Valley. Lodging overlay again outside of Jackson over 30 miles to town.”

### Theme 5 - Housing comments

#### *Introduction:*

- “Better control needed on “workforce” housing. Should be for essential workforce (i.e., emergency workers, teachers, etc.). Current affordable housing projects are abused. People are living in them that should not qualify. Not everyone deserves housing.”
- “Can’t be expected to be entitled to live here. Has always been a struggle, always will be. Old timers struggled too.”
- “Affordable housing needs to be monitored so current owners cannot rent out their properties, so can they convert garage space and rent the housing. This should be illegal.”
- (Relying on neighboring counties to house the workforce detracts.) “Yes – They will find jobs in their own communities after they mature.”
- (Significant reliance on commuters does not promote sustainability.) “So why South Park?”
- “Pay living wages.”
- “Require that affordable housing percent be built—no fee in lieu.”

#### *Principles and Policies:*

- “Density decreases quality of life.”
- “End the AH PUD”
- “How about living wages instead of affordable housing and START commute.”
- Policy 5.2a: Maintain at least 60% of the workforce as community residents.
  - “60% is not realistic... Look at other mountain towns.”
  - “Probably not fairly or reasonably achievable.”
- Policy 5.2d:
  - “Very important” to limit additional resort developments that create a high number of jobs.
  - “No more resorts.”
- Policy 5.3a: Mandatory housing requirements.
  - “You must increase the % of the affordable housing extraction to maintain a stable workforce.”
- Policy 5.3d: Permit higher densities of housing to minimize need for deed restricted housing.

- “No to 5.3d. 5.2d major source of problems now.”
- Policy 5.3e: Promote financing programs...
  - “Providing subsidies for people with graduate degrees to buy a house is sheer lunacy.”
  - “More emphasis on rental housing. Ownership housing should be multi-family, no single family houses.”
- Policy 5.4b: Avoid net loss of housing units during redevelopment.
  - “What will you do when affordable housing residents retire?”
- Policy 5.5a: Locate workforce housing in villages and town, identified through this Plan.
  - “What does the Town of Jackson think about becoming the service community for the five-star county?”
- Principle 5.6
  - “Social engineering seldom works.”
- Policy 5.6b: New neighborhoods with amenities.
  - “We do not need new neighborhoods.”
- Policy 5.6e: Preserve stable neighborhoods.
  - “Eliminate density bonus. Major source of community acrimony.”
  - “High density belongs in Colorado. This is Wyoming.”
- General:
  - “Affordable housing is a trap for the residents who live there. Financially they are further behind each year and will end of trapped, unable to move if they want. Therefore, the number of retirees likely will exceed expectation because they cannot afford to move to another nice place.”
  - “We should avoid creating affordable housing ghettos.”
  - “Define percent of workforce housing in each “village” to handle needs (e.g., town – 50%, Wilson – 10%, 390 – 10%, etc.).”
  - “Put clear ‘zoning tools’ in plan for developers and neighboring areas. Less confusion for all.”
  - “Workforce housing in all areas, not just selected 1-2 areas. Workers work north of town, west bank, etc. Not just south.”
  - “How can we/you decide where to conserve/expand and select densities if you don’t have a growth goal/total plan? The parts should not make the sum; the sum should make the parts.”
  - “START and community is the answer. Also have renter-only affordable houses for core infrastructure employees – nice, no density.”

### **Theme 6 - Diverse and Balanced... comments**

#### *Introduction:*

- “How do you expect to have a balanced community and preserve natural resources when you dump all the development in South Park. Urban sprawl is something we don’t need.”
- “If a little of every type of housing is included in every ‘node’ or ‘village’ it would make for an interesting, diverse mix. Don’t ‘dump’ certain types in large ghettos.”
- “Qualify jobs – a great idea. How?”

#### *Principles and Policies:*

- Principle 6.1: Community first... resort second.
  - "You have said this for years and the County Commissioners have betrayed the community trust."
- Policy 6.1A – Do not approve new Planned Resorts.
  - "Very good idea."
  - "Definition please. The proposed hotel at the Painted Buffalo is a Planned Resort—right?"
  - "No new resorts. Excessive employee housing needs."
- Policy 6.1b: Limit new lodging to the Lodging Overlay District and existing Planned Resorts
  - "Yes" (x 2)
- Policy 6.1C – Opportunities for... workforce housing to keep pace with demands of approved resorts.
  - "Reduce resorts. You cannot keep pace with affordable housing (even at present)."
  - "Workforce housing should be placed close to villages and town where the workers are expected to work to reduce VMTs. The current 'affordable housing' proposal for South Park does not do that."
  - "Why not provide for people who really need the housing and who really help the community. Please provide for the emergency aid people, nurses, teachers, first. Then you can open it up to the general public. Affordable housing will always be a need in this community. Please use what we have wisely."
  - "Make lodging and other high employment-intensive businesses mitigate housing at appropriate rates."
  - "No more affordable housing. Creates greater demand for service workers."
- Policy 6.1D – small locally owned businesses...
  - "yes, yes, yes"
  - "Yes, very important to limit the growth of luxury hotels and resorts."
- Principle 6.2–Balance economic development with workforce housing and community needs.
  - "No more resort zones."
- Policy 6.2 a – balance quantity of (uses)
  - "Yes"
- Policy 6.2b: ...commercial development consistent with Future Land Use Plan
  - "Yes"
  - "I don't think we need to be creating more jobs."
- Policy 6.2d: ...mixed-use development
  - "Yes"
- Policy 6.2f: Support small neighborhood commercial.
  - "Not in South Park due to road traffic."
  - "Have 'affordable' commercial?"
- Policy 6.2g: Commercial and mixed-use sensitive to context...
  - "Yes"
- Principle 6.3—Continue to support diverse economic sectors that fit the region...
  - "Good ideas, but how?"
  - "Yes on all three policies."

- "6.3C at all costs." (agricultural character)
- "6.3B – qualify 'green'."
- General:
  - "No more planned resorts."
  - "No more \_\_ (word?) propaganda."
  - "We need to make sure that there are homes (Housing Trust) (Housing Authority) for those of us who work in Jackson."

### **Theme 7: Infrastructure... Comments**

#### *Introduction:*

- "Plan for growth incorporating mail delivery. This simple action could contribute to reducing number of trips generated at the individual household level."
- "South Park in High School area: growth should include connection to town water (not wells, which are problematic in South Park with unknown impacts on existing well supply and sand problems)."
- "Sewage: Increasing population will increase sewage loads, and discharges of treated sewage could pose increased problems (e.g., pharmaceuticals and endocrine-disrupting chemicals in relatively pristine waters and watersheds)."
- "Electric Utilities: Transmission lines should be buried, however, when above ground lines are necessary, they should be situated to preserve scenic views. The line north of Highway 22 should be buried."
- "Various groups – School board, S.O., PD, St. Js Hospital, need to house their workers in rental units, nice units. When they quit teaching and sell real estate, they leave the rental unit."
- "Maybe we can't have it all."