



Jackson Planning & Design Charrette/ Open House – MAY 2008

Wednesday, May 14, 2008 – 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
St. John’s Episcopal Church, Fellowship Hall, Jackson

Format/Agenda:

- Brief Orientation Presentation
- Small group exercises – to share opinions and knowledge about Jackson subareas.

Participation:

Almost 70 people signed in for the two meetings.

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

Meeting Summary:

The planning team provided an overview of the “Town Subarea Issues and Opportunities – Worksheets” and maps, the tool for asking questions and generating discussion about the town’s future. The following notes reflect verbatim written comments from the maps and materials AT THE MEETING. (See also meeting results from the May 15 County Public Meeting for comments on county maps and themes and policies.)

Additional comments for the town subarea materials 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.

Subareas:

1. South Highway 89

- “Work on improving looks – yes. (Policy 1.2)”
- “No sprawl on South Highway 89. No strip development. Frontage road? No way? Where is the ‘informal’ frontage road? The only one I think of is on the Sunrise Lumber block.”
- “Need bike lanes clearly demarked on 89/Broadway (existing too narrow).”
- “Definitely needs improvement visually. Frontage Road a good idea – hard to pull out of businesses in rush hour.”

- “Encourages sprawl down highway.”
- “Need to improve wildlife crossings and corridors.”
- “Why not 4 stories, especially for housing? Smiths Plaza has 4 stories already.”
- “Too many people. Sprawl sucks.”
- “Establish guidelines to preserve Jackson character with building style and design; also signs – make wooden.”
- “Agree gateways need to be visually attractive and functional for both retail/commercial up front and residential in back.”
- “Feature bridges over waterways with very attractive structures. Waterways Flat Creek at DQ Sport, Flat Creek at Hoback, Flat Creek at Karns Meadow (Snow King), Flat Creek by Eagle.
- Policy 1.2 – Pursue opportunities for pedestrian and streetscape... “but not actually instrument them?” “How?”
- “Aren’t there already design criteria?”
- “Agree” with issues and opportunities.
- “Too damn many people. Generally disagree. Traffic and density are dealbreaker.”

2. Town Square

- “Consider underground parking for core commercial area. We are very short of spaces.”
- “Do not mess with Town Square.”
- “Agree” with issues and opportunities
- “Agree – plus businesses need to plan for housing needs of their staff evening when they redevelop their buildings.”
- “Lower max height to 30’ and 2 stories on buildings facing the square. Treat parking as a utility – eliminate parking credits.”
- “Maintain town square and surrounding buildings as max 2 stories.”
- “High unlikely basement too valuable (re: underground parking).”
- “__ (word illegible) 2 expand T.S. overlay Historic Jackson corridor (Cache) north to edge of town (2 stories max.).”
- “Don’t stray too far from the architectural character that makes us unique versus other resorts. (...for Town Square overlay).”
- Policy 2.1: Encourage Retention of Local Business. “Very important to maintain local character and encourage spending.”
- “Yes, keep this from becoming ‘Anytown USA’.”
- “Contact AMIBA.org in Bozeman for ideas for policy. American Independent Business Alliance.”
- “Rent subsidized for small grocery to save trips ‘across town for milk’, perhaps a grocery co-op. I don’t believe a grocery could be viable without a rent subsidy as they cannot do the volume the big boxes are. Perhaps the funding could come out of transportation or affordable housing?”
- Policy 2.2: Encourage a mix... “Probably should not have lodging immediately on square.”
- Policy 2.3: Protect Historic Character... - “Yes, absolutely! Close off Center Street, on Town Square from cars.”
- Policy 2.4: Maintain Current Parking Levels – “Use underground parking. Significantly under capacity at this time.”

- “And underground - south of town square needs much more parking.”
- Policy 2.5: Limit Office Uses on the First Floor – “Destroys energy at street of retail.”
- Policy 2.6: Reevaluate Town Square Overlay... - “Yes, reevaluate – enlarge.”
- General: “Keep parking away (2 blocks) from Town Square. People will walk and buy.”
- “Utilities underground.”
- “Yes, work to keep local businesses and character of Town Square.”
- “TSO smaller. 3 + 4 stories. Take housing out of FAR.”
- “Yes” (policy recommendations are consistent with vision...)
- “I question the desirability of large luxury hotels anywhere in town. We’ve got quite enough of that sort of thing!”
- “Generally agree. Less is more in Wyoming.”

3. Downtown Commercial

- “Good idea on #3 except 4 stories.”
- “No four stories.”
- “Four floors is a deal killer”
- “Managed parking in downtown core. Eliminate surface lots – restrict parking to on-street, sub-grade, or structural. Encourage pedestrian mobility and minimize car activity by removing convenience.”
- “Agree should be more symmetrical around square. No reason zone should be same as Lodging Overlay. Lodging overlay for downtown core different; fee-in-lieu parking different.”
- “I think not more than 3, definitely not 4.”
- “FAR 2.0 by right. Public parking utility. No housing. No office on 1st.”
- “No 4 stories – setbacks necessary. Tall buildings create icy streets with no sun.”
- “I would like to see no housing within the boundaries of the above sketch.” (Note: sketch shows King at east, Pearl at South, Glenwood at west, and Gill at north.)
- “Get parking meters to encourage use of parking structure. We are the only town I know who doesn’t have them.”
- “Do we really need 4 stories.”
- “Eliminate FAR for housing. Public parking utility. Town Square only blocks facing square.”
- “Parking not an important issue.”
- “Generally disagree - Employee housing will turn the Town of Jackson into blue collar dumping ground to serve the five star county.”
- Policy 3.1
 - “Height should be limited – not more than 3-4 stories.”
 - “I agree.”
 - “Limit height increase – visitors and locals alike would like to see mountains from the square. Also, taller buildings = less light on streets and sidewalks = more ice in winter.”
- Policy 3.3 –
 - “Discourage or restrict vehicles in town and provide expanded public transportation.”
 - “Encourage alternative transportation.”

- “(Parking) Structures 2-3 blocks from square—(with) pedestrian movement and customers for retail, restaurants, etc.”
- Policy 3.4 – Encourage Provision of Employee Housing. –
 - “Yes.”
 - “Need 25% to affordable housing requirement or continued and worsening shortage of employees.”
 - “Require only hotel development to have all employee housing on site.”
 - “I hope someone monitors use of the new existing parking structure this summer before launching another similar structure.”

4. South Park Loop Road

- “Sprawl sucks. Fewer people better.”
- More residential fine south of High School Road (and west of High School) but keep some views open of Munger Mountain – have a set back. Bob Wemple.”
- “Water table problems.” (Issue for parking below grade. “High water table.”).
- “2 stories max.”
- “Clarify which part of South Park Loop.”
- Policy 4.2: “Cannot be served by transit.”
- “Generally disagree - Density and traffic.”

5. North “Y” Hillside

- “Two stories max”
- “Allow taller buildings along Broadway to screen road cut behind, similar to hillside building/sidewinders. This way the taller building works to enhance the visual experience instead of being contentious.”
- “Greater FAR of four stories is setback along hill. Multi-use is key! Inexpensive office space and living.”
- “Development should not change hillside and should be minimized on hillsides.”
- “3-4 story not needed. Density involved cannot be handled by __ (word illegible).”
- “Like idea of increasing residential but question how you’d integrate the ‘population’ into the traffic that exists. Minimize/limit building ‘up’ on hillsides.”
- “Traffic bottleneck – too many people – county dumping its development problems downtown with employee housing.”
- Policy 5.1 (adapt to topography...)” “Agreed”
- Policy 5.2
 - “Yes (residential uses),
 - Yes (Reduction of commercial uses...) – Slopes impossible for commercial as well as highway access problems.”

6. West Broadway Commercial Corridor

- “We need a distinct bike path all the way from Gros Ventre through town to connect with existing path south of town.”
- “What is wrong with a quaint old style residential area?”
- “Seems like you have to consider both local and visitor due to high volume of traffic that flows through this area.”

- "I like the pedestrian connection at rear of south side commercial properties along downhill edge of Karns Meadow. Can there be an opportunity for some seasonal small commercial kiosks along this path (coffee, lunch, etc.) street vendors on pathway."
- "Umm... bike path? Need to connect Y with North Cache with Snow King Avenue (via Flat Creek) with downtown with Redmond. Bikes are easy to park!"
- "We need a better wildlife/ (pedestrian?) crossing to access Flat Creek."
- "Access along Broadway not the problem. Crossing the street is the problem."
- "Can't stop on highway anyway—hard to get pull-out."
- "(Pedestrian path) ... or in front? Maybe on Broadway street frontage?"
- "Generally agree – wildlife cross here."

7. Mixed-Use Office Districts

- "Some of these real close to downtown – don't need to be residential-scale there. Awful big area. Why scatter offices all through broad area?"
- "FAR of 2. Parking = utility or underground. Housing not part of FAR."
- "Why is employee housing opportunity low? Why not zone multi-family residential with existing variances. Limit or stop office development – encourage employee housing."
- "Mixing space within residential seems funky if office outnumbered residential. Anyway to use #3 that allows for apartments/condos over offices?"
- "Keep number of stories – 2 max maybe 3 with setback and step back."
- "If we can't find employees, do we really need more low paying jobs?"
- "No multi-family huge apartment complexes east of Redmond in Zone 7."
- "The area east of Redmond is clearly residential, single-family homes with a few duplexes. Doesn't suggest need for mixed-use."
- "Across from Center for Arts not residential choice for area. – redevelopment area." (referring to the picture of the law office)
- "If east Jackson remains at its current density there will be no need for additional pedestrian connections."
- "Keep offices in residential-scale buildings. Avoid density, fewer people."

8. The "Y"

- Mixed-use development is an excellent concept."
- "Limit commercial. There is a lot already here."
- "How will traffic be managed. Its already difficult. Can't turn left out of Phillips 66/Spring Creek Animal Hospital."
- "Make PMUD - like development and intensity by right. Need high mitigation rates for affordable."
- "Important to preserve and improve water quality and character of wetlands – Flat Creek area."
- "Affordable housing should be a lot here."
- "Agree on residential potential – encourage."
- "Manage parking here if significant push for infill will become more like downtown if use/density increases. Limit surface parking lots and emphasize pedestrian facilities."

- “Like the idea of turning this into a ‘local’ focused area including residential, pedestrian, office, commercial, great area for a village feel.”
- “No 4 stories seen in survey results, except against hillsides. Consider workforce housing in this area.”
- “No 4 floor buildings. Density = traffic = road kill. Traffic big issue.”
- “Re-design traffic plan through this area. No 4 story buildings.”
- “Disagree (with 4 stories). Limit to 3 preferable 2 stories. Tall buildings cause icy streets.”
- “Generally disagree – big traffic bottleneck.”

9. NoBro

- “Overrated as lodging.”
- “Protect the East Gros Ventre Butte; it is a wildlife corridor especially in the winter.”
- “Underground parking extremely difficult. Surface parking only.”
- “This is awful. I want to live in a community not a resort or a service community for the five star county.”
- Add “Saddle Butte” to environment/wildlife sensitivity.
- “Don’t build high density and commercial up the hill or Saddle Butte for scenic and wildlife reasons. We don’t want to look like Park City – same with other hills around town.”
- “No. Cache is entrance corridor and should be restricted to 2 stories or what is already there. Should be set backs off Cache.”
- “North Cache is busy in summer.”
- “Agree with opportunities stated.”
- “2 story limit for frontage properties is key. Generally support policy questions.”
- “Restrict building height to two stories max – also N. Cache is an important wildlife corridor.”
- “Please take proximity to the park and refuge in mind. The wildlife doesn’t understand these boundaries.”
- “Max multi-use with very clear pedestrian access movement. Make FAR 2.0.”
- “Path/public along Flat Creek! Mixed-use and lodging.”
- “Cache itself not pedestrian friendly at all. Too much traffic there.”
- “Establish a bicycle-pedestrian connection(s) through this region. Connect the future Karns Meadow and North 89 pathways.”
- “I agree – needs a bike path on No. Cache.”
- “Generally disagree.”

10. Existing Residential Areas

- “No PUDs in alley neighborhoods.”
- “Hold to this plan as residential only—no business. Setbacks should be 10’- to 7’ to allow more residential character with landscaping and views.”
- “Alleys should not become streets. Allow 600 sf cabins on NC-SF lots with alley access. 3,000 sf max housing size excluding garage including basements. PUDs should be rental only – apartments. I agree with issues opportunities described.”
- “AR – need to promote / allow street accessed parking as well as alley access. Parking is key to long-term workability.”

- “Generally agree.”
- “Need street parking (alternate side if required) during winter months in AR.”
- “Increase FAR. Decrease LSR. Decrease impervious surface.”
- “Would like the best of both with a better standard of character for transition as are rebuilt but bringing in the better base development to fit well as appropriate.”
- “How about 7,500 sq. ft. lot, 1,500 office, 1,500 residence, 800 employment housing 600-800 sq garage sold separately!”
- “One, two or three units.”
- “Make all alley setbacks 5 feet!!!”
- “Generally agree – This is Jackson, not Colorado. We like it this way.”

11. Redmond Corridor

- “No multiple family – duplex and single family – yes.”
- “There are all the conveniences we need just a few blocks away in town.”
- “What is this ‘milk’ stuff. You already have a liquor store. Minimum commercial please.”
- “Having a convenience store in the Redmond Corridor is a great idea. Those of us in the hood will use it lots! (on our bikes).”
- “Limit to two stories and low density to fit surrounding residential areas.”
- “Focus on housing and office. Multi family is good.”
- “Yes on workforce housing.”
- “Generally disagree - Forget commercial and multifamily.”

12. South Cache Corridor

- “Yes” to mix of uses.
- “OK”
- “Connection to Snow King not a high priority.”
- “It would be great to have a “walking/working” neighborhood with primarily foot-traffic transportation from home-to-work-to-downtown.”
- “Doesn’t connection hotel to downtown well. Willow works better.”
- “3 stories to allow more versatility – make pedestrian-friendly. 2 __ (word illegible) parking. No buses or motor homes.”
- “Pedestrian-friendly”
- “2 stories only.”
- “Shouldn’t go above 2 stories for character, views, and light in wintertime (taller buildings – less light hitting streets and sidewalk- more ice.”
- “Generally disagree – spreading.”

13. Single Family Neighborhoods

- “Good” (re: Single-family only)
- “If zoned SF or NCSF.”
- “Yes” (re: Area of Preservation...)
- “Yes in residential only open up other areas.” (re: Limited employee/workforce housing desirability).
- “Why limit employee workforce housing?? We should not encourage ‘employee housing ghettos’. Rather encourage integrated neighborhoods.”

- “Why limit affordable housing? It should be integrated here.”
- “Should recommend that Cottonwood has a lot of multi-family, Blair apartments, Elligwood, Manview, and approved townhomes. Please put in place design standards to avoid a repeat of Blair apartment.”
- “No need to limit lot consolidation. Variety of home size and types is good.”
- “Agreed.”
- “Generally agree – Thank God you are doing something right.”
- “Limit population if we wanted to be like Colo. we would move to Colo.”
- Policy 13.1: Retain Single Family Character... - “Good in theory but such limits will prevent the creation of much needed housing.”
- Policy 13.2: Avoid the Consolidation of Lots...
 - “Yes, yes, yes.”
 - “Agreed”
 - “Disagree, we should allow development through consolidation in these areas by limiting structures to be single family detached (slightly increase zoning).
 - “No”
 - “Eliminate PUD?”
 - “Agree!” “Agree.”
 - “Agree – see the claustrophobic development on east Kelly.”
 - “How many lots?” (re: large scale development).
 - “Agree with 13.2 – no large scale development in residential areas.”
- Policy 13.3: Encourage reinvestment... - “This would seem to contradict above statement. There needs to be some infill where old homes take up too much space.”
- Policy 13.4: Limit the maximum size of single family homes –
 - “Very good idea to limit size!”
 - “And institute energy premiums/fees based on home size for new/reconstruction.”
 - “Yes, limit size. Jackson does not need McMansions.”
 - “Yes, to size of homes allowed!”
 - “Yes, limit home size.”
 - “Yes on 13.4.”
 - “House size in NC-SF too big! Allow for (1) guesthouse/accessory/type units as part of main house.”
 - “There are several areas in town – especially on the west side – where the neighborhoods are becoming depressed. Rehab and reinvestment should be initiated to rejuvenate these areas.”
 - “Bravo!”
 - “Great idea! There is no need for such large houses!”
- Are policy recommendation provided above consistent...
 - “Yes!” “Generally, yes” “Yes” “Pretty much.”
 - “Give choices to property owners.”
 - “SR areas could go to higher density while maintaining strong neighborhoods – 15 – 25 du/ac.”