

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
11 Administration	<p>Administration:</p> <p>More detail needs to be provided on the frequency of amendments. The public cannot keep up with amendments that occur on a haphazard basis. Amendments should be reviewed on an annual basis. To repair the problem of haphazard and discretionary review of projects and amendments in the past, amendments should require a 4/5 vote of the appropriate jurisdictional body. This would keep amendments from eating a hole in the document.</p> <p>There should be a provision for public comment on amendments to occur at a time that is regular, convenient for the public, and disclosed to the public suitably in advance.</p>	Cathy Kehr	5/14/2009 14:48
11 Administration	<p>The community response to the proposed Comprehensive Plan [CP] has been uniformly one of disbelief and outrage, reactions that are well grounded as the CP has not been advanced in good faith. What should be a document of transparent communication has become, instead, one of co-opted equivocation.</p> <p>Behind the verbiage that "We listened to you", the reality of the draft CP is that it has become a case study in co-option by the undisclosed but indispensable parties of those who feed off the "growth for the sake of growth" machine and the mammonic power structure that finances them under the jurisprudential mandates of compounding usury. It has been deliberately formulated to ignore all the major concerns of the community such as minimizing future "growth", development, and commercialization, preserving scenic vistas and the ecology, and protecting wildlife habitat and migration corridors. And development in "nodes" rather than in more "open spaces", does not remedy these concerns, it exacerbates them. Furthermore, by advancing this agenda, the Planning Department [PD] that should provide a protective voice for the community has now become complicit in this co-option and a hostile witness.</p> <p>The relationship between the community, the PD, and the commissioners, is thus no longer communicative and responsive, but adversarial, and can only be remedied through the adoption of "Community Impact Analyses" [CIAs] as an integral part of both the CP and the Land Development Regulations [LDRs].</p> <p>What is a CIA? It can best be viewed as a "Community 'Bill of Rights'" against the conduct of vested interests and local government determined to advance development agendas that clearly contravene the community's intent. A CIA provides the community a formal place at the table of development applications and the creation of development plans by requiring that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) An arm of the PD formally represents the community's interests in one of the steps in the planning and application processes that currently focus only on the imperatives of the "growth machine."</li> <li>2) The PD's representation includes, but is not limited to, the identification and quantification of all cost and other externalities associated with any development plan or application.</li> <li>3) The PD ensures that those costs and other impacts are formally internalized and capitalized into development costs rather than being surreptitiously foisted onto the community as a whole through self-serving proposals, unchallenged analyses, and rising costs and taxes.</li> <li>4) Public concerns and comments are made part of a written public record requiring formal response rather than just being an abbreviated audio recording that is boxed away and ignored.</li> </ol> <p>In the same way that no legitimacy can attach to any adversarial legal proceeding that only recognizes the prosecution's evidence and permits no formal defense, the absence of a CIA in the development application and comprehensive planning processes similarly deprives these procedures of legitimacy. The CP must thus be recognized for it is — a co-opted framework to advance the undisclosed agendas of the development machine and the dictates of mammon and compounding usury that impel them.</p> <p>The CP, for example, supposedly embraces the concept of "Accountability" which is covered by an "Annual Review" of the Plan to elected officials only and a "report directly to the public" only "every 5 years". It does not even contemplate accountability for the impacts and externalities of individual applications on the community as a whole. On its face, therefore, the CP's gesture of "accountability" is presumptively disingenuous as it implicitly speaks to an accountability to the "growth machine" itself rather than the extent to which the planning process has protected and advanced community interests and intent. And the same can be said of the CP's equivocal use of the concept of sustainability" that needs to be supplanted with the idea of "regeneration". In other words, the language in the CP has intentionally side-stepped the community's protective intent in order to maintain the prerogatives for unbridled "growth".</p> <p>The initial draft of the Comprehensive Plan has also embraced the notion of a "Statement of Ideal" to describe a particular planning Theme". An "ideal", however, connotes some aspiration that is both elevated and worthy, but that is typically unattainable. In other words, an "ideal" is not a yardstick amenable to accountability, a concept grounded in reality and subject to verification.</p> <p>Adopting "Statements of Ideal" thus only serves to attenuate any meaningful community accountability on the part of the PD and commissioners, to wit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It provides no basis for verifying the PD's and commissioners' compliance with community intent;</li> <li>2) It provides a cover for developers and others feeding off the "growth machine" against community criticism and accountability and serves to conceal the continuing advancement of undisclosed development and mammonic agendas.</li> </ol>	Roger Elletson	5/18/2009 0:00
11 Administration	<p>3) And instead of requiring compliance with the CP, it uses equivocal language and contradictory assertions to allow the PD and elected officials to "Continuously improve upon the policies of the Comprehensive Plan" and thus effectively ignore the Plan at will.</p> <p>"Statements of Ideal" need to be replaced with "Statements of Community Accountability" that specifically delineate those elements and externalities of any theme, proposal or plan to which the community can hold the PD and commissioners accountable.</p> <p>In summary, as the CP recognizes, "it is essential that the community remains invested in the successful implementation of this Plan." And to make this community investment possible, CIAs need to become integral parts of the planning and development processes and included in both the CP and in the LDRs.</p>	Roger Elletson (cont.)	5/18/2009 0:00
11 Administration	<p>We totally agree with the following statements: "Where government and other organizations are falling short in the implementation of this Plan, the community will hold them accountable and take additional action as needed."</p> <p>"The collective input from all non-profits will be helpful in monitoring community perception of and satisfaction with this Plan." P.140</p>	Save Historic Jackson Hole	5/15/2009 15:52