

Public Comment on draft Character Districts (1:30 pm 2/3/12 - 5:00 pm 2/6/12)

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/6/2012	Creel, Margaret	Thank-you for all the work that you have put in over the last number of years to make sure that you come up with a comprehensive plan that speaks to the needs and wants of this community. It has been a long process, one that I have paid close attention to, and one that simply seems to be in constant flux.
	Interested Public	<p>Although I applaud you in your recent recognition of not increasing densities in the Aspens area, I strongly urge you to not add that density to other areas in Teton County, simply because you "have to put it somewhere". This is clearly not good planning. In particular, South Park in its entirety is not nor has it ever been the logical place to dump density although there are forces that are arguing to the contrary. As you move forward towards the conclusion and subsequent adoption of the new comprehensive plan, please uphold the map descriptions and delineations that affirm the scenic, wildlife, and ranching heritage values for all of South Park (District 10). In addition, do not even consider putting more density in the NW corner of South Park until infill in the town of Jackson has occurred. This alone could take years. As at least a half century of growth is already entitled here in Teton County, I would say it's a slippery slope to put together a plan that encourages more density and more development especially given our current economic climate. As much attention has been given to the fragmentation of South Park into the NW portion and other parts, let me be clear in stating that there needs to be significant clarification in the plan that ties any development in the NW portion of South Park to the permanent protection of the rest of South Park. Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period.</p> <p>To be quite honest, I do not support any kind of development in South Park. The recent deaths of moose along the Village Road has led to an outcry from many in the community. Why is it that the death of moose elicit more emotion than the death of deer, elk, coyotes, foxes, skunks, owls, hawks, mink and others? These are the animals that I have either seen killed or dead along High School Road, South Park Loop Road, and South Highway 89 over the years that I have lived in Rafter J. These animals are all using the corridors between the Snake River and the foothills to the West and East as well as moving both north and south in annual patterns. They do not understand delineations and designations. Although laudable that you are looking at the importance of the Flat Creek riparian area to wildlife, do not fail to recognize the importance of the larger land area of South Park and the habitat and food resources that it provides. I bet the wildlife that have no voice, will appreciate it.</p> <p>Again, thank-you for the time and effort you have put in towards coming up with a plan that speaks to the better good of this community in the future. Your attention to the importance of wildlife and their movements needs to continue to play a major role in what you decide as you move forward.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	Greger, Art Interested Public	<p>I am reading the Illustrating our Vision document on the comprehensive plan. What a beautiful picture of what I believe to be Phelps Lake. This illustrates very well what most people have indicated they want in this comprehensive plan... conservation. The nodes concept has been changed to complete neighborhoods, but the idea is the same. Growth in these areas has been consistently opposed - witness the opposition to growth in the Aspens just this week.</p> <p>I live in Rafter J and love the quality of life here; I oppose any development of South Park. It is probably the most scenic area that everyone sees coming into our tourist town. It needs to be preserved for its scenic and wildlife values as it is.</p> <p>I don't believe growth is really needed at this time. How long will the old Valley Feed sit empty? How long will the land west of Staples be for sale? How long will it take to sell the old Mojos, or the old Bubbas? How long will the new lots developed in Rafter J sit empty? When will the hole that is McCabe Corner turn into a swimming pool? How many people are trying to sell existing homes and can't? Infill and improvement are much more needed than more sprawl and area to be developed. A well developed line to the beginning of town exists at High School road, and should be preserved as such.</p> <p>I see in the plan increased connectivity with roads in the Rafter J area. This has been consistently opposed in the past (when the New Neighborhood was proposed) and will be opposed in the future, I am sure. No one I have ever talked to in Rafter J wants this. There is too much traffic here as it is.</p> <p>The process has been dragging on for years, and it is still uncertain how many homes, of what type, are going to be put in certain areas? A goal was predictability, and I don't see it. The comments made at the beginning of this process have been consistent, and should still be considered. Most working people don't have the time to follow this lengthy process, but their opposition to increased growth in South Park still stands.</p> <p>Please focus in conservation, infill of existing areas, and improving existing areas. Please conserve the beauty and character of South Park (and the whole valley for that matter) as it exists. Don't make South Park a dumping ground for unneeded and unwanted development.</p>
2/5/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	<p>I know you're hearing a lot these days - and I thank you for listening - but it's the same, familiar-by-now story that ordinary people have been trying to get across, since the early days of '08. Wildlife, wildlife crossings, neighborhood character, keeping rural places rural, and of course, my favorite, dumping of density, specifically into South Park.</p> <p>So, at the risk of redundancy, please uphold the map descriptions that affirm scenic, wildlife, wildlife crossings and rural heritage values of ALL of South Park. Also, any development in northwest South Park needs to be solidly linked to the large rural land stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Please, Please no dumping of density from places like Buffalo Valley or anywhere else into South Park. NO infill from town should be allowed anywhere until the town infill potential has been satisfied, nor any commercial in S.P. The people are just not into the rampant growth that could happen.</p> <p>Sorry to be a broken record here but these things are important and we've all slogged through 4 years of this comp plan revision process, to the tune of I've-forgotten-how-much public money. We've lived here 33-34 years, respectively, and have seen so many changes. Please, once again, listen to the common people and take these thoughts into consideration in your deliberations. At the moment we are out of the country and not able to attend meetings, but we have been to so many over the years, and are currently being kept up to speed via emails.</p> <p>Thank you again for taking the time to listen to 2 more residents of Teton County, and for considering what we've said.</p> <p>We look forward to resolving these issues soon, as we're sure you do as well.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2012	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	<p>We would like all of you to know that we very much appreciate the careful thought and intensive energy that has gone into revising the Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long, hard process, but the final drafts seem to be much improved from the originals.</p> <p>With specific regard to South Park:</p> <p>We are pleased with the maps that acknowledge the importance of special qualities in South Park (scenic, wildlife, and ranching). Please hold firm to these positives in the final draft of the Plan.</p> <p>We do not want growth in South Park beyond what is currently entitled, however we support the idea of clustered growth in South Park that is directly tied to permanent open space protection of other land WITHIN the South Park area.</p> <p>We are concerned about the types of development that may be proposed for the NW section of South Park, and feel that it should be appropriate for a location that is close to existing neighborhoods and schools. This would eliminate any industrial and some commercial activities.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our comments.</p>
2/3/2012	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	<p>As you (finally!) finalize the Comprehensive Plan revision, please do not give up on South Park and treat it as the County's unloved stepchild. It would be totally unfair to use South Park as the density dumping ground for more development that no other neighborhood wants either. A lot of us have been reluctantly willing to tolerate some limited additional density in the northwest corner of South Park, so long as it 1) was only used to preserve rural land elsewhere in South Park, and 2) was consistent with the density of the surrounding neighborhoods. But any such development should not precede development in town; otherwise, the whole goal of "Town as Heart" would be meaningless.</p> <p>When Leland Christiansen was a County Commissioner, he stated at a South Park public meeting that "this is the community's plan." Planning Commissioner Patricia Russell said essentially the same thing at a meeting last month. Over the last four years, the community has said over and over that they don't want more density added to the valley. We already have zoning enough to double the growth we have now; if this is really the community's plan, how can it identify more "spots" for additional density? The only people that would benefit from more growth are the few large landowners/developers that want to make money at the expense of everything else, including residents, wildlife, and ultimately the economy of Jackson Hole, which is so dependent on the quality of its environment – both natural and built.</p> <p>The proposed plan started out by offering up South Park as a sacrificial lamb to growth. Over the last four years, thanks to vigorous input from the community, and responsiveness from the electeds, it has been changed to be more responsive to preserving the qualities that make South Park a primary contributor to the overall special quality of Jackson Hole. We're almost there; please stay the course, preserve the character of South Park and in turn the valley as a whole.</p>

5: West Jackson

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Swope, Linda Interested Public	<p>You may remember the photo collage I sent you a few weeks ago - wildlife roaming through my yard in Melody Ranch... I have been pleased to see further progress made in the Comprehensive Plan to protect and value our truly unique resource. Thank you for listening to public input and acknowledging that our valley residents as a whole do treasure our wildlife.</p> <p>And for some of us in business here, we know that our clients are drawn here because the abundance is distinctive to Jackson Hole. The wildlife brings the families. The families book our services. We pay our taxes. Simple, really.</p> <p>And you know how we feel in South Park:</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>South Park is a VITAL area for wildlife migration into our valley and beyond! The historic ranch district is the gateway...</p> <p>The danger now is writing in more growth. I don't know one valley resident that wants MORE growth. Please keep your ear to the ground. That rumble is us, the taxpayers who you represent.</p> <p>Let's keep the progress we've made and know when to call it good.</p> <p>Thank you for your time!!</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/6/2012	Creel, Margaret Interested Public	<p>Thank-you for all the work that you have put in over the last number of years to make sure that you come up with a comprehensive plan that speaks to the needs and wants of this community. It has been a long process, one that I have paid close attention to, and one that simply seems to be in constant flux.</p> <p>Although I applaud you in your recent recognition of not increasing densities in the Aspens area, I strongly urge you to not add that density to other areas in Teton County, simply because you "have to put it somewhere". This is clearly not good planning. In particular, South Park in its entirety is not nor has it ever been the logical place to dump density although there are forces that are arguing to the contrary. As you move forward towards the conclusion and subsequent adoption of the new comprehensive plan, please uphold the map descriptions and delineations that affirm the scenic, wildlife, and ranching heritage values for all of South Park (District 10). In addition, do not even consider putting more density in the NW corner of South Park until infill in the town of Jackson has occurred. This alone could take years. As at least a half century of growth is already entitled here in Teton County, I would say it's a slippery slope to put together a plan that encourages more density and more development especially given our current economic climate. As much attention has been given to the fragmentation of South Park into the NW portion and other parts, let me be clear in stating that there needs to be significant clarification in the plan that ties any development in the NW portion of South Park to the permanent protection of the rest of South Park. Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands – period.</p> <p>To be quite honest, I do not support any kind of development in South Park. The recent deaths of moose along the Village Road has led to an outcry from many in the community. Why is it that the death of moose elicit more emotion than the death of deer, elk, coyotes, foxes, skunks, owls, hawks, mink and others? These are the animals that I have either seen killed or dead along High School Road, South Park Loop Road, and South Highway 89 over the years that I have lived in Rafter J. These animals are all using the corridors between the Snake River and the foothills to the West and East as well as moving both north and south in annual patterns. They do not understand delineations and designations. Although laudable that you are looking at the importance of the Flat Creek riparian area to wildlife, do not fail to recognize the importance of the larger land area of South Park and the habitat and food resources that it provides. I bet the wildlife that have no voice, will appreciate it.</p> <p>Again, thank-you for the time and effort you have put in towards coming up with a plan that speaks to the better good of this community in the future. Your attention to the importance of wildlife and their movements needs to continue to play a major role in what you decide as you move forward.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	Greger, Art Interested Public	<p>I am reading the Illustrating our Vision document on the comprehensive plan. What a beautiful picture of what I believe to be Phelps Lake. This illustrates very well what most people have indicated they want in this comprehensive plan... conservation. The nodes concept has been changed to complete neighborhoods, but the idea is the same. Growth in these areas has been consistently opposed - witness the opposition to growth in the Aspens just this week.</p> <p>I live in Rafter J and love the quality of life here; I oppose any development of South Park. It is probably the most scenic area that everyone sees coming into our tourist town. It needs to be preserved for its scenic and wildlife values as it is.</p> <p>I don't believe growth is really needed at this time. How long will the old Valley Feed sit empty? How long will the land west of Staples be for sale? How long will it take to sell the old Mojos, or the old Bubbas? How long will the new lots developed in Rafter J sit empty? When will the hole that is McCabe Corner turn into a swimming pool? How many people are trying to sell existing homes and can't? Infill and improvement are much more needed than more sprawl and area to be developed. A well developed line to the beginning of town exists at High School road, and should be preserved as such.</p> <p>I see in the plan increased connectivity with roads in the Rafter J area. This has been consistently opposed in the past (when the New Neighborhood was proposed) and will be opposed in the future, I am sure. No one I have ever talked to in Rafter J wants this. There is too much traffic here as it is.</p> <p>The process has been dragging on for years, and it is still uncertain how many homes, of what type, are going to be put in certain areas? A goal was predictability, and I don't see it. The comments made at the beginning of this process have been consistent, and should still be considered. Most working people don't have the time to follow this lengthy process, but their opposition to increased growth in South Park still stands.</p> <p>Please focus in conservation, infill of existing areas, and improving existing areas. Please conserve the beauty and character of South Park (and the whole valley for that matter) as it exists. Don't make South Park a dumping ground for unneeded and unwanted development.</p>
2/5/2012	McGregor, Bob and Kim Interested Public	<p>I know you're hearing a lot these days - and I thank you for listening - but it's the same, familiar-by-now story that ordinary people have been trying to get across, since the early days of '08. Wildlife, wildlife crossings, neighborhood character, keeping rural places rural, and of course, my favorite, dumping of density, specifically into South Park.</p> <p>So, at the risk of redundancy, please uphold the map descriptions that affirm scenic, wildlife, wildlife crossings and rural heritage values of ALL of South Park. Also, any development in northwest South Park needs to be solidly linked to the large rural land stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands. Please, Please no dumping of density from places like Buffalo Valley or anywhere else into South Park. NO infill from town should be allowed anywhere until the town infill potential has been satisfied, nor any commercial in S.P. The people are just not into the rampant growth that could happen.</p> <p>Sorry to be a broken record here but these things are important and we've all slogged through 4 years of this comp plan revision process, to the tune of I've-forgotten-how-much public money. We've lived here 33-34 years, respectively, and have seen so many changes. Please, once again, listen to the common people and take these thoughts into consideration in your deliberations. At the moment we are out of the country and not able to attend meetings, but we have been to so many over the years, and are currently being kept up to speed via emails.</p> <p>Thank you again for taking the time to listen to 2 more residents of Teton County, and for considering what we've said.</p> <p>We look forward to resolving these issues soon, as we're sure you do as well.</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/4/2012	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	<p>We would like all of you to know that we very much appreciate the careful thought and intensive energy that has gone into revising the Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long, hard process, but the final drafts seem to be much improved from the originals.</p> <p>With specific regard to South Park:</p> <p>We are pleased with the maps that acknowledge the importance of special qualities in South Park (scenic, wildlife, and ranching). Please hold firm to these positives in the final draft of the Plan.</p> <p>We do not want growth in South Park beyond what is currently entitled, however we support the idea of clustered growth in South Park that is directly tied to permanent open space protection of other land WITHIN the South Park area.</p> <p>We are concerned about the types of development that may be proposed for the NW section of South Park, and feel that it should be appropriate for a location that is close to existing neighborhoods and schools. This would eliminate any industrial and some commercial activities.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our comments.</p>
2/3/2012	Swope, Linda Interested Public	<p>You may remember the photo collage I sent you a few weeks ago - wildlife roaming through my yard in Melody Ranch... I have been pleased to see further progress made in the Comprehensive Plan to protect and value our truly unique resource. Thank you for listening to public input and acknowledging that our valley residents as a whole do treasure our wildlife.</p> <p>And for some of us in business here, we know that our clients are drawn here because the abundance is distinctive to Jackson Hole. The wildlife brings the families. The families book our services. We pay our taxes. Simple, really.</p> <p>And you know how we feel in South Park:</p> <p>Any development in Northwest South Park needs to be firmly linked to the large rural land owner stewards in South Park achieving permanent conservation of their lands . We do not want unwanted density dumped into South Park from Alta, Buffalo Valley or anywhere else in the valley. The language in NW South Park (sub-area 5.6) needs to be STRICTLY TIED to the minimum amount of growth needed in order to help our rural land owners achieve permanent conservation of their other South Park lands. Without this linkage – we do not support any additional density anywhere in our region – as we do not need any more development, and the sole reason for consideration of the NW corner is to achieve permanent conservation of these land owners other lands that dominate South Park. The NW corner of South Park should NOT be developed before the substantial in-fill potential in Town is completed. If some development in this NW corner is needed to permanently conserve South Park - then it should REFLECT the mix and density of housing of Cottonwood Park and NOT have any commercial, mixed use or light industrial in NW South Park.</p> <p>South Park is a VITAL area for wildlife migration into our valley and beyond! The historic ranch district is the gateway...</p> <p>The danger now is writing in more growth. I don't know one valley resident that wants MORE growth. Please keep your ear to the ground. That rumble is us, the taxpayers who you represent.</p> <p>Let's keep the progress we've made and know when to call it good.</p> <p>Thank you for your time!!</p>

10: South Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/3/2012	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	<p>As you (finally!) finalize the Comprehensive Plan revision, please do not give up on South Park and treat it as the County's unloved stepchild. It would be totally unfair to use South Park as the density dumping ground for more development that no other neighborhood wants either. A lot of us have been reluctantly willing to tolerate some limited additional density in the northwest corner of South Park, so long as it 1) was only used to preserve rural land elsewhere in South Park, and 2) was consistent with the density of the surrounding neighborhoods. But any such development should not precede development in town; otherwise, the whole goal of "Town as Heart" would be meaningless.</p> <p>When Leland Christiansen was a County Commissioner, he stated at a South Park public meeting that "this is the community's plan." Planning Commissioner Patricia Russell said essentially the same thing at a meeting last month. Over the last four years, the community has said over and over that they don't want more density added to the valley. We already have zoning enough to double the growth we have now; if this is really the community's plan, how can it identify more "spots" for additional density? The only people that would benefit from more growth are the few large landowners/developers that want to make money at the expense of everything else, including residents, wildlife, and ultimately the economy of Jackson Hole, which is so dependent on the quality of its environment – both natural and built.</p> <p>The proposed plan started out by offering up South Park as a sacrificial lamb to growth. Over the last four years, thanks to vigorous input from the community, and responsiveness from the electeds, it has been changed to be more responsive to preserving the qualities that make South Park a primary contributor to the overall special quality of Jackson Hole. We're almost there; please stay the course, preserve the character of South Park and in turn the valley as a whole.</p>

12: Aspens/Pines

Date	Name	Comment
2/6/2012	Strawbridge, Robert Interested Public	<p>Jackson Hole is what it is because men like Albright, Roosevelt , and Rockefeller had the vision that this place had a unique combination of natural assets which should be preserved. More growth is threatening to these assets. We are here because of these unique assets and the expansionists want to expand because of them. However, expansion will endanger the very assets which attracted the expansionists and ourselves in the first place.</p> <p>The plan to increase density in the Aspens is only one poor growth idea. Please oppose it.</p> <p>I urge you to vote against all schemes to increase population density in our valley.</p>
2/6/2012	Lyons, Fred and Dee Interested Public	<p>We have owned property in Jackson Hole since early 1970's, first in the Aspens then over 25 years in John Dodge and now are permanent (and voting) residents in Lake Creek Ranch. All of these locations involve travel on highway 390.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that planners and officials can think about, let alone initiate plans, to increase the density of homes and especially traffic in this area. One only has to travel on the highway to understand that additional traffic is not only undesirable but also risky to wildlife, the safety of persons and the character of the area.</p> <p>We do not want to simply transfer this problem to other areas of the valley. It is an extremely bad concept looking for a place to land. ALL of this valley is a special place and should NOT be subject to urbanized plans.</p>
2/5/2012	van Roijen, Bea Interested Public	<p>Please reconsider your decision to increase the density on Village Road. We do not want more housing along this corridor. Thanks for your attention.</p>
2/3/2012	Levy, Allison Interested Public	<p>I am reading the full page ad in Friday's Daily.</p> <p>I have to speak up because I have lived here for 25 years and fail to understand why county officials continue to think and act like real estate agents. Population has tripled since I moved here but the infrastructure to support that increase has not. Why do you continue to not think basic needs such as widening the roads such as 390 and 22 but instead push more building and concentrated populations. Don't you work with Wydot? I have no clue. But I don't get why you continue to allow building yet don't address increased traffic. There is more money in your virtual pockets to develop. We are busting at the seams. Can't anyone see that?</p> <p>The Aspens area is one of the last places to change the least. Put your egos aside and listen to the people. Traffic, wildlife, the RV's and Fireside resort already are a mess - then you are going to add construction workers and trucks to the equation.</p> <p>And isn't there enough for sale that you don't have to build more?</p> <p>I just don't get it.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. I know this won't make any difference but it helps get it off my chest how frustrated I am with how this town has grown. Its a bummer.</p>

Illustration of Our Vision

Date	Name	Comment
2/5/2012	Rockwell, Donald and L Interested Public	We share the concerns of neighborhood groups about your redo of the Comprehensive Plan for Jackson Hole. We implore you to KEEP JACKSON HOLE AND ITS NEIGHBORHOODS STABLE and to curtail the development of the Valley into a more urban community.
2/4/2012	Brooks, Susan Interested Public	Everything I read suggests that the city and county are in the pockets of the real estate and building businesses. A shame. I moved here from an upscale NJ suburb with NO open land. The real estate and building businesses did just fine because real estate was in demand and sold quickly and there was a big business in remodels, additions and tear downs. They did not try to tear down big houses and build condos. They respected the character and quality of the town. I suggest that you all do the same for this county and stop trying to make it into a city.
2/3/2012	Bocker, Carol and Dee Interested Public	Please take into serious consideration to resist a transition to this Valley and make it more urban. We have chose to live here because of its uniqueness; it truly is a special place. We came and stayed because of its open space and small town characteristics. We appreciate our wildlife and that they have room to live a natural life. Neighborhoods should not grow - if anything they should downsize. And as far as the tourists and the benefits from them, they too come because we have remained special and held our size. Please dump this re-doing of the Comprehensive Plan - it is fine the way it is and our Valley needs protection.
2/3/2012	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Thank you for your public service and hard work. Current events around the world, and especially in the Middle East today, are a reminder of how fortunate we are to live in a place where public participation is an expected part of the political process. Below are comments on the Comprehensive Plan Draft. A letter similar to the below was submitted to the New and Guide's editor for this week's paper. When the Aspens was delisted as a density target, Planning Commissioner Paul Duncker's response was "we need some other spots", referring to neighborhoods to which planners could ADD density. It appears the Comprehensive Plan process has become a game of whack-a-mole. Why? The community does not want additive growth nor do we have the funds to pay for the associated roads, sewers, law enforcement and other infrastructure costs, not to mention the costs that are off the books such as the degradation of our environment and loss of small town, rural character. There is already room for a doubling of both commercial and residential development in the pipeline, not to mention a backlog of unused commercial space and a glut in the residential housing market. Who could possibly benefit from adding additional entitlements? The concept of preserving wildlife habitat and open spaces by shifting actual density into already developed areas is constructive and I believe one the community supports. The key is to shift actual density potential, not simply add new density. Adding density accomplishes nothing but sprawl. Right now Middle and Southern South Park are on the maps as rural areas with important scenic and wildlife value to preserve by moving development rights from these areas into a corner of Northwest South Park. If this is done right (i.e. without bringing in growth from elsewhere in The County), permanent conservation can be achieved by clustering units into a residential neighborhood, consistent with Cottonwood Park, the adjacent neighborhood and, most importantly, without adding density. It is important to keep in mind that conservation is the driving force behind clustering neighborhoods, not adding density. No one wants added density of any sort and that includes phantom density. Please instruct the planners to throw out the density you intended for the Aspens. It has no community benefit.